



CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
6th Cycle Housing Element
2023-2031

November 2022 HCD Draft



CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW
**6th Cycle Housing Element
2023-2031**

July 2022 HCD Draft

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Organization of the Housing Element	3
Consistency with the General Plan	3
Public Participation	4
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF PRIOR HOUSING ELEMENT	17
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).....	18
Quantified Objectives.....	19
Progress in Implementing 2015 to 2023 Housing Element Programs	19
Effectiveness of the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element.....	19
Appropriateness of 5 th Cycle Programs for Inclusion in 6 th Cycle Housing Element Update	22
CHAPTER 3: HOUSING PLAN	25
Summary of Major Actions to be Continued in the Sixth Housing Element Cycle.....	25
Housing Goals and Policies	26
Housing Programs.....	29
CHAPTER 4: QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES	50
Construction	51
Rehabilitation	52
Conservation.....	52
APPENDIX A: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF 5TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS	53
APPENDIX B: HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT	64
Summary of Findings	65
Note on Data Sources.....	67
Population and Household Characteristics	68
Economic and Employment Characteristics.....	80
Housing Stock Characteristics	85
Housing Costs and Affordability	92
Housing and Special Needs Populations.....	107
Assessment of Fair Housing.....	124

Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors	216
APPENDIX C: PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS	219
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	220
Housing Needs for Extremely Low-Income Households	220
APPENDIX D: HOUSING CONSTRAINTS.....	222
Governmental Constraints.....	223
Non-Governmental Constraints.....	260
Environmental Constraints	263
APPENDIX E: HOUSING SITES ANALYSIS AND INVENTORY	266
Introduction	267
Sites Selection Process	270
Realistic Capacity Evaluation	277
Mixed-Use Areas.....	283
Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels	284
Sites Inventory.....	286
Evaluation of Sites Inventory Through the Lens of AFFH.....	315
Local Data and Knowledge.....	327
Summary of Conclusions and Approach to Policies and Programs	328
HCD Sites Inventory Spreadsheets	329
APPENDIX F: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT.....	336
APPENDIX G: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING VIOLATION CHECKLIST ...	364
APPENDIX H: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENTAL REQUIREMENTS	369

List of Tables

Table 1: Sixth Cycle Quantified Objectives for New Construction, Rehabilitation, and Conservation	52
Table 2: Population Growth Trends	68
Table 3: Household Growth Trends	69
Table 4: Population by Age, 2010-2019	69
Table 5: Tenure by Housing Type.....	72
Table 6: Household Income Level by Tenure	74
Table 7: Examples of Low Wage Occupations	75
Table 8: Housing Cost Burdens for Extremely Low Income Households, City of Mountain View	77
Table 9: Extremely Low-Income Households by Race and Ethnicity, City of Mountain View	78
Table 10: Housing Problems by Race and Ethnicity for ELI Households, Mountain View.....	79
Table 11: Housing Permitting	89
Table 12: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units	93
Table 13: Monthly Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units.....	95
Table 14: Market-Rate Multifamily Rent Summary, Q3 2021	96
Table 15: Inventory of Assisted Affordable Housing Units, 2021.....	105
Table 16: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion	106
Table 17: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age.....	114
Table 18: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence	115
Table 19: Point-In-Time Count, 2015-2019	116
Table 20: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness.....	119
Table 21: Mountain View Vehicles in Public Right-of-Way (PROW), 2017-2020.....	119
Table 22: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting Employment in Mountain View, 2019 .	121
Table 23: Migrant Worker Student Population	121
Table 24: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type, 2013-2020	125
Table 25: DFEH Fair Housing Complaints, 2018-2020	126
Table 26: Mountain View Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2000 - 2020	129
Table 27: Dissimilarity Index, Mountain View, 2010 and 2020	131
Table 28: Isolation Index, Mountain View, 2010 and 2020	132
Table 29: Household Income Distribution and Median Income, 2015-2019	162
Table 30: Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, City of Mountain View, 2015-2019	171
Table 31: Distribution of Homeowners by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View and San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	201
Table 32: Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View.....	203
Table 33: Severe Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View	203
Table 34: Housing Cost Burdens by Income Bracket and Tenure, City of Mountain View.....	214
Table 35: Regional Housing Needs Allocation	220
Table 36: Off-Street Parking Requirements.....	233
Table 37: Estimated Residential Development Impact Fees.....	239

Table 38: Base and Maximum FAR for Select Precise Plans.....	247
Table 39: Typical Processing Procedures by Project Type	250
Table 40: Recent Multi-family Developments in Mountain View	252
Table 41: Mountain View Mobile Home Parks.....	256
Table 42: Mountain View’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation	268
Table 43: Mountain View Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to 6th Cycle RHNA by Income.....	269
Table 44: Consolidated Sites	275
Table 45: Precedent Projects List.....	279
Table 46: Realistic Density Assumptions – Non-Rezoning	281
Table 47: Realistic Density Assumptions – Rezoning.....	282
Table 48: Affordability Assumptions.....	285
Table 49: Lower Income Units on Non-vacant Sites.....	285
Table 50: Sites Inventory Summary.....	286
Table 51: Non-Residential Previous Uses on Select Precedent and Pipeline Projects.....	289
Table 52: Capacity Discount on Multi-tenant Opportunity Sites.....	292
Table 53: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summary by Project Address	298
Table 54: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summarized by Neighborhood...	299
Table 55: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summarized by Precise Plan.....	299
Table 56: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summary by Address	302
Table 57: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summarized by Neighborhood.....	304
Table 58: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summarized by Precise Plan.....	305
Table 59: Pending Projects (Rezoning) Summarized by Project Address	306
Table 60: Status and Expected Timeline of Major Proposed Affordable Developments	307
Table 61: Opportunity Sites Summary by Neighborhood	311
Table 62: Opportunity Sites Summary by Precise Plan	311
Table 63: Rezoned Opportunity Site Summarized by Designation.....	313
Table 64: Accessory Dwelling Units Built in Prior Housing Element Cycle	314
Table 65: Accessory Dwelling Units Projected Over the Planning Period.....	315
Table 66: Distribution of the Sites Inventory by Block Group Racial and Ethnic Composition, Excluding the North Bayshore Area	317
Table 67: Distribution of the Sites Inventory by Census Tract Low- and Moderate-Income Composition, Excluding the North Bayshore Area	320
Table 68: Site Inventory Distribution of Low- and Moderate-Income Units, North Bayshore Area	321
Table 69: Site Inventory Distribution by TCAC/HUD Opportunity Area, Excluding the North Bayshore Area.....	324
Table 70: Site Inventory Distribution by Education Domain Score.....	326

List of Figures

Figure 1: Population by Race, 2000-2020.....	70
Figure 2: Household Tenure.....	71
Figure 3: Tenure by Housing Type	72
Figure 4: Households by Household Income Level.....	73
Figure 5: Resident Employment by Industry	80
Figure 6: Jobs in Mountain View	82
Figure 7: Ratio of Jobs to Workers, by Wage Group	83
Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio	84
Figure 9: Housing Units by Type, 2010-2020	86
Figure 10: Housing Units by Year Structure Built	87
Figure 11: Vacant Units by Type	88
Figure 12: Substandard Housing Issues	91
Figure 13: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)	92
Figure 14: Median Contract Rent	94
Figure 15: Cost Burden by Income Level	97
Figure 16: Cost Burden by Tenure.....	98
Figure 17: Cost Burden by Household Size.....	99
Figure 18: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level.....	100
Figure 19: Overcrowding by Severity	101
Figure 20: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity	102
Figure 21: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity.....	103
Figure 22: Household Size by Tenure.....	107
Figure 23: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms	108
Figure 24: Household Type	109
Figure 25: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status.....	110
Figure 26: Senior Households by Income and Tenure	111
Figure 27: Population by Disability Status	112
Figure 28: Disability by Type	113
Figure 29: Homelessness by Household Type & Shelter Status, Santa Clara County	117
Figure 30: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, Santa Clara County	118
Figure 31: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, Santa Clara County.....	122
Figure 32: Population with Limited English Proficiency	123
Figure 33: Census Block Groups by% Non-White, Mountain View	136
Figure 34: Census Block Groups by% Non-White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	137
Figure 35: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic White, Mountain View	138
Figure 36: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	139
Figure 37: Census Block Groups by% Hispanic or Latino, Mountain View.....	140

Figure 38: Census Block Groups by% Hispanic or Latino, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	141
Figure 39: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, Mountain View	142
Figure 40: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	143
Figure 41: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Asian, Mountain View	144
Figure 42: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Asian, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	145
Figure 43: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, Mountain View	146
Figure 44: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	147
Figure 45: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Native American, Mountain View	148
Figure 46: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Native American, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	149
Figure 47: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, Mountain View	150
Figure 48: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	151
Figure 49: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, Mountain View	152
Figure 50: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	153
Figure 51: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, Mountain View	155
Figure 52: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	156
Figure 53:% of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, Mountain View	158
Figure 54:% of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	159
Figure 55:% of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, Mountain View	160
Figure 56:% of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	161
Figure 57: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, Mountain View	164
Figure 58: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	165
Figure 59:% of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, Mountain View	166
Figure 60:% of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	167
Figure 61: Poverty Status by Census Tract, Mountain View.....	168
Figure 62: Poverty Status by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	169
Figure 63: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	170
Figure 64: Distribution of Non-Hispanic White Population by Median Income, City of Mountain View	173

Figure 65: Distribution of Non-Hispanic White Population by Median Income, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	174
Figure 66: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, Mountain View	176
Figure 67: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	177
Figure 68: School Boundaries Map for the Mountain View Whisman School District	178
Figure 69: Elementary School Boundaries Map for the Los Altos School District.....	179
Figure 70: Junior High School Boundaries Map for the Los Altos School District	180
Figure 71: Mountain View Whisman Elementary School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21	182
Figure 72: Los Altos Elementary School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21.....	183
Figure 73: Mountain View Middle/Junior High School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21	184
Figure 74: Mountain View High School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21	185
Figure 75: TCAC Education Domain Score, Mountain View	187
Figure 76: TCAC Education Domain Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	188
Figure 77: Jobs Proximity Index Score, Mountain View.....	190
Figure 78: Jobs Proximity Index Score, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	191
Figure 79: VTA System Map	193
Figure 80: Caltrain System Map	194
Figure 81: % of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in Mountain View	196
Figure 82: % of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	197
Figure 83: Areas of High Pollution in Mountain View	199
Figure 84: Areas of High Pollution in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	200
Figure 85: Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity in Mountain View, 2020.....	202
Figure 86: Overpayment by Renters, Mountain View	205
Figure 87: Overpayment by Homeowners, Mountain View	206
Figure 88: Overpayment by Renters, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	207
Figure 89: Overpayment by Homeowners, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.....	208
Figure 90: Overcrowded Households, Mountain View.....	210
Figure 91: Overcrowded Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	211
Figure 92: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, Santa Clara County.....	212
Figure 93: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, Santa Clara County ..	213
Figure 94: Housing Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View.....	215
Figure 95: Housing Sites Overview	295
Figure 96: Pipeline Projects	300
Figure 97: Summary of Opportunity Sites	312
Figure 98: Housing Sites by Share of Non-White Population.....	319
Figure 99: Housing Sites by Share of Low- and Moderate-Income Households.....	322
Figure 100: Housing Sites by TCAC Opportunity Score	325



CHAPTER

1

Introduction

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The City of Mountain View's Sixth Cycle Housing Element provides a policy framework and implementation plan for addressing housing needs in Mountain View over the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element planning period. The Housing Element is a required component of the City's General Plan and must be completed in accordance with requirements under State law and is also a reflection of local needs and priorities related to housing.

The City of Mountain View has a strong history of promoting the production and preservation of a range of housing types beyond the minimum requirements of State Housing Element Law. Mountain View's elected and appointed officials have a reputation for providing strong support for affordable housing development and the City regularly provides financial support for affordable housing projects. Many members of the community and local advocacy groups are also supportive of both market-rate and affordable housing production.

During the Fifth Housing Element Update Cycle, the City supported ambitious housing production and the creation and preservation of affordable housing, including the following:

- The City adopted rezonings to increase the City's total residential development capacity by over 20,000 units—60 percent of the number of existing residential units in Mountain View.
- The City has a long-standing inclusionary ordinance to ensure that new residential developments provide affordable housing in addition to market-rate units. During the Fifth Housing Element Update Cycle, Mountain View adopted updates to the ordinance to increase the number of inclusionary affordable units in a development, resulting in hundreds of new lower- and moderate-income units, while adopting a flexible alternative to on-site units that allows developers to accommodate the requirement in ways that advance City housing goals and exceed minimum affordability requirements.
- The City also developed partnerships with Santa Clara County and affordable housing developers to create hundreds of affordable units, including units for veterans, people with disabilities, families, and other special-needs populations.
- Through a 2016 voter-approved measure, the City established rent stabilization to protect renters from significant rent increases and in October of 2021, the City Council extended rent stabilization benefits to residents of mobile home parks.
- The City also adopted development impact fee exemptions for affordable housing and adopted modifications to the park land dedication fee to allow alternative compliance through Privately Owned, Publicly Accessible (POPA) open areas and create predictability and transparency by calculating the fee basis every year and setting the fee at the time of application submittal.
- To improve the development review process, the City began utilizing "EIR consistency checklists" in Precise Plan areas, a streamlined CEQA procedure that provides more legal protections than a categorical exemption at lower cost and in less time than an initial study.
- In addition, the City used SB35 ministerial streamlining for multiple affordable housing developments and prepared Density Bonus Guidelines to facilitate developer understanding

of this complex state law, which has reduced uncertainty and staff review times of density bonus projects.

Mountain View's Housing Element functions within the context of the broader San Francisco Bay Area and Silicon Valley setting, where a dynamic economy and robust job growth create strong demand for housing, while a constrained supply of land, high construction costs, and other factors constrain the supply of housing. This creates challenges for providing an adequate supply of housing that is accessible to all economic segments of the community.

Organization of the Housing Element

Following this introduction, the Housing Element includes the following major components:

Chapter 2: Review of Prior Housing Element. A review of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, including an analysis of the effectiveness and appropriateness of each program established for the previous housing element planning period.

Chapter 3: Housing Plan. A series of goals, policies, and programs to address the City's housing needs.

Chapter 4: Quantified Objectives. An estimate of the anticipated and potential housing development during the planning period, including units assisted through programs;

Appendices: A series of appendices containing background details and technical analysis are included at the end of this document. These include:

- A. Implementation Status of 5th Cycle Housing Element Programs
- B. Housing Needs Assessment
- C. Projected Housing Needs
- D. Housing Constraints
- E. Housing Sites Analysis and inventory
- F. Summary of Public Input
- G. City of Mountain View Multi-Family Housing Violation Checklist
- H. Economic Analysis of Governmental Constraints

Consistency with the General Plan

State Law requires that General Plan elements be “integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies.” This implies that all elements have equal legal status and no one element is subordinate to any other element. The Housing Element must be consistent with land use goals and policies set forth in the Land Use Element, and closely coordinated with the Mobility Element of the City's General Plan, among others. For the 2023-2031 planning period, the City will ensure consistency between the Housing Element and other General Plan Elements as outlined in Program 4.10 of the Housing Plan. Upon adoption of the Housing Element Update, the City of Mountain View

will review the other General Plan elements and identify and undertake any updates needed to achieve General Plan consistency.

Public Participation

The process for preparing the City of Mountain View 2023-2031 Housing Element Update included a multifaceted approach to obtain input from the general public, a broad range of stakeholders, and City decision makers. Community engagement opportunities included virtual community meetings, in-person pop-up events, focus groups, solicitation of feedback through a community feedback form, individualized presentations to various community groups, and public meetings with the City’s Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) and City Council. The City’s consultant team created a dedicated website for the Housing Element Update and the City also provided updates to the public via social media, and the “City Hall Connection” and “The View” newsletters. The outreach process for the Housing Element Update actively sought input from underrepresented groups. Efforts to make the outreach process inclusive included translation during meetings and translation of written materials to increase accessibility to members of the community with limited English proficiency. In addition, stakeholders that were targeted for focus groups included individuals that work with non-English-speaking populations, persons with disabilities, persons experiencing homelessness, and seniors. The outreach process also included a range of types of activities, including scheduled meetings and workshops, City staff attendance at community events to involve members of the public that might not attend a community meeting, and opportunities to provide extensive feedback online. Providing a wide variety of mechanisms for members of the public to provide input was a key focus in the outreach process, with an emphasis on reaching broad segments of the community. Input from the public participation process was incorporated into the housing needs assessment, assessment of fair housing, analysis of constraints on housing production, housing plan, and sites inventory portions of Mountain View’s 2023-2031 Housing Element Update.

Social Media

The City used social media to publicize information about the Housing Element Update, including information regarding opportunities for the public to provide input. Social media engagement included five Twitter posts, five Facebook posts, and three posts on Nextdoor between April 28, 2021 and March 7, 2022. City staff conducted Spanish-language outreach and outreach to the Latinx community by sharing information on WhatsApp platforms for several groups, including Embajadores Mountain View (62 members), 2021 Academia (18 members), Amigos de Listos (117 members), Padres de Mistral (170 members), Padres de Castro (56 members), and Anuncios Comunitarios (60 members). City staff used this outreach to encourage community members to attend meetings, identify other active groups to engage in the process, create a bridge between existing groups and the community at large, and build trust between the City and the community.

City Hall Connection Newsletter

City Hall Connection is a bimonthly e-newsletter that features updates about City of Mountain View events, news, and information, along with a local COVID-19 briefing. The City began publishing the e-newsletter in March 2021. City Hall Connection has approximately 3,880 current subscribers.

Seven editions of City Hall Connection included articles or upcoming meeting information related to the Housing Element Update between April 28, 2021 and December 22, 2021.

The View Newsletter

The View is Mountain View's semi-annual publication, which magazine provides news on major projects and plans and initiatives in the community with two editions – one edition for Fall/Winter and the other for Spring/Summer. *The View* is mailed to all residential addresses and businesses and Mountain View and is available online. Information about the Housing Element Update was included in both editions in 2021 and 2022 of *The View* newsletter.

Housing Element Website

At the outset of the Housing Element preparation process, the City's consultant team created a dedicated website for the Housing Element Update at mvhousingelement.org. The website has been continuously updated throughout the update process to provide the public with educational resources along with draft materials for public review. The website also provides information on opportunities for public engagement, allows the public to submit comments via an online comment form, and enables the public to sign up for emails to receive information about important events and other updates related to the Housing Element. The Housing Element website is available in 11 languages. As of March 24, 2022, the website had received 2,500 total visits and 1,700 unique visitors.

Stakeholder Focus Groups

In April and May 2021, the City's consultant team held a series of virtual focus groups with a broad range of stakeholders to obtain input on the Housing Element Update. The focus group sessions included a brief overview of the Housing Element process, followed by a guided discussion focused on encouraging stakeholders to provide thoughts on housing needs and priorities in Mountain View. Focus group attendees included affordable housing developers, market-rate housing developers, local service providers, major local employers, and members of community-centered organizations and local advocacy groups. In total, the consultant team held six focus group sessions with a total of 24 attendees. The consultant team and City staff also held individual follow-up calls with some stakeholders who were unable to attend the scheduled focus group dates.

Summary of Input Received from Affordable Housing Developers: Participants expressed appreciation that the Mountain View City Council supports affordable housing efforts and is willing to make a financial commitment to meet housing goals. Participants noted that the challenges related to residential development in Mountain View include multiple and conflicting development standards, poor coordination between City departments, a lack of streamlining of the entitlement process, a need for additional coordination between the City and County to align funding priorities, a need for more City staff to review projects, process requirements that tie the process for getting approval for funding to the process for getting entitlements, high land and construction costs, and community opposition due to concerns about overflow parking impacting existing residents.

Summary of Input Received from Market-Rate Housing Developers: Participants stated that Mountain View’s form-based zoning and precise plans with clear design and guidelines are helping to facilitate residential development in Mountain View. Challenges to development that were cited include land and construction costs, the cost of City fees, the City’s parking requirements and a lack of options for unbundling parking, the 25 percent BMR requirement for townhomes and rowhomes, and public opposition to higher-density projects. In addition, participants cited challenges with the approvals process, including the timeline for the approvals process, subjective criteria for approvals, and a lack of certainty in the process. Participants suggested that the City re-evaluate its parking policies, hire more staff, and add certainty and consistency to the design review process.

Summary of Input Received from Local Service Providers: Participants stated there is good communication between service providers and City staff and noted that the City has had successes in efforts to address homelessness, including a Homekey interim housing community and a partnership with the County to convert the Crestview Hotel to residential use. Participants also noted that there is an ongoing need to address the needs of individuals and families that are experiencing homelessness and those that may be at risk of homelessness, and that there are many families that are doubled up with multiple families in one home due to affordability issues. Participants also noted a need for more affordable housing, childcare services, and senior housing. In addition, participants stated that some individuals do not access benefits due to fear, shame or a lack of knowledge regarding eligibility. This group recommended that the City coordinate with Santa Clara County to finance affordable housing.

Summary of Input from Local Advocacy Groups: Participants stated that the City has done well in terms of supporting housing in general, additional density, and ADUs. Participants expressed support for several ongoing City policies and initiatives, including reviewing R3 development standards, the 25 percent BMR requirement for townhomes and rowhomes, commercial linkage fees for affordable housing, the City’s work on the Homekey project, safe RV parking, and the Crestview hotel project. Participants stated that there are needs for missing middle and workforce housing, three-bedroom apartments for families, universal design for an aging population, and mixed-use design for walkable neighborhoods. Recommendations from participants included supporting transitional, supportive, and permanent housing; mitigating displacement; conducting more outreach to renters facing displacement to make them aware of their right to relocation benefits; preserving deed-restricted units; educating the public about upzoning and addressing fear of change; adopting a local ordinance to extend SB 330 protections; and encouraging a mix of housing types.

Summary of Input from Community-Centered Organizations: Participants expressed support for several ongoing City policies and initiatives, including recent changes to strengthen the inclusionary ordinance, adoption of rent stabilization, and eviction defense funding enacted by the Rental Housing Committee (RHC). Participants also stated that there is a need for more affordable units, housing for vulnerable populations such as persons with disabilities and unhoused persons, and tenant education regarding tenant protections. Participants stated that many lower-income households are at risk of displacement. Participants recommended providing funding to rehabilitate multifamily rental units to prevent units from getting sold and redeveloped, City acquisition of vacant

homes and empty lots, increasing inclusionary requirements to 20 percent, streamlining the process for ADUs, providing more common space and high-density housing, streamlining the permitting process for ADUs, addressing needs among those living in semi-permanent housing and mobile homes, providing storage for unhoused populations, and providing more safe parking programs.

Summary of Input from Major Local Employers: Participants stated support for City efforts to address housing needs and concern over the ongoing regional housing affordability crisis. Participants reported that people continue to move further away from their jobs due to a mismatch between salaries and rents. Participants stated that the community needs workers at all income levels and that it is becoming more difficult to recruit and retain workers, especially for roles that require in-person collaboration as well as hospital and other essential service workers. However, some participants also noted that the Bay Area continues to have prestige and status that attracts people to the area and Silicon Valley continues to have a pool of labor that makes it attractive to tech companies. Participants noted Mountain View's CalTrain station as an amenity for commuting workers. Participants recommended more housing and higher densities, especially in the downtown area; expanding rent stabilization to new units; and improve public transit infrastructure, bike lanes, and pedestrian trails.

Farmer's Market Pop-up Events

On August 19, 2021 and September 2, 2021, City staff attended the Thursday Farmer's Market in downtown Mountain View to pass out event fliers, talk to residents who had questions about the Housing Element Update, and collect input from the public on housing issues and solutions. Approximately 20 people approached staff at each of the events. In part, the pop-ups were designed to allow the public to provide input in a casual setting without requiring attendance at a public meeting, with the goal of engaging community members that might not otherwise participate in the public process. The pop-ups also provided an in-person venue for the public to provide input despite the challenges associated with in-person community engagement events due to the Covid pandemic.

Summary of Input Received: Comments received including statements that Mountain View should find enough sites to accommodate five times the number of units called for in the RHNA allocation and that the site inventory needs to take the probability of development into account. Comments expressed support for eliminating parking requirements and setback requirements, lifting height restrictions, and significant increases in density. Commenters advocated for prioritizing renters, creating middle-income housing, and preventing displacement. At least one commenter felt that the R3 zone should allow for retail and office uses to create walkable spaces, while at least one commenter felt that the zoning in the R3 area should not be changed. The City also received questions about how the new housing will be served by parks, water, parking, and schools.

Individually Requested Group Meetings

During the Housing Element preparation process, City staff attended meetings held by various groups upon request to provide information on the Housing Element Update and encourage community members to participate in the process. City staff attended meetings held by Cafecito, the Mountain View Whisman School District English Language Advisory Committee (DELAC), the

Mountain View Chamber of Commerce Business Issues & Public Policy Committee, the Mountain View Solidarity Fund (i.e., Fondo de Solidaridad), and Livable Mountain View.

Summary of Input Received: Comments included concern over displacement due to the redevelopment of rental housing to construct townhomes and rowhomes. In addition, attendees noted that subsidized housing does not serve undocumented residents or those who are paid in cash, and that it can be difficult to qualify without a steady income. Commenters also expressed a need to translate information about the BMR program to Spanish and a lack of awareness among potential program participants about programs that are available to serve them. Comments also included statements about a mismatch between income levels and the type of affordable housing available, both because some residents make too much to qualify for subsidized housing but cannot afford market-rate housing, and because some residents are unable to afford subsidized housing. There were multiple comments about the complexities of the affordable housing application process and a need to make it more accessible. Comments also included a recommendation that parking reductions be tied to providing affordable housing in a project.

“Let’s Talk Housing Santa Clara County” Virtual Community Meeting

The Santa Clara County Collaborative hosted a series of virtual community meetings to involve residents and interested stakeholders across Santa Clara County. On August 30, 2021, the technical support team for the Collaborative, comprised of Baird + Driskell staff, facilitated this meeting for the cities of Sunnyvale, Milpitas, Santa Clara, and Mountain View. Attendees listened to a general presentation about the Housing Element process and then participated in city-specific breakout rooms. Approximately thirty participants joined the Mountain View breakout room. The event was presented in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Additional information about this event and the input received is provided in Appendix F.

Summary of Input Received: Participants expressed that they valued living in Mountain View and expressed appreciation of recent efforts the City has made to boost affordable housing. However, they recognized that there is a substantial imbalance between jobs and housing and that much more is needed. They also shared a desire for more walkable and connected neighborhoods, particularly in neighborhoods with more affordable housing options like rowhouses. Participants identified parking as an inefficient use of land that contributes to pollution and raises rental prices. They expressed the need for the City to preserve mobile homes, as they are one of the few remaining affordable housing options for many immigrant low-wage workers. Other housing challenges they recognized are the lack of housing options for older adults and young people, and the lack of options and services for people who are homeless. Participants pointed out that there often is not enough of an effort to engage young people in housing discussions and suggested the City focus on engaging them as well. Among ideas to address Mountain View’s housing challenges were: promoting affordable housing opportunities and removing barriers to apply for them, preservation of mobile home parks, a community or tenant opportunity to purchase program, a young adult housing program, and rezoning land for five times the City’s allocated RHNA number to build in a buffer since only 20 percent of the available sites were developed during the last RHNA cycle.

Virtual Community Workshop

On September 23, 2021, the City and consultant team held a virtual community workshop to provide general education on the Housing Element Update and obtain input on housing needs, as well as actions that the City can take to address unmet needs. The City initially planned to conduct a similar workshop in an in-person open house setting, but adjusted to a virtual format because of limitations on in-person gatherings due to the Covid pandemic. The workshop included an overview of the Housing Element process and requirements followed by guided small-group discussions in three breakout rooms, with live interpretation in Mandarin. The workshop was attended by 38 members of the public along with several City staff members and members of the consultant team. Both the English and Mandarin translations of the workshop were posted to the Housing Element webpage. Additional information about this event and the input received is provided in Appendix F.

Summary of Input Received: When asked about the most critical housing issues in Mountain View, some of the most common responses related to a need for more affordable housing and for more housing at all income levels; a desire to see new housing located near existing housing, jobs, and transit; improving the balance between housing and office space; concern over buildings with three or more stories adjacent to single-family homes, and reducing the time and costs to develop housing. When asked what Mountain View should do to address housing needs, responses included support for rezoning to allow higher densities, making it easier to develop on infill lots, reducing parking requirements or unbundling parking, and facilitating the production of non-traditional housing types. In addition, some participants emphasized a need for infrastructure such as roads, parks, sidewalks, transit connectivity, schools, and other services to accompany new housing and expressed concerns that new housing would create parking and traffic congestion issues. Some participants expressed concern about increases in density and stated a preference for limiting the pace of new development. When asked about desirable characteristics for housing in Mountain View over the next ten years, participants cited mitigation or elimination of homelessness; a diverse community; environmentally responsible development, and ensuring that employers pay for infrastructure, housing, transit, and other public services.

Community Feedback Form

From September 23, 2021 through January 2, 2022, the City collected feedback through an online Community Feedback Form, which asked the public to provide input on critical housing issues and actions that the City can take to address these issues. The feedback form was available in English, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese. The online feedback form was made available on the project website and the survey link was shared at community events (e.g., Monster Bash, Tree Lighting), via social media and community chat groups, published in City publications, and sent to stakeholders and interested parties who signed up for project notifications. A total of 343 responses were received in English, Russian, Spanish, and Chinese. The results from the Community Feedback Form are provided in Appendix F.

Summary of Input Received: The most common responses to the Community Feedback form identified Mountain View's most critical housing issues to be not enough housing for low-income and middle-income households, not enough housing for unhoused people, and not enough new housing

development, though several other items were identified as critical issues (see Appendix F). Respondents favored rezoning to allow redevelopment from non-residential to residential uses, rezoning to allow more homes in existing residential areas, and streamlining the City approvals process, along with other actions, to support housing construction. To make housing more affordable, respondents favored providing more funding for affordable housing projects and increasing inclusionary requirements. To provide more housing for residents with special needs, respondents favored requiring more units to include accessibility features and working with housing providers to create more housing for people who are experiencing homelessness. To protect existing residents, respondents favored providing housing for people who are displaced from their homes due to demolition, strengthening protections for mobile home park residents, and strengthening protections for renters. Overall, most responses favored policies that would facilitate the production of affordable housing and housing for populations with special needs, though some respondents stated a preference for limiting growth.

City Council and Environmental Planning Commission Study Sessions

The City of Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) addressed the Housing Element Update during study sessions on October 20, 2021; February 16, 2022; May 18, 2022; and November 16, 2022. The Mountain View City Council addressed the Housing Element Update during study sessions held on November 16, 2021; March 8, 2022; June 14, 2022; and December 13, 2022. During the City Council and EPC study sessions, City staff and the consultant team provided information on the Housing Element Update process and requirements, presented draft goals and policies, and discussed the draft Housing Element. City staff and the consultant team responded to questions and received feedback and direction from the City Council and EPC. The City Council and EPC study sessions also provided an opportunity for the general public to comment on the Housing Element Update. City Council and EPC meetings were held in a virtual format due to Covid restrictions.

Summary of Input Received: The following list provides a summary of public comments provided to the City Council and EPC prior to the release of the public review draft of the Housing Element Update. Comments received during the 38-day public review period for the public review draft are provided in the following subsection. Prior to release of the draft Housing Element Update to the public, comments received during City Council and EPC meetings and in letters to the City Council and EPC prior to meetings generally covered the following topics:

- Support for additional density and construction of additional residential units (both affordable and market rate)
- Consider affordable housing opportunities Citywide, such as in neighborhoods around downtown or other commercial areas (e.g., CN, CO Zones).
- Concerns about using the R3 Zoning Update to meet RHNA due to:
 - Development standards inconsistent with neighborhood scale;
 - Increase of affordable versus market-rate housing imbalance; and
 - Increase of displaced residents and loss of CSFRA-covered units.
- Concerns about housing affordability and displacement
- Focus RHNA sites in precise plan areas.

- Reexamine fees (e.g., park fees).
- Encourage preservation of naturally affordable housing (possibly through R3 Zoning Update).
- Consider sites near amenities like parks and transit.
- Support streamlined process to provide predictability, to shorten timelines, and to reduce the overall costs for both developers and residents.
- Increase City staffing to shorten the entitlement process.
- Conduct more outreach to Mountain View residents from different segments of the community to get meaningful input.
- Reduce or eliminate parking requirements, impose parking maximums, and unbundle parking.
- Focus on a strategic approach to funding affordable housing.
- Develop a local no-net-loss policy for rent-controlled units.
- Expand the Eviction Protection Program.
- Invest in community-owned housing, e.g., community land trust or tenant/community option to purchase act (TOPA/COPA).
- Create a portal for residents to find and apply for all affordable housing units in Mountain View.
- Expand safe parking and rapid re-housing support.
- Increase protections for COVID impacts and enact special housing protections for essential workers.
- Enact protections against special offers to fill a vacancy that leads to future rent increases in excess of increases allowed under the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance.
- Enhance the ADU program with design, permitting, and financing assistance.
- Consider unique programs for longer leases on transitional/supportive housing.
- Concerns that the draft site inventory was insufficient in producing enough affordable housing; did not include any rezonings, thus maintaining status quo.
- Rezone to accommodate more units than needed to meet the RHNA.
- Concerns that the site inventory relies too heavily on the North Bayshore and East Whisman plan areas.
- Requests that the site inventory include sites south of El Camino Real to affirmatively further fair housing.
- Concerns that specific sites in the draft site inventory could not realistically be developed with residential units during the planning period.
- Support Pro-Housing Designation application but should not drive housing policy.
- Do not rezone for more units than necessary.
- Do not reduce parking requirements or developer fees.
- Ensure that infrastructure and public services (e.g., schools, roads, water, parks, retail, bike/pedestrian improvements) can support growth.
- Concerns about the possibility that the Mountain View Whisman School District might establish a Community Facilities District that could increase the cost of housing.

[Please Note: this draft is being completed in advance of the November 16, 2022 Environmental Planning Commission study session and the December 13, 2022 City County study session.

Additional comments received during these upcoming meetings will be considered and included before adopting the Housing Element Update.]

36-Day Public Review Period

On May 9, 2022, the City published the draft Housing Element Update for public review on the project website (www.MVHousingElement.org). In addition to the full English language version, the City published the Housing Plan chapter of the document translated into both Spanish and Chinese. The public comment period ran through June 14, 2022, which was the date of the City Council study session on the draft Housing Element. During the public comment period, comments were submitted in writing to the EPC and City Council in advance of study sessions on May 18, 2022 and June 14, 2022. Public comments were also provided during each study session. Comments received during the public comment period covered a range of topics, and included:

Comments regarding missing or inadequate analysis on specific topics included comments on the lack of an analysis of the Los Altos School District in the Access to Education section, inadequate analysis of the impact of cumulative fees as a potential governmental constraint, inadequate analysis of the impact of development review times, and inadequate reporting on the input from the public participation process and how this input informed the Housing Element Update.

Comments on the sites inventory included that the assumptions regarding the redevelopment of sites are unrealistic (e.g., opportunity sites generally and land dedications in North Bayshore and East Whisman specifically), and that the sites inventory does not have enough sites south of El Camino Real. Comments also included requests for inclusion of specific sites and removal of other sites from the sites inventory.

General comments on the goals, policies, and programs included comments that the programs are too vague, include noncommittal language, and lacked specific actions and timelines.

Comments related to development standards included suggestions to reduce parking requirements or unbundle parking, permit emergency shelters in more zones, rezone to allow additional density, exclude parking from FAR calculations, and remove the one-acre minimum site size from the R4 zoning guidelines.

Comments related to the development review and approvals process included suggestions that the City implement additional actions to streamline development and reduce permitting times. Many of these comments focused the findings and recommendations from a study that the City recently conducted to identify process improvements in the development review and approvals process (i.e., the Matrix Study). Recommended actions also included reducing discretionary review processes, improving clarity of requirements, providing support for innovative construction practices, and prioritizing processing for affordable housing projects.

Comments related to development fees and the cost of City requirements included suggestions to reduce City fees for residential development, many of which focused on reducing park land

fees. Conversely, some comments also requested that the City not reduce park land fees to ensure that new development pays for the need for new parks. Some comments also cited the potential CFD for the Mountain View Whisman School District as a constraint. Comments also included recommendations that the City ensure that the inclusionary ordinance maximize affordable unit production while avoiding discouraging new residential construction.

Comments related to displacement included suggestions that the City add additional programs to mitigate displacement, such as a COPA or TOPA, a local ordinance to extend provisions of SB 330, a no net loss policy for rent controlled units, an expansion of the Eviction Protection Program, an increase in relocation assistance, additional protections for residents impacted by Covid, special protections for essential workers, protections against misrepresentation of special offers to fill a vacancy, additional education regarding tenant rights, and a moratorium on rent increases. Comments also included suggestions to apply displacement mitigation measures such as a COPA or TOPA to mobile home residents in addition to other residents.

Comments related to affordable housing funding included suggestions that the City adopt a real estate transfer tax to support subsidized housing.

Comments related to services and public improvements to accompany residential growth included suggestions that new residential development be accompanied by parks, roads, schools, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and other infrastructure. In addition, some comments requested that the City preserve existing local-serving commercial uses in the Village Centers. Other comments included suggestions related to incorporating the natural environment into new development and preserving trees, enhancing highway vegetation barriers, and other suggestions related to the environmental impacts of new residential development.

Comments related to jobs/housing imbalance included suggestions that the City increase the Housing Impact Fee or tie approvals for the construction of new office development to the production of housing.

Other comments related to programs included suggestions to add additional safe parking sites, create a citywide portal for finding and applying for affordable housing, support Community Land Trusts and Community Development Corporations, provide financial assistance to homeowners constructing ADUs/JADUs, and support SB 9 lot-splits.

HCD Review Period

The City of Mountain View submitted the draft Housing Element Update to HCD for HCD's 90-day review on July 1st, 2022. The draft that was submitted to HCD incorporated significant edits to respond to comments from the public that were received during the 36-day review period described above. HCD received comments from the public on the draft Housing Element Update, which HCD provided to City staff at the end of the 90-day review period. Many of the comments from the public that were submitted to HCD were submitted prior to the HCD review period, including letters that were submitted prior to the release of the first public review draft of the Housing Element Update

and during the 36-day public review period for the Housing Element Update. Most of these letters were also submitted directly to the City of Mountain View prior to or during the 36-day public review period, and therefore many of these comments are captured in the subsections above and helped to inform the draft Housing Element that was submitted to HCD on July 1st, 2022. In addition to comments sent to HCD, the City of Mountain View received comments from the public during the 90-day review period. Comments received by HCD and the City covered a range of topics and included:

Comments related to the site inventory included statements that that the number of units that will be built on Housing Element sites will be lower than projected in the site inventory, that approved and pending projects will not be constructed during the planning period, and that the site inventory did not adequately address AFFH considerations. Other comments requested that the City not add more sites and expressed concern that the Housing Element plans for too much housing. In addition, some comments expressed concern that redevelopment in Village Centers would result in a loss of retail space and requested that the City ensure that retail space in the Village Centers is retained or replaced.

Comments related to the programs included requests for new or modified programs to:

- Incentivize ADU production
- Address constraints to residential development
- Streamline the development approvals process and improve transparency of requirements
- Reduce parking requirements, require unbundled parking, and implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce development costs
- Prevent displacement
- Address needs among unhoused populations, including addressing housing needs among RV and car dwellers, removing restrictions on RV parking, and expanding rapid re-housing assistance
- Improve protections for mobile home park residents
- Add a local density bonus program
- Provide a single portal for applying to affordable housing units
- Preserve neighborhood commercial spaces to maintain walkability and livability

Incorporation of Input into the Housing Element Update

Mountain View's Housing Element Update includes programs and analysis that respond to many of the issues that were raised during the public outreach process. Much of the data in the Housing Needs Assessment, including the Assessment of Fair Housing, is consistent with input received during the public engagement process that highlighted high housing costs and displacement risk as critical housing issues in Mountain View, as well as the disproportionate impact that these issues have on people of color, seniors, people with disabilities, and other special-needs groups. The Housing Element responds to these needs through programs that will facilitate the production of affordable housing, including Programs 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, as well as programs that will mitigate displacement, including Programs 1.5, 1.12, 3.1, 3.2,

4.2, and 4.4. In addition, Programs 4.2, 4.3, and 4.6 address the impacts that the jobs-housing imbalance has on housing costs.

In addition, the Housing Element includes several programs that will mitigate constraints on housing production that were identified through the public participation process. These include but are not limited to Program 1.2, which will reduce parking requirements for 100% affordable projects, Program 1.3, which includes various actions to address potential constraints related to development standards, Program 1.8, which will revise the park land dedication requirements, Program 1.9, which will assess the City's BMR housing requirements, and Program 4.1, which will streamline the approvals process. It should be noted that public comments related to each of these items were somewhat mixed. For example, while some commenters advocated for reducing parking requirements, others stressed the importance of maintaining parking standards. In addition, many comments cited park land dedication requirements as a constraint to development, while others stressed the importance of ensuring that new development is accompanied by parks to serve new residents. Similarly, while some comments cited the City's inclusionary requirements as a potential constraint, others noted its importance in generating affordable housing units in Mountain View or advocated for increasing the inclusionary requirements.

The sites inventory portion of the Housing Element Update also responds to input received during the public engagement process. Some specific sites were removed from the inventory in response to input from property owners and the general public that redevelopment was unlikely on those sites. The City is undertaking a voluntary rezoning effort concurrent with the Housing Element Update to increase the capacity in the sites inventory and include additional sites throughout the City, including south of El Camino Real, even though the inventory can reasonably achieve the RHNA without these rezonings. While there are still fewer sites south of El Camino Real compared to the remainder of the City, the site inventory identifies all sites south of El Camino Real with a reasonable likelihood of generating affordable units consistent with HCD guidance regarding likelihood and viability of redevelopment with affordable units. In addition, the Housing Element identifies additional programs to further increase the potential of affordable unit production south of El Camino Real, which are not reflected in the inventory. These programs include Program 1.4, which will allow affordable multifamily housing in the R1 district when constructed in conjunction with non-profit religious and community assembly uses on large sites, and Programs 1.6, 1.7, and 2.2, which will facilitate ADU production and SB9 projects.

Following the 36-day public review period, the Housing Element Update was edited to respond to many of the key comments that were received during the public review period. Additional analysis was included to provide an assessment of the Los Altos School District in terms of providing access to education. The Housing Constraints appendix was revised to include additional analysis on the cumulative impact of development fees, the cumulative impact of development standards, and the impact of permit processing procedures. Information was added throughout the document to provide additional information on the input received through the public engagement process and how that input relates to the programs, sites, and analysis that is provided in the Housing Element. In addition, sites that were found to be unlikely to be developed with residential uses were removed

from the sites inventory. Most of the programs in the Housing Element Update were also revised to provide more specificity and more clear timelines and objectives.

In addition, substantial edits were made to the Housing Element Update following receipt of HCD's comments on the draft, many of which respond to comments received from the public during HCD's 90-day review period as well as during earlier phases of the public participation process. Key changes that relate to input received during the public participation process include:

- Changes to the site inventory, including additional analysis of non-vacant sites, additional analysis regarding pipeline projects to demonstrate that pending projects in the inventory are anticipated to be completed during the planning period, and reductions in the estimated capacity for some sites.
- Added analysis regarding racial and ethnic differences between schools and disparities in education scores, including connecting the findings from the analysis to the site inventory and Housing Element programs.
- Added analysis related to the AFFH implications of the sites inventory and strengthened programs to facilitate housing development in high-opportunity areas and areas where non-White populations and lower-income households are currently underrepresented.
- Added analysis of fees and development standards and strengthened programs that address potential constraints related to fees and development standards.
- Revised programs to better facilitate ADU production (1.7 and 2.2), including adding a pilot ADU and SB9 financial incentives program (2.2).
- Added new programs and revised existing programs that address constraints related to development standards, City fees, and the development approvals process (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, and 4.1), including adding new programs and adding more meaningful and concrete objectives, metrics, and timeframes to existing programs. These changes include the addition of programs to reduce parking for affordable housing projects (1.2), update development standards to ensure the projects can meet allowed densities, refine other polices including Heritage tree preservation and Public Works requirements, and adopt a TDM ordinance that will allow for reduced parking for projects that implement TDM (1.3).
- Enhanced the objectives, metrics, and milestones for programs that address the needs of unhoused populations (2.1 and 3.1).
- Enhanced programs to prevent displacement (1.5, 1.12, 3.2), including adding more meaningful and concrete objectives, metrics, and timeframes and including mobile homes in displacement prevention programs.
- Strengthened Program 2.4 to make the affordable housing application process more inclusive and equitable.
- Added new programs and strengthened existing programs to address housing needs among people with disabilities, including those with developmental disabilities (1.1, 2.1, and 2.3)



CHAPTER

2

Review of Prior Housing Element

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF PRIOR HOUSING ELEMENT

The City of Mountain View adopted its 5th Cycle Housing Element for the 2015 to 2023 time period on October 14, 2014. The 2015-2023 Housing Element was built around seven goals, as follows:

Goal 1: Support the production of new housing units serving a broad range of household types and incomes.

Goal 2: Provide assistance to households at different income levels to address their housing needs.

Goal 3: Conserve and improve Mountain View’s housing stock.

Goal 4: Address, remove, or mitigate constraints to housing production.

Goal 5: Support fair and equal housing opportunities for all segments of the community.

Goal 6: Promote environmentally sensitive and energy-efficient residential development, remodeling, and rehabilitation.

Goal 7: Maintain an updated Housing Element that is monitored, reviewed, and effectively implemented.

Each goal had a set of supporting policies and corresponding implementation programs.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

In addition to reflecting local needs and priorities, the 2015-2023 Housing Element also incorporated the City’s 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), which identified the number of new housing units for which the City was required to provide sufficient sites for construction. The City’s 5th Cycle RHNA was as follows:

Income Category	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Number of Units	814	492	527	1,093	2,926

Quantified Objectives

Considering its available resources and the constraints in the local housing market, the City of Mountain View established the following quantified objectives for the construction, rehabilitation, and conservation/preservation of housing units for the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element:

Income Category	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Construction	75	175	20	45	1,000	1,315
Rehabilitation	60	360	50	0	0	470
Conservation	0	809	497	0	0	1,306

Progress in Implementing 2015 to 2023 Housing Element Programs

The City of Mountain View has made good progress in implementing its programs from the 5th Cycle Housing Element. Appendix A contains a summary of the implementation status of each of the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element's implementation programs, as reported in the City's 2021 Annual Progress Report to the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

Effectiveness of the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element

Overall, the 2015 to 2023 Housing Element was effective in guiding achievement of the City of Mountain View's housing goals and objectives. In particular, the City issued building permits for 4,270 housing units between 2015 and 2021, exceeding not only the total unit count for its quantified objective for new construction (1,315 total units) but also exceeding its overall RHNA (2,926 total units). Following is a breakdown of units permitted between 2015 and 2021:

Income Category	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Construction Permits	72	146	196	18	4,060	4,492
% of RHNA Permitted	26.8%		39.8%	3.4%	371%	N/A

Considering below market rate units already permitted and units in the housing development pipeline, the City will likely meet or exceed its quantified construction objectives for all income categories. As of March 2022, a total of 2,712 net new residential units had recently been approved but were not yet under construction and 2,072 net new units were under entitlement review.

Although the effectiveness of the Housing Element is not solely judged by housing production in relation to the City's RHNA numbers, it is instructive to see that while the City has issued permits for above moderate-income units that were 371.0% of its RHNA for that income category through 2021, the number of permits issued for the other income categories is still significantly below the RHNA numbers. The City has issued permits for very low-income units that is 26.8% of its RHNA, permits

for low-income units that are 39.8% of its RHNA, and permits for moderate-income units that are just 3.4% of its RHNA. The overall production numbers reflect the strong demand for housing in Mountain View and the City’s ability to work with the developer community to deliver new housing units in response to that demand. At the same time, the fact that the permit activity for above moderate-income units (i.e., market rate units) exceeds the RHNA targets and the permit activity for housing units serving moderate incomes and below (i.e., below market rate units) reflects the limited resources available to develop subsidized housing that can meet the needs of moderate- and lower-income households and the fact that the market does not produce affordable housing on its own. As a result, cities are forced to create programs such as fee programs (which generate revenues for the City to finance affordable housing) or BMR programs (which require developers to include affordable housing in their projects). It is notable, but not surprising, that the City has made the least progress on production relative to its RHNA for moderate-income housing, since there are few sources of subsidy for moderate-income housing. Most state, federal, and regional subsidy programs target households at or below the low-income level, and the market price for newly developed units for sale or rent in Mountain View generally is not low enough to be considered affordable to moderate income households.

Progress in Rehabilitation

For housing rehabilitation, the City has also been successful in using federal CDBG and HOME funding to help rehabilitate Tyrella Gardens, Shorebreeze, The Fountains, Ginzton Terrace, and a major rehabilitation of the Sierra Vista I family apartments. In total, these projects include 314 very low-income units and 107 low-income units.

Income Category	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Rehabilitation	0	314	107	0	0	421

Progress in Preserving Affordable Units

Since the City has not had to act to assist in the preservation of any subsidized housing units that were at-risk of converting to market rates in the 2015 to 2023 planning period, no such conversions occurred during the planning period. Furthermore, the City took steps to protect many households by enacting the Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act (CSFRA), which was approved by local voters on November 8, 2016, and the Mobilehome Rent Stabilization Ordinance (MHRSO), which the City Council enacted on September 28, 2021. Prior to the implementation of the State Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (SB 330; Government Code section 66300), several buildings with rent stabilized units were demolished and replaced with fewer units, mostly for sale units at market rate prices, creating challenges for preserving CSFRA units in Mountain View. Some affordable housing advocates that participated in the initial phases of the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update recommended that the City extend the provisions of SB 330 past its initial expiration date of 2025 by adopting a comparable local ordinance. SB 330 has since been extended by the State until January 1, 2030. In addition, the City continues to regulate the conversion of multifamily rental units to condominiums and also updated its Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance (TRAO) to expand

assistance to tenants who have household incomes up to \$5,000 above 120% of area median income, to expand the types of properties that must comply with the TRA0, and to include First Right of Return benefits to displaced residents. The City has passed the Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance in 2021. In 2022, the TRA0 was modified again to extend the protections to mobile home tenants.

Effectiveness in Meeting the Housing Needs of Special Needs Populations

During the 2015-2023 Housing Element period, the City of Mountain View was successful in implementing multiple Housing Element programs to address housing needs among special needs households.

In 2013, the City Council approved a development for 27 studios for persons with developmental disabilities at 1585 West El Camino Real, which is located on a high-frequency transit route. This project completed construction in September 2015. Palo Alto Housing also received a funding appropriation in the amount of \$8 million to develop 67 studio units, a portion of which are reserved for veterans, at 1701 West El Camino Real. In 2019, the City approved 950 W El Camino, a 71-unit project that will provide 15 units for developmentally disabled adults. The City also expects several pipeline projects with set-asides for permanent supportive housing to provide units for special needs populations.

The City of Mountain View is an active participant in the creation of new transitional and supportive housing facilities to address homelessness, through regional collaboration and cooperation with nonprofit agencies, housing developers, and other jurisdictions. Throughout the 2015-2023 planning period, City staff attended quarterly meetings held by the CDBG Coordinators group in addition to meetings with nonprofit agencies and developers to identify possible projects that could be implemented in future years. The City currently supports, and will continue to provide oversight for, two transitional homes located within the City: (1) Alice Avenue Transitional Home, which serves up to five formerly homeless persons; and (2) Quetzal House, a local youth shelter and transitional home operated by the Bill Wilson Center that serves about 40 to 50 homeless youth annually. In an effort to further help end chronic homelessness, the City has funded the San Antonio Place Efficiency Studios that include 10 units for persons transitioning out of homelessness. The City continues to look for opportunities to fund supportive housing units within the City in new affordable developments. As part of the City's comprehensive response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City Council approved over \$3.8 million composed of various funding sources for the City's COVID-19 rent relief program, administered by Community Services Agency (CSA). In 2022, the City entered into an agreement with the County to leverage \$80 million in County 2016 Measure A funds for various housing sites with permanent supportive and rapid rehousing units in the City, for up to 200 units.

In 2020, the City applied with LifeMoves to the State Project HomeKey Program to rapidly deploy modular units to provide interim housing for unhoused seniors and families who may be particularly vulnerable to COVID-19. The project was awarded \$11.95 million in capital funds and \$2.4 million in operating funds. In 2021, Mountain View City Council reserved CDBG and HOME funds to support the conversion of the Crestview Hotel into permanent housing, largely for families and individuals at

risk of homelessness or experiencing homelessness. The City also supported the County's application for state funds for this project. The hotel conversion will make it possible to make units available more quickly and affordably.

In 2019, Council adopted a safe parking ordinance that establishes health and safety guidelines for safe parking facilities in the City. In 2020, the City opened two public parking lots as safe parking sites and financially supported operations at a third safe parking site.

The City has also supported the production of affordable housing for large family households. In 2018, MidPen Housing received entitlements for to add an additional 50 affordable units, ranging from studios to three-bedroom units, on the project site located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard. ROEM Development Corporation included 45 two-bedroom and 15 three-bedroom units for its Evelyn Family Apartments located at 779 East Evelyn Avenue, which opened early 2019. Several of the housing developments in the City's development pipeline include units for large households.

Mountain View's housing stock also includes a number of options for senior households. There are 16 small assisted facilities for seniors in the City with a total capacity of 152 beds. In addition to the smaller facilities available, there are also six subsidized rental properties in the City with a total of 704 units. These larger complexes have units with one- to two-bedroom apartments and have deed restrictions to ensure affordability. In 2013, the City Council updated the Zoning Ordinance, adding senior facilities to the list of projects eligible for a Planned Unit Development, to allow more development flexibility. In 2016, the City spent approximately \$1 million in CDBG and \$185,000 in HOME funds on green and sustainable rehabilitation at two subsidized apartment complexes for lower-income seniors: Ginzton Terrace Apartments (107) units and The Fountains Apartments (124 units). In 2021, the City Council approved a Mobile Home Rent Stabilization program to regulate rent increases in Mobile Home Parks. Mobile homes tend to provide an important source of affordable housing for seniors.

The City continues to work with various partners, including nonprofit developers, the County, and the Housing Authority, to determine potential opportunities to develop affordable housing, including housing for extremely low-income households and households with special needs.

Appropriateness of 5th Cycle Programs for Inclusion in 6th Cycle Housing Element Update

Many of the 5th Cycle Housing Element's programs were effective and remain relevant as the City moves into the 6th Cycle. Public input during the Housing Element Update process did not call for elimination of any 5th Cycle Housing Element programs. Rather, a streamlined programs list facilitates ongoing implementation, tracking, and reporting. Only a limited number of 5th Cycle Housing Element programs were completely eliminated from the 6th Cycle Housing Element (i.e., not carried over as-is or revised and/or consolidated in 6th Cycle program); however, as noted below, elements of some of these eliminated programs are reflected in 6th Cycle programs.

- The City deleted Program 1.5, Lot Consolidation, because the City determined that there is relatively limited opportunity for lot consolidation to assist with housing production in the 6th Cycle and resources should be focused on other programs.
- The City deleted Program 3.3, Opportunities for Rehabilitation, because the City had included rehabilitation activities in its Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for affordable housing during the 5th Cycle but received no applications and instead is focusing those resources on new housing unit production. Rehabilitation of naturally occurring (i.e., non-regulated) affordable housing is included as part of 6th Cycle Housing Element Program 3.2, Displacement Prevention and Mitigation.
- The City deleted Program 3.6, Preservation of Subsidized Housing Stock, because the City has no subsidized affordable housing units at-risk of conversion to market rate in the next ten years. Preservation of naturally occurring (i.e., non-regulated) affordable housing is included as part of 6th Cycle Housing Element Program 3.2, Displacement Prevention and Mitigation.



CHAPTER

3

Housing Plan

CHAPTER 3: HOUSING PLAN

The Housing Plan is the core of the Mountain View Housing Element, as it lays out the City’s housing goals; the policies that will guide City actions to achieving those goals; and the programs that the City will implement in the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element Planning period to work toward its goals.

Summary of Major Actions to be Continued in the Sixth Housing Element Cycle

In addition to the Housing Plan presented in this chapter, the City of Mountain View continues to implement a number of actions that the City initiated during the Fifth Housing Element Cycle that have significantly increased residential development capacity, facilitated the production and preservation of affordable housing, and removed constraints on residential development. These actions include:

- **Zoning to Accommodate Residential Development.** During the Fifth Housing Element Update Cycle, Mountain View adopted zoning to allow high-density residential in the San Antonio, North Bayshore, and East Whisman Precise Plan Areas, creating capacity for over 15,000 units. The North Bayshore and East Whisman areas have local density bonus programs that incentivize the creation of thousands of affordable units with allowances for doubling to more than quadrupling the “base” densities. The City also increased densities along El Camino Real and San Antonio Road, facilitating creation of over 2,000 units and creating capacity for thousands more. In addition, the City approved one-off residential development rezonings that are creating thousands of new units. The overall effect of these changes is an increase in housing opportunity equal to more than 60 percent of existing units and twice the City’s 6th cycle RHNA. This growth is focused in areas with access to transit, jobs and services and in areas with the greatest opportunity for redevelopment of aging suburban malls and industrial parks and the lowest risk of residential displacement.
- **Job-Housing Balance Policies.** Mountain View’s East Whisman Precise Plan includes a Jobs-Housing Linkage requirement that requires residential development to accompany any new office development over 0.4 FAR (approximately the current intensity of office in the area), with the effect that no more than approximately 30 percent of any such development can be net new office. Developers of nonresidential projects are required to provide a Jobs-Housing Linkage Plan with a phasing or housing delivery plan that proposes how the project applicant will facilitate residential development in the Precise Plan Area. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that any new office development is accompanied by residential development to foster a more balanced jobs-housing mix. The North Bayshore Precise Plan has a similar policy, and it can be a template for future policies in other jobs-rich areas.
- **Production and Preservation of Affordable Housing.** Mountain View adopted updates to the City’s Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program to increase the number of inclusionary affordable units in a development, resulting in hundreds of new lower- and moderate-income units. At the same time, the City also adopted a flexible alternative to on-site units that allows developers to accommodate BMR requirement in ways that advance City housing goals and exceed minimum affordability requirements. The City also developed partnerships with Santa Clara County and affordable housing developers to create hundreds of affordable

units, including units for veterans, people with disabilities, families, and other special-needs populations. In addition, the City adopted a City-wide rent-stabilization ordinance, which applies to multifamily rental units as well as mobile homes.

- **Fee Adjustments.** The City adopted exemptions from development impact fees for affordable housing. The City also adopted modifications to the park land dedication fee, to allow alternative compliance through Privately Owned, Publicly Accessible (POPA) open areas, which count to both private and public open space requirements. The City also modified the park land dedication fee to create predictability and transparency by calculating the fee basis every year and setting the fee amount at the time of application submittal.
- **Development Review Process Improvements.** Mountain View began using “EIR consistency checklists” in Precise Plan areas, a streamlined CEQA procedure that provides more legal protections than a categorical exemption, at lower cost and in less time than an initial study. In addition, the City utilized SB35 ministerial streamlining for multiple affordable housing developments. The City also prepared Density Bonus Guidelines to facilitate developer understanding of this complex state law, which has reduced uncertainty and staff review times for density bonus projects.

Because the City initiated these actions during the last Housing Element Update Cycle, the ongoing implementation of these actions is not reflected in the Sixth Cycle housing programs shown below. However, these ongoing actions continue to have a meaningful impact on addressing the City’s housing needs.

Housing Goals and Policies

This section articulates each of Mountain View’s housing goals. A series of supporting policies accompanies each goal. Along with other goals and policies contained in other elements of the General Plan, City decision-makers and City staff will use these goals and policies to guide their work in administering their duties. In particular, housing developments and other projects affecting housing within Mountain View must be consistent with these goals and policies.

Goal 1: An increase in the quantity and diversity of housing options, focusing on active nodes, and walkable neighborhoods with amenities and services.

To achieve this goal, the City will address, remove, or mitigate constraints to housing production, produce new affordable units, and preserve existing housing units.

Policies:

1.1. Ensure that adequate residential land is available to accommodate the City’s RHNA, with special focus on Precise Plan areas near transit, employment centers, and services.

1.2. Encourage a mix of housing types, at a range of densities, that serves a diverse population, including rental and ownership units serving both young and mature families, singles, young professionals, single-parent households, seniors, and both first-time and move-up buyers, at a broad range of incomes, through development policies and City-subsidized affordable housing.

1.3. Maintain or improve the character and quality of neighborhoods through upgrades to existing developments, sensitively designed new developments, improved streetscapes, and better access to schools, parks, goods, services, jobs, transportation, and other needs.

1.4. Maintain and improve housing to meet health, safety, fire, and other applicable codes and standards.

1.5. Periodically evaluate the City's development standards, review processes and, if necessary, remove unnecessary barriers to quality housing for all income levels.

1.6. Provide incentives, such as reduced parking standards and/or reductions in other development standards and fees, to facilitate the development of housing that is affordable to lower- and moderate-income households.

1.7. Support environmentally sustainable practices in all aspects of residential development, including energy and water efficiency.

1.8. Pursue innovative housing options to better meet the needs of the community, such as land trusts, middle-income housing, shared ownership models, innovative construction, and more.

Goal 2: An inclusive and equitable community with available and accessible housing assistance

To achieve this goal, the City will facilitate the development and preservation of affordable housing and support fair and equal opportunities for all segments of the community.

Policies:

2.1. Initiate and maintain programs to assist extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households in accessing affordable rental and ownership units

2.2. Continue efforts to develop culturally competent outreach programs to connect residents to anti-displacement programs and affordable housing resources.

2.3. Give priority for affordable housing to persons who live or work in Mountain View whenever legally feasible.

2.4. Continue efforts to communicate effectively on affordable housing efforts so that building an inclusive community is widely championed.

2.5. Support programs to address discrimination and other fair housing issues in the sale, rental, and development of housing.

2.6. Support mediation programs between housing providers and tenants.

2.7. Encourage and support the maintenance/preservation and development of affordable housing that serves low-income households, seniors, individuals with developmental, intellectual, or physical disabilities, the homeless, larger households, historically underserved communities, and other special-needs populations.

Goal 3: A comprehensive suite of housing opportunities and services to prevent, respond to, and address displacement and homelessness

To achieve this goal, the City will seek funding and partnerships to increase resources towards the prevention of displacement and address the housing needs of people experiencing homelessness.

Policies:

3.1. Support a range of housing solutions and assistance, such as congregate shelter, safe parking, interim housing, and permanent housing, along with a pathway for individuals to get the housing they need.

3.2. Provide responsive assistance and referrals for community resources, access, case management, and basic services (food and other items).

3.3. Coordinate with the County, community-based organizations, nonprofits, faith, and intergovernmental partners to assist the homeless.

3.4. Support housing solutions and resources for lower- and moderate-income residents displaced by development, rent increases, and other factors.

3.5. Strive to preserve affordable housing opportunities such as CSFRA units, mobile homes, and deed-restricted units.

3.6. Keep households at risk of homelessness housed such as with emergency rental assistance and fair-housing services.

Goal 4: A City that is an effective steward of housing solutions through funding, advocacy, partnerships, and community outreach and engagement

To achieve this goal, the City will pursue local housing funding, and work with partners to create additional housing opportunities, and otherwise support efforts that help implement the City's housing goals and policies.

Policies:

4.1. Advocate for additional State, regional, and private funding for affordable housing and affordable housing programs.

4.2. Promote and support State and local programs for energy conservation and renewable energy system installation in existing homes.

4.3 Promote water conservation and stormwater controls, including rainwater capture systems for homes, incentives to promote stormwater control/site design features and water wise landscaping.

4.4. Solicit community and stakeholder feedback on housing issues and the effectiveness of Housing Element program implementation.

4.5. Build partnerships to increase the availability of City resources in producing housing and providing services.

Housing Programs

To work towards achieving the four Goals and implementing the Policies presented above, the Housing Element includes a series of Programs that identify specific actions that the City of Mountain View will take during the Housing Element planning period. These programs include a mixture of programs carried over from the 5th Cycle Housing Element that were deemed still relevant, 5th Cycle Programs that have been modified to address current opportunities and challenges, and new programs. The programs are formulated to respond to findings from the Housing Needs Assessment, including the Assessment of Fair Housing (see Appendix B), the Constraints Analysis (see Appendix D), as well as input received from housing stakeholders and the general public, and direction from the Environmental Planning Commission and the City Council.

Each program below includes: a statement of its objective(s); a description of the actions the City will take, specific timeframes for implementation within the Housing Element planning cycle; the City department responsible for implementation; and the targeted source of funding to support implementation.

1.1 Zoning Ordinance Update for Consistency with State Laws

Update the Zoning Ordinance to address consistency with the following State laws and HCD guidance:

- a) Add provisions for Low-Barrier Navigation Centers in compliance with AB 101 (2019)
- b) Add provisions for Employee Housing in compliance with Health and Safety Code, § 17000 et seq)
- c) Add provisions to allow mobilehome parks in all residential zones in compliance with Government Code 65852.7
- d) Amend ordinance to add definition of residential care homes and allow residential care homes as a permitted use regardless of the number of residents
- e) Amend ordinance to remove unnecessary findings associated with Reasonable Accommodation permits to remove constraints to housing for special needs populations
- f) Ensure zoning and general plan for all sites is consistent with the Housing Element site inventory and pipeline projects

Objectives and Metrics:

- Update the Zoning Ordinance as needed to fully accommodate the City's 6th Cycle RHNA.

- Update the Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with recent legislation, Government Code and Health and Safety Code regulations

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Adopt general zoning updates by December 31, 2024
- Adopt zoning updates needed for any sites included in the sites inventory by January 31, 2024. If a pipeline rezoning project is not approved by this date, those units will be removed from the buffer. If there is no buffer remaining, then additional sites will be identified through the “no net loss” process.
- Adopt zoning updates annually as necessary to respond to future changes in State law (ongoing).

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund (DSF) and General Fund

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility

1.2 Reduced Parking for Affordable Housing:

- a) Study past parking reductions, viable TDM measures, State exemptions and conduct outreach to affordable housing developers
- b) Identify and codify parking reductions for 100% affordable housing developments.

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline review by reducing studies and uncertainty and facilitate 100% affordable housing developments by reducing parking standards

Milestones and Timeframe

- Prepare documentation and resources by June 30, 2026 and update zoning ordinance (if necessary) by December 31, 2026, including review of past affordable housing developments, outreach to affordable developers, preparation of guidelines and (if necessary) zoning or Precise Plan amendments.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund (DSF)

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility

1.3 Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards:

Review development standards to ensure they reflect contemporary building types, improve ease of implementation and improve consistency across districts.

