

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA.95833
(916) 263-2911 / FAX (916) 263-7453
www.hcd.ca.gov



March 25, 2021

Pamela Antil, City Manager
City of Encinitas
505 S. Vulcan Avenue
Encinitas, CA 92024

RE: City of Encinitas Notice of Violation, Ordinance No. 2020-09 (Density Bonus)

Dear Pamela Antil:

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has reviewed the City's Ordinance No. 2020-09 under its authority pursuant to Government Code section 65585, which extends to State Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code, § 65915). HCD must notify the City and may notify the Office of the Attorney General when a city takes actions that violate Government Code section 65915. (Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (j).)

On December 16, 2020, the City adopted Ordinance No. 2020-09 titled, "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Encinitas, California, Adopting Amendments to Chapter 30.16.020(C) (Density Bonus Regulations) of the Encinitas Municipal Code to be Consistent with State Law." HCD acknowledges receipt of correspondence dated February 1, 2021, from the City's attorneys, Goldfarb and Lipman, regarding the City's density bonus ordinance.

As described in greater detail below, HCD finds that the ordinance conflicts with State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) requirements pre- Assembly Bill (AB) 2345 by adding burdensome requirements for projects to access development concessions, incentives, and waivers, as well as changing the density calculation to effectively reduce the net number of units available to a given project. In addition, HCD finds that the ordinance does not qualify for the exemption from the new State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) standards. Accordingly, the City must process density bonus applications in accordance with current SDBL law and take immediate steps to repeal Ordinance No. 2020-09.

State Density Bonus Law Is a Critical Tool for Resolving the Housing Crisis

California is experiencing a housing crisis, and remedying that shortage is of vital statewide importance. To resolve the crisis, all levels of government must work together and do their part. (Gov. Code, § 65580.) SDBL is a critical part of the solution. Recognizing this, the Legislature recently adopted, and on September 28, 2020, the Governor signed, AB 2345 to substantially strengthen SDBL. The changes to SDBL became effective on January 1, 2021.

SDBL incentivizes affordable housing using a number of tools, including the following:

- **Density Bonus Units:** SDBL requires local agencies to grant an increase to the allowable residential density over the otherwise maximum eligible density. (Gov. Code § 65915, subds. (f), (g).) This density bonus is a foundational tool to incentivize affordable housing. However, it is generally understood that the density provision is not as effective at incentivizing affordable housing as the other provisions of SDBL, and it is purposefully complemented by other tools to incentivize affordable development.¹ The law has been strengthened over time, as early versions were not deemed to be sufficiently incentivizing. Thus, it was amended (1) to require progressively more “concessions or incentives” and “waivers” in addition to a density bonus; (2) to make it easier to get concessions, incentives, and waivers; and (3) to include parking incentives. These are described below.
- **Incentives and Concessions:** Local agencies are required to provide one or more “incentives” or “concessions” to each project that qualifies for a density bonus. A concession or incentive is defined as a reduction in site development standards or a modification of zoning code or architectural design requirements, such as a reduction in setback or minimum square footage requirements; approval of mixed-use zoning; or other regulatory incentives or concessions that result in identifiable and actual cost reductions. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (k).) The number of required incentives or concessions is based on the percentage of affordable units in the project. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (d).)
- **Waiver or Reduction of Development Standards:** Beyond the concessions or incentives, if any city or county development standard physically prevents the project from being built at the permitted higher density with the granted concessions/incentives, the developer may propose to have those standards waived or reduced. The city or county is not permitted to apply any development standard that physically precludes the construction of the project at its permitted density and with the granted concessions/incentives. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (e).)
- **Reduced parking requirements:** Local agencies are also required to reduce parking requirements for projects that qualify for a density bonus even if the developer does not request density bonus, incentives, or waivers. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (p).)

AB 2345 Substantially Strengthens SDBL by Increasing Density Bonuses as well as Reducing the Threshold for Obtaining Concessions and Incentives

AB 2345 modified the calculations for awarding density bonuses relative to the number of units of affordable housing included in the proposed project. AB 2345

¹ See, e.g., Jon Goetz and Tom Sakai, Guide to the California Density Bonus Law (Meyers Nave, January 2020), p. 2.

increased the maximum density bonus from 35 percent to 50 percent for projects with 44 percent moderate-income units, 24 percent lower-income units, or 15 percent very low-income units.

