



City of Anaheim Housing Element Update Committee (HEUC) Meeting Summary

Thursday, August 12th, 2021
5:30 p.m.

Location: Virtual; Zoom

The City of Anaheim (City) hosted the sixth meeting for the HEUC (Committee) on August 12, 2021. The Committee meeting started at 5:30 p.m. below is a summary of the meeting.

Attendance:

Committee members present: Maggie Downs, Tim Graham, Natalie Rubalcava, Linda Lehnkering, Thomas Fielder, Christina Cota, , Benjamin Hurst, Cesar Covarrubias, Rochelle Mills, James Lott, Elizabeth Hansburg (alternate to James Lott), Mitchell Lee, James Lawson, Adam Wood (alternate to Steve Lamotte)

Committee members absent: Steve Lamotte, Rob Mitchell, Rachael Mask, Todd Ament

City staff present: Susan Kim, Bianca Alcock, Charles Guiam, Niki Wetzel, Ted White, Andy Nogal

Consultant team present: David Barquist, Ines Galmiche

Interpretation staff present: Michelle Díaz, Omar Garza

City staff and the Consultant team welcomed Committee members and the public and provided Spanish translation upon request. Additionally, the Consultant reviewed the agenda for the evening, the following question was asked by the committee:

- Is tonight's meeting a review of progress on the Housing Element or will there be action or recommendation taken and made by the committee?

1. Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee

The Consultant team provided an overview of the expected roles of Committee members as well as roles of the public during the Committee meetings.

2. Adequate Sites Analysis Summary

The Consultant team provided an overview of the sites analysis including the following key topics:

- A summary of the committee's discussion regarding sites at the July 15 HEUC meeting (Meeting No. 5).
- An overview of pipeline projects including how the city defines the different stages of pipeline projects and the total number of units in the pipeline.

- A review of the qualifications for sites identified to accommodate the lower income RHNA units.
- A review of the qualifications for sites identified to accommodate the moderate and above moderate income RHNA units.

The Consultant team then provided maps of the identified candidate sites to accommodate the RHNA. The maps displayed the candidate sites by council district (1-6). The City then walked through the sites identified on each map, the income category of the sites, and provided background and context for the purpose and identification of the sites. The City then provided an overview of the sites summary table, describing the summary of units each sites category can yield.

Committee members had the following questions:

- Can you clarify which corridors the sites identified are on?
- Are the low and very low based purely on default density?
- Can you clarify how a project that was started during the 5th cycle, but was not finished, can be counted in the 6th cycle?
- The Kaiser site (off of Lakeview), is that marked as pipeline?
- For the Imperial sites, are they designated for low and very-low? And is that where the theater is? Is this just going to be a zoning change?
- It looks like the Savi Ranch option was removed, is there a reason for that?
- On La Palma and State College (northeast corner), has that site been considered for rezoning? The mall has been dying for 20 years and it would be a good option for low income.
- As you are identifying potential sites, in the event that they are privately owned, what is the process?
- What does “Residential Capacity that Requires a General Plan Amendment” mean?
- Are general plan re-designations generally successful?

3. Draft Policies and Programs Summary

The Consultant team provided information and an overview of the draft policies and programs for the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The Consultant team provided a quick background on the development of the policy program, then walked through the new draft policies for the 6th cycle. The Consultant team also reviewed the policy discussion items that the City would like the committee to discuss, including the following topics:

- Inclusionary housing
- Incentivize housing on religious institutions and community facilities
- Update community care facilities ordinance
- Continued compliance with Surplus Land Act
- Implementation of Affordable Housing policy
- Surplus Land Act (Angel’s stadium)

A summary of committee member comments and questions is below:

- I have an issue with Housing Strategy 5A – Low Barrier Navigation Centers are not housing, why is this mentioned? Is it mandated by the state?

- Do we have anyone on the committee or does the city have a connection to the churches? A lot of the churches in my committee have large parking lots.
- The programs look good, but in the last cycle the city ended up with a disparity between low income and market rate housing. I want to learn more about the City's process, how often do you revisit the Housing Element, is there check and balances internally, how often do you revisit the Element with the public?
- In terms of opportunities for the public to weigh in, is the best opportunity the City Council meeting for the annual review? Is there an outreach program?
- What is the intent of the discussion topics? Can you provide a clear question about what feedback you are looking for, for each topic?

4. General Public Comment

The Consultant team opened the floor for public comments. The following are summary themes of questions received:

- Are the total units shown in the chart for lower income, are those total units that would be built through 2029 for those incomes?
- Is there any way to differentiate between rentals and homeownership?
- Is there any Covid money to support these efforts from the government?
- Inclusionary policies should be a requirement.
- There should be a requirement for ownership vs. renter, in order to create a variety of housing options.
- On the policy discussion items, I think workforce and low/moderate income housing should be required. Inclusionary in-lieu fees should be substantial in order to fund other affordable housing projects.
- Focus on enhancing job opportunity and protecting Anaheim residents.
- Use local work force and create policies to focus on increasing local workers and create jobs, create a local hire component.
- I support a future inclusionary housing ordinance, the cities that have inclusionary ordinances seem to be doing better.
- Focus on lower income housing for its community benefits and economic benefits and because it is the right thing to do.
- ADUs and maintaining affordability is essential.
- I think the pro-housing designation is great and very important.

5. Open Committee Member Q&A

The Consultant team and City staff opened the floor to comments and questions from Committee members; comments were received verbally and through the Q&A feature in the zoom webinar. Below is a summary of all committee comments:

- Inclusionary requirement is a key part in getting the low and very low-income housing.
- It seems clear that the Anaheim stadium sale will go through, the deal may need to be redone and I'm curious if the deal goes through, will it change any of the numbers shown today?
- Tacking on additional cost while there already are challenges to getting housing built makes it harder for developers to create housing

- Inclusionary requirements should be used more on a discretionary basis where they can make significant progress, but a one size fits all instrument feels like a bad policy.
- District 3 has done a lot to create low and very low-income housing and therefore inclusionary housing should be applied in all areas of the city in order to disperse affordable housing opportunity.
- Inclusionary housing policy is appropriate when looking at housing policies that creates incentives for market rate development, if you rezone sites but don't have an inclusionary policy to go with you will most likely get housing production that is at market rate.
- It is reasonable to request in exchange for highest and best use that some of the developed housing units are affordable to low and very low-income units.
- Important to find a more nuanced and discretionary way of approaching inclusionary housing, we need more housing, and we need to do it in a way that meets the different needs of people in the community.
- Is there any effort being made to include permanent supportive housing?
- What are the future outreach plans and possibilities? There is concern that responses to the survey don't adequately reflect the concerns of low income and Spanish speaking community.

6. Next steps

The Consultant team provided an overview of next steps for the update process, information on future public engagement opportunities. The Consultant team also provided the time and date of the next HEUC meeting. The following questions were asked during this time:

- When does the first draft need to go to HCD?
- The Kennedy commission just did a great workshop and, if that was taped, can the City make it available?
- When are the workshops that the public can attend? What time are the meetings and where is the information going to be posted?
- Can you send the information with the dates and times out to the committee members?
- Will there be a presentation at city council for the findings and recommendations of the committee?

7. Adjourn

The Consultant team called the meeting to a close at 8:00p.m.