- a) Ensure development projects can meet their allowed densities. Conduct a development prototype study, update definitions as necessary for consistency between plans and districts, and revise multifamily development standards in major districts (including R3) and Precise Plans to ensure projects can meet their allowed density

- b) Compile, evaluate and refine requirements outside the Zoning Ordinance, include Heritage tree preservation and Public Works requirements
- c) Ensure that zoning code is updated to reflect densities and other standards as required by state law (e.g., SB 478)
- d) Adopt a TDM Ordinance that provides clear requirements for residential trip reduction across all precise plans and zoning districts and update precise plans as needed. Through the ordinance, study the cost of TDM requirements on typical residential developments, and allow residential developers to meet TDM goals through lower-cost options. Update the zoning ordinance to allow residential parking reductions for projects that implement TDM.
- e) Study live-work as an allowed residential use near retail areas, major corridors and other viable locations

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline the development review process by updating definitions for standards such as height, open area, common usable open area, floor area ratio, personal storage, pavement coverage and building coverage, and ensuring definitions are consistent with contemporary building types and across the Zoning Ordinance and precise plans.
- Reduce government constraints in multifamily zoning districts (R3, R4, CRA) and four Precise Plans (El Camino Real, San Antonio, North Bayshore and East Whisman) by ensuring that projects can build up to their allowed density.
- Reduce government constraints by allowing reduced parking for projects that implement TDM.
- Expand small business access to opportunity by creating live-work spaces in appropriate residential areas

Milestones and Timeframe

- Conduct prototype study and evaluate standards outside the Zoning Ordinance by June 30, 2026
- Update Zoning Ordinance and precise plans to reflect reduced standards and live-work by December 31, 2026
- Adopt TDM ordinance by December 31, 2026

Responsibility: Planning Division, Community Services Department and Public Works Department

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund (DSF)

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity

1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing

Religious and community assembly sites are typically larger sites and are located throughout the City, with several in the City’s highest opportunity neighborhoods. This program would allow affordable multifamily housing on these sites.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Create more affordable housing in the City’s highest opportunity neighborhoods by allowing deed-restricted affordable multifamily housing up to 3 stories on non-profit, religious and community assembly sites in the R1 and R2 districts. Typical densities are expected to be approximately 30 to 40 dwelling units per acre on the residential portions of the sites.
- Incentivize such development through ongoing actions, such as outreach, funding and promotional materials

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Complete zoning amendments by December 31, 2026, including outreach to affordable housing developers, non-profit and advocacy organizations and religious and community assembly properties; development of standards and incentives; and creation of ongoing monitoring and promotional materials.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

1.5 Non-conforming R1 and R2 Multifamily Developments

Update the Zoning Ordinance to allow replacement of multifamily development in the R1 and R2 districts with non-conforming density to preserve units above the allowed density in the underlying zone

Objectives and Metrics:

- Allow more flexibility for building upgrades, additions and structural alterations that can prolong the life of the building without reducing the number of units on site
- Conserve 600 units in multi-family development in R1 and R2 districts where there is currently non-conforming density of residential units

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Inform property owners of the proposed Zoning Ordinance update that would allow them to preserve units by June 30, 2025
- Complete Zoning Ordinance update by December 31, 2025
- Ongoing monitoring of identified sites in the R1 and R2 where there is non-conforming density of residential units and to evaluate whether intended objectives are being met

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund

AFFH Program: Displacement Prevention, Place-Based Strategies

1.6 SB9 DUO Subdivisions

Update the zoning and subdivision codes to allow two-unit subdivisions of SB9 DUOs (such as condominiums).

Objectives and Metrics:

- Facilitate the creation of middle-income ownership units in the City's highest opportunity single family neighborhoods through subdivision of DUO developments
- Create additional economic incentives to build DUOs through subdivision opportunities
- Address potential operations with 2-unit subdivisions, such as owner conflicts or requests for additions/modifications

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Adopt Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Amendments by December 31, 2026

Responsibility: Planning Division and Public Works Department

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund (DSF)

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

1.7 Monitor and Promote Accessory Dwelling Units, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units and SB9 Developments

Although the City already has a successful ADU/JADU program, the City will make the following additional enhancements to further promote them:

- a) Develop an ADU/JADU/SB9 Monitoring Survey to collect data from project applicants during the building permit application process in order to enhance the existing tracking of ADUs/JADUs/SB9 production with more details such as occupancy status and rent levels at time of occupancy.
- b) Utilize the data collected from the Monitoring Survey to better understand the income groups they serve and inform future improvements to the outreach and educational efforts
- c) Continue to track and monitor the number and rents of ADUs/JADUs/SB9 Developments proposed and constructed and the progress of meeting RHNA assumptions of 12 units per year.
- d) Create a pre-approved design resource program for ADUs and SB9 projects, including approved designs with streamlined approval processes
- e) Distribute and make available updated promotional materials to market the approval process, reduced fees, and additional benefits. Update the ADU and SB9 webpages with up-to-date resources (e.g., educational tools and public information) to increase awareness and provide assistance tools

Objectives and Metrics:

- Maintain or increase ADU/JADU production in typically high-resource single-family neighborhoods where otherwise net new housing units may not occur and improve residential mobility and access to opportunity.
- Enable the construction of at least 96 net new units through ADUs/JADUs/SB9 during the planning period through promotion, assistance and other tools.
- Determine the obstacles affecting affordable ADU/JADU/SB9 production through monitoring and data collection and alleviate them as needed
- Streamline ADU and SB9 development through pre-approved design resources

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Implement ADU monitoring survey by December 31, 2024
- Update webpage and prepare promotional materials by June 30, 2025 and ongoing.
- Create pre-approved ADU and SB9 design resource framework by June 30, 2025

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update

Complete Phase 2 of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance update and the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan. Analysis that would support fee reductions could include:

- Review of best-practices for parkland acquisition funding
- Pursuit of grants and other funding sources
- Review of the City’s population density assumptions
- Opportunities for private development to provide public open space through existing zoning requirements (e.g., POPAs)
- Development incentives and exceptions to standards for public open space

Objectives and Metrics: Reduce constraints on residential development by reviewing and revising the park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development.

Milestone and Timeframe: By December 31, 2024, including adoption of the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan (addressing anticipated open space needs and long-term funding strategies) and adoption of reduced fees, alternate mitigations and/or other programs to reduce costs on residential.

Responsibility: Community Services Department and Planning Division

Potential Funding: Park Land Dedication Fund and Shoreline Regional Park Community Fund

1.9 BMR Program Review

- a) Continue BMR program, as revised in 2019, to include more opportunities for inclusionary units as opposed to fees
- b) Review BMR program to identify needed changes based on City goals, including the following as appropriate:
 - Impact of program on affordable housing production in Mountain View
 - Impact of program on production of affordable housing across unit types and, special needs (including accessible units) and affordability levels as compared to City needs
 - Impact of program on City fair housing goals for increased mobility and access to opportunity
 - Potential policy changes based on best practices, new laws, or unanticipated program outcomes
 - Potential cleanup in guidelines/policies/procedures to clarify program requirements/facilitate program implementation.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Increasing the diversity, supply, and affordability of housing. Achieving the BMR objective standard of realizing BMR units on-site and integrated with market-rate units for both rental and ownership projects.
- Evaluating best practices and incorporate modifications if any to enhance the efficacy of the program.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Complete the first review of the BMR Phase 2 program against the objectives in 2023
- Complete the second review in 2028

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division and Planning Division

Potential Funding: Local Housing Funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity

1.10. Density Bonus

Continue to implement the requirements in the density bonus ordinance for Density Bonus projects that offers bonuses for the provision of affordable housing, depending on the amount and type of subsidized housing provided, consistent with the revised Government Code 65915. In addition, continue to implement the city's local density bonus programs in the North Bayshore and East Whisman Precise Plans, which offer higher bonuses with the provision of more affordable housing, and the City's NOFA process, which allows unlimited density bonuses to 100% affordable projects.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Ensure City codes and procedures are consistent with State law by monitoring and implementing new State legislation (such as AB 2334).

- Maintain production of units containing affordable housing through the review and approval of projects consistent with the State Density Bonus Law and its local provisions

Milestone and Timeframe: Ongoing-- every year review State legislation for updates that may affect the City's Density Bonus program.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

1.11 No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites

Monitor and update the availability of sites to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA in accordance with No Net Loss rules.

If a shortfall is identified in any income category, identify necessary replacement sites, considering, but not limited to "Back Pocket" areas discussed during adoption of the Housing Element Update.

Back Pocket areas included:

- Moffett Boulevard Change Area
- Neighborhood shopping areas other than General Plan Village Centers (such as Bailey Park Shopping Center, Monta Loma Shopping Center, and Leong Drive)
- Downtown Transit Center
- Other nonresidential sites south of El Camino Real

The City will annually report on projects under review to see if they reduce any buffers below 5%. If they do, the City will initiate a No Net Loss rezoning process.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Ensure adequate capacity for the City's RHNA by maintaining a list of opportunity sites that accommodates the City's RHNA and initiating a rezoning process for new sites if the buffer falls below 5 percent, after accounting for development projects under review

Milestone and Timeframe:

- If the City receives an application for a new construction development project on a housing element site with fewer (or greater) units at the given income level than shown in the site inventory (including pipeline sites), those units will be provisionally removed from (or added to) the inventory. If the project is approved (building permit approval for ministerial projects), they will be officially removed from (or added to) the inventory.
- Annually update and report on the provisional and official inventories.
 - If the moderate-income provisional inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, transfer one or more sites from the lower-income provisional inventory to the moderate-income provisional inventory (prioritizing lowest-opportunity neighborhoods) until the moderate-income provisional inventory is at least 5 percent buffer.
 - If the moderate-income official inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, transfer the sites from the lower-income official inventory.

- If the lower-income provisional inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, initiate the no net loss rezoning process.
- Make necessary findings on projects that reduce the number of units on Housing Element sites
- If the number of units in the official inventory falls below the RHNA, rezone additional sites within six months

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

1.12 Maintenance of Existing Housing Stock

Utilize existing programs to ensure proper maintenance of the existing housing stock and support rehabilitation of existing housing developments when needed.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Respond to housing code violations through the Code Enforcement, CSFRA petition and Multi-family Housing Inspection programs
- Enforce CSFRA provisions that limit rent increases and displacement impacts to tenants when violations are found.
- Rehabilitation and upgrades at affordable housing developments/CSFRA units

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Ongoing implementation and enforcement of Code Enforcement, CSFRA Petition and Multifamily Housing Inspections, utilizing the compliance order process, including landlord penalties
- By December 31, 2024, prepare additional outreach and marketing materials to tenants and landlords regarding tenants’ rights to habitability and safety without rent increases under the CSFRA
- Ongoing assessment and funding of improvements at affordable housing projects

Responsibility: Fire Department, Code Enforcement Division, Housing Division, CSFRA

Potential Funding: General Fund, housing funds, external funding/partnerships

AFFH Program: Displacement Prevention, Place-Based Strategies

1.13. Sustainable Housing

- a) Implement the City's various sustainable and green building requirements, including: the City's Green Building and Reach Codes, the Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations, Bonus FAR requirements for more sustainable buildings, and others.
- b) Encourage City Staff to attend conferences, training sessions, and other events to learn and stay informed on new green initiatives and technologies. Hold in-house training sessions to facilitate inter-department cooperation on green building practices.

Objectives and Metrics: Streamline green building review and development of more sustainable (cost-effective and energy-efficient) housing.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Ongoing
- Training should occur at least two times during the planning cycle

Responsibility: Planning and Building Divisions

Potential Funding: General Fund, including existing training budget

2.1. Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs

Make funding available and support programs that allow for the City to increase the number of affordable housing units for underserved populations, particularly:

1. permanent supportive housing for unhoused community members,
2. larger units to serve larger households,
3. people with special needs, including a range of disabilities, and
4. homeownership programs for middle income residents.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Make more housing available to households otherwise left out of the Mountain View housing market.
- Mitigate displacement from a range of unit types, including apartments and mobile homes, through community-centered programs, possibly including COPA/TOPA or community land trusts
- Produce at least 200 supportive housing units for households who have experienced homelessness.
- Increase the share of two and three-bedroom units in the City's affordable housing stock.
- Increase the number of ownership opportunities for middle-income households, and market those opportunities to historically excluded populations
- Increase the number of units built for special needs populations and market those units to organizations that support disabilities

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Funding opportunities will be made available ongoing via the City’s NOFA process and other programs.
- Ongoing evaluation of needed units for populations with special needs, and funding opportunities through the City’s NOFA process as needed and available
- Staff will evaluate innovative programs over the housing element period, bringing findings to the Council as appropriate. This will include research as part of the 2022-2024 Breakthrough Grant to identify and implement affordable housing funding programs, displacement response strategy, and outreach/education/community building efforts. This may include study sessions on affordable housing and displacement. Once research is complete, if directed to pursue further, develop program with 5 years.
- Update Council on the suitability of community land trusts or COPA/TOPA to address unmet needs. If directed by Council, develop program within 5 years.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: General Fund and local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity, Displacement Prevention

2.2 Pilot ADU & SB9 Financial Incentives Program

- a) Continue to exempt impact fees to promote the development of ADUs and JADUS
- b) Pilot a program to partially subsidize the cost of building ADUs and SB9 DUOs (Dual Urban Opportunities), either deed-restricted at affordable rents or targeted to households that would otherwise be unable to afford them. This program may build on existing regional programs.

Objectives and Metrics

- Continue to reduce costs of developing ADUs through exemptions from impact fees.
- Support economic feasibility of ADUs and DUOs by making funds available to households who would like to build them but would otherwise not be able to afford to develop these units
- Increase the supply of naturally-affordable or deed-restricted affordable rental housing in Mountain View through the development of more ADUs and DUOs
- Decrease pressure on market-rate housing market by increasing density on single-family sites, which are focused on areas of highest opportunity.

Milestones and Timeframe

- Perform a needs assessment and identify best practices by December 2025
- Develop a pilot program informed by the needs assessment by December 2026
- Assess pilot for continuation based on objectives and metrics by December 2028

Responsibility: Planning and Housing Divisions

Potential Funding: Local housing funds, regional sources

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

2.3 Reasonable Accommodation

Implement City reasonable accommodations procedures.

Objectives and Metrics: Review and approve requests to modify development standards to reasonably accommodate person with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Update Zoning Ordinance to remove unnecessary requirements or findings associated with Reasonable Accommodation application procedures (Program 1.1)
- Produce and make available informational materials on the program by June 30, 2024.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility

2.4 Inclusive and Equitable Affordable Housing Application Processes

Review BMR and NOFA application process for inclusivity for language access, technological access, and other barriers and make adjustments to increase inclusivity.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Remove barriers to accessing affordable housing.
- Observed diverse and robust participation in City affordable housing information sessions, clinics, lotteries, and waitlists.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Market available affordable housing programs to underserved communities and continue to remove barriers to accessing affordable housing programs by removing language, technology, and other barriers. Potential actions include:
 - Providing increased in-person affordable housing application availability to overcome technological barriers
 - Providing increased interpretation services for potential applicants
 - Reviewing application processes for unintended barriers
 - Maintaining the single application portal for inclusionary BMR units, and evaluating/implementing a single application portal for affordable developments if a regional model is developed
- Evaluate effectiveness of changes at least once during the planning period to ensure equitable representation on waitlist and interest lists. Include this evaluation in 2028 BMR review as well.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: Local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility

2.5 Mediation and Fair Housing Programs

- a) Fund fair housing education, enforcement, and counseling to prevent fair housing violations and help community members understand and assert their rights.
- b) Provide financial support to mediate housing issues involving City residents, with a focus on tenant/property owner mediation and eviction prevention.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Make information and legal services available to tenants and property owners to support fair housing
- Help tenants and property owners exercise their rights
- Prevent eviction and displacement.
- Maintain the Housing and Eviction Help Center and expand it as demand requires.
- Utilize the Multicultural Engagement Program to support access to fair housing programs across languages and cultural groups

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Annually fund fair housing and mediation services
- Continuously provide information about tenant and landlord rights.
- Target at least one annual outreach/education event targeted to local residents and one annual outreach/education event targeted to local property owners and managers.
- Evaluate fair housing via self-evaluation process as part of 2028 BMR review.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: General Fund and local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Displacement Prevention

2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

Continue to prepare and update the City's Assessment of Fair Housing and implement actions as necessary to remove barriers to fair housing choice, as required by HUD and State Housing Element law.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Remove impediments to fair housing and provide equitable access to housing and opportunity.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Update Assessment of Fair Housing as required by HUD with the first update completed in 2023, and subsequent updates based on HUD guidance.
- Implement necessary actions continuously as needed.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: CDBG/HOME funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity, Place-Based Strategies, Displacement Prevention

3.1 Homelessness Prevention and Services for the Unhoused

- a) Develop and implement a strategy to support those who are unhoused and prevent people from becoming unhoused
- b) Continue to partner with the Mountain View Los Altos Community Services Agency (CSA), LifeMoves and similar agencies that provide services and/or shelter to the unhoused community members, by offering financial support and advertising available programs to residents living in the City.
- c) Participate in regional homeless programs that support short-term shelter and transitional housing programs that accommodate families and individuals from Mountain View.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Prevent households from becoming homeless – fewer evictions than in the past
- Available safety net services for those who need them (such as shelter) - maintain at least 100 shelter or interim housing spots
- A range of housing options to move households from homelessness to permanent housing, including the development of at least 200 supportive housing units
- Mobility out of homelessness and into permanent housing, with data showing households moving from shelter and interim housing to Mountain View-based permanent housing

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Develop strategy by December 31, 2024. Strategy may include:
 - Funding for rental assistance or financial assistance programs to prevent homelessness
 - Preferences for new housing for households who experienced or are at risk of experiencing displacement
 - Funding and incentives for the development of shelter, interim housing, and supportive housing
- Annually support CSA, LifeMoves and other partner agencies as part of Annual Plan.
- Regularly support the development of permanent housing via regular NOFA process.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: Local housing funds and CDBG/HOME funds

AFFH Program: Displacement Prevention

3.2 Displacement Prevention and Mitigation

Prevent displacement of households, including those in mobile homes, and prevent the loss of naturally occurring affordable units. Conserve and improve existing affordable housing stock.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Prevent displacement through rent stabilization, deed restriction, and housing preservation work. Eviction levels should be maintained or lowered.
- Provide benefits and relocation assistance to displaced residents to partially mitigate impacts of displacement, with the goal of having a comprehensive strategy to prevent displacement before the expiration of SB 330. Strategies may include:
 - Temporary relocation
 - Realistic options for exercising right of first refusal
 - Pathways to affordable housing
 - Preservation of “naturally affordable” housing
 - Connections to owners of developments with vacant “naturally affordable” units
- Assist in preserving at least two naturally occurring affordable housing projects during the planning period, and aim to preserve more, to both preserve units and create a viable space for displaced residents to move

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Continuously enforce the Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance, Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act (CSFRA), Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance (MHRSO), Condominium Conversion Ordinance (CCO), and relevant state tenant protection laws
- Continuously monitor conditions to identify need for updates to TRA0, including potential necessary increases in assistance.
- Develop funding strategy for affordable housing preservation by December 31, 2025.
- Propose anti-displacement strategies to Council in 2023. Develop comprehensive potential “alternatives to displacement,” via first right of refusal requirements, displaced-resident preferences, partnerships with developers on alternative units for displaced residents, and plans for unit preservation by 2028.
- Target expenditure of funds to assist in preserving at least two naturally occurring affordable housing projects during the planning period

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods and Planning Divisions

Potential Funding: Local housing funds and CDBG/HOME funds

AFFH Program: Place-Based Strategies, Displacement Prevention

4.1 Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions

- a) Review and update the City's affordable Housing NOFA process to improve coordination and communication internally (e.g., coordination between Housing, Planning and other departments and internal processes in Planning and other departments) and with applicants. Encourage affordable housing developers to work with outside funding sources to leverage the City's local funds to the maximum extent possible. Initial steps in the review include additional developer roundtables, garnering consultant advice, and scanning other public agency processes for best practices. In addition, the City will continue to facilitate and support 100% affordable housing development in the review process, by allocating dedicated staff and utilizing streamlining opportunities.
- b) Review development and post-development processes, timelines, and approval body levels to streamline permitting processes.
- c) Acquire tools and software that will improve development review, monitoring of housing supply, management of funding, transparency of data and approvals, and other processes involved in housing development for staff and public use.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Facilitate at least 1,100 units of 100% affordable development by streamlining the funding approval process, prioritizing staff review, utilizing State streamlining (e.g., SB35)
- Reduce the number of resubmittals and time between application completeness and approval through process and approval body revisions
- Bring the city fully into compliance with new transparency legislation by posting project-specific fees online.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Bring City into full compliance with transparency requirements as soon as possible.
- Review and update NOFA process by June 30, 2024.
- Update the Zoning Ordinance process and approval bodies by December 31, 2026
- Fully implement electronic review software by June 30, 2024. Acquire additional software and tools as identified.

Responsibility: Housing, Building and Planning Divisions

Potential Funding: General Fund, Development Services Fund and local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity

4.2 Federal, State, and Regional Policy Initiatives

- a) Advocate for, propose, and shape legislation that increases the ability to develop affordable housing, prevent displacement, and remove impediments to accessing housing.
- b) Support regional funding measure to support affordable housing.

Objectives and Metrics:

Advocacy for:

- State, Federal, and regional policies that support efforts to develop affordable housing, prevent displacement, and remove impediments to accessing housing.
- Change in State law that would allow assessment of impact fees on office and other employment-generating uses to account for the impacts that residential uses have on infrastructure and services on the basis that new employment-generating development creates demand for new residential development.
- Long term anti-displacement measures that support the City's anti-displacement goals
- Additional state funding to support the City's affordable housing new construction, preservation, and rehabilitation pipelines.
- Regional funding to support the City's RHNA goals for low-income, very-low-income, and extremely-low-income units as well as the City's efforts at unit preservation/rehabilitation.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Participate in the planning process for a 2024 regional housing funding measure, and support such measure.
- Continuously monitor federal and State legislation and submit support letters as appropriate.
- Propose legislation if directed by Council, especially with regards to objectives listed above.
- Monitor changes to SB 330 that would affect displacement prevention efforts in Mountain View and lobby for anti-displacement measures as appropriate.
- Apply for State funding programs as appropriate.

Responsibility: City Manager's Office, Housing and Neighborhoods and Planning Divisions

Potential Funding: General Fund and local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Displacement Prevention

4.3 Financial Support for Subsidized Housing

- a) Examine new revenue sources and increases to existing revenue sources to meet extremely low- to moderate-income housing needs, including increasing housing impact fees on office development, and periodically consider updates to fees.
- b) Perform asset management to ensure loan repayment.
- c) Prioritize funding opportunities for lower-income and special needs population groups, such as families and unhoused individuals.
- d) Provide about \$40 million to make available for financing affordable and special needs housing units.

- e) Develop local revenue ballot measure to fund affordable housing if regional measure is not implemented.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Subsidize affordable housing, especially housing for lower-income households, unhoused, and families and effectively steward housing funds.
- Produce at least 200 supportive housing units for households who have experienced homelessness.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Complete evaluation of new funding sources by 2025; at least once during the planning period conduct an analysis to update existing affordable housing fees.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: Local housing funds

AFFH Program: Housing Mobility, Access to Opportunity

4.4 Partnerships to Support Affordable Housing

Work with private sector, philanthropy, and public agencies to bring in additional funding sources to support a range of affordable housing opportunities in Mountain View.

Objectives and Metrics:

Explore partnerships with other public agencies and external partners to leverage funds and increase access to affordable housing programs. In particular, explore “programmatic partnerships,” that leverage funds for a range of projects, to provide increased certainty to the City’s affordable housing pipeline. These partners may include:

- The County of Santa Clara
- The Santa Clara County Housing Authority
- Private Employers in Mountain View
- The Housing Trust of Silicon Valley
- Philanthropic Agencies in Mountain View
- Private Residential and Commercial Developers in Mountain View

Increase funding available for affordable housing preservation, rehabilitation, and construction to meet funding gaps anticipated in pipeline with the goal of fulfilling the City’s RHNA goals for low-income, very-low-income, and extremely-low-income units.

Milestone and Timeframe: Continuously develop relationships with partner agencies and private philanthropy to find opportunities to leverage additional funding for affordable housing.

- Secure enough funding to support identified near-term pipeline projects, likely totaling over \$66 million, by 2025.
- Secure additional funding needed to preserve and rehabilitate projects to meet City’s anti-displacement goals.

- Secure additional funding needed to support the achievement of the City’s RHNA goals for low-income, very-low-income, and extremely-low-income units.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity, Place-Based Strategies, Displacement Prevention

4.5 Partnerships with Subsidized Housing Developers

Make City-owned properties available for affordable housing development.

Objectives and Metrics:

- Partner with subsidized housing developers to further affordable housing priorities.
- Leverage a range of funding sources – including land dedication – to lower the cost of affordable housing development, and thus increase affordable housing development.

Milestone and Timeframe: When appropriate, partner with affordable housing developers to develop affordable housing on City-owned sites.

Responsibility: Housing and Neighborhoods Division

Potential Funding: Local housing funds and CDBG/HOME funds.

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

4.6 Partnerships with Employers

- a) Study opportunities for short-term employee housing on sites zoned for office use, and implement if feasible
- b) Create framework to collaborate with major employers (including large public entities) to provide workforce housing (potentially on office sites)

Objectives and Metrics

- Create new housing opportunities and reduce pressure on rental housing supply through new employee housing
- Build partnerships with the school districts, hospital district, and major private employers to help improve their employee’s access to housing and quality of life

Milestones and Timeframe

- Analyze legal constraints, consistency with State laws (such as AB 2011 and SB 6) and consider a land use framework for short-term employee housing
- Meet with at least five major employers to discuss opportunities and constraints for workforce housing (both permanent and short-term), and develop policy recommendations and bring before Council by December 31, 2025

Responsibility: Planning Division, City Managers Office, City Attorney’s Office

Potential Funding: General Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

4.7 Neighborhood Engagement

The City will encourage and facilitate housing developers to communicate and share information with neighborhood groups and other organizations regarding their proposed projects, including:

- Providing contact information for neighborhood groups and other organizations that can help inform the project, including special needs groups (disabilities, unhoused, seniors) and marketing units to special needs targets
- Continuing to prepare and implement required mailing notices for hearings
- Continuing to maintain the City’s email notification system so stakeholders can get updates on major projects

In addition, the City will continue to make information about upcoming developments available on the City’s website, as well as providing contact information for key staff.

Objectives and Metrics: Keep the community informed on proposed projects and give developers an opportunity to address neighborhood concerns early by encouraging meetings and other communications to solicit input and foster support for new residential developments

Milestone and Timeframe:

- By December 31, 2023, the City will have contacts, and procedures for maintaining those contacts, for a range of neighborhood groups and other organizations
- The City will continuously support neighborhood engagement and transparency about developments, and will improve resources and processes as identified.

Responsibility: Planning and Housing Divisions

Potential Funding: General Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

4.8 School District Coordination

Provide a copy of the Housing Element to school districts serving the City. Share information on new residential developments including number of units and bedrooms and demographic information with school districts.

Objectives and Metrics: Support school district planning by sharing information on residential developments with school districts

Milestone and Timeframe:

- Share a copy of housing element within one month of adoption.
- Share development information with Districts annually.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

4.9 Water and Sewer Service Coordination

Provide a copy of the Housing Element to Water and Sewer Utility staff and ensure that they understand that priority for connections must be given to housing developments that address the City's lower-income RHNA.

Objectives and Metrics: Ensure that Water and Sewer connections will be made available to address the RHNA

Milestone and Timeframe: Share a copy of housing element within one month of adoption

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

4.10 City Council Goal Setting

Incorporate Housing Element programs and recommendations from the City's annual monitoring and review process into the City Council's goal-setting process. Ensure consistency between the Housing Element and other General Plan Elements throughout the planning period.

Objectives and Metrics: Implement major programs in the Housing Element

Milestone and Timeframe: Annually

Responsibility: Planning Division, City Manager's Office

Potential Funding: General Fund

4.11 Annual Monitoring and Reporting

Per Government Code Section 65400, annually review the Housing Element and submit findings to the Office of Planning and Research and HCD.

Objectives and Metrics: Ensure compliance with state reporting requirements by completing and submitting the Annual Report each year of the planning period

Milestone and Timeframe: Annually

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: General Fund

Schedule

Date	Program/Task	Responsibility
Short-term	- 4.1: Compliance with new transparency requirements for posting all zoning, development standards and fees on the City's website	Building
	- 4.8: Share a copy of the updated Housing Element to school districts	Planning
	- 4.9: Share a copy of the updated Housing Element to water/sewer utility staff	Planning
December 2023	- 1.9: Complete first review BMR Phase 2 program	Housing
	- 2.6: Update Assessment of Fair Housing	Housing
	- 3.2 Propose anti-displacement strategies to Council	Housing
	- 4.7: Compile and maintain contact list for community engagement	Housing and Planning
June 2024	- 2.4: Produce and distribute Reasonable Accommodation information materials	Planning
	- 4.1: Review and update NOFA process	Housing and Planning
	- 4.1: Implement electronic review software	Building, Planning
December 2024	- 1.1: Zoning Ordinance Update for Consistency with State Laws	Planning
	- 1.7: Implement ADU monitoring survey	Planning
	- 1.8 Adoption of Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan	Community Services
	- 1.12: Outreach to tenant and landlords about tenants' rights under CSFRA	Housing
	- 2.1: Update Council on innovative affordable housing programs, including assessment of CLTs, COPA/TOPA	Housing
	- 3.1: Develop Homelessness Prevention and Services for the Unhoused strategy	Housing and City Manager's Office
June 2025	- 1.7: Update webpage and prepare ADU/SB9 promotional materials	Planning
	- 1.7: Create pre-approved ADU and SB9 design resource framework	Planning and Building
December 2025	- 2.2: Perform needs assessment for Pilot ADU & SB9 Financial Incentives Program	Housing

	- 3.2 Develop funding strategy for affordable housing preservation	Housing
	- 4.3 Complete evaluation of new funding sources	Housing
	- 4.4: Secure funding to support identified near-term pipeline projects	Housing
	- 4.6: Meet with major employers to partner on workforce housing	Planning
June 2026	- 1.2: Prepare reduced parking documentation and resources	Planning
	- 1.3: Conduct prototype study for residential standards	Planning
	- 1.5: Inform property owners about non-conforming density updates to Zoning Ordinance	Planning
December 2026	- 2.2: Develop pilot ADU & SB9 grant program informed by needs assessment	Housing
	- Various Zoning Ordinance Updates (Planning, unless specified below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1.2: Reduced parking for affordable housing o 1.3: Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards o 1.3: TDM Ordinance (Public Works) o 1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing o 1.5: Non-conforming R1 and R2 Multifamily Developments o 1.6: SB9 DUO Subdivisions (Public Works) o 4.1: Review Zoning Ordinance processes and approval bodies 	Planning, unless specified
December 2028	- 1.9: Complete second review BMR Phase 2 program, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.4: Evaluate effectiveness of efforts to increase equitable access to housing. o 2.5: Perform self-evaluation on fair housing practices. 	Housing
	- 2.2: Assess pilot ADU & SB9 grant program for continuation	Housing
	- 3.2 Develop comprehensive “alternatives to displacement” strategy	Housing
December 2029	- 2.1: Develop program for innovative housing solutions based on research and findings	Housing



CHAPTER

4

Quantified Objectives

CHAPTER 4: QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

State Housing Element Law requires that each jurisdiction establish quantified objectives for Housing Element planning period. Quantified objectives differ from the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) because they include not only targets for production of new housing units by household income level, but also include targets for rehabilitation of housing units and targets for conservation of housing units. In addition, local jurisdictions set their quantified objectives based on their realistic assessment of what can be achieved during the Housing Element planning period. Thus, the quantified objectives for housing production may differ from the local jurisdiction's RHNA for new housing units for the same planning period. The distinction is that the RHNA requires that the City provide sufficient land, appropriately zoned, to accommodate construction of the targeted number of housing units, while the quantified objective for housing production represents the number of housing units that the local jurisdiction expects to be built, rehabilitated, or preserved, considering market conditions, financial resources, and other factors. Table 1 below shows the City of Mountain View's quantified objectives for the upcoming Housing Element planning period.

Construction

As can be seen in Appendix E, a significant portion of the City's RHNA is accommodated through already-proposed projects ("Pipeline"). These can be split into two major "timing" groups – Single Projects and Master Plans. The number of units attributed to the Master Plans is across all eight years of the RHNA cycle. However, the City can reasonably expect approximately double the number of Single Projects than what has been proposed at this time – based on the fact that the projects include applications over roughly the last four years. Based on this calculation (Master Plans plus two times Single Projects), the City can reasonably target new construction of approximately 3,700 low-income (LI) units, 750 moderate-income (MI) units and 9,550 above-moderate-income (AMI) units.

Some of the very low income (VLI), LI and MI units anticipated will be included in market rate projects under the City's BMR inclusionary program.

The majority of extremely low income (ELI), VLI and LI units are provided through 100% affordable projects developed by non-profits. The target proportion of ELI, VLI and LI units is based on the current number of such units known in the Pipeline of 100% affordable projects, doubled (as described above).

These units are dependent on subsidies from numerous public and private sources, including the City. The City's construction objectives for affordable housing are dependent on continued funding

via existing fees, as well as additional funding sources, which the City will pursue. The Housing Element includes programs that will need to be carried out to acquire this funding, such as:

- 1.9 (BMR Program Review)
- 4.2 (Federal and State Policy Initiatives)
- 4.3 (Financial Support for Subsidized Housing)
- 4.4 (Partnerships to Support Affordable Housing)

Rehabilitation

The City hopes to pursue significant preservation activities to conserve naturally affordable housing in the City, some large portion of which would require rehabilitation. This effort will require additional funding sources, however, and thus modest goals are set for rehabilitation, although the need is significantly greater.

Conservation

The City's existing deed-restricted affordable housing stock is not timed to convert to market rate housing in the Housing Element period, and thus no conservation of deed-restricted units is described, although the aforementioned efforts to preserve naturally affordable housing should be noted.

Table 1: Sixth Cycle Quantified Objectives for New Construction, Rehabilitation, and Conservation

Income Category	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Construction	750	1,700	1,250	750	9,550	14,000
Rehabilitation	25	50	50	25	0	150
Conservation	0	0	0	0	0	0



APPENDIX

A

Implementation Status of 5th Cycle Housing Element Programs

ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Housing Element Implementation

(CCR Title 25 §6202)

Jurisdiction	Mountain View	
Reporting Year	2021	(Jan. 1 - Dec. 31)

Table D

Program Implementation Status pursuant to GC Section 65583

Housing Programs Progress Report

Describe progress of all programs including local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing as identified in the housing element.

1	2	3	4
Name of Program	Objective	Timeframe in H.E	Status of Program Implementation
Financial Support for Subsidized Housing	<p>In October 2014 and six years into the planning period (by 2021), the City Council will determine whether to increase any of the City's affordable housing fees. Administer funds, as they become available, to support housing development, housing programs, and rehabilitation activities. Prioritize funding opportunities for lower income and special needs population group.</p>	Ongoing, 2015-2023	<p>The City collects Housing Impact Fees to address the impact on the demand for affordable housing, when new nonresidential uses and market-rate rental apartments are developed. On December 9, 2014, the Council increased the Housing Impact Fee for Office/High-Tech/Industrial Development from \$10.26 per net square foot to \$25 per net square foot effective February 7, 2015. In 2018, the City ended the Rental Housing Impact Fee and began requiring 15 percent on-site affordable units to achieve more development of affordable units instead of accepting payment of fees. In 2016, the City reserved or appropriated approximately \$36 million in City housing funds for three developments at 779 East Evelyn Avenue, 460 North Shoreline Boulevard, and 1701 West El Camino Real, that will account for approximately 233 units serving extremely, low- and very low-income households. A portion of these units are intended for veterans. In 2018, the City reserved \$22 million and appropriated an additional \$1.7 million for predevelopment costs for 950 West El Camino Real, a 71-unit affordable multi-family rental housing project. The project, and said funding were approved in 2019. In 2019, the City updated its BMR in-lieu fees to \$96 per net square foot for rental, \$54.50 per net square foot for ownership (other than rowhouses and townhouses), and \$125 per net square foot for rowhouses and townhouses effective August 24, 2019. In 2020, the City reserved \$15 million for La Avenida Apartments, a 100 unit affordable multi-family rental housing project as well as an initial \$1million for the City's Lot 12 affordable housing project. In 2021, the City updated its BMR in-lieu fees to \$100.66 per net square foot for rental, \$57.14 per net square foot for ownership (other than rowhouses and townhouses), and \$131.06 per net square foot for rowhouses and townhouses. Housing Impact Fees were increased per CPI to \$1.60 for the first 25,000 square feet of net new Commercial/Entertainment/Hotel/Retail development, and \$3.17 for every foot thereafter and \$14.81 for the first 10,000 square feet of net new High-Tech/Industrial/Office development and \$29.62 for every square foot thereafter. In 2021 the City reserved \$16 million for an 85-unit affordable multi-family rental housing project at 1265 Montecito Ave, and appropriated the funds to the La Avenida Apartments which were previously reserved. The City approved using \$3.7 million in CDBG and HOME funds to support the conversion of the Crestview Hotel into multi-family affordable housing. The City also ground-leased the site at 87 E. Evelyn with the intent to purchase the site for future affordable housing. Funding for the Lot 12 project increased to \$12.25 million. The LiveMoves-Mountain View Homekey interim housing project to serve unsheltered persons was completed in April 2021, which includes City funding for operations. In addition to funds that the City has reserved, the City has an active affordable housing pipeline that consists of several hundred units and a significant amount of City funding will be considered for these projects.</p>
Extremely Low-Income Housing	<p>In October 2014 and within five years of Housing Element adoption (by 2020), the City will convene meetings with stakeholders to advance housing for extremely low income households and at least annually consider potential opportunities. By 2016, the City will evaluate reduced development standards, and other incentives for affordable housing, and implement, where appropriate within the El Camino Real and San Antonio Precise Plans.</p>	Ongoing, 2015-2023 and at least annually consider potential opportunities	<p>In February 2014, the City released a second NOFA for affordable rental and ownership housing developments. So far, the City has appropriated \$21.7 million of the funding to ROEM Development Corporation to construct a 116-unit affordable development at 779 East Evelyn Avenue and \$8 million to Palo Alto Housing (PAH) for a 67 studio unit affordable development at 1701 West El Camino Real, including 39 ELI studio units. The City also reserved funding for MidPen Housing's 50 affordable family units at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard and for Eden's 69 affordable units at La Avenida. The funding reservations for affordable multi-family housing at Lot 12, 1265 Montecito, and the Crestview Hotel also require units for households with extremely-low incomes. The LifeMoves-Mountain View Homekey project serves ELI households focusing on unsheltered individuals, seniors, and families. The City will continue to explore opportunities to fund affordable housing developments with units for extremely low-income households. This may most likely occur in developments targeted toward housing for the homeless, seniors, or those with special needs, as well as projects with Measure A funding.</p>

Partnerships with Subsidized Housing Developers	Encourage affordable housing developers to work with outside funding sources to leverage the City's local housing funds to the maximum extent possible. Assess the feasibility of using available City-owned properties as subsidized housing sites, when appropriate and feasible. Hold meetings to inform developers of the application procedures and the City's affordable housing priorities, as part of the funding selection process.	Ongoing, 2015-2023 and at least annually consider potential opportunities.	The City continues to work with affordable housing developers such as ROEM Development Corporation, Palo Alto Housing, MidPen Housing, and First Community Housing. In 2016, the City hosted a developer's forum to seek feedback on the affordable housing NOFA and RFQ process. In 2021, the City hosted meetings with developers to seek feedback on underwriting guidelines and on development opportunity in Precise Plan areas. The City worked with the County to determine potential opportunities for Measure A funds, with the Housing Authority, and with VTA on its Evelyn Avenue site. The City worked with the County on an agreement with the County (expected to be approved in 2022) to leverage \$80 million in County 2016 Measure A funds for various housing sites with permanent supportive and rapid rehousing units in the City, for up to 200 units. The City also worked with nonprofit developers on various affordable housing projects. As of 2021, there are four projects in the affordable housing development pipeline that intend to partner with the City through the NOFA process in the coming years, leveraging a variety of funding sources that includes tax credits, Federal funds, and local funding, including the City's housing impact funds. The City worked with the Lot 12 developer on a lease disposition, development, and lease agreement (LDDLA) which neared completion in 2021 and was fully executed in early 2022.
Update Zoning Ordinance	Complete a comprehensive Zoning Code update by 2017 to ensure consistency with the 2030 General Plan. Review 2030 General Plan Implementation on an annual basis. Upon completion of the Zoning Code update, review on an annual basis for consistency and to address any changes to State law.	Annual review of the 2030 General Plan implementation; Update Zoning Code by 2017, Review annually for consistency.	The 2030 General Plan implements new land use standards through adoption of major Precise Plans for the San Antonio, El Camino Real, and North Bayshore areas in 2014. The San Antonio and El Camino Real areas contain opportunities for new residential/mixed-use development and the North Bayshore Precise Plan was approved in 2017 and includes up to 9,850 residential units. In 2017, the City updated the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance to allow more properties the opportunity to build a second dwelling unit and will be proposing additional updates in 2020 to be compliant with new State laws. In 2019, the City approved the East Whisman Precise Plan and includes up to 5,000 residential units. Additionally, in 2019, the City approved minor zoning code amendments to increase clarity as well as consistency with State law.
Lot Consolidation	Encourage lot consolidation of smaller parcels to accommodate projects to a density of at least 30 dwelling units per acre.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The subdivision process has been posted on the City's website to support lot consolidation. In addition, the new El Camino Real Precise Plan includes guiding principles and standards to encourage small parcel aggregation along the corridor. Staff will continue to work with applicants at no cost to encourage lot consolidation. The major developments are either currently going through the approval process or were approved in 2020 for lot consolidation:
Underutilized Sites	Monitor the supply of underutilized sites throughout the City and within the Housing Element to ensure opportunities are available to encourage a variety of housing types.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	City staff continues to promote the redevelopment of underutilized sites through informal meetings with developers and has identified appropriate sites in the Housing Resources section, which is posted on the City website to accommodate development of a variety of housing types. The San Antonio, El Camino Real, North Bayshore, and East Whisman Precise Plans provide opportunities for higher-intensity development which will serve as an incentive for redevelopment of underutilized parcels in those areas. The City is currently reviewing the R3 (Multifamily Residential) zoning standards and considering modifications to increase opportunities for additional housing types.
Density Bonus	Continue to promote the updated density bonus ordinance that offers bonuses for the provision of affordable housing, depending on the amount and type of subsidized housing provided, consistent with the revised Government Code 65915.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City continues to promote the use of the State Density Bonus Ordinance that offers bonuses for the provision of affordable housing, depending on the amount and type of subsidized housing provided, consistent with revised Government Code §65915. This information is provided at City Hall and online at the City's website to promote the application of this ordinance. Between 2014 and 2020, nine projects with a density bonus were approved: 1701 West El Camino Real, 400 San Antonio Road, 1998 Montecito Avenue, 1101 West El Camino Real, 2700 West El Camino Real, 1313 West El Camino Real, 828 Sierra Vista Avenue, 950 West El Camino Real, and 2645 Fayette Drive. In 2021, the City updated its standards for the State Density Bonus to be consistent with the range of densities and development types in the City.
Federal and State Policy Initiatives	Monitor legislation regarding financing and housing development.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City continuously monitors Federal and State legislation and is supportive of efforts that involve financing options for affordable housing. The City sent support letters on various State bills of California's 2017 Housing Package, including SB 2, SB 3, and AB 1505. In 2018, the City sent a support letter to the Governor for new homelessness program funding. The City also sent a letter in support of Federal Bill S. 548 to expand the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program. As part of the 2020 Federal CARES Act, the City received CDBG CARES Act Rounds 1 and 3 funding totaling approximately \$957,000, which supports the City's COVID-19 rent relief program. In 2021, the City sent a support letter to the County and affirmed funding reservations for the Crestview Motel application for State Homekey funds. The City successfully applied for State CDBG Homekey funding for the LifeMoves-Mountain View project, which required a Council resolution. The City also worked with Senator Becker's office to request funding support for the Lot 12 project, which through his leadership resulted in \$8 million awarded to the City through the State Budget Act of 2021 (SB 129).
Project Design and Integration	As projects are submitted Planning Staff will review General Plan policies and zoning code regulations and design standards to ensure that transitions between proposed developments and existing neighborhoods are appropriate.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	As many recently approved projects include higher-density development on underutilized sites, City staff recognizes that it is critical to provide adequate transitions to existing land uses, particularly single-family neighborhoods. The General Plan includes goals and policies to ensure project designs are appropriately integrated into existing neighborhoods. Staff has worked with developers on the following projects providing appropriate transitions (i.e., building heights and setbacks) with surrounding lower-density neighborhoods: 1616 West El Camino Real; 500 Ferguson Drive, 1701 West El Camino Real, 100 Moffett Boulevard, 801 West El Camino Real, 400 San Antonio Road, and 1255 Pear Avenue.

<p>Innovative Housing Programs</p>	<p>Review residential development standards to ensure that there is flexibility in the Zoning Code to allow for innovative housing types such as co-housing, shared housing, and intergenerational housing.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>In 2012, the Mountain View City Council approved a 19-unit, three-story, “co-housing” development project over an underground garage at 445 Calderon Avenue, which included moving an existing historic home on-site. The project is marketed as a new, “old-fashioned” neighborhood of energy-efficient condominiums and common facilities, homes that promote collaboration and community, in a convenient walkable downtown location. The City expects that a number of the units will be inhabited by senior residents, although the project is not age-restricted. To approve the project, the City also approved a density bonus to allow a BMR unit to be located in the historic home on-site.</p> <p>In 2017, LinkedIn prepaid a portion of its \$16 million housing impact fee obligation that would have been part of its project approval by investing \$10 million in the Housing Trust Silicon Valley Tech Fund. By prepaying, the funds are able to become available to affordable housing developers sooner. The fund provides short-term loans for land acquisition and other related costs for developments in Mountain View.</p> <p>In 2017, the City Council approved the North Bayshore Precise Plan, which includes an innovative affordable housing program that has provisions for both rental and ownership housing at various income levels, achieved through a Bonus FAR mechanism.</p> <p>In 2019, the City Council approved a 716-unit apartment building that includes 144 moderate-income units available for Mountain View Whisman School District teachers and City staff housing.</p> <p>In 2020, the City applied with LifeMoves to State Project HomeKey Program to rapidly deploy modular units to provide interim housing for unhoused seniors and families who may be particularly vulnerable to COVID-19. The project was awarded 11.95 million in capital funds and 2.4 million in operating funds. This was a highly competitive program and to staff’s knowledge, one of the only funded projects to use modular housing approach statewide. In 2021 the City Council reserved CDBG and HOME funds to support the conversion of the Crestview Hotel into permanent housing, largely for families and individuals at risk of homelessness or experiencing homelessness. The City also supported the County’s application for state funds for this project. The hotel conversion will make it possible to make units available more quickly and affordably. The City also worked on a Memorandum of Understanding with the County for its Measure A funds, which provides a programmatic approach to funding multiple City projects.</p>
<p>Units for Large Households</p>	<p>Ensure at least 25 percent of the units in a subsidized family housing development have three or more bedrooms to accommodate large families if City provides financial assistance. Consider alternatives to preserve and rehabilitate apartments with large family units</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>MidPen Housing received entitlements in January 2018 for a NOFA project to increase affordable units on the project site located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard. A total of 50 new studios to three-bedroom units for low-income households were approved, and construction is anticipated to begin in early 2019. ROEM Development Corporation included 45 two-bedroom and 15 three-bedroom units for its Evelyn Family Apartments located at 779 East Evelyn Avenue, which opened early 2019. Several of the housing developments in the pipeline include units for large households.</p>
<p>Maintain Residential Development Capacity</p>	<p>Development of evaluation procedure to implement Government Code section 65863 by January 31, 2015.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City has identified a residential capacity shortfall from the site inventory list in Section 7, Housing Resources to accommodate 22 low-income units and 257 moderate-income units. Staff is expecting to accommodate this shortfall with the addition of 2,970 affordable residential units in North Bayshore as well as East Whisman to assist with meeting the City’s low and moderate-income unit RHNA allocation.</p> <p>Staff will continue to monitor this residential capacity and evaluating development applications on properties identified in the Housing Element site inventory included in Section 7, Housing Resources. If a development project reduces capacity below the residential capacity needed to accommodate the City’s lower-income unit RHNA allocation, staff will identify sites to accommodate the difference.</p>
<p>Boomerang Funds</p>	<p>Ensure 20% of net “Boomerang” funds are utilized for low and moderate income housing.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>In June 2015, the City of Mountain View committed to reserve “Boomerang” funds to be used for eligible housing related activities. The City has committed an amount equal to 20 percent of all funds distributed to the City as a taxing entity under the redevelopment dissolution laws. Beginning in the 2016-17 budget, an ongoing set-aside of \$51,000 was approved.</p> <p>In addition to the Boomerang funds, the successor agency has been receiving loan repayments from former redevelopment housing activities. Close to \$1 million has accumulated since 2011 and the City will use these funds for affordable housing and plans to use up to \$250,000 for eligible homeless services in the coming years. \$1 million of the successor agency funds have been reserved for affordable housing which will be built on Lot 12.</p>
<p>Homebuyer Assistance Programs</p>	<p>Support Housing Trust Fund homebuyer assistance programs and other federal, State and local programs that enable households to purchase homes.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City continues to support the Housing Trust Fund’s homebuyer program. Staff periodically meets with the Housing Trust staff to discuss programs and marketing opportunities. In both Fall 2019 and 2020, the City hosted an informational events in partnership with the Housing Trust regarding their homebuyer program that was open to the public. In 2020, the City is in the process of modifying its Employee Homebuyer Assistance program. In 2021, the City began working with the Housing Trust and HouseKeys to develop a more accessible homebuyer program for displaced tenants seeking to use “right of first refusal” rights to buy below-market-rate condos.</p>

<p>Priorities for Affordable Units</p>	<p>Implement the City's preferences for new BMR ownership and rental units as specified in the BMR Administrative Guidelines. Give preference to people who live and work in Mountain View when units become available in subsidized rental housing developments. Do extensive advertising and outreach whenever new BMR or subsidized units become available and waitlist are opened for existing affordable units.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City continues to implement the various housing fee programs. For BMR units, the City has prioritized funding and housing assistance for public safety workers, teachers, and persons who either work or live within Mountain View. The City notices the availability of BMR units through ads in the local paper, articles in The View, multilingual outreach, e-mail notifications to those on the City's Housing Interest List, signs and information posted on the website, outreach through churches and other nonprofit organizations, and web announcements.</p>
<p>Partnerships with County Agencies</p>	<p>Increase resident awareness about housing programs offered by County and regional agencies by providing information at City Hall and on the City's website, when funding is available.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City continues to work with the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara to promote affordable housing opportunities in Mountain View and to coordinate support of Mountain View's affordable housing units through the Project-Based Voucher (PBV) program.</p> <p>The City also continues to work closely with the Santa Clara County Office of Supportive Housing on funding opportunities for Mountain View's affordable developments including Measure A projects, as well as Project HomeKey. Staff participates in regional discussions to monitor new regulations and possible collaboration on preparation of the federal Fair Housing Assessment, and to share information and strategies for addressing affordable housing, homelessness, fair housing, and other issues of common concern. The City worked on an agreement with the County (expected to be approved in 2022) to leverage \$80 million in County 2016 Measure A funds for various housing sites with permanent supportive and rapid rehousing units in the City, for up to 200 units.</p>
<p>Anti-Displacement Strategies. Tenant Relocation Assistance Program</p>	<p>Conserve updates to the Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance when there are major changes to the rental market, the economy, or development activity.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>In 2010, the City Council adopted a Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance (TRAO) requiring developers to pay for relocation assistance to very low- or extremely low-income households displaced by new development. In June 2014, the Council amended the ordinance to increase the amount of assistance and to make households up to 80 percent AMI eligible for relocation assistance. Also, eligible tenants will receive the cash equivalent of three months median market-rate rent for a similar apartment instead of two months of the tenant's current rent.</p> <p>On November 8, 2016, the Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act (CSFRA) was adopted by voters to regulate rent increases and to provide just-cause eviction provisions. Staff has implemented the CSFRA, including convening a Rental Housing Committee, establishing an operating budget, and developing policies and procedures for petitions.</p> <p>In April 2018, the City Council amended the TRAO to bring it in line with the CSFRA, which increased the eligibility threshold to 120 percent AMI. The new ordinance redefines an eligible rental unit as one covered under the CSFRA or containing three or more units on one parcel of land not covered by the CSFRA. It also introduces First Right of Return benefits.</p> <p>In 2019, the TRAO was utilized in fourteen development projects to assist with the relocation of 69 displaced households.</p> <p>In October 2019, the City Council held a Study Session to explore additional strategies to respond to displacement. Council provided direction to staff to evaluate an acquisition/rehabilitation program, a displacement mitigation program, further modifications to the TRAO, a Landlord-Rental Set-Aside Program, Tenant Preference for displaced tenants in BMR units, and other modifications to the City's ordinances as needed. In 2020, the TRAO was modified per Council direction, and staff conducted additional evaluation on an acquisition rehabilitation program and also local replacement requirements for residential projects that include the demolition of existing housing units. In October of 2020, Council held a second study session to provide additional direction on these elements, with Council supporting evaluating program design considerations. In November of 2020, the City received a technical assistance grant from the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative to support the acquisition rehabilitation program evaluation and design. In 2021 the City Council approved a Mobile Home Rent Stabilization program to regulate rent increases in Mobile Home Parks.</p>
<p>Code Enforcement Program</p>	<p>Maintain the quality of the existing housing stock by addressing housing code violations as they are reported.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City continues to maintain the quality of the existing housing stock by addressing Housing Code violations as they are reported. For calendar year 2020, Code Enforcement addressed 158 housing violations that were reported.</p>
<p>Multi-family Housing Inspection Program</p>	<p>Continue annual inspection of multi-family rental properties throughout the City to ensure property owners and management companies comply with the California Building Code and the City's Municipal Code.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>On an annual basis, the City of Mountain View Fire Department conducts inspections of multi-family rental units throughout the City. Staff is also available to address complaints as they are reported. For calendar year 2021, City staff conducted interior inspections of approximately 4 properties. Inspections inside apartment units were stopped in March 2020 as a safety precaution due to COVID. Staff did conduct approximately 842 common area inspections at apartment buildings in 2021.</p>

Opportunities for Rehabilitation	Collaborate with affordable housing developers on funding applications or when feasible offer direct financial assistance.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City had a NOFA process that included acquisition and rehabilitation projects; to date, no proposals have been received for acquisition and rehabilitation. Consequently, the City has focused funding on new construction of subsidized units. The City has used CDBG and HOME funds to rehabilitate existing subsidized projects, including Tyrella Gardens, Shorebreeze, The Fountains, Gintzon Terrace, and a major rehabilitation of the Sierra Vista I family apartments. In 2020, as part of the displacement response strategy and as directed by Council, staff evaluated options for an acquisition/preservation program, which would include funding for rehabilitating acquired apartment buildings.
Home Repair Assistance	Continue to provide annual funding for home repair services, such as the Minor Home Repair Access Program to support lower-income households.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City coordinates with firms to operate a minor home repair program for lower-income households. Under the program, low-income homeowners may receive minor repairs and low-income homeowners and tenants can request accessibility modifications.
Condominium Conversion	Continue to regulate Conversions of rental multi-family units to condominiums per Municipal Code (Chapter 28, Article VII).	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City continues to regulate condominium conversions on a project-by-project basis per the City's Municipal Code. The City Code prohibits conversion of apartments to condominiums if the number of apartments Citywide falls below 15,373 units. As of December 31, 2019, there were at approximately 1,000 rental units in the City above the condominium conversion threshold. As such, the City will consider condominium conversion applications on a case-by-case basis, consistent with Municipal Code requirements for such conversions.
Preservation of Subsidized Housing Stock	Maintain a list of subsidized units throughout the City, including their affordability levels and monitor affordability covenants. Continue to update and post the City's AB 987 Affordable Housing Database online and track affordable housing units. Work with owners of at-risk units to determine if City housing funds could be used to preserve subsidized units.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City has posted their AB 987 Affordable Housing Database on its website and will continue to monitor affordable housing units, including units at risk of losing their affordability status. New units are also added and monitored. The City deed-restricts subsidized affordable housing for a minimum of 55 years. The vast majority of the City's subsidized housing stock was built in the last 15 years, which means that the issue of expiring deed restrictions will not emerge for a few decades.
Mobile Home Parks	Preserve mobile home parks in the City by enforcing the provisions established by the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Mobile Home Park Conversion Ordinance.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The 2030 General Plan includes a "Mobile Home Park" land use designation to protect mobile home housing. This designation is shown on the General Plan Land Use Map and any proposal to convert or eliminate a mobile home use from a property requires a General Plan amendment as well as a Zoning Code amendment. Additionally, proposals to displace a mobile home park require a conversion impact report as well as multiple review and approval processes before a conversion could be approved. The City will continue to allow and preserve mobile homes as a valuable housing resource. As part of the work of the CSFRA in 2018, the Rental Housing Committee discussed whether mobile home spaces would be covered under the rent stabilization provisions of the CSFRA and came to the conclusion that they do not fall under the parameters of the CSFRA. Consideration of mobile home rent regulations is part of the Council Major Goals Workplan for FY2019-21. Council held a discussion in early 2020 but additional deliberations were paused pending litigation regarding Rental Housing Committee decision above that mobile homes are not covered under CSFRA. In 2021 the City Council approved a Mobile Home Rent Stabilization program to regulate rent increases in Mobile Home Parks.
Residential Development Standards	Review development standards annually, to identify constraints and remove or offset constraints, where possible.	The City will review development standards annually throughout the planning period.	Staff continues to annually review development standards to identify constraints and remove offset constraints, where possible. In 2017 and 2020, staff updated the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance to encourage development of more accessory dwelling units and provide additional housing opportunities and diversity within the City.
Reduced or Modified Parking Requirements	Review parking demand analyses for specific projects, as they are submitted, and work with housing developers to identify opportunities for reduced or shared parking requirements. Analyze and reduce, where appropriate. Parking requirements as part of the San Antonio and El Camino Real Precise Plan updates and future comprehensive Zoning Code update.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City continues to work with developers to reduce the parking standards where appropriate. For example, ROEM Development Corporation requested a reduced parking ratio for their 116 unit affordable development located at 779 East Evelyn Avenue. A lower parking ratio of 1.75 spaces per unit instead of the 2.10 spaces per unit required by the City Code was approved with the project by the City Council. The North Bayshore Precise Plan and East Whisman Precise Plan include reduced parking requirements and Transportation Demand Management measures for new residential development.
Second Units	Track the number of second units proposed and constructed during the planning period. Evaluate the Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fee, as it applies to second unit development, and adjust the application of the fee, if necessary.	Ongoing, 2015-2023, within two years of Housing Element adoption, the City will evaluate Park Land Dedication In-Lieu fees.	In 2017 and 2020, staff updated the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance to encourage development of more accessory dwelling units and provide additional housing opportunities and diversity within the City. Staff is tracking the number of second units proposed and constructed. Between 2000 and 2016, 15 units were constructed. Between 2017 and 2020, after the City updated its Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance, 28 units were constructed. In 2021 alone, 35 accessory dwelling units began construction and 15 accessory dwelling units were completed. The City has eliminated Parkland Dedication Fees for ADUs.

Streamlined Entitlement Process	Assign a primary contact for new subsidized housing developmemnts to assist with all necessary entitlements and city processes. Hold pre-application development meetings.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City has primary contacts in Planning and Housing for new subsidized housing developments. Pre-application meetings are held with these developments.
School District Coordination	Provide a copy of the Housing Element to school districts serving the City. Share information on new residential developments including number of units and bedrooms and demographic information with school districts.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	Depending on the size and impact of a development project, the City encourages developers to work with the school districts to ensure that facilities are available to new residents. School impact fees continue to be collected for new development projects Citywide and projects are analyzed through the environmental review process for potential impacts consistent with State law. City staff continues to communicate with local school districts on planned City growth to assist in their student projections.
Neighborhood Engagement	Encourage housing developers to communicate and share information with groups regarding their proposed projects.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	City staff actively updates a list of proposed and approved projects on the Planning Division website and provides project notices at various points during the development review process. Depending on the size of the development, the City encourages developers to communicate and share information with groups regarding their proposed projects. For affordable developments, the City proactively schedules neighborhood meetings to receive feedback from the neighborhood on the proposed development. This has been an effective tool to engage the community and seek input on affordable developments in the City.
Water and Sewer Service Provider Coordination	Ensure that water and sewer providers are aware of the City's plans for residential development throughout the City.	By January 31, 2015	The City has delivered a copy of the Housing Element to all public agencies or private entities that provide water or sewer services to properties within the City. Additionally, the City ensures water and sewer providers are aware of the City's plans for residential development throughout the City.
Flood Management	Ensure that flood risks are considered when making land use decisions, including the selection of sites to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	As part of the recent General Plan update, the City revised the General Plan conservation and safety policies to consider flood risks as they relate to future land use decisions. The Infrastructure and Conservation and Public Safety Elements have been updated to identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitats, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. Additionally, these Elements identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to, flood hazard zones, National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA, information about flood hazards designated floodway maps, dam failure inundation maps, areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of levees or floodwalls, etc., as listed in Section 65302(g)(2). These Elements establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objective for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding.
Emergency Resoures to Prevent Homelessness	continue to partner with the Mountain View Los Altos Community Services Agency (CSA) or similar agencies that provide services to the homeless, by offering financial support and advertising available programs to residents living in the City. Continue to fund the provision of shelter and support services for the homeless such as the Emergency Housing Consortium, the Community Services Agency's Emergency Assistance Program, Graduate House, and Quetzal House. Participate in regional homeless programs that support short-term shelter and transitional housing programs, such as the Clara-mateo homeless shelter which accomodated families and individuals from Mountain View.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	City of Mountain View is an active participant in the creation of new transitional and supportive housing facilities to address homelessness, through regional collaboration and cooperation with nonprofit agencies, housing developers, and other jurisdictions. Throughout the planning period, City staff attended quarterly meetings held by the CDBG Coordinators group in addition to meeting with nonprofit agencies and developers to identify possible projects that could be implemented in future years. The City currently supports, and will continue to provide oversight for, the two transitional homes located within the City: (1) Alice Avenue Transitional Home, which serves up to five formerly homeless persons; and (2) Quetzal House, a local youth shelter and transitional home operated by the Bill Wilson Center that serves about 40 to 50 homeless youth annually. In an effort to further help end chronic homelessness, the City has funded the San Antonio Place Efficiency Studios that include 10 units for persons transitioning out of homelessness. The City continues to look for opportunities to fund supportive housing units within the City in new affordable developments. In 2020, the City continued to fund basic human needs and essential services for those unhoused and living in Mountain View. Additionally, the City has committed funding for its Project Home Key initiative, which provides interim housing for unhoused persons. As part of the the City's comprehensive response to the pandemic, COuncil approved over \$3.8 million composed of various funding sources for the City's COVID-19 rent relief program, administered by Community Services Agency (CSA). In October 2016, the City identified potential short-term homelessness response and longer-term homeless housing strategies for Council consideration. Short-term responses include funding outreach workers and case workers to identify homeless individuals; to connect them with housing and services as appropriate; and to respond to the human service needs of those living in vehicles/RVs. A strategy to respond the longer-term housing needs of the homeless is being developed based on Council input. (.see more below) In 2019, Council adopted a safe parking ordinance that establishes health and safety guidelines for safe parking facilities in the City. In addition, the City is in the process of establishing two public parking lots as safe parking sites. In 2020, the City opened two public parking lots as safe parking sites and financially supported operatinos at a third safe parking site. In 2021, the City supported the opening of a 100-room transitional housing site funded by the City, County, State Project Homekey and private sources, run by LifeMoves.

Special Needs Housing	Encourage the development of special needs housing with convenient access to services, public facilities, and transit. Support developers of special needs housing facilities through the application process for federal, State and similar funding sources or through direct financial assistance from local housing funds. Provide technical assistance through the entitlement process, as projects are submitted for review.	Ongoing, 2015-2023 and at least annually consider potential opportunities. In October 2014 and again within five years of Housing Element adoption (by 2020), the City will convene a meeting with developers and service providers and at least annually consider potential opportunities.	<p>The City has successfully initiated the development of a range of subsidized housing, including units for special-needs groups. Whenever feasible, projects are located near transit and other services; however the high cost and limited availability of land make siting requirements difficult. On January 22, 2013, the City Council approved a development for 27 studios for the developmentally disabled at 1585 West El Camino Real, which is a high-frequency transit route. This project completed construction in September 2015.</p> <p>Palo Alto Housing has also received a funding appropriation in the amount of \$8 million to develop 67 studio units at 1701 West El Camino Real. At least 39 of these units will be reserved for veterans. In 2021, 950 W. El Camino Real - a City funded affordable housing multi family development - opened along a high-frequency transit route. 15 of the 70 affordable units are set aside for adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities. The City also expects several pipeline projects - with set-asides for permanent supportive housing - to provide units for special needs populations. The LifeMoves-Mountain View Homekey project provides 100 units to serve unsheltered persons, seniors, and families.</p> <p>The City also assists developers through the entitlement process by providing a streamlined time frame for approval.</p> <p>The City continues to work with various partners, including nonprofit developers, the County, and the Housing Authority, to determine potential opportunities to develop affordable housing, including housing for extremely low-income households, special needs, and the homeless.</p>
Mediation and Fair Housing Programs	Continue to fund fair housing education, enforcement, and counseling. Provide financial support to mediate housing issues involving City residents. Continue to support Santa Clara County Fair Housing Task Force activities. Provide information about tenant and landlord housing rights at City Hall, on the City's website and in other public places to increase awareness.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	<p>Throughout the planning period, the City has provided funding to Project Sentinel, who is an active member of the Santa Clara County Fair Housing Task Force. The Santa Clara County Fair Housing Task Force meets quarterly to coordinate and collaborate on the promotion of fair housing. Through the Task Force, priorities have been established for fair housing outreach and education. Resources have also been identified within the municipalities, the community, and private industry that can be used to affirmatively further fair housing. Information from the Task Force is distributed by Project Sentinel and City staff regarding activities that are performed to implement Task Force objectives.</p> <p>Project Sentinel also works closely with the Fair Housing Law Project (FHLP) and has asked the City to provide roughly \$3,000 per year in in-kind services to support FHLP housing legal services for Mountain View residents. The FHLP attorneys provide guidance to Project Sentinel's housing counselors and take many cases that are not considered by other attorneys in private practice, including cases involving reasonable accommodation/disability, overly restrictive rules of conduct/familial status, and similar issues.</p>
Reasonable Accommodation	Provide information to residents on reasonable accommodation procedures at public counters and on the City website. Promote rehabilitation programs and resources for accessibility modifications and improvements. Evaluate the Municipal Code to identify and remove any constraints regarding reasonable accommodation as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.	Ongoing, 2015-2023. As part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update, expected to be completed by 2017, the City will identify and remove any constraints to reasonable accommodations.	The City continues to evaluate the Municipal Code to identify and remove any constraints regarding reasonable accommodation as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.
Senior Housing	Study the need and feasibility of zoning code amendments, such as permitting the development of senior housing in specific areas of the community, including residential and commercial zones at higher densities than are traditionally allowed. Encourage developments with subsidized senior units to locate near services, public facilities, transit and the Mountain View Senior Center	Ongoing, 2015-2023	In 2016, the City funded the rehabilitation of 360 senior units located in Ginzton Terrace Apartments (107 units) and The Fountains Apartments (124 units) and 56 family units located at Tyrella Gardens Apartments. These subsidized rental projects utilized \$1.17 million in CDBG and \$838,000 in HOME funds for the rehabilitation.