In addition to an increased density bonus, AB 2345 reduced the threshold required to qualify for incentives/concessions. The prior threshold to qualify for two incentives/concessions was 20 percent for lower-income households; as of January 1, 2021, the threshold is 17 percent. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (d)(2)(B).) The prior threshold to qualify for three incentives/concessions was 30 percent for lower income households; as of January 1, 2021, the threshold is 24 percent. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (d)(2)(C).)

However, where a program, ordinance, or both “that ***incentivizes the development of affordable housing*** that allows for density bonuses that exceed the density bonuses required by the [SDBL] effective through December 31, 2020,” the city or county with such a program or ordinance is not required by SDBL to amend or otherwise update its ordinance or housing program to comply with certain changes made in AB 2345 and is exempt from complying with the incentive and concession calculation amended by AB 2345. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (s), emphasis added.)

Ordinance No. 2020-09 Contravenes SDBL by Introducing New Burdensome Requirements and Changing Density Calculation

The City’s proposed ordinance is impermissibly inconsistent with SDBL because it increases, rather than decreases, the costs and burdens on applicants (*Friends of Lagoon Valley v. City of Vacaville* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 807, 830 [SDBL preempts inconsistent provisions in these municipal ordinances]), including by, without limitation, imposing the following:

- (1) *Report and burden of proof*: In order to obtain requested incentives or concessions, the ordinance mandates that the applicant provide a financial analysis or report to show that the “requested concessions and incentives will: 1) result in identifiable and actual cost reductions; and 2) are required in order to provide for affordable housing costs as defined in Health and Safety Code Section 50052.5, or for rents for the affordable units to be set as specified in Government Code Section 65915(c).” To add to the burden of this request, the City also requires the applicant to pay for a consultant to review the report. (Municipal Code Section 30.16.020(C).) This mandate exceeds the “reasonable documentation” standard set forth in SDBL.

The requirement to include an additional “financial analysis or report” is expressly prohibited under SDBL. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (a)(2) [“local government shall not condition the submission, review, or approval of an application pursuant to this chapter on the preparation of an additional *report or study*”], emphasis added.) While

early versions of SDBL required the applicant to prove that the incentives, concessions, and waivers would result in identifiable cost reductions, SDBL has long since reversed that burden. SDBL now requires that the city or county approve requested incentives, concessions, or waivers unless the city or county can find no identifiable cost reduction or other specific reasons for denying them. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subds. (d), (e).) While the applicant may have to provide a *basic explanation* showing why the application is eligible for an incentive or concession or to demonstrate the incentive or concession meets the definition set forth in subdivision (k), the city cannot require any report or study of any sort as “reasonable documentation” under subdivision (j). (Gov. Code, § 65915, subds. (a)(2), (j), (k).) The Legislature was clear that no additional studies, reports, or analysis were to be required. (See also Sen. Rules Com., Analysis of Assem. Bill No. 2501 (2015 – 2016 Reg. Sess.), as amended August 1, 2016, p. 6.) The City can require the submission of a reasonable amount of documentation, such as drawings and the like, to establish eligibility for a density bonus, incentives, concessions, waivers, reductions, or parking ratios. However, the overall intent of AB 2501 is to create a presumption that incentives and concessions provide cost reductions, and therefore contribute to affordable housing development. A municipality has the burden of proof of demonstrating that a concession or incentive would not generate cost savings.²

Further, the ordinance substantially heightens the demonstration required to obtain a concession or incentive in the city, contrary to SDBL. Under the city’s ordinance, an applicant would have to show that an incentive or concession would (1) result in identifiable and actual cost reductions *and* (2) that such reductions “**are required** in order to provide for affordable housing costs as defined in Health and Safety Code Section 50052.5, or for rents for the affordable units to be set as specified in Government Code Section 65915(c).” SDBL merely requires that such cost reductions help free up funds for affordable housing, not that they are essential to the provision of affordable housing. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subds. (a)(2), (j), (k).) The showing is not substantial: “If a development provides the required affordable housing, the applicable density bonus and reduced parking standards must be provided. There are no grounds in the statute to deny a developer’s request.” (Lynn E. Hutchins and Karen Tiedemann, Goldfarb & Lipman “Not Just Density Bonuses: Dealing with Demands Beyond the Bonus” (League of California Cities, 2016, at p. 2.) These requirements in the City’s ordinance are contrary to SDBL and **disincentivize** affordable housing.

² This interpretation is consistent with the weight of the commentary as well. (See, e.g., Jon Goetz and Tom Sakai, Guide to the California Density Bonus Law (Meyers Nave, 2020), at pp. 3, 5; Karl E. Geier “Going for the Capillaries: Legislative Tinkering with California Planning and Zoning Laws to Address the Housing Shortage” (March 2017) 27(4) Miller & Starr, Real Estate Newsalert NL 1; David Blackwell and Timothy Hutter, “California Governor Signs Four Bills Affecting Density Bonus Projects” (September 29, 2016); City of Santa Rosa, “White Paper: Density Bonus Ordinance Update” (Undated), at pp. 16, 20, 54.)

Cost reductions resulting from incentives or concessions should be apparent from the project application, thus negating any need for a “financial analysis or report.” Additionally, the City’s February 1, 2021 correspondence to HCD asserts Encinitas has had a “model density bonus program” that has “incentivized more affordable and market-rate units than in the City of San Diego” and “Almost every project of 5 units or more in the City utilizes Density Bonus Law in some fashion.” As such, it is unclear why the City would add burdensome requirements to what it claims was a successful program.

- (2) *Documentation of other alternatives*: In order to obtain requested waivers, the ordinance mandates that the applicant provide not only reasonable documentation establishing that development standards preclude development at the allowed density, but also (1) reports, (2) drawings and elevations, (3) consultants, and (4) alternative designs. (Municipal Code Section 30.16.020(C).)

These additional requirements are not permitted under SDBL and include evidentiary showings that go well beyond SDBL’s “reasonable documentation” standard. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (a)(2); *Wollmer v. City of Berkeley* (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 1329, 1346-1347.) Courts have held, for instance, that SDBL does not require a housing development project to be void of amenities to accommodate needed densities with fewer waivers. (*Wollmer, supra.*) The project applicant need not consider various alternatives that might be accommodated on site without the concessions, incentives, or waivers. If the project meets the requirements for a density bonus, the City must waive development standards requested pursuant to section (e) that preclude development of the project as proposed. These requirements are contrary to SDBL and **disincentivize** affordable housing.

- (3) *Change in base density calculation*: The ordinance modifies key definitions, which would have the actual effect of reducing the number of affordable units and implementing a net density that is explicitly contrary to state law. In particular, the City proposes to include the following definitions:

“Maximum Allowable Residential Density” means the density allowed under the zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan, or, if a range of density is permitted, means the maximum allowable density for the specific zoning range and land use element of the general plan applicable to the project. If the density allowed under the zoning ordinance is inconsistent with the density allowed under the land use element of the general plan, the general plan density shall prevail. In Encinitas, maximum allowable residential density allowed in the General Plan is based on net acreage.

“Maximum Allowable Gross Residential Density” means the maximum number of dwelling units allowed under the General Plan per net acre of land.

Notably, the previous version of the City's ordinance calculated density based on *gross* acres, rather than *net* acres. The City previously adopted its ordinance taking a gross acres approach on the advice of its counsel that this was mandated by SDBL. Indeed, SDBL refers to gross density, not net density. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (f).) Accordingly, "the City has since 2017 consistently used gross acreage to calculate base density for density bonus purposes." (Nick Zornes, City of Encinitas, Agenda Report Item #10A, December 9, 2020, p. 10.) The City cites no legal basis for changing its ordinance in this manner, and indeed the City's own attorney advises against the change. For these reasons, HCD advises that this change is contrary to SDBL (Gov. Code, § 65915, subds. (f) and (r)) and further **disincentivizes** affordable housing.