Senior Care Facilities	Study the appropriateness and effectiveness of amending the Zoning Ordinance to establish development standards for senior care facilities.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City of Mountain View understands the importance of affordable housing options and desire for seniors to age in place. To accommodate the aging population, the City has a number of housing options. There are 16 small assisted facilities for seniors in the City with a total capacity of 152 beds. In addition to the smaller facilities available, there are also six subsidized rental properties in the City with a total of 704 units. These larger complexes have units with one- to two-bedroom apartments and have deed restrictions to ensure affordability. In 2013, the City Council updated the Zoning Ordinance, adding senior facilities to the list of projects eligible for a Planned Unit Development, to allow more development flexibility.
Housing for Developmentally Disabled Persons	Assist developers to apply for available State and Federal monies in support of housing construction and rehabilitation targeted for person with disabilities, including developmental disabilities. Initiate a cooperative outreach program with San Andreas Regional Center to inform individuals when new housing becomes available for developmentally disabled persons.	Ongoing, 2015-2023 and at least bi-annually consider potential opportunities. In October 2014 and again within five years of Housing Element adoption (by 2020), the City will convene a meeting with developers of supportive housing and at least bi-annually consider potential opportunities.	The City is an active member of the CDBG Coordinator group, and participates through Project Sentinel in the Fair Housing Task Force. These groups are both regional efforts that include leaders from the corporate, educational, and labor communities, as well as community fair housing advocates and local jurisdictions. These groups provide key opportunities to network, share information, and coordinate on projects. 1585 Studios, a 26-unit studios project at 1585 West El Camino Real, was approved in 2013 and completed in September 2015, providing 26 affordable units for developmentally disabled adults. 950 W El Camino, a 71-unit project, was approved in 2019 and will provide 15 units for developmentally disabled adults. The City will continue to explore opportunities with affordable housing developers to create housing for those with special needs.
Analysis of Impediments for Fair Housing Choice (AI)	Continue to prepare and update the City's Analysis of Impediments very five years, as required by HUD.	Every five years as required by HUD	The City completed its update of the Analysis of Impediments (AI) in 2016. The actions to address identified needs are being implemented during the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan cycle. Key City actions to remove barriers include adoption of a reasonable accommodation section in the Zoning Ordinance in 2015 and continued funding for fair housing counseling, education and enforcement. In 2016, the City funded this agency in an amount of \$25,000 for fair housing services. In 2019, the City monitored potential changes in requirements for Fair Housing plans for entitlement jurisdictions receiving CDBG/HOME funding. It is anticipated that the City will begin the update of its Fair Housing Plan as part of explore development of the regional consortium. In 2020, the City as part of the regional consortium process began development of its Analysis of Impediments/Fair Housing Plan for the 2020-2025 period.
Employee Housing Act	Ensure zoning ordinance consistency with State law.	Concurrent with comprehensive Zoning Code update to be completed by 2017.	The City will amend the Zoning Code to comply with State law (Health and Safety Code Section 17021.5) concurrently with the comprehensive Zoning Code update.
Green Building Principles	Implement changes to local building codes based on State Green Building Code requirements. Provide technical assistance to housing developers to implement the Green Building Code and Water Conservation in Landscape Regulation ordinance.	Ongoing, 2015-2023	The City's Green Building Code and Water Conservation in Landscape Regulations require new developments to incorporate green building techniques. The City provides information to developers on design techniques to implement Green Building Code and Water Conservation in Landscape Regulations. The City also encourages new projects to be developed with green building principles during the review process and through policies in the new precise plans. Additionally, the North Bayshore Precise Plan has more stringent requirements for higher FAR projects, to establish the area as a leader in sustainability. In 2016 the City also amended its Water Conservation in Landscape Regulations to further encourage water conservation.

<p>Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Ordinance</p>	<p>Implement the Construction and Demolition Ordinance to ensure effective demolition and construction recycling. When appropriate incentivize use of recycled and rapidly renewable building materials.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>Established in 2008, the City has adopted a Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Ordinance. The purpose of the ordinance is to establish a program for the recycling and salvage of construction and demolition (C&D) debris. C&D debris comprises a significant portion of the waste stream that can be diverted from the landfill, thereby conserving resources, protecting our environment, and extending landfill life. The ordinance requires at least 50 percent of the debris from construction, renovation, and demolition projects be diverted from landfills through salvage and recycling practices. The program makes it easy and convenient for property owners, general contractors, and subcontractors to meet their responsibilities under the ordinance. The City currently has information about the program posted on their website. To comply with the ordinance, developers are encouraged to contact the City's exclusive hauler, Recology, for roll-off box service. Using Recology is beneficial to the developers as the paperwork is then complete by the City, materials may be mixed together in one box, and boxes are recycled at SMaRT stations. The program allows the City to verify the hauling and processing of boxes, achieving a 78 percent diversion rate.</p>
<p>Staff Training on Green Building Principles</p>	<p>Encourage City Staff to attend conferences, training sessions, and other events to learn and stay informed on new green initiatives and technologies. Hold in-house training sessions to facilitate inter-department cooperation on green building practices.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>To effectively maintain an awareness of new legislation and practices regarding green building practices, staff attends meetings, conferences, and other related events. On a regular basis, staff also reviews the Green Building Code and Water Conservation in Landscape Regulations to ensure they are up to date with the latest advancements.</p>
<p>Energy Efficiency</p>	<p>Encourage the use of residential developers to maximize energy conservation through proactive site, building and building system design, materials and equipment to maximize energy efficiency. Encourage the use of Energy Star appliances and materials in subsidized housing developments. Encourage use of upgraded insulation, advanced air infiltration reduction practices (air sealing), and Low-E double-pane windows. Promote use of energy efficient lighting including fluorescent.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>During 2016, the City spent approximately \$1 million in CDBG and \$185,000 in HOME funds on green and sustainable rehabilitation at two subsidized apartment complexes for lower-income seniors: Ginzton Terrace Apartments (107) units and The Fountains Apartments (124 units).</p>
<p>Water Efficiency and Conservation</p>	<p>Encourage residential developers to maximize water conservation through effective water management designs (i.e., use of water efficient landscaping, efficient irrigation systems, incorporating wastewater reuse and metering). Encourage owners of existing buildings to conduct water conservation retrofits. Continue to review residential landscape plans for consistency with the City's Water Conservation in Landscaping regulations. Provide information on available water conservation programs and measures at the Planning counter to all residents and developers planning to expand or build new residences.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>The City continues to encourage residential developers to maximize water conservation through effective water management designs (i.e., use of water efficient landscaping, efficient irrigation systems, incorporating wastewater reuse and metering). In 2016, the City amended its Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations to meet new State requirements and further encourage water conservation.</p> <p>Information regarding the Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations is provided online and at City Hall.</p>
<p>Annual Monitoring and Review</p>	<p>Per Government Code Section 65400, annually review the Housing Element and submit findings to the Office of Planning and Research and HCD.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>In March 2022, the City prepared an annual report on the progress toward implementation of the 2015-2023 Housing Element. This report was presented to the Environmental Planning Commission and City Council and submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development on April 1, 2022.</p>

<p>City Council Goal Setting</p>	<p>Incorporate Housing Element programs and recommendations from the City's annual monitoring and review process into the City Council's goal-setting process. Ensure consistency between the Housing Element and other General Plan Elements throughout the planning period.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2015-2023</p>	<p>Based on the annual report prepared for HCD and general evaluation of implementation programs, the City takes into account funding opportunities and actions necessary to implement the Housing Element, ensuring consistency with other established goals.</p>
----------------------------------	---	---------------------------	--



APPENDIX

B

Housing Needs Assessment

APPENDIX B: HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

California Housing Element law requires local governments to adequately plan for the existing and projected future housing needs of their residents, including the jurisdictions' fair share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). A complete and thorough analysis must include both a quantification and a descriptive analysis of the specific housing needs that currently exist and those that are reasonably anticipated within the community during the planning period, as well as the resources available to address those needs. The following section summarizes information regarding existing and projected housing needs in Mountain View broken down into the following categories:

- Population and Household Characteristics
- Economic and Employment Characteristics
- Housing Stock Characteristics
- Housing Costs and Affordability
- Housing and Special Needs Populations
- Assessment of Fair Housing
- Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors

Summary of Findings

Major findings from the following Housing Needs Assessment include:

- Mountain View experienced significant population growth between 2010 and 2020, outpacing the rate of growth Santa Clara County and the Bay Area overall during this period. The number of households also increased significantly during this period, but at a slower pace than population growth. A sizable share of recent population growth has consisted of young, working age individuals between the age of 25 and 34, with children under 15 also comprising a significant share of the growth. Overall, these trends indicate that Mountain View has grown to accommodate new households over the past ten years. These data could indicate an increase in the number of households with children and correspondingly larger household sizes as well as an increase in the number of young individuals that share homes in order to afford housing.
- More than half of all households in Mountain View rent their homes, which is a higher percentage of renters than either Santa Clara County or the Bay Area overall. Because those that rent their homes are generally more susceptible to displacement than those that own their homes, this suggests a need for programs to prevent displacement of existing Mountain View residents. Indeed, over 1,000 apartments in Mountain View have been demolished over the past several years, displacing many families and households. Mountain View has several existing programs and policies to address displacement and stabilize the living situation of renters, including the CSFRA, MHRSO, TRAO, and implementation of SB 330. Programs in the Housing Plan in this Housing Element Update that further the City's ongoing displacement mitigation efforts include Programs 1.5, 1.12, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, and 4.2.
- Mountain View residents face extremely high housing costs, including for both ownership and rental units. The City's high cost for housing is likely due to a range of factors, including

Mountain View's position as a significant job center in Silicon Valley. The pace of job growth has exceeded the rate of growth in households in Mountain View and there are more people that work in Mountain View than there are employed residents, creating strong demand for housing. Program 4.6 addresses the impact of jobs on housing costs.

- Compared to the surrounding region, Mountain View has a higher proportion of non-Hispanic White residents, and growth among other racial and ethnic groups has been slower in Mountain View compared to the surrounding region. These trends are likely due largely to the high cost of housing in Mountain View, coupled with wage and income gaps between racial and ethnic groups. The Housing Plan that is included in this Housing Element Update includes several programs to facilitate the production and preservation of affordable housing in Mountain View, including Programs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.
- Consistent with the City's high housing costs, many lower-income households in Mountain View experience high housing cost burdens that can put these households at risk for displacement and make it difficult for these households to afford housing costs along with food, healthcare, and other basic needs. High housing cost burdens have a disproportionate impact on large households, seniors, persons with disabilities, and Hispanic and Latinx individuals. The City can help to address housing needs among these groups by undertaking displacement prevention efforts as well as facilitating the production and preservation of affordable housing. This Housing Element Update includes several related actions that the City will take as part of the Housing Plan, including programs that facilitate the production and preservation of affordable housing as well as those that address displacement, as noted above.
- Mountain View offers relatively high access to opportunity, including in areas with comparatively large non-White populations and areas with lower-income residents. The only area considered "Low Resource" in the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map is the North Bayshore area, but that area has access to the greatest number of jobs is the subject of a major precise plan that will bring new development and services to the area, helping to improve access to opportunity.

These findings are consistent with input that was received through the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update. Participants in the public engagement process highlighted the high cost of housing and associated affordability challenges for lower-income households, including the disproportionate impact that high housing costs have on seniors, persons with disabilities, and Hispanic and Latinx residents. Displacement was cited as a major concern among those that participated in the public engagement process, including concerns about the impact of displacement on the local workforce, people of color, and special needs groups. Input also highlighted the impact that non-residential development has on housing costs in Mountain View. As noted above, the Housing Plan chapter of the Housing Element Update includes several programs to address these key issues that were emphasized by those that participated in the public engagement process, and which are also apparent through the data presented in this Appendix.

Note on Data Sources

The following housing needs assessment relies upon data from a variety of sources, including but not limited to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS), Decennial Census, and Local Employment Housing Dynamics (LEHD); the U.S. Department of Housing and Community Development (HUD) Comprehensive Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data set; the California Department of Finance (DOF); the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data; the City of Mountain View; and other sources as noted in the tables and figures. Much of the data was compiled by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) specifically for use in Housing Elements. Information sourced from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey or U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, both of which rely on samples and as such, are subject to sampling variability. This means that the data represent estimates, and that other estimates could be possible if another set of respondents had been reached. This analysis uses the five-year release to get a larger data pool to minimize this "margin of error" but particularly for smaller communities such as Census tracts and block groups, the data will be based on fewer responses, and the information should be interpreted accordingly. In contrast, the decennial Census attempts to survey 100% of the population. Only basic limited data from the 2020 Census were available at the time of analysis.

Impacts of COVID-19

This Housing Needs Assessment was prepared during 2021 and 2022, at which point local demographics, housing market conditions, employment characteristics, and other key issues that are discussed in this section were continuing to experience impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic. While some of the data presented in this section were collected after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the majority of the data that were available at the time that this document was prepared were collected prior to the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that the data may not reflect current conditions to the extent that these conditions have changed as a result of the pandemic. Moreover, even where more recent data are available, it is difficult to assess the extent to which current data reflect temporary impacts from COVID-19 or longer-term trends.

Despite these data challenges, the primary findings from the Housing Needs Assessment remain relevant for addressing housing needs in Mountain View over the next eight years. For example, while some data on housing costs in Mountain View reflect pre-pandemic conditions, the following sections also provide data on residential rental rates in Mountain View as of 2021 that indicate that rental rates have begun to recover from the impacts of the pandemic. This suggests that Mountain View continues to be a high-cost housing market in which lower-income households will experience affordability challenges and displacement risk. Input from a variety of groups that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update underscored that high housing costs and displacement risk continue to be key issues affecting Mountain View residents, particularly among racial and ethnic minority groups and special-needs populations. Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has not fundamentally altered the factors that lead to disparities in access to opportunity, such as historic patterns of segregation and wage and income gaps. While the specific data points

may differ somewhat from current conditions, these differences would not substantially alter the findings presented in this section or the appropriateness of related actions that are included in the Housing Plan.

Population and Household Characteristics

Population

The Bay Area is the fifth-largest metropolitan area in the nation and has seen a steady gradual increase in population since 1990. 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. Since 2000, Mountain View’s population has increased by 15.0%; this rate is above that of the region as a whole (13.5%).

As of 2020, Mountain View had a population of 81,302 residents, as reported in Table 2. Mountain View’s population makes up 4.2% of the total population in Santa Clara County. From 1990 to 2000, the population in Mountain View increased by 5.0%, while it increased by 4.7% during the first decade of the 2000s. In the most recent decade, the population in Mountain View increased by 9.8%. This growth rate was higher than the growth rates in Santa Clara County (9.2%) and the Bay Area (8.4%) during this period.

Table 2: Population Growth Trends

Geography	1990	2000	2010	2020
Mountain View	67,365	70,708	74,066	81,302
Santa Clara County	1,497,577	1,682,585	1,781,642	1,945,166
Bay Area	6,020,147	6,784,348	7,150,739	7,703,016

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-4 series; BAE, 2021.

Household Growth Trends

Since 2000, Mountain View’s number of households has grown slower than its population, increasing by 9.4% compared to the population growth rate of 15.0%. This household growth rate is slower than that of Santa Clara County (13.7%) or the Bay Area (11.6%). As shown in Table 3, in 2020 Mountain View had 34,184 households, which make up 5.3% of the total households in Santa Clara County. From 1990 to 2000, the number of households in Mountain View increased by 4.2%, while growth slowed to 2.3% between 2000 to 2010.

In the most recent decade, the number of households in Mountain View increased by 7.0%. Though the household growth rate in Mountain View has historically lagged behind those of Santa Clara County and the Bay Area, Mountain View has since accelerated and surpassed both (6.5% and 5.6%, respectively) during the 2010 through 2020 period.

Table 3: Household Growth Trends

Geography	1990	2000	2010	2020
Mountain View	29,990	31,242	31,957	34,184
Santa Clara County	520,180	565,863	604,204	643,265
Bay Area	2,245,865	2,466,020	2,606,288	2,752,510

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-5 and E-8 series; BAE, 2021.

Age

The distribution of age groups in a city shapes what types of housing the community may need in the near future. An increase in the older population may mean there is a developing need for more senior housing options, while higher numbers of children and young families can point to the need for more family housing options and related services. There has also been a move by many to age-in-place or downsize to stay within their communities as they grow older, which can mean more multifamily and accessible units are also needed.

In Mountain View, the median age in 2000 was 34.6; by 2019, this figure had increased slightly to approximately 34.8 years. Between 2010 and 2019, Mountain View experienced a significant increase in the number of residents between the ages of 25 and 34 (see Table 4). With the exception of the 45 to 54 age category, all other groups showed an increase in population.

Table 4: Population by Age, 2010-2019

Age Group	2010		2019		2010-2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age 0-14	12,568	17.0%	14,087	17.3%	1,519	12.1%
Age 15-24	7,428	10.0%	7,936	9.7%	508	6.8%
Age 25-34	15,637	21.1%	19,243	23.6%	3,606	23.1%
Age 35-44	12,940	17.5%	13,520	16.6%	580	4.5%
Age 45-54	10,294	13.9%	9,922	12.2%	-372	-3.6%
Age 55-64	7,353	9.9%	7,993	9.8%	640	8.7%
Age 65+	7,846	10.6%	8,955	11.0%	1,109	14.1%
Total, All Ages	74,066	100.0%	81,656	100.0%	7,590	10.2%


Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001; BAE, 2021.

Race and Ethnicity

Understanding the racial makeup of a city and region is important for designing and implementing effective housing policies and programs because this information provides a starting point to assess how housing needs and access to opportunity may differ between racial and ethnic groups.

According to data from the 2020 Decennial Census, 40.1% of residents in Mountain View identify as non-Hispanic White (see Figure 1). Non-Hispanic Asian/Asian Pacific Islander (API) residents account for 35.2% of the population, while Hispanic/Latinx residents account for an additional 17.2%. Since 2000, the number of residents in Mountain View identifying as White has decreased by 15.4%—and concurrently the number residents of all *other* races and ethnicities has increased by 55.8%. In absolute terms, the Asian/API, Non-Hispanic population increased the most while the White, Non-Hispanic population decreased the most (see Table 26 below for the change in absolute numbers). The Assessment of Fair Housing section of this Housing Needs Assessment chapter provides additional information regarding patterns of segregation and housing needs among racial and ethnic minority populations.

Figure 1: Population by Race, 2000-2020




Notes: Data for 2019 represents 2015-2019 ACS estimates. The Census Bureau defines Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity separate from racial categories. For the purposes of this graph, the “Hispanic or Latinx” racial/ethnic group represents those who identify as having Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity and may also be members of any racial group. All other racial categories on this graph represent those who identify with that racial category and do not identify with Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004, Census 2010, Table P5, and Census 2020, Table P4, PL94-171 data; BAE, 2021.

Household Tenure

The number of residents who own their homes compared to those who rent their homes can help shed light on the level of housing insecurity – the ability or lack thereof for individuals to stay in their homes – in a city and region. Generally, renters face greater displacement risks from increases in housing costs or redevelopment, and displacement among renters was noted as a key issue during the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update. As shown in Figure 2, Mountain View has a much larger share of renter households than Santa Clara County and the Bay Area overall. Approximately 58% of households in Mountain View are renters, compared to 44% of households in Santa Clara County and in the Bay Area overall.

Figure 2: Household Tenure



Universe: Occupied housing units

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003; BAE, 2021.

A large majority (82%) of the renter households in Mountain View reside in multifamily housing units, and only 17% of renters live in single-family homes (see Table 5). Unsurprisingly, homeownership rates for households in single-family homes are substantially higher than the rates for households in multifamily housing.

Approximately 83% of Mountain View’s households in detached single-family homes are homeowners, while 62% of the households in attached single-family homes own their homes (see Figure 3). For households in multifamily housing, the homeownership rate is only 14%. This suggests that there is a relatively small inventory of smaller ownership units in Mountain View, which could point to a shortage of comparatively affordable options for homeownership. However, the large inventory of renter-occupied multifamily units also suggests that the housing inventory in Mountain View provides options for renter households that may be unable to afford homeownership.


Table 5: Tenure by Housing Type

Housing Type	Renter Occupied		Owner Occupied	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Detached Single-Family	1,633	8.3%	7,784	55.4%
Attached Single-Family	1,715	8.7%	2,820	20.1%
Multifamily Housing	16,148	82.0%	2,525	18.0%
Mobile Homes	201	1.0%	927	6.6%
Boat, RV, Van, or Other	3	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total, All Unit Types	19,700	100.0%	14,056	100.0%

Universe: Occupied housing units.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25032; BAE, 2021.

Figure 3: Tenure by Housing Type



Universe: Occupied housing units


Note: Figure omits data on persons living in boats, RVs, vans, or other similar structures due to the lack of a statistically valid sample. Persons living in RVs or other vehicles on the street are not included in the Census housing unit count and are instead generally included in the Census' group quarters homeless population.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25032; BAE, 2021.

Household Income Distribution

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 income inequality between high- and low-income households in the state. In Mountain View, 63% of households have incomes greater than 100% of Area Median Income (AMI), compared to 55% in Santa Clara County and 52% regionally (see Figure 4). Approximately 31% of households in Mountain View are considered lower income (incomes less than or equal to 80% of AMI). While this is lower than the proportion for Santa Clara County overall (36%), and well below the 39% in the Bay Area, having nearly one-third of Mountain View households in the lower-income categories is a significant proportion of total households. These trends are likely due to the high cost of housing in Mountain View compared to more affordable locations in Santa Clara County – such as San Jose, Morgan Hill, and Gilroy – and the rest of the Bay Area. Input received during the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update underscored the extent to which lower-income households are increasingly struggling to find affordable housing in Mountain View.

Figure 4: Households by Household Income Level



Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017; BAE, 2021.

Table 6 reports Mountain View households by HUD-defined income category based on household income as a percentage of the HUD Adjusted Median Family Income (HAMFI). As shown in the table,

approximately 30.8% of all households in Mountain View qualify as lower income, meaning they have incomes that are equal to or less than 80% of the HAMFI. This includes 13.8% of households that have extremely low incomes (incomes less than or equal to 30% of HAMFI), 8.1% that have very low incomes (incomes greater than 30 but less than or equal to 50% of HAMFI), and 8.8% that have low income (incomes greater than 50 but less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI).

Throughout the region, there are disparities between the incomes of homeowners and renters. Typically, the number of low-income renters greatly exceeds the amount of housing that is available and affordable for these households. The data in Table 6 indicate that lower-income households in Mountain View are disproportionately renters, who currently make up 67.8% of all lower income households in the City. An estimated 36% of all renter households in Mountain View have incomes less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI. By comparison, approximately 23.6% of the City’s owner households are considered lower income.

Table 6: Household Income Level by Tenure

Household Income Category	Renter Households		Owner Households		Total Households	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<=30% HAMFI (see note)	3,160	16.2%	1,469	10.4%	4,629	13.8%
>30%, <=50% HAMFI	1,930	9.9%	800	5.7%	2,730	8.1%
>50%, <=80% HAMFI	1,910	9.8%	1,055	7.5%	2,965	8.8%
>80, <=100% HAMFI	1,360	7.0%	833	5.9%	2,193	6.5%
>100% HAMFI	11,090	57.0%	9,940	70.5%	21,030	62.7%
Total	19,450	100.0%	14,097	100.0%	33,547	100.0%

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI), often referred to as simply Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas. The numbers in the table may not sum to the totals shown due to independent rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017; BAE, 2021.

Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs

Due to their limited financial resources, extremely low-income households (those with incomes below 30 percent of the area median income) face particular challenges in securing suitable, affordable housing.

Household 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 income inequality between high- and low-income households in the state.¹

The current (2022) area median annual income in Santa Clara County is \$168,500.² For extremely low-income households, this translates to an income of \$55,550 or less for a four-person household or \$35,400 or less for a one-person household. Households with extremely low-incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance such as supplemental security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance are considered extremely low-income households. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farm workers and healthcare professionals – can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively low and stagnant wages in many industries.

Table 7 shows examples of occupations with wages where the worker households could potentially qualify as extremely low-income households. It should be noted that the hourly wages shown in the table are based on data collected between 2020 and 2022, and therefore some of the wages shown are lower than the 2022 California minimum wage (\$15 per hour for employers with 26 employees or more; \$14 per hour for employers with 25 employees or less). Moreover, Mountain View has a local minimum wage, which was set at \$17.20 per hour as of January 2022. Neighboring jurisdictions including Los Altos, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, and Sunnyvale have similar local minimum wages. Therefore, the wages shown in the table below are generally lower than the minimum wage that would apply in Mountain View and neighboring jurisdictions. However, workers earning the local minimum wage could nonetheless be members of extremely low-income households.

Table 7: Examples of Low Wage Occupations

Occupation Title	Median Hourly Wage
Hotel and Resort Clerks	\$14.45
Child Care Workers	\$13.83
Housekeepers	\$14.94
Manicurists and Pedicurists	\$13.34
Hosts and Hostesses	\$12.91
Education, Training, and Library Workers	\$28.47
Agricultural Graders and Sorters	\$12.77
Waiter and Waitresses	\$13.16
Food Preparation and Serving Related Workers	\$13.47

Source: Employment Development Department, 2020-2022 Occupational Employment Projections for California.

¹ Bohn, S. et al. 2020. Income Inequality and Economic Opportunity in California. Public Policy Institute of California.

² Based on HCD Income Limits for 2022.

As noted above, in Mountain View 14 percent of households fall in the extremely low-income category (see Figure 4 and Table 6). This is approximately the same as the proportion for Santa Clara County overall and for the entire Bay Area. Sixty-three percent of Mountain View households have incomes above 100 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), compared to only 52 percent regionally. However, even though Mountain View is a relatively affluent community, the city has over 4,600 extremely low-income households, many of whom are likely to have a need for more affordable housing. The following discussion provides additional information profiling those households.

Household Income Distribution by Tenure

Throughout the region, there are disparities between the incomes of homeowners and renters. Typically, the number of low-income renters greatly exceeds the amount of housing available that is affordable for these households. While the majority of both renters and owners in Mountain View have incomes above the median level (see Table 6 above), renter households are more likely to be extremely low income than owners in Mountain View; 16 percent of renters are in extremely low income households, in comparison to only 10 percent of owners. Even though some of these extremely low-income owners may be seniors who own their homes outright, these households are likely to have difficulty affording the upkeep and maintenance of their homes.

While the majority of both extremely low-income renters and owners face severe housing cost burdens in Mountain View, the proportion of renters is much higher. For extremely low-income renters, two-thirds face housing costs of over half their income; only 53 percent of owners face the same level of housing cost burden, as shown in Table 8. In contrast, only 18 percent of all renters in Mountain View and 10 percent of all owners in Mountain View have this level of housing costs relative to income.

Table 8: Housing Cost Burdens for Extremely Low Income Households, City of Mountain View

	Renter Households		Owner Households		All Households	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Extremely Low-Income Households (a)	3,040	100.0%	1,325	100.0%	4,365	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	320	10.5%	290	22.0%	610	14.0%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	380	12.5%	205	15.5%	585	13.4%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	2,020	66.4%	700	53.0%	2,720	62.4%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	320	10.5%	125	9.5%	445	10.2%
Total Households (b)	19,695	100.0%	14,015	100.0%	33,705	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	12,150	61.7%	10,215	72.9%	22,365	66.4%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	3,720	18.9%	2,275	16.2%	5,995	17.8%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	3,505	17.8%	1,395	10.0%	4,900	14.5%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	320	1.6%	125	0.9%	445	1.3%

Notes:

(a) Households with incomes equal to 30% of HAMFI (HUD Area Median Family Income) based on CHAS data, which reflect HUD-defined household income limits.

(b) Totals may not equal the sum of individual figures due to independent rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2022.

Extremely Low-Income Households by Race

Table 9 below provides a breakdown of extremely low-income households by race and ethnicity. As shown, White households account for approximately half of all extremely low-income households in Mountain View. However, Latino households have the highest share of households with extremely low incomes; among Latino households. While 13 percent of all households in Mountain View have extremely low incomes, 22 percent of Latino households have extremely low incomes. The prevalence of extremely low-income households is similar among Pacific Islander households, but there are very few of these households in Mountain View. These data indicate that Latino households are disproportionately impacted by the housing problems experienced by extremely low-income households, including those that put households at risk for displacement.

Table 9: Extremely Low-Income Households by Race and Ethnicity, City of Mountain View

Race/Ethnicity	Total Households		ELI Households		Share Below 30% AMI
	#	%	#	%	
White	17,725	53.9%	2,185	50.6%	12%
Black/African American	665	2.0%	100	2.3%	15%
Asian	10,035	30.5%	1,035	24.0%	10%
American Indian	15	0.0%	0	0.0%	0%
Pacific Islander	45	0.1%	10	0.2%	22%
Hispanic	4,425	13.4%	990	22.9%	22%
Total Households (a)	33,715	100.0%	4,360	100.0%	13%

Universe: Occupied housing units

Note: Numbers may not match other tables due to independent rounding. HAMFI refers to HUD Area Median Family Income.

(a) Figures may not sum to total due to independent rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2014-2018 release.

Extremely Low Income Households with Housing Problems

Extremely low income households are significantly more likely than other households to have housing problems. As reported in the CHAS data presented in Table 10, “housing problems” include the following: lack of complete kitchen, lack of complete plumbing facility; more than one person per room; and cost burden greater than 30 percent of income. Severe housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than 1 persons per room; cost burden greater than 50 percent of income. Additional data not presented here indicate that the most common of these problems is high cost burdens. As shown in Table 10, 77 percent of extremely low-income households in Mountain View have one or more housing problems, while 63 percent have one or more severe housing problems. Table 10 also indicates that housing problems among extremely low-income households disproportionately impact Latino households, Black/African American households, and Asian households.

Table 10: Housing Problems by Race and Ethnicity for ELI Households, Mountain View

Race/Ethnicity	ELI Households		ELI Households with Housing Problems (a)		ELI Households with Severe Housing Problems (b)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	2,185	50.6%	1,660	76.0%	1,255	57.4%
Black/African American	100	2.3%	65	65.0%	65	65.0%
Asian	1,035	24.0%	725	70.0%	635	61.4%
American Indian	0	0.0%	0	n.a.	0	n.a.
Pacific Islander	10	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic	990	22.9%	870	87.9%	775	78.3%
Total ELI Households (c)	4,360	100.0%	3,345	76.7%	2,760	63.3%

Notes:

(a) Household has one or more housing problems. Housing problems include: Lack of complete kitchen, Lack of complete plumbing facility; More than one person per room; Cost burden greater than 30% of income.

(b) Severe housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than 1 persons per room; cost burden greater than 50% of income.

(c) Figures may not sum to total due to independent rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2022.

Extremely Low-Income Housing Resources and Remaining Needs

Although Mountain View has a variety of housing resources for extremely low-income households, many extremely-low income households continue to have unmet housing needs. Housing resources for extremely low-income households in Mountain View include units within affordable developments in Mountain View, including units for individuals with special housing needs such as those with developmental disabilities and seniors. In addition, many extremely low-income households are served by transitional and supportive housing facilities in Mountain View such as Alice Avenue Transitional Home, Quetzal House, the San Antonio Place Efficiency Studios, and the Project Homekey project. In 2022, the City entered into an MOU with the County for \$80 million in Measure A funding to develop up to 200 units of rapid rehousing/permanent supportive housing units.


Even with these resources, a significant number of extremely low-income households continue to face high housing cost burdens, displacement, and homelessness. The Housing Plan chapter of this Housing Element Update includes programs to help narrow the gap between extremely low-income households’ needs and the resources available to address these needs.

Economic and Employment Characteristics

Resident Employment by Industry

According to 2015-2019 ACS, there are approximately 47,660 employed civilian residents aged 16 and older in Mountain View. The top three industries in terms of employing residents are Financial and Professional Services, Health and Educational Services, and Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation (see Figure 5). The largest proportion of employed residents in Mountain View, nearly one-third, work in Financial & Professional Services. While this is also the largest category in the county and the region, only about one-fourth of all employed residents in those two geographies work in this industry grouping. The Health & Educational Services category is the second most prevalent sector of employment for all three areas. Mountain View has a notably greater proportion of employed residents working in the Information industry than both comparison geographies, highlighting its robust technology sector.

Figure 5: Resident Employment by Industry



Universe: Civilian employed population age 16 years and over.

Notes: The data displayed shows the industries in which jurisdiction residents work, regardless of the location where those residents are employed (whether within the jurisdiction or not).

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table C24030; BAE, 2021.

Balance of Jobs and Workers

A city houses employed residents who either work in the community where they live or work elsewhere in the region. Conversely, a city may have job sites that employ residents from the same city, but more often employ workers commuting from outside of it. To some extent the Bay Area regional transportation system is set up for a flow of workers to the region's core job centers. At the same time, as the housing affordability crisis illustrates, local imbalances may be severe, where local jobs and worker populations are unbalanced at a sub-regional scale.

One measure of this dynamic is the relationship between those workers *living* in a city and those workers *employed* in a city. A city with a surplus of workers “exports” workers to other parts of the region, while a city with a surplus of jobs must conversely “import” workers. Based on 2015-2019 ACS data, there are 47,657 resident workers³ and 95,818 persons working⁴ in Mountain View. With a ratio of workers employed in the city to working residents of 2.01, Mountain View is a net importer of workers.

Long-term employment growth has been strong in Mountain View. Based on the U.S. Census Local Employment Housing Dynamics (LEHD) data from 2002 to 2018, Mountain View gained a total of 39,272 jobs, an increase of approximately 74.2% (see Figure 6).⁵


While the number of jobs and the number of workers in a given community may be balanced, that community may offer employment for 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 cast extra light on potentially pent-up demand for housing in particular price categories. A relative *surplus* of jobs relative to residents in a given wage category suggests the need to import those workers, while conversely, surpluses of workers in a wage group relative to jobs means the community will export those workers to other jurisdictions.

³ Based on residents 16 and over who worked during the ACS reference week, as shown in ACS Table B08128 for 2015-2019. May exclude some workers who were employed but not working during the reference week; these additional workers were counted in the industry tabulation. These persons may work anywhere, including outside their place/city of residence. In the case of multiple jobs, this is the job where the respondent worked the most hours during the reference week.

⁴ Workers by place of work includes those who worked in that place (e.g., Mountain View) during the ACS reference week, as shown in ACS Table O8604 for 2015-2019. These persons may live anywhere. In the case of multiple jobs, this is the job where the respondent worked the most hours during the reference week.

⁵ The job totals reported here may differ from the number of workers reported above as the source for the time series is from administrative records, while the data on workers is from a survey.

Figure 6: Jobs in Mountain View



Universe: Jobs from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state, and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment.

Notes: The data is tabulated by place of work, regardless of where a worker lives. The source data is provided at the census block level. These are crosswalked to jurisdictions and summarized.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files, 2002-2018; BAE, 2021.

Mountain View has both a jobs-housing imbalance, reflected in a high ratio of jobs relative to housing units, and a jobs-housing mismatch, with housing costs that are not aligned with the incomes for a portion of the workers that work in Mountain View. Figure 7 shows the ratio of jobs to workers in Mountain View broken down by different wage groups. A value of 1 means that the city has the same number of jobs in a wage group as it has resident workers - in principle, a balance. At the regional scale, this ratio is 1.04 jobs for each worker, implying a modest import of workers from outside the region. In Mountain View, the ratio of jobs to workers is significantly higher across all wage groups. The figure shows that the highest ratio of jobs to workers is for workers with wages over \$3,333 per month, which is likely due large part to a significant number of relatively high-wage jobs in Mountain View, rather than a mismatch between wages and housing costs that is more significant than the mismatch for other income groups. Meanwhile, jobs with wages that are under \$3,333 per month comprise a comparatively small proportion of total jobs in Mountain View, leading to a lower ratio of jobs to workers in that income range. Most Mountain View workers with incomes under \$3,333 per month, as well as many with incomes above this amount, likely struggle to find affordable housing in Mountain View's high-cost housing market.


Figure 7: Ratio of Jobs to Workers, by Wage Group



Universe: Jobs in a jurisdiction from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state, and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment
 Notes: The ratio compares job counts by wage group from two tabulations of LEHD data: Counts by place of work relative to counts by place of residence. See text for details.
 Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs); Residence Area Characteristics (RAC) files (Employed Residents), 2010-2018; BAE, 2021.

The jobs-household ratio in Mountain View has increased significantly in recent years, from 1.68 in 2002 to 2.74 jobs per household in 2018. Imbalances between jobs and workers can directly influence housing demand and affordability in a community. New jobs may draw new residents, and when there is high demand for housing relative to supply, many workers may be unable to afford to live where they work. This dynamic not only means many workers might need to prepare for long commutes and time spent journeying to work, but in the aggregate, it contributes to traffic congestion and time lost for those workers. As shown in Figure 8, Mountain View has a much higher jobs-household ratio than Santa Clara County and the Bay Area as a whole. The slow rate of household growth relative to job growth in Mountain View, together with Mountain View’s low residential vacancy, could indicate that housing production has not kept pace with job growth in the City, which is often a key factor that leads to high housing costs. Mountain View residents and other participants in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update highlighted jobs-housing imbalance and mismatch as key factors contributing to high housing costs in Mountain View.

Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio



Universe: Jobs in a jurisdiction from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state, and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment;
Notes: The ratio compares place of work wage and salary jobs with households, or occupied housing units. A similar measure is the ratio of jobs to housing units. However, this jobs-household ratio serves to compare the number of jobs in a jurisdiction to the number of housing units that are actually occupied. The difference between a jurisdiction’s jobs-housing ratio and jobs-household ratio will be most pronounced in jurisdictions with high vacancy rates, a high rate of units used for seasonal use, or a high rate of units used as short-term rentals.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs), 2002-2018; California Department of Finance, E-5 (Households); BAE, 2021.

Mountain View’s East Whisman Precise Plan includes a Jobs-Housing Linkage requirement that requires residential development to accompany any new office development over 0.4 FAR (approximately the current intensity of office in the area), with the effect that no more than approximately 30 percent of any such development can be net new office. Developers of nonresidential projects are required to provide a Jobs-Housing Linkage Plan with a phasing or housing delivery plan that proposes how the project applicant will facilitate residential development in the Precise Plan Area. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that any new office development is accompanied by residential development to foster a more balanced jobs-housing mix. The North Bayshore Precise Plan has a similar policy. During a Study Session for the Housing Element Update, the Environmental Planning Commission cited this policy as a potential template for future zoning actions in Mountain View to improve jobs-housing balance.


Housing Stock Characteristics

Housing Types

As of 2020, the housing stock in Mountain View was made up of 29.1% single-family detached homes, 12.6% single family-attached homes, 8.4% multifamily homes in structures with two to four units, 47.0% multifamily homes in structures with five or more units, and 2.9% mobile homes (see Figure 9). Multifamily units in buildings with five or more units make up the largest share of the City’s housing stock and experienced the most growth between 2010 and 2020. Meanwhile, the number of detached single-family homes increased only slightly, reflecting a trend toward more multifamily development in Mountain View and fewer new single-family homes.

In recent years, most housing produced in the region and across the state consisted of single-family homes and larger multi-unit buildings. However, as the housing stock becomes more constrained and housing costs rose rapidly, some households are increasingly interested in more affordable “missing middle” housing – including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, cottage clusters, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). These housing types may open up more options across incomes and tenure, serving a range of needs, from young households seeking homeownership options to seniors looking to downsize and age-in-place.

Figure 9: Housing Units by Type, 2010-2020




Universe: Housing units
Sources: California Department of Finance, E-5 series; BAE, 2021.

Housing Units by Year Built

In Mountain View, the largest proportion of the housing stock was built between 1960 to 1979, with 15,608 units constructed during this period (see Figure 10). Approximately 7.4% of the City's current housing stock has been built since 2010, more than was built between 2000 and 2009.

Figure 10: Housing Units by Year Structure Built



Universe: Housing units

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25034; BAE, 2021.


Vacancy Rates

Vacant units, including units that are vacant and not available for rent or for sale, such as units that are held for seasonal or recreational use, make up 7.0% of the overall housing stock in Mountain View. Throughout the Bay Area, vacancies make up 5.9% of the total housing units. However, many vacant units are not necessarily available for full-time occupancy. Figure 11 below shows the breakdown of vacant units in Mountain View by type. As shown, slightly more than half (56 percent) of the vacant units in Mountain View are available for rent or sale, with the remainder comprised of other types of vacant units. Vacant units classified as “for recreational or occasional use” are those that are held for short-term periods of use throughout the year. Accordingly, vacation rentals and short-term rentals like AirBnB are likely to fall in this category. The Census Bureau classifies units as “other vacant” if they are vacant due to foreclosure, personal/family reasons, legal proceedings, repairs/renovations, abandonment, preparation for being rented or sold, or vacant for an extended absence for reasons such as a work assignment, military duty, or incarceration.⁶ In a region with a thriving economy and housing market like the Bay Area, units being renovated/repared 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

⁶ For more information, see pages 3 through 6 of this list of definitions prepared by the Census Bureau: <https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/definitions.pdf>. Note that these definitions are for the Housing Vacancy Survey, a program separate from the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey, and there may be slight variations in how vacant units are defined for the data used in this report.

proportion of “other vacant” units in some jurisdictions.⁷ Excluding those units that are not available for rent or for sale, a review of detailed vacancy data from the 2015-2019 ACS indicates that only 3.7% of the housing stock was vacant and available for rent and that only 0.2% was vacant and available for sale. This represents an effective vacancy rate of 3.9 percent. This is somewhat higher than the county and the region, where the effective vacancy rates were 1.9% and 1.8 percent, respectively.

Figure 11: Vacant Units by Type



Universe: Vacant housing units

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25004; BAE, 2021.

Housing Permits

Between 2015 and July 2021, the City of Mountain View issued permits for construction of 5,084 housing units. Most of these permits, about 90.6 percent, were for above moderate-income housing. As shown in Table 11, Mountain View has exceeded its 5th Cycle Housing Element RHNA for above moderate-income housing but lags behind in units permitted for other income groups. A total of 459 permits (9.1 percent) were issued for low-income or very low-income housing. Moderate income permits made up just 0.4% of the total number of permits. Many cities in high-cost areas have limited tools to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing because rents and sale prices for market-rate units typically exceed affordability thresholds for moderate-income households, while

⁷ See Dow, P. (2018). Unpacking the Growth in San Francisco’s Vacant Housing Stock: Client Report for the San Francisco Planning Department. University of California, Berkeley.

affordable housing financing sources fund lower-income units but not moderate-income units. This creates a gap between the income levels served by subsidized affordable units and the income levels served by market-rate units, which is often referred to as the “missing middle” in housing production.

Table 11: Housing Permitting

Income Group	Permits	% Attained
Above Moderate-Income Permits	4,607	421.5%
Moderate Income Permits	18	3.4%
Low Income Permits	215	43.7%
Very Low-Income Permits	244	30.0%

Universe: Housing permits issued between 2015 and July 2021.

Notes: HCD uses the following definitions for the four income categories: Very Low Income: units affordable to households making less than 50% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Low Income: units affordable to households making between 50% and 80% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Moderate Income: units affordable to households making between 80% and 120% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Above Moderate Income: units affordable to households making above 120% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located.

Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), 5th Cycle Annual Progress Report Permit Summary (2021); BAE, 2021.

Substandard Housing

In general, substandard housing is not a significant issue in Mountain View. However, housing costs in the region are among the highest in the country, which could result in households, particularly renters, needing to live in substandard conditions in order to afford housing. Generally, there is limited data on the extent of substandard housing issues in a community. However, the Census Bureau data included in the graph below gives a sense of some of the substandard housing conditions that may be present. In Mountain View, about 0.8% of renters reported lacking a kitchen and 0.3% of renters lack plumbing, compared to 0.7% of owners who lack a kitchen and 0.1% of owners who lack plumbing (see Figure 12).

To monitor the condition of the City’s multifamily housing stock and ensure that tenants are not subjected to substandard living conditions, the City of Mountain View implements its Multifamily Housing Inspection Program. The City of Mountain View Fire Department normally conducts interior inspections of multifamily rental units throughout the City every five to eight years depending on compliance status.⁸ The program covers 705 properties containing 16,267 housing units. Inspectors categorize properties as “serious” or “non-serious,” depending on the type of violations identified during inspections. Inspection program data indicate that approximately 6,954 units (43% of the total units inspected) are in the “serious” category. However, it is important to understand

⁸ The timetable for interior inspections was disrupted by the Covid-19 pandemic.

that a “serious” rating in this inspection program does not necessarily equate to substandard housing conditions; rather, these properties may require some improvement or maintenance, or have potential safety concerns, but do not necessarily have structural decay or uninhabitable conditions. A complete checklist for the program can be found in Appendix G. A better indicator of housing with potentially substandard conditions is the number of properties that were issued a “Compliance Order” which is the first level of escalated enforcement action. Escalated enforcement occurs when the routine inspection and re-inspection process do not result in compliance OR unsafe conditions may dictate urgent repairs or other action to protect tenants. Examples include structural conditions, failing decks, failing stairways, and fire alarm and sprinkler systems that are not operable. According to the Fire Department, only five properties were issued a Compliance Order in the last five years. This represents less than one percent of the City’s multifamily housing structures. There were a total of 82 multifamily rental units in properties that have been issued Compliance Orders in the past three years (the only years for which data are available), which suggests an average of fewer than 30 units each year in properties that have been issued Compliance Orders. This indicates that the City’s inspection program is effectively helping to maintain the City’s housing stock by proactively identifying problems with rental housing conditions and bringing properties into compliance. Property owners are incentivized to maintain their properties through assessment of lower fees and less frequent inspections for properties that are categorized as non-serious. Inspection program staff are also available to address complaints as they are reported.⁹

Additionally, Mountain View is located in the seismically active Bay Area and requires its future housing development to undergo analyses of increased risks to safety related to fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction. Although there are no known active faults present within the City, there are a significant number of soft-story buildings¹⁰ in the City that could be extremely vulnerable to collapse and failure if a major earthquake were to occur in the region. According to the Mountain View Soft Story Study Report from May 2018, 1,152 of the 1,383 multi-unit buildings in Mountain View are woodframe buildings that were built between 1950¹¹ and 1980, representing 71% of total multifamily units. Of these, 488 buildings appear to have a “woodframe target story” (WFTS), which is a first-story condition associated with disproportionate earthquake damage and potential collapse. These 488 buildings, containing 5,123 units, make up about 31% of total multifamily units in the City of Mountain View and about 16% of total housing units including single-family housing units.

Units in Need of Rehabilitation or Replacement

There are no known residential units in Mountain View that are in need of replacement, though there are some needs for housing rehabilitation, primarily among the City’s rental housing stock. As noted above, an estimated 30 multifamily rental units or fewer are issued Compliance Orders through the

⁹ Personal communication, Eric Anderson, Fire Marshal, Mountain View Fire Department, February 28, 2022.


¹⁰ Soft-story buildings are low-rise, multi-story, wood frame structures that are typically older and have an open wall condition on the first floor to accommodate tuck-under parking.

¹¹ Pre-1950 buildings can also be vulnerable to earthquakes, but usually in ways that do not involve a typical soft-story condition.

Multifamily Housing Inspection Program per year on average, suggesting a total of 240 units over the eight-year Housing Element Planning Period. In addition, 5,123 multifamily units in Mountain View have potential earthquake vulnerabilities due to woodframe soft stories. This suggests a total of up to 5,363 multifamily rental units in Mountain View with potential rehabilitation needs. However, this is almost certainly an overestimate, as not all buildings with Compliance Orders are in need of substantial rehabilitation and many buildings with woodframe soft stories may have already been retrofitted. The Housing Plan in this Housing Element Update includes Program 3.2, which includes providing City funds to assist in preserving at least two naturally occurring affordable housing projects during the planning period.

There is a minimal need for rehabilitation among Mountain View’s owner-occupied housing stock. Mountain View has high home sale prices and owner-occupied homes are generally in good condition. Rehabilitation of existing units is typically undertaken as needed by private homeowners, sometimes in connection with a transfer of ownership. Rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing has not been cited as a major issue during the public engagement process for this Housing Element Update. As noted in the introduction to this Housing Element Update, the public engagement process included a Community Feedback Form to obtain input on critical housing issues. One portion of the form asked respondents to identify up to five of the most critical housing issues in Mountain View. The housing issue that respondents identified the least frequently was “Not enough financial assistance for lower-income homeowners that need to make home repairs.”

Figure 12: Substandard Housing Issues



Universe: Occupied housing units


Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25053, Table B25043, Table B25049; BAE, 2021.

Housing Costs and Affordability

Residential Home Sale Prices

Overall, home values in Mountain View are much higher than the countywide and regional averages and are unaffordable to most of the households and workers in the City and region (see Figure 13). Home prices reflect a complex mix of supply and demand factors, including an area’s demographic profile, labor market, prevailing wages, and job outlook, coupled with land and construction costs. Housing sale prices and rental rates are also an indicator of housing affordability and can signal high incidence of housing cost burden and overcrowding. In the Bay Area, the costs of housing have long been among the highest in the nation. The region’s home values have increased steadily since 2000, aside from a slight 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. Home values in Mountain View have also appreciated at a much more rapid rate than homes throughout Santa Clara County and the region since the Great Recession. Since 2001, the typical home value has increased 229.7% in Mountain View from \$554,520 to \$1,828,466 in December of 2020, according to Zillow. This change is significantly greater than that of Santa Clara County, at around 168.3 percent, and of the Bay Area, at around 142.3% (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)



Universe: Owner-occupied housing units

Notes: Zillow describes the ZHVI as a smoothed, seasonally adjusted measure of the typical home value and market changes across a given region and housing type. The ZHVI reflects the typical value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The ZHVI includes all owner-occupied housing units, including both single-family homes and condominiums. More information on the ZHVI is available from Zillow. The regional estimate is a household-weighted average of county-level ZHVI files, where household counts are yearly estimates from DOF’s E-5 series.

Sources: Zillow, Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI); BAE, 2021.

Based on American Community Survey (ACS) data from 2015-2019 (inflation-adjusted to 2019 values), the largest proportion of homes, about 25 percent, was valued at more than \$2 million (see Table 12). By comparison, the largest share of units was valued between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000 in the county and between \$500,000 and \$750,000 in the region. The limited number of lower-value homes in Mountain View indicates a lack of units affordable to middle and lower-income households interested in homeownership. Housing prices have increased significantly during the pandemic, fueled in part by historically low mortgage rates. In addition, the pandemic is believed to have contributed to high housing costs by increasing demand for homes that provide more space for working from home, particularly single-family homes with yards, encouraging many buyers to enter the home sale market for the first time. Meanwhile, there was a shortage of supply as fewer existing homeowners were listing homes for sale. According to data from Redfin, the median single-family home sale prices in Mountain View was \$2.014 million in March 2022, up from \$1.473 million in March of 2019. Individuals that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update noted that high home costs prevent many households from having the ability to purchase a home in Mountain View.

Table 12: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units

Home Value	Mountain View		Santa Clara County		Bay Area	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$250K	888	6.3%	19,359	5.4%	93,478	6.1%
\$250K to \$500K	519	3.7%	22,636	6.3%	249,138	16.3%
\$500K to \$750K	968	6.9%	64,280	17.8%	345,087	22.5%
\$750K to \$1M	1,737	12.4%	79,354	22.0%	307,689	20.1%
\$1M to \$1.5M	3,263	23.2%	82,485	22.8%	274,733	17.9%
\$1.5M to \$2M	3,112	22.1%	40,175	11.1%	120,970	7.9%
More than \$2M	3,569	25.4%	52,816	14.6%	140,860	9.2%
Total	14,056	100.0%	361,105	100.0%	1,531,955	100.0%

Universe: Owner-occupied units.


Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25075; BAE, 2021.

Residential Rents

Similar to home sales prices, residential rental rates 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. Between 2009 and 2019, the median rent increased by 78.9% in Mountain View, from \$1,328 to \$2,376 per month, according to ACS data (see Figure 14). This rate of increase was greater than in Santa Clara County, where the median rent increased by 67.7

percent, from \$1,285 to \$2,155, or regionwide, where the median rent increased from \$1,196 in 2009 to \$1,849 in 2019, an increase of 54.6% over the same period. Input obtained during the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update indicates that rents have continued to increase in more recent years.

Figure 14: Median Contract Rent



*Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent.
 Note: County and regional counts are weighted averages of jurisdiction median using B25003 rental unit counts from the relevant year.
 Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data releases, starting with 2005-2009 through 2015-2019, B25058; BAE, 2021*

According to ACS data, more than one-fourth of the rental units in Mountain View rented for \$3,000 or more per month between 2015 and 2019 (see Table 13). In Santa Clara County, approximately 18.5% of the rental units rented for \$3,000 or more, while the same was true of 13.0% of the units in the Bay Area. Just 13.1% of the rental units in Mountain View rented at rates below \$1,500 during this period. Rents skewed much lower in Santa Clara County and the Bay Area, where 22.6% and 35.2% of rental units rented below \$1,500 per month, respectively. These data suggest that Mountain View renters face high housing costs, pricing out many lower income households and potentially putting existing lower-income renters at risk of displacement.

Table 13: Monthly Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units

Contract Rent	Mountain View		Santa Clara County		Bay Area	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$1,000	1,048	5.4%	27,896	10.2%	190,335	16.3%
\$1,000 to \$1,500	1,491	7.7%	33,902	12.4%	220,281	18.9%
\$1,500 to \$2,000	3,731	19.2%	55,666	20.4%	265,903	22.8%
\$2,000 to \$2,500	4,566	23.5%	58,293	21.4%	201,746	17.3%
\$2,500 to \$3,000	3,598	18.5%	46,239	17.0%	135,830	11.7%
\$3,000 to \$3,500	2,849	14.7%	29,415	10.8%	85,150	7.3%
\$3,500 or more	2,119	10.9%	20,957	7.7%	66,440	5.7%
Total	19,402	100.0%	272,368	100.0%	1,165,685	100.0%

Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25056; BAE, 2021.

Data on residential rents in Mountain View between 2019 and 2021 indicate that while the COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on market-rate rents, rents have begun to rebound, approaching pre-pandemic levels. The rent data in Table 13 come from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, which does not fully reflect current rents. Table 14 presents more current rent data for Mountain View from CoStar, a private data vendor. According to CoStar, Mountain View's multifamily inventory included 15,678 market-rate rental units as of the third quarter of 2021, an increase of about 1.4% from third quarter 2019. The majority of inventoried rental units are either one-bedroom or two-bedroom units, which make up about 39.5% and 34.3% of the multifamily rental stock, respectively. The average monthly asking rent per unit was \$2,851 across all units at the end of the third quarter of 2021. This is an increase of 6.8% from Q3 2020 rents, but a 3.8% decrease from Q3 2019 rents, which may be due to the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on rental housing. These impacts are also reflected in recent changes in the average vacancy rate. The multifamily vacancy rate was 6.3% at the end of the third quarter of 2019, growing to 11.4% at the end of the third quarter of 2020. As of the third quarter of 2021, the average multifamily vacancy rate was 9.4 percent, 3.1 percentage points above the rate at the end of the third quarter of 2019. These data suggest that the rental housing market is continuing to recover from the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and may continue to experience higher vacancies and lower rental rates in the near term as a result. However, even at these lower rental rates the average rent for multifamily rental units in Mountain View is substantially higher than many lower-income households can afford.

Table 14: Market-Rate Multifamily Rent Summary, Q3 2021

Multifamily Residential Summary	All Unit Types	Studio	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-or-more Bedroom
Inventory	15,678	3,365	6,197	5,379	737
% of Units	100.0%	21.5%	39.5%	34.3%	4.7%
Vacancy Rate	9.4%	7.0%	10.7%	9.6%	6.9%
<u>Average Monthly Asking Rent (per unit)</u>					
Q3 2021 Rent	\$2,851	\$2,111	\$2,528	\$3,233	\$4,183
Q3 2020 Rent	\$2,670	\$1,914	\$2,385	\$3,026	\$3,888
Q3 2019 Rent	\$2,965	\$2,203	\$2,672	\$3,318	\$4,300
Q3 2020 – Q3 2021 % Change	6.8%	10.3%	6.0%	6.8%	7.6%
Q3 2019 – Q3 2021 % Change	-3.8%	-4.2%	-5.4%	-2.6%	-2.7%

Sources: CoStar Group; BAE, 2021.

Housing Cost Burden


A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% 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. High housing cost burdens put low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, and homelessness. Displacement risk due to high housing costs was emphasized as a key concern among those that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update.

There are well-documented and persistent relationships between income, tenure, and the likelihood of a household to experience a moderate or severe cost burden. Generally speaking, as household income decreases, housing costs typically account for an increasingly large share of a household’s monthly budget. Similarly, renter households are also typically more likely to experience moderate and severe housing cost burdens, even across income levels. While the housing market has resulted in home prices increasing dramatically, homeowners often have mortgages with fixed rates and fixed monthly payments, whereas renter households are more readily subject to periodic rent increases, though Mountain View has had a rent stabilization program since 2016.

In Mountain View, 14.5% of households spend more than half of their income on housing, while 17.4% have a cost burden of 30% to 50 percent. However, these rates vary greatly across income

categories (see Figure 15). For example, 66.9% of Mountain View households with income less than 30% of HAMFI are severely cost-burdened. For Mountain View residents above 100% of HAMFI, only 0.8% are severely cost-burdened, and 88.8% of those above 100% of HAMFI spend less than 30% of their income on housing.

Figure 15: Cost Burden by Income Level



Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs,” which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI).

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.

When looking at the cost burden across tenure in Mountain View, 19.0% of renters spend 50% or more of their income on housing, while only 11.2% of owners are severely cost-burdened (see Figure 16). Additionally, 18.2% of renters spend 30% to 50% of their income on housing, compared to only 16.7% of those that own.

Figure 16: Cost Burden by Tenure



Universe: Occupied housing units


Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs,” which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25070, B25091; BAE, 2021.

Large family households of five or more persons often have special housing needs due to a lack of adequately sized affordable housing. The higher costs associated with homes with multiple bedrooms can result in larger families experiencing disproportionate cost burdens compared to the rest of the population and can increase the risk of housing insecurity.

In Mountain View, 21.1% of large family households experience a cost burden of 30% to 50 percent, while 18.6% spend more than half of their income on housing. In comparison, 17.3% of all other households have a cost burden of 30% to 50 percent, and 14.3% of households are severely cost burdened (see Figure 17).

Figure 17: Cost Burden by Household Size




Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs,” which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.

Senior households also have special housing needs and are disproportionately cost burdened compared to the total population. Based on 2013-2017 CHAS data, 40.5% of senior households were cost burdened compared to 31.9% of total households. When cost-burdened seniors, especially those on a fixed income, are no longer able to make house payments or rents, displacement from their homes can occur. This puts further stress on the local rental market and forces long-time residents out of the community they call home. Because of this, understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance. About 46.9% of seniors with incomes less than 30% of AMI are spending the majority of their income on housing. For seniors with incomes more than 100% of AMI, about 90.6% are not cost-burdened and spend less than 30% of their income on housing (see Figure 18).

Figure 18: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level



Universe: Senior households

Notes: For the purposes of this graph, senior households are those with a householder who is aged 62 or older. Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs,” which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI).

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.


Overcrowding

Overcrowding is often related to the cost of housing and most often occurs when demand for housing in a city or region is high. Overcrowding occurs when the number of people living in a household exceeds the number of people the home they occupy was designed to hold. This report uses the Census Bureau definition of overcrowding, which is more than one occupant per room (including bedrooms, living rooms, family rooms, dining rooms, and other rooms but not including bathrooms or kitchens). Additionally, units with more than 1.5 occupants per room are considered severely overcrowded.

Figure 19 illustrates overcrowding by severity in Mountain View, Santa Clara County, and the Bay Area. The percentage of severely overcrowded households is roughly the same in all three geographies, at around 2.9 percent. In Mountain View, about 92.8% of households are not considered overcrowded. This suggests that overcrowding does not impact a disproportionate share of Mountain View households, though some households in Mountain View live in overcrowded units. Stakeholders that participated in the public engagement process noted that there are families in

Mountain View that live with multiple families in one unit, likely in overcrowded conditions, in order to afford housing.

Figure 19: Overcrowding by Severity




Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.

In many cities, overcrowding is more prevalent among those who are renting, with multiple households sharing a unit to spread out costs and make it possible to stay in their communities or large households living in small units relative to their household size to afford housing. In Mountain View, approximately 11.2% of renter households are overcrowded (more than one occupant per room), compared to just 1.5% for those who own their homes. In addition, approximately 4.9% of households that rent are severely overcrowded (more than 1.5 occupants per room), compared to only 0.2% of owner households (see Figure 20).

Figure 20: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity




Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.

Similar to cost burden, overcrowding often disproportionately impacts lower income households. About 11.4% of extremely low-income households (incomes below 30% of HAMFI) experience overcrowding in Mountain View, with 5.2% experiencing severe overcrowding. Low-income households (incomes between 50% and 80% of HAMFI) have a higher rate of severe overcrowding, with 5.6% occupying units with more than 1.5 occupants per room. Of the households with incomes above 100% of HAMFI, approximately 3.6% are considered overcrowded, with 1.5% experiencing severe overcrowding (see Figure 21).

Figure 21: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity



Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI).

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.

Assisted Housing At-Risk of Conversion

California Government Code Section 65583 requires that housing elements identify all assisted rental housing units within the jurisdiction that are at risk of converting to market rate within ten years of the beginning of the Housing Element Planning period. Many subsidized affordable housing developments receive government funding that requires units be made affordable for a specified amount of time. Typically, assisted units are potentially considered to be at risk of converting to market rate if they are subject to local affordability requirements that will soon expire, or if the affordable units were financed using sources that required affordability for a set period that will soon expire. However, units that are potentially at risk for these reasons may not actually be at risk of conversion, particularly in cases where the units are owned by a nonprofit or other entity that is dedicated to preserving the units as affordable housing. Table 15 presents an inventory of the existing assisted affordable units in Mountain View, including information on affordability time period requirements associated with different funding sources. As shown, none of the subsidized units have affordability terms that would expire in the next ten years. In addition, all of the units are located within 100% affordable developments that are owned by non-profit and mission-driven affordable housing developers who would be likely to extend the affordability restrictions beyond the expiration date associated with the funding sources.

Table 15: Inventory of Assisted Affordable Housing Units, 2021

Project	Total Units	Assisted Units	Affordability Level			Funding Source	Expiration Date	Risk Status 2023-2032
			ELI	VLI	LI			
Maryce Freelen Place Apartments (Latham Park Apts) 2230 Latham Street	75	74	0	74	0	CDBG HOME LIHTC	2044 2025 2027	No Risk
San Veron Park Apartments 807 San Veron Avenue	32	32	7	10	15	CDBG	2044	No Risk
Monte Vista Terrace Apartments 1101 Grant Road	150	149	149	0	0	LIHTC	2060	No Risk
Sierra Vista One Apartments 1909 Hackett Avenue	34	27	18	7	2	CDBG	2070	No Risk
Ginzton Terrace Apartments 375 Oaktree Drive	107	106	0	53	53	CDBG CCRC HOME LIHTC	2038 2023 2071 2048	No Risk
Shorebreeze Apartments (Mountain View Apts) 460 N. Shoreline Blvd	120	119	103	11	5	CDBG HOME LIHTC	Indefinitely 2027 2027	No Risk
San Antonio Place Apartments 210 San Antonio Circle	120	118	36	82	0	CDBG HOME	2052 2057	No Risk
Tyrella Gardens Apartments 449 Tyrella Avenue	56	55	0	43	12	CDBG LIHTC	2058 2059	No Risk
Paulson Park I & II (New Central Park) 111 Montebello Avenue 50 Sierra Vista & 1929 Hackett Avenue	253	251	32	219	0	CDBG HOME LIHTC	2034 2073 2029	No Risk
The Fountains Apartments (San Ramon) 2005 San Ramon Ave	124	123	0	84	39	HOME LIHTC	2044 2019	No Risk
Franklin Street Apartments 135 Franklin Street	51	50	15	35	0	BMR CDBG RDA	2066 2066 2066	No Risk
Studio 819 Apartments 819 N. Rengstorff Ave	49	48	13	35	0	BMR	2068	No Risk
1585 Studios 1581-85 W. El Camino Real	27	26	16	10	0	BMR HOME	2069 2069	No Risk
1701 ECR 1701 W. El Camino Real	67	66	39	10	17	BMR	2072	No Risk
Evelyn Family Apartments 779 E. Evelyn Avenue	116	114	0	12	102	BMR	2072	No Risk
Total	1,381	1,358	428	685	245			

Source: City of Mountain View.

The data in the table below comes from the California Housing Partnership’s Preservation Database, the state’s most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing. However, this database does not include all deed-restricted affordable units in the state, so there may be at-risk assisted units in a jurisdiction that are not captured in this data table. Based on this data from 2020, there are 1,460 assisted units in Mountain View in the Preservation Database. Of these units, all are at low risk of conversion.¹²

Table 16: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

Income	Mountain View	Santa Clara County	Bay Area
Low	1,460	28,001	110,177
Moderate	0	1,471	3,375
High	0	422	1,854
Very High	0	270	1,053
Total Assisted Units in Database	1,460	30,164	116,459

Universe: HUD, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), USDA, and CalHFA projects. Subsidized or assisted developments that do not have one of the aforementioned financing sources may not be included.
Notes: While California Housing Partnership’s Preservation Database is the state’s most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing, this database does not include all deed-restricted affordable units in the state. Consequently, there may be at-risk assisted units in a jurisdiction that are not captured in this data table.
Sources: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database (2020); BAE, 2021.


¹² California Housing Partnership uses the following categories for assisted housing developments in its database:
 Very-High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate within the next year that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
 High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 1-5 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
 Moderate Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.
 Low Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in 10+ years and/or are owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.

Housing and Special Needs Populations

Large Households

As mentioned earlier, large households often have different housing needs than smaller households. If a city's rental housing stock does not include larger unit sizes, large households who rent could end up living in overcrowded conditions. In Mountain View, slightly more than half of large households with five or more persons are renters, as shown in Figure 22. Furthermore, according to 2013-2017 HUD CHAS data, approximately 40% of large family households in Mountain View were lower income at less than 80% of HAMFI; these lower income households may have trouble finding affordable and appropriately sized units in Mountain View.

Figure 22: Household Size by Tenure




Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25009; BAE, 2021.

The unit sizes available in a community affect the household sizes that can access that community. Large family households are generally served by housing units with three or more bedrooms, of which there are 13,054 units in Mountain View. Among the 12,629 large units with three or more bedrooms that are occupied, 23.6% are renter occupied and 76.4% are owner occupied (see Figure 23). While the data in Figure 22 and Figure 23 indicate that Mountain View has a relatively large inventory of rental units with two or more bedrooms relative to the number of renter households with three or more people, City staff report that

there is a shortage of deed-restricted affordable units with two or more bedrooms for lower-income families. This represents a challenge for larger lower-income households that are in need of affordable housing.

Figure 23: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms



Universe: Occupied housing units

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25042; BAE, 2021.


Household Type

Family households¹³ headed by one person are often at greater risk of housing insecurity, particularly female-headed households, who may be supporting children or a family with only one income. While Mountain View has significantly fewer family households than the County and the region (56.5% compared to 71.8% and 66.4 percent, respectively), over ten% of local households are families with a single parent. Mountain View has a higher proportion of single-person households and non-family households (such as cohabiting roommates) than the County and the region. Single-person households are likely to seek smaller units than larger households, and non-family households of more than one person may seek different types of

¹³ Family households consist of two or more individuals who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption, although these households may also include other unrelated people.

units than family households (e.g., two non-cohabiting adults may seek not just separate bedrooms but also separate bathrooms).

Figure 24: Household Type




Notes: For data from the Census Bureau, a “family household” is a household where two or more people are related by birth, marriage, or adoption. “Non-family households” are households of one person living alone, as well as households where none of the people are related to each other.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B11001; BAE, 2021.

Female-Headed Households with Children

Female-headed households with children may face particular housing challenges, with pervasive gender inequality resulting in lower wages for women. Moreover, the added need for childcare can make finding a home that is affordable more challenging. According to 2019 ACS data, there are more female-headed households with children (at 57.5 percent) than without children (at 42.5 percent) in Mountain View. In addition, 227 (16.4 percent) of all female-headed households with children, fall below the federal poverty line, while 76 (7.4 percent) of all female-headed households *without* children, live in poverty (see Figure 25).

Figure 25: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status



Universe: Female Households


Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012; BAE, 2021.