Further, the implementation of a net density standard potentially impacts the feasibility of proposed development, particularly given the absence of any grandfathering provisions for pending development applications.

The City's February 1, 2021 letter to HCD asserts that because HCD's *Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook* allows for use of net density, it is appropriate to do so in the City's density bonus ordinance. This is faulty logic and compares apples to oranges. Calculating realistic capacity for a housing element site inventory pursuant to the provisions of Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (c), is irrelevant to the calculations required pursuant to SDBL. SDBL has its own terms, its own definitions, and occupies a completely different chapter of Government Code. SDBL explicitly requires the use of gross acreage.

The City's February 1, 2021 letter further justifies the use of net acreage because some of its neighboring jurisdictions do so. The erroneous application of the law in one or more jurisdictions does not justify its widespread adoption. HCD appreciates the information and will be following up with those cities.

- (4) *Lack of grandfathering provisions*: The ordinance, as currently adopted, appears to lack grandfathering provisions for developments currently in the entitlement process, including developments that are proposed on sites recently rezoned as a result of housing element requirements. The lack of grandfathering provisions impacts the feasibility of development and adds additional timing delays. The lack of grandfathering provisions is especially troublesome when considered in combination with significant constraints such as the City's density-related definitions. The Department reminds the City of the requirements of Government Code section 65589.5, subdivision (o)(1), "... a housing development project shall be subject only to the ordinances, policies, and standards adopted and in effect when a preliminary application including all of the information required by subdivision (a) of Section 65941.1 was submitted."

(5) *Other disincentivizing impediments to affordable housing:* In other respects, the proposed ordinance includes new requirements that shift mandates, increase the time needed to prepare an application, cause regulatory confusion, and increase costs of housing development.³ For instance, the new ordinance dictates that affordable units must be at least 75 percent of the average square footage of market rate units. SDBL does not mandate the size of either the density bonus units or the affordable units in the development. SDBL references only the requirements for replacement units, which is based upon bedroom count, not square footage. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (c)(3).) The imposition of a 75 percent requirement is arbitrary—the City provided no data or other evidentiary basis for its decision. In addition, the ordinance mandates the cost of the review of reasonable documentation supporting the request of concessions or incentives, and waivers be borne by the applicant. Furthermore, the ordinance anticipates hiring a consultant to review documentation. SDBL places the burden of proof for denial of requested concessions or incentives on the City – not on the applicant. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (d)(4).) SDBL allows the request of only reasonable documentation for requested concessions or incentives, and waivers. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (a)(2).) The burden of developing such findings is placed squarely on the city or county.

Government Code section 65915, subdivision (r), provides, “This chapter shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units.” An ordinance that nominally allows slightly greater densities but that has the primary effect of increasing the costs and burdens of applying for a density bonus cannot be reasonably construed as one that maximizes the number of housing units developed. For all the reasons above, the City’s Ordinance No. 2020-09 violates SDBL.

Ordinance No. 2020-09 Fails to Meet Exemption Threshold: “Incentivize the Development of Affordable Housing that Allows for Density Bonuses that Exceed the Density Bonuses Required By [SDBL] Effective Through December 31, 2020.”

The City argues that it is exempt from SCBL mandates because it falls within the exemption set out in Government Code section 65915, subdivision (s). As a threshold matter, the City misapprehends the scope of that exemption. Government Code section 65915, subdivision (s), does not authorize a city or county to replace its SDBL mandates with a wholesale new ordinance that supplants the established mandates of SDBL. As a result, even if a city or county qualifies for the exemption from the new SDBL mandates, the remainder of SDBL continues to apply to the jurisdiction in 2021.

³ These restrictions are concerning from a fair housing perspective as well: “Examples of land use practices that violate the Fair Housing Act under a discriminatory effects standard include minimum floor space or lot size requirements that increase the size and cost of housing if such an increase has the effect of excluding persons from a locality or neighborhood because of their membership in a protected class, without a legally sufficient justification.” (United States Department of Justice and United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, “Joint Statement: Local Land Use Laws and Practices and the Application of the Fair Housing Act” (November 10, 2016) (“Joint Statement”), p. 5.)