Seniors

Senior households commonly experience a combination of factors that can make accessing or keeping housing a challenge. As noted above (see Figure 18) seniors often are faced with high cost burdens. They often live on fixed incomes and are more likely to have disabilities, chronic health conditions, and/or reduced mobility. Seniors who rent may be at even greater risk for housing challenges than those who own, due to income differences between these groups. The largest groups of seniors have incomes greater than 100% of AMI or incomes less than 30% of AMI (see Figure 26). Senior renter households are much more likely to be lower income. Approximately 78.8% of senior renter households have incomes less than or equal to 80% of AMI, while 47.8% of senior owner households have incomes less than or equal to 80% of AMI. The group most likely facing challenges finding suitable affordable housing is extremely low-income senior renters, who make up over 45% of all senior renter households. Senior owners may have limited incomes but may also reside in homes that they own outright with no mortgage payments, resulting in low overall housing costs.

Figure 26: Senior Households by Income and Tenure



Universe: Senior households

Notes: For the purposes of this graph, senior households are those with a householder who is aged 62 or older. The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release; BAE, 2021.


People with Disabilities

Disability data provide valuable context for assessing the current and future need for accessible housing units. 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 are in need of specialized care, yet often rely on family members for assistance due to the high cost of care. People with disabilities face additional housing challenges, as they not only need housing that is affordable but also accessibly designed housing, which offers greater mobility and opportunity for independence. Unfortunately, the need typically outweighs what is available, particularly in a housing market with such high demand. As a result, people with disabilities are at a high risk for housing insecurity, homelessness, and institutionalization, particularly when they lose aging caregivers.

In Mountain View, approximately 5,700 of the civilian noninstitutionalized population (7.0 percent) are estimated to have one or more of the six disability types specified below in Figure 28. As shown in Figure 27, this proportion is slightly lower than the proportions in Santa Clara County (8.0 percent) and the Bay Area (9.6 percent), potentially due to high housing costs in

Mountain View, as individuals with disabilities tend to have lower incomes on average than the population as a whole.

Figure 27: Population by Disability Status




Universe: Civilian noninstitutionalized population

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B18101; BAE, 2021.

Figure 28 shows the rates at which different disabilities are present among residents of Mountain View. The most common disabilities in Mountain View are ambulatory (3.2 percent), independent living (2.7 percent), and hearing (2.5 percent). Some individuals have more than one disability and therefore are represented more than once in the figure below. Housing preferences and needs for persons with disabilities varies widely, with many requiring additional services such as live-in care, social services, job training programs, or counseling to help them achieve independent living.

Figure 28: Disability by Type



Universe: Civilian noninstitutionalized population 18 years and over

Notes: 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. The Census Bureau provides the following definitions for these disability types: 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.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B18102, Table B18103, Table B18104, Table B18105, Table B18106, Table B18107; BAE, 2021.

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

Those with developmental disabilities have a high risk of housing insecurity due to aging caretakers, usually an elderly parent or family member, no longer being able to care for them. In addition, they may be at risk due to their specific housing needs. Persons with developmental disabilities are a subset of the population with disabilities as represented in Figure 28 above, and are defined as those with 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. This can include Down's Syndrome, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and mild to severe intellectual disability, as well as disabling conditions that are closely related to intellectual disability or require treatment similar to that required for individuals with an intellectual disability but does not include conditions that are solely physical in nature. Some people with developmental disabilities are unable to work, rely on Supplemental Security Income, and live with family members.

In Mountain View, out of the population of 298 people with a developmental disability, about 50.3% are children below the age of 18, while adults account for the remaining 49.7% (see Table 17).

Table 17: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age

Age Group	Total
Age Under 18	150
Age 18+	148

Universe: Population with developmental disabilities

Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

Sources: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Age Group (2020); BAE, 2021.

The most common living arrangement for individuals with developmental disabilities in Mountain View is the home of a parent, family, or guardian. As shown in Table 18, approximately 82.3% of the individuals with developmental disabilities residing in Mountain View currently live with a parent, family, or guardian, while 12.9% live in an independent or supported living facility. Many people with developmental disabilities have extremely low incomes, making it difficult to find housing in Mountain View’s high-cost housing market. Adults with developmental disabilities that live with parents or other elderly family members may be at risk of displacement or homelessness if those family members are no longer able to care for them due to death or other factors that affect their ability to provide care. This could indicate a need for additional independent or supported living facilities, care homes, and other housing options for persons with disabilities as well as a need to ensure that existing homes can be adapted to meet the needs of persons with disabilities. In addition, there may be a need for additional units for extremely low-income households in order to meet the needs of many individuals with developmental disabilities.

As discussed in the Constraints Analysis (see Appendix C), the City of Mountain View has reasonable accommodation procedures to facilitate equal access to housing. Program 1.1 will update the reasonable accommodation procedures to removing unnecessary findings that could be a constraint to providing reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities. In addition, Program 1.1 will amend the City’s Zoning Ordinance to permit of residential care homes as a permitted use regardless of the number of residents. Program 2.1 in the Housing Plan states that the City will make funding available to support a range of housing needs, including permanent supportive housing and housing for people with special needs. Program 2.5 states that the City will fund fair housing education, enforcement, and counseling to

prevent fair housing violations and provide financial support for tenant/property owner mediation and eviction protection, which can help to prevent displacement among individuals with developmental disabilities. Program 3.1 states that the City will develop and implement a strategy to prevent people from becoming unhoused. In addition, many of the other programs in the Housing Plan that will facilitate the production and preservation of affordable housing can also help to address housing needs among individuals with developmental disabilities.

Table 18: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence

Residence Type	Total
Home of Parent /Family /Guardian	255
Independent /Supported Living	40
Other	10
Community Care Facility	5
Foster /Family Home	0
Intermediate Care Facility	0

Universe: Population with developmental disabilities

Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

Sources: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020); BAE, 2021.

Homelessness

One of the most pressing and challenging issues in California is homelessness, reflecting a range of social, economic, and psychological factors. Rising housing costs in already-expensive areas such as the Bay Area result in increased risks of community members experiencing homelessness. Too many residents who have found themselves housing insecure have ended up unhoused in recent years, either temporarily or longer 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 with disabilities, those struggling with addiction, and those dealing with traumatic life circumstances.

Table 19 presents HUD’s biennial Point-In-Time (PIT) count of sheltered and unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness at the city and county level. Of the 9,706 persons experiencing homelessness in Santa Clara County, the vast majority of whom are unsheltered, 606 persons, or six percent, are in Mountain View. However, over 10% of the increase in persons experiencing homelessness between 2015 and 2019 in Santa Clara County was in Mountain View. Indeed, the PIT count in Mountain View increased by nearly 120% between

2015 and 2019, compared to a 48% increase countywide.¹⁴ The PIT count, however, should be considered a conservative estimate as many homeless individuals cannot be identified or counted, even with the most thorough methodology. Furthermore, a decrease in homeless persons counted during the census does not necessarily signify a decrease in homelessness. Although careful training took place prior to the count of unsheltered homeless, which includes homeless people who are unlikely to be found in shelters or in other residential programs within a local homeless assistance network, it is very difficult to count all homeless individuals living on the streets.

Table 19: Point-In-Time Count, 2015-2019


	2015	2019	2015-2019 Change	
			Number	Percent
<u>City of Mountain View</u>				
Sheltered	5	32	27	540%
Unsheltered	271	574	303	112%
Total	276	606	330	120%
<u>Santa Clara County</u>				
Sheltered	1,929	1,784	-145	-8%
Unsheltered	4,627	7,922	3,295	71%
Total	6,556	9,706	3,150	48%

Sources: City of Mountain View; 2020; BAE, 2021.

Over three-quarters of the countywide population experiencing homelessness are unsheltered adults in households without any children under 18, as shown in Figure 29. Persons experiencing homelessness that are in households with at least one adult and children are the second largest subgroup of the homeless population, accounting for 9.5% of the population, while 2.8% are households composed solely of children under 18. Only ten of the 276 persons experiencing homelessness that are in households composed solely of children are sheltered, which is particularly concerning for the County, although it is unclear how many of the 266 unsheltered households in this category reside in Mountain View.

¹⁴ The 2021 PIT was deferred due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the count was completed in February 2022. Results were not yet available as of the writing of this report.

Figure 29: Homelessness by Household Type & Shelter Status, Santa Clara County




Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); BAE, 2021.

One common challenge among individuals experiencing homelessness is severe mental illness, with the countywide PIT data showing 2,659 persons reporting this condition among the homeless population. Another common affliction is chronic substance abuse, reported by 1,949 persons among the countywide homeless population.

Figure 30: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, Santa Clara County



Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD's requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness. These challenges/characteristics are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one challenge/characteristic. These counts should not be summed.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); BAE, 2021.

In Mountain View, the student population experiencing homelessness totaled 161 during the 2019-20 school year, which is about 7.0% and 1.2% of the total homeless student population in Santa Clara County and the Bay Area, respectively. Between the 2016-17 school year and the 2019-20 school year, this population increased by 571 percent, although notably there were no reported homeless students for the 2018-19 school year, which may reflect a discrepancy in the data. By comparison, Santa Clara County has seen a 3.5% increase in the population of students experiencing homelessness since the 2016-17 school year, while the Bay Area population of students experiencing homelessness decreased by 8.5 percent. During the 2019-2020 school year, there were still some 13,718 students experiencing homelessness throughout the region.

Table 20: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness

Academic Year	Mountain View	Santa Clara County	Bay Area
2016-17	24	2,219	14,990
2017-18	46	2,189	15,142
2018-19	na	2,405	15,427
2019-20	161	2,297	13,718

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools

Notes: The California Department of Education considers students to be homeless if they are unsheltered, living in temporary shelters for people experiencing homelessness, living in hotels/motels, or temporarily doubled up and sharing the housing of other persons due to the loss of housing or economic hardship. The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography. 2018-19 data not available for Mountain View.

Sources: ABAG, based on data from the California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020); BAE, 2021.

To augment the information from the County count, the City also conducts a street-by-street count of vehicles that appear to be in use for living purposes. From 2017 until 2020, the count of vehicles in the public right-of-way (PROW) used for living has ranged from 250 to 300 vehicles on average. The highest count was in July 2020 at 320 (combined street and in safe parking vehicles). The safe parking lots were operating 24/7 at the time and vehicles onsite were excluded from the PROW count and have since been counted separately.

Over time, the counts reflect that more than half of the counted vehicles have been RVs. The 2022 count reflects an increase in other types of vehicles, including vans, buses, and box trucks. While there has been both a modest decrease and a change in types of vehicles used for living purposes in the public right-of-way in the most recent count, the overall trend for lived-in vehicles has remained fairly consistent. Though the numbers are down in some of the on-street counts, the challenges and factors that may result in living in vehicles remain.

Table 21: Mountain View Vehicles in Public Right-of-Way (PROW), 2017-2020

	2017	Dec. 2018	Jul-19	Feb. 2020	Jul-20	Jan-22	2017- Jan 2022 Change	
							Number	Percent
RV	158	189	207	205	191	135	-23	-15%
Passenger Vehicle	94	89	80	89	70	18	-76	-81%
Other/Unspecified	0	9	11	5	4	63	63	n.a.
Total	252	287	298	299	265	216	13	5%

Sources: City of Mountain View; 2022; BAE, 2022.

In 2018, the City partnered with the County of Santa Clara and a local nonprofit safe parking provider to provide safe parking and a range of other services to support unstably housed residents on a path to permanent housing. Overnight safe parking programs were launched at faith-based locations and the program has since grown to become the largest safe parking provider in the region with the capacity for up to 101 vehicles (includes both faith-based lots). The City also adopted a Safe Parking Ordinance to facilitate the creation of safe parking locations on private lots in 2019. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the city extended the safe parking program to operate 24/7. The City has been increasing the options available along the continuum of housing and the focus on the affordable housing pipeline remains one of the highest priorities. The continuum in addition to safe parking lots includes the interim LifeMoves Mountain View facility, which in addition to accepting the City's unhoused resident also accepts unhoused people from across the County as a part of the County system of coordinated care. Between 2016 and 2021, the city invested \$9.9 million in strategies to address homelessness and fund associated services, including over \$3.8 million in rent relief to address impacts due to the pandemic. Some of the investment has been directed towards healthcare and providing showers and laundry services for the homeless population, such as the MayView Community Health Center and Hope's Corner. The city has partnered with the State, private companies, and nonprofits to raise an additional \$22.4 million between 2016 and 2021, including a \$1 million grant from Google and approximately \$17 million in State, City, County, and philanthropic funding for LifeMoves Mountain View (Project Homekey interim housing site). County investment for initiatives in Mountain View specifically includes five years of funding for a cold weather homeless shelter, safe parking, construction of a resource center, and funding for job training programs. In 2022, the City entered into an MOU with the County for \$80 million in Measure A funding to develop up to 200 units of rapid rehousing/permanent supportive housing units. The Housing Plan component of this Housing Element Update includes Programs 2.1, 3.1, and 4.3 to address the needs of homeless individuals and families, as well as Programs 1.5, 1.12, 2.1, 2.5, 3.2, 4.2, and 4.4 to prevent displacement that could lead to homelessness.

Farmworkers

Mountain View does not have a significant farmworker community. There are no major agricultural operations in Mountain View, and very few if any in the immediate surrounding area. While there are no available data on the number of farmworker that live in Mountain View or the number of farmworker jobs in Mountain View Table 22 shows the number of jobs in the agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting sector. As shown, there are less than 200 local residents with jobs in the sector, and less than 40 jobs in Mountain View. This indicates that few if any Mountain View residents are farmworkers, as the total number of resident jobs shown in the table include jobs outside of the agriculture industry, and even residents with jobs in the agriculture industry could hold work in positions other than farmworker positions. Similarly, it is unlikely that there are any farmworker jobs located in Mountain View.

Table 22: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting Employment in Mountain View, 2019

	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting	Total
Employed Resident Jobs	181	44,711
Jobs in Mountain View	38	93,107

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002-2019).

In Mountain View, there were no reported students of migrant workers in the 2019-20 school year, or in the preceding three school years, as shown in Table 23. These data further demonstrate that Mountain View does not have a significant farmworker community. In the Bay Area, there has been a decline of 14.1% in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-17 school year, and the change at the county level was a 49.7% decrease.

Table 23: Migrant Worker Student Population

Academic Year	Mountain View	Santa Clara County	Bay Area
2016-17	0	978	4,630
2017-18	0	732	4,607
2018-19	0	645	4,075
2019-20	0	492	3,976


Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools

Notes: The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography.

Sources: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020); BAE, 2021.

As shown in Figure 31, the number of permanent farmworkers in Santa Clara County increased by 42.6% between 2002 and 2017, totaling 2,418 in 2017, while the number of seasonal farm workers decreased by 53.3 percent, totaling 1,757 in 2017. Overall, the farmworker population in Santa Clara County decreased by 23.5 percent, totaling 4,175 in 2017.

Figure 31: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, Santa Clara County



Universe: Hired farm workers (including direct hires and agricultural service workers who are often hired through labor contractors)

Notes: Farm workers are considered seasonal if they work on a farm less than 150 days in a year, while farm workers who work on a farm more than 150 days are considered to be permanent workers for that farm.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Census of Farmworkers (2002, 2007, 2012, 2017), Table 7: Hired Farm Labor

Farmworker Housing Needs and Resources: 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 many hold jobs that are temporary or seasonal. Finding decent and affordable housing can be challenging for these farmworker households, particularly in high-cost housing markets. While farmworker housing often includes temporary accommodations that provide beds in group living quarters, farmworkers in Santa Clara County are increasingly shifting toward permanent jobs, as shown in Figure 31. As a result, an increasing number of workers are likely to be interested in permanent homes that are suitable for themselves and their families, rather than living alone while traveling for work. As a result, farmworkers often seek out the same type of affordable housing as other lower-income households, including a preference for housing that is close to schools and other amenities in more urban areas.


Because Mountain View is not in close proximity to a large number of agricultural jobs, Mountain View is not an ideal location for housing that is targeted to farmworkers. Any farmworkers that currently live in Mountain View or are seeking housing in Mountain View are likely interested in permanent housing in a location with access to schools and other

amenities. These residents could be served by Mountain View’s existing affordable housing stock or new affordable units that will be built in Mountain View during the upcoming Housing Element Cycle.

Non-English Speakers

California has long been an immigration gateway to the United States, which means that many languages are spoken throughout the Bay Area. Since learning a new language is universally challenging, it is not uncommon for residents who have immigrated to the United States to have limited English proficiency. This limited proficiency can lead to additional disparities if there is a disruption in housing, such as an eviction, because residents might not be aware of their rights or might be wary to engage due to immigration status concerns. In Mountain View, 5.8% of residents five years and older identify as speaking English not well or not at all, which is below the proportion for Santa Clara County and the Bay Area at 8.8% and 7.8 percent, respectively. Individuals that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update noted that language barriers can prevent lower-income households from accessing subsidized housing. Program 2.2 seeks to address this barrier by providing increased interpretation services for the City’s BMR application process.

Figure 32: Population with Limited English Proficiency



Universe: Population 5 years and over
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B16005
 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table AFFH-03.

Assessment of Fair Housing

With the adoption of AB 686, all 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.”¹⁵

The City of Mountain View complies with all State and Federal fair housing laws and regulations and continuously self-assesses to ensure it is in compliance with State and Federal fair housing rules. The City has not received any judgements, lawsuits, or enforcements as a result of fair housing violations.

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. The following section summarizes key findings from the Assessment of Fair Housing, which was completed in accordance with current HCD guidance regarding the application of the new AB686 requirements, as well as a detailed reading of the California Government Code.¹⁶

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), HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), and the City of Mountain View.

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

¹⁵ California Government Code § 8899.5 (a)(1)

¹⁶ 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).

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 limited number of complaints have been filed with FHEO over housing discrimination in Mountain View in recent years. From 2013 through 2020, 14 complaints were recorded and closed, as shown in Table 24. Nine complaints were conciliated or settled, a no cause determination was made for three complaints, and two complaints were withdrawn after resolution.

Table 24: FHEO Fair Housing Complaints by Resolution Type, 2013-2020

Resolution	Total, 2013-2020	Percent of Total
Conciliated/settled	9	64.3%
Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction	0	0.0%
No cause determination	3	21.4%
Withdrawn after resolution	2	14.3%
Withdrawn without resolution	0	0.0%
Total, Closed Complaints	14	100%

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 25, there were a total of three complaints in Mountain View between 2018 and 2020, covering four basis types and eight discriminatory practices (a single complaint can include more than one of each of these two categories). All three of the complaints were found to have no cause.

Table 25: DFEH Fair Housing Complaints, 2018-2020

Basis Type (a)	Total, 2018-2020	Percent of Total
Ancestry	0	0.0%
Disability	2	50.0%
Familial status	1	25.0%
National origin/color/race	1	25.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Sexual harassment-Quid Pro Quo	0	0.0%
Total, All Basis Types	4	100%
Discriminatory Practice (a)		
Denied equal terms and conditions	1	12.5%
Denied reasonable accommodation	0	0.0%
Denied reasonable accommodation for a disability or medical cond.	1	12.5%
Denied rental/lease/sale	0	0.0%
Evicted	1	12.5%
Harassed	0	0.0%
Subjected to discriminatory zoning/land use	1	12.5%
Subjected to restrictive rule/covenant	2	25.0%
Subjected to discriminatory statements/advertisements	1	12.5%
Other	1	12.5%
Total, All Practices	8	100%
Resolution		
No cause determination	3	100.0%
Voluntary mediation	0	0.0%
Withdrawn after resolution	0	0.0%
Total, All Resolutions	3	100%

Note:

(a) Each complaint may involve more than one basis type or discriminatory practice, but there is only one resolution per complaint.

Sources: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, 2022; BAE, 2022.

While these data suggest that fair housing complaints that arise in Mountain View are relatively rare, the overwhelming majority of fair housing issues are not typically captured in fair housing complaints. In part, this is because many fair housing issues go unreported due to a lack of awareness of fair housing laws, fear of retaliation, or other factors that prevent individuals from coming forward. More broadly, fair housing issues include a range of factors that limit access to opportunity, often with disparate impacts on communities of color, people with disabilities, those with limited English proficiency, and other vulnerable populations. The fair housing complaint system is not designed to address the majority of these factors, and therefore provides information on only a small component of potential fair housing issues. The remainder of this section provides additional data and analysis to assess potential fair housing issues and identify factors that may limit access to opportunity.

Mountain View Fair Housing Services

The City of Mountain View helps fund Project Sentinel, a regional non-profit agency, to provide fair housing services. Project Sentinel provides assistance with housing discrimination, dispute resolution, and housing counseling for residents in Mountain View and throughout Santa Clara, San Mateo, Stanislaus, and Sacramento Counties and Cities of West Sacramento, Fremont, Merced, and Roseville. Through Project Sentinel, the City provides landlord tenant counseling, outreach and education, arbitration, audits, and discrimination investigation. The City also allocates additional General Fund monies to support Project Sentinel to administer a tenant/landlord referral and mediation program, as well as to refer cases that may potentially involve violations of fair housing law to the fair housing service provider.

The City also has an established a Multi-Cultural Engagement Program, which focuses on outreach and education to inform non-English speaking residents on available services, including fair housing services. Outreach workers are fluent in the three primary non-English languages spoken in Mountain View: Spanish, Mandarin, and Russian. Services provided include providing non-English speaking residents with information about programs, meetings, and other community events/activities; providing assistance in completing applications for subsidized housing and community programs; providing translation services as needed; and making presentations and distributing brochures at churches, apartment complexes, and other locations where non-English speaking persons can be found.

Integration and Segregation Patterns and Trends

Race and Ethnicity

As noted above, Mountain View has a slightly larger proportion of its population that identifies as Non-Hispanic White than the County and Bay Area region, and the share of residents that identify with other racial and ethnic groups has increased more slowly in Mountain View than in the County and region over recent years. As shown in Table 26, approximately 40.1% of residents in Mountain View were non-Hispanic White in 2020, compared to 30.8% of residents in the two-county region. Non-Hispanic Asian residents account for approximately 34.9% of the citywide population, while Hispanic and Latino residents comprise an additional 17.2 percent. In both Mountain View 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 in both the City and the two-county region. The Hispanic population has increased absolutely in both geographies, but its proportion of the total has decreased in Mountain View. This is in contrast to the two-county region, where the Hispanic proportion of the total population increased slightly between 2000 and 2020. These trends may be due at least in part to the high cost of housing in Mountain View relative to the County and region overall, coupled with wealth and income gaps between racial and ethnic groups. It should be noted that, as illustrated in the table below, some groups have very limited populations in the City, which means that a small change in

absolute numbers among these groups has a significant impact on the percentage change in the population of these groups.

Table 26: Mountain View Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2000 - 2020

	City of Mountain View									
	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	39,029	55.2%	34,052	46.0%	33,008	40.1%	(6,021)	-12.8%	(1,044)	-3.1%
Black or African American	1,674	2.4%	1,468	2.0%	1,155	1.4%	(519)	-12.3%	(313)	-21.3%
Native American Indian & Alaska Native	164	0.2%	116	0.2%	101	0.1%	(63)	-29.3%	(15)	-12.9%
Asian	14,513	20.5%	19,064	25.7%	28,760	34.9%	14,247	31.4%	9,696	50.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	160	0.2%	372	0.5%	215	0.3%	55	132.5%	(157)	-42.2%
Some other race alone	221	0.3%	241	0.3%	557	0.7%	336	9.0%	316	131.1%
Two or more races	2,036	2.9%	2,682	3.6%	4,374	5.3%	2,338	31.7%	1,692	63.1%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	57,797	81.7%	57,995	78.3%	68,170	82.8%	10,373	0.3%	10,175	17.5%
Hispanic or Latino	12,911	18.3%	16,071	21.7%	14,206	17.2%	1,295	24.5%	(1,865)	-11.6%
Total, All Races	70,708	100.0%	74,066	100.0%	82,376	100.0%	11,668	4.7%	8,310	11.2%
	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	1,096,637	45.9%	930,518	37.2%	831,610	30.8%	(265,027)	-15.1%	(98,908)	-10.6%
Black or African American	68,253	2.9%	61,094	2.4%	56,849	2.1%	(11,404)	-10.5%	(4,245)	-6.9%
American Indian & Alaska Native	6,816	0.3%	5,167	0.2%	4,261	0.2%	(2,555)	-24.2%	(906)	-17.5%
Asian	567,084	23.7%	741,400	29.7%	981,182	36.3%	414,098	30.7%	239,782	32.3%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	14,152	0.6%	16,136	0.6%	14,785	0.5%	633	14.0%	(1,351)	-8.4%
Some other race alone	5,739	0.2%	6,586	0.3%	16,035	0.6%	10,296	14.8%	9,449	143.5%
Two or more races	72,956	3.1%	77,480	3.1%	117,236	4.3%	44,280	6.2%	39,756	51.3%
Subtotal, Not Hispanic nor Latino	1,831,637	76.6%	1,838,381	73.5%	2,021,958	74.9%	190,321	0.4%	183,577	10.0%
Hispanic or Latino	558,109	23.4%	661,712	26.5%	678,743	25.1%	120,634	18.6%	17,031	2.6%
Total, All Races	2,389,746	100.0%	2,500,093	100.0%	2,700,701	100.0%	310,955	4.6%	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

While Mountain View today is a racially diverse community, historic patterns of discrimination have helped to shape disparities between neighborhoods as well as between Mountain View and the region. Citywide, the proportion of the population that identifies as White non-Hispanic is only about 40% of the total, well above the 31% proportion regionally. However, this proportion has been declining over the last several decades, just more slowly than in the region overall.

One set of historic factors contributing to segregation was national policies such as FHA redlining and loan discrimination. These factors as well as the impact of regional and local planning decisions are discussed in “Segregation Shaped the San Mateo Housing Crisis,”¹⁷ In an interview¹⁸ discussing his book *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*, author Richard Rothstein points out numerous policies and actions in the region, including blockbusting and government policies that led to segregated patterns of housing in local communities such as Mountain View, and how this led in part to the wealth gaps, and health disparities by race/ethnicity that still exist today.

However, one Bay Area developer of suburban housing in the region following WWII, Joseph Eichler, “was one of the first builders to sell a home to whoever could afford it...,”¹⁹ Today, Eichler houses with their open floor plans are still sought by homeowners. Reportedly, there are 275 Eichler homes in Mountain View, with additional similar houses designed and built by others.²⁰

While national policies have contributed historically to patterns of segregation, economic considerations have also been a factor. As discussed above, housing prices in Mountain View have increased substantially over at least the past 20 years, surpassing the pace of housing cost increases in the surrounding region. As a result, other communities in the County and region provide a slightly more affordable option for lower-income households. Due to the economic disparities between racial and ethnic groups, which are attributable in part to historic patterns of redlining and loan discrimination and the resulting impact on wealth gaps that persist today, the high cost of housing in Mountain View is likely a key factor contributing to the differences between the City and the surrounding region in terms of the racial and ethnic composition of the population. The City of Mountain View has engaged in numerous

¹⁷ Marcy Rein, “Segregation Shaped the San Mateo Housing Crisis,” *RP&E Journal*, undated, <https://www.reimaginerpe.org/20-2/rein/san-mateo-segregation> access February 14, 2022.

¹⁸ Charles Russo, “Un-forgetting the segregationist history of the Midpeninsula,” *Mountain View Voice*, June 30, 2020, <https://www.mv-voice.com/news/2020/06/30/un-forgetting-the-segregationist-history-of-the-midpeninsula>, accessed February 14, 2022.

¹⁹ Lisa Keys, “Famous for his California homes, this Jewish developer pushed to integrate the burbs,” *The Jewish News of Northern California*, August 5, 2020, <https://www.jweekly.com/2020/08/05/famous-for-his-california-homes-this-jewish-developer-pushed-to-integrate-the-burbs/>, accessed February 14, 2022.

²⁰ “Mountain View Eichler Homes,” <https://www.eichlerforsale.com/mountain-view-eichlers/>, accessed February 14, 2022.

past and ongoing efforts to address the need for affordable housing in the City, and the Housing Plan section of this Housing Element Update includes new and continued actions to improve the affordability of housing in Mountain View.

Dissimilarity Index

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 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.²¹ The sub-city analysis, including the calculation of both the dissimilarity and isolation indexes, relies on the use of Block Group-level data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Mountain View generally shows low dissimilarity index scores by race/ethnicity (see Table 27). In 2020, the scores ranged from 11.0 for non-Hispanic persons of two or more races to 55.0 for non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native residents. However, it should be noted that the only groups with dissimilarity index scores in the moderate range are those with very small populations in Mountain View; their higher dissimilarity index scores may in part reflect segregation resulting from their limited numbers. Most of the groups show a decrease in the dissimilarity index between 2010 and 2020, indicating that segregation of racial and ethnic groups within Mountain View has generally declined in recent years.

Table 27: Dissimilarity Index, Mountain View, 2010 and 2020

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Dissimilarity Index	
	2010	2020
Black or African American alone	32.7	25.7
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	38.7	55.0
Asian alone	18.8	14.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	47.0	44.4
Some other race alone	31.1	24.7
Two or more races	11.9	11.0
Hispanic or Latino	36.7	29.6

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 and 2020 Decennial Census, Table P2; BAE, 2022.

²¹ 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.

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 mechanically with that group’s share of the overall study area’s population. Using Hispanic or Latino residents as an example, the isolation index of 7.8 indicates that the average Hispanic or Latino resident in 2020 lives in a Block Group where the Hispanic or Latino share of the population exceeds the overall citywide average by 7.8 percent. Isolation index values close to zero indicate that members of that minority group live in relatively integrated neighborhoods.^{22 23}

Table 28 summarizes isolation index scores by racial and ethnic group. The data indicate that most residents live in areas with relatively high degrees of racial and ethnic integration. The isolation indexes decreased in most groups between 2010 and 2020. None of the scores indicate a high degree of isolation for any group in either 2010 or 2020.

Table 28: Isolation Index, Mountain View, 2010 and 2020

Racial and/or Ethnic Group	Isolation Index	
	2010	2020
Non-Hispanic White	7.8	3.8
Black or African American alone	0.7	0.5
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0.1	0.4
Asian alone	3.5	3.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.7	0.4
Some other race alone	0.2	0.3
Two or more races	0.3	0.5
Hispanic or Latino	12.2	7.8

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 and 2020 Decennial Census, Table P2; BAE, 2022.

Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity

Figure 33 through Figure 50 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 Mountain View and a comparison region, defined as San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties combined.

²² HUD. (2013). *AFFH Data Documentation*. Available at: http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/pdf/FR-5173-P-01_AFFH_data_documentation.pdf

²³ 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>

As shown above in Table 26, approximately 60% of Mountain View's population is non-White. The share of non-White residents varies considerably by Census Block Group, as shown in Figure 33, ranging from 39% to 77 percent. The highest minority concentrations can be found in Block Groups in the areas around Rengstorff Park, as well as North Whisman, Whisman Station, and areas north of Old Middlefield Way. In the two-county region, the Block Groups with the highest minority population tend to be in urban areas in East San Jose and Milpitas, with concentrations by Block Group ranging from 15% up to 99% (see Figure 34). For many of the groups, the population overall in Mountain View is extremely small.

The percentage of non-Hispanic White population by Block Group in Mountain View ranges from 23% to 61% (see Figure 35). Monta Loma, Downtown and many of the Block Groups south of El Camino Real are majority non-Hispanic White, with proportions of non-Hispanic White residents exceeding 50 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 36.

As of 2020, Hispanic and Latino residents made up 17% of the citywide population. By Block Group, the percentage varies widely, from three% to 50% (see Figure 37). The highest concentrations can be found in block groups around Rengstorff Park and North Bayshore. 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% by block group. The highest concentrations can be found in the cities of East Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Jose, and Gilroy (see Figure 38).

The non-Hispanic Black population in Mountain View is extremely small, accounting for just 1.4% of the citywide population as of 2020. By Block Group, the percentage ranges from 0.1% to four percent. In the two-county region, the range by Block Group is from zero to 19 percent, as shown in Figure 40. The Block Groups with high concentrations are clustered in and around northern neighborhoods in Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and San Jose.

The largest minority group in Mountain View is the Non-Hispanic Asian population, which makes up 35% of the citywide population. The proportion of non-Hispanic Asians by Block Group varies from 15% to nearly 60 percent, with the highest concentrations found near the San Antonio and Whisman Station neighborhoods (see Figure 41). In the two-county 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 42)

The Non-Hispanic Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander population in Mountain View is extremely small, making up just 0.1% of the citywide population as of 2020. By Census Block Group the proportions range from none to two percent (see Figure 43). Regionally, the highest Block

Group concentration is 14 percent, with high concentrations in East Palo Alto, San Mateo, and San Bruno (see Figure 44).

As displayed in Figure 45, the non-Hispanic Alaska Native/Native American population in Mountain View is also extremely small, ranging from zero to less than two% by Block Group. Regionally, the proportion in all Block Groups is also less than two percent. One Block Group in North Bayshore in the City shows non-Hispanic Native Americans making up approximately 1.6% of the population, the highest proportion regionally (Figure 46).

The non-Hispanic Some Other Race Alone population in Mountain View is another very small cohort, as seen in Figure 47. The percentage by Block Group ranges from zero to just 2.2 percent. Regionally, the percentage by Block Group ranges from zero to six percent (see Figure 48). 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.

Non-Hispanic persons of two or more races comprise 5.3% of the citywide population according to 2020 Census data. By Block Group, the concentration ranges from three percent to ten percent. The highest concentrations can be found in multiple Block Groups throughout the City, but in no real pattern (see Figure 49). Regionally the percentage by Block Group ranges from less than one percent to 13 percent.

Summary of Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity. Overall, the figures provided below indicate that some areas of Mountain View include concentrations of various racial and ethnic groups in Block Groups throughout the City. In particular, there are concentrations of White residents in Monta Loma, Downtown and many of the Block Groups south of El Camino Real; concentrations of Hispanic and Latino residents in Block Groups around Rengstorff Park and North Bayshore; and concentrations of Asian residents in Block Groups near the San Antonio and Whisman Station neighborhoods. During the public review period for the Housing Element Update, several individuals commented on the high proportion of Latino students at Mariano Castro Elementary School (see Figure 71 below), which has an attendance zone that overlaps with the area around Rengstorff Park (most notably Block Groups 1 and 3 in Census Tract 5094.03 and Block Groups 1 and 2 in Census Tract 5095) that has a large Latino population. These commenters expressed concerns that the differences between schools in terms of the racial and ethnic composition of the students provided an indicator of segregated living patterns within Mountain View. All other racial and ethnic groups comprise a relatively small share of the population in Mountain View overall and in individual Block Groups throughout the City.

Implications of Geographic Distribution of Residents by Race and Ethnicity for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing through the Housing Element Update. Affirmatively furthering fair housing through the Housing Element Update includes taking actions that overcome patterns


of segregation. The primary mechanism that a local jurisdiction can use to overcome existing patterns of racial or ethnic segregation is to identify affordable housing opportunity sites throughout the community, rather than concentrating affordable housing in areas with existing concentrations of racial and ethnic minority residents. As shown in Figure 97 below and discussed in Appendix E, the housing sites inventory that is included in this Housing Element Update identifies sites throughout the City where affordable housing could be built, and does not concentrate affordable housing opportunity sites in areas with disproportionate concentrations of racial or ethnic minority groups.

The housing site inventory shown in Appendix E helps to affirmatively further fair housing as it relates to the four Block Groups identified above that have a disproportionate share of Latino residents. These four block groups currently account for an estimated 9.6 percent of all existing housing units in Mountain View. Of the housing sites identified in Appendix E, sites in these four Block Groups account for 1.7 percent of lower-income units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites. This means that these Block Groups have a disproportionately low share of the lower-income units in the site inventory relative to the number of existing units in these Block Groups.


Another key component of affirmatively furthering fair housing entails ensuring that residents live in areas that provide them with access to opportunity. Though some areas of Mountain View have large populations of various racial and ethnic minority groups, there are no racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty in Mountain View, as discussed below (see Figure 63). In addition, almost all of Mountain View offers relatively high access to opportunity, including in areas with comparatively large non-White populations.

The only area considered “Low Resource” in the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map is the North Bayshore area. However, the North Bayshore area has access to a significant number of jobs. It is also the subject of a major precise plan that will bring new development and services to the area, helping to improve access to opportunity. The City prepared and adopted the North Bayshore Precise Plan to create a complete community north of Highway 101, including new neighborhood-serving retail and services, new open spaces, land for a new school, and transit improvements along North Shoreline Boulevard to connect the area to the Downtown Transit Center and the rest of the City. The North Bayshore Master Plan, a development framework to implement the vision of the Precise Plan, is already under review, with approval expected in 2023. This Master Plan includes up to 7,000 dwelling units as well as services, open spaces, a school and mobility improvements to vastly improve the quality of life for existing residents north of Highway 101.

Figure 33: Census Block Groups by% Non-White, Mountain View




- City of Mountain View
- % of Non-White Population by Block Group**
- 39% - 49%
- 50% - 59%
- 60% - 69%
- 70% - 77%



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

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 34: Census Block Groups by% Non-White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



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

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 35: Census Block Groups by % Non-Hispanic White, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% Non-Hispanic White Population by Block Group

- 23% - 29%
- 30% - 39%
- 40% - 49%
- 50% - 61%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 36: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic White, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 37: Census Block Groups by% Hispanic or Latino, Mountain View




- City of Mountain View
- % Hispanic Population by Block Group
- 3% - 9%
- 10% - 19%
- 20% - 29%
- 30% - 49%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 38: Census Block Groups by % Hispanic or Latino, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 39: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% Non-Hispanic Black Population by Block Group

- 0.1% - 0.9%
- 1.0% - 1.9%
- 2.0% - 2.9%
- 3.0% - 4.2%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 40: Census Block Groups by Non-Hispanic Black, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 41: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Asian, Mountain View




- City of Mountain View
- % Non-Hispanic Asian Population by Block Group**
- 15% - 29%
- 30% - 39%
- 40% - 49%
- 50% - 60%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 42: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Asian, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 43: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% of Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander Population by Block Group

- 0.00% - 0.19%
- 0.20% - 0.49%
- 0.50% - 0.99%
- 1.00% - 2.04%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 44: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Pacific Islander, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 45: Census Block Groups by % Non-Hispanic Native American, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% Non-Hispanic Native American/Alaskan Native Population by Block Group

- 0.00% - 0.24%
- 0.25% - 0.49%
- 0.50% - 1.55%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 46: Census Block Groups by % Non-Hispanic Native American, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.


Figure 47: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% Non-Hispanic Other Race Population by Block Group

- 0.00% - 0.19%
- 0.20% - 0.49%
- 0.50% - 0.99%
- 1.00% - 2.22%




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 48: Census Block Groups by% Non-Hispanic Other Race Alone, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties




Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 49: Census Block Groups by % Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, Mountain View




- City of Mountain View
- % Non-Hispanic 2 or more Race Population by Block Group**
- 2.6% - 4.9%
- 5.0% - 5.9%
- 6.0% - 6.9%
- 7.0% - 9.7%



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Figure 50: Census Block Groups by % Non-Hispanic Persons of Two or More Races, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census; BAE, 2022.

Persons with a Disability

Regional Trends. As discussed in the housing needs assessment, approximately 5,700 residents in Mountain View are estimated to have one or more of the six disability types specified by the American Community Survey. Compared to Santa Clara County, Mountain View has a smaller proportion of the population living with a disability at 7% compared to 8% in the County overall. Additionally, there are 11 Census Tracts in the County with proportions of the population living with a disability over 15%, and none of those Census Tracts are located in the City of Mountain View.




Trends over Time. The proportion of the population living with a disability remained relatively unchanged from 2010 to 2019. The share of the population living with a disability decreased

in the City of Mountain View from 7.2% in 2010 to 7.0% in 2019. Meanwhile, the share of the population living with a disability increased in the County overall from 7.9% to 8.0%.

Patterns across Census Tracts. Figure 51 shows the percent of persons with a disability by Census Tract in Mountain View based on ACS data from 2015-2019. The Tracts range from 8.2% to 15.8% of the civilian noninstitutionalized population having one or more type of disability. The Census Tracts with highest proportion of those with a disability (about ten percent) are located around the western portions of the city. As shown in Figure 52, the San Mateo and Santa Clara County Region shows some Census Tracts with high proportions of disabled persons, though all of the Census Tracts report having less than 20% of the non-institutionalized civilian population with a disability.


Specifically, Census Tracts 5093.03 and 5094.04 have 10.1% and 10.4% of the population living with a disability. Tract 5093.03 is just north of El Camino Real and has a cluster of apartments, commercial uses, and the Mountain View Community Center. Additionally, the Mountain View Senior Center is nearby to east. This concentration of housing suitable for residents with a disability and the proximity to services such as the community and senior center may account for the higher concentration of residents living with a disability in this area. Tract 5094.04 is directly northeast of the other tract and includes a concentration of low density, one-story apartments. Again, the proximity to services and apartments suitable for residents living with disabilities is likely the cause of the concentration.

Figure 51: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, Mountain View



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2022.

Figure 52: Population with a Disability by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2022.

Familial Status

Regional Trends. 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.

Mountain View has a lower proportion of married-couple households than Santa Clara County overall and the Bay Area, with 45.3% of households reporting as married-couple families compared to 57% for the county and 51% of the region. Although a minority of households are characterized as married-couple, most children under 18 in Mountain View live in these

households. Overall, 13.8% of households with children in Santa Clara County are single-female households compared to 12.3% in the City of Mountain View.

Trends over Time. The share of married-couple household with children under 18 years old increased in Santa Clara County from 79% in 2010 to 82% in 2019. The share of households with children that are married-couple households stayed the same in Mountain View from 2010 to 2019 (81% of households with children).


Patterns across Census Tracts. By Census Tract, between 56.9% and 96.4% of children under 18 reside in married-couple households (as shown in Figure 53), with no areas with a majority of children in living in single-parent or other non-married couple households. The highest concentrations of children under 18 in married couple households are in the northern and southern portions of Mountain View. The tracts with the highest share of households with children under 18 in married-couple households are Tract 5046.01 (94%) and Tract 5098.01 (92%). Tract 5046.01 is in the far north of the city along the Bay and home to Google, Intuit, NASA, and Microsoft campuses. Tract 5098.01 is in the southwest of the city and is comprised of single family detached homes west of Miramonte Avenue and north of Cuesta Drive.

For the San Mateo and Santa Clara County Region, the proportion of children in married-couple households by Census Tract ranges from 31.9 to 100 percent, though the tracts with 100% in married-couple households have smaller populations of children under 18.

Households with only one parent or guardian present, especially female-headed households, are more likely to face problems in finding affordable housing. Figure 55 shows the distribution in Mountain View of the percent of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present in Mountain View. The proportion of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present by Census Tract ranges from zero to 37.2 percent. Three Tracts show concentrations greater than 20 percent, located around the center of the City or near San Antonio Center. The highest concentration, at 37.2 percent, is located in Tract 5092.01, bordered by North Shoreline Boulevard, the Central Expressway, Route 85, and US 101. The second highest is Tract 5095 (29%) which is located just north of El Camino Real. This Tract is home to several apartment communities, single family homes, Mariano Castro Elementary, Mountain View Academy, and the Khan Lab School. Additionally, the Public Library and Downtown Mountain View are nearby to the east. The third highest is Tract 5094.04 (25%) which is home to the San Antonio Center, the community center, and several apartment communities.

In the two-county region, the proportion of children in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present by Census Tract ranges from zero to 44.7% (see Figure 56). Only four Tracts have concentrations over 40 percent. These tracts can be found in San Jose and Redwood City.


Figure 53: % of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2015-2019, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% of Children in Married-Couple Households by Tract

- 57% - 69%
- 70% - 79%
- 80% - 89%
- 90% - 96%




Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2022.

Figure 54: % 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, 2022.


Figure 55: % of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% of Children in Female Householder (No Spouse/Partner Present) Households by Tract

- 0.0% - 4.9%
- 5.0% - 9.9%
- 10.0% - 14.9%
- 15.0% - 37.2%



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2022.

Figure 56: % of Children in Single-Female Headed Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data; BAE, 2022.

Income

Regional Trends. As shown in Table 29, the median annual household income in Mountain View during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period was \$139,720 (2019 dollars), compared to \$123,700 in the two-county region. Approximately 47% of the City's households had incomes of \$150,000 or more, compared to 41.4% of households in the two-county region. At the lower end of the income scale, roughly one-fifth of the households in both geographies had incomes less than \$50,000.

Table 29: Household Income Distribution and Median Income, 2015-2019

Household Income	Mountain View		San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$14,999	1,808	5.4%	48,211	5.3%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	1,418	4.2%	38,244	4.2%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	1,360	4.0%	39,964	4.4%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	1,916	5.7%	58,461	6.5%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	2,926	8.7%	96,299	10.7%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2,711	8.0%	91,657	10.1%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	5,840	17.3%	156,622	17.3%
\$150,000 and above	15,777	46.7%	374,300	41.4%
Total Households	33,756	100.0%	903,758	100.0%
Median Household Income	\$139,720		\$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, 2022.

Figure 61 shows the percentage of the population living in poverty by Census Tract in Mountain View. According to 2015-2019 ACS data, approximately 6.7% of the citywide population lives below the federal poverty limit compared to 7.5% in Santa Clara County.

Trends over Time. Median household income increased from \$88,244 in 2010 to \$139,720 in 2019 (an increase of 58%) in Mountain View. Santa Clara County's median income increased by 43% during the same time. Therefore, median income growth in Mountain View outpaced growth in the County overall.

Between 2010 to 2019, it is estimated that the poverty rate in the City of Mountain View decreased from 7.1% to 6.7%. Similarly, the poverty rate in Santa Clara County decreased from 10.5% in 2010 to 7.5% in 2019.

Patterns across Census Block Group and Census Tract. Figure 57 below shows the geographic distribution of households by median household income by Block Group in Mountain View.


The median ranges widely, from \$67,800 in a small Block Group near the intersection of Rengstorff Avenue and El Camino Real to over \$250,000 in multiple Block Groups south of El Camino Real. There are seven Block Groups with median household incomes below \$100,000. These Block Groups are dispersed throughout the city and primarily located along El Camino Real and Highway 85 (see Figure 57).

As illustrated in Figure 58, the two-county region shows a broader 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 such as San Jose and Campbell, while the highest incomes can be found in more suburban areas, such as Palo Alto, Los Altos, and Woodside.

Figure 59 displays additional information regarding income levels in Mountain View, showing the percentage of persons in low- to moderate-income households by Census Tract. The percentage of persons in low- to moderate-income households by Census Tract ranges from 6.5% to 59.9 percent. In the two-county region, the percentage ranges from two to 94% (see Figure 60). There are four Census Tracts in Mountain View where a majority (greater than 50 percent) of the population is low- to moderate-income. These lower-income Tracts are located in the western and northern portions of the City. The western Tracts with majority low- to moderate-income households have a concentration of apartments, the San Antonio Shopping Center, the Community Center, and the Senior Center. The north tract is the location of Google, Intuit, NASA, and Microsoft campuses.


By Census Tract, the poverty rate ranges from 1.5% to 16.4%. The two Tracts with the highest proportions of the population with incomes below the poverty level (greater than 10%) are located in the San Antonio and Monta Loma/Farley/Rock areas. In the two-county region, the percent of the population living in poverty by Census Tract ranges from zero to 43.6 percent. The Tracts with the highest concentrations (greater than 20 percent) are found in downtown San Jose and Redwood City (see Figure 62). There is also one Tract with a high rate of poverty near Stanford University, largely due to the significant student population living there.

Figure 57: Distribution of Median Household Income by Block Group, Mountain View






Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2022.

Figure 58: 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, 2022.

Figure 59: % of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, Mountain View




Sources: HUD; U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2011-2015 data.

Figure 60: % of Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Tract, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Sources: HUD; U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2011-2015 data.


Figure 61: Poverty Status by Census Tract, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% of Population whose Income in the Past 12 Months is Below Poverty Level

- 1.5% - 2.9%
- 3.0% - 6.9%
- 7.0% - 9.9%
- 10.0% - 16.4%



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 five-year sample period; BAE, 2022.

Figure 62: 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% or more. The poverty test defines areas of “extreme poverty” as those where 40% 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 Mountain View. There are a small number of R/ECAP areas in the larger two-county region in central San Jose and in Gilroy (see Figure 63).

Figure 63: 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, 2022.

While none of the tracts in Mountain View meet the criteria for a R/ECAP, there are some areas in the city, such as San Antonio, Monta Loma/Farley/Rock, and North Bayshore that have higher concentrations of non-White and lower income populations (see Figure 33 and Figure 59). Table 30 reports the prevalence of poverty by race and ethnicity between 2015 and 2019. The data show that several racial and ethnic groups, including Black or African American, American Indian and Alaskan Native, Hispanic or Latino, and residents of Some Other Race alone, have poverty rates in excess of the citywide average of 6.7 percent. However, it should be noted that since the ACS is based on a sample, some of the numbers for some of the groups e.g., American Indian and Alaska Native) are subject to a high margin of error.

Table 30: Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, City of Mountain View, 2015-2019

Racial/Ethnic Group	Total Population	Total Below Poverty	Poverty Rate
White alone	44,333	2,583	5.8%
Black or African American alone	1,268	134	10.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native	324	101	31.2%
Asian alone	25,958	1,684	6.5%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	246	12	4.9%
Some other race alone	5,411	800	14.8%
Two or more races	3,754	164	4.4%
Total, All Races	81,294	5,478	6.7%
Hispanic or Latino	14,757	1,823	12.4%
Not Hispanic or Latino	66,537	3,655	5.5%
Total, All Ethnicities	81,294	5,478	6.7%

Note:

(a) Includes only those for whom poverty status was determined.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2019 five-year sample period, S1701; BAE, 2022.

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 non-minority affluent populations 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 Mountain View or the larger two-county region.

Figure 64 shows the distribution of Census Block Groups in Mountain View by the percent of the population that is Non-Hispanic White as well as Block Groups with a median annual household income above the regional median of \$124,000. The figure shows that most Block Groups in Mountain View, including most with a predominantly non-Hispanic White population, have a median household income that is higher than the regional median. However, some Block Groups with a predominantly non-Hispanic White population have median household incomes below the regional median. In addition, Block Groups with a median household income above the regional median include many where the non-Hispanic White population comprises a relatively small share of the population in the Block Group.

Figure 65 shows the distribution of Census Block Groups in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties by the percent of the population that is Non-Hispanic White as well as Block Groups with a median annual household income above the regional median of \$124,000. This figure shows that relatively high-income communities along the Highway 101 corridor and in San Jose include areas in which the population is predominantly non-Hispanic White as well as

areas in which the non-Hispanic White population comprises a relatively small share of the population, similar to the findings for Mountain View. However, the map also indicates that significant areas within the western portion of both Counties are both relatively affluent and predominantly non-Hispanic White.

Figure 64: Distribution of Non-Hispanic White Population by Median Income, City of Mountain View





Figure 65: Distribution of Non-Hispanic White Population by Median Income, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Disparities in Access to Opportunity

AB 686 requires the 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.”²⁴

TCAC and HCD created these “Opportunity Maps” using reliable and publicly available data sources to derive 21 indicators used to calculate opportunity index scores for Census tracts in each region in California. The TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map categorizes Census tracts into five groups based on the opportunity index scores:

²⁴ 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>


- 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% of the 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% of tracts in each region with the highest relative opportunity index scores to the Highest Resource designation and the next 20% 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 66, Mountain View 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 the southern part of the City and overlap with many of the higher-income tracts and many of the tracts with higher concentrations of White residents. There is one Low Resource-designated tract located at the northernmost part of the City (North Bayshore). This tract contains the Shoreline Amphitheatre, and the headquarters of Google, Intuit, and other tech companies, and has relatively small amounts of housing. While this Census Tract is one of the City's Census tracts with a higher proportion of non-White residents and lower-income residents, that may be a function of the only housing type available (a mobile home park) and limited access to daily goods, services and/or schools. While this could potentially indicate disparities in access to opportunity across racial, ethnic, and income groups, this Census tract also overlaps with the North Bayshore Precise Plan area, which is planned for a mix of uses including residential, office, retail, services, and open space. Implementation of the North Bayshore Precise Plan will help to improve access to opportunity in this area by bringing services to the neighborhoods that will be created under the plan.

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 67). 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 south of the airport in the I-280 corridor and west of US 101, as well as additional areas in Foster City and parts of Redwood City.

Figure 66: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, Mountain View




-  City of Mountain View
- 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map
-  High Resource
-  Highest Resource
-  Low Resource
-  Moderate Resource



Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2022.

Figure 67: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map by Census Tract, 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, 2022.

Access to Education

Most of Mountain View is served by the Mountain View Whisman School District which has approximately 4,400 students enrolled up through eighth grade. Figure 68 shows the location of each of the district’s schools and the elementary school attendance areas.

Figure 68: School Boundaries Map for the Mountain View Whisman School District



Notes:
Mistral Elementary and Stevenson Elementary are Choice Schools available to students throughout the district. Huff Elementary was recently renamed as Amy Imai Elementary.


Source: Mountain View Whisman School District.

The remainder of Mountain View is served by the Los Altos School District, which has approximately 3,600 students²⁵ from kindergarten through eighth grade. Figure 69 shows the location of each of the district’s schools and the elementary school attendance areas.

²⁵ This is the total enrollment not just of Mountain View resident students.


Mountain View is served by Covington, Almond, Springer, Santa Rita, and Oak Elementary Schools. Figure 70 shows the boundaries for the attendance areas for the two junior high schools, both of which serve some Mountain View students.

Figure 69: Elementary School Boundaries Map for the Los Altos School District



Source: Los Altos School District

Figure 70: Junior High School Boundaries Map for the Los Altos School District



Source: Los Altos School District

Elementary Schools


Figure 71 shows that there are substantial disparities between elementary schools in the Mountain View Whisman school district in their ethnic makeup. These differences in part reflect the residential makeup of the surrounding neighborhoods that feed each of these schools as shown in the discussion of race and ethnicity above. One of the two schools with a majority Latino population, Gabriela Mistral Elementary is a Spanish language immersion school that is a choice school rather than a neighborhood school. The other school with a majority Latino population, Mariano Castro Elementary, is located on the same school site as Gabriela Mistral Elementary and serves an area that overlaps with an area around Rengstorff Park that has a large concentration of Hispanic and Latino residents, as shown in Figure 37

above. More specifically, the attendance zone for this school overlaps with four Census Block Groups in which the Latino population accounts for 30 to 50 percent of the total population in each Block Group.

As discussed in the section on the geographic distribution of residents by race and ethnicity, above, the primary mechanism that the City can use to overcome existing patterns of discrimination is to ensure that there are sites where affordable housing can be built throughout Mountain View, such that affordable units that are developed during the Housing Element planning period are not overly concentrated in areas with existing concentrations of racial and ethnic minority groups. While the housing sites inventory in this Housing Element Update includes some housing sites in the neighborhood that Mariano Castro Elementary serves, the vast majority of housing opportunity sites are located elsewhere in the City. The four Block Groups that overlap with the Gabriela Mistral Elementary attendance zone in which 30 to 50 percent of the population is Latino currently account for an estimated 9.6 percent of all existing housing units in Mountain View. Of the housing sites identified in Appendix E of this Housing Element Update, sites in these four Block Groups account for 1.7 percent of lower-income units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites. This means that these Block Groups have a disproportionately low share of the lower-income units in the site inventory relative to the number of existing units in these Block Groups.

The attendance zone that Mariano Castro Elementary serves is comprised of areas that are classified as “Moderate Resource” or “High Resource” on the TCAC/HCD opportunity map (see Figure 66), indicating relatively high access to opportunity in this area.

Figure 71: Mountain View Whisman Elementary School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21




Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

The variation in the ethnic mix between the Los Altos elementary schools is not as pronounced as for the Mountain View Whisman school district, although there is some variation, as shown in Figure 72. For these schools, the two largest groups are Whites and Asians, who together make up over two-thirds of the student body in all the schools; White students are the majority at one school, but neither Asians nor Whites make up a majority at any other school. Latino/Hispanic children and children of two or more races make up most of the remainder of the student population in each of the schools. Black students make up less than one percent of the students in any of the schools, and all other groups account for the remaining 0.6 percent to 4.4 percent.

These schools also vary from the Mountain View Whisman district schools; the Los Altos schools tend to have fewer Hispanic students and more White and Asian students.

Figure 72: Los Altos Elementary School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21




Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

Middle Schools

The Mountain View Whisman School District provides two middle schools that serve the city, Crittenden Middle School and Isaac Newton Graham Middle School. The variation in race and ethnicity at the middle school level is not as significant as for the Mountain View Whisman elementary schools (see Figure 74). The Los Altos School District has two junior high schools, Ardis G. Egan Junior High and Georgina P. Blach Junior High, also shown in Figure 73. The ethnic/racial mix in these two schools is similar to that for the district’s elementary schools.

As with the elementary schools, the student body in middle schools in the Mountain View Whisman district has a different race and ethnic mix than the Los Altos district schools, with a much higher proportion of Hispanic students and lower proportions of Asian and white students.

Figure 73: Mountain View Middle/Junior High School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21




Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

High Schools

Mountain is served by a single high school district. Mountain View-Los Altos Union High district has three high schools with a total of approximately 4,500 students, serving a district that encompasses Mountain View, Los Altos, parts of Los Altos Hills, and other nearby unincorporated areas. The two large high schools (Mountain View and Los Altos) have similar diverse ethnic makeups; Alta Vista, which is a very small (71 students) alternative/continuation school, shows a very different mix, with a student body that is approximately three-fourths Latino, in contrast to one-fourth for the district overall.

Figure 74: Mountain View High School Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2020-21



Sources: California Department of Education, Ed-Data; BAE, 2021.

Education Domain Scores

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% for each Census Tract (or in some cases, rural block group), with a higher score representing better educational opportunities.²⁶

Figure 75 shows the Education Domain scores for Mountain View and Figure 76 shows the Education Domain scores for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The Education Domain scores for Census Tracts in Mountain View range from 53 percent to 99 percent, with a median of 81 percent. Within San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties overall, the Education Domain scores range from zero percent to 100 percent, with a median of 60 percent. These data indicate that Mountain View generally has relatively high Education Domain scores, though scores within some Census Tracts fall somewhat below the median for the two-County region.


²⁶ The methodology for this can be found in <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2021-hcd-methodology.pdf>.

As shown in Figure 75, the Census Tracts in Mountain View with the lowest Education Domain scores are Tract 5094.04 (53 percent), 5904.03 (56 percent), 5098.01 (67 percent) and 5095 (69 percent). These four Census Tracts overlap with an area that has a disproportionately large Latino population, which is discussed in more detail in the Segregation and Integration section of this analysis, as well as areas with a majority White population and areas with a racial and ethnic mix that is somewhat similar to the overall citywide mix. These four Census Tracts include some of the Census Tracts in Mountain View with the highest proportion of low-income and moderate-income households as well as one Census Tract south of El Camino Real (5098.01) with one of the lowest proportions of low-income and moderate-income households. All other Census Tracts in Mountain View have an Education Domain score of 71 percent or higher, putting them over ten percentage points higher than the median for the two-County region.


The housing site inventory shown in Appendix E helps to affirmatively further fair housing as it relates to the four Census Tracts identified above that have the lowest Education Domain scores in Mountain View. These four Census Tracts currently account for an estimated 27 percent of all existing housing units in Mountain View. Sites in these four Census Tracts account for nine percent of units in the housing site inventory provided in Appendix E. This means that these Census Tracts have a disproportionately low share of the lower-income units in the site inventory relative to the number of existing units in these Census Tracts.

As illustrated in Figure 76, the Education Domain scores across the two-county region tend to mirror the scores of the overall Opportunity Index, with high scores tending toward rural areas and lower scores in the more urbanized areas.

Figure 75: TCAC Education Domain Score, Mountain View




- City of Mountain View
- 2021 TCAC Education Domain Score
- 53% - 69%
- 70% - 74%
- 75% - 79%
- 80% - 99%



Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2014-2018 five-year sample data; BAE, 2022.

Figure 76: 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, 2022.

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, 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.²⁷


Located within the Silicon Valley, Mountain View has generally high job proximity index scores, with scores higher than 51 in all of its Census Tracts (see Figure 77). The higher index scores, ranging from 75 to 99, are all located in the northern portions of the City where most of the City's commercial and industrial areas are located. These are also the portions of the City that include some of the City's Census tracts with larger non-White and larger low-income populations. With the exception of some largely unpopulated rural Block Groups, the areas with high proximity index values 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 101 (see Figure 78).

²⁷ <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 77: Jobs Proximity Index Score, Mountain View




-  City of Mountain View
- Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group
-  51 - 74
-  75 - 99



Source: HUD, based on U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2014 Data.

Figure 78: 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

Public transportation is made available through Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Caltrain, and Mountain View Community Shuttle, providing Mountain View residents with multimodal transit options. VTA runs three light rail lines; 19 frequent, 24 local, and four express bus routes; and nine shuttle routes (see Figure 79). Routes operate on a mix of schedules on weekdays, and on select routes, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays²⁸. VTA routes also connect transit riders to transit centers, BART, and Caltrain.

Caltrain provides regional commuter rail service along the San Francisco Peninsula from Gilroy to San Francisco and makes a stop in Downtown Mountain View and San Antonio, as shown in Figure 80. Caltrain runs a 104-train schedule on weekdays and more limited service on

²⁸ Visit <https://www.vta.org/go/routes> for complete route and schedule information.

weekends and holidays. Services include Baby Bullet, Limited Express, and Local Service. Caltrain riders also can access two free or low-cost shuttle services at the Mountain View station, including the Mountain View Community Shuttle and MVgo.

In partnership with the City, Google, and VTA, Mountain View Transportation Management Association provides a free Mountain View Community Shuttle service throughout the City, making a total of 50 stops. The shuttles run seven days a week: every 30 minutes from 7AM to 7PM on weekdays and every hour from 10AM to 6PM on weekends and holidays.

MVgo's shuttle service, also provided by Mountain View Transportation Management Association, runs from Monday through Friday, excluding observed holidays. MVgo has four routes²⁹ that provide access throughout Mountain View. Through a partnership with Waze Carpool, MVgo also offers a \$5 subsidy on all carpool trips for people commuting to or from Mountain View.

²⁹ Visit <https://mvgo.org/shuttles/> for complete route and schedule information.

Figure 79: VTA System Map



Source: <https://vta.org/>, October 11, 2021.

Figure 80: Caltrain System Map



Source: <https://www.caltrain.com/>


The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT)³⁰ has developed a metric, the H+T (Housing and Transportation) Index that takes into account housing and transportation costs for a typical household. By their metric, in order to remain affordable housing costs plus transportation costs should equal 45% or less of total household income. They estimate this burden at the Census block group level, so disparities in this total estimated cost can be seen at a local or a regional level.

Based on these estimates, the Census Block Groups in Mountain View range from 29 to 68% on the index, with many exceeding the 45% threshold for moderate-income households at 80% of AMI, as shown in Figure 81. This means that a household at this income level would, on average, be cost-burdened when considering combined housing and transportation costs. According to the H+T Fact Sheet by CNT, Mountain View has an average H+T cost of 44 percent, which is just below the threshold. Most of the cost-burdened Block Groups are located towards the south of the City, which are mainly comprised of single-family homes occupied by higher-income households.

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% 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 Mountain View (see Figure 82). These areas are generally considered higher-income.


³⁰ <https://htaindex.cnt.org/>. For more on the methodology, see https://htaindex.cnt.org/about/HTMethods_2016.pdf.

Figure 81: % of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in Mountain View



Source: Housing + Transportation Index, Center for Neighborhood Technology.

Figure 82: % of Income to Housing + Transportation for a Typical Moderate-Income Household in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



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 2017.³¹ The analysis here uses the draft CalEnviroScreen version 4.0, released in the first half of 2021.

³¹ For more information, see <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen>.


As shown in Figure 83 below, the highest score (indicating the percentile of the CalEnviroScreen score, or the worst environmental conditions) is found in the northernmost tract in the City north of Highway 101. This is likely due largely to the area's proximity to Highway 101 and air quality issues related to the freeway. In addition, the presence of landfills factors into the methodology for assigning CalEnviroScreen scores and this Census Tract includes two closed landfills: one at Shoreline Park in Mountain View and one at Byxbee Park in Palo Alto. Because the scores include a weighting based on socioeconomic factors, other factors that likely increase the score for this area include lower household incomes and a high proportion of Latino residents among the population in this Census Tract. All of the housing units in this Census Tract that are within Mountain View are within one mobile home park, which likely accounts for the lower household incomes among the Tract's population. Another Census Tract in Mountain View that also has a high CalEnviroScreen score is located directly on the other side of Highway 101 on the western edge of the City. This Tract likely has a high score due largely to its proximity to the freeway.

Areas in Mountain View with high CalEnviroScreen scores are anticipated to accommodate a share of the City's RHNA during the Housing Element planning period. Among approved projects, pending projects, and available sites combined, units in these Census Tracts account for 22 percent of lower-income units, 19 percent of moderate-income units, and 44 percent of above moderate-income units. While some of the sites for these units are located close to the freeway, all are located relatively far from both landfill sites. In the Census Tract that is north of Highway 101 that includes the North Bayshore Master Plan area, the addition of a significant number of above moderate-income units may also impact the socioeconomic factors that affect the CalEnviroScreen score, which could have the effect of reducing the score during the planning period.

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 84).


Overall, these data suggest that Mountain View is similar to neighboring communities along the Highway 101 corridor with respect to providing access to a clean environment. More specifically, areas between Highway 101 and the Bay tend to have lower CalEnviroScreen scores while these scores generally improve on the opposite side of Highway 101, increasing in conjunction with distance with the Highway.

Figure 83: Areas of High Pollution in Mountain View



Source: DRAFT CalEnviroScreen Version 4.0.

Figure 84: 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 Mountain View, particularly members of racial and ethnic minority groups, experience disproportionate housing needs and are at risk for displacement.

Minority Homeownership Rates

According to the available data from the 2015-2019 ACS, the Mountain View homeownership rate is 42 percent, compared to 58% in the two-county region. The lower homeownership rate in Mountain View is reflected across all racial and ethnic groups. Table 31 shows that there are significant racial disparities in homeownership rates in both Mountain View and the larger two-county region. In Mountain View, the homeownership rate is highest for non-Hispanic Whites, at 47 percent, and lowest for householders of some other race alone, at 15 percent. Black and Hispanic/Latino homeownership rates in Mountain View are less than half the rate of non-Hispanic Asians and Whites. In the two-county region, the Black homeownership rate is 52% of the non-Hispanic White

rate, while the Hispanic/Latino homeownership rate is 60% of the non-Hispanic White rate. These trends likely reflect a combination of market and economic factors and historic discrimination in the housing market in Mountain View and the broader region.

Table 31: Distribution of Homeowners by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View and San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties

City of Mountain View				
Householder by Race	Household Tenure		Total Households	Ownership Rate
	Owner	Renter		
White Alone	8,852	11,310	20,162	43.9%
<i>Non-Hispanic White Alone</i>	8,223	9,340	17,563	46.8%
Black or African American Alone	104	454	558	18.6%
Asian Alone	4,539	5,934	10,473	43.3%
Some other race alone (a)	258	1,460	1,718	15.0%
Two or more races	303	542	845	35.9%
Total, All Races	14,056	19,700	33,756	41.6%
Hispanic or Latino	914	3,535	4,449	20.5%

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	61.1%
<i>Non-Hispanic White Alone</i>	252,655	136,015	388,670	65.0%
Black or African American Alone	7,747	15,123	22,870	33.9%
Asian Alone	181,128	116,583	297,711	60.8%
Some other race alone (a)	25,300	50,676	75,976	33.3%
Two or more races	13,472	15,880	29,352	45.9%
Total, All Races	519,648	384,110	903,758	57.5%
Hispanic or Latino	65,796	101,870	167,666	39.2%


(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 Mountain View were combined with Some Other Race Alone.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015-2019 5-year sample data, B25003A-I, BAE, 2022.

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 Mountain View in 2020 indicates that loan application and approval rates vary widely by race and ethnicity. As shown in Figure 85, approval rates in 2020 were lowest for Non-Hispanic Blacks and other Non-Hispanic minorities, at 67% and 50 percent, respectively. Notably, both of these groups recorded less than five valid loan applications in 2020, meaning these data are not statistically reliable due to the small sample size. Similarly, while the Hispanic approval and origination rates appear high, at 100 percent, they are based on a total of only seven valid home purchase loan applications in 2020. Nevertheless, these low application rates may be indicative of racial disparities in access to homeownership opportunities in Mountain View.

Figure 85: Disposition of Home Loans by Race/Ethnicity in Mountain View, 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, 2022.

Prevalence of Housing Problems

Table 32 and Table 33 report the relative prevalence of housing problems among households with incomes equal to, or less than, the area median by race and ethnicity. 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. For example, 76.7% of all extremely low-income households (i.e., household incomes less than 30% of AMI) in Mountain View experienced at least one of the four housing problems between 2014 and 2018 (see Table 32). Extremely low-income Hispanic households experienced housing problems at a significantly greater rate, at 87.9 percent. The results are similar for severe housing problems, with only Hispanic households experiencing severe housing problems at rates that, at one or more income levels, exceed the citywide average by at least ten percentage points (see Table 33).

Table 32: Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of AMI				Total (b)
	0-30%	31-50%	51-80%	81-100%	≤ 100% AMI
White	76.0%	73.1%	65.9%	56.2%	69.1%
Black/African American	65.0%	90.0%	0.0%	28.6%	58.7%
Asian	70.0%	85.6%	73.5%	59.2%	72.0%
American Indian	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Pacific Islander	0.0%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0%
Hispanic	87.9%	89.7%	78.8%	59.4%	82.7%
Subtotal, Housing Problems	76.7%	81.3%	72.4%	55.6%	72.9%
<i>Average Rate +10%</i>	86.7%	91.3%	82.4%	65.6%	82.9%

Notes:

Housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than one person per room; cost burden greater than 30% of income. 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, 2022.

Table 33: Severe Housing Problems Rate by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View

Race/Ethnicity	Percent of AMI				Total
	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	80-100%	≤ 100% AMI
White	57.4%	46.2%	27.3%	15.1%	40.0%
Black/African American	65.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%
Asian	61.4%	56.8%	45.1%	18.4%	49.0%
American Indian	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Pacific Islander	0.0%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0%
Hispanic	78.3%	69.0%	43.8%	18.8%	59.6%
Subtotal, Severe Housing Problems	63.3%	53.7%	37.1%	15.1%	46.5%
<i>Average Rate +10%</i>	73.3%	63.7%	47.1%	25.1%	56.5%

Notes:

Housing problems include lack of complete kitchen; lack of complete plumbing facility; more than 1.5 persons per room; cost burden greater than 50% of income. 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, 2022.

Housing Cost Burden

Regional Trends. As described in the housing needs assessment, overpayment for housing is defined as a household paying more than 30% of its gross income on housing-related expenses, such as rent, utilities, or mortgage payments. By this measure, 33% of all households in Mountain View were cost-burdened during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period. This proportion is similar to that for Santa Clara County overall where 35% of all households were cost burdened in 2019.

Trends over Time. The prevalence cost-burdened households decreased substantially in the County between 2010 to 2019, from 42% to 35%. The share of households in Mountain View that are cost burdened also decreased, from 37% in 2010 to 33% in 2019.


Renters in the County and City have higher rates of high housing cost burdens than owners and the share of renters that have a high housing cost burden was essentially constant in the County and City between 2010 and 2019. In Santa Clara County, 44% of renters had a high housing cost burden in 2010, compared to 45% in 2019. In Mountain View, 36% of renters had a high housing cost burden in 2010, compared to 37% in 2019.

For owners, cost burden is considerably lower than renter cost burden in both Santa Clara County and Mountain View and decreased between 2010 and 2019. The share of owner households with high housing cost burdens decreased in Santa Clara County, from 41% in 2010 to 28% in 2019. Similarly, the share of owner households with high housing cost burdens also decreased in Mountain View, from 37% in 2010 to 28% in 2019.

Patterns across Census Tracts. Figure 86 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for renters in Mountain View and Figure 87 shows the geographic distribution of overpayment for homeowners. Overall, 37% of renters during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period paid 30% or more of their incomes on housing. By Census Tract, the proportion of renters who were overpaying ranged from zero percent to 55 percent. For the region, the proportion by Census Tract ranged from zero percent to 80 percent, as shown in Figure 88 below. The areas in Mountain View with the highest concentrations of overpaying renters are located in the western and southern portions of the city. These areas vary significantly with respect to the racial and ethnic composition of the population as well as household income levels, as indicated in the maps above in this section.

Unlike the geographic pattern for renters, most of the Census Tracts with higher proportions of overpaying homeowners are located in neighborhoods east of State Highway-85, such as North Whisman and Whisman Station. However, the Tract with the highest share of overpaying homeowners can be found in the western portion of the City in the San Antonio area near Rengstorff Park (Census Tract 5094.03). This tract showed 71% of owner households paying 30% or more of their incomes on housing costs during the 2015-2019 ACS survey period, which was the highest proportion regionally (see Figure 89). As demonstrated above in Figure 59, most of the population living in this tract is considered low- or moderate-income, which may be a contributing factor. Notably, the housing stock in this Census Tract is almost entirely dominated by rental apartment buildings and complexes, with most of the for-sale inventory consisting of smaller one- and two-bedroom condominium units. Partly due to the characteristics of the housing stock, home sale prices in this area tend to be lower than the citywide average, so it is noteworthy that such a high proportion of homeowners are overpaying for housing in this Census Tract.

Figure 86: Overpayment by Renters, Mountain View



Sources: County of Santa Clara, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, NPS; BAE, 2021.

City of Mountain View

% of Renter Households with Gross Rent \geq 30% of Household Income by Tract


- 0% - 29%
- 30% - 39%
- 40% - 49%
- 50% - 55%

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles




Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 87: Overpayment by Homeowners, Mountain View




Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 88: Overpayment by Renters, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 89: 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. Citywide, approximately seven% of housing units are considered overcrowded. By Census Tract, the proportion of overcrowded households ranges from one to 21 percent. The Tracts located in the San Antonio area have the highest rates of overcrowding, with the proportion of overcrowded households exceeding ten percent. Census Tract 5094.03 has the highest proportion of overcrowded units, at 21% (see Figure 90). As mentioned above, this Tract also has the highest percentage of the population with incomes below the federal poverty level, suggesting that many households in this area are likely struggling to afford suitable housing.

In the two-county region, the proportion of overcrowded households by Tract ranges from zero to 41 percent. Of the populated Tracts, 38% have 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 91).


Figure 90: Overcrowded Households, Mountain View



City of Mountain View


% of Overcrowded Household by Tract

- 0.0% - 4.9%
- 5.0% - 9.9%
- 10.0% - 14.9%
- 15.0% - 20.7%



Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.

Figure 91: Overcrowded Households, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties



Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2015-2019 data.


Homelessness

As shown in Table 19 above, there were an estimated 606 unhoused persons living in Mountain View and 3,150 unhoused persons living in Santa Clara County as of the 2019 Point-In-Time Count. While the Point-In-Time Count does not provide demographic data at the City level, the countywide data indicate that people with disabilities are disproportionately impacted by homelessness in Santa Clara County. Data from the Point-In-Time Count indicate that 45 percent of unhoused people surveyed in the 2019 count had one or more disabilities. This is a significantly higher prevalence of persons with disabilities than in the population in Santa Clara County overall, among which an estimated eight percent (see Figure 27) has one or more disabilities.

In addition, Latino residents, American Indian/Alaska Native residents, Black or African American residents, and residents of “Other Races” (i.e., any race other than American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, or White) or Multiple Races are disproportionately impacted by homelessness. As shown in Figure 92, Latino residents comprise an estimated 26 percent of the

County’s population overall but comprised an estimated 43 percent of the County’s unhoused population. Figure 93 shows that American Indian and Alaska Native residents, Black and African American residents, and residents of Other Races or Multiple Races comprised large shares of the County’s unhoused population relative to each group’s share of the overall County population. White residents made up the largest group of unhoused residents in terms of race, though the proportion of White residents as a share of the unhoused population was similar to the proportion of White residents as a share of the County’s population overall (44 percent).

Figure 92: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, Santa Clara County




Notes:

This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January.

The data from HUD on Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for individuals experiencing homelessness does not specify racial group identity. Accordingly, individuals in either ethnic group identity category (Hispanic/Latinx or non-Hispanic/Latinx) could be of any racial background.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I)

Figure 93: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, Santa Clara County



Notes:

This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January.

HUD does not disaggregate racial demographic data by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness. Instead, HUD reports data on Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness in a separate table. Accordingly, the racial group data listed here includes both Hispanic/Latinx and non-Hispanic/Latinx individuals.

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I)

Resident Displacement

Table 34 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% of income, and to have a severe cost burden when housing expenses exceed 50% of income. Particularly for lower-income households, having housing costs that exceed 30% of household income often means that households are unable to afford housing while also meeting other basic needs such as food and healthcare. Between 2014 and 2018, there were an estimated 7,765 renter households who earned less than 100% of HUD-Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) and spend more than 30% of their incomes on housing in Mountain View. These households are more likely than others to experience displacement as a result of increasing housing costs especially if they reside in units not covered by rent stabilization. There were also an estimated 3,945 owner

households with incomes at or below 100% of HAMFI and moderate or severe housing costs burden during this period. 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.

Table 34: Housing Cost Burdens by Income Bracket and Tenure, City of Mountain View

Household Income Brackets (a)	Renter Households		Owner Households		All Households	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HH Income <=30% HAMFI (b)	3,040	100.0%	1,325	100.0%	4,365	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	320	10.5%	290	22.0%	610	14.0%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	380	12.5%	205	15.5%	585	13.4%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	2,020	66.4%	700	53.0%	2,720	62.4%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	320	10.5%	125	9.5%	445	10.2%
HH Income >30% to <=50% HAMFI (b)	1,785	100.0%	840	100.0%	2,625	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	250	14.0%	335	39.9%	585	22.3%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	545	30.6%	355	42.3%	900	34.4%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	985	55.3%	150	17.9%	1,135	43.3%
HH Income >50% to <=80% HAMFI (b)	1,700	100.0%	830	100.0%	2,530	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	335	19.7%	450	54.2%	785	31.0%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	995	58.5%	125	15.1%	1,120	44.3%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	370	21.8%	255	30.7%	625	24.7%
HH Income >80% to <=100% HAMFI	1,240	100.0%	950	100.0%	2,190	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	445	35.9%	595	62.6%	1,040	47.5%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	700	56.5%	240	25.3%	940	42.9%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	95	7.7%	115	12.1%	210	9.6%
HH Income >100% HAMFI (b)	11,930	100.0%	10,075	100.0%	22,005	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	10,800	90.5%	8,545	84.9%	19,345	87.9%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	1,100	9.2%	1,350	13.4%	2,450	11.1%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	35	0.3%	175	1.7%	210	1.0%
Total Households (b)	19,695	100.0%	14,015	100.0%	33,705	100.0%
With ≤ 30% Housing Cost Burden	12,150	61.7%	10,215	72.9%	22,365	66.4%
With > 30%, but ≤ 50% Cost Burden	3,720	18.9%	2,275	16.2%	5,995	17.8%
With > 50% Housing Cost Burden	3,505	17.8%	1,395	10.0%	4,900	14.5%
Not Computed (No or Negative Income)	320	1.6%	125	0.9%	445	1.3%

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, 2014-2018 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2022.

As discussed above, Hispanic households are disproportionately likely to experience one or more housing problems (see Table 32 and Table 33) than the population overall. Hispanic households in Mountain View are also far more likely to be housing cost burdened, with the majority of Hispanic households in the city devoting more than 30% of their income towards housing. As shown in Figure

94 below, 53% of Hispanic households in Mountain View are housing cost burdened, compared to 29% of non-Hispanic White households. This could indicate that Hispanic and Latinx households are disproportionately impacted by displacement risk compared to other racial and ethnic groups in Mountain View. This is consistent with the information provided in Figure 92 above, which indicates that Latino residents in Santa Clara County are disproportionately impacted by homelessness.

Figure 94: Housing Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity, Mountain View



Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2013-2017 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data; BAE, 2022.

In addition, people with disabilities are disproportionately vulnerable to displacement. As discussed in the section of this Appendix that addresses populations with special housing needs, individuals with disabilities often have extremely low or very low incomes, making it difficult to afford housing in Mountain View’s high-cost housing market. In addition, individuals with disabilities are disproportionately represented in the County’s unhoused population, indicating that people with disabilities are disproportionately likely to experience displacement.

Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors

The table below summarizes known fair housing issues and their contributing factors, as identified through the Assessment of Fair Housing provided above. This section was also informed by the City of Mountain View’s federal Assessment of Fair Housing document, which was in preparation concurrent with the preparation of the City’s sixth cycle Housing Element Update. In addition, many of the issues cited below are consistent with input that was provided during the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update, which highlighted the high cost of housing, risk of displacement, disproportionate impacts on non-White and special-needs households, and shortage of housing for some special-needs groups as key concerns affecting Mountain View residents.

To advance the objective to affirmatively further fair housing in Mountain View, Goal 2 of the Housing Plan portion of Mountain View’s sixth cycle Housing Element Update is “An inclusive and equitable community where housing assistance is available and accessible.” The fair housing issues and related contributing factors listed above are key priorities for achieving this goal. Most of the programs in the Housing Plan consist of actions that will serve to address these issues and contributing factors. Programs that will help to address the identified fair housing issues and contributing factors are shown in the table below

Fair Housing Issue	Contributing Factor	Key Actions
<p>1. The high cost of housing in Mountain View contributes to disparities in access to opportunity and racial and ethnic segregation.</p>	<p>Mountain View generally has low levels of segregation within City limits and offers high access to opportunity citywide, including in areas with large non-White and/or lower-income populations. However, there are some areas of Mountain View with comparatively high concentrations of non-White residents, while residents in many of the high-cost single-family neighborhoods south of El Camino Real are disproportionately White. In addition, the City's high housing costs makes it more difficult for lower-income and moderate-income households to find housing in Mountain View, which is a primary factor that has led Mountain View to be less racially and ethnically diverse than the region. Because Mountain View provides high access to opportunity but lower levels of diversity than the region overall, barriers to securing housing in Mountain View also create disparities in access to opportunity at the regional level. The City of Mountain View undertakes numerous actions to facilitate the production and preservation of affordable housing, which help to mitigate these disparities.</p>	<p>1.2: Reduced Parking for Affordable Housing 1.3: Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards 1.6: SB9 DUO Subdivisions 1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing 1.7: Monitor and promote Accessory Dwelling Units, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units and SB9 Developments 1.8: Park Land Ordinance Update 1.9: BMR Program Review 1.10: Density Bonus 1.11: No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites 2.2: Pilot ADU & SB9 Financial Incentives Program 2.4: Inclusive and Equitable Affordable Housing Application Processes 2.6: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing 4.1: Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions 4.2: Federal, State, and Regional Policy Initiatives 4.3.: Financial Support for Subsidized Housing 4.7: Neighborhood Engagement</p>
<p>2. Many lower-income Mountain View residents have been impacted by displacement, while others currently face displacement risk.</p>	<p>Many lower-income residents in Mountain View experience high housing cost burdens, putting them at risk of displacement. In addition, prior to the implementation of SB 330, many Mountain View residents have been displaced due to the demolition of rent-stabilized units and redevelopment of these sites as higher-cost rental and townhome developments. Mountain View's Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act, Mobilehome Rent Stabilization Ordinance, and Tenant Relocation Ordinance help to prevent or mitigate the impact of displacement of existing residents. SB 330 and other changes to State law have largely prevented ongoing demolition of rent-stabilized units and other lower-cost rental units in Mountain View.</p>	<p>1.5: Non-conforming R1 and R2 Multifamily Developments 1.12 Maintenance of Existing Housing Stock 2.1: Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs 2.5: Mediation and Fair Housing Programs 2.6: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing 3.1: Homelessness Prevention and Services for the Unhoused 3.2: Displacement Prevention and Mitigation 4.2: Federal, State, and Regional Policy Initiatives 4.4: Partnerships to Support Affordable Housing 4.5: Partnerships with Subsidized Housing Developers</p>

Fair Housing Issue	Contributing Factor	Key Actions
<p>3. Mountain View’s high-cost housing market disproportionately impacts non-White and special needs households, who tend to have lower incomes and therefore a disproportionate need for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Many special needs populations and households, such as persons with disabilities, seniors on fixed incomes, and single parent households, tend to have low incomes and are therefore disproportionately impacted by the high cost of housing in Mountain View. As a result, special needs populations and non-White residents are impacted by Mountain View’s high housing costs to a greater degree than other households. The City of Mountain View undertakes a range of actions to facilitate the production and preservation of affordable and special needs housing, and the Housing Element includes several policies to advance these goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Zoning Ordinance Update for Consistency with State Laws 1.2: Reduced Parking for Affordable Housing 1.3: Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards 1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing 1.7: Monitor and promote Accessory Dwelling Units, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units and SB9 Developments 1.8: Park Land Ordinance Update 1.10: Density Bonus 1.11: No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites 2.1: Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs 2.2: Pilot ADU & SB9 Financial Incentives Program 2.4: Inclusive and Equitable Affordable Housing Application Processes 2.6: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing 4.1: Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions 4.3.: Financial Support for Subsidized Housing 4.4: Partnerships to Support Affordable Housing 4.5: Partnerships with Subsidized Housing Developers 4.7: Neighborhood Engagement
<p>4. Some special-needs groups face a mismatch between the supply of housing in Mountain View and the type of housing needed to address their specific needs.</p>	<p>Mountain View has a shortage of affordable housing options for some households and individuals with special housing needs, including lower-income large family households, individuals with disabilities, individuals and families experiencing homelessness, and those in need of supportive services. Market-rate units do not typically address these special needs, while significant funding gaps lead to a shortage of affordable units to address these needs. These challenges are not unique to Mountain View, and Mountain View has engaged in actions to address these gaps, such as participating in two State Homekey applications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Zoning Ordinance Update for Consistency with State Laws 2.1: Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs 2.3: Reasonable Accommodation 2.6: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing 3.1: Homelessness Prevention and Services for the Unhoused 4.3.: Financial Support for Subsidized Housing 4.7: Neighborhood Engagement



APPENDIX

C

Projected Housing Needs

APPENDIX C: PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

A key component of any Housing Element Update is identifying adequate sites to address the jurisdiction’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines state-wide projected housing needs and allocates new housing unit target numbers to regional councils of government (COGs). State law (California Government Code Section 65584) provides for COGs to then prepare and adopt plans that assign a “fair share” of the region’s housing construction need to each city and county. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the COG that determines fair-share portions of state allocations for the City of Mountain View.

The City’s RHNA requirements for the 2023-2031 Housing Element projection period are summarized in Table 35. For the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period, the City of Mountain View is required to plan to accommodate the development of at least 11,135 housing units. This includes 2,773 units for very low-income households, 1,597 units for low-income households, 1,885 units for moderate-income households, and 4,880 units for above moderate-income households.

Table 35: Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Income Group	Number of Units	Percent of Total
Very Low	2,773	25%
Low	1,597	14%
Moderate	1,885	17%
Above Moderate	4,880	44%
TOTAL	11,135	100%

Source: ABAG, 2021.

Housing Needs for Extremely Low-Income Households

Although the RHNA does not include allocations for extremely low-income households, Housing Element Law requires that jurisdictions estimate the need for housing units affordable to extremely low-income households and plan to accommodate this need. Extremely low-income households are those with income less than 30% of area median income. In Santa Clara County, 30% of the AMI is the equivalent to an annual income of \$49,700 for a family of four. Households with extremely low incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance, such as supplemental security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance, are considered extremely low-income households. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers, and healthcare

professionals – can also fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in these industries.

HCD’s official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making zero to 50% AMI) to calculate their projected need to house extremely low-income households. HCD provides three methodologies for estimating this need: 1) allocate the% of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the ABAG region’s proportion; 2) allocate the% of very low-income need to extremely low -income households based on the current proportion for Mountain View; 3) assume that 50% of Mountain View’s very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households. To estimate the projected housing need for extremely low-income households, 50% of Mountain View’s 2,773 very low-income RHNA units are assumed to serve extremely low-income households. Based on this methodology, the City has a projected need of 1,387 units for extremely low-income households over the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period.



APPENDIX

D

Housing Constraints

APPENDIX D: HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Sections 65583(a)(5) and 65583(a)(6) of the California Government Code state that the purpose of a Housing Element is to identify governmental and non-governmental factors (constraints) that inhibit the development, maintenance, or improvement of housing. The Housing Element must analyze “potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the types of housing identified for persons with disabilities, land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, local processing and permit procedures, and any locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development.” Where constraints are identified, the City is required to take action on any unnecessary constraints and to mitigate or remove them. A thorough understanding of the constraints to development can help to create appropriate policy responses to mitigate constraints and also make it easier and more affordable to affirmatively further fair housing development.

The following sections analyze the various governmental, market, and environmental factors that may constrain the production of affordable housing in Mountain View. These include infrastructure availability, environmental features, economic and financing constraints, and public opinion.

Governmental Constraints

Government regulations are required because the housing market on its own does not produce the range of housing to meet the spectrum of community needs. Conversely, these actions can affect housing costs by limiting the supply of buildable land, setting standards and allowable densities for development, and exacting fees for the use of land or the construction of homes. Potential regulatory constraints include local land use policies (as defined in a community’s general plan), zoning regulations and their accompanying development standards, subdivision regulations, growth control ordinances or urban limit lines, and development impact and building permit fees. Lengthy approval and processing times also may represent regulatory constraints. Since the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, updated State legislation related to housing has been incorporated into the California Government Code and Mountain View City Code (City Code or Zoning Ordinance). These regulatory considerations have been incorporated into the analysis and are mentioned throughout in specific instances where governmental constraints are applicable.

Cumulative Impacts of Governmental Constraints

The City of Mountain View commissioned an economic analysis to evaluate the cumulative impact that various local governmental requirements have on the feasibility of residential development in Mountain View. The economic analysis, provided in Appendix H, evaluated the impact of the City’s requirements related to affordable housing, parks, transportation impact fees, transportation demand management, community benefits, parking, design, building, and infrastructure, as well as the impact of City processing times and school district fees and taxes. The analysis classified the impact that each of these requirements have on development costs as:

- “Minimal,” which represents approximately 0 to 0.6 percent of the development cost

- “Moderate,” which represents approximately 1 to 2.8 percent of the development cost, or
- “Major,” which represents approximately 7.6 to 9.3 percent of the development cost.

The full analysis is presented in Appendix H and a summary of the findings is presented below.

- Constraints as having “major” cost impacts:
 - On-site inclusionary housing requirements
 - BMR in-lieu housing fees
 - Park land dedication in-lieu fee, park land dedication, and POPA credit for multi-family
 - Annual school assessments or taxes (explored by the MVWSD since August 2021 – see “Mountain View Whisman School District Community Facilities District” below)
- Constraints as having “moderate to major” cost impacts:
 - Park land dedication in-lieu fee, park land dedication, and POPA credit for rowhomes
- Constraints as having “moderate” cost impacts:
 - TDM measures (TMA)
 - Parking requirements
 - Extended development schedules
- Constraints as having “minimal” cost impacts:
 - Schools impact fees
 - Parcel tax
 - Citywide TIF
 - Transit Pass
 - Provision of community benefits
 - Design, building, infrastructure requirements

In acknowledgment of the costs and constraints imposed by these governmental requirements and standards, the Housing Element includes a number of targeted programs aimed at evaluating and reducing the cumulative impacts of such constraints on housing production. While some governmental requirements may not impose direct constraints on housing development, in combination with other regulatory standards or when constraints considered as having minimal impacts are combined, they can compound to impose barriers to housing development. Many of the outlined programs address the challenges associated with the compounding nature of governmental requirements. Below are the most pertinent programs; other programs not listed may be relevant as well. Refer to Chapter 3: Housing Plan for a full list of all Housing Element programs. Additionally, a summary of the Governmental Constraints Findings is presented at the end of this section.

- Program 1.2: Reduced Parking for Affordable Housing
 - Streamline review by reducing studies and uncertainty and facilitate 100% affordable housing developments by reducing parking standards.
- Program 1.3: Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards
 - Review development standards to ensure they reflect contemporary building types, improve ease of implementation and improve consistency across districts.

- Program 1.8: Park Land Ordinance Update
 - Reduce constraints on residential development by reviewing and revising the park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development.
- Program 1.9: BMR Program Review
 - Review BMR program to identify needed changes based on City goals; adjust BMR requirements to address City's needs across unit types, affordability levels, and special needs populations.
- Program 1.10: Density Bonus
 - Implement density bonus requirements supports the development of affordable housing by supporting density bonus projects. Continue to implement the requirements in the density bonus ordinance for Density Bonus projects that offers bonuses for the provision of affordable housing, depending on the amount and type of subsidized housing provided, consistent with the revised Government Code 65915.
- Program 2.1: Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs
 - Make funding available and support programs that allow for the City to increase the number of affordable housing units for underserved populations.
- Program 4.1: Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions
 - Review and update the City's affordable Housing NOFA process to improve coordination and communication; review development and post-development processes, timelines, and approval body levels to streamline permitting processes.
- Program 4.2: Federal, State, and Regional Policy Initiatives
 - Advocate for, propose, and shape legislation that increases the ability to develop affordable housing, prevent displacement, and remove impediments to accessing housing.
- Program 4.3: Financial Support for Subsidized Housing
 - Subsidize affordable housing, especially housing for lower-income households, unhoused, and families and effectively steward housing funds.
- Program 4.4: Partnerships to Support Affordable Housing
 - Work with private sector, philanthropy, and public agencies to bring in additional funding sources to support a range of affordable housing opportunities in Mountain View.
- Program 4.8: School District Coordination
 - Provide a copy of the Housing Element to school districts serving the City. Share information on new residential developments including number of units and bedrooms and demographic information with school districts.
- Program 4.9: Water and Sewer Service Coordination
 - Provide a copy of the Housing Element to Water and Sewer Utility staff and ensure that they understand that priority for connections must be given to housing developments that address the City's lower-income RHNA.
- Program 4.10: City Council Goal Setting

- Incorporate Housing Element programs and recommendations from the City's annual monitoring and review process into the City Council's goal-setting process. Ensure consistency between the Housing Element and other General Plan Elements throughout the planning period.

In addition to these programs, there are a number of Housing Element policies intended to help reduce the cumulative impact of governmental constraints related to requirements, standard, and processes. These policies include:

- Policy 1.5. Periodically evaluate the City's development standards, review processes and, if necessary, remove unnecessary barriers to quality housing for all income levels.
- Policy 1.6. Provide incentives, such as reduced parking standards and/or reductions in other development standards and fees, to facilitate the development of housing that is affordable to lower- and moderate-income households.
- Policy 2.1. Initiate and maintain programs to assist extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households in accessing affordable rental and ownership units
- Policy 4.1. Advocate for additional State, regional, and private funding for affordable housing and affordable housing programs.

Land Use Designations and Zoning

Land use controls take a number of forms that affect the development of housing. One example of land use control is the City's General Plan, which establishes the City's overall vision of preservation and change. On July 10, 2012, the Mountain View City Council adopted the 2030 General Plan. The General Plan includes revised land use designations that describe the general distribution and intensity of land uses in Mountain View. The 2030 General Plan creates several new mixed-use land use designations and identifies several action items that call for the comprehensive review and update of the Zoning Ordinance and Precise Plans. To implement the General Plan, Title 36 of the Mountain View Zoning Ordinance identifies corresponding zoning districts. Zoning has the most immediate impact on the construction of new housing. The City's zoning and development regulations establish permitted uses within each zone and standards that dictate how much development can occur on a given parcel of land by setting parameters such as maximum densities, height, setback, and lot coverage.

Note that the Housing Element Site Inventory does not include any sites in the City's R districts (including R1, R2, R3, R4 or RMH), except as applied to the projected Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

- **R1 Single-Family Residential.** The R1 district is intended for detached, single-family housing and related uses compatible with a family living environment allowing up to 6 dwelling units per acre. This district is consistent with the low-density residential land use designation in the City's General Plan. Minimum lot areas in the R1 district range from 6,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet. The maximum building height is 24 feet for single-story homes and 28 feet for two-story structures. There is no lot coverage standard, but there is an FAR standard that ranges from 0.4 to 0.45. Senate Bill 9 (the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act) went into effect on January 1, 2022. The bill allows a housing

development containing two residential units on one lot within the R1 district without discretionary review or a public hearing, subject to certain criteria as well as a lot split to create two lots from one lot. The provisions of SB 9 are applied in tandem with the City's existing Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) standards, resulting in the potential for up to four residential units on an eligible R1-zoned property. While SB9 (consistent with State law) results in fairly small units on some lots, other R1 development is not constrained by the development standards.

- **R2 One- and Two-Family Residential.** The R2 zoning district, consistent with the medium-low density residential land use designation of the General Plan, is intended for single-family dwellings, duplexes, low-density rowhouse and townhouse developments, small-lot single-family developments, and similar and related compatible uses. This zone allows for up to 12 dwelling units per acre. This district requires minimum lot sizes of 7,000 square feet and allows two units one each lot. The maximum building height is 24 feet for single-story structures and 30 feet for two-story structures. There is no lot coverage standard but there is a 0.55 FAR standard. R2 development is not constrained by the development standards.
- **R3 Multi-family Residential.** The R3 district is intended for multi-family housing including apartments, condominiums, rowhouse and townhouse development, small-lot single-family development, and similar and related compatible uses. This district is consistent with the medium, medium-high, and high-density residential land use designation of the General Plan, which allow up to 25, 35, and 80 dwelling units per acre, respectively. This district allows densities of 13 to 55 dwelling units per acre, although the specific density allowed depends on the lot size with larger parcels capable of achieving higher densities. The minimum lot size is 12,000 square feet. However, lots in small-lot single-family, townhomes, and rowhouse developments approved through the planned unit development (PUD) process may be smaller. The maximum height is 45 feet. There is a maximum lot coverage of 35 percent (40 percent in R3-D). There is also a minimum open area of 55 percent (though this can be on a podium, balcony or rooftop). The maximum FAR is 1.05. The City is currently updating the R3 zoning district development standards to incorporate form-based zoning standards, incentivize stacked-flat development, and amend the City's Design Guidelines. Through that process, the City identified several standards that constrain the densities allowed in this zone, including lot coverage, open area, and maximum units on small sites. To address this, the City will update the R3 zoning standards to ensure that projects can meet their maximum density (Program 1.3).
- **R4 High Density Residential and Multi-family.** The R4 zoning district, consistent with the General Plan's high density residential land use designation, is intended for multi-family housing including apartments and condominiums, located near transit, and not adjacent to R1 and R2 areas. This district allows for densities of up to 80 dwelling units per acre. Depending on the number of stories, the maximum building height ranges from 62 feet to 70 feet. The maximum FAR is 2.3. There is no lot coverage standard. The minimum open area is 30 percent. R4 development does not appear constrained by the development standards, but the City will conduct further study and address this through Program 1.3.
- **RMH Mobile Home Park.** The RMH district allows for mobile homes within a mobile home park or mobile home subdivision with shared recreational and open space facilities. This

district is consistent with the General Plan's mobile home park residential land use designation. The maximum density in the RHM district is 14 dwelling units per acre. This zoning district is completely built out with mobile home parks and the zoning standards are not expected to have an effect on these sites.

- **CRA Arterial Commercial-Residential.** The CRA zoning district permits a broad range of commercial, office, and residential uses along the City's major arterials. For residential and mixed-use projects, the minimum lot size is 20,000 square feet. The maximum residential density in the CRA district is 43 dwelling units per acre and the maximum building height is 45 feet, 35 feet to the top of the wall plate. The maximum FAR is 1.35. There is no lot coverage requirement. The minimum open area is 45 percent. The minimum lot size constrains projects that would otherwise be allowed to build residential and other standards may also constrain allowed density. The City will conduct further study and address this through Program 1.3.

In addition, Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance allows for permanent emergency shelters as a permitted use in the MM zoning district in compliance with SB 2. The City treats transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, subject only to restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. In alignment with Federal and State fair housing policies, the Zoning Ordinance includes a process for reasonable accommodation requests for individuals with physical disabilities to provide equal access to housing. Additionally, accessory uses in agricultural zones include living quarters for persons regularly employed on the premises and conditional uses include accommodations for transient labor such as labor cabins or camps.

The City's zoning code, specific development standards for each zone, as well as other ordinances and the General Plan can be reviewed online through the City's website. Chapter 36 of Mountain View's Code of Ordinances includes more information specifically on zoning districts, zoning maps, development standards, impact fees, and other land use controls.

Precise Plans

Precise Plans are a planning mechanism used to coordinate future public and private improvements on specific properties where special conditions of size, shape, land ownership, or existing or desired development require particular attention. Precise Plans can be exclusively residential, commercial, and industrial, or allow a mix of uses. Currently 21 of the 25 Precise Plan areas in the City of Mountain View allow residential uses. Precise Plans are generally more flexible than traditional zoning standards and are designed to address local conditions and opportunities. These Precise Plans contain broad goals and objectives and establish development and design standards for the specific locations. The development standards in the Precise Plans have the same legal status as traditional zoning district standards.

Several of the City's Precise Plans (including Downtown, San Antonio, El Camino Real, East Whisman, and North Bayshore) regulate density by floor area ratio (FAR), rather than dwelling units per acre. This supports the City's goal to allow developers the flexibility to create more units while providing a

predictable building envelope. The net result of this policy has been the creation of hundreds of additional units, while limiting height, bulk, and character effects on surrounding neighborhoods.

As described in Appendix E: Housing Sites Analysis and Inventory, the majority of the City's sites inventory for accommodating the housing need for this cycle falls within these Precise Plan areas. The residential development standards for these Precise Plans are summarized below:

- **Downtown Precise Plan.** The Precise Plan is subdivided into 10 subareas, each with its own unique characteristics and development standards. It allows residential development up to 30 to 60 units per acre and an FAR range of 1.0 to 2.75. Maximum density in the Precise Plan is determined by sliding scales for different subareas based on the lot area. Maximum heights range from 3 to 5 stories. There is no lot coverage standard. Minimum open area is 30 percent. There is no evidence at this time that standards may constrain development at allowed densities, since few recent projects have been proposed (likely based on the small size of most parcels).
- **San Antonio Precise Plan.** The 2030 General Plan establishes five “change” areas, where new, higher intensity land uses are allowed, one of which is the San Antonio area. The San Antonio Precise Plan allows residential development with intensities of up to 1.85 to 2.35 FAR (roughly 70 to 80+ units per acre), depending on location. Maximum heights range from 4 stories to 6 stories. There is no coverage requirement. The minimum open area is 175 square feet per unit. The San Antonio Precise Plan also includes reduced parking requirements and other incentives for affordable and higher density residential development. The Plan was last updated in May 2019. There is no evidence at this time that standards may constrain development at allowed densities, since several projects have recently been built in the area.
- **El Camino Real Precise Plan.** El Camino Real was established as a “change area” in the 2030 General Plan. Change area direction from the plan includes: a diverse mix of land uses, improved connections to and between neighborhoods, and the creation of a vibrant, multi-modal corridor. Residential development in the El Camino Real Precise Plan ranges from 1.35 to 2.30 FAR (roughly 50 to 75 units per acre). Maximum heights range from 3 to 6 stories. There is no coverage requirement. The minimum open area is 175 square feet per unit. The Precise Plan also includes reduced parking requirements and other incentives for affordable and higher density residential development. The Plan was last updated in June 2019. There is no evidence at this time that standards may constrain development at allowed densities, since several projects have recently been built in the area.
- **East Whisman Precise Plan.** The East Whisman Precise Plan calls for a mix of offices, neighborhood-serving commercial, multi-family residential, lodging, and small businesses. The purpose of the Precise Plan is to foster a sustainable, transit-oriented residential neighborhood and employment center with an increased diversity of land uses and mobility choices. To achieve this intent, the East Whisman Precise Plan splits the plan area into three “Character Areas”: (1) Mixed Use Character Area, (2) Employment Character Area, and (3) Village Center Character Area. Height limits range from 60 feet to 120 feet (4 to 11 stories)

within the Mixed Use and Employment Character Areas of the plan, and are 50 feet (3 to 4 stories) within the Village Center Character Area. For residential development within the Mixed-Use Character Area, there are an additional three categories of development intensity: High, Medium, and Low. The maximum FAR for residential development is up to 3.50 FAR in High Intensity development locations (up to about approximately 160 units per acre), up to 2.50 FAR in Medium Intensity development locations (up to approximately 110 units per acre), and finally, up to 1.85 FAR in Low Intensity development locations (up to approximately 75 units per acre). The Village Center Character Area allows up to 1.35 FAR (up to approximately 50 units per acre). There is no coverage requirement. The open area requirement ranges from 120 to 200 square feet per unit. The Plan was last updated in October 2020. There is no evidence at this time that standards may constrain development at allowed densities, since several projects have recently been approved and proposed in the area.

- **North Bayshore Precise Plan.** An objective of the North Bayshore Precise Plan is to create complete neighborhoods that integrate and connect residential uses with office, retail, service uses, and open spaces. The Precise Plan area is divided into three Complete Neighborhoods (Joaquin, Shorebird, and Pear) and organized into four Character Areas (Gateway, Core, General, and Edge). Height limits for residential buildings range from four stories (55 feet) to 15 stories (160 feet) within the Complete Neighborhood Areas of the Plan. The maximum FAR for residential development is up to 4.5 FAR in the Gateway and Core Character Areas (up to approximately 200 units per acre), up to 3.5 FAR in the General Character Area (up to approximately 160 units per acre), and up to 1.85 FAR in the Edge Character Area (up to approximately 100 units per acre). Expected unit densities are higher in North Bayshore because the Plan puts a special emphasis on smaller, workforce units. The maximum building coverage is 70 percent. The minimum open area is 80 square feet per unit. The Plan was last updated in October 2020. There is no evidence at this time that standards may constrain development at allowed densities, since several projects have recently been approved and proposed in the area.

Design Guidelines

The City has design guidelines for different housing types for various non-standard unit types. The City's zoning districts determine which unit types are allowed, but the design guidelines provide developers with the City's design expectation for small-lot, single-family units, townhouse, rowhouse, and units in the R4 zoning districts. The following section is a summary of the different guidelines and unit types. As discussed above, the City commissioned an economic analysis as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) to evaluate the impact of various City requirements, including residential design requirements, on the cost of residential development. That analysis found that the City's design requirements have a minimal impact on residential development costs.

Small-Lot Single-Family Guidelines

Small-lot single-family developments are detached single-family homes typically built on 3,000 to 4,000 square feet lots with a minimum private yard area of 15 feet by 15 feet. With a density range

of 7 to 10 units per acres, it bridges the gap between conventional single-family homes (1 to 6 units per acre) and rowhomes and multi-family housing, such as apartments and condominiums.

Small-lot single-family development is permitted in the City's R2 and R3 zoning districts. A small-lot, single-family development does not comply with many of the standard zoning requirements of the R2 and R3 zones, and therefore, a PUD permit is required. The PUD allows exceptions to the standard zoning requirements and is intended to encourage innovative housing design and to allow variations for properties with unique lot sizes and special development needs. In addition to a PUD, a developer would need to obtain a Tentative Map or Preliminary Parcel Map (depending on the number of lots), and a Development Review Permit (DRP) for site plan and architectural review of projects. Small-lot, single-family townhomes and rowhouses are also permitted in some Precise Plans. The permit is different in Precise Plans, but the process and timing are similar. In place of a PUD, an applicant would need to obtain a Planned Community Permit (PCP).

Townhouse Guidelines

Townhouses are two- to three-story attached dwellings with a private yard area. Townhouses are intended to provide opportunities for home ownership with many characteristics of single-family homes, such as large floor area, private yards, and ground-floor front doors. The guidelines require private yards with a minimum dimension of 15 feet. Attached garages are characteristic of this building type, but parking may also be provided in detached garages, parking courts, or some combination of garage type, typically on the same side as the unit entrance. The allowable density is 12 units per acre, but densities of 14 units per acre may be approved if the proposed average unit size is less than 1,400 square feet, including garage, and the total amount of paving coverage is less than 20 percent of lot area.

Rowhouse Guidelines

A rowhouse is a one-family dwelling unit that is aligned in a row with each unit facing a street or open space. Rowhouses have alley-loaded garages on the opposite side of the front door. Rowhouses provide ownership opportunities with many characteristics of single-family homes, such as the privacy of no upstairs neighbors, large floor area, front porches, and attached car garages. The rowhouse guidelines recommend a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre and a minimum lot width of 100 feet. Rowhouses differ from townhouses in that rowhouses can be built at a higher density and the garages for rowhouses face the rear of the unit.

R4 Guidelines

The R4 guidelines were developed to encourage high-density residential development in standard residential zones. The R4 guidelines are intended to provide guidance to those who develop stacked flats (apartments and condominiums) and to better integrate these types of developments into existing neighborhoods.

The R4 guidelines require a 1-acre minimum lot size and allow for densities up to 80 units per acre. R4 development cannot be contiguous to R1 or R2 zoning districts and should be within walking distance of transit stations and nearby arterial streets. The R4 guidelines only apply to the City's R4

zoning district. If a developer meets all the standards for the district and does not pursue ownership units, they would need to obtain a DRP Permit. If ownership units (condominiums) are proposed, a developer would need to attain a PUD, DRP, and Tentative Map.

Precise Plans

Many of the City's Precise Plans, including all five of the Plans listed above, also include design guidelines that supplement the standards and special conditions in these areas. The guidelines address issues such as: the massing of large buildings, the quality and detail of finish materials, the size and shape of windows and roof lines, the relationship between public and private open areas, and the design of service and utility areas. In general, these design guidelines are not meant to limit development density or intensity and can be applied without reducing residential capacity.

Parking

Parking requirements may serve as a constraint on housing development by increasing development costs and reducing the amount of land available for project amenities or additional units. In addition, the average cost of development per parking space varies widely, depending on whether parking will be included as underground parking or at-grade parking, as well as site conditions. Costs associated with this development range from \$30,000 to up to \$90,000 per parking space. The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) found that increased parking requirements have a moderate impact on residential development costs. As shown in Table 36, off-street residential parking requirements vary by housing type. Parking requirements range from one space per unit for efficiency studios to two spaces for single-family homes and multi-family units with one or more bedrooms. Some types of housing are also required to provide guest parking. In multi-family developments, 15 percent of the required parking spaces must be conveniently located for guest parking. Parking requirements established for Precise Plans supersede the provisions of required parking spaces for other development types. Of note, the East Whisman and North Bayshore Precise Plans designate parking maximums (and no minimums) for many new residential development projects. Other developments such as small-lot single-family homes, townhouses, and rowhouses must provide additional guest parking above the parking for the individual units. The additional guest parking requirements range from 0.3 spaces per unit for rowhouses to 0.6 spaces per unit for townhouses. The combined off-street parking for residents and guests ranges from 2.3 spaces per rowhouse unit to 2.6 spaces per townhouse unit. The Zoning Ordinance also requires bicycle parking for most housing types to encourage alternative forms of transportation. Development requesting parking reductions as part of a density bonus incentive is required to maintain affordability in compliance with specific criteria for unit types.

Table 36: Off-Street Parking Requirements

Housing Unit	Parking Required	Bicycle Parking Required
Accessory Dwelling	1 space per unit, except near public transit or where the ADU is replacing a garage or where other conditions apply	None
Multi-family (R3 & R4)	Studio: 1.5 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered 1-bedroom unit less than or equal to 650 sf; 1.5 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered 1-bedroom unit greater than 650 sf; 2 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered Units with 2 or more bedrooms: 2 spaces per unit, 1 space shall be covered. Guest parking: 15% of the parking spaces required will be reserved for guest parking ^(a)	1 space per unit; 1 space per 10 units for guest parking
Multi-Family (El Camino Real and San Antonio)	Studio and 1-bedroom: 1 space per unit 2-bedroom and larger: 2 spaces per unit Guest parking: 15% of the parking spaces required will be reserved for guest parking	1 space per unit; 1 space per 10 units for guest parking
Multi-Family (North Bayshore and East Whisman)	Various maximums apply and no minimums	Varies
Rooming and Boarding Houses	Parking Study Required	Parking Study Required
Senior Care Facility	Parking Study Required	Parking Study Required
Senior Congregate Care	1.15 spaces per unit (half spaces covered)	2% of vehicle spaces
Single-Family/Duplex	2 spaces per unit (1 covered)	None
Efficiency Studios	1 space per unit, plus 1 space per non-resident employee ^(b)	1 space per 10 units
Small Lot, Single-Family	2 spaces per unit (1 covered). 0.5 spaces per unit for guest parking	None

Housing Unit	Parking Required	Bicycle Parking Required
Townhouse	2 spaces per unit (1 covered). 0.6 spaces per unit for guest parking	1 space per unit
Rowhouse	Studio: 1.5 spaces per unit 1-Bedroom or more: 2 spaces covered per unit; 0.3 spaces per unit for guest parking	1 space per unit

Source: Mountain View City Code Section A36.37.040, 2021.

Notes:

(a) The Zoning Administrator may increase the parking requirement to 2.3 spaces per unit if needed to ensure adequate guest parking. Refer to Mountain View City Code Section A36.37.040 on model parking standards for details. Parking standards may differ between Precise Plans.

(b) Reduction of up to 0.5 spaces may be granted through the conditional use permit process.

The Zoning Administrator may grant a reduction in off-street parking requirements through a Conditional Use Permit. Applicants must demonstrate that changes in conditions or issues justify a reduction, and that the reduction would not result in a parking deficiency. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance includes several specific exceptions to parking standards. Applicants requesting a parking reduction must submit a parking management plan that ensures parking space availability.

The City modified several parking requirements for both parking and bicycle parking to align with model parking standards for multi-family residential projects. These parking standards put in place lower parking requirements based on the number of bedrooms per unit. The model parking standard requires one parking space for studio and one-bedroom units, two parking spaces for two-bedroom units or more units, and 15 percent of the required vehicle spaces available for guests. This standard was adopted in the El Camino Real and San Antonio Precise Plans. Housing Element Program 1.3 states that the City will complete a review of development standards, which could include parking requirements, in at least one zoning district by December 31, 2025, and modify standards to address feasibility constraints. Parking requirements under the State Density Bonus Law supersede the City’s parking standards. In many cases, these parking requirements can be as low as 0.5 parking spaces per unit.

Cumulative Impacts of Development Standards

The cumulative impacts of Mountain View’s development standards and parking requirements established in the Zoning Ordinance and Precise Plans do not appear to unduly constrain residential development in the City, especially in recently adopted Precise Plans. Multi-family developments in these Precise Plan areas have consistently been approved or constructed to the maximum density (or higher pursuant to State Density Bonus Law or other provisions), including the projects at 950 West El Camino Real, 801 West El Camino Real, 2268 West El Camino Real, 2700 West El Camino Real, 400 Logue Avenue, 400 San Antonio Road, and 2580 California Street. This is evident in the precedent projects analysis in Appendix E.

Other development types, such as rowhouses and small-lot single family units, tend to be constrained by the development type rather than standards applicable to the zone (e.g., only so many detached single-family homes can fit on a lot).

Developers, residents, and other stakeholders that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update provided suggestions for several aspects of the City's development standards that could be changed to facilitate the production of housing in Mountain View. These included rezoning to allow additional density in existing residential areas, rezoning non-residential areas to allow residential development, and reducing parking requirements. Concurrent with the Housing Element Update, the City rezoned several areas to create additional capacity for residential development and create additional housing opportunity sites. As part of Program 1.3, the City will also review other development standards to reduce constraints on residential development.

Inclusionary Housing

The City of Mountain View has adopted and incorporated a Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program as part of its Zoning Ordinance. City Council initiated a process to make updates to the City's BMR Housing Program requirements, which were completed in June 2019. The updates resulted in the increase of inclusionary affordable units, leading to hundreds of new lower- and moderate-income units. The primary goal of the updates was for the BMR program to create actual BMR units integrated with market-rate development instead of receiving in-lieu fees. To accomplish this objective, the BMR in-lieu fees were set at a level proportional to the number of market rate units proposed. Developers of any residential project involving the creation of one or more dwelling units (except ADUs) or the conversion of rental units to ownership units shall meet the requirements of the BMR Housing Program. Projects involving fewer than seven units may pay an in-lieu fee, while projects with seven units or more must provide on-site BMR units. A project with seven or more units may pay an in-lieu fee for a fractional BMR unit when the BMR obligation results in a fractional BMR unit that is less than 0.5 (i.e., less than half a unit). In addition, the City adopted a flexible alternative to on-site units that allows developers to accommodate the requirement in ways that advance City housing goals and exceed minimum affordability requirements.

All rental developments must provide 15 percent of the total number of units to low-income or very-low-income tenants, with two income levels provided for a weighted average income level at less than or equal to 65 percent of Area Median Income (AMI). The weighted average approach provides developers flexibility. Ownership units other than rowhouses and townhouses must include 15 percent of the total number of ownership units affordable to moderate-income households, to a minimum of two income levels, with a weighted average income level of 100 percent AMI. Rowhouse or townhouse ownership units in residential developments must provide a 25 percent on-site requirement to moderate-income households with 15 percent affordable to a weighted average of 100 percent AMI and 10 percent affordable to a weighted average of 135 percent AMI. All BMR units provided by developers must be integrated throughout the development and be comparable to market rate units in terms of size and design.

The BMR Housing Program does allow for alternative mitigation measures, such as land dedication or the provision of off-site units, if the City Council determines that such alternative measures will further the availability of affordable housing opportunities in the City to a greater extent than providing BMR units on-site.

BMR in-lieu fees are used by the City to address other housing needs, such as assisting households earning less than 50 percent of AMI. For example, BMR in-lieu fees are used for downtown multi-family development that will provide rental housing for extremely low- and very low-income families in Mountain View. These fees are leveraged with other fees and outside funding sources (including state programs) to help subsidize 100 percent affordable developments.

The City has two different sources of local affordable housing funds: BMR in-lieu fees, and Housing Impact Fees on new commercial/office development. As of July 1, 2021, the City had over \$47 million in BMR funds and over \$25 million in Housing Impact funds. The fund balance allows the Council to subsidize new affordable housing projects and other housing initiatives. Of the \$72 million, over \$50 million had already been reserved or planned for affordable housing projects and housing initiatives. The City also has a pipeline of housing projects that will continue to draw from these funds, and in fact, will likely outpace the replenishment of these funds.

The City continually reviews its inclusionary housing program and is scheduled for the first review of the 2019 guidelines in late 2022. City staff's review will include an assessment as to the effect of the program on housing production. Local developers interviewed during this Housing Element Update did not generally cite the City's inclusionary ordinance as a constraint, though one reported that the recently adopted 25 percent inclusionary requirement for townhouses and rowhouses could make development of these types of units more challenging. However, the economic returns for these units have been historically high, with the analysis supporting that developers can bear this requirement. The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) found that on-site inclusionary requirements and BMR in-lieu fees account for 13 percent of townhouse development costs and nine percent of multifamily rental development costs; however, while the BMR obligation is an added development cost, it is necessary in that the ordinance contributes to fair housing and equity, and achieves more affordable units.

The City's pipeline projects are evidence that significant BMR units can be provided through the City's BMR program. The City provides multiple avenues for projects to customize their BMR provision to meet their needs, including off-site mitigation, density bonus (which reduces the proportion of units that must be affordable), and alternate income levels. In addition, the City's allowed residential FARs (1.85 to 4.5 in key growth areas) and incentives for residential (such as its jobs-housing linkage program) continue to generate residential project applications, despite the cost to developers. As a result, thousands of recent and pipeline development units are proposed consistent with the City's BMR program, already exceeding the City's total RHNA. This finding shows that, while it is a cost, it is not a constraint.

Housing Element Program 1.9 states that the City will review and revise its BMR Phase 2 program requirements against objectives in 2023 and complete a second review in 2028 to reflect community needs for affordable and market rate housing. The review process identifies changes that need to be made to the program in order to meet City goals regarding:

- The impact of the program on affordable housing production in Mountain View.
- The impact of the program on production of affordable housing across unit types, special needs (including accessible units) and affordability levels as compared to City needs.
- The impact of the program on the City's fair housing goals for increased mobility and access to opportunity.
- The potential policy changes based on best practices, new laws, or unanticipated program outcomes.
- Potential cleanup in guidelines/policies/procedures to clarify program requirements/facilitate program implementation.

Housing Element Program 1.9's review of the inclusionary ordinance ensures the continued balance of feasibility and benefits that come as a result of creating affordable housing through BMR requirements.

Park Dedication

The City of Mountain View requires developers of residential subdivisions as well as single-family dwellings, duplexes, multi-family dwellings, mobile homes, rowhouses, and other dwelling units to dedicate park land, pay an in-lieu fee, or both as a condition of approval. The intent of this dedication requirement is so that such developments contribute their fair share toward the purchase, development and/or improvement of park and recreational facilities. If a proposed residential development includes land that has been designated as a park or recreational facility in the General Plan, the developer may be required to dedicate land. Developers are required to pay an in-lieu fee if the development occurs on land on which no park is shown or proposed, where dedication is impossible, impractical, or undesirable, or if the proposed development contains 50 or fewer units. The in-lieu fee is based on the fair market value of the land that otherwise would have been required for dedication.

The required land dedication varies by the proposed project's density, ranging from 0.0081 acres per dwelling unit for low density development (i.e., one to six units per acre) to 0.0060 acres for medium to high density development (i.e., more than 13 units per acre), which accounts for the vast majority of Mountain view's residential development. The in-lieu fee is based on the value of land and is adopted every year. In 2021, the park land dedication in-lieu fee for developments of 26 units per acre and above was \$240-\$280 per required square feet of land, equivalent to \$62,726 to \$73,181 per unit.

Mountain View allows developers to receive credit for privately owned/publicly accessible (POPA) open space provided within their developments, as of 2019. Developers may receive credits for up to 75 percent of their park land dedication requirements for recreational spaces such as turf fields,

children play areas, picnic areas, swimming pools, and recreation areas. The City's ordinance currently exempts affordable units from paying the park in-lieu fee. In 2021, to mitigate this constraint, modifications to the park land dedication fee were adopted, such as calculating the fee basis annually and setting the fee at the time of application submittal, Such modifications provide more predictability and transparency to the process.

The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) found that Mountain View's park dedication requirements have a moderate to major impact on development costs for rowhouses and a major impact on development costs for multifamily development. This is consistent with feedback obtained during the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update, which cited the park dedication requirements as a potential constraint to development. Housing Element Program 1.8 states that the City will review and revise the park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development. The adoption of the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan (addressing anticipated open space needs and long-term funding strategies) and adoption of reduced fees, alternate mitigations and/or other programs to reduce costs on residential will be done by December 31, 2024.

Fees and Exactions

Like cities throughout California, Mountain View collects development fees to recover the capital costs of providing community services and the administrative costs associated with processing applications. New housing typically requires payment of school impact fees, sewer and water connection fees, building permit fees, wastewater treatment plant fees, and a variety of handling and service charges. Typical fees collected in the City are outlined in Table 37. Meeting transparency requirements, the City has posted planning application and development fee schedules on the Planning Division webpage on the City website. Additionally, Housing Element Program 4.1 will ensure fee consistency. As shown, fees range from \$69,497 per multi-family unit (based on a small project of approximately 10 units) to \$238,987 per single-family home. The median sale price for new condominiums is approximately \$1.68 million in Mountain View. While there are relatively few, new single-family homes in Mountain View, the median sale price for single-family homes in Mountain View built in 2010 or later is approximately \$2.63 million. Based on these sales prices, total fees and exactions in the City would represent 5 to 6 percent of condominium sales prices and 8 percent of new single-family sales prices. Most development fees in Mountain View are adjusted for cost of living increases annually.

Table 37: Estimated Residential Development Impact Fees

Fee Type	Single-Family ⁽¹⁾	Multi Family Small ⁽²⁾	Multi Family Large ⁽³⁾
Entitlement Fee(4)	--	\$2,841	\$45,000
Building Permit Fee/Construction Fee (5)	\$14,720	\$137,000	\$278,900
Impact Fees(6)	\$71,347	\$550,700	\$7,899,900
Other Fees(7)	\$152,920	\$4,356	\$35,250
Total	\$238,987	\$694,967 (or \$69,497 per unit)	\$8,259,050 (or \$82,591 per unit)

Source: City of Mountain View.

Notes:

¹ Based on a 2,600 square foot house

² Based on 10 units (2 bedroom 9,000 square foot unit and 3 bedroom 12,000 square foot unit)

³ Based on 100 units

⁴ May include the following: Development Review Permit or Planned Community Permit, Heritage Tree Removal, Cost Recovery.

⁵ May include the following: Plan Check Fee, Building Permit Fees, Electrical Fee, Mechanical Fee, Plumbing Fee, Land Use document.

⁶ May include the following: Water Capacity Fee, Sewer Capacity Fee, Transportation Impact Fee, Park Land Dedication In-Lieu Fees, School Impact Fee.

⁷ May include the following: Excavation Permit for new utility services and driveway, BMR In-Lieu Fees, Improvement Plan Check and Construction Inspection.

⁸ Residential developments that are for 100 percent affordable housing units are exempt from impact fees.

Although development fees and exactions do increase the cost of producing housing, in general Mountain View’s fees do not appear to create an undue constraint on residential development in the City. The cumulative effect of all fees on housing production should be considered when evaluating possible constraints. Table 37 outlines the estimated residential development impact fees using a typical 2,600 square foot single family house, a small ten unit multi-family development, and a large one hundred unit multi-family development. The entitlement fees may include fees associated with Development Review Permit or Planned Community Permit, heritage tree removal, and/or cost recovery. The building permit fees/construction fees may include plan check fees, building permit fees, electrical fees, mechanical fees, plumbing fees, and/or land use document. The impact fees may include water capacity fees, sewer capacity fees, transportation impact fees, park land dedication in-lieu fees, and school impact fees. Other fees associated may include Excavation Permit for new utility services and driveway, BMR in-lieu fees, Improvement Plan Check and construction inspection. Note that residential development that is for 100 percent affordable housing units are exempt from impact fees.

However, the economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) identified the City’s BMR requirements and park dedication requirements as having a major impact on residential development costs. As discussed above, the Housing Element Update includes programs to evaluate and address the potential impacts of these requirements during the

Housing Element planning period. Appendix H outlines various fees and their associated level of impact on development either as “minimal”, “moderate”, or “major” as previously mentioned. Major fee constraints based on cost evaluation as described in Appendix H include on-site inclusionary housing requirements and BMR in-lieu fee, park fees, and school assessments and special taxes.

The on-site inclusionary housing requirements and below market rate (BMR) in-lieu fee requires developers to provide a percentage of below market rate units on site that are affordable to specific income levels. This reduces land values to property owners and increases development fees in order to provide affordable housing to a broader range of local residents to help meet RHNA and other important policy objectives. The costs associated with these fees per rowhome unit are \$196,600 (or approximately 13.9 percent of development cost). The costs associated with these fees per multifamily unit are \$80,500 (or approximately 9.3 percent of development cost).

For Mountain View, the majority of fees for housing development are incurred through the park land dedication requirements. The Mountain View park fee expands park land and recreational resources to residents and students at local school districts. This constraint reduces developable land area for housing and increases development costs for market rate housing. As a response to this, in accordance with Housing Element Program 1.8, by December 31, 2024 the City will review and revise this requirement to maintain access to open space while seeking to reduce the financial impact to residential development. The costs associated with these fees per rowhome unit are \$57,500- \$74,400 (or approximately 4.1 percent-5.3 percent of development cost). The costs associated with these fees per multifamily unit are \$51,600- \$73,200 (or approximately 6.0 percent-8.5 percent of development cost).

The cumulative effect of all fees on housing production should be considered when evaluating possible constraints. For Mountain View, the majority of fees for housing development are incurred through the park land dedication requirements. Program 1.8 was created to assess the park land dedication requirements through the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan. However, a program to address the remaining development impact fees is not deemed necessary, since such fees represent a lower amount - approximately one percent of development costs in aggregate, and address critical utilities and transportation infrastructure, and/or support necessary costs to implement the general plan and precise plan vision in areas with the greatest growth and change. Meaningful reductions of these small fees would significantly affect these programs and improvements. In addition, the City evaluates the cumulative effect of these fees on a regular basis when new fees are adopted.

East Whisman Development Impact Fee

On May 24, 2022, the City of Mountain View adopted the East Whisman Development Impact Fee to finance transportation, potable water, recycled water, and sewer improvements in the East Whisman Precise Plan Area. The fee rate for residential uses ranges from \$2,888 per unit for a studio to \$6,223 for a three-bedroom unit, plus an additional \$864 per additional bedroom for units with more than three bedrooms.

Although the fee amounts shown in Table 37 and the economic analysis of governmental constraints in Appendix H were prepared prior to the adoption of the East Whisman Development Impact Fee, the findings related to City fees as discussed above also apply in the East Whisman Precise Plan area, even with the newly-adopted impact fee. Based on the economic analysis of constraints shown in Appendix H, the East Whisman Development Impact Fee is equal to approximately 0.3 percent of total development costs for a multifamily development, and therefore has a minimal impact on development feasibility. Moreover, the fee rates shown in Table 37 and the economic analysis of governmental constraints shown in Appendix H assume a community benefits requirement that would apply in the El Camino Real or San Antonio Precise Plan areas, each of which have a community benefit requirement that is equivalent to approximately 0.6 percent of total development costs for a multifamily project. The East Whisman Precise Plan Area has a lower community benefits requirement that is equal to approximately 0.4 percent of total development costs. Therefore, the combined effect of the newly-adopted East Whisman Development Impact Fee (0.3 percent of total development costs) and the East Whisman community benefits requirement (0.4 percent of total development costs) is approximately equal to the effect of the community benefits requirement that was assumed in Table 37 and in the economic analysis shown in Appendix H (0.6 percent of total development costs). The East Whisman Development Impact Fee adds a minimal amount to total development costs in the Precise Plan area, while contributing funds that are necessary to enable construction of capital improvements that are necessary to support new development in the Precise Plan area. Therefore, this fee does not constitute a significant or undue constraint on new residential development in the Precise Plan area.

Mountain View Whisman School District Community Facilities District

At its August 12, 2021 meeting, the Mountain View Whisman School District (School District) Board of Trustees provided direction for the School District to explore the establishment of a Community Facilities District (CFD). The purpose of the district would be to support the siting and construction of new schools to serve the anticipated population growth. CFDs fund these facilities through parcel taxes, which could be enacted through a two-thirds vote of the residents in the affected area.

The August 12, 2021 presentation to the School District Board indicates the School District's intention to apply the CFD to the area north of Central Expressway, which would include much of the City's R3 areas which house apartments and other multi-family units as well as new housing areas in North Bayshore and East Whisman. The tax would be based on the number of units on a parcel and would levy a significantly higher tax on new units than existing ones. In October 2021, the School District began polling a sample of registered voters in the affected area about the creation of a CFD. It is unknown whether the School District will ultimately decide to place a CFD on the ballot and whether voters would approve such a measure. The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of the Housing Element Update process (see Appendix H) included an evaluation of the impact of the CFD and found that, if enacted, the CFD would have a major impact on residential development costs. While the City cannot prevent the adoption of the CFD, the programs in this Housing Element Update include several programs to improve development feasibility, including Programs 1.8 (Park Land Ordinance Update), 1.9 (BMR Program Review), 1.10 (Density Bonus), and

4.1 (Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions) which could help to partially counteract any feasibility impacts of the CFD if adopted.

On- and Off-Site Improvements

Residential developers are responsible for constructing road, water, sewer, and storm drainage improvements on new housing sites. Where a project has off-site impacts, such as increased stormwater runoff, increased sewer load or added congestion at a nearby intersection, additional developer expenses may be necessary to mitigate impacts. The contractor is required to make site improvements before constructing a building on the property. Site improvements can include connections to existing utility systems, rough grading, and installation of water and sewer lines. The cost variation depends on the lot size, unit size, and type of residential dwelling. Other factors that can influence costs are the primary infrastructure needed for the site and roadway improvements. While land costs are lower in greenfield areas at the edge of the City, these areas typically require a greater amount of investment in backbone infrastructure and site improvements. Given there are such limited vacant sites in the City, development is primarily in infill areas, where site improvement costs are typically lower since infrastructure is already in place; however, the cost to repair aging infrastructure can be high.

The street improvement standards ordinance, Article V of Chapter 27 of the Mountain View City Code, states that minimum standard street right-of-way width shall be at least sixty (60) feet. In such cases as special circumstances may warrant, the Subdivision Committee or City Council may authorize a street of lesser right-of-way width, but not less than fifty (50) feet, unless a further reduction in right-of-way width is authorized as an integral part of a planned unit development and established pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 36 of the Code. However, Mountain View is an almost completely built-out city with negligible need for new public streets.

Certain Precise Plan areas, such as East Whisman and North Bayshore, are located in areas with large industrial blocks that must be reduced to provide the necessary access to and between new residential uses. These plans lay out new paths that can be accommodated by new publicly-accessible streets, bike paths, or pedestrian paseos. These new dedication requirements tend to be much smaller than the typical public street, can serve “double-duty” as emergency access, and are not deducted from the project’s land area for the purpose of calculating FAR or density. They are also located at distances typically appropriate for multifamily blocks. These requirements are not a constraint on new development, as evidenced by the number of pipeline units proposed in these locations.

Based upon recent proposals submitted by the development community for a variety of housing sites throughout the City, off-site improvements required for housing development was not found to be a major constraint, and was not identified by developers.

Processing and Permit Procedures

The City of Mountain View has several different processes for approving new residential developments.

- Projects in standard zoning districts without subdivision or subdivision involving fewer than five lots are approved by the Zoning Administrator at a public hearing. Subdivisions are approved by the Subdivision Committee, which is held at the same hearing, but the committee also includes staff from the City Attorney's Office and Public Works Department (one hearing required). When discretionary, a Development Review Permit is always required and a Conditional Use Permit, and/or Planned Unit Development Permit may be required, depending on the zone or project.
- Projects in standard zoning districts with subdivision of five or more lots are approved by the City Council after recommendation from the Zoning Administrator and Subdivision Committee (two hearings required). A Development Review Permit is always required and a Conditional Use Permit, and/or Planned Unit Development Permit may be required, depending on the zone or project.
- Projects in Precise Plans have various review processes, including the two above or approval by the City Council after recommendation by the Environmental Planning Commission (one to two hearings required). The permits above may be required, in addition to a Planned Community Permit.
- Projects requesting Zoning, Precise Plan or General Plan Amendments (with or without subdivision) are approved by the City Council after recommendation by the Environmental Planning Commission (two hearings required). These projects require authorization ("gatekeeper") prior to beginning review, unless they are a 100 percent affordable project or consistent with a number of minor exemptions in the code. The permits required include all those above, plus the amendment(s).

The following are required findings for each of the permits that may be required for zoning-compliant projects:

- Development Review Permit (DRP) (always required for new construction)
 - The project complies with the general design considerations as described by the purpose and intent of Chapter 36 (Zoning) of the City Code, the General Plan, and any City-adopted design guidelines.
 - The architectural design of structures, including colors, materials, and design elements (i.e., awnings, exterior lighting, screening of equipment, signs, etc.), is compatible with surrounding development.
 - The location and configuration of structures, parking, landscaping, and access are appropriately integrated and compatible with surrounding development, including public streets and sidewalks and other public property.
 - The general landscape design ensures visual relief, complements structures, provides an attractive environment, and is consistent with any adopted landscape program for the general area.