In this case, however, the City appears to also err in its determination that it has satisfied the exemption. To meet the exemption threshold, the City's ordinance must be an ordinance "that incentivizes the development of affordable housing." What does it mean to incentivize in the context of the SDBL? The City asserts that its ordinance satisfies the exemption in subdivision (s) because it "allows a housing development to request a density bonus that is higher than the ... 35 percent maximum" set out in SDBL in 2020, and accordingly "the City would not be required to implement the amendments contained in AB 2345 with respect to the increase in density bonus (50 percent maximum) or incentive/concessions." (Nick Zornes, City of Encinitas, Agenda Report Item #10A, December 9, 2020, p. 5.)

However, the term "incentivize" in this context takes meaning from the history of SDBL, which shows that the Legislature, over time, has realized that substantial enticements beyond density bonus (additional units over zoning) are needed to incentivize the development of affordable housing. As noted above, SDBL includes several provisions beyond density bonus—such as incentives and concessions, waivers, and reduced parking standards—that have been deemed essential to incentivize affordable housing. It is generally recognized that these "other tools are even more helpful to project economics than the density bonus itself." (See, e.g., Jon Goetz and Tom Sakai, Guide to the California Density Bonus Law (Meyers Nave, January 2020, p. 2.).) The subdivision (s) exemption to AB 2345 accordingly contemplates something more than simply allowing someone to request a density bonus that is only *slightly higher* than the 35 percent maximum bonus in effect at the close of 2020, while, at the same time, creating disincentives elsewhere within its ordinance that have a net negative effect on incentivizing affordable housing. Here, the ordinance substantially raises the hurdles to qualify for incentives, concessions, and waivers (by introducing new burdensome requirements) and effectively reduces the net number of units available (by moving to net density calculation instead of gross density). SDBL "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of producing the maximum number of total housing units." (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (r).)

In defense of its ordinance the City's February 1, 2021 letter to HCD refers to the UC Berkeley Turner Center for Housing Innovation's (Turner Center) July 2020 Policy Brief entitled "Revisiting California's Density Bonus Law: Analysis of SB 1085 and AB 2345." The City's letter states that "AB 2345 was marginally less attractive than existing density bonus law." This is an incomplete characterization of the Turner Center's conclusion as the document also states, "In addition to added density, developers may also take advantage of other incentives allowed under density bonus law that can sometimes prove just as valuable—or even more valuable than additional units." Thus, the Turner Center agrees with Goetz and Sakai that other elements of density bonus law are often more incentivizing, concluding: "Our California Residential Land Use Survey found that developers do not always choose to utilize the added density afforded by density bonus law, but other concessions are frequently received." In no way does the Turner Center advocate efforts to avoid compliance with AB 2345: "SB 1085 and AB 2345 represent a

step in the right direction for legislation that prioritizes affordability while recognizing the need for offsets to achieve financial feasibility.”

The City also argues that modifications to its density bonus ordinance are justified due to its prior success with the law, citing 33 project approvals over two decades that resulted in a total of 908 new units, about 97 of which were affordable. It suggests that its density bonus ordinance is more successful than San Diego’s prior to that city’s adoption of a new density bonus program that served as the model for AB 2345. This appears to be incorrect, however. Between 2005 and 2017, a briefer period than Encinitas’ sample, San Diego approved 36 projects with 3,959 units under its density bonus ordinance, about 454 were affordable.⁴ Initial data from San Diego’s implementation suggest that its new ordinance is even more successful at producing housing generally and affordable units in particular.⁵

Further, even assuming Encinitas’ prior density bonus program was successful (though it is also possible that Encinitas’ generally restrictive practices deterred multifamily production outside of its density bonus program), any such past successes by the City using density bonuses alone is not sufficient to trigger an exemption from SDBL now. The City complains that its ordinance resulted in too many market-rate homes and too few affordable homes. AB 2345 does not authorize the City to adopt an ordinance further disincentivizing housing generally.