- The design and layout of the proposed project will result in well-designed vehicular and pedestrian access, circulation, and parking.
- The approval of the Development Review Permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- The following DRP findings also apply to Density Bonus projects:
 - The project is a housing development that contains at least one (1) of the features described in Section 65915(b) of the State Density Bonus Law to qualify for a density bonus, and all other eligibility requirements as described in Government Code Section 65915(c) have been met.
 - The project has provided sufficient affordable units or otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for the bonus density as described in Section 65915(f) of the State Density Bonus Law.
 - The project meets the eligibility requirements for reduced parking ratios as described in Section 65915(p) of the State Density Bonus Law.
 - The project meets the eligibility requirements for incentive(s)/concession(s) as described in Section 65915(d) of the State Density Bonus Law, and the incentive(s)/concession(s) result(s) in reduced costs to provide the affordable units.
 - The development standard(s) requested to be waived would physically preclude the units or incentives/concessions provided in the project as described in Section 65915(e) of the State Density Bonus Law.
- Conditional Use Permit (required in certain mixed-use zones)
 - The proposed use is conditionally permitted within the project's Zoning District and complies with all of the applicable provisions of Chapter 36 (Zoning) of the City Code.
 - The proposed use is consistent with the project's Land Use Designation of the General Plan
 - The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the site, building character, and environmental conditions of existing and future land uses in the vicinity
 - Any special structure or building modifications necessary to contain the proposed use would not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.
 - The approval of the Conditional Use Permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Planned Unit Development Permit (PUD) (required for projects with non-standard subdivisions, such as rowhouses, or other prescribed exceptions to standards). The proposed land use(s) are allowed within the subject zoning district. The site is physically suitable for the type and intensity of the land use being proposed. The proposed project would be harmonious and compatible with existing and future developments within the zoning district and surrounding area. In the case of a proposed residential project, the development will constitute a residential environment of sustained desirability and stability and will result in an intensity of land utilization no higher than, and standards of open space no less than, permitted for a similar development within the zone district. The approval of the PUD permit for proposed project complies with the California Environmental Quality Act

(CEQA). The proposed project is consistent with the general plan. The location, size, design and operating characteristics of the proposed project are not detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or welfare of the community. The proposed project is in substantial compliance with the intent of requirements of the applicable zone district and implementation of the proposed harmonious and integrated PUD design is superior to standard development in the underlying zone and, therefore, justifies the exceptions to the requirements of this chapter. Planned Community Permit (PCP) (required in precise plans)The proposed use or development is consistent with the provisions of the project's Precise Plan, or, if no Precise Plan exists for the subject area, the proposal clearly demonstrates superior site and building design and compatibility with surrounding uses and developments; or if variations from requirements in the applicable Precise Plan are granted, the proposal clearly demonstrates superior site and building design and is in substantial compliance with the intent of the requirements in the applicable Precise Plan.

- The proposed use or development is consistent with the project's Land Use Designation of the General Plan.
- The proposed uses and development will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare.
- The proposed project promotes a well-designed development that is harmonious with existing and planned development in the surrounding area.

The approval of the Planned Community Permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Many of the findings above are certain and independently verifiable (e.g., consistency with zoning and general plan). Others appear more subjective. However, the subjective findings are generally used to reinforce the vision and intent of zoning districts and precise plans, which are implemented through objective and independently verifiable standards. Consistent with State law, the City does not deny residential projects on the basis of subjective guidelines or standards.

The presence of multiple permits and findings (such as CUPs, PCPs) do not change the duration of review or reduce the certainty of approval. The primary process by which residential projects are assessed is the Development Review process, which looks at compliance with development standards, architectural design, site planning, health and safety, and similar issues. This review covers all the given findings simultaneously. Though additional minor fees may occasionally apply to additional permits, most projects are reviewed based on a cost recovery, which does not depend on the number of permits. Lastly, the additional findings may also reduce constraints: for example, projects in Precise Plans are subject to an additional set of findings (Planned Community Permit) that actually allow relief from development standards, which offers additional flexibility to development that meets the vision and intent of the precise plan.

Housing Element Program 4.1 outlines steps for the Planning Division to review and streamline development permitting processes including acquiring software tools to improve development review and seeking consultant and public agency input for best practices.

All new construction that requires planning approval receives design comments and recommendations from the City's Development Review Committee (DRC). The DRC, consisting of the Deputy Zoning Administrator (Staff person) and two advising architects, reviews the architectural and site design of new projects and improvements to existing sites.

Small-lot single-family, rowhouses, and townhomes are allowed in the City's R2, R3, R4 and CRA zoning districts with a PUD permit. The PUD allows exceptions to the standard zoning requirements and is intended to encourage innovative housing design and to allow variations for properties with unusual shapes and sizes. In addition to a PUD permit, a developer would need to obtain a Tentative Map for developments with five or more lots and a Development Review Permit for site plan and architectural review of projects. The permits can be processed concurrently and typically takes 6-18 months.

If a zone change or General Plan amendment is required for a project, the City Council first considers this "gatekeeper" request. This means the Council decides whether the request should be processed by Staff. The Council considers estimated resources required to process the application, estimated cost, existing and scheduled City resource commitments, and summary of other General Plan, precise plan or zoning considerations affecting the proposed text amendment. The intent of this process is not to approve or deny an application, but rather to confirm that there is sufficient interest in the project that it is worth devoting City resources towards the review of the legislative approvals necessary for the project. Once Council has authorized a project to apply for a General Plan amendment, the application will progress through the process as described above. Development projects that are subject to the gatekeeper process require zoning and general plan map or text amendments, or Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) related to the Citywide School Strategy, in order to proceed. No sites in the inventory will require rezoning that would subject them to the gatekeeper process, so this process will not affect nor is considered a constraint to the sites inventory.

Developers and other stakeholders that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update cited the City's permit processing procedures as a constraint to residential development. In addition, the City recently completed a detailed analysis of its entitlement process (i.e., the Development Review Assessment) that identified a series of process improvements to streamline the development review and entitlement process. The City is currently in the process of implementing the recommendations from the Development Review Assessment. Housing Element Program 4.1 includes actions to streamline the development review process.

Senate Bill 35

Senate Bill (SB) 35, passed in 2017, requires jurisdictions that have not approved enough housing projects to meet their RHNA to provide a streamlined, ministerial entitlement process for housing developments that incorporate affordable housing. Per SB 35, review and approval of proposed projects with specified levels of affordability must be based on objective standards and cannot be based on subjective design guidelines or undergo any discretionary review. Historically, projects in Mountain View qualify for SB 35 by providing at least 50 percent of their units as affordable to lower

income households; however, SB 35’s provisions can be triggered with as little as 10 percent affordability if the City does not make sufficient progress towards issuing building permits that satisfy its RHNA during the planning period. In addition to the affordability criteria to be eligible, projects must also meet a list of other criteria, including prevailing wage requirements for projects over 11 units. In order for applicants to take advantage of SB 35, per Government Code Section 65913.4 (10)(b)(1)(a)(et seq.), they need to submit a Notice of Intent and jurisdictions need to give Native American tribes an opportunity for consultation. The City of Mountain View has developed a SB 35 Preliminary Application Checklist form, consistent with the law, for streamlined ministerial review.

Bonus FAR or Development Tiers

The City’s four newest Precise Plans (El Camino Real, San Antonio, North Bayshore and East Whisman) include Bonus FAR or development tiers above allowed-by-right densities. The purpose of these additional tiers is to allow a framework by which development can support the re-envisioning of these change areas through community benefits and additional affordable housing. With the adoption of each Precise Plan, an economic analysis was conducted to set the community benefits at a level where developers would choose to build the additional density while contributing to the City’s infrastructure and affordable housing. Refer to Table 38 for the base and maximum FARs for the recent Precise Plans.

Table 38: Base and Maximum FAR for Select Precise Plans

	Base Residential FAR	Maximum FAR with Bonus
El Camino Real Precise Plan	1.35	1.85
San Antonio Precise Plan	1.35	1.85 – 2.35
North Bayshore Precise Plan	1.0	1.85 – 4.5
East Whisman Precise Plan	1.0	1.35 – 3.5

Design Review by DRC

The Development Review Committee (DRC) considers a proposed project’s conformance with City-adopted design guidelines and the development standards of the zoning district, in addition to architectural best practices, use of high-quality and durable materials, and other considerations that improve the quality and design of developments.

The DRC meeting is intended to be a working meeting between the applicant and Staff, and act as a collaborative process between the applicant and DRC. Small projects are generally reviewed and recommended for approval by the DRC in one meeting. In the past, larger projects may have required multiple meetings during which design modifications were made at the request of the DRC. As of late, DRC typically provides recommendations for residential projects in at most two meetings as part of a streamlined effort and also provides developers with greater certainty regarding the length of their project’s design review.

Zoning Administrator Approvals

The Zoning Administrator makes final decisions on single-family residences with major FAR exceptions, residential development with a subdivision of fewer than five lots, commercial and industrial projects that conform to the existing (standard) zoning, variances, planned unit developments, and planned community permits when specified within a Precise Plan. The Zoning Administrator makes recommendations for current development projects that require City Council approval in standard zoning districts and many Precise Plans. The Zoning Administrator holds a public hearing where they make findings and determine the conditions of approval. The Zoning Administrator usually meets the second and fourth Wednesday of every month. For applications requiring Zoning Administrator approval, the Zoning Administrator may announce and issue their decision at the conclusion of the scheduled hearing; may continue the item for additional public hearing; or may defer action by taking the item under advisement and issuing the decision no later than thirty (30) days following the hearing. The decision shall contain applicable findings and any conditions of approval. Following the hearing, a notice of the decision and any conditions of approval shall be mailed to the property owner and applicant at the address shown on the application.

Environmental Planning Commission

The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) provides recommendations for General Plan amendments, zoning amendments, Precise Plan amendments and new Precise Plans. The EPC also reviews and makes recommendations to the City Council regarding updates to the City's General Plan, including the Housing Element. Unlike Planning Commissions in other jurisdictions, the EPC is solely an advisory body that does not make final decisions on development projects. The EPC makes recommendations on development projects to the City Council (in lieu of the Zoning Administrator) when associated with General Plan and zoning amendments, or planned community permits when prescribed by a Precise Plan.

City Council Approvals

The City Council makes final decisions on Tentative and Final Subdivision Maps, planned community permits when specified within a precise plan, General Plan and Zoning maps, Ordinance amendments, and any permit or entitlement application referred by the Zoning Administrator. The Council also approves updates to the City's General Plan, including the Housing Element. The Council also reviews appeals on determinations by the Zoning Administrator. Council decisions are made based on recommendations provided by the EPC, Zoning Administrator (with DRC input), and public input.

Senate Bill 330

Senate Bill (SB) 330, Housing Crisis Act of 2019, prohibits cities and counties from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would impose or enforce design standards that are not objective design standards on or after January 1, 2020 [Government Code Section 663300 (b)(C)]. The bill also established specific requirements and limitations on development application procedures. Per SB 330, housing developers may submit a "preliminary application" for a residential development project. Submittal of a preliminary application allows a developer to provide a specific

subset of information on the proposed housing development before providing the full amount of information required by the local government for a housing development application. The City of Mountain View has developed a preliminary application form consistent with SB 330. In addition, the bill limits the application code-compliance review process (after a project is deemed complete) to 30 days for projects less than 150 units, 60 days for projects greater than 150 units. It also limits residential projects to hold no more than five total public hearings, including Environmental Planning Commission, design review, and City Council.

Planning Permit Processing Times

Planning permits are not just Planning Division review. They also include review by a multi-disciplinary team of Public Works engineers, Building Permit reviewers, fire protection engineers, stormwater control and other environmental protection reviews and others.

Table 39 presents a summary of the typical approvals required for various housing types and the median permit processing times, including Planning Permits and Building Permits. Actions requiring ministerial review, such as single-family homes, duplexes and ADUs, are approved with the Building Permit and do not contribute to the processing times. The times shown are the median among projects submitted between 2015 and 2020, excluding COVID times, for reasons stated below. They are the total times from when an applicant submits their application to approval date. The median time to approve Planning Permits for most projects is just over a year. However, the time to approve legislative actions is generally longer, about 20 months.

The City complies with all State laws related to permit processing, including the Permit Streamlining Act, which mandates that cities provide a list of all items an application must still submit within 30 days of receiving a submittal. The processing times below are not a result of City responsiveness to applications but are generally due to the number of incomplete submittal iterations and/or the time between incomplete submittal iterations and/or CEQA requirements.

Environmental review is conducted concurrently with development review. While an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may extend a project's timeline (e.g., up to 24 months, depending on the complexity), EIRs are generally only needed for rezonings and General Plan amendments. Other types of environmental documents, such as an exemption, an Initial Study with Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/ND or IS/MND), can add small amounts to the processing times, but these are included in the times reported in Table 39. In addition, over the last eight years the City has implemented "EIR consistency checklists" in Precise Plan areas, in the interest to streamline the CEQA procedure and provide more legal protections than categorical exemption but at lower cost and in less time than an initial study.

The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) found that extended development schedules for City review and approvals can have a moderate impact on residential development costs. In addition, developers, residents, and others that participated in the public engagement process for the Housing Element Update noted that the City's processing procedures have a negative impact on the feasibility of new residential development.

Permit processing timelines have increased since 2014. However, this has been due to several factors:

- Housing projects since 2014 have generally been larger with more units and complexity than projects prior to 2014.
- Increased complexity of State housing legislation has led to delays of some projects, as developers and City staff have occasionally needed to change course on projects, mid-review.
- COVID forced the City to adopt new procedures and increased times between submittals for several development applicants. Overall processing times since 2020 have been significantly higher than between 2015 and 2019.

The City is currently conducting studies to improve development review efficiency and reduce timelines. Program 4.1 in this Housing Element is intended to help mitigate this issue.

Table 39: Typical Processing Procedures by Project Type

Project Type	Typical Approvals Required	Median Planning Review Time (Before 2020)	Median Building Permit Review Time (Before 2020)
Single-Family Home or Duplex	Building Permit	n/a	5 months
Accessory Dwelling Unit	Building Permit	n/a	4.5 months
Rowhouse, Townhouse, Small-Lot Single Family (5 or more lots)	Planned Unit Development Permit and Tentative Map (Council approval)	13 months	12 months
Apartments			
Standard Zones (R and CRA)	Development Review Permit, sometimes Conditional Use Permit (Zoning Administrator approval)	13 months	11 months
Precise Plans	Planned Community Permit (Council approval)		
Condominiums	Same as Apartments with Tentative Map (Council Approval)	Same as Apartments	
Any project with a Zoning Change or General Plan Amendment (GPA)	Rezoning or GPA (Council Approval)	20 months	11 months

Source: City of Mountain View, 2022.

Building Permit Processing

Building Permits are reviewed by the same multi-disciplinary team that Planning Permits are. Table 39 shows the median review time of applications before COVID, from first submittal to approval. Single family homes generally take about 5 months to review, while ADUs take a bit less. These are the total review times since Planning Permits are not required. Larger projects generally take a year or just less.

Codes and Enforcement

The Code Enforcement Division of the City Attorney's Office is responsible for enforcement of property maintenance, zoning, and building codes throughout Mountain View. Code enforcement is a responsibility shared by many City departments along with cooperation from residents and businesses. Housing Element Program 1.12 Maintenance of Existing Housing Stock was developed to respond to housing code violations. The program will maintain the quality of the existing housing stock by addressing housing code violations as they are reported.

Mountain View has adopted (with Mountain View City Code amendments) the 2019 California Building Code, the 2019 California Mechanical Code, the 2019 California Plumbing Code, the 2019 California Electrical Code, the 2019 California Fire Code, the 2019 California Residential Code, 2019 the Mountain View Green Building Code, the 2019 California Energy Code, and the 2019 Handicapped Accessibility Regulations (Title 24). City codes are updated regularly as these codes and standards are modified at state and national levels.

The City has adopted several minor amendments to the 2019 California Building Code to prevent unsafe or hazardous building conditions. The City's Building Code would not adversely affect the ability to construct housing in Mountain View.

Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types

Multi-family Housing

Multi-family housing, including rental and ownership products, is the primary permitted use in the City's R3 and R4 zoning districts, as well as in several of the City's Precise Plan districts. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required for multi-family housing in the R2 and CRA districts. Multi-family housing accounts for approximately 57 percent of the units in the City and approximately 75 percent of the new housing units approved since 2010. Recent developments have been approved and built at the upper end of allowed densities, and even higher when including State Density Bonus. Major multi-family developments approved and built between 2014-2022 are shown in Table 40.

Table 40: Recent Multi-family Developments in Mountain View

Address	Number of Units
2580 California Street	632
400 San Antonio Road	582
555 East Evelyn Avenue	471
500 Ferguson Road	394
2700 West El Camino Real	211
1720 Villa Street	226
2268 West El Camino Real	204
394 Ortega Avenue	144
779 East Evelyn Avenue	116

Emergency Shelters

Emergency shelters provide a critical resource for individuals or families experiencing housing instability. Government Code Section 65582(d) defines an emergency shelter as “housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is 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.” Effective January 1, 2008, California SB 2 requires all jurisdictions to have a zoning district that permits at least one year-round emergency shelter without a CUP or any other discretionary permit requirements. Jurisdictions must identify a zone where emergency shelters are permitted by-right within one year from the adoption of the housing element.

The City of Mountain View identified several possible zones to permit emergency shelters by-right based on their compatibility, access to transit and services, and suitability to accommodate permanent shelters for the homeless, and determined that City’s General Industrial (MM) district could support emergency shelters. The MM district allows for processing, assembling, research, wholesale, warehousing, data centers, personal storage facilities, or other storage uses. Conditional uses include offices, veterinary clinics, lodges, private clubs and halls, educational and recreation uses, religious institutions, and assorted retail and commercial uses.

The City’s Zoning Ordinance permits emergency shelters by-right in the MM district which includes objective development and management standards for emergency shelters and are in conformance with State law. In addition, the City’s Zoning Ordinance includes standards for off-street parking in compliance with AB 139/Gov. Code § 65583 subd. (a)(4)(A) with emergency shelters required to provide thirty-five-hundredths (0.35) of a parking space per individual bed plus one (1) additional space per employee.

The permit processing and development standards encourage and facilitate the development of emergency shelters and no discretionary permits are required for approval of a permanent emergency shelter. The City will continue to monitor the inventory of sites appropriate to accommodate emergency shelters and provide information to appropriate organizations that serve the needs of homeless and extremely low-income persons. In addition, the City allows Emergency Shelters with a CUP in all commercial and industrial zoning districts.

Transitional and Supportive Housing

Transitional housing helps transition an individual or family from a short-term emergency shelter. Government Code Section 65592 (j) defines transitional housing 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.”

Supportive housing is generally described as permanent housing linked to a range of support services. Government Code Section 65582(g) defines supportive housing as “housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to 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.” Services typically include assistance designed to meet the needs of the target population in retaining housing, living and working in the community, and/or improving health, and may include case management, mental health treatment, and life skills.

Pursuant to SB 2, the City’s Zoning Ordinance has been updated to treat transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. For example, if the transitional housing is a multi-family use proposed in a multi-family zone, then zoning treats the transitional housing the same as other multi-family uses proposed in the zone. Per Government Code Section 65582, target population is defined 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 pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 commencing with Section 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.

Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Assembly Bill (AB) 101, passed in 2019, requires that a low barrier navigation center be a use permitted by right in mixed-use zones and non-residential zones permitting multi-unit uses if it meets specified requirements. AB 101 defines “low barrier navigation center” 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. The Housing Element includes an

implementation program to amend the Planning and Development Code to comply with this new requirement (Housing Element Program 1.1 Update Zoning Ordinance).

Efficiency Studios/SROs

Efficiency studios, also known as single-room occupancy (SRO) units, often provide affordable housing opportunities for lower-income residents. Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance requires efficiency studios to have a minimum floor area of 150 square feet and include a private bathroom and partial kitchen. The average size of efficiency studios cannot exceed 325 square feet. Efficiency studios are allowed with a CUP in the CRA zoning district and with a planned community permit in the El Camino Real Precise Plan, the San Antonio Precise Plan and areas of the Downtown Precise Plan area that specifically lists efficiency studios as permitted or provisional use. To help encourage development of this product type, the City's Zoning Ordinance allows a reduction of parking standards by the Zoning Administrator, and a waiving of City fees with Council approval (including park fees and transient occupancy taxes). Further, the El Camino Real and San Antonio Precise Plans limit density based on floor area rather than units, which has the result of creating opportunity for many more efficiency studios than would otherwise be allowed.

The City's Zoning Code previously established a cap of 180 new efficiency studios be developed within the City. However, as 118 efficiency studios were approved as part of San Antonio Place, the City repealed the limit on new efficiency studios as it was deemed to be a constraint to the development of new units. Projects containing efficiency units are now reviewed and approved as they are submitted to the City.

Employee Housing

For consistency with the Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code, § 17000 et seq.), the Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 17021.5 requires that employee housing serving six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure and shall be treated subject to the standards for a family dwelling in the same zone. The City does not have any provisions in the Zoning Ordinance addressing employee housing serving six or fewer employees. Further, HSC Section 17021.6 requires that employee housing of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units or spaces designed for use by a single family or household be considered an agricultural use. The City does not have such provisions in its Zoning Ordinance. The Housing Element includes an implementation program to amend the Planning and Development Code to comply with this new requirement (Housing Element Program 1.1 Update Zoning Ordinance).

Accessory Dwelling Units

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) often provide affordable housing opportunities for lower-income residents or additional housing opportunities for extended families and affordable housing options. Effective December 10, 2020, the City Council adopted new zoning regulations to align with recent State laws pertaining to ADUs, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs), and multi-family ADUs. The zoning text amendments were made to bring the City into compliance with updated ADU legislation and to be consistent with the General Plan in supporting the policies of the prior Housing Element (2015-2023) by removing constraints to the development of ADUs, as provided in specific Housing

Element programs. The City finds that ADUs and JADUs are residential uses that are consistent with the allowable density, with the General Plan, and zoning designation for the site, provided the units are located on properties zoned to allow single-family or multi-family dwelling residential uses. While no Planning permit is required, all new ADUs require building permits. ADUs are allowed with ministerial approval only when the site complies with all applicable requirements and a building permit is issued within sixty (60) days of submittal of a complete application. These requirements are not seen as a constraint to the production of ADUs, as the trend for ADUs permitted and constructed have increased each year between 2018 to 2020. The City encourages all applicants to review preliminary ADU plans with Planning staff to ensure the project meets all zoning requirements, prior to preparing detailed construction plans for building permit submittal.

Density Bonuses

To provide additional opportunities for housing and housing variety, the City has adopted a Density Bonus ordinance that allows for incentives for the development of housing affordable to qualifying residents and households. The incentives include the ability to construct more residential dwelling units than the maximum residential density permitted by the applicable zoning and General Plan designations and other discretionary incentives. This ordinance was implemented to align with State Density Bonus Law as required by Government Code Section 65915(a). Density bonus programs are also included in the City's Precise Plan areas, including the North Bayshore Precise Plan, to increase the supply of new market rate and affordable housing.

Mobile Homes and Factory-Built Housing

Manufactured housing and mobile homes are a permitted use in all of the City's residential zoning districts. However, mobile home parks are only permitted in the RMH zoning district, subject to approval of a mobile home park permit (MHPP). The City currently has approximately 1,100 mobile homes in mobile home parks. These units make up approximately three percent of the City's housing stock. Refer to Table 41 for more details.

Mobile homes provide affordable housing with low yard and housing maintenance, which attracts a high number of seniors. The parks are distinctive because the homes are owned by residents, while they rent the land beneath them. Separate ownership carries the risk of conversion of the parks to another land use and possibly resulting in the loss of affordable housing. The State requires a conversion report with applications for park conversions. The conversion report must provide appropriate measures to mitigate potential impacts of mobile home park conversions on displaced residents, and strategies to assist displaced residents to obtain replacement housing.

In addition to State regulations, the City adopted a mobile home conversion ordinance (Chapter 28, Article X), which also requires a conversion report and identification of measures to mitigate the impacts of conversions. In recognition of mobile homes' value as an affordable housing option, the City has a mobile home park General Plan designation and a mobile home park zoning designation that also provide protection for existing mobile home parks. The City requires a Conversion Impact Report to convert a property with a mobile home to another use. Further, to help maintain the

affordability of mobile homes and provide other protections to mobile home park residents, the City Council adopted the Mobile Home Park Rent Stabilization Ordinance in September of 2021.

Table 41: Mountain View Mobile Home Parks

Park Name	Address	Number of Units
Moorpark Mobile Home Park	501 Moorpark Way	138
Sahara Village Mobile Home Park	191 El Camino Way	206
New Frontier Mobile Home Park	325 Sylvan Avenue	141
Santiago Villa Mobile Home Park	1075 Space Parkway	358
Sunset Estates Mobile Home Park	433 Sylvan Avenue	144
Moffett Mobile Home Park	440 Moffett Boulevard	143
TOTAL		1,130

Source: City of Mountain View, 2021.

Affordable Housing – State Laws Impacting Local Development Standards

Specific housing laws passed during the last housing cycle would revise policies and processes of the City and potentially reduce governmental constraints on housing development. These laws guide the development of recommendations in this update for the 6th cycle. The legislation that impacts residential development standards and potential affordable housing includes though is not limited to:

- AB 686 (Santiago): Places requirements on Housing Elements, and revisions to Housing Elements that occur on and after January 1, 2021, to include an assessment of fair housing within the jurisdiction.
- SB 330 and SB 8 (Skinner): Declares a statewide housing emergency to be in effect until January 1, 2030. To increase the production of housing, the bill suspends certain restrictions on the development of new housing during this period of statewide emergency and expedites local government permitting processes and timeframes. The bill applies to all “housing development projects,” with a special emphasis on projects for very-low-, low-, and moderate-income households and emergency shelters.
- AB 2162 (Chiu): Requires that supportive housing be allowed by-right in zones where multi-family and mixed uses are permitted, including non-residential zones that permit multi-family uses. Minimum parking requirements for units occupied by supportive housing residents are prohibited if the development is located within 0.5 mile of a public transit stop.
- SB 9 (Atkins): Signed by the California Governor on September 16, 2021, SB 9 requires “a proposed housing development containing no more than 2 residential units within a single-family residential zone to be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements.” The law also requires a local agency to ministerially approve a parcel map for an urban lot split that meets certain requirements and thus allow, ministerially without CEQA, up to four units on all single-family zoned parcels.

Constraints for Persons with Disabilities

Senate Bill 520, passed in October 2001, requires local housing elements to evaluate constraints for persons with disabilities and develop programs which accommodate the housing needs of disabled persons. Persons with special needs or disabilities have a number of housing needs related to housing accessibility; access to transportation, employment, and commercial services; and alternative living arrangements that include on-site or nearby supportive living services. The following is a description of City regulations, policies, and procedures that support housing opportunities for people with disabilities.

Procedures for Ensuring Reasonable Accommodation

Both the federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act impose an affirmative duty on cities and counties to make reasonable accommodations in their zoning and land use policies when such accommodations are necessary to provide equal access to housing for persons with disabilities. Reasonable accommodations refer to modifications or exemptions to particular policies that facilitate equal access to housing. Examples include exemptions to setbacks for wheelchair access structures or reductions to parking requirements.

The City's Zoning Ordinance incorporates procedures for reasonable accommodation that comply with State requirements. The process for reasonable accommodation includes submittal of an application form, an administrative review by City Staff, and a decision within 30 days after the application is submitted. An application for a reasonable accommodation is granted if all of the following findings are made:

- The housing, which is the subject of the request, will be used by an individual with a disability as defined under the Fair Housing Acts.
- The requested reasonable accommodation is necessary to make specific housing available to an individual with a disability under the Fair Housing Acts.
- The requested reasonable accommodation would not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City.
- The requested reasonable accommodation would not require a fundamental alteration in the nature of a City program or law, including but not limited to land use and zoning.
- The requested reasonable accommodation would not adversely impact surrounding properties or uses.
- There are no reasonable alternatives that would provide an equivalent level of benefit without requiring a modification or exception to the City's applicable rules, standards and practices.

Residential Care Homes

In conformance with State law, Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance permits residential care homes with six or fewer residents in all residential zones as permitted by State law. Residential care homes with six or fewer residents are not subject to special development requirements, policies, or procedures which would impede them from locating in a residential district. Residential care homes with seven or more residents are allowed through a Conditional Use Permit in all residential zones.

In the past, some zoning codes have included narrow definitions of the term family. The City's Zoning Code does define the term "family" so as not to discriminate against unrelated persons with disabilities living together.

Building Codes and Permitting

The City's Building Code includes amendments to the 2019 California Building Code, which do not have the potential to diminish the City's ability to accommodate persons with disabilities. The City Code goes further than the 2019 California Building Code in that it provides for fee waivers or reductions for those persons with disabilities. Specifically, in relation to the payment of fees for the construction, alteration, removal or demolition of materials for housing units, the City has amended the City's Building Code to include a fee waiver or reduction at the discretion of the chief building official, for all building permits related to improvement to the home of a person at least sixty (60) years of age with a qualifying disability and such improvements are made to accommodate that disability.

Tree Preservation

The City has a Tree Preservation Ordinance that is intended to prevent uncontrolled and indiscriminate destruction of mature trees in order to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the City. The Ordinance protects Heritage Trees, which are defined as:

- A tree that has a trunk with a circumference of 48 inches or more measured at 54 inches above the natural grade;
- A multi-branched tree that has major branches below 54 inches above the natural grade with a circumference of 48 inches measured just below the first major trunk fork;
- Any *quercus* (oak), *sequoia* (redwood), or *cedrus* (cedar) tree with a circumference of 12 inches or more when measured at 54 inches above natural grade; or
- A tree or grove of trees designated by resolution of the City Council to be of special historical value or of significant community benefit.

Heritage trees may not be removed on public or private property without a valid heritage tree permit from the City. Applications for the removal of heritage trees in connection with a discretionary development project permit are subject to review by the City's Zoning Administrator or City Council. Applications for permits are approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the official or hearing body which acts on the associated development permit application.

The City strives to preserve trees where possible and may require developers to build around trees. In most cases, however, developers are allowed to remove Heritage trees if they are replaced at a two-to-one ratio, depending on the type of tree. Because a large share of residential development in Mountain View is infill development that involves demolition and replacement, building footprints are often already in place and tree preservation issues do not arise as a major concern to developers.

Governmental Constraints Findings

- **Overall, Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance generally does not act as a constraint to new housing production.** The development standards and parking requirements for the existing six zoning districts that permit residential development are reasonable. When appropriate, the Zoning Administrator may approve a CUP to reduce the number of parking spaces for a development with smaller units. Housing Element Program 1.3 includes a review of development standards to address potential feasibility constraints. In addition, the City of Mountain View is adopting updates to its Zoning Ordinance concurrent with the Housing Element Update to increase residential development capacity.
- **Although Mountain View's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance could pose a constraint to housing production, the City has experienced significant amounts of market-rate residential construction activity with the inclusionary requirements in place and these requirements remain an important tool for generating affordable housing.** Mountain View's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires projects of a certain size to provide at least 15 percent of the total number of dwelling units (or 25 percent for ownership townhouses and rowhouses) as below-market rate or, in the case of a fractional unit (below 0.5 for developments with more than seven units) pay an in-lieu fee. There is also an option for alternatives to the production requirement. In general, this creates more affordable units than with a fee-only system. Housing Element Program 1.9 states that the City will review and revise the Below-Market-Rate program requirements during the planning period to reflect community needs for affordable and market rate housing.
- **The City's park land dedication requirements may act as a constraint to housing production but will be addressed through a Housing Element program.** The park land dedication in-lieu fee totals approximately \$238,987 for a single-family unit, \$69,497 for a unit in a small (ten units or less) multi-family project, and \$82,591 for a unit in a large (100 units or more) multi-family project. Overall, the City's park land dedication requirements were found to have a moderate to major impact on residential development costs, depending on the unit type. Housing Element Program 1.8 will address this potential constraint through a review and revision to the City's park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development.
- In compliance with SB 2, **Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance allows permanent emergency shelters** as a permitted use in the MM zoning district.
- **Mountain View's Zoning Ordinance treats transitional and supportive housing as a residential use**, subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.
- **The City's Zoning Ordinance includes a process for reasonable accommodation requests for people with physical disabilities.** Federal and State fair housing laws require jurisdictions to make reasonable accommodations to their zoning and land use policies when such accommodations are necessary to provide equal access to housing for persons with disabilities.

Non-Governmental Constraints

In addition to governmental constraints, there may be non-governmental factors which may constrain the production of new housing. These could include market-related conditions, such as the availability of financing and land and construction costs, as well as community opposition to new development.

Availability of Financing

The availability of financing can have an impact on the supply and cost of housing. Developers typically rely on construction financing to construct new housing units, while home buyers generally rely on financing to purchase residential properties. Interest rates can have a considerable impact on the cost to build, purchase, and improve homes, while restrictive lending terms can make it difficult to qualify for financing.

Financing is generally available for the residential construction and home mortgages and does not generally pose a constraint to the production of housing. While one developer interviewed for this Housing Element Update reported that decreases in rents due to the COVID-19 pandemic had made financing more challenging, these impacts likely reflect broader feasibility challenges due to decreased rents rather than challenges related specifically to financing. Moreover, residential rents have shown continuing increases as the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have lessened, mitigating these feasibility challenges.

Assembling financing for new construction is consistently challenging for affordable housing developers, though this challenge is not unique to the Mountain View context. In fact, the City of Mountain View routinely provides financing to affordable housing projects to help fill funding gaps. Affordable housing developers that were interviewed for this Housing Element Update cited the City's financial contributions to affordable housing projects as a key factor that facilitates the production of affordable housing in Mountain View. Most affordable housing developments require several sources of financing to become feasible, including bank loans as well as federal, State, local, and philanthropic funding. Major sources of funding include low-income housing tax credits, Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities funding, HOME funds, and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Local sources of funding for projects in Mountain View include the City's affordable housing funds as well as Santa Clara County Measure A funds. The City has also been part of two state Homekey applications, drawing in additional state funds to build housing for people experiencing homelessness. In order to meet its RHNA goals for affordable units, the City will have to find other sources of funding in order to meet the significant gaps in funding availability compared to the units in its pipeline. Housing Element Program 4.3 seeks to identify other sources of funding to meet this need. In addition, Housing Element Program 4.1 includes updating the City's NOFA process for affordable housing to improve coordination and communication internally and with applicants.

Land Costs

Land costs in Mountain View are high, as are land costs in much of the rest of Santa Clara County. The cost of land can vary considerably based on location, lot size, zoning, availability of existing infrastructure, and other factors. Recent sales of sites in Mountain View that are zoned for multi-

family residential development indicate that typical land prices for multi-family sites are approximately \$13 million per acre. Affordable housing developers that were consulted as part of the Housing Element Update process reported that a land cost of \$100,000 per unit or more is not unusual in the Mountain View market. The economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update (see Appendix H) assumed a land cost of \$122,000 per unit for multifamily housing. While the available data on single-family land sale costs in Mountain View is limited due to the limited inventory of vacant single-family sites, and land zoned for single-family uses tends to have a lower per-acre cost but a higher per-unit cost than land zoned for multi-family uses.

Construction Costs

Construction costs have increased substantially over the past several years and are often cited as a key barrier to the production of housing. Causes for the increase in construction costs include increases in the cost of materials as well as increases in labor costs. While demand for construction labor has remained strong in recent years, the pool of construction labor in California has not kept pace with demand. The COVID-19 pandemic led to further increases in construction costs due to supply chain disruptions and a shortage of construction materials and equipment. According to historical cost increases published by RS Means, hard construction costs for projects in the San Francisco region increased by 11 percent between 2018 and January 2021, and by 25 percent between the start of the City's last Housing Element cycle (2015) and 2021. The TBD Construction Bid estimate shows more significant construction cost escalation, increasing by 17 percent between 2018 and 2021 and by 42 percent between 2015 and 2021.

As of the third quarter of 2021, development costs for multi-family units often total \$550,000 per unit or more, before including the cost of land. One affordable housing developer that was consulted as part of the Housing Element Update process reported that it is difficult to build an affordable unit in Silicon Valley for less than \$700,000 per unit including the cost of land, and that the cost of one recent project in Mountain View exceeded \$1 million per unit. Single-family construction costs can vary substantially based on home size, quality of finishes, and other factors, but are often higher than the cost of a multi-family unit.

Public Opinion

Other constraints to housing production in Mountain View include public opinion, specifically community concern about higher-density development. Developers acknowledged that projects will almost always encounter some form of resistance from neighbors and residents, most commonly citing concerns about density and parking. This is the case not just in Mountain View, but in many jurisdictions. Within Mountain View, public opinion on new residential development at higher densities can have community support as well. Therefore, engagement with the local neighborhood associations can be critical for projects. Extensive community outreach can help to mitigate concern over new residential development. Despite some opposition to increased density, there is almost always a show of support for housing in Mountain View, particularly housing that addresses unmet needs, such as affordable housing.

Requests to Develop Housing Below the Densities Identified in the Sites Inventory

Residential development in Mountain View is not likely to be constrained due to requests to develop housing at densities below the densities that are identified in the Housing Element site inventory and analysis. Requests to develop sites at low densities tends to be a constraint to housing production if the market favors lower-density product types, such as detached single-family homes, on sites where higher-density product types, such as multifamily units, are allowed. As evidenced by construction activity in Mountain View during the last Housing Element Cycle and projects currently in the pipeline, there is strong demand for multifamily housing in Mountain View. Meanwhile, there has been virtually no construction of detached single-family homes in Mountain View in recent years. More importantly, the sites inventory for Mountain View's Housing Element determined the capacity for opportunity sites based on the actual densities of recently-constructed projects in Mountain View, as discussed in the Housing Sites Analysis and Inventory chapter. The sites inventory and analysis demonstrates that the densities used to determine capacity on housing opportunity sites are consistent with densities among recent projects in Mountain View under the same or similar development standards.

Time Between Approval and Building Permits

The time between project approvals and issuance of building permits is not generally a constraint to housing production in Mountain View. Before COVID, Multifamily and rowhouse developments had a median time from planning application to building completion of about 3.7 years. Since construction can take over 2 years, this means there is not usually very much time between entitlement and building permit application.

During the previous Housing Element Update cycle, the City of Mountain View issued building permits for more units than called for the City's RHNA allocation, as discussed in Chapter 2. Mountain View continues to have a robust project pipeline, as discussed in Appendix E, with strong developer interest in both entitling and building projects.

While some developments do not proceed after entitlement, this is exceedingly rare. Those projects that do not proceed are nearly always followed by a new residential entitlement (usually by a new developer). This is because under-utilized sites in Mountain View are good development opportunities, especially for residential uses.

Non-Governmental Constraints Findings

- **High land construction costs present challenges to the development of both market rate and affordable housing in Mountain View.** Land prices in Mountain View are high, much like the rest of Silicon Valley, often reaching \$100,000 per unit for multi-family developments. Construction costs are also high and have increased steadily during recent years. Together, high land and construction costs present barriers to the production of housing in Mountain View. Neighboring jurisdictions face similar constraints, contributing to the regional housing shortage. The City of Mountain View helps to address this constraint by providing funding for affordable housing construction. In addition, Mountain View has increased density in large

portions of the City through various Precise Plans, which help to reduce the per-unit land cost for both market rate and affordable developments.

- **Public opinion, particularly community concern over higher-density development, may constrain housing production in Mountain View.** Projects in many jurisdictions, including Mountain View, often encounter some form of resistance from neighbors and residents. Engagement with local neighborhood associations and other community involvement processes can help to mitigate concern over new residential development. In addition, Mountain View has active groups and individuals that support pro-housing policies, which help to balance opposition to density with support for additional housing. Housing Element Program 4.7 addresses this issue by encouraging developers to facilitate early and ongoing outreach with surrounding neighborhood groups while planning for new residential development.

Environmental Constraints

Environmental hazards affecting housing units include geologic and seismic conditions that provide the greatest threat to the built environment. The City has identified areas where land development should be carefully controlled. The following hazards are examples of environmental constraints that may impact future development of residential units in the City. For a summary of additional environmental constraints, it is recommended that the City's General Plan Safety Element be referenced as well as the City's most recent Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP). All parcels included in the sites inventory were reviewed for any known environmental constraints, such as wildfire, sea level rise, earthquake/seismic zones, and landslide risk, and other possible constraints to development feasibility. The sites included in the inventory have all been designated for residential development and are not constrained by special hazard risk, known environmental factors, or other site-specific constraints that would limit development. The specific process for this analysis is described in the Sites Selection Process section within Appendix E. Precedent development projects within Mountain View have been completed without major impacts from environmental constraints.

Seismic Hazards

Mountain View is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. Mountain View City Hall is located approximately 6.7 miles northeast of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone (A-PEFZ) for the San Andreas Fault, and approximately 11.2 miles southwest of the A-PEFZ for the Hayward Fault. The complex and potentially active Berrocal/Monte Vista-Shannon fault zone has its northern terminus about 2.7 miles to the southwest, while the inactive Cascade, Stanford, and San Jose faults all cross the City of Mountain View from the southeast to the northwest. There are, however, no known active faults present within the City, and the fault rupture hazard for the City is considered to be very low. Future development of housing would be required to undergo review, including analysis of increased risks to human health or safety related to fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction, in addition to compliance with standard California building and safety code requirements.

Flooding

Portions of the City are within the 100-year flood zones as determined by FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps. There are Pipeline projects in the sites inventory that are located in the 100-year flood zone, near US-101 and El Camino Real's crossing of Permanente Creek. In addition, there is one Opportunity Site in the sites inventory in the flood zone near El Camino Real and Miramonte Avenue. These projects would need to obtain a flood development permit as described in Section 8.160 of the City Code and be in compliance with California building and safety code requirements.

There are no dams or reservoirs within the City, with the exception of the irrigation ponds at the Shoreline Golf Links. The City is not located within a dam failure inundation zone. The Stevens Creek Reservoir is located upstream from the City on Stevens Creek, but its dam failure inundation zone does not cross into Mountain View's jurisdictional boundary. In addition, creeks within the City are maintained for flooding with slope protection by the Valley Water (VW). Future housing development within the City would not be affected by any levee failures along the creek channel and would not expose residents to flooding risks as a result of a failure of a levee or dam.

Fire Hazards

The most serious fire threat within the City is building and structure fires. Other fire hazards within the City may be associated with heavy industrial uses, older commercial and residential structures, the presence of hazardous materials, and arson. No Fire Hazard Severity Zones for State responsibility areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones for local responsibility areas have been identified within or adjacent to the City of Mountain View. Future housing development within the City would be required to comply with the materials and construction methods for exterior wildfire exposures and vegetation management practices described in the 2019 California Building Code and Chapter 47 in the California Fire Code and/or any other ordinances adopted by the City of Mountain View thereafter.

Noise

The ambient noise environment in the City of Mountain View is impacted by a variety of noise sources, including traffic, railroad, airport, and stationary noise sources. The City addresses noise in the Noise Chapter of the General Plan and in Chapter 5: Animals and Fowl, Chapter 8: Buildings, and Chapter 21: Miscellaneous Offenses and Smoking Regulations of the City Code. The City's exterior noise acceptability guidelines for new development show that environments with ambient noise levels of up to 55 dBA are considered normally acceptable for residential development and conditionally acceptable up to 65 dBA. The interior noise acceptability is 45 dBA and conditionally acceptable up to 50 dBA. In addition, the City Code restricts the operation of loud noise producing equipment used in construction or demolition on weekdays to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and restricts such activities from occurring on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays unless City Staff grant prior written approval. Future housing development in the City would be required to comply with City policies regulating noise. Analysis and review of the following noise-related topics may occur including exposure of persons to excessive noise levels, including airport noise; exposure of persons to excessive ground borne vibration; generation of excessive noise; construction noise; and increases in ambient noise levels.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

The East Whisman and North Bayshore areas have significant soil and groundwater contamination from previous industrial uses. Commercial sites may also have issues from previous dry cleaning or automotive operations.

In order to further effectively manage soil and groundwater contamination, the City has established procedures for determining where contamination is located and how to mitigate it. The City addresses soil and groundwater contamination in Chapter 5, Infrastructure, of the General Plan. In addition, the City regularly communicates with county, State, and federal agencies on the monitoring, remediation, and reporting of its contaminated soil and groundwater sites. Often, podium apartment buildings over underground garages - the most typical construction of new units in the City - can help the issue by removing contaminated soil. Future housing can build safe housing even in these conditions, by incorporating vapor barriers and active and passive ventilation, among other tools.



APPENDIX

E

Housing Sites Analysis and Inventory

APPENDIX E: HOUSING SITES ANALYSIS AND INVENTORY

Introduction

A Housing Element must include an inventory of available land that is appropriately zoned and suitable for housing development to accommodate a jurisdiction’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as required by State law. This inventory for the City of Mountain View focuses on sites that are, or can be made available, for housing development affordable to households of varying income levels. This Appendix summarizes the evaluation of potential housing sites, and the adequacy of sites to meet development capacities to accommodate the City’s regional housing needs for the 2023-2031 planning period.

Specifically, California law (Government Code Sections 65583 (a)(3)) requires that the Housing Element contain an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and non-vacant (i.e., underutilized) sites having potential for development. State law also requires an analysis of the relationship to zoning and services to these sites as well as identifying sites throughout the community, in a manner that is consistent with its duty to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH).

The analysis presented in this Appendix demonstrates there is an adequate supply of suitable land to accommodate the City’s housing allocation of 11,135 units, plus a surplus of over 6,644 additional units (1,612 of which are low and moderate income units) to acts as a “buffer” if sites develop to non-residential or at different affordability levels than assumed in the sites inventory. This section is organized by the following topics:

- Summary of the regional context and capacity;
- Sites selection process which includes a description of the methodology and evaluation of site criteria, unit capacity, and sites to accommodate varied income levels; and
- Sites inventory which includes the identification of sites by project type categories and evaluation of sites in meeting AFFH requirements.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The City’s housing target for the eight-year planning period (January 31, 2023, to January 31, 2031) is defined by its RHNA (also referred to as the City’s 6th cycle RHNA). RHNA is the California State-required process that seeks to ensure cities and counties are planning for enough housing to accommodate all economic segments of the community. Each city and county in the Bay Area must update their current housing element to meet statutory requirements by January 31, 2023 and plan for a specific allocation of assumed new housing units for specified income groupings as part of their sites inventory process to address their RHNA target. The City’s RHNA for this planning period is shown in Table 42.

Table 42: Mountain View’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Summary Info	Units by Income Group				Total Units
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
City RHNA ^a	2,773	1,597	1,885	4,880	11,135
Percent of Total	25%	14%	17%	44%	100%

NOTES: ^a The RHNA allocation shown was adopted by ABAG on December 16, 2021.

SOURCE: ABAG, December 2021.

Summary of Capacity to Accommodate RHNA

The total realistic development capacity of all sites in the land inventory is listed in Table 43 which provides a summary of the total residential capacity against the City’s 6th cycle RHNA. The total realistic capacity shown is 17,779 units, which exceeds the net target of 11,135 units the City is required to accommodate for its RHNA, and also supplements that allocation by representing a 60 percent buffer, of which 46 percent is a buffer on low and moderate income units. HCD recommends that jurisdictions provide a 15 to 30 percent buffer beyond the minimum RHNA target to comply with the “no net loss” provisions of State Housing Element Law that require the jurisdiction to maintain sufficient capacity to accommodate its RHNA for the duration of the planning period at every income level. In addition to considering the aggregate number of units that the sites can accommodate, it is necessary to consider the potential for sites to accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels, in accordance with the RHNA allocations, as discussed in the Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels section. Each of the two primary project types, Pipeline Projects and Opportunity Sites, are presented in Table 43 and described in further detail in the Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites section. As shown in Table 43, the number of units from Pipeline Projects alone is greater than the City’s RHNA. Though these Pipeline units do not fulfill the RHNA allocation at every income level, this demonstrates there are sufficient sites for the City’s RHNA and provides strong evidence there is residential developer interest and economic feasibility for housing development on the types of sites, including non-vacant sites, identified in this inventory.

Table 43: Mountain View Summary of Residential Capacity Compared to 6th Cycle RHNA by Income

Summary Info	Units by Income Group			Total Units ¹
	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Mountain View RHNA	4,370	1,885	4,880	11,135
Capacity from Pipeline Projects	2,501	499	8,435	11,435
Approved/Under Construction	509	247	3,186	3,942
Proposed Projects	1,992	252	5,232	7,476
Capacity on Opportunity Sites				
Developable Sites	3,127	1,654	1,484	6,265
ADU Projection	48	38	10	96
Total Capacity	5,676	2,191	9,912	17,779
Surplus (+) / Deficit (-) from RHNA	1,306	306	5,032	6,644
Buffer	30%	16%	103%	60%

Source: Environmental Science Associates, June 2022.

Note: There may be some rounding of total units.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

AB 686 (Santiago) created a new requirement for local jurisdictions to evaluate their Housing Element sites inventories through the lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. This Housing Element Update addresses these requirements in part by providing data and analysis in the Assessment of Fair Housing section of Appendix B, which informs many of the programs provided in the Housing Plan chapter of this document.

The law also requires that the sites inventory be used to identify sites throughout the community, consistent with the local jurisdiction’s duty to affirmatively further fair housing. As discussed in more detail below, (see “Evaluation of the Sites Inventory Through the Lens of AFFH”) the housing sites detailed in this Appendix will affirmatively further fair housing by disproportionately providing

opportunities for housing development for lower income households in areas with high opportunity and good access to jobs, transportation, high-quality educational opportunities, and a healthy environment. In addition, lower-income housing sites in the inventory are disproportionately located in areas with comparatively low existing concentrations of low-income and moderate-income households. The lower-income housing sites identified in this Appendix are not concentrated in areas with existing concentrations of non-White residents. However, due to the challenges associated with identifying developable housing sites in locations south of El Camino Real, there is a shortage of housing sites in predominantly White neighborhoods. The Housing Plan chapter of this Housing Element update includes programs that would facilitate the production of affordable housing on sites that are not identified in the site inventory through development on religious sites, ADUs, and SB 9 projects. Many of the opportunities for these types of development are located in predominantly White areas south of El Camino Real.

Although sites are not identified on every city block, the sites inventory is in compliance with the goals of affirmatively furthering fair housing. The sites inventory and Mountain View's progressive inclusionary housing policies will help to integrate households with a mix of incomes in locations throughout the community. Overall, the housing sites inventory does not exacerbate or create R/ECAPS, RCAAs, or racial or ethnic isolation or segregation; nor does it overly concentrate lower income housing Opportunity Sites in any single area of the City. The sites inventory also helps to affirmatively further fair housing from a regional perspective by creating opportunities for housing development for households at all income levels in a community that has *outstanding* access to jobs, services, a healthy environment, and other amenities that support a high quality of life and positive life outcomes for residents.

The only area considered "Low Resource" in the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map is the North Bayshore area, where some (though not a majority) of the lower income sites are located. However, the North Bayshore area has access to a significant number of jobs. It is also the subject of a major precise plan that will bring new development and services to the area, helping to improve access to opportunity. The City prepared and adopted the North Bayshore Precise Plan to create a complete community north of Highway 101, including new neighborhood-serving retail and services, new open spaces, land for a new school, and transit improvements along North Shoreline Boulevard to connect the area to the Downtown Transit Center and the rest of the City. The North Bayshore Master Plan, a development framework proposed to implement the vision of the Precise Plan, is already under review, with approval expected in 2023. This Master Plan includes up to 7,000 dwelling units as well as services, open spaces, a school and mobility improvements to vastly improve the quality of life for existing residents north of Highway 101.

Sites Selection Process

The following is a summary of the overall sites inventory process and the methodology and assumptions that support the sites selection process. Using guidance provided by HCD, an inventory of available sites was conducted by closely examining site characteristics and other HCD-established criteria. Primarily, sites were identified by using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping software from multiple datasets to identify parcels that fit the HCD-specified criteria as adequate

housing sites. Sites were further refined over a series of working sessions and through input from the Environmental Planning Commission, City Council, and stakeholders through the community engagement process. The information used to generate the sites inventory database was derived from these primary resources:

- 1) ABAG's Housing Element Site Selection (HESS) Tool;
- 2) Santa Clara County Office of the Assessor; and
- 3) City of Mountain View.

Housing sites identified as part of the sites inventory analysis were evaluated using a variety of criteria to determine their ability to meet State requirements and meet the City's RHNA, plus a buffer. The following sections describe the screening criteria and methodology applied for the sites selection process. Once all sites had been selected and verified, the realistic density assumption that was informed by and calculated from City precedent projects was applied to determine each sites' realistic unit capacity.

Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites

To meet the City's RHNA requirement, two primary project types are identified in the sites inventory, as described below. The methodology and assumptions that support these project types are summarized in the General Site Evaluation Considerations and Sites for Rezoning sections.

Pipeline Projects

Pipeline Projects include those that have been approved, permitted, or received a certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA projection period (which started on June 30, 2022). Based on HCD guidance, these projects may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development. The following is a description of the subcategories under Pipeline Projects:

- **Approved/Under Construction:** These projects include those that have been approved or are under construction and will receive a certificate of occupancy after the beginning of the RHNA projection period, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA.
- **Proposed Projects:** These are projects that are seeking entitlements, including one project that requires rezoning. Project status includes formal applications or pre-applications under review, master plans with development agreements approved or under review (only those portions realistically expected to start construction by 2031), and sites owned by 100 percent affordable housing developers with the intent to submit applications in the next year. Permits or certificates of occupancy for these Proposed Projects are expected to be issued in the 6th cycle, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA as well.

Opportunity Sites

Opportunity Sites is the second main project type that includes both vacant and non-vacant sites that have available infrastructure and meet a variety of criteria that make them candidates for residential

development during the 6th cycle planning period. The following is a description of the subcategories under the Opportunity Sites.

- **Developable, Underutilized Opportunity Sites:** These identified Opportunity Sites are considered vacant or underutilized and are eligible for residential development as is currently allowed under the existing zoning or General Plan. . There are some sites that will require rezoning and it is anticipated that these rezonings will have been adopted prior to the start of the 6th cycle while others may be enacted soon after the start of the 6th cycle. These include General Plan Village Center sites, including those south of El Camino Real. Refer to these sections for more information on rezoned sites: Sites for Rezoning and Rezoned Opportunity Sites.
- **Accessory Dwelling Units:** Accessory Dwelling Units are considered opportunities for residential development and are based on projected development during the planning period as is currently allowed under the existing zoning or General Plan.

General Site Evaluation Considerations

This section provides a summary of the evaluation considerations made as part of the analysis and a description of each consideration. As most of the City is already built out with there being limited number of vacant parcels remaining, sites in the inventory primarily include non-vacant parcels that already have access to infrastructure and meet a variety of HCD criteria that make them suitable candidates for housing redevelopment. While sites not included in the sites inventory can also be developed for housing to meet RHNA targets, those sites identified in the inventory are considered optimal and most likely to develop and contribute to housing production in the 6th cycle. The following considerations were evaluated and are described in more detail in the following sections:

- Infrastructure Availability;
- Environmental Constraints;
- Site Status and Capacity (i.e., vacant, underutilized, existing uses, and residential zoning);
- Site Size;
- Permitted Density; and
- Evaluating Sites from Prior Housing Element(s).

Infrastructure Availability

The availability of utility infrastructure to a site can be a constraint to housing development and was considered as an evaluation criterion when working to identify sites for the inventory. As a primarily urban and developed community, the City of Mountain View is well-served by existing infrastructure systems, including both wet and dry utilities. As much of Mountain View already has available or nearby access to water and wastewater services, wet utilities is not a constraint to residential development though minor upgrades to these services (e.g., expanded sewer and water hookups to the trunk line) may be needed to develop select sites for residential uses. Dry utilities, including natural gas and electricity provided by PG&E, and telecommunication services by AT&T, will continue to be available throughout the City. All sites have been screened to have available infrastructure.

Environmental Constraints

The analysis of environmental constraints included a review of all parcels identified in the inventory using different GIS-based data screens as well as ABAG's HESS tool to determine if sites possess one or more environmental constraint, including hazard risks such as wildfire, sea level rise, earthquake/seismic zones, and landslide risk, or other restrictive environmental conditions. Overall, the urbanized areas of the City where the sites for the inventory are located do not have special hazard risks or significant environmental challenges. Where siting housing on parcels with environmental constraints may be unavoidable to accommodate the City's housing need, risks would be addressed through building codes and other mitigation measures. Refer to the Environmental Constraints section in Appendix D for more information.

Site Status and Capacity

After accounting for Pipeline Projects, whose combined unit capacity exceeds the City's entire RHNA, only low income and moderate income RHNA categories remain which must be met through developable Opportunity Sites in the inventory. The existing characteristics of the site were considered as evaluation criteria for the Opportunity Sites. Specifically, all residentially zoned sites, either vacant or underutilized, were considered as potential buildable residential sites and were evaluated for site adequacy and capacity. Government Code Sections 65583(a)(3) and 65583.2 require that the inventory of suitable land look at criteria for vacant and underutilized sites as outlined below:

- Vacant sites that are zoned for multi-family development
- Vacant sites that are not zoned for multi-family development, but that allow such development (such as Precise Plans)
- Underutilized sites that are zoned for residential development and capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity
- Sites that are not zoned for residential development, but can be redeveloped for and/or rezoned for multi-family residential development
- Sites owned or leased by the City that can be redeveloped for multi-family residential development within the housing cycle
- Sites controlled by the State, a city/county, or another public agency where there is agreement/documentation that the site can be developed within the housing cycle
- Non-vacant sites require substantial evidence to demonstrate that existing development will not preclude housing production during the planning period

A methodology to determine "underutilized" sites was necessary given the City has negligible vacant land. Sites were removed from consideration in the underutilized methodology if sites: did not initially allow residential uses, were historic resources, were sites that support community-serving uses (parks, utilities, transportation, schools, hospitals), had structures that were recently built or modified, and were generally built out to their allowed density. In addition, Opportunity Sites with more than three existing residential uses were removed from consideration since they could result in displacement of rent-controlled units, which is contrary to the City's goals for affordable housing

production. The final sites inventory does not include any sites that have existing residential on site. Refer to the Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites section, under the Sites Inventory subsection for more details on underutilized sites in the inventory.

Sites owned by the City and other public agencies were also evaluated for affordable housing development (including City facilities, City parking Lot 11, the VTA Bus Yard on North Shoreline Boulevard, the DMV site on Showers Drive and various federally-owned sites within City limits). However, these sites are fully encumbered through the end of the 6th cycle. The Downtown Transit Center may have a joint development opportunity this cycle, but it does not currently allow residential, and it is not necessary to meet the RHNA. Therefore, its zoning will be carried out at a time appropriate for the development.

Site Size

Per State law, sites smaller than half an acre or larger than 10 acres are not considered adequate to accommodate lower income housing needs unless it can be demonstrated that sites of equivalent size were successfully developed during prior planning periods, or other evidence is provided that sites at this size can be developed as lower income housing.

- *Large Sites* – There is only one site in the inventory larger than 10 acres, 1500 North Shoreline Boulevard. This and other large sites (less than 10 acres) use a special methodology that only applies a maximum of 150 lower -income units to any given site. Based on the City’s experience with past residential projects, larger sites tend to include a mix of units affordable to various income levels, rather than 100 percent affordable, so only applying a maximum of 150 lower income sites is consistent with that experience as well as the City’s BMR requirements. 1500 North Shoreline Boulevard can yield 1,689 units when calculating its size with its the realistic density of 110 dwelling units per acre based on the General Plan land use designation, North Bayshore Mixed-Use, and the zoning, North Bayshore Precise Plan (this is a very conservative assumption, treating it like a 3.5 FAR site, when the Precise Plan actually allows up to 4.5 FAR). The North Bayshore Precise Plan requires 10 percent low income and either 5 percent or 10 percent moderate income units (depending on the size of the project), or at least 169 low income units and 84 to 169 moderate income units. However, based on the large site methodology, this would cap the number of low income units to 150 and moderate-income units to 150, with the remainder for above-moderate income units. This is a more conservative approach and lower estimation for both low and moderate-income units. The City has been meeting with a developer who has shared plans for a potential large residential project at 1500 North Shoreline Boulevard that would likely include more affordable units than have been designated in the inventory for this project. Further, 1500 Shoreline Boulevard is surrounded on all four sides with projects under review.
- *Small Sites* – The sites inventory includes parcels that are less than or slightly greater than one-half acre in size. A screening of these smaller parcels and common ownership was conducted. Where smaller parcels were immediately adjacent to other Opportunity Sites that

had the same landowner, these parcels were consolidated to create larger sites, given the likelihood of these consolidated sites being developed together as a single project. Refer to Table 44 for a list of consolidated sites in the inventory.

Table 44: Consolidated Sites

Site Address	APN	Consolidated Sites	Acres
2630 W EL CAMINO REAL	14816012	A	1.79
FAYETTE DR	14816013	A	0.32
2116 W EL CAMINO REAL	14836028	B	1.00
2100 W EL CAMINO REAL	14836029	B	0.52
2124 W EL CAMINO REAL	14836027	B	0.74
2483 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WY	14711025	C	1.34
2485 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WY	14711029	C	0.50
1134 W EL CAMINO REAL	15807026	D	0.64
1128 W EL CAMINO REAL	15807025	D	0.42
S OAK ST	15807007	D	0.10
2690 W EL CAMINO REAL	14816001	E	1.03
2674 W EL CAMINO REAL	14816004	E	0.26
630 SAN ANTONIO RD	14816016	F	2.82
FAYETTE DR	14816014	F	0.15
1949 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006058	G	0.32
1921 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006060	G	1.30
1935 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006062	G	1.66

Permitted Density

State law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)) establishes a “default density standard” of 30 units per acre for lower income units in a metropolitan jurisdiction such as Mountain View. This is the minimum density that is deemed appropriate in State law to accommodate the City’s lower income RHNA. In accordance with the State’s default density standards, sites that could support a minimum of 30 units per acre were considered appropriate for very low and low income units, as well as for moderate income units. All underutilized Opportunity Sites in the inventory can accommodate at least the default density.

Evaluating Sites from Prior Housing Element(s)

To accommodate the 2023-2031 RHNA, sites from the 2014-2022 Housing Element sites inventory were evaluated to determine their viability for the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period. It was determined that seven sites were identified in the 2014-2022 Housing Element sites inventory, as listed below.

- 2026 W El Camino Real (APN 15437018)

- 2674 W El Camino Real (APN 14816004)
- 2690 W El Camino Real (APN 14816001)
- 2630 California Street (APN 14815018)
- 2633 California Street (APN 14815021)
- 384 San Antonio Road (APN 14815022)
- 789 E El Camino Real (APN 19801003)

The zoning status for these sites had changed since the 5th cycle Housing Element, allowing a higher density and therefore increasing the potential housing capacity of these sites. Based on this circumstance, HCD considers these sites that have been rezoned since the last cycle as “new sites” and not sites that were used in a prior Housing Element. The following is a timeline of the subsequent rezonings for these seven sites, which are incorporated and categorized as new sites in the 6th cycle sites inventory.

- October 14, 2014: The previous Housing Element was adopted, which assumed the seven sites were zoned “CRA”.
- November 17, 2014: The El Camino Real Precise Plan was adopted and replaced the “CRA” zoning.
- December 2, 2014: The San Antonio Precise Plan was adopted and also replaced the “CRA” zoning.
- January 31, 2015: This was the start of the 5th cycle.

There are eleven other sites from the 2014-2022 Housing Element sites inventory that are found within this 6th cycle’s Pipeline Projects, where projects have been approved, are under construction, or seeking entitlements. While these eleven sites are not in 6th cycle sites inventory, these sites are contributing to this 6th cycle RHNA.

Sites for Rezoning

Government Code section 65583.2(h) sets requirements if sites are identified for rezoning to accommodate a lower income RHNA shortfall. The City’s sites inventory does not have a lower income shortfall, and therefore is not subject to those requirements. Nonetheless, the City is rezoning sites that will contribute to the increase in the RHNA buffer. Some of these rezonings will have been adopted prior to the start of the 6th cycle while others may be enacted soon after the start of the 6th cycle. These rezonings include the following:

- Implementing General Plan Village Center uses and standards at existing underutilized shopping centers throughout the City (including south of El Camino Real where the highest opportunity neighborhoods are located);
- Removing the requirement to obtain legislative approvals in order to build at the highest densities along El Camino Real; and

- Various under review and anticipated affordable housing developments on previously non-residential sites throughout the City .

Realistic Capacity Evaluation

As required by Housing Element statute, local governments must analyze available sites based on a determination of the realistic residential development capacity. To establish realistic capacity, precedent projects were referenced when evaluating vacant and underutilized sites, and specifically the typical densities of existing or approved residential development at similar affordability levels to confirm local development trends. The precedent projects used as references are subject to the same land use controls and site improvement standards as the sites in the inventory. While precedent projects provide an average density, or what is referred to as “Characteristic Density” by General Plan designation or zone in Table 45 and Table 46, the realistic density assumption applied to the sites inventory is one that is more conservative than the built or approved densities and discounts the “Characteristic Density” by as much as 15 percent to 45 percent, depending on the General Plan designation or zone. Refer to the “Mixed-Use Areas” section below for more details on realistic capacity assumptions.

Density is dictated by the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan. As a conservative estimate of capacity, the sites inventory applies the more restrictive density standard of either the zone or the General Plan. In zones that are regulated by floor area ratio (FAR), the maximum density is defined by the FAR. Densities achieved through FARs and the General Plan are based on precedent projects, which were used to determine the realistic density assumptions.

Over 90 Mountain View residential and mixed-use precedent projects were initially analyzed to calculate the realistic density based by zone or General Plan land use designation for the Opportunity Sites (excluding the ADUs). These precedent projects have applicable zones and General Plan land use designations, consistent with the sites in the inventory. As an example, there are no Medium Density Residential parcels in the inventory and as a result, these precedent projects are not shown. Refer to Table 45 for a listing of the relevant City precedents projects, along with details on the project acreage, dwelling units, density achieved, Precise Plan information if applicable, and General Plan land use designation.

Precedents provide an average density and are inherently more conservative than taking the highest density allowed or built. For zones with FARs where no built precedents were available (or too few to have an average), the realistic capacity assumption was determined by applying the same realistic density assumption for zones with the same FAR maximum where there were precedents to draw from, given these zones had similar characteristics. Refer to Table 45 for more details on precedent projects along with Table 46 and Table 47 for realistic density assumptions.



Example of a precedent project in the El Camino Real Precise Plan - 2700 West El Camino Real



Example of a precedent project in the Downtown Precise Plan - 135 Franklin Street

Table 45: Precedent Projects List

Project Address	Project Area Acreage	Dwelling Units, excluding Density Bonus	Density (DU/ac), excluding Density Bonus	Zoning/Precise Plan
324 Bryant Street	0.26	7	26.92	Downtown
676 Dana Street	0.25	7	28.00	Downtown
231-235 Hope Street	0.26	9	34.62	Downtown
135 Franklin Street	1.03	51	49.51	Downtown
City Lot 12 (Bryant Street)	1.50	75	50.00	Downtown
400 Logue Avenue	2.54	374	147.24	East Whisman (High Intensity)
320 Logue Avenue	2.15	363	168.84	East Whisman (High Intensity)
819 N Rengstorff Avenue	0.83	36	43.37	CRA
870 E El Camino Real (Mixed-Use Corridor Portion Only)	1.16	97	83.62	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
1411-1495 W El Camino Real	1.25	53	42.40	El Camino Real (Low Intensity)
334 San Antonio Road	0.66	42	63.64	San Antonio (Mixed-Use Corridor)
1616 W El Camino Real	0.99	66	66.67	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
1701 W El Camino Real	0.49	54	110.20	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
950 W El Camino Real	0.61	68	111.48	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
394 Ortega Avenue	1.62	144	88.89	San Antonio (Mixed-Use Corridor)
865 E El Camino Real	2.30	150	65.22	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
1720 W El Camino Real	2.43	162	66.67	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)

Project Address	Project Area Acreage	Dwelling Units, excluding Density Bonus	Density (DU/ac), excluding Density Bonus	Zoning/Precise Plan
801 W El Camino Real	2.39	164	68.62	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
100 Moffett Boulevard	2.70	184	68.15	Planned Community
2650 W El Camino Real	2.91	193	66.32	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
2268-2280 W El Camino Real	2.61	204	78.16	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
2700 W El Camino Real	2.28	172	75.44	El Camino Real (Medium Intensity)
400-520 San Antonio Road	5.75	432	75.13	San Antonio (Mixed-Use Corridor)
2580 California Street	8.63	632	73.23	San Antonio (Mixed-Use Corridor)
455 San Antonio Road (Residential portion only)	5.5	330	60	San Antonio (Mixed-Use Center)
601 Escuela Avenue	0.50	25	50.00	El Camino Real (Low Intensity)
1313 and 1347 W El Camino Real	0.44	18	40.91	El Camino Real (Low Intensity)
730 Central Avenue	0.24	15	62.50	CRA

Notes: Projects labeled as "not a precedent" are not useful for the selection of sites because they were vacant or replaced dwelling units. These projects are useful as development density precedents, however.