Conclusion

In sum, HCD has reviewed the City’s Ordinance No. 2020-09 under its authority pursuant to Government Code section 65585, which extends to State Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code, § 65915). HCD has found that Ordinance No. 2020-09, violates separate SDBL requirements by adding burdensome requirements for projects to access development concessions, incentives, and waivers, as well as by changing the density calculation to effectively reduce the net number of units available to a given project. In addition, HCD finds that the City does not meet the threshold for exemption from recent legislative changes. Accordingly, the City must apply State Density Bonus Law by processing density bonus applications in accordance with AB 2345 and take immediate steps to repeal Ordinance No. 2020-09. As noted above, HCD is hereby notifying the City of the above findings and violations pursuant to Government Code section 65585, subdivision (j).

⁴ See Colin Parent, *Early Win for Affordable Homes Bonus Program* (Circulate San Diego, October 18, 2017) [Density Bonus Production Figures Data at <<https://www.circulatesd.org/ahbpreport>>].

⁵ See Parent, *supra*, at p. 6.

Pamela Antil, City Manager
Page 10

If you have any questions, or would like to discuss the content of this letter, please contact Robin Huntley of our staff at Robin.Huntley@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Megan Kirkeby". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small dot at the end.

Megan Kirkeby
Deputy Director

POLICY WHITE PAPER:
CITY OF SANTA ROSA

DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE UPDATE



This document prepared for the City of Santa Rosa

CITY STAFF

David Guhin, Planning & Economic Development Director
Clare Hartman, Deputy Director – Planning
William Rose, Supervising Planner – Planning Development Review
Jessica Jones, Supervising Planner – Long Range Planning
Megan Basinger, Housing & Community Services Manager

CONSULTANT TEAM

Heather Hines, M-Group
Milan Nevajda, M-Group
Krystle Rizzi, M-Group
Karen Warner, Karen Warner Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
DENSITY BONUS BASICS.....	8
Sliding Scale (Income-Based) Density Bonus.....	8
Basic Provisions: Fixed-Rate (Specialized Housing) Density Bonuses.....	9
Basic Provisions: Other Density Bonuses.....	10
Basic Provisions: Affordability Restrictions.....	11
Basic Provisions: Incentives and Concessions, Waivers, and Reductions.....	11
Basic Provisions: Alternative By-Right Parking Standards.....	13
POST-2012 REGULATORY UPDATES TO THE SDBL.....	13
AB 2222 (2014). Expands affordability terms to 55 years; requires affordable unit replacement.....	13
AB 744 (2015). Requires local governments to allow reduced parking requirements.....	14
AB 1934 (2016). Includes a density bonus option for commercial projects with affordable housing.....	14
AB 2556 (2017). Provides clarifying language on addressing replacement units.....	15
AB 2501 (2017). Streamlines density bonus processing and clarifies application requirements.....	16
AB 2442 (2017). Expands the housing categories that could qualify for a density bonus.....	17
Summary of Density Bonus Law Key Features with Amendments Since 2012:.....	18
LOCAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR SDBL IMPLEMENTATION.....	19
Density Bonuses in Areas with No Maximum Density.....	19
Density Bonus Application Requirements.....	20
Inclusionary Housing Policies.....	20
Density Bonus Beyond 35%.....	20
Denial of Incentives, Concessions, Waivers, or Reductions.....	21
Local Integration: CEQA Exemptions, Historical Resources, and Neighborhood Integration.....	22
CITY OF SANTA ROSA DENSITY BONUS REGULATIONS	23
GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENT.....	23
HOUSING ACTION PLAN.....	25
Program #1: Increase Inclusionary Housing.....	25
Program #4: Improve Development Readiness of Housing Opportunity Sites.....	25
MUNICIPAL CODE.....	25
LOCAL DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE COMPARISON	27
BERKELEY.....	28
EMERYVILLE.....	29
HAYWARD.....	32
NAPA.....	32
OAKLAND.....	34
RICHMOND.....	35
SACRAMENTO.....	36
SAN FRANCISCO.....	37
SANTA CRUZ.....	39
SONOMA COUNTY.....	40
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	42
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SANTA ROSA DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE.....	46
APPENDICES	55

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1 - REQUIREMENTS FOR DENSITY BONUS ELIGIBILITY AND ASSOCIATED DENSITY BONUSES.....	9
TABLE 2 - SCHEDULE FOR RECEIVING DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES OR CONCESSIONS PER SDBL SECTION 65915(D).....	12
TABLE 3 - PARKING REQUIREMENTS AVAILABLE BY REQUEST UNDER DENSITY BONUS LAW	13
TABLE 4 - SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR DB PROJECTS BY TYPE AND TRANSIT ACCESS.....	14
TABLE 5 - UPDATED REQUIREMENTS FOR DENSITY BONUS ELIGIBILITY AND ASSOCIATED DENSITY BONUSES	18
TABLE 6 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES RELATED TO AFFORDABLE AND SPECIALIZED HOUSING DENSITY BONUSES	23
TABLE 7 - INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN SANTA ROSA'S CURRENT DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE AND DENSITY BONUS LAW ...	26
TABLE 8 - CITY OF BERKELEY PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATING DENSITY BONUS APPLICATIONS.....	28
TABLE 9 - EMERYVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE TABLE 9-4.203(A): RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AREA DESIGNATIONS	30
TABLE 10 - EMERYVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE TABLE 9-4.204(D)(1): BONUS POINTS SCHEDULE FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS	31
TABLE 11 - AFFORDABILITY-BASED SLIDING SCALE DENSITY BONUS SCHEDULE IN RICHMOND.....	35
TABLE 12 - PRE-APPROVED CONCESSIONS AND WAIVERS IN SAN FRANCISCO	38
TABLE 13 - FEATURES OF HOUSING PROJECTS THAT QUALIFY PROJECTS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL DENSITY BONUSES.....	41
TABLE 14 - SUMMARY TABLE OF DENSITY BONUS REGULATIONS FOR COMPARABLE CITIES TO SANTA ROSA.....	43
TABLE 15 - SUMMARY OF APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR DENSITY BONUS PROJECTS	45
TABLE 16 - PROPOSED SANTA ROSA WORKSHEET FOR DENSITY BONUS PROJECTS IN AREAS WITHOUT DENSITY LIMITS.....	46
TABLE 17 - RECOMMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL DENSITY BONUS AREA DESIGNATIONS BASED ON LOCATIONAL FACTORS.....	48
TABLE 18 - SUPPLEMENTAL DENSITY BONUS POINT GENERATION SCHEDULE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.....	51
TABLE 19 AFFORDABLE HOUSING ALTERNATIVE: POINT GENERATION SCHEDULE	52
TABLE 20 - RECOMMENDED PRE-APPROVED CONCESSIONS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL DENSITY BONUS PROJECTS.....	53
FIGURE 1 - EMERYVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE FIGURE 9-4.203(A): RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AREA DESIGNATIONS	30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) was adopted in 1976 to address California's affordable housing needs. As originally enacted, the SDBL sought to increase the production of affordable housing by requiring local agencies to grant an increase to the maximum allowable residential density for eligible projects, and to support the development of eligible projects at greater residential densities by granting incentives, concessions, waivers, and/or reductions to applicable development regulations.

The City of Santa Rosa has adopted a local Density Bonus Ordinance (included in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 20-31) that complied State law at the time the ordinance was adopted and through to the last amendment in 2012. Several updates to SDBL have occurred since 2012 and Santa Rosa's local Ordinance is currently inconsistent with State law. This report provides an overview of the SDBL to highlight its basic provisions, and the six amendments that have been adopted to the law since 2012 (AB-2222, AB-744, AB-1934, AB-2556, AB-2501, and AB-2442). The report clarifies necessary updates to the Santa Rosa Density Bonus Ordinance to comply with State law.

In addition to ensuring compliance with SDBL, this report assists the City with implementing its Housing Action Plan (2016), which provides clear direction on updating the local Density Bonus Ordinance to increase regulatory incentives that promote affordable housing production. Specifically, Program #1 and Program #4 of the Housing Action Plan direct the City to develop a local density bonus ordinance that allows for density beyond the 35% provided by the SDBL. The Housing Action Plan calls for a supplemental density bonus of up to 100%, as well as a structure for processing supplemental density bonus applications.