Table 46: Realistic Density Assumptions - Non-Rezoning

General Plan Designation	Maximum Density – GP	Zoning District	Maximum Density - Zoning	Characteristic DU/ac	Target Percentage	Realistic Density
General Mixed-Use	1.35 FAR	CRA and equivalent	43 DU/ac	43.37	84%	36
Mixed-Use Corridor	1.85 FAR	El Camino Real Precise Plan (Village Center)	1.85 FAR including required retail	53.98	84%	45
		El Camino Real Precise Plan (Medium Intensity)	1.85 FAR	71.97	84%	60
		San Antonio Precise Plan (Mixed-Use Corridor)	1.85 FAR	71.97	84%	60
		El Camino Real Precise Plan (Low Intensity)	1.35 FAR	45.74	84%	38
		CRA (Moffett Blvd)	43 DU/ac	62.5	84%	36
East Whisman Mixed-Use	1.0 FAR + Precise Plan Bonus	East Whisman Precise Plan (High Intensity)	3.5 FAR	157	70%	110
		East Whisman Precise Plan (Medium Intensity)	2.5 FAR	no example projects*; 112	70%	79
		East Whisman Precise Plan (Village Center)	1.35 FAR	no example projects***; 45	84%	38
North Bayshore Mixed-Use	1.0 FAR + Precise Plan Bonus	North Bayshore Precise Plan (General)	3.5 FAR	no example projects*; 157	70%	110
		North Bayshore Precise Plan (Edge)	1.85 FAR	no example projects**; 71	70%	50
Mixed-Use Center	2.35 FAR	San Antonio Precise Plan (Mixed-Use Center)	2.35 FAR	65 ****	60%	39
Downtown Mixed-Use	References Downtown Precise Plan	Downtown Precise Plan	Varies - most sites are 50 DU/ac	45.15	55%	25

* This is based on a proportional increase/decrease from the East Whisman Precise Plan (High Intensity)

** These are based on the characteristic projects in El Camino Real Precise Plan (Medium Intensity) and San Antonio Precise Plan (Mixed-Use Corridor).

*** This is based on the characteristic projects in El Camino Real Precise Plan (Low Intensity).

**** This is significantly lower than the actual density allowed on these sites. However, this assumes that developments will include a mix of uses that will reduce the developable area of residential (such as office, entertainment, etc.).

Table 47: Realistic Density Assumptions - Rezoning

General Plan Designation	Maximum Density - GP	Zoning District	Maximum Density - Zoning	Characteristic DU/ac	Target Percentage	Realistic Density
Neighborhood Mixed-Use	1.05 FAR	Updated CN District	1.05 FAR	30	70%	21
Mixed-Use Corridor Residential	1.85-2.3 FAR	Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan or Moffett Boulevard	1.85 FAR	72	70%	50
		El Camino Real Precise Plan (Village Center)	Increase of 0.45 FAR (to 2.3 FAR including retail)	Increase of 17.99 (to 71.97)	84%	Increase of 15 (to 60)



Example of a precedent project in the El Camino Real Precise Plan - 1701 West El Camino Real



Example of a precedent project in the San Antonio Precise Plan - 400 San Antonio Road

Mixed-Use Areas

The precedent projects were evaluated to determine the likely density of 100 percent residential development in each of the zones. However, most sites are within mixed-use zones with there being a possibility that non-residential uses could be built. This likelihood was conservatively set at either 55-60 percent, 70 percent, or 84 percent depending on the following:

- 84 percent: This includes areas with many precedents, specifically the Mixed-Use Corridor General Plan designation areas along the City's main arterials. Over the last 10 years, 84 percent of development land area in this area was residential, or residential with a trivial amount of commercial that did not reduce the density. This reflects the strong density incentives the City has in these areas (allowing much more residential development than commercial), and developers rarely choose other uses (mostly hotels and very small offices).
- 70 percent: This reflects areas with fewer precedents, more uncertainty and/or a higher commercial development potential. This is, however, still quite conservative for these areas. For example, East Whisman has a Jobs-Housing Linkage requirement that requires residential development to accompany any new office development, with the effect that no more than approximately 30 percent of any given development can be office. North Bayshore has a similar policy. Other areas where there are no precedents, such as the Neighborhood Mixed-Use (General Plan Village Center) areas, have similar density incentives as the Mixed-Use Corridor areas given these designations share some like characteristics.
- 55-60 percent: This reflects areas where residential and non-residential development may be roughly equally, but only reflects a small number of sites in the inventory, within the Downtown area and the San Antonio Shopping Center.

In addition, ten of the Mixed-Use Corridor sites where the realistic capacity is set at 84 or 70 percent as mentioned above are large, multi-tenant shopping centers. These retail areas have older buildings with low FARs. For these ten sites, an additional 80 percent discount has been applied to account for their lower likelihood of redevelopment, especially given State guidance that multitenant centers may be a constraint on redevelopment. Nonetheless, Mountain View has experience redeveloping large multi-tenant shopping centers. Refer to the Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites section below for more information on large multi-tenant sites.

Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels

One of the most important evaluation considerations of the sites selection process is to evaluate a sites' ability to accommodate households with varying income levels. To satisfy the RHNA requirement, the amount of lower, moderate, and above moderate income units is specified for each site in the inventory. Refer to the HCD Sites Inventory Spreadsheets at the end of Appendix E for more details. Furthermore, the unit capacity must be maintained throughout the 2023-2031 planning period. Therefore, a buffer of at least 15 percent to 30 percent is generally recommended by HCD, and the Mountain View's sites inventory buffer is well beyond this recommendation (60 percent). If sites listed in the inventory are redeveloped with other uses or different income levels than what is identified, the difference can be made up with the buffer sites to ensure there is "No Net Loss" of RHNA capacity at each income level.

Affordability assumptions for Opportunity Sites (excluding ADUs) are outlined in Table 48 by site characteristic and income levels. As mentioned in the Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites section, State law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)) establishes a default density standard of 30 units per acre for lower-income units in a metropolitan jurisdiction. Opportunity Sites (with the exception of consolidated sites) that are 0.5 to 10 acres that allow for development at 30 units per acre are suitable to accommodate the lower income RHNA, as indicated by HCD. This guidance is based on HCD's experience that fewer lower income projects are developed with fewer than 50 units or more than 150 units. As a response to this, the City has taken the more conservative approach, which is to limit a single site's lower income allocation to a range between 50 and 150 units, even though that further disqualifies many sites that are greater than 0.5 acres. No sites less than 0.5 acres can accommodate more than 50 units, unless consolidated. There is only one opportunity site greater than 10 acres, and using this methodology the number of lower income units assumed on the site is consistent with the likely BMR requirement for any project in this location. This splitting of incomes is reasonable because many large developments choose to comply with their below-market-rate housing requirement through land dedication, on which affordable housing developers can build at higher densities than the original development. The North Bayshore and Middlefield Park Master Plans and 1255 Pear Avenue are good examples of this. In addition, the City has elected to limit moderate-income allocation to a range between 0 and 150 units, both because this is a more conservative assumption and in order to limit the risk that a single project will require a significant amount of new Housing Element sites under "No Net Loss".

Table 48: Affordability Assumptions

Site Characteristic	Capacity Assumption	Income Category Application
Accommodates fewer than 50 units (includes all sites smaller than 0.5 acres)	100%	Moderate Income Units
Accommodates between 50 and 150 units	100%	Lower-Income Units
Accommodates between 150 and 300 units	150	Lower-Income Units
	Remainder	Moderate Income Units
Accommodates more than 300 units	150	Lower-income Units
	150	Moderate Income Units
	Remainder	Above Moderate Income Units

50 percent Threshold of Lower Income Units on Non-vacant Sites

State law requires additional analysis of existing uses in the sites inventory if more than 50 percent of the City’s low-income RHNA is accommodated on non-vacant sites. HCD has published guidance for how to determine this, which includes adjustments for proposed lower income projects and ADU capacity, in addition to vacant sites in the inventory. Table 49 shows this analysis based on HCD’s guidance. A substantial amount of the City’s lower-income units (more than 50 percent of the lower income RHNA) are within Pipeline Projects. In addition, the inventory includes affordable ADU units and a vacant Opportunity Site with low income unit capacity. In summary, approximately 41.7 percent of Mountain View’s lower income RHNA is accommodated on non-vacant sites, which is below the 50 percent threshold. Therefore, no additional analysis is needed to support the site inventory’s non-vacant sites.

Table 49: Lower Income Units on Non-vacant Sites

Adjustment Factor	Number of Units
Proposed Lower Income Projects	2,501
ADU Capacity (affordable to lower incomes)	48
Capacity on Vacant Sites	0
Total Capacity (not related to non-vacant sites)	2,549
RHNA on Non-vacant Sites	$4,370 - 2,549 = 1,822$
Percentage of Lower Income RHNA accommodated on Non-vacant sites	$1,822 / 4,370 = 41.7\%$



"Park Place," a downtown multi-family development



A rowhouse development on Willowgate Street

Sites Inventory

A summary of all sites identified by project type categories identified in the Mountain View 6th cycle Housing Element sites inventory for the 2023-2031 planning period is provided in this section. Figure 95 presents an overview map of the identified housing site locations within Mountain View (excluding ADUs), and Table 50 outlines the unit capacity by income level for each of the two main project types.

Table 50: Sites Inventory Summary

Project Category Type	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate-Income Capacity	Realistic Capacity Total (Units)
Pipeline Projects	2,501	499	8,418	11,418
Opportunity Sites	3,175	1,692	1,494	6,361
Sub Total (A)	5,676	2,191	9,912	17,779
6 th cycle RHNA (B)	4,370	1,885	4,880	11,135
RHNA Buffer (A-B)	+1,306	+306	+5,032	+6,644

Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites

If a housing element relies on non-vacant sites to accommodate 50 percent or more of its RHNA for lower income households, the housing element must describe findings with substantial evidence that the use on sites will be discontinued. Examples of substantial evidence include expiring leases, dilapidated building conditions, development agreements to develop the site, and letters with owners expressing development interest. The City of Mountain View's reliance on non-vacant sites for lower income units in the sites inventory, as defined by HCD, does not meet this 50 percent threshold. The City's reliance on non-vacant sites for lower income units is 41.7 percent. Refer to the "50 percent Threshold of Lower Income Units on Non-vacant Sites" section for more information on this topic.

State law requires each jurisdiction to include a land inventory to identify specific sites that are suitable for residential development and demonstrate that sufficient land is zoned to provide housing capacity that is adequate to meet the RHNA for each income level. The lack of vacant land in Mountain View and the relatively high value of new residential development means that the City consistently sees the redevelopment of underutilized sites, including ones that contain functioning residential and commercial uses.

Non-vacant, Opportunity Sites in the inventory were screened based on the criteria previously described. Online tools, including Google Earth and Google Street View whereby a desktop windshield survey was conducted, were used to verify uses and conditions of buildings or lots on non-vacant sites. Several salient characteristics stood out among the redeveloped sites seen in Precedents Projects and the soon to be developed Pipeline Projects that are consistent with sites in the inventory.

- Opportunity Sites are underutilized and fall short of the site's development potential. Non-consolidated, Opportunity Sites in the inventory have low FARs (less than 0.35 FAR office or retail or less than 0.5 FAR industrial or Research and Development). Exceptions to this criteria include 1) 910 El Monte Avenue, which has a one-story building that is 70 years old, located in a high opportunity area, and adjacent to existing residential, 2) 2320 W. El Camino Real, which was built in 1969 and has a chain link fence around the site, and 3) 1952 W. El Camino Real, which was built in 1959 and the property owner is marketing the site based on the desktop windshield survey.
- Opportunity Sites have buildings that are older with many of them nearing the end of their lifespan. All non-consolidated, Opportunity Sites were built before 1986 except 1350 Pear Avenue, which was built in 1987 and has tenant vacancy based on the desktop windshield survey.



Examples of buildings in older condition at underutilized sites: 2026 W El Camino Real (left), 624 W El Camino Real (right)

- Precedent and Pipeline Projects show that multi-family developments replaced or will replace in this 6th cycle a broad array of different non-residential land uses, including multi-tenant shopping centers, motels, office and R&D buildings, among other uses. Refer to Table 51 for a list of non-residential uses that existed in the year or two before applications were submitted on select Precedent and Pipeline Projects, consistent with those existing uses found on Opportunity Sites, furthering the point that existing uses are not a limitation to redevelopment. This is a strong indicator that development of residential uses on underutilized, non-vacant sites with existing uses is occurring and will continue to be an on-going trend given the scarcity of vacant land in the City. Based on this, the non-vacant Opportunities Sites included in the inventory do not face impediments to residential development due to existing land uses.

Of the 96 sites in the inventory, existing uses share common characteristics with those previous uses found on Precedent and Pipeline Projects. Below is a list of such characteristics and the number of sites in the inventory with these characteristics. While the characteristics are generally described separately, more than one site may present multiple characteristics; therefore, the numbers presented are not intended to add up to 96, the number of sites in the inventory. Refer to the HCD Sites Inventory Spreadsheets at the end of this Appendix E to find details, including existing uses and data by address and APN, for sites in the inventory.

- 1 Opportunity Site is vacant with no signs of site infrastructure or improvements present; a chain link fence surrounds the site
- 18 Opportunity Sites have tenant vacancy and/or property marketing based on a desktop windshield survey and/or through other research
- 10 Opportunity Sites are small multi-tenant sites that have older, one-story buildings with low FARs
- 15 Opportunity Sites are one-story (with the exception of 1280 Space Park Way which is two-stories) buildings with FARs below 0.5; buildings are older and have been built prior to 1986 (with the exception of 1350 Pear Avenue which has tenant vacancy)
- 16 Opportunity Sites are gas stations or auto service related; these one-story facilities were built in the 1960s (with the exception of two that were built in the

1970s: 1288 W El Camino Real and 62 W El Camino Real), and generally have FARs below 0.15 (with the exception of a 0.27 tire store at 30-40 W El Camino Real)

- 5 Opportunity Sites are parking lots
- 8 Opportunity Sites are in poor condition (signs of graffiti, boarded up windows) and/or have chain link fences surrounding the site
- 41 Opportunity Sites are single retail tenants (including banks and personal services) and exhibit other characteristics described above, such as having tenant vacancy, is a gas station or auto service related, and/or is in poor condition

Table 51: Non-Residential Previous Uses on Select Precedent and Pipeline Projects

Address	Previous Use
1001 N Shoreline Blvd	Large parking lot serving a recent office development
1100 La Avenida	1-story light industrial with multiple tenants
1313 and 1347 W El Camino Real	1-story small retail center with multiple tenants
1411-1495 W El Camino Real	Three one-story retail buildings fully occupied with multiple tenants
2645 Fayette Drive	2-story light industrial building, fully occupied with one tenant
334 San Antonio Rd	Operating gas station
400 Logue Avenue	1-story research and development use fully occupied with an existing tenant
901 E El Camino Real	Operating 2-story hotel
City Lot 12 (Bryant St)	Public parking lot
355-401 E Middlefield Rd	Two 1-story light industrial buildings occupied with existing tenants
615-749 W El Camino Real	Operating 1-story bank and fast-food restaurant
96 W El Camino Real	Operating 1-story mortuary
Middlefield Park Master Plan	Broad range of occupied and vacant 1-story light industrial buildings, plus a 4-story and a 3-story Class A office building built in 1997
North Bayshore Master Plan	Broad range of occupied and vacant 1- to 2-story office, light, and commercial industrial buildings
320 Logue Ave	1-story multi-tenant office building with some tenant spaces available
685 E Middlefield Rd	Occupied multi-tenant 2-story office buildings
1265 Montecito Ave	Occupied office building

Address	Previous Use
67 E Evelyn Avenue	1- to 2-story light industrial with multiple tenants, with tenant spaces available
87 E Evelyn Avenue	Public parking lot
950 W El Camino Real	Fast food restaurant
865 E El Camino Real	Billiard hall and occupied 2-tenant retail building
801 W El Camino Real	Several small, occupied retail buildings
100 Moffett Boulevard	Occupied social service office and car repair
400-520 San Antonio Road	Multiple office and light industrial buildings, tire store, multi-tenant retail (mostly occupied)
601 Escuela Avenue	Small retail strip center occupied with multiple tenants

- The sites inventory includes ten parcels that are occupied by larger shopping centers (i.e., more than 2 acres) with multiple tenants (i.e., more than three). However, all of these sites are underutilized with low FARs and have older buildings. They also have large parking lots that may be able to accommodate stand-alone residential developments. Furthermore, five of the ten parcels are within two consolidated sites that have common ownership, increasing the likelihood of development to occur under one project (for each landowner). Six of the ten parcels are located in high opportunity areas. Given these conditions, these sites have been included in the inventory. However, the full unit capacity of these sites based on their General Plan land use designation, size, and density has not been applied. Instead, a more conservative estimate was calculated to heavily discount the capacity by 80 percent, yielding a reduced capacity of 303 units (rather than 1,515 units). Refer to Table 52. This discount acknowledges the constraint of multitenant retail centers for redevelopment. Nonetheless, in the last 15 years, the City’s largest multiple tenant shopping center has had significant redevelopment: San Antonio Center is a prime example of redevelopment that occurred on sites that supported existing larger and multiple tenants, including a Sears, Rite Aid, Ross, BevMo, Kohls, and many small retail spaces. Phases of this project have been completed, are under construction, or under review. At full build out, the San Antonio Village Center will include over 300 residential units, a neighborhood center, a grocery store, specialty retail, class A office, a hotel, a cinema, a parking structure and an elementary school. See images from the project below.



Source: Merlone Geier Partners

Source: Brookfield

New Housing at the San Antonio Village Center

Table 52: Capacity Discount on Multi-tenant Opportunity Sites

Site Address	APN	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Land Use Designation	Acres	Maximum Density	Unit Capacity	Unit Capacity with 80% Discount	Located in High Opportunity Area
2630 W EL CAMINO REAL	14816012	A	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	1.79	47-93	108	22	
FAYETTE DR	14816013	A	Mixed-Use Corridor	0.32	63-89	30	6	
2600 W EL CAMINO REAL	14816015	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	0.50	47-93	19	4	
1910 W EL CAMINO REAL	15436018	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	2.47	47-93	149	30	
1949 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006058	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	0.32	47-93	255	51	Yes
1921 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006060	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	1.30	47-93	481	96	Yes
1935 W EL CAMINO REAL	17006062	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	1.66	47-93	19	4	Yes
1504 GRANT RD	19312001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	5.08	~72	78	16	Yes
121 E EL CAMINO REAL	19742004	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	7.96	47-93	99	20	Yes
789 E EL CAMINO REAL	19801003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	4.59	65-111	277	55	Yes
Sum Total						1,515	303	

Existing leases or other contracts in non-vacant sites have been considered. It is important to note that leases and contracts related to privately owned properties are not public information, and the City does not have any power to require or compel property owners to provide this information. Through public listings, the City has identified that nearly a quarter of the non-vacant sites in the inventory are up for lease. Additionally, the shift toward residential and mixed-use development on commercially zoned sites is reflective of broader national trends in the shifting retail market. The expansion of online retailing has had major impacts on consumer behaviors and greatly reduced demand for brick-and-mortar retail. These trends are expected to continue leading to even more opportunities for the redevelopment of commercial properties.

Demand for residential development within Mountain View is evident based on the volume of development applications and housing trends throughout the Bay Area and California as a whole. Mountain View's location within the greater San Francisco Bay Area and Silicon Valley has a significant impact on the demand for housing. Job growth, employment opportunities, and the dynamic economy that characterize the region result in a strong demand for residential development. The creation of housing has not kept up with the demand, so demand has only grown. This demand for housing has influenced trends that include the redevelopment of non-vacant sites into housing. These trends are evidenced in the Precedent and Pipeline Projects, as stated above, and the reason why the number of units in the Pipeline Projects alone exceed Mountain View's entire 6th cycle RHNA. Compared to its neighboring peers, Mountain View has one of the highest RHNA in Santa Clara County, third to the City of Sunnyvale and City of Santa Clara, whose land area however exceeds Mountain View's by approximately 46% and 33%, respectively.

Refer to the *Developable, Underutilized Opportunity Sites* section for a summary of the unit capacity for these sites and HCD Sites Inventory Spreadsheets at the end of this Appendix E for a list of all Opportunity Sites and its attributes.

Unit Capacity by Project Type

The following are summaries of the key findings for each of the project types: Pipeline Projects and Opportunity Sites, including Opportunity Sites that do not and do require rezonings and ADUs. Refer to Table 50 for the sites inventory summary and Figure 95 for an overview map of all sites in the inventory (ADUs excluded). This inventory was developed based on HCD requirements for locations and affordability levels as well as City goals focusing on sites that have residential capacity under the current zoning and areas that have had undergone robust community engagement, such as Precise Plan areas. Sites that would cause high residential displacement were avoided.



A rowhouse development in the South Whisman neighborhood.



A multifamily development in the San Antonio mixed-use neighborhood.

Figure 95: Housing Sites Overview





Figure 95: Housing Sites Overview, continued



SOURCE: ESRI, 2022.

City of Mountain View

Pipeline Projects

Pipeline Projects include those that have been approved, permitted, or received a certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA projection period (which started on June 30, 2022). Based on HCD guidance, these Pipeline Projects are not considered sites in the inventory; however, these sites may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development. Refer to Figure 94 for all Pipeline Project locations, including approved and under construction projects.

Approved/Under Construction: Pipeline Projects include a subcategory of projects that have been approved or are under construction and will receive a certificate of occupancy after the beginning of the RHNA projection period, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA. Projects in this category conform with the current General Plan and zoning, therefore no rezoning is required. A total of 3,942 units are listed in Table 53 which summarizes those projects that are approved or are under construction, by address and site status. Affordability assumptions are based on approved entitlements and include deed-restricted units per BMR requirements. Projects under construction that will receive a certificate of occupancy during the projection period include: 1001 N Shoreline Boulevard, 1255 Pear Avenue, 777 W Middlefield Road, 851-853 Sierra Vista Avenue, 950 W El Camino Real, 1720 Villa Street, and 555-557 E Evelyn Avenue. Remaining projects in this subcategory have been approved and are listed as such in Table 53. Expected completion dates are provided in this table as well. Approved/under construction projects are made up of 60 sites, on parcels totaling approximately 92 acres, as shown in Figure 96 While some neighborhoods have more approved/under construction project units than others, Table 54 demonstrates how units at varied income levels appear and are distributed in each of the City's recognized neighborhoods. Approximately 56 percent of approved/under construction projects are located in the City's Precise Plan areas, including Downtown, East Whisman, El Camino Real, San Antonio, Villa Mariposa, and North Bayshore, where robust community engagement has already occurred to vet areas that would support residential development. Refer to Table 55.

Table 53: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summary by Project Address

Address	Lower Income Units	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units	Total Capacity	Expected Entitlement Date (Year)	Projects that contain Deed-restricted Affordable Lower Income Units
1001 N Shoreline Blvd	20	20	263	303	2024(apt) 2025(condos)	Yes
1100 La Avenida	100	0	0	100	2024	Yes
1255 Pear Ave	0	0	220	220	2024	Yes
1313 and 1347 W El Camino Real	2	0	22	24	2024	Yes
1411-1495 W El Camino Real	0	5	48	53	2024	Yes
1720 Villa Street	3	0	204	207	2023	Yes
1919 Gamel Way	29	0	63	92	2024	Yes
1958 Latham St	0	0	6	6	2024	No
198 Easy Street	0	0	4	4	2024	No
2580-2590 California Street	14	18	600	632	2023	Yes
2645 Fayette Drive	5	0	33	38	2025	Yes
334 San Antonio Rd	10	3	49	62	2026	Yes
400 Logue Avenue	24	38	346	408	2025	Yes
555 East Evelyn Avenue	0	0	471	471	2023	No
555 W Middlefield Rd	32	16	275	323	2029	Yes
570 Rengstorff Ave	0	0	15	15	2024	No
601 Escuela Ave	2	2	21	25	2025	Yes
773 Cuesta Drive	0	0	3	3	2024	No
777 W Middlefield Rd	0	144	364	508	2025	Yes
828-836 Sierra Vista Ave and 1975/1979 Colony St	1	0	14	15	2024	Yes
851-853 Sierra Vista Avenue	0	0	6	6	2023	No
870 E El Camino Real	33	0	158	191	2025	Yes
901 E El Camino Real	45	0	0	45	2023	Yes
950 West El Camino Real	70	0	1	71	2022 (August)	Yes
City Lot 12 (Bryant St)	119	1	0	120	2026	Yes
Grand Total	509	247	3,186	3,942		

Table 54: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summarized by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Net New Units
Central Neighborhoods	194	3	226	423
Grant Road/Sylvan Park	78	0	629	707
Moffett/Whisman Road	76	218	1,252	1,546
Monta Loma/Farley/Rock Street	1	0	20	21
North Bayshore	100	0	220	320
San Antonio/Rengstorff	58	21	766	845
Springer/Cuesta/Phyllis	2	5	73	80
Grand Total	509	247	3,186	3,942

Table 55: Approved/Under Construction Pipeline Projects Summarized by Precise Plan

Precise Plan	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Net New Units
Downtown	119	1	0	120
East Whisman	24	38	346	408
El Camino Real	152	7	250	409
North Bayshore	100	0	220	320
San Antonio	29	21	682	732
Villa Mariposa	3	0	204	207
Not in Precise Plan	82	180	1,484	1,746
Grand Total	509	247	3,186	3,942

Figure 96: Pipeline Projects





Figure 96: Pipeline Projects, continued



SOURCE: ESRI, 2022.

City of Mountain View

Proposed Projects: Proposed Projects are Pipeline Projects that are seeking entitlements, including those where formal applications or pre-applications have been submitted. Building permits or certificates of occupancy for these Proposed Projects are expected to be issued in the 6th cycle, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA. Proposed Projects also include land dedications for 100 percent affordable housing projects, and sites owned by affordable housing developers who have plans in place for developing these sites within this planning period. –There are 66 parcels, totaling approximately 182 acres, that yield 7,476 units identified as Proposed Projects in the sites inventory. This subcategory yields the greatest unit capacity and fulfills more than half the RHNA requirement. This demonstrates there is continued interest and desire to develop housing on non-vacant parcels with existing residential and non-residential uses in the City. With the exception of 1020 and 1040 Terra Bella Avenue, all Proposed Projects do not require rezoning as these sites conform to the current General Plan and zoning. Refer to Table 56 for all Proposed Projects.

Table 56: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summary by Address

Site Address/ Intersection	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Expected Entitlement Date (Year)	Projects that contain Deed- restricted Affordable Lower Income Units
1255 Pear Ave (Affordable Housing Dedication)	112	0	0	112	2024	Yes
1332 Park Dr	0	0	2	2	2023	No
355-401 E Middlefield Rd	92	58	466	616	2023	Yes
615-749 W El Camino Real	33		266	299	2023	Yes
730 Central Ave	2	0	19	21	2022	Yes
89 W El Camino Real	61	0	0	61	2024	Yes
918 Rich Ave	3	1	24	28	2023	Yes
96 W El Camino Real	70	0	0	70	2024	Yes
Middlefield Park Master Plan	338	0	750	1088	2022	Yes
North Bayshore Master Plan	528	167	2670	3365	2023	Yes
320 Logue Ave	30	25	309	364	2023	Yes

Site Address/ Intersection	Lower Income Capacity	Moderate Income Capacity	Above Moderate Income Capacity	Total Capacity	Expected Entitlement Date (Year)	Projects that contain Deed- restricted Affordable Lower Income Units
685 E Middlefield Rd	138	0	690	828	2023	Yes
266/272 Tyrella Ave	6	0	36	42	2024	Yes
1265 Montecito Ave	84	1	0	85	2022	Yes
1012 Linda Vista	69	0	0	69	2023	Yes
67 E Evelyn Avenue	126	0	0	126	2024	Yes
87 E Evelyn Avenue	150	0	0	150	2024	Yes
57 E Evelyn Avenue	42	0	0	42	2024	Yes
1020 & 1040 Terra Bella Ave	78	0	0	78	2023	Yes
1020 & 1040 Terra Bella Ave	30	0	0	30	2023	Yes
Grand Total	1,992	252	5,232	7,476		

Lower and moderate-income units among the Proposed Projects are based on submitted applications, site capacities and other available information. While the ultimate number of units may change a small amount based on unforeseen circumstances, these projects are committed to very nearly the identified number of lower- and moderate-income units based on the City’s BMR requirements, ownership by non-profit affordable developers, and current Council goals.

Proposed Projects where no rezoning is required are present throughout the City. Typical review times and times between building permit and construction are no more than five years (see Appendix D: Housing Constraints). Therefore, other than projects without a development agreement or projects that are dependent on City funding and coordination, it is reasonable for these projects to start construction by 2031.

Many units occur in two master plans involving long, multi-year Development Agreements: Middlefield Park (East Whisman Precise Plan) and North Bayshore. Applications have been submitted for these Master Plans which include the proposed housing units as described below. Both plans are multi-year developments and will provide a combination of affordable and market-rate housing. The City is not taking credit for 100 percent of the build-out of the Master Plans (only the portion reasonably expected to occur within an 8 year period or by 2031). Refer to the City of Mountain View homepage at www.mountainview.gov for more information on these master plans. For more details on the unit distribution of Proposed Projects, refer to Table 57 and Table 58.

- North Bayshore Master Plan:** A formal application for this Proposed Project was submitted in September 2021. It includes a Development Agreement for 30 years. Within the 2023-2031 planning period, the North Bayshore Master Plan is assumed to provide approximately half of land dedications for affordable units and start construction of approximately 3,365 market-rate and inclusionary units, of which approximately 695 units are affordable to lower- and moderate-income levels. This represents less than half of the anticipated units (out of up to 7,000 total units) in the project that is counted for this cycle. This is reasonable because this Master Plan and Development Agreement includes a phasing plan that requires construction of residential early in the entitlement period.
- Middlefield Park Master Plan:** A formal application for this Proposed Project was submitted in September 2020 and project approval in late 2022 is anticipated. It includes a Development Agreement for 20 years. The Middlefield Park Master Plan is assumed to provide 100 percent of land dedications for affordable units and start construction of approximately 50 percent of market-rate units, which yield 1,088 net new units, of which 338 units are affordable. This is the portion of the units expected to be built within the 8 year planning period (out of up to 1,900 total units). This is reasonable because this Master Plan and Development Agreement includes a phasing plan that requires construction of residential early in the entitlement period.

Table 57: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summarized by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Net New Units
Moffett/Whisman Road	92	58	466	616
Central Neighborhoods	70	0	0	70
Grant Road/Sylvan Park	318	0	0	318
Moffett/Whisman Road	691	25	1,804	2,520
Monta Loma/Farley/Rock Street	84	1	0	85
North Bayshore	640	167	2,670	3,477
Springer/Cuesta/Phyllis	97	1	292	390
Grand Total	1,992	252	5,232	7,476

Table 58: Proposed Pipeline Projects Summarized by Precise Plan

Precise Plan	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Net New Units
East Whisman	598	83	2,215	2,896
El Camino Real	164	0	266	430
North Bayshore	640	167	2,670	3,477
Not in Precise Plan	590	2	81	673
Grand Total	1,992	252	5,232	7,476

- Proposed Projects – Rezoning Required

Proposed Project sites identified within this subcategory require rezoning, or are those that the City or affordable housing developers have acquired with the intent to redevelop. Among this project type are affordable developments on Montecito Avenue and Terra Bella Avenue as shown in Table 59. In addition, several sites on East Evelyn Avenue and one on Linda Vista Avenue have been acquired by the City or by affordable housing developers with the intent to build. These applications would be exempt from the City’s “gatekeeper” process because they are 100 percent affordable developments going through the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process to allocate City affordable housing funds, and the City and developer can be confident that they will proceed within the timeframe of the Housing Element. The number of units assumed on each site are based on discussions with the developers and are corroborated by the capacities of nearby and similar affordable housing developments. Sites in this subcategory include seven sites on parcels totaling approximately 8.6 acres. Refer to Figure 97.

Table 59: Pending Projects (Rezoning) Summarized by Project Address

Site Address	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Total Unit Capacity
1020 & 1040 Terra Bella Ave	108	0	0	108
1265 Montecito Ave	84	1	0	85
57 E Evelyn Avenue	42	0	0	42
67 E Evelyn Avenue	126	0	0	126
87 E Evelyn Avenue	150	0	0	150
1012 Linda Vista	69	0	0	69
Grand Total	579	1	0	580

Affordable Pending Proposed Projects

Many of the Pending Proposed Projects described above are 100 percent affordable developments. While these projects are at different points in the review process, all are expected to be developed within the 6th Cycle, even though they depend on City action, including funding, to proceed. Table 60 shows the status and steps necessary to bring these developments to fruition. A tentative timeline is also shown. In addition, Programs 1.2, 1.4, 1.7, 1.9, 1.10, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5. ensure that these projects will continue to move forward.

Table 60: Status and Expected Timeline of Major Proposed Affordable Developments

Address	Sponsor	City Subsidy	Expected Affordable Units	Estimated Construction Start	Next Steps (planning entitlement, building plans preparation, building permit issuance, construction, etc.)
1265 Montecito Avenue	Charities	\$16 million	85	2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning and entitlement expected December 2022 Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year
89 W. El Camino Real	First Community Housing	pending NOFA committee	61	2024/2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan development and NOFA Process — less than 1 year Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year
96 W. El Camino Real	Danco	pending NOFA committee	70	2024/2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan development and NOFA Process — less than 1 year Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year
1020 Terra Bella Avenue	Alta	\$13.5 million	108	2023/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan development and NOFA Process — less than 1 year Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year

Address	Sponsor	City Subsidy	Expected Affordable Units	Estimated Construction Start	Next Steps (planning entitlement, building plans preparation, building permit issuance, construction, etc.)
87 E. Evelyn Avenue	TBD	pending development agreement	150	2025/2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City-leased with intent to own & will be rezoned with Housing Element Update • Select developer— less than 1 year • Plan preparation & funding— approx. 1 year • Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year • Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year
57-67 E. Evelyn Avenue	Charities	pending NOFA committee	168	2025/2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan development and NOFA Process — TBD • Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year • Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year
1012 Linda Vista Avenue	Alta	pending NOFA committee	69	2024/2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan development and NOFA Process — less than 1 year • Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year • Building Permit and secure non-City funding — approx. 1 year

Address	Sponsor	City Subsidy	Expected Affordable Units	Estimated Construction Start	Next Steps (planning entitlement, building plans preparation, building permit issuance, construction, etc.)
Pear Ave. Sobrato Dedication	TBD	not yet known	112	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging for nearby development - 2 years • Select developer(s)— less than 1 year • Plan preparation & funding — less than 1 year • Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year • Building Permit —approx. 1 year
Middlefield Park Master Plan	TBD	not yet known	338	2027 – if land is dedicated in 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Action on Master Plan — 2022; Construction of the Master Plan anticipated to start in 2023. • Land dedication anticipated in Master Plan— 3 years • City to select nonprofit developer(s)— approximately 1 year • Plan preparation & funding — less than 1 year • Entitlement (SB 35) — less than 1 year • Building Permit — 6-9 months for each site

Address	Sponsor	City Subsidy	Expected Affordable Units	Estimated Construction Start	Next Steps (planning entitlement, building plans preparation, building permit issuance, construction, etc.)
North Bayshore Master Plan	TBD	not yet known	695	<p>Phase 1: 2028/2029, if land is dedicated by 2026</p> <p>Phase 2: by 2031, if land is dedicated by 2029</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council action on Master Plan — 2023 • Land dedication anticipated in Master Plan— Phase 1 by 2026; Phase 2 tentatively by 2029 • Start construction within two years from land dedication

Source: City of Mountain View, 2022.

Developable, Underutilized Opportunity Sites

These sites were filtered and selected as described in the Site Selection Process section, and will support multi-family housing at a minimum density of 30 dwelling units per acre. Almost all of these sites (96 percent) are within the recently updated Precise Plans for Downtown, East Whisman, El Camino Real, North Bayshore, and San Antonio, which are well distributed throughout the City as illustrated in Figure 9795. As shown in Table 61 and Table 62, the Opportunity Sites identified will provide capacity to develop at least 6,265 units across all City neighborhoods, within six Precise Plans.


Table 61: Opportunity Sites Summary by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Sum of Low Income Capacity	Sum of Moderate Income Capacity	Sum of Above Moderate Income Capacity	Sum of Net New Capacity
Central Neighborhoods	220	102	0	322
Grant Road/Sylvan Park	303	76	0	379
Moffett/Whisman Road	1,079	297	52	1,428
Monta Loma/Farley/Rock Street	66	85	0	151
North Bayshore	463	242	1,432	2,137
San Antonio/Rengstorff	613	585	0	1,198
Springer/Cuesta/Phyllis	383	267	0	650
Grand Total	3,127	1,654	1,484	6,265

Table 62: Opportunity Sites Summary by Precise Plan

Precise Plan	Sum of Low Income Capacity	Sum of Moderate Income Capacity	Sum of Above Moderate Income Capacity	Sum of Net New Capacity
Downtown	0	6	0	6
East Whisman	997	263	52	1,312
El Camino Real	1,127	778	0	1,905
Grant – Phyllis	201	121	0	322
North Bayshore	463	242	1,432	2,137
San Antonio	191	119	0	310
Not in Precise Plan	148	125	0	273
Grand Total	3,127	1,654	1,484	6,265

Figure 97: Summary of Opportunity Sites



Rezoned Opportunity Sites

Some Opportunity Sites were rezoned as a result of stakeholder input that was gathered during the development of the sites inventory process. These Opportunity Sites are consistent with General Plan direction and have been rezoned concurrent with this Housing Element Update before the beginning of the 6th cycle (though some actions will not take effect while others will be rezoned shortly after the start of the cycle)³².

These sites include the following:

- Existing shopping centers that were identified as “Village Centers” in the 2030 General Plan, where new residential development could be integrated into redeveloped neighborhood centers with a mix of uses.
- El Camino Real “Village Centers” that already allow up to 2.3 FAR through a legislative “floating zone” process—a process that is superseded by State law and the General Plan.

Many of these sites align with a variety of the evaluation criteria that make them ideal candidates for residential development given their proximity to services, goods, amenities, and transit.

Rezoned Opportunity Sites within the General Plan Village Centers and El Camino Real Village Center sites include a total of 25 parcels and yield 664 units total. Refer to Table 63 and Figure 97.

Table 63: Rezoned Opportunity Site Summarized by Designation

	Sum of Lower Income Units	Sum of Moderate Income Units	Sum of Above Moderate Income Units	Sum of Total Unit Capacity
General Plan Village Center	283	192	0	475
El Camino Real Village Center	131	59	0	189
Grand Total	413	251	0	664

Accessory Dwelling Unit

Accessory dwelling unit is a subcategory under the Opportunity Sites project type. An evaluation was conducted to determine the projected number of ADUs to be built within the planning period.

³² Though all pipeline and inventory sites have been rezoned consistent with the inventory by January 31, 2023 (with the exception of 1020 Terra Bella which is proceeding on its own schedule), some rezonings will not take effect until slightly afterward due to the City’s ordinance procedures.

Accessory dwelling units and junior accessory dwelling units are small, self-contained dwelling units that provide a kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping area. The unit can be attached to the main home with a separate entrance or can be a small, detached unit in the rear yard or above a garage (Mountain View Ordinance Section 36.12.60). Because of their small size (between 500 to 1,000 square feet), ADUs typically rent for less than apartments and can provide affordable rental options for smaller households, as well as affordable housing options for extended family. Consistent with State law, the City’s zoning permits one ADU and one JADU per parcel within single family residential zoning, and additional units within multi-family residential zoning. HCD guidance suggests that jurisdictions can assume that ADUs and JADUs continue to develop at the same pace that has occurred over the last three years. Between 2018 to 2020, 22 ADUs/JADUs were completed in Mountain View as shown in Table 64, with 2020 having 12 built ADUs/JADUs.

Table 64: Accessory Dwelling Units Built in Prior Housing Element Cycle

Year	2018	2019	2020	Total
Building Completed	5	5	12	22

Based on the trend of the 12 ADUs built in 2020, which is more than double from the prior year, the inventory assumed 96 ADUs total (12 units multiplied over an 8-year planning period). It is anticipated that a similar number of ADUs and JADUs, if not more, will be permitted and built in Mountain View during each year in the 6th cycle, with additional improvements to be made to ADU processes and public education, and through expanding policies and programs to further advance ADU/JADU development (for more information, refer to the Policies & Programs section of the Housing Element).

The affordability assumptions for ADUs/JADUs are based on a study prepared by UC Berkeley Center for Community Innovation (April 2021), noting that ADUs/JADUs in Santa Clara County are affordable to 50 percent of families (family of two) making equal to or less than 80 percent of AMI. By applying these assumptions to Mountain View, the results project the following as shown in Table 65.

Table 65: Accessory Dwelling Units Projected Over the Planning Period

Income Category	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Total ADUs	24	24	38	10	96
Percentages	25%	25%	40%	10%	100%

Source: ABAG. September 8, 2021. Draft Affordability of Accessory Dwelling Units. <http://21elements.com/documentsmainmenu-3/housing-elements/rhna-6-2022-2030/1327-draft-adu-affordability-report-sep-8-2021-1/file>

Evaluation of Sites Inventory Through the Lens of AFFH

AB 686 (Santiago) created a new requirement for local jurisdictions to evaluate their Housing Element sites inventories through the lens of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. The law requires that the site inventory be used to identify sites throughout the community, consistent with the local jurisdiction’s duty to affirmatively further fair housing. HCD’s guidance on implementation of the requirement for the sites inventory analysis states that it should address:

- **Improved Conditions:** A discussion of how the sites are identified in a manner that better integrates the community with a consideration for the historical patterns and trends, number of existing households, the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group and impacts on patterns of socio-economic and racial concentrations.
- **Exacerbated Conditions:** Similar to above, an explanation of identified sites relative to the impact on existing patterns of segregation and number of households relative to the magnitude (e.g., number of units) of the RHNA by income group.
- **Isolation of the RHNA:** An evaluation of whether the RHNA by income group is concentrated in areas of the community.
- **Local Data and Knowledge:** A consideration of current, planned and past developments, investment, policies, practices, demographic trends, public comment and other factors.
- **Other Relevant Factors:** Any other factors that influence the impacts of the identification of sites to accommodate the regional housing need on socio-economic patterns and segregation.

Overall, the Sites Inventory supports the City’s efforts to affirmatively further fair housing through the Housing Element Update process. The following discussion evaluates how the housing sites

inventory for the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element relates to various measures of affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) and Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence

Mountain View does not have any areas that qualify as R/ECAPS; thus, there is no concern about the distribution of lower-income RHNA sites potentially exacerbating R/ECAPS.

While Mountain View also does not have any areas that meet the technical definition for RCAAs, Figure 64 in Appendix B shows that most of the Census Tracts in Mountain View with high proportions of White residents also have relatively high median household incomes. The following subsection evaluates the site inventory in relation to areas with concentrations of White residents. The findings from that subsection also generally apply to the distribution of sites in relation to areas that have both a high concentration of White residents and a high median household income.

Areas with Concentrations of Minority Residents (percent of Population Non-White)

Mountain View is 60 percent non-White, and as a result most Mountain View residents live in neighborhoods with a majority non-White population. Within Mountain View there is some variation in the racial and ethnic mix between neighborhoods; Census Block Groups in Mountain View range from 39 percent non-White to 77 percent non-White, with Latino residents and Asian residents constituting a significant share of residents in some areas of the City. These trends are discussed in more detail in the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Section shown in Appendix B.

While lower-income RHNA sites are not found on every City block, they are distributed across all seven City neighborhoods. Table 66 provides an analysis of the site inventory in relation to the share of the population that is comprised of non-White residents. This analysis excludes the Census Block Group where the North Bayshore Master Plan is located (Census Tract 5046.01, Block Group 1), which is analyzed separately below. This Block Group is unique from the remainder of the City in that the units in the site inventory that would be located in this Block Group would significantly outnumber the existing units in the Block Group. As a result, construction of the units in the site inventory could have a significant effect on the racial and ethnic mix in the Block Group as new households move into new units. This potential change could occur even with no change in the composition of the existing households in the Block Group, most or all of which live in a mobile home park and would be subject to various protections under the Mountain View Municipal Code. The existing mobile home park is anticipated to remain throughout the planning period.

Table 66 shows the existing distribution of housing units in Mountain View in relation to the non-White share of the population in each Block Group. As shown, almost half (48 percent) of all existing housing units in Mountain View are located in Census Block Groups in which non-White residents constitute 55 to 65 percent of the Block Group's population. Among units in approved projects, pipeline projects, and available sites outside of the North Bayshore area, 74 percent of lower-income units are located in Census Block Groups where non-White residents constitute 55 to 65 percent of the Block Group's population, meaning that approximately three quarters of all lower-income units in

the site inventory outside of the North Bayshore area are located in areas with a racial and ethnic mix that is fairly typical for Mountain View.

As shown in Table 66, approximately 29 percent of existing housing units are located in Block Groups in which non-White residents constitute 65 percent of the population or more. Among lower-income units in the site inventory outside of the North Bayshore area, 19 percent would be located in these Block Groups, meaning that the site inventory does not overly concentrate affordable units in Block Groups with existing concentrations of non-White households.

Table 66 also demonstrates that the units in the site inventory are disproportionately located outside of areas with particularly small non-White populations. As shown, 23 percent of existing housing units in Mountain View are located in Block Groups in which non-White residents comprise less than 55 percent of the population. Among units in the site inventory, eight percent of lower-income units (excluding those in the North Bayshore area) would be located in Block Groups in which non-White residents comprise less than 55 percent of the population. This is due largely to the challenges associated with identifying viable housing opportunity sites in areas south of El Camino Real, which is where most of the City’s majority-White Block Groups are located. This Housing Element Update includes programs that will help to facilitate affordable housing production South of El Camino Real by allowing affordable multifamily housing in the R1 district when constructed in conjunction with non-profit religious and community assembly uses on large sites (Program 1.4) and facilitating ADU production and SB9 projects (Programs 1.6, 1.7, and 2.2). Units that would be facilitated through these programs are not captured in the site inventory.

Table 66: Distribution of the Sites Inventory by Block Group Racial and Ethnic Composition, Excluding the North Bayshore Area

Block Group Racial and Ethnic Composition	Existing Housing Units (a)	Lower-Income Units in Site Inventory (b)
Less than 55% Non-White	23%	4%
55%-65% Non-White	48%	74%
65% or more Non-White	29%	21%

Notes:

(a) Excludes existing households in the Census Block Group that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. This Block Group is analyzed separately.

(b) Includes units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites. Excludes units in the Census Tract that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. This Census Tract is analyzed separately.


Sources: US Census, 2020; BAE 2022.

In addition to the units evaluated in Table 66, the site inventory also includes 5,934 units in the Census Block Group that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. Within this Block Group, non-White residents comprise an estimated 69 percent of the population, higher than is typical within Mountain View. It should be noted that most if not all of the existing housing units in this

Census Tracts are in a mobile home park, which likely provides a comparatively affordable housing option. The 5,934 units in the site inventory are equal to approximately 16 times the number of existing units in this Census Tract. Of these units in the site inventory in this Census Tract, most (4,322 units) are anticipated to be affordable to above moderate-income households, with the remainder affordable to low-income or moderate-income households. The inclusion of a significant number of above moderate-income units in this area along with the smaller share of low- and moderate-income units will prevent a concentration of lower-income units in this Census Tract.

Figure 98 further demonstrates the findings described above. The figure shows the sites in the site inventory, including approved projects, pending projects, and opportunity sites, as well as the non-White share of the population in each Census Tract. In addition, the map also shows religious sites, on which the development of affordable housing will be facilitated by Program 1.4, and areas zoned for single-family use, which are potential sites for ADUs and SB9 projects that will be facilitated by Programs 1.6, 1.7, and 2.2. As shown, the sites are not concentrated in any one area of the City, nor are sites concentrated in areas with particularly high concentrations of non-White residents. The figure demonstrates that there is a shortage of sites in the Census Tracts with particularly low concentrations of non-White residents. However, the map also demonstrates that much of these Census Tracts are zoned for single-family use, enabling the creation of affordable units through ADUs or SB9 projects in these areas. These Census Tracts also include religious sites that could be potential future sites for affordable housing. The site inventory does not include ADUs, SB9 projects, or housing that could be built on religious sites, and therefore these units would be additive to units built on sites in the inventory.

Figure 98: Housing Sites by Share of Non-White Population



Concentrations of Poverty Level and Low and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods

Overall, Mountain View has very low levels of poverty, and its areas of highest concentration of households with income below poverty level only reach a maximum of 16.4 percent. There is a grouping of lower-income RHNA sites in one of two Census Tracts with between 10.0 and 16.4 percent poverty; however, sites are predominantly located in areas with poverty below 10 percent.

Table 67 demonstrates that the units in the site inventory – including all approved projects, pending projects, and units on available sites – would help to affirmatively further fair housing by expanding low-income housing opportunities in areas with comparatively low proportions of low- and moderate-income households. The table shows that approximately half (49 percent) of households in Mountain View live in Census Tracts where less than 35 percent of households have low or moderate incomes. Excluding units in the North Bayshore area, approved projects, pending projects, and available sites in the site inventory, 54 percent of lower-income units are in Census Tracts in which less than 35 percent of households have low or moderate incomes. This means that the lower-income units in the site inventory are disproportionately located in Census Tracts with relatively low existing concentrations of low- and moderate-income households.

Table 67: Distribution of the Sites Inventory by Census Tract Low- and Moderate-Income Composition, Excluding the North Bayshore Area

Census Tract Income Composition	Existing Housing Units (a)	Lower-Income Units in Site Inventory (b)
Less than 35% Low/Moderate Income	49%	54%
35% or higher Low/Moderate Income	51%	46%

Notes:

(a) Excludes existing households in the Census Tract that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. This Census Tract is analyzed separately.

(b) Includes units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites. Excludes units in the Census Tract that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. This Census Tract is analyzed separately.

Sources: US Census ACS, 2015-2019; BAE 2022.

The analysis shown in Table 67 excludes the Census Tract that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan area (Census Tract 5046.01). As noted above, this Census Tract is unique from the remainder of the City in that the units in the site inventory that would be located in this Census Tract would significantly outnumber the existing units in the Tract. As a result, construction of the units in the site inventory would likely have a significant effect on the income distribution in the Census Tract as new households move into new units that target households at a range of income levels.

As shown in Table 68, an estimated 53 percent of households in Census Tract 5046.01 are low or moderate-income households, making this one of the Census Tracts with the largest concentrations of low- and moderate-income households in Mountain View. This is likely because the most if not all

of the existing housing units in this Census Tract are in a mobile home park, which tend to provide a comparatively affordable housing option. In total, there are an estimated 370 existing households in this Census Tract.

Among approved projects, pipeline projects, and units on available sites, 27 percent of the units in this Census Tract would consist of low- or moderate-income units, a significantly lower proportion than among existing households in this Census Tract. Assuming no change in the household income distribution among existing units in the Census Tract, the addition of these units would result in an estimated 29 percent of households in the Census Tract having low or moderate incomes. As shown in Table 67 above, approximately half of all households in Mountain View live in Census Tracts in which 35 percent of households have low or moderate incomes, meaning that the construction of the units in the site inventory would make the concentration of low- and moderate-income households in the North Bayshore area lower than the existing concentration in most areas of the City.

Table 68: Site Inventory Distribution of Low- and Moderate-Income Units, North Bayshore Area

	Existing Housing Units	Units in Site Inventory	Total
All Units	370	5,934	6,304
Low-Income & Moderate-Income Households/Units (a)	196	1,612	1,808
% Low/Moderate Income	53%	27%	29%


Note:

(a) The number of low/moderate-income units among existing units is estimated based on the share of existing households in the Census Tract with low or moderate incomes.

Sources: US Census ACS, 2015-2019; BAE 2022.

Figure 99 further demonstrates the findings described above. The figure shows the sites in the site inventory, including approved projects, pending projects, and opportunity sites, as well as the share of low- and moderate-income households in each Census Tract. The map also shows religious sites, where the development of affordable housing will be facilitated by Program 1.4, and areas zoned for single-family use, which are potential sites for ADUs and SB9 projects that will be facilitated by Programs 1.6, 1.7, and 2.2. Apart from the North Bayshore area, the map does not show any significant concentrations of units in areas with large existing concentrations of low- and moderate-income households. Within the North Bayshore areas, most new units are anticipated to be affordable to above moderate-income households, as discussed above and therefore the addition of units in that portion of the City would not increase the existing concentration of low- and moderate-income households in this area. The map also demonstrates that many of the Census Tracts with low proportions of low- and moderate-income households are zoned for single-family use and include religious sites, and therefore could be potential locations for the construction of affordable units through ADUs, SB9 projects, or development of affordable housing on religious sites.

Figure 99: Housing Sites by Share of Low- and Moderate-Income Households



Environmental Conditions (CalEnviroScreen)

Sites are well distributed, with significant concentrations of RHNA sites in areas with the lowest percentile (best) scores. There are also concentrations of sites in the City's areas that have higher percentile scores; however, the City's percentile scores rise only to 50.5 percent at their highest, meaning that these sites are in areas that still rank well on a statewide basis. Some areas with high CalEnviroScreen scores, most notably the North Bayshore area, are anticipated to accommodate a portion of the City's RHNA. These areas have high CalEnviroScreen scores largely due to the proximity to Highway 101. While the site inventory does include affordable units in these areas, most of these units are anticipated to be affordable to above moderate-income households. Therefore, the site inventory does not concentrate affordable units in areas with high CalEnviroScreen scores.

Access to Opportunity (TCAC/HCD Opportunity Areas)

The TCAC/HUD Opportunity Index designates most of Mountain View as either a "highest resource," "high resource," or "moderate resource (rapidly changing)." The exception is the Census Tract that is located north of Highway 101, which encapsulates the North Bayshore Master Plan Area. The North Bayshore area currently has access to a significant number of jobs and is the subject of a major precise plan that will bring new development and services to the area, helping to improve access to opportunity. The City prepared and adopted the North Bayshore Precise Plan to create a complete community north of Highway 101, including new neighborhood-serving retail and services, new open spaces, land for a new school, and transit improvements along North Shoreline Boulevard to connect the area to the Downtown Transit Center and the rest of the City. The North Bayshore Master Plan, a development framework to implement the vision of the Precise Plan, is already under review, with approval expected in 2023. This Master Plan includes up to 7,000 dwelling units as well as services, open spaces, a school and mobility improvements to vastly improve the quality of life for existing residents north of Highway 101.

Construction of the units in the site inventory will help to improve access to opportunity and affirmatively further fair housing in Mountain View. With the exception of units in the North Bayshore Master Plan area, more than half (52 percent) of all lower-income units in the site inventory are located in "highest resource" areas and 43 percent are located in "high resource" areas, while five percent are located in "moderate resource (rapidly changing)" areas, as shown in Table 69.

Table 69: Site Inventory Distribution by TCAC/HUD Opportunity Area, Excluding the North Bayshore Area

Opportunity Index Designation	Existing Housing Units (a)	Lower-Income Units in Site Inventory (b)
Highest Resource	41%	52%
High Resource	45%	43%
Moderate Resource (rapidly changing)	14%	5%
Low Resource	0%	0%

Notes:


(a) Excludes existing households in the Census Block Group that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. This Block Group is analyzed separately.

(b) Includes units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites. Excludes units in the Census Tract that encompasses the North Bayshore Master Plan. These Census Tracts are analyzed separately.

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; BAE, 2022.

Figure 100 further demonstrates the findings described above. The figure shows the sites in the site inventory, including approved projects, pending projects, and opportunity sites, as well as the TCAC Opportunity Index score in each Census Tract. The map also shows religious sites, where the development of affordable housing will be facilitated by Program 1.4, and areas zoned for single-family use, which are potential sites for ADUs and SB9 projects that will be facilitated by Programs 1.6, 1.7, and 2.2. Apart from the North Bayshore area, the vast majority of sites are located in High Resource and Highest Resource areas, with the remainder located in Moderate Resource Areas. While there are a significant number of sites in the North Bayshore area, which is designated as a Low Resource area, implementation of the North Bayshore Master Plan is anticipated to improve access to opportunity in this area, as discussed above. The map also shows that there is significant potential for development of affordable housing on religious sites in High Resource and Highest Resources areas. In addition, there is potential for development of ADUs and SB9 projects in High and Highest Resource areas that are zoned for single-family use.

Figure 100: Housing Sites by TCAC Opportunity Score



Education Domain Scores

The geographic distribution of units in the site inventory will help to improve access to opportunity and affirmatively further fair housing in Mountain View. As shown in Table 70, approximately half (49 percent) of all existing housing units in Mountain View are located in Census Tracts with an Educational Domain score under 80 percent, with the remainder (51 percent) in Census Tracts with an Education Domain score of 80 percent or higher. Among lower-income units in the site inventory, 66 percent are located in Census Tracts with an education domain score of 80 percent or higher. This means that lower-income sites are disproportionately located in areas with high education domain scores. Many Census Tracts with Education Domain scores under 80 percent also have significantly higher scores than the regional (San Mateo and Santa Clara County) median of 60 percent.

Table 70: Site Inventory Distribution by Education Domain Score

Census Tract Education Domain Score	Existing Housing Units	Lower-Income Units in Site Inventory (a)
Less than 80%	49%	34%
80% or higher	51%	66%

Note:

(a) Includes units in approved projects, pending projects, and available sites.

Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee; HCD; 2022.

Transportation Access (Housing + Transportation Cost as percent of Income)

Most of the housing Opportunity Sites are located in areas with lower (best) to moderate H+T cost as a percentage of income for a moderate-income household. Many of the housing sites are spread along El Camino Real with significant transit options.

Access to Jobs (Jobs Proximity Index)

All of Mountain View has either a jobs proximity index value of 51 to 74 or 75 to 99 (with 100 being the best); thus, all of the lower-income RHNA sites are in locations with good access to jobs. Many of the sites that are in the areas with values in the 51 to 74 range are directly across El Camino Real from areas ranked 75 to 99.

Housing Element Actions to Address AFFH Implications of the Site Inventory. This analysis demonstrates that the site inventory supports the City’s efforts to affirmatively further fair housing by identifying sites for a significant number of affordable units in high-resource areas with access to opportunity and areas with relatively low proportions of low- and moderate-income households.

While the site inventory does not concentrate sites for affordable units in areas with existing concentrations of non-White households, it also does not include a significant number of sites in predominantly White areas. This is due primarily to the challenges associated with identifying housing opportunity sites in areas south of El Camino Real, an area that is characterized by high-

value single-family homes, where most of the predominantly White Census Block Groups in Mountain View are located. While the site inventory does identify some sites within this area, due to the high value of the existing homes and challenges with site assembly, much of this area would be unlikely to meet HCD's criteria for lower-income housing opportunity sites even if rezoned at to allow for higher densities. This Housing Element Update includes programs that will help to facilitate affordable housing production South of El Camino Real by allowing affordable multifamily housing in the R1 district when constructed in conjunction with non-profit religious and community assembly uses on large sites (Program 1.4) and facilitating ADU production and SB9 projects (Programs 1.6, 1.7 and 2.2). Units that would be facilitated through these programs are not captured in the site inventory.

Local Data and Knowledge

The sites inventory includes a number of parcels in the part of Mountain View located north of Highway 101, which is currently classified by the HCD/TCAC Opportunity Areas map as a Low Resource area. The Low Resource classification is likely due to fact that the area has historically been a non-residential area with limited amenities for residents; however, this area is planned for substantial housing development in the 2023 to 2031 Housing Element planning period and beyond via the North Bayshore Precise Plan. The implementation of the precise plan can be considered a place-based strategy that will help to transform the area into a vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood that is well connected to the rest of the City of Mountain View and has access to the largest concentration of jobs in the City. The first guiding principle of the precise plan is to create complete neighborhoods, calling for the blending of residential, commercial, and office uses with services, open space, and transportation options for residents and area employees. While the precise plan includes a number of sites identified to accommodate a portion of the City's lower-income RHNA, the precise plan calls for new residential development to be mixed-income, 20 percent affordable units and the balance market rate units.

During the public review process for the Housing Element Update, some stakeholders commented that they wished to see more housing Opportunity Sites identified in the more affluent neighborhoods south of El Camino Real. In response to those comments, the Housing Sites inventory process included an evaluation of additional sites south of El Camino Real, including religious sites and shopping centers.

- While religious sites did not meet the Opportunity Sites criteria, primarily because there are few precedents involving church sites and multi-family development, the Housing Element includes a program to allow religious sites additional density when constructing affordable housing developments on their land.
- Several shopping centers south of El Camino Real were identified as "Village Centers" in the 2030 General Plan, where new housing could be allowed in the context of redeveloped neighborhood shopping sites. Zoning amendments adopted with the Housing Element Update implemented this General Plan direction. These sites were included in the sites inventory if they are consistent with the underutilized sites methodology (see Rezoned Opportunity Sites section).

In addition, the area does include a substantial amount land zoned R3 (Multiple Family), primarily just south of El Camino Real. The sites inventory is not targeting rezoning of land zoned R1 (Single Family) in the areas south of El Camino Real. Although there are practical reasons for this, such as a lack of vacant land in the R1 district that meets the State’s criteria for housing sites (e.g., larger than one-half acre, vacant, likely to redevelop in the 2023-2031 time period), there are still opportunities for new housing for lower-income households in the form of potential Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units that could be added to existing single-family lots, as well as the potential for some densification of the neighborhood through the provisions of SB9.

In addition, the City identified several “back-pocket” rezonings that could be carried out in case Opportunity Sites are developed with uses other than the income level signified in the sites inventory. Some of these sites are in high opportunity areas, including the following:

- The Downtown Transit Center, which may be an opportunity for a joint development with CalTrain; and
- Other nonresidential sites south of El Camino Real, such as 1949 Grant Road and offices near Blossom Valley Shopping Center.

Summary of Conclusions and Approach to Policies and Programs

The sites inventory and the housing development opportunities that it provides will help to affirmatively further fair housing. Overall, the sites inventory does not exacerbate fair housing issues, such as contribute to R/ECAPS, RCAAs, or racial or ethnic isolation or segregation; nor does it overly concentrate lower income housing Opportunity Sites in any single area of the City. It does not concentrate lower-income housing Opportunity Sites in areas that already have significant concentrations of poverty or areas of racial or ethnic isolation or segregation. In contrast, opportunities for housing development for lower-income households are identified in areas with high opportunity and good access to jobs, transportation, and a healthy environment.

The sites inventory, which fully accommodates the City’s share of the regional housing need for the 2023 to 2031 planning period, along with a substantial buffer, also helps to affirmatively further fair housing from a regional perspective by creating opportunities for housing development for households at all income levels in a location that has outstanding access to jobs, services, a healthy environment, and other amenities that support a high quality of life and positive life outcomes for residents.

A robust roster of local policies and programs will complement the sites inventory to help protect housing opportunities for existing lower-income households, households with special needs, and minorities, and work to ensure equitable access to housing within the community for all socio-economic segments of the community as well as prospective residents.

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1500 SHORELINE BL	94043-1314	11613030	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~157	15.75	one-story single tenant cinema; surrounded on all sides with projects under review that are expected to be entitled by 2023; FAR: 0.10; Year Built: 1986	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (3.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1280 SPACE PARK WY	94043-1434	11614071	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~157	0.98	two-story light industrial/science laboratory - FAR: 0.42; Year Built: 1959	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (3.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1060 LA AVENIDA	94043-1422	11614107	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~71	1.24	one-story light industrial/consultant office - FAR: 0.364; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1070 LA AVENIDA	94043-1422	11614108	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~71	1.07	one-story USPS Carrier Annex - FAR: 0.334; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1080 LA AVENIDA A	94043-1422	11614109	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~71	0.92	one-story light industrial/medical clinic - FAR: 0.331; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1090 LA AVENIDA	94043-1422	11614110	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~71	0.96	one-story light industrial space - FAR: 0.31; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1350 PEAR AV	94043-1302	11614114	Not Applicable	North Bayshore Mixed-Use	P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	0	~157	0.84	one-story vacant, multi-tenant light industrial - FAR: 0.332; Year Built: 1987	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (3.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2483 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WY	94043-2330	14711025	C	General Mixed-Use	CRA	0	43	1.34	one-story restaurant with two-story office behind - FAR: 0.384; Year Built: 1973; tenant vacancy signs at both 2483 and 2485 Old Middlefield Way which have the same ownership	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site		
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2485 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WY	94043-2316	14711029	C	General Mixed-Use	CRA	0	43	0.50	one-story vacant service/light industrial building - FAR: 0.375; Year Built: 1963; tenant vacancy signs at both 2483 and 2485 Old Middlefield Way which have the same ownership	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site		
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2495 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WY	94043-2316	14711034	Not Applicable	General Mixed-Use	CRA	0	43	0.56	one-story single tenant liquor store - FAR: 0.168; Year Built: 1977	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site		
MOUNTAIN VIEW	110 N RENGSTORFF AV	94043-4222	14736025	Not Applicable	Neighborhood Mixed-Use	CN	0	~30	0.44	gas station - FAR: 0.028; Year Built: 1958	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~30 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2312 ALMA ST	94043	14736037	Not Applicable	Neighborhood Mixed-Use	CN	0	~30	0.97	one-story retail (salon, insurance, restaurants) - FAR: 0.211; Year Built: 1960	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~30 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	112 N RENGSTORFF AV	94043-4222	14736038	Not Applicable	Neighborhood Mixed-Use	CN	0	~30	1.72	one-story restaurant and vacant fitness center - FAR: 0.268; Year Built: 1960	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~30 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	298 SAN ANTONIO RD	94040-1212	14815017	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.53	one-story medical offices - FAR: 0.298; Year Built: 1965	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2630 CALIFORNIA ST	94040-1206	14815018	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	1.05	one-story retail (laundromat, convenience store, auto parts) - FAR: 0.193; Year Built: 1900	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2633 CALIFORNIA ST	94040-1205	14815021	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.40	one-story single tenant restaurant - FAR: 0.099; Year Built: 1964	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	384 SAN ANTONIO RD	94040-1214	14815022	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.98	one-story single tenant bank - FAR: 0.252; Year Built: 1971	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2690 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1117	14816001	E	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	1.03	vacant, single tenant car wash - FAR: 0.1; Year Built: 1962	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2674 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1117	14816004	E	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.26	one-story single tenant service building (associated with adjacent closed car wash at 2690 W El Camino Real); Year Built: 1955	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2630 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1117	14816012	A	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.79	one-story pharmacy that is part of a multi-tenant shopping center - average FAR: 0.15 for adjoining sites at 2630 W El Camino Real and Fayette Drive (APN 14816013); Year Built: 1972; part of a consolidated site with common ownership with potential to develop as one project	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	22	0	22	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	FAYETTE DR	94040	14816013	A	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.32	Parking lot (serving adjacent multi-tenant retail) - average FAR: 0.15 for adjoining sites at 2630 W El Camino Real and Fayette Drive (APN 14816013); Year Built: Not Applicable (no building on site); part of a consolidated site with common ownership with potential to develop as one project	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	4	0	4	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	FAYETTE DR	94040	14816014	F	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.15	Parking lot (serving adjacent retail) - FAR: 0; Year Built: Not Applicable (no building on site)	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2600 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1117	14816015	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.50	one-story bank that is part of a multi-tenant shopping center - FAR: 0.19; Year Built: 1972	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	6	0	6	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	630 SAN ANTONIO RD	94040	14816016	F	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	2.82	one-story vacant, single tenant grocery store - FAR: 0.292; Year Built: 1972	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	150	20	0	170	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	608 SAN ANTONIO RD	94040-1304	14816017	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	1.03	one-story single tenant bank - FAR: 0.222; Year Built: 1970	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	100 SAN ANTONIO CL	94040-1210	14817001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	63-89	0.51	one-story glass retailer/service - FAR: 0.258; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2560 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1307	14821008	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Center	P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	0	~65	0.75	one-story single tenant restaurant - FAR: 0.175; Year Built: 1981	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2464 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1421	14828005	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.61	one-story six-unit retail (beauty, wellness, acupuncture, restaurant) - FAR: 0.167; Year Built: 1984	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	37	0	37	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2320 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1420	14836001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.40	one-story vacant single tenant retail - FAR: 0.39; Year Built: 1969; a chain link fence surrounds the site	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2124 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1612	14836027	B	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.74	one-story vacant, single tenant retail - FAR: 0.402; Year Built: 1960; chain link fence surrounds the adjoining parcels at 2116 and 2100 W El Camino Real; 2116, 2100, and 2124 W El Camino Real are under the same ownership	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2116 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1612	14836028	B	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	1.00	one-story vacant, single tenant retail - FAR: 0.17; Year Built: 1995; chain link fence surrounds the parcels at 2116 and 2100 W El Camino Real; 2116, 2100, and 2124 W El Camino Real are under the same ownership	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2100 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-1612	14836029	B	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.52	one-story vacant, single tenant retail - FAR: 0.176; Year Built: 1960; chain link fence surrounds the parcels at 2116 and 2100 W El Camino Real; 2116, 2100, and 2124 W El Camino Real are under the same ownership	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	400 A MOFFETT BL	94043	15324016	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	CN	0	~72	1.64	one-story 4-unit commercial (beauty, cleaners, mini-mart, gun shop) - FAR: 0.196; Year Built: 1969	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~72 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1398 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2404	15430015	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.53	one-story six-unit commercial (beauty, computer service, vaping, fitness) - FAR: 0.282; Year Built: 1975	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1288 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2402	15430044	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.96	gas station - FAR: 0.059; Year Built: 1972	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1905 LATHAM ST	94040-2107	15436007	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.74	one-story retail (convenience, laundromat, restaurants) - FAR: 0.266; Year Built: 1964	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1962 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2002	15436012	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.80	one-story single tenant restaurant - FAR: 0.123; Year Built: 1971	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1952 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2002	15436014	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.03	one-story party supply store; property owner is marketing the site - FAR: 0.444; Year Built: 1959	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	61	0	0	61	Opportunity Site - EI Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1910 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2002	15436018	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	2.47	one-story six-unit retail (furniture, restaurants, fitness) with tenant vacancy - FAR: 0.318; Year Built: 1984	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	30	0	30	Opportunity Site - EI Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2080 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437006	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.45	single tenant, self car wash - FAR: 0.149; Year Built: 1968	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2090 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437007	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.56	one-story single tenant, fountain store - FAR: 0.043; Year Built: 1958; building is not well maintained/ boarded up windows	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2098 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437008	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.45	one-story single tenant fast food - FAR: 0.1; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	615 S RENGSTORFF AV	94040-2105	15437009	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.60	one-story four-unit commercial (convenience, restaurant, beauty, laundry) - FAR: 0.207; Year Built: 1974	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2034 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437015	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.73	one-story single tenant mattress store - FAR: 0.221; Year Built: 1960	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2020 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437016	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.64	one-story retail (restaurant, florist, vacuum store) - FAR: 0.077; Year Built: 1951	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2026 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2104	15437018	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.52	vacant one-story restaurant - FAR: 0.172; Year Built: 1952; site is surrounded by a chain link fence; the building has not been well maintained (signs of graffiti)/boarded up windows	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	30 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040	15801001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.36	one-story single tenant tire store - FAR: 0.27; Year Built: 1965	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	21	0	21	Opportunity Site - EI Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	40 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040	15801002	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.20	one-story single tenant tire store - FAR: 0.27; Year Built: 1965	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	12	0	12	Opportunity Site - EI Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	62 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040	15801003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.55	one-story single tenant truck rental - FAR: 0.035; Year Built: 1979	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	93	0	0	93	Opportunity Site - EI Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	200 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2606	15805112	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.45	one-story single tenant fast food - FAR: 0.131; Year Built: 1969	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	286 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2606	15805113	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.43	one-story single tenant restaurant - FAR: 0.146; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	624 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2508	15806006	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - EI Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.28	one-story vacant, single tenant car service building - FAR: 0.159; Year Built: 1958; building is not well maintained/ boarded up windows	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	S OAK ST	94041	15807007	D	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.10	parking lot for medical office at 1128 W El Camino Real - FAR: Not Applicable; Year Built: Not Applicable	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1128 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2518	15807025	D	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.42	one-story single tenant medical office - FAR: 0.285; Year Built: 1945	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1134 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2518	15807026	D	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.64	two-story vacant offices - FAR: 0.154	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	785 CASTRO ST	94041-2013	15809009	Not Applicable	Downtown Mixed-Use	P(19) - Downtown Precise Plan	0	50	0.28	one-story vacant offices - FAR: 0.30; Year Built: 1970	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site		
MOUNTAIN VIEW	495 MOFFETT BL	94043-4727	15849002	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	CRA	0	43	0.96	gas station - FAR: 0.04; Year Built: 1968	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site		
MOUNTAIN VIEW	282 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-3910	16026007	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~45	1.19	vacant; chain link fence surround the site; no site infrastructure or improvements is present	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	N WHISMAN RD	94043	16028003	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~45	0.50	Parking lot for fast food at 209 W Middlefield Road - FAR: 0; Year Built: Not Applicable (no building on site)	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	209 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-3909	16028004	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~45	0.55	one-story single tenant fast food - FAR: 0.161; Year Built: 1984	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	295 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-3909	16028005	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~45	0.45	one-story single tenant restaurant/deli - FAR: 0.09; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	295 E MIDDLEFIELD RD		16028006	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~45	0.13	one-story single tenant restaurant/deli - FAR: 0.09; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	325 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043	16052010	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	2.05	one-story light industrial - FAR: 0.373; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	335 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-4028	16052011	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	0.93	one-story light industrial - FAR: 0.357; Year Built: 1982	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	345 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-4067	16052012	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	1.07	one-story light industrial - FAR: 0.339; Year Built: 1959	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	460 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-4032	16053005	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	147 - 169	1.27	one-story light industrial/service agency office - FAR: 0.333; Year Built: 1977	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (3.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	450 E MIDDLEFIELD RD	94043-4006	16053006	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	147 - 169	1.00	one-story light industrial - FAR: 0.307; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (3.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	475 ELLIS ST	94043-2203	16058011	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	4.49	one-story light industrial - FAR: 0.335; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent. projects.	

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	815 MAUDE AV	94043-4021	16059001	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	0.93	one-story church office - FAR: 0.21; Year Built: 1962	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	835 MAUDE AV	94043-4021	16059002	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	0.90	one-story light industrial office - FAR: 0.381; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	855 MAUDE AV	94043-4021	16059003	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	0.97	one-story light industrial office - FAR: 0.369; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	875 MAUDE AV	94043-4021	16059004	Not Applicable	East Whisman Mixed-Use	P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	0	~112	0.96	one-story vacant light industrial office - FAR: 0.39; Year Built: 1963	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (2.5). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on a proportional increase or decrease of similar district's precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	820 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2836	16110003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	1.37	one story four-unit commercial (restaurant, beauty salon, chiropractors) - FAR: 0.235; Year Built: 1971	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1953 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2262	17005016	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.46	one-story single tenant deli - FAR: 0.084; Year Built: 1970	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2065 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040	17005026	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	1.32	one-story single tenant daycare center - FAR: 0.248; Year Built: 1980	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1901 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2216	17006006	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.27	one-story single tenant rental car location - FAR: 0.11; Year Built: 1958	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	16	0	16	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	910 EL MONTE AV	94040-2319	17006007	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.10	one-story single tenant office supply store - FAR: 0.424; Year Built: 1952; located in a high opportunity area and adjacent to existing residential	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	66	0	0	66	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1949 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2216	17006058	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.32	one-story multi-tenant retail (pet store, pool store, auto parts, shipping) - average FAR: 0.22 for 1949, 1921 and 1935 W El Camino Real; Year Built: 1984; part of a consolidated site with common ownership with potential to develop as one project; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	4	0	4	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1921 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2216	17006060	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.30	one-story multi-tenant retail (pet store, pool store, auto parts, shipping) - average FAR: 0.22 for 1949, 1921 and 1935 W El Camino Real; Year Built: 1984; part of a consolidated site with common ownership with potential to develop as one project; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	16	0	0	16	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1935 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2216	17006062	G	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	1.66	one-story multi-tenant retail (pet store, pool store, auto parts, shipping) - average FAR: 0.22 for 1949, 1921 and 1935 W El Camino Real; Year Built: 1984; part of a consolidated site with common ownership with potential to develop as one project; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	20	0	0	20	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1010 EL MONTE AV	94040-2321	17007067	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.31	gas station - FAR: 0.074; Year Built: 1955	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	810 MIRAMONTE AV	94040-2514	18902024	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.32	one-story single tenant auto repair - FAR: 0.081; Year Built: 1963	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1708 MIRAMONTE AV	94040-3763	18906096	Not Applicable	Neighborhood Mixed-Use	CN	0	~30	0.32	gas station - FAR: 0.08; Year Built: 1955	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~30 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.

HCD Sites Inventory Table A

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Inter section	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 Information 1	Optional Information 2	Optional Information 3
MOUNTAIN VIEW	595 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2641	19303044	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.40	one-story single tenant paint store - FAR: 0.26; Year Built: 1981	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	215 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2605	19304006	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.39	one-story single tenant tire store - FAR: 0.077; Year Built: 1959	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	239 W EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2605	19304018	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	41-50	0.28	one story single tenant liquor store - FAR: 0.183; Year Built: 1971	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.35). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1504 GRANT RD	94040-3214	19312001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(27) - Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan	0	~72	5.08	large multi-tenant shopping center with one-story buildings (grocery and various other retail uses) - FAR: 0.242; Year Built: 1973; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	51	0	0	51	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~72 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	975 BAY ST	94040-2626	19314001	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.39	single tenant self car wash - FAR: 0.095; Year Built: 1965	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	23	0	23	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1220 GRANT RD	94040-3227	19314011	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(27) - Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan	0	~72	0.36	gas station - FAR: 0.131; Year Built: 1963	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~72 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1250 Grant Road	94040-3227	19314012	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(27) - Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan	0	~72	5.62	supermarket - FAR: 0.23; Year Built: 1971	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site - General Plan Village Center		Rezoned to allow residential at approximately ~72 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	101 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2701	19742003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	0.58	gas station - FAR: 0.063; Year Built: 1967	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	35	0	35	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	121 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2701	19742004	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor (ECR Village Center)	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	47-93	7.96	large multi-tenant shopping center with one-story buildings (pharmacy and various other retail uses) - FAR: 0.257; Year Built: 1966; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	96	0	0	96	Opportunity Site - El Camino Real	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	Rezoned to 2.3 FAR, allowing approximately 65-111 DU/ac. Rezoning not necessary to meet RHNA.
MOUNTAIN VIEW	789 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2833	19801003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	4.59	electronics store with other retail tenants - FAR: 0.275; Year Built: 1971; located in high opportunity area	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	55	0	0	55	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	825 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2807	19807003	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.29	one story single tenant restaurant - FAR: 0.095; Year Built: 1968	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	831 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2807	19807004	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	1.16	one-story single tenant used goods retail - FAR: 0.231; Year Built: 1966	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	
MOUNTAIN VIEW	891 E EL CAMINO REAL	94040-2807	19807008	Not Applicable	Mixed-Use Corridor	P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	0	65-111	0.40	one-story single tenant rental car location - FAR: 0.059; Year Built: 1963	Yes - current	No - Privately-Owned	Available	Not Used in Prior Housing Element	0	0	0	0	Opportunity Site	Maximum Density set by FAR (1.85). Maximum dwelling units per acre shown is based on the range of precedent projects.	

HCD Sites Inventory Table B: this is intentionally blank

HCD Sites Inventory Table C

Zoning Designation From Table A, Column G and Table B, Columns L and N (e.g., "R-1")	General Land Uses Allowed (e.g., "Low-density residential")
R1	Low-Density Residential, up to approximately 6 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV3SIMIR1ZODIST
R2	Medium Low-Density Residential, up to approximately 12 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV4ONTMIR2ZODIST
R3-1	Medium Density Residential, up to approximately 35 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV5MUMIR3ZODIST
R3-1.25	Medium Density Residential, up to approximately 35 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV5MUMIR3ZODIST
R3-2	Medium Density Residential, up to approximately 22 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV5MUMIR3ZODIST
R3-3sd	Medium Density Residential, up to approximately 15 DU/ac - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTIVREZO_DIV5MUMIR3ZODIST
P	Planned Community (Planned Development zoning), uses depend on approval -
CN	Neighborhood-serving commercial - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTVCOZO_DIV4COIGCNZODIST
CRA	Multi-family residential up to 43 DU/ac, office, commercial, hotels, etc - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTVCOZO_DIV6CORETECRZODIST
MM	Industrial - https://library.municode.com/ca/mountain_view/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIITHCO_CH36ZO_ARTVIINZO_DIV5GEINMMZODIST
P(19) - Downtown Precise Plan	Downtown Mixed Use (commercial, office, multi-family residential) - https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=29
P(27) - Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan	Shopping center (commercial); General Plan allows residential up to 1.85 FAR and Precise Plan will be amended -
P(38) - El Camino Real Precise Plan	Multi-family residential up to 1.35/1.85/2.3 FAR (depending on area), office, commercial, hotels, etc -
P(39) - North Bayshore Precise Plan	Multi-family residential up to 1.85/3.5/4.5 FAR (depending on area), office, commercial, hotels, etc -
P(40) - San Antonio Precise Plan	Multi-family residential up to 1.85/2.35 FAR (depending on area), office, commercial, hotels, etc -
P(41) - East Whisman Precise Plan	Multi-family residential up to 1.85/2.5/3.5 FAR (depending on area), office, commercial, hotels, etc -



APPENDIX

F

Summary of Public Input

Countywide Meeting Summary




Mountain View: Introducing the Housing Element Update

A series of countywide meetings about the Housing Element update were held from August to September 2021. Each meeting offered Spanish-language interpretation and 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. Breakout room discussions with individual cities and towns followed.

Who We Heard From


In total 832 registered for the series. Of those who registered for the series, the majority identified as White and over half were 50 years or older. Over sixty percent lived over 21 years within the county, and over half were homeowners.

How long have you lived in County?




■ Don't live here ■ 0-5 years ■ 6-10 years
■ 11-20 years ■ 21+ years

Living Situation



■ Live with friends or family ■ Own ■ Rent ■ Other

Type of Home



■ ADU ■ Apartment ■ Single family home ■ Mobile or Manufactured home ■ Other

Countywide Meeting Summary



Mountain View was part of the August 30th, 2021 introductory meeting, along with Milpitas, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara. This meeting offered Vietnamese interpretation in addition to Spanish, courtesy of the City of Milpitas, and outreach for the meeting was conducted in the three languages. Twenty-seven people who registered for the August 30th meeting identified as living in Mountain View. Of the Mountain View participants, half indicated owning their home. A majority of them indicated that they lived in an apartment or condo and one indicated living in a mobile or manufactured home. Half of participants were between the ages of 30-49 and half identified as White.

What We Heard

Main Meeting

People were asked to share a word in the chat describing housing now at the beginning of the meeting, and the housing they envisioned in their communities ten years from now.

Now



In 2030



English-language Breakout Session

In the breakout session, participants expressed that they valued living in Mountain View. However, they recognized that there is a substantial imbalance between jobs and housing. They also shared a desire for more walkable and connected neighborhoods, particularly in neighborhoods with more affordable housing options like rowhouses. Participants identified parking as an inefficient use of land that contributes to pollution and raises rental prices as well. Ideas to address these needs included rezoning land for five times the City's allocated RHNA number to build in a buffer since only 20% of the available sites were developed during the last RHNA cycle.

Spanish-language Breakout Session

Mountain View residents participating in the Spanish-language breakout room recognized recent efforts the City has made to boost affordable housing and expressed appreciation for them. At the same time, they acknowledged that much more is needed. They expressed the need for the City to preserve mobile homes, as they are one of the few remaining affordable housing options for many immigrant low-wage workers. Other housing challenges they recognized are the lack of housing

Countywide Meeting Summary



options for older adults and young people, and the lack of options and services for people who are homeless. Participants pointed out that there often isn't enough of an effort to engage young people in housing discussions and suggested the City focus on engaging them as well. Among ideas to address Mountain View's housing challenges were: promoting affordable housing opportunities and removing barriers to apply for them, preservation of mobile home parks, a community or tenant opportunity to purchase program, and a young adult housing program.

Post Event Survey

The post-event survey reflected the variety of opinions present on issues ranging from a desire to preserve communities as they are, to an appeal for more and diverse housing everywhere in the county. Community members responded that they valued the space and the information provided within it and would like to have longer times for such community discussions in the future so all participants can share their thoughts. Additionally, they suggested the City target outreach for future housing element engagement opportunities to the local day worker center and the Mobile Home Alliance.

Mountain View Appendix

Main Meeting

Questions from Feedback form

NA

Breakout Room Chat and/or Notes

Questions:

N/A

Comments

N/A

Responses to facilitator questions:

What is working in Mountain View? (In the chat, share a word or two about what you value or love about your community and it's housing.)

Rowhouses: Nice rowhouses but disconnected - uncomfortable walking environment. Would like to see neighborhoods that are walkable, and also connect to somewhere. This would allow less parking. I am a part of a housing association that focuses on community organizing. It's great to be in these kinds of meetings. Mountainview has to add 11,135 housing units according to the RHNA 2023-2031 plan. Of those, 2,773 have to be for very low income houses.

There's several affordable housing units and Mountainview has mobile parks. Someone in the chat (Doris) mentioned this in the chat: she asked if the housing elements can be applied to mobile homes. If the owner of the mobile home park for personal reasons decides that he has to get rid of the property. That creates anguish because sometimes they are parks of more than 200 mobile homes. I think it is important to think about the needs of these mobile home parks.

2. What are some of our key housing needs, challenges and opportunities? (In the chat, share a word or two about our key housing needs, challenges or opportunities.)

A single parking spot can increase rent by \$3000 per year and also contributes to pollution

Need enough development in an area to support businesses, etc., to create more walkable areas

Jobs/Housing imbalance: Google putting up offices, etc.

A lot of offices being built, every office built makes the job/housing balance worse

We're way behind on park space - City keeps collecting in-lieu fees

It seems that 11,000 additional units is not very high nor is the percentage of housing separated for low income units. What do you think? I think the number is too low - I think the city is trying to help I think the challenges Hispanic families have is the high cost of housing in Mountainview. For example, someone in the elderly, 80 years old, applied for support (to rent an inexpensive apartment) and was asked to have 40 thousand in the bank and that exceeds our ability to pay. She applied to Affordable Housing and was told that she did not have sufficient funds. Hopes are dashed by those high standards

If someone has a good credit history, it should be enough. The two dads - dad and mom - have to work and the children are often left alone in order to pay the rent. Family time is sacrificed. In Mountain View I see that the city is making an effort to support us but there are obstacles that we must work on to move forward together. There is a housing program: if someone is going to build, the owner can offer to make the units affordable. I see that as positive. It is working well. There are several elements that I do not know but I

3. What ideas or suggestions do you have to help meet our housing needs? (In the chat, share any ideas or suggestions you have to help meet our housing needs.)

Only developed 20% of inventory sites in last RHNA cycle, need to zone for 5x RHNA in order to accommodate (LA model), we should do the same, otherwise rent will keep going up because not Building in a buffer

When an owner decides to sell their property, it would be good if they had contemplated offering the city to work with the city in order to serve the needs of the community. But I see that sometimes they prefer to offer it to other private / for-profit actors. It would be good to enter into negotiations to San José has a similar program. It gives the option to NGOs or non-profit organizations. Perhaps Mountain View will be encouraged to adopt something similar.

I am concerned about homeless street dwellers. I want them to have a home. I don't see it much but once in a while I have seen it near my home. It is not a problem of a single city - it is of the whole My daughter told me that it would be good to have a program for young people who want to be able to save for their housing needs. It is important to involve young people.

4. How can we make sure we hear from our entire community?

Neighborhood meetings: neighborhood associations - Reach out to ones you have contacts for that have regular meetings and make sure community knows about plans that affect that particular I think it is important to spread the word. I did not know about this Housing Elements process. As we were told, it only happens every 8 years. Perhaps my colleagues had problems entering through Zoom. I think there were several steps and it would be easier not to have the registration process but to simply be able to access with a single button. That can help those struggling with technology and with

We use email or whatsapp. The city of Mountain View has a WhatsApp of ambassadors and with great pride I am part of that group. There is another group of “Mountain View High School parents” and I am also part of that group. Churches and other community groups can also help spread the word.

5. What Kind of Housing Do We Have in the Future (Let’s return to it being 2030, and how we’ve accomplished a lot! In the chat, share with us a word or two about your vision for the housing in our

No responses

It's 2030, and we've accomplished a lot! What kind of housing is in our community now?

No responses



HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE WORKSHOP #1

September 23, 2021 - 6:30-8:00pm

The purpose of the Housing Element Update Workshop was to provide an overview of the intention, components, and process of a Housing Element Update and gather questions and comments from participants about housing concerns, goals, and characteristics. Feedback received will inform the content of future outreach events, and will guide in preparing the Housing Element Update.

The meeting was held via Zoom on Thursday, September 23, 2021 from 6:30-8:00pm and was facilitated by City staff and the consultant team. Live simultaneous Mandarin interpretation was available, and there were approximately 40 public participants. The format of the meeting is described in the agenda below:

- Welcome & Introductions & Live Poll: Demographic Questions
- Housing Element Update Presentation: Overview of the Project & Process
- Live Poll: Housing Questions
- Small Group Discussion Breakout rooms
- Small Group Report Out
- Closing and Next Steps

ATTENDANCE

Meeting participants: A total of 60 individuals registered; 38 attended

Presenters

- **City** – Ellen Yau
- **BAE**– Stephanie Hagar
- **Plan to Place** – Dave Javid

Consultant Team

- **BAE** – Stephanie Hagar
- **ESA** - Evan Wasserman
- **Plan to Place** – Dave Javid, Paul Kronser, Rachael Sharkland

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Dave Javid and Ellen Yau opened the meeting by welcoming attendees, giving an agenda overview, and opening the demographic live poll (see results below). After the poll closed, Stephanie Hagar delivered a presentation offering an overview of the Housing Element Update project and process, which was recorded and will be posted on the website for public access. After the presentation, Dave gave an overview of the small group breakout logistics and opened the second live poll to garner feedback related to housing priorities.

Demographic Poll Results (Full results in appendix)

- **Age:**
 - 36% of the attendees were between the ages of 26-45;
 - 29% were between 46-64;

- **Race and Ethnicity:**
 - 50% White
 - 32.1% Asian

- **Do you currently rent or own the home you live in?**
 - 53.6% Own
 - 39.3% Rent

- **What type of housing do you live in?**
 - 46.4% Home/ Duplex
 - 39.3% Apartment

- **Which bracket best describes your household income**
 - 78.6% \$100,000 or more
 - 17.9% \$60,000 to \$99,999

- **Which of the following describes why you decided to attend tonight's workshop? (May select more than one)**
 - 82.1% I live in Mountain View
 - 14.3% I want to know more about the Housing Element Update Process

Housing Poll Results (Full results in appendix)

- **How satisfied are you with your current housing situation?**
 - 32% Satisfied
 - 25% Somewhat satisfied

- **How satisfied are you with the affordability of housing in Mountain View?**
 - 46.4% Dissatisfied
 - 25% Somewhat dissatisfied

- **How satisfied are you with the variety of housing types that are available in Mountain View?**

- 35.7% Dissatisfied
- 21.4% Somewhat dissatisfied
- **How do you feel about the amount of new housing that has been built in Mountain View during the past few years?**
 - 46.4% Too little has been built
 - 21.4% Somewhat too much has been built
- **How Well do you think Mountain View provides access to housing and opportunity for all segments of the population, regardless of race, ethnicity, age, disability, status etc?**
 - 46.4% Neutral
 - 25% Not Well

The majority of the meeting was devoted to gathering input from meeting participants through facilitated small group discussions. Feedback was recorded in a virtual whiteboard in response to the discussion prompts below. The summary below provides a high-level overview of themes that emerged from the break-out discussions.

SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS! COMPLETE A HOUSING ELEMENT COMMUNITY INPUT FORM HERE: <https://bit.ly/mvhousing>



分享您的想法! 请在这里填写一份“住房要素”社区意见表: <https://bit.ly/mvhousing-chinese>

2) What do you think Mountain View should do to address housing needs or goals? / 你认为山景城应该做什么来解决住房需求或目标?

Examples / 例子:

- Increase existing residential areas to allow more apartments to be built in these areas / 重新划分现有住宅区, 允许在这些地区建造更多的公寓
- Rezone non-residential areas to allow housing to be built on sites that could be redeveloped from non-residential to residential uses, e.g. shopping center parking lots, retail or offices / 重新划分非住宅区, 为可以在非住宅区重新开发为住宅区的空地上建造新的商业/零售/办公中心
- Examine the City process to allow homes to be produced more quickly / 审查现有程序, 提高建造房屋的速度
- Introduce requirements for new developments to include low-income units / 对新开发项目的要求, 包括低收入单元
- Provide down-payment assistance to low-income and middle-income households / 为低收入和中等收入家庭提供购房付款援助

- Provide more funding for affordable housing projects / 为可负担住房项目提供更多资金
- Require more units to include accessibility features / 要求更多的单元包括无障碍设施
- Work with housing providers to create more housing for people who are homeless / 与住房提供者合作, 为无家可归的人建造更多的住房
- Work with housing providers to create more senior housing / 与住房提供者合作, 创造更多老年住房
- Strengthen protection for renters and/or mobile home park residents / 加强租房者和/或移动房屋居民的保护
- Help homeowners with home repairs and maintenance / 帮助业主进行房屋维修和维护
- Objective design standards / higher quality / 客观的设计标准, 更高的质量

DISCUSSION	CHAT	MANDARIN TRANSLATION
<p>Costs increase and resources reduce development incentives, especially for small builders and MNT. Mountain view is not built with them. MNT they should consider making it easier to develop smaller, single units.</p> <p>Regulations change during the process and cost of jobs has increased. The development process is part of the housing element but to address the difficulty of production because lack of supply is one of the main issues.</p> <p>Some of the presentation said density is a problem. Thanking we might not have to reduce density with the development. Density is an anomaly, more people support more jobs. Density and a diversity of options. This is a chance to create and we should do it robustly rather than being timidly we can't have it.</p> <p>For density, concerns about parking, eg. how many cars in 15 second parking spots, etc. (the main thing the residents) in the production unit with 15 second parking spots in 15 seconds. MNT show how to park, space, etc. in the element. How to manage the use of the land. What forms of parking.</p> <p>Reduce the vehicle, public transportation, and job opportunities to be built before or with density to support movement density. We can adopt a more holistic approach. To create car-free spaces and connectivity in MNT. Make them to be a lot of options, any, although from density to be a lot of options. People that can support themselves.</p> <p>The problem with parking, not to build too many, and not to make it that it takes years and the return continues to grow, and the property value continues to go up. More payment assistance programs are super important because a big amount of people are not able to pay the price.</p>	<p>Mountain view can't just say other cities should do more - all cities should do more.</p> <p>What is incentive for existing and family projects can be included for the higher density. As presented with some examples, can be used to build a job's job apartment. Cost right now is not high. That's not negotiable. Can be done because to sell our new home as a sale item.</p> <p>Compare all other cities. How many people will be produced in the area.</p> <p>How do we ensure that the development is not just for developers but also with some parking, space, etc. (MNT)</p> <p>We need to plan for how people will be used. Parking on the street, in cars, etc. How we manage the parking. How public is used.</p> <p>Density should be an anomaly, not a standard. It should be a more holistic approach. More options, more and alternative (including parking and development).</p> <p>More interesting, etc. (MNT)</p> <p>With the housing, we already build. How many people are already built. How many people are already built. How many people are already built.</p> <p>The problem with parking, not to build too many, and not to make it that it takes years and the return continues to grow, and the property value continues to go up. More payment assistance programs are super important because a big amount of people are not able to pay the price.</p>	<p>山景城不能只说其他城市应该做更多 - 所有城市都应该做更多。</p> <p>对于现有项目和家庭项目, 有什么激励措施可以包括在内? 正如提出的例子, 可以用于建造更多的工作型公寓。目前的成本并不高。这不是可以谈判的。我们可以做到的, 因为我们要出售我们的新房子。</p> <p>与其他城市进行比较。在这个地区, 将生产多少人口。</p> <p>我们如何确保开发不仅仅是为了开发商, 还包括一些停车位、空间等。(MNT)</p> <p>我们需要计划人们将如何使用。街道上的停车位, 在车里, 等等。我们如何管理停车位。公共停车位如何使用。</p> <p>密度应该是一个例外, 而不是标准。它应该是一个更全面的办法。更多选择, 更多替代方案(包括停车和发展)。</p> <p>更有趣, 等等。(MNT)</p> <p>随着住房, 我们已经建造。已经建造了多少人。已经建造了多少人。已经建造了多少人。</p> <p>停车问题的关键是不要建造太多, 也不要让它花很多年, 而且回报率会继续增长, 而且房产价值会继续上涨。更多的付款援助计划非常重要, 因为很大一部分人无法支付价格。</p>

BREAK OUT DISCUSSION PROMPTS AND SUMMARY

The following questions were asked in each small break out room. Participants were encouraged to raise their virtual hands and offer verbal responses, or could respond via Chat. The Main Takeaways section below provides a high level summary of responses collected from each of the 3 breakout rooms. The numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of breakout rooms in which the referenced comment was expressed.

Discussion Prompts:

1. *What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Mountain View?*
2. *What do you think Mountain View should do to address Housing needs or goals?*
3. *What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?*
4. *What suggestions do you have for Mountain View to solicit additional feedback on the Housing Element Update?*


Main Takeaways:

1. *What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Mountain View?*
 - We need more affordable housing. (3)
 - There is a lack of Senior housing. (1)
 - We need more types of housing at all income levels. (3)
 - The lack of housing at all levels is largely because it isn't legal according to planning and zoning code to build at needed densities. (1)
 - The densities needed to make building housing profitable for a developer aren't permitted. (1)
 - The City should thoughtfully locate new housing units and consider existing housing stock, co-location with jobs and transit. (3)
 - City should concentrate higher density housing in Precise Planned areas / planned communities. (1)
 - We have an imbalance between office space and housing (office space outcompetes housing). (2)
 - Minimum parking requirements, setbacks, and height requirements are too restrictive and prevent housing from being built. (1)
 - Concern expressed around buildings 3 stories and higher directly adjacent to single family homes. (2)
 - We should reduce the costs and time it takes to build in order to incentivize housing at all levels. (2)
2. *What do you think Mountain View should do to address Housing needs or goals?*
 - Support expressed for exploring rezoning as a strategy to allow for higher densities. (3)
 - The City should simultaneously plan for more infrastructure when planning for housing (i.e. wider roads, more parks, sidewalks, better connection to public transit, schools and other services). (2)
 - The City should fund down payment assistance programs. (1)
 - The City should make it easier to develop smaller, infill sites. (2)
 - The City should change regulations, especially parking requirements (lower or unbundle) to encourage housing construction. (2)
 - The Housing element should address the difficulty of production, because lack of supply is one of the main issues. (2)

- Concern expressed about parking and traffic congestion. (2)
 - The Housing Element should include non-traditional housing types (ie. stacked flats, co-ops, and ADUs). (2)
 - Building new housing is an opportunity for more walkable/interconnected neighborhoods. (1)
 - The City needs to do more precise plans, and less broad sweeping changes on rezoning / new construction due to the wide variety of housing types co-existing already. (1)
3. *What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?*
- The City should focus on the mitigation/ elimination of homelessness. (2)
 - Tech companies are one of the main pressures increasing housing costs. (2)
 - Desire to see corporate/tech neighbors paying for infrastructure, housing, transit and other public services. (2)
 - Focus on continued support for more diverse demography in Mountain View; diversity is an asset. (2)
 - I would like to see environmentally responsible development (recycled water, solar etc.). (2)
4. *What suggestions do you have for Mountain View to solicit additional feedback on the Housing Element Update?*
- City should solicit feedback from everyone who works in Mountain View, survey at offices/ employers. (2)
 - There should be more outreach to renters (eg. posting ads on Craigslist, mailers in utility bills). (2)
 - The City should reach out to leverage neighborhood associations. (1)
 - City should try to reach out to future/ potential residents. (1)
 - Please offer Spanish interpretation. (1)
 - Reach out to Mountain View Day worker center, grocery stores, mobile home alliance, CSA's, rent relief, next door and community forums, connect with different faith communities, and contact authors of <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6786z5j9> (1).


APPENDIX

LIVE POLL: DEMOGRAPHIC RESULTS




2.Race and Ethnicity: (select all that apply)

● White ● Hispanic or LatinX ● Asian ● Other




3.Do you currently own or rent the home you live in?

● Rent ● Own ● Other




4. What type of housing do you live in?

● Apartment ● House/Duplex ● Townhome ● Mobilehome or manufactured home




5. Which bracket best describes your household income?

● \$21,000 to \$44,999 ● \$60,000 to \$99,999 ● \$100,000 or More



6. Which of the following describes why you decided to attend tonight's workshop? (may select more than one)


- I live in Mountain View
- I work in Mountain View
- I want to know more about the Housing Element Update Process



LIVE POLL: HOUSING RESULTS


1.How satisfied are you with your current housing situation?

Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Neutral Somewhat Dissatisfied Dissatisfied




2. How satisfied are you with the affordability of housing in Mountain View?

● Satisfied ● Somewhat Satisfied ● Neutral ● Somewhat Dissatisfied ● Dissatisfied




3. How satisfied are you with the variety of housing types that are available in Mountain View?

● Satisfied ● Somewhat Satisfied ● Neutral ● Somewhat Dissatisfied ● Dissatisfied




4. How do you feel about the amount of new housing that has been built in Mountain View during the past few years?

- Too little has been built
- Somewhat too little has been built
- About the right amount has been built
- Somewhat too much has been built
- Too much has been built



5. How well do you think Mountain View provides access to housing and opportunity for all segments of the population, regardless of race, ethnicity, age, disability status, etc.?

Well Somewhat well Neutral Not very well Not well





HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

ONLINE FEEDBACK FORM SUMMARY

September 23, 2021 - January 2nd, 2022

The purpose of the Housing Element Update is to guide how the City seeks to produce new housing, preserve existing housing, ensure fair access to housing, prevent displacement of existing residents, and meet other critical housing needs over the next 8 years as required by California's Department of Housing and Community Development. To gather feedback and reach a broader audience, an online feedback form was prepared to gather input from the Mountain View community in addition to other engagement efforts.

The online feedback form was made available on the project website (www.mvhousingelement.org) from September 23rd, 2021 through January 2nd, 2022. The survey link was shared at community events (e.g. Monster Bash, Tree Lighting), via social media and community chat groups, published in City publications, and sent to stakeholders and interested parties who signed up for project notifications. A total of 343 responses were received in English, Russian, Spanish and Chinese. Feedback received will inform the content of future outreach efforts, and will guide the development of the Housing Element.


The following questions were included in the online feedback form.

1. *What do you think are the most critical housing issues in Mountain View (select top 5)?*
2. *What do you think Mountain View should do to support more housing construction?*
3. *What do you think Mountain View should do to make housing more affordable ?*
4. *What do you think Mountain View should do to provide more housing for residents with special housing needs?*
5. *What do you think Mountain View should do to protect existing renters and homeowners?*
6. *What characteristics do you want to see in housing over the next 10 years?*
7. *What suggestions do you have for Mountain View to solicit additional feedback on the Housing Element Update?*
8. *What is one thing that you think is most important for us to consider as part of the Housing Element Update?*
9. *Is there anything else that you would like to add?*

Below is a summary of the input received through the multiple choice questions, followed by common themes captured from the open ended "Other" option that accompanied each question (see complete list of responses at www.mvhousingelement.org). Numbers in parentheses after each common theme indicates the number of responses that were accounted for.

ONLINE FEEDBACK FORM SUMMARY: MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS 1-5


1. WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MOST CRITICAL HOUSING ISSUES IN MOUNTAIN VIEW (SELECT TOP 5)?



- **Common themes for open-ended response for 'Other':**


- Need for Complementary Infrastructure/Services to Support Housing (5)
- Excessive Development (5)
- Neighborhood Preservation (5)
- Need for Innovation and Diversity in Housing Types (4)
- Environmental Quality (e.g. open space, trees) (4)

2. WHAT DO YOU THINK MOUNTAIN VIEW SHOULD DO TO SUPPORT MORE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION?



- **Common themes for open-ended response for 'Other':**
 - Limit Housing Growth (11)
 - Allow/Encourage Mixed Use (4)
 - Reduce/Remove Governmental Constraints (4)
 - Redevelop Obsolescent Offices with Housing (3)
 - Advocate for Regional Cooperation (3)
 - Ensure Adequate Infrastructure to Support Housing (3)
 - City As Developer (3)


3. WHAT DO YOU THINK MOUNTAIN VIEW SHOULD DO TO MAKE HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE?



- **Common themes for open-ended response for 'Other':**

- Build More Housing (5)
- Not The City's Role/Do Nothing (5)
- Provide Incentives and Streamline Approvals (3)
- Focus Housing Near Transit (2)
- Improve Transit Service (2)
- Leverage Public Land for Affordable Housing (2)
- City As Developer (2)


4. WHAT DO YOU THINK MOUNTAIN VIEW SHOULD DO TO PROVIDE MORE HOUSING FOR RESIDENTS WITH SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS?



• Common themes for open-ended response for 'Other':

- Nothing Needs To Be Done (7)
- Advocate for Regional Cooperation (4)
- Not Familiar With Issue/Needs (3)
- Provide Funding for Accessible Housing (3)
- Develop Accessible Housing (2)

5. WHAT DO YOU THINK MOUNTAIN VIEW SHOULD DO TO PROTECT EXISTING RENTERS AND HOMEOWNERS?



- **Common themes for open-ended response for 'Other':**
 - Nothing Needs to be Done (11)
 - Control Costs or Provide Financial or Displacement Assistance (5)
 - Preserve Neighborhoods (5)
 - Create Local Funding Mechanism (3)
 - Enforce Existing laws/policies (3)

OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS 6-9 - COMMON THEMES FOR OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

6. WHAT CHARACTERISTICS DO YOU WANT TO SEE IN HOUSING OVER THE NEXT 10 YEARS?

- More Supply and Density
- Affordable Housing Across Socio-Economic Spectrum
- Small-Scale Infill/Existing Neighborhood Preservation
- Transit-Oriented Development
- Diverse Housing Options (e.g. special needs housing)
- Maintain Quality of Life and Environment
- Limit Growth and Density
- Quality and Unique Design
- Evaluate Review Process/Fees/Regulations

7. WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR MOUNTAIN VIEW TO SOLICIT ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK ON THE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE?

- Comments received regarding what groups the City should outreach to:
 - Community Organizations/Neighborhood Groups (8)
 - Workers/Businesses (5)
 - Families with children (4)
 - Renters (4)
 - Low-Income/Unhoused (3)
 - Homeowners (3)
- Comments received on the best methods to take feedback from the community:
 - Community Meetings/Workshop/Pop-ups (8)
 - Surveys (5)
 - Go to existing meetings (2)
- Comments received on the best method to conduct outreach:
 - Direct Mailing (11)
 - Social Media//Online/Email (6)
 - City Bills & Newsletter/City Locations (e.g. Library/Senior Center) (6)
 - Article (3)
 - Door to Door (flyers, solicitors) (2)
- Other comments regarding additional feedback suggestions:
 - More of it (2)
 - Provide more education resources (2)

8. WHAT IS ONE THING THAT YOU THINK IS MOST IMPORTANT FOR US TO CONSIDER AS PART OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE?

- Focus new housing on Affordability Across Socio-Economic Spectrum (44)
- Comments about R3 Zoning Update (32)
- Increase the quantity and density of new housing. (30)

- Focus on new low and/or medium density housing to preserve the existing neighborhoods. (18)
- Promote new housing near transit centers and create walkable developments. (14)
- When adding new housing, provide additional infrastructure to support the added residents. (11)
- Protect the quality of life and environment of Mountain View. (11)
- Develop funding programs for affordable housing. (8)
- Provide programs that protect renters. (6)
- Streamline the approval process for new building and development. (6)
- Ensure the safety of Mountain View residents.(6)
- Reduce parking standards for new developments. (5)
- Include adequate parking for new development. (3)

9. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD?

- Limit the density and height of new development/housing. (32)
- Build more housing in general. (22)
- Provide more housing that is affordable for families, seniors, disabled, workers, and service providers. (19)
- Thank you for providing opportunities for community feedback. (17)
- New housing should be environmentally sensitive. (14)
- Preserve the City characteristics. (9)
- New housing should be able to limit the need for automobile use. (5)
- Protect existing renters from future rent increases.(4)
- Provide more outreach and education on housing opportunities and existing issues facing Mountain View residents. (4)
- Recreational Vehicles (RVs) should not be allowed Citywide and should not take up parking needed for Mountain View residents. (3)
- Ensure that Mountain View is a safe community. (2)
- The City should work on streamlining the development process and reduce costs associated with building. (2)



APPENDIX

G

City of Mountain View Multi-Family Housing Violation Checklist

APPENDIX G: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING VIOLATION CHECKLIST

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING VIOLATION CHECKLIST

This checklist is provided for your convenience and is designed to assist you in understanding inspection and code requirements. This checklist can be used by you on a regular basis to evaluate your property in regards to basic fire, electrical, plumbing, housing, and mechanical code requirements. Use of this checklist does not replace the City's routine inspection program, but it will help you understand the types of issues the City inspector looks for during the inspection. Items marked with a shaded box are considered serious violations, versus nonserious violations marked with an unshaded box. If used proactively, correcting any serious violations prior to the inspection can reduce the annual inspection fee. This is not an exhaustive or comprehensive list but only provided as a guide.

Electrical Standards

- The electrical wiring of the garbage disposal must be properly installed. Flexible electrical cords shall be so connected to devices and fittings so that tension will not be transmitted to electrical joints or terminals and labeled on outlet.
- Grounded electrical outlets must be properly wired. Reverse polarity and/or open grounds are not allowed.
- All ground-type, three-prong receptacles must be properly grounded or provided with GFCI protection. All ground-type electrical receptacles wired to nongrounded electrical systems must be replaced with proper two-prong, nonground receptacles to prevent misuse and to protect users from possible injury.
- Circuit breakers or fuses must be legibly and durably marked at the circuit box or subpanel to indicate the circuit it protects. (No voids shall be left in panel.)
- All electrical light switches and receptacles shall be securely attached to the junction box and fit snugly against the wall surface. All faceplates must be solid, unbroken, and secured tightly to the device yoke and flush against the wall.
- To prevent possible injury to the user, pull-chain switches for electrical fixtures must be made of nonconductive material at any point at which the user can make contact.
- Higher-ampage fuses than design and wire gauge are not allowed.
- Flexible electrical cords and cables (such as extension cords, etc.) cannot be used: (1) as a substitute for the fixed wiring of a structure; (2) through holes in walls, ceilings, or floors; (3) through doorways, windows, or similar openings; (4) where attached to building surfaces; (5) where concealed behind building walls, ceilings, or floors; (6) where installed in raceways.
- In locations where electrical equipment could be exposed to physical damage, appropriate enclosures or guards shall be installed to prevent damage to it.
- All splices and joints and the free ends of conductors shall be covered with an insulation equivalent to that of the conductors suitable for the purpose and terminated in the junction box.
- No electrical system, including outlets, permanently wired outlet extensions, and electrical devices, shall be installed or altered unless a separate permit for each building or structure has first been obtained from the Chief Building Official.

Fire Safety Standards

- To maintain required fire separation protection for dwelling units, all holes, gaps, and openings in the ceiling and walls of the carport/garages must be repaired. Finished surfaces must be solid, continuous and sealed around all penetrations. Repairs must be made in the same material as the original construction or of a material with equal fire rating.
- Vegetation overgrowth must not inhibit proper use of required exiting stairways. All encroaching

vegetation must be trimmed or removed to assure safe ingress and egress.

- Every apartment complex is required to have at least one (1) 2-A:10-B:C rated fire extinguisher located within 75' travel distance of the entrance door of each dwelling unit and 50' travel distance of every covered parking stall. In multi-story apartment complexes, extinguishers must be provided and mounted on every floor so that travel on stairways will not be required to reach an extinguisher.
- All fire extinguishers are required to have a minimum 2-A:10-B:C rating. Soda acid and water load extinguishers are inadequate to fight electrical and oil fires and must be replaced.
- Fire extinguishers are required to be serviced, recharged, and tagged by a State licensee at least once a year, after each use, or when pressure gauge shows recharge needed.
- Smoke alarms shall be installed and maintained in full working order at all of the following locations: on the ceiling or wall outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of bedrooms, in each room used for sleeping purposes, and in each story within a dwelling unit and in enclosed common stairwells of apartment complexes and other multiple-dwelling complexes.
- A carbon monoxide (CO) alarm shall be installed in all dwelling units of multi-unit occupancies having fossil-fuel-burning appliances or attached garages. CO devices should be installed outside each sleeping area. The device manufacturer's installation instructions should also be followed (*Senate Bill 183, also known as the "Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act"*).
- Refuse dumpsters/containers with an individual capacity of 1.5 cubic yards or greater stored or placed within 5' of combustible walls, openings, or eave lines, shall be protected by an automatic fire protection (sprinkler) system (keep lids closed).
- Windows, sliding glass doors, and all exiting systems within a dwelling unit shall be obvious, unobstructed, and permit exiting from the building in the case of an emergency.

General Exterior Standards

- The exterior surfaces of the buildings must be maintained, including replacement of broken and cracked windows and doors and providing paint or other approved protective covering for weather-exposed surfaces.
- All crawl space vent openings must be covered with a corrosion-resistant wire mesh with mesh openings of 1/4" in dimension. All screens must seal tightly to prevent infestation.
- Crawlspace shall be provided with a minimum 18" by 24" opening unobstructed by pipes, ducts, crawl spaces, and similar construction with cover.
- Leaking roofs should be repaired or replaced.
- The guardrails and/or handrails of exterior stairways and balconies must be securely attached to the deck or structure.
- The swimming pool or the entire property on which it is located shall be walled or fenced as to prevent uncontrolled access by children from the street or from adjacent properties. The wall or fence shall be a minimum of 60" high with a self-closing, self-latching device placed no lower than 54" above the ground.
- All required security lighting must be maintained operational at all times. All automatic control devices must be periodically adjusted to assure lighting fixtures will operate from before dusk to after dawn.
- All garbage containers are required to have tight-fitting lids which must be in place at all times in order to promote sanitation and health.
- Property owners shall provide a sufficient number of standard garbage containers with close-fitting covers for receiving and holding all garbage from the premises without leakage or escape of odor.
- Registration shall be current for all vehicles on a property unless vehicles are completely enclosed within a building.
- Fences, walls, hedges, or street plantings shall not exceed 3' in height within the required front yard or street setback.

General Interior Standards

- ❑ Surfaces shall be protected by appropriate moisture-resistant wall covering or paint.
- ❑ All holes, gaps, cracks, and openings in floors, walls, and ceilings must be patched and sealed, and all baseboards secured in place to prevent insect infestation.
- ❑ All water-damaged surfaces must be restored to their original condition.
- ❑ All missing, broken, and loose wall and/or countertop ceramic tile must be replaced and/or reattached to create a solid surface. All cracked ceramic tile must be sealed to prevent water entry to the substructure and water damage to the structure.
- ❑ All habitable rooms within a dwelling unit shall have a minimum net glazed opening of not less than 8 percent of the floor area of the room served.
- All habitable rooms within a dwelling unit shall be provided with natural ventilation by means of openable exterior openings with an area of not less than 4 percent of the floor area being ventilated.
- ❑ In lieu of required exterior openings for natural ventilation, a mechanical ventilation system may be provided. Such mechanical ventilation system must be maintained in full operational condition at all times (bathrooms).
- ❑ Shower walls shall have smooth, hard, nonabsorbent surfaces such as Portland cement, concrete, ceramic tile, or other approved material to a height of 70" above the drain inlet. All valves, faucets, and shower assemblies provided on these walls shall be installed and sealed in an appropriate manner to protect structural elements from moisture and water damage.
- Water-heating equipment shall be provided with an approved listed, adequately sized pressure relief valve.
- All water heater pressure relief valves installed on water heaters located within a building or structure shall be provided with full-sized drain of galvanized steel or hard-drawn copper piping and fittings. Such pipes shall extend from the valve to the outside of the building, with the end of the pipe not more than 2' nor less than 6" above ground and pointing downward. No part of such pipe shall be trapped, and the terminal end of the drainpipe shall not be threaded.
- An odorizing agent in natural gas has a detrimental effect on copper gas lines, causing deterioration to the inside of the pipe. The International Plumbing Code requires the replacement of all copper gas lines supplying gas-burning appliances with approved materials.
- ❑ No drainpipe for any clothes washer shall extend more than 30" nor less than 18" above the trap. Clothes washer drainpipe traps shall be installed not less than 6" and not more than 18" above the floor.
- Clothes washers and similar plumbing appliances shall not be directly connected to the building drainage system in such a manner as to create a back-siphonage due to suction (air break required).
- ❑ All floor-mounted plumbing fixtures, such as toilets, shall be rigidly secured to the drainage connection and to the floor and caulked around the base.
- ❑ No domestic dishwashing machine shall be directly connected to a drainage system or food waste disposer without the use of an approved dishwasher air-gap fitting on the discharge side of the dishwashing machine.
- ❑ All faucets, stop valves, drains, shower heads, and toilet assemblies shall be drip-free and not leak.
- ❑ Bathroom sink drain stop valve strainers are required to prevent rodent and vermin migration through the drainage system.
- Gas-burning water heaters shall be securely fastened in place by anchors or strapping to resist horizontal displacement due to earthquake motion. Strapping shall be at points within the upper one-third (1/3) and lower one-third (1/3) of its vertical dimensions. At the lower point, a minimum distance of 4" shall be maintained above the controls with the strapping (100-gallon—4 straps; 75-gallon—3 straps; 40-gallon—2 straps).

- Tub and shower enclosures, as well as sinks and countertops, require caulking, grouting, or sealing to prevent water leaks and damage to substructures.
- The drainage system (including "P-traps" and trap arms) is required to have a smooth and uniform interior waterway with a minimum 1/4" per foot slope and smooth interior surfaces for all drainage pipes and fittings. The use of "corrugated" flexible elbow pipes, traps, and trap arms is not permitted.
- The minimum required total area of combustion air openings in enclosures for gas-burning appliances shall be one hundred (100) square inches each; openings shall be located within the upper 12" of the enclosure and in the lower 12".
- Combustion air openings to attic spaces for gas-burning appliances are to be provided with galvanized sleeves of not less than 26-gauge steel or other approved material extending from the appliance enclosure to at least 6" above the top of the ceiling joist. Such openings must not be covered with screens.
- Domestic clothes dryers must terminate to the outside of the building and must be equipped with backdraft dampers. Ducts used for domestic clothes dryers must be of metal and shall have smooth interior surfaces. Screws are not permitted in ducts.
- No part of the grille for wall-mounted, gas-burning heaters shall be closer than 18" to combustible materials; i.e., couches.
- Dwelling units shall be provided with heating facilities capable of maintaining a room temperature of 68 degrees F. at a point 3' above the floor in all habitable rooms.
- Water heaters which depend on the combustion of fuel for heat shall not be installed in a room used or designed to be used for sleeping purposes, bathroom, clothes closets, or in a closet or other confined space opening into a bath or bedroom.
- Warm-air furnaces shall not be located in a room used or designed to be used as a bedroom, bathroom, closet, or in any enclosed space with access only through such room or space.
- Unused openings in a venting system must be closed or capped.
- Heating system and water heater flues must be properly connected. (Single-wall pipe connections shall be secured with three (3) screws.)
- The filter and filter enclosure cover for all furnaces must be maintained in proper position.
- An accessible shutoff valve must exist in the fuel-gas piping outside of each appliance and ahead of the union connection.
- Sliding glass windows shall have both a primary and an auxiliary locking device.
- A vent connector which is part of a gravity-type venting system shall have a continuous rise of not less than 1/4" per foot of length measured from the appliance vent collar to the vent.
- A manager, janitor, housekeeper, or other responsible person shall reside on the premises and shall have charge of every apartment complex in which there are 16 or more dwelling units.
- Openable windows must have screens.
- All window opening/closing devices for casement windows must be operable to allow window operation.
- The apartment complex shall be free of cockroach or rat infestations.
- Locks and latches for exit doors must allow opening from the inside without the use of a key or any special knowledge or effort. Locks, latches, and deadbolts for exiting doors of individual dwelling units must be mounted no higher than 48" above the floor level.



APPENDIX

H

Economic Analysis of Governmental Requirements

Exhibit 1
 Evaluation of Governmental Constraints for Rowhomes and Multifamily Rental Housing
 Mountain View Housing Element Governmental Constraints Analysis

Constraint Category	Governmental Constraint	Summary Description of Governmental Constraint	Purpose of Governmental Constraint	Potential Impacts on Development Feasibility	Significance of Constraint Based on Cost Evaluation*
Affordable Housing	On-site Inclusionary Housing Requirements	The City's inclusionary housing (IH) program requires developers to provide a percentage of below market rate (BMR) units on-site that are affordable to households at specified income levels. Developers can alternatively meet this obligation via land dedication, payment of BMR in-lieu fees or other strategies if approved by the City Council.	Providing new BMR housing affordable to a broad range of local residents and workers helps meet RHNA goals and other important State, regional and local policy objectives.	Reduces land values to property owners, increases development costs, affects market rate unit pricing, and/or lowers developer/investor returns. (If developers cannot meet underwriting criteria or achieve adequate returns to attract investment, then development will not proceed.)	Major
Affordable Housing	BMR In-Lieu Housing Fee	The City has adopted a BMR in-lieu housing fee to help fund affordable housing in the City. The housing fee is paid by developers that are unable to fully meet the inclusionary housing requirement on-site or via land dedication.	"	"	Major
Parks	Park Land Dedication In-lieu Fee	Park land dedication in-lieu fee is based on residential land value, which varies by residential density and geography. In FY 21/22, fee ranges from \$57,500 to \$73,200 per market rate unit (see Exhibit 3).	Expanding park land provides new open space and recreational resources to residents and students of the local school districts.	Reduces developable land area for housing and increases development costs for market rate housing. (See Exhibit 3)	Moderate to Major (rowhome), Major (multifamily)
	Park Land Dedication	Park land dedication requirement varies by residential density with ratio of .0060 acres of parkland per market rate unit for development of 13 du/acre or greater. Affordable housing is exempt from park land dedication requirement.	"	"	
	POPA Credit	Privately owned/publicly accessible (POPA) open space that meets specific criteria for recreational and open space use is eligible for a land dedication or fee credit up to seventy-five (75) percent of the value of the land devoted to the POPA open space.	"	"	
Schools	School Impact Fees	School fee is based on Statewide Level 1 fee of \$4.08/SF, distributed to the two school districts.	Improving academic resources and school facilities is important to maintaining quality public education.	Increases development costs.	Minimal
Schools	Parcel tax	All parcels in Mountain View pay a parcel tax to fund schools.	"	Increases annual costs of owning or operating housing, which reduces capacity to secure funding to help pay for development costs.	Minimal
Schools	Additional annual assessments or taxes	Local school districts are considering levying additional assessments or special taxes to help fund schools.	"	"	Major

Exhibit 1
 Evaluation of Governmental Constraints for Rowhomes and Multifamily Rental Housing
 Mountain View Housing Element Governmental Constraints Analysis

Constraint Category	Governmental Constraint	Summary Description of Governmental Constraint	Purpose of Governmental Constraint	Potential Impacts on Development Feasibility	Significance of Constraint Based on Cost Evaluation*
Transportation	Citywide TIF	City has adopted a citywide transportation impact fee (TIF) for residential development.	Enhancing multi-modal transportation networks helps achieve circulation, Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) and climate goals.	Increases development costs.	Minimal
Transportation	TDM - Transit Pass	City requires a transportation management analysis for new development, which often includes adoption of a transportation demand management (TDM) program that may include offering a free transit pass to residents.	Implementing a TDM program helps achieve circulation, Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) and climate goals while reducing parking needs.	Increases annual costs of owning or operating housing, which reduces capacity to secure funding to help pay for development costs.	Minimal
Transportation	TDM- Other TDM measures including TMA	Other TDM measures include an onsite TDM coordinator, TDM electronic signage, shuttles, and/or participation in a Transportation Management Association (TMA).	"	"	Moderate
Community Benefits	Provision of community benefits	City requires that developers provide community benefits in order to secure certain development approvals, including increased Floor Area Ratio (FAR).	Enhancing community amenities, such as providing space for local organizations and businesses, helps meet community goals.	Increases development costs and may change the amount of land available for new housing units, parks and community amenities.	Minimal
Development Requirements	Increased Parking Requirements	Parking requirements range from 1-2 spaces/unit depending on housing type and bedroom size. Guest parking requirements range from .15 to .60 spaces per unit. Model parking standard requires 1 space for studio/one-bedroom units, 2 parking spaces for two bedroom or larger units, with 15% of required spaces for guests.	Providing on-site parking may reduce parking pressures on surrounding neighborhoods.	Increases amount of parking, which affects building construction, increases development costs and may change the amount of land available for new housing units, parks and community amenities, plus inhibit reaching multi-modal transportation and climate goals.	Moderate
Development Requirements	Design, Building, Infrastructure Requirements	City requires developer to meet numerous design, building and infrastructure requirements, which could result in increased development costs as predevelopment progresses	Enhancing design and building standards, such as REACH codes, helps meet planning, design and climate goals.	Increases development costs and may change the amount of land available for new housing units, parks and community amenities.	Minimal
Development Requirements	Extended Development Schedule	City requirements and/or processing time frames may increase the time it takes for developers to receive land use, design, infrastructure, permitting, plan check, and construction related approvals.	Allows additional staff review to help assure housing meets pertinent land use, design, infrastructure, and building standards	Increases carrying costs for land and predevelopment expenses and/or increases construction costs due to extended schedule.	Moderate

* Minimal - increases development costs less than 1%, Moderate - increases development costs between 1% to 5%, Major - increases development costs by 5% or more.

Source: City of Mountain View Municipal Code, FY 2021/22 Master Fee Schedule and Below Market Rate (BMR) Program, California Housing and Community Development Department.

Exhibit 2
 Summary Financial Evaluation of Governmental Constraints Based on Cost Impact Per Housing Unit
 Mountain View Housing Element Governmental Constraints Analysis

Constraint Category	Governmental Constraint	Increase in Development Costs and Obligations	Key Assumptions	Rowhome Unit		Multifamily Rental Unit		Significance of Constraint Based on Cost Evaluation
				Cost Impact Per Unit	Percent of Dev't Cost	Cost Impact Per Unit	Percent of Dev't Cost	
Affordable Housing	On-site Inclusionary Housing Requirements and BMR In-lieu Fee	Provision of BMR units on-site that are priced or rented for less than development cost or fee payment	Housing BMR in-lieu fee for rowhome at \$131.06/habitable SF and multifamily rental at \$100.66/habitable SF	\$ 196,600	13.9%	\$ 80,500	9.3%	Major
Parks	Park Land Dedication and In-lieu Fee	Park land dedication or payment of fee per market rate unit	See Exhibit 3– Scenario 1	\$57,500- \$74,400	4.1%-5.3%	\$51,600- \$73,200	6.0%-8.5%	Moderate to Major (rowhome), Major (multifamily)
	Park Land Dedication	Proportion of site to be dedicated.	See Exhibit 3– Scenario 2					
	POPA Credit	Proportion of site to be dedicated.	See Exhibit 3– Scenario 3					
Schools	School Impact Fees	School impact fee per unit	Level 1 fee cost of \$4.08/assessable SF	\$ 6,120	0.4%	\$ 4,080	0.5%	Minimal
Schools	Parcel tax	Annual parcel tax payment	Parcel tax of \$191 per parcel	\$ 3,141	0.2%	\$ 16	0.0%	Minimal
Schools	Additional annual assessments or taxes	Potential increase in annual costs associated with new school funding	Projected at \$5,000/year for rowhome and \$4,000/year for multifamily	\$ 82,200	5.8%	\$ 65,800	7.6%	Major
Transportation	Citywide TIF	Impact fee per unit	TIF for rowhome at \$5,188/unit and multifamily rental at \$2,905/unit	\$ 5,188	0.4%	\$ 2,905	0.3%	Minimal
Transportation	TDM - Transit Pass	Annual cost of VTA transit pass (discounted for larger residential developments)	VTA Smart Pass at \$135/year X 2 persons for rowhome and \$135/year X 1.5 persons for multifamily	\$ 4,400	0.3%	\$ 3,300	0.4%	Minimal
Transportation	TDM- Other TDM measures including TMA	Annual contribution to TMA and other TDM measures	TDM/TMA contribution estimated at \$100/month/unit.	\$ 19,700	1.4%	\$ 19,700	2.3%	Moderate

Exhibit 2
 Summary Financial Evaluation of Governmental Constraints Based on Cost Impact Per Housing Unit
 Mountain View Housing Element Governmental Constraints Analysis

Constraint Category	Governmental Constraint	Increase in Development Costs and Obligations	Key Assumptions	Rowhome Unit		Multifamily Rental Unit		Significance of Constraint Based on Cost Evaluation
				Cost Impact Per Unit	Percent of Dev't Cost	Cost Impact Per Unit	Percent of Dev't Cost	
Community Benefits	Community benefit payment or contribution	Cost of community benefits	ECRPP community benefit payment at \$6.60/SF for multifamily but may be lower elsewhere.	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 5,280	0.6%	Minimal
Development Requirements	Increased Parking Requirements	Parking increase of .4 spaces per unit	Estimated increase in parking development cost based on 0.4 spaces @ \$60,000/space.	\$ 24,000	1.7%	\$ 24,000	2.8%	Moderate
Development Requirements	Design, Building, Infrastructure Requirements	City design, building and/or infrastructure requirements that increase development costs	Estimated increase at 1% of building related costs.	\$ 6,000	0.4%	\$ 5,000	0.6%	Minimal
Development Requirements	Extended Development Schedule	Increased development costs due to delays in City approval.	Schedule extended by 4 months multiplied by 50% of land and construction costs at 10% equity carrying cost.	\$ 16,000	1.1%	\$ 9,000	1.0%	Moderate

Translation of Annualized Cost to Development Cost	
Loan Constant as Proxy for Annual Cost	6.08% (4.5% interest, 30 year amortization)

Source: City of Mountain View Municipal Code, FY 2021/22 Master Fee Schedule and Below Market Rate (BMR) Program, California Housing and Community Development Dept.

Exhibit 3
 Evaluation of Alternative Park Land Dedication Scenarios
 Mountain View Housing Element Governmental Constraints Analysis

	R3 Zoning Rowhome	R3 Zoning Multifamily	R4 or ECR & SA PP Multifamily	NBPP, EWPP Multifamily
Assumed Density per Acre	20 du/acre	30 du/acre	75 du/acre	125 du/acre
Park Land Dedication Density Category	13-25 du/acre	26+ du/acre	26+ du/acre	26+ du/acre
Park Land Dedication Requirement	0.006 acres/unit	0.006 acres/unit	0.006 acres/unit	0.006 acres/unit
Scenario 1– Fee Only – Developments less than 50 units, on Small Sites and/or Undesirable Park Locations (Most Projects)				
Value per Acre (per Master Fee Schedule)	\$ 9,580,000 per acre	\$ 10,450,000 per acre	\$ 12,200,000 per acre	\$ 12,200,000 per acre
Park Land Fee Per Market Rate Unit	\$ 57,500 per unit	\$ 62,700 per unit	\$ 73,200 per unit	\$ 73,200 per unit
Scenario 2– Park Land Dedication + Fee With Allowed Increase in Density for Multifamily (6 Acre Developments)				
Assumed Parcel Area	6 acres	6 acres	6 acres	6 acres
Potential Housing Units	120	180	450	750
Park Land Requirement	0.50 acres	0.92 acres	2.29 acres	3.82 acres
<i>Percent of Site Required for Park</i>	8%	15%	38%	64%
Onsite Park Land Dedication	0.40 acres	0.60 acres	0.60 acres	0.60 acres
<i>Percent of Site Dedicated as Park</i>	7%	10%	10%	10%
Remaining Development Potential	5.60 acres	5.40 acres	5.40 acres	5.40 acres
<i>Density (Increased for Multifamily)</i>	20 du/acre	33 du/acre	83 du/acre	139 du/acre
Housing Units on Remaining Acreage	112 units	180 units	450 units	750 units
<i>Percent Affordable</i>	25%	15%	15%	15%
Affordable BMR Units	28 units	27 units	68 units	113 units
Market Rate	84 units	153 units	382 units	637 units
Remaining Park Land Requirement	0.10 acres	0.32 acres	1.69 acres	3.22 acres
Total Cost of Park Land Plus Fee	\$ 4,828,000	\$ 3,323,000	\$ 20,642,000	\$ 39,308,000
<i>Per Market Rate Unit</i>	\$ 57,500 per unit	\$ 21,700 per unit	\$ 54,000 per unit	\$ 61,700 per unit
Potential Decrease in Units from Park Land Dedication	8 units	0 units	0 units	0 units
Scenario 3– POPA Land Dedication + Fee With Allowed Increase in Density for Multifamily (6 Acre Developments)				
Assumed Parcel Area	6 acre	6 acre	6 acre	6 acre
Park Land Requirement	0.51 acres	0.92 acres	2.29 acres	3.82 acres
POPA Dedication	0.6 acres	0.9 acres	0.9 acres	0.9 acres
Potential POPA Dedication Credit	0.45 acres	0.675 acres	0.675 acres	0.675 acres
<i>Percent of Property as POPA</i>	10%	15%	15%	15%
Remaining Development Potential (Deducting 50% of POPA)	5.70 acres	5.55 acres	5.55 acres	5.55 acres
<i>Density (Increased for Multifamily)</i>	20 du/acre	32 du/acre	81 du/acre	135 du/acre
Housing Units on Remaining Acreage	114 units	180 units	450 units	750 units
<i>Percent Affordable</i>	25%	15%	15%	15%
Affordable BMR Units	29 units	27 units	68 units	113 units
Market Rate	85 units	153 units	382 units	637 units
Remaining Park Land Requirement	0.06 acres	0.24 acres	1.62 acres	3.15 acres
Total Cost of POPA Plus Fee	\$ 6,323,000	\$ 2,539,000	\$ 19,727,000	\$ 38,393,000
<i>Per Market Rate Unit</i>	\$ 74,400 per unit	\$ 16,600 per unit	\$ 51,600 per unit	\$ 60,300 per unit
Potential Decrease in Housing Units from POPA Dedication	6 units	0 units	0 units	0 units

Source: City of Mountain View Municipal Code and FY 2021/22 Master Fee Schedule.