In Chapter IV of this White Paper, a series of recommendations are provided for a supplemental density bonus program in Santa Rosa. The recommendations provide for additional density bonuses of up to 60%, 80%, and 100% of base density, depending on site suitability, which is determined by evaluating the following factors:

- **Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Service Capacity.** Larger bonuses are considered if a property is within a PDA. These sites typically are located in areas with larger-scale development, have access to necessary infrastructure, and are close to major transit service routes.
- **Land Use Designations that allow denser residential development.** Where higher density residential development is already permitted, a greater degree of density bonus is considered to incentivize affordable housing production with future projects.
- **Proximity to single-family neighborhoods.** Sites that border predominantly single-family residential developments are proposed to have a lower supplemental density bonuses to ensure an appropriate scale of development is achieved in transition areas.
- **Existing conditions, infrastructure and development patterns.** Sites adjacent to major infrastructure (predominantly major corridors) are considered to have a better capacity to handle higher density development and therefore greater supplemental density bonuses are proposed in these areas.

- **Redevelopment Impediments.** Properties with existing development that would require increased investment to redevelop are targeted with higher supplemental density bonuses to overcome redevelopment barriers.
- **Access to transit.** Proximity to transit reduces parking demand, which enables higher density development, thus greater supplemental density bonuses are proposed in these areas.
- **Proximity to Schools.** Sites within a ½-mile of schools are considered more appropriate for higher density development. Reduced density bonuses are provided for properties located further from schools.
- **Preservation Districts.** Single-family areas in Santa Rosa’s preservation districts face excessive redevelopment pressure because they are typically located close to the urbanized core of the city. Supplemental density bonuses are targeted to the periphery of preservation districts if other factors align to support supplemental density bonuses.

The structure for the proposed supplemental density bonus program in Santa Rosa is based on a point system. A request for larger density bonuses results in a larger required number of points to qualify for the bonus. Points are generated predominantly through the production of affordable housing across a range of income levels. A smaller share of the required points may also be generated by providing certain community benefits that may include:

- Open space
- Historic or Landmark Preservation
- Family-sized units
- Infrastructure/Capital improvements
- Public art
- Innovative Community Benefits supported by City Council using a predictable model that balances the degree of community benefit with capital invested.

The next step in developing a supplemental density program in Santa Rosa is to evaluate the proposed structure with the community, to gather feedback and reactions to the program, and to revise the recommendations for an improved policy that is appropriate, viable, and effective in Santa Rosa. Following the community outreach and refinement of the proposed amendments to the City’s existing Density Bonus Ordinance, the proposal will be scheduled for review and consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

I. INTRODUCTION

The California State Density Bonus Law (SDBL) was adopted in 1976 in recognition of California's acute and growing affordable housing needs. The SDBL has been amended multiple times since adoption in response to evolving housing conditions, to provide clarification on the legislation, to respond to legal and implementation challenges, and to incorporate new or expanded provisions. The SDBL, as originally enacted, sought to address the affordable housing shortage by encouraging development of low- and moderate-income units; over time, the law was expanded to recognize the need for housing for households at a wider range of income levels and with specialized needs.

The SDBL incentivizes affordable and other specialized housing production by requiring local agencies to grant an increase to the maximum allowable residential density for eligible projects, and to support the development of eligible projects at greater residential densities by granting incentives, concessions, waivers, or reductions to applicable development regulations. An example of a concession or incentive is a reduction in the number of parking spaces that may be required for a project, or an increase in the allowable building height that applies to the project. The SDBL applies to projects providing five or more residential units, including mixed-use developments. Density bonuses and associated incentives, concessions, waivers, or reductions are intended to offset the financial burden of constructing affordable or specialized units.

All local governments are required to implement the SDBL or adopt local ordinances that are consistent with State law. Local jurisdictions may adopt an ordinance that allows greater incentives and bonuses than the SDBL. The City of Santa Rosa amended its local density bonus ordinance in 2012; since that time a series of updates were adopted at the state level to amend the SDBL, including three major updates that took effect January 1, 2017.

The purpose of this White Paper is to propose changes to the City's existing Density Bonus Ordinance that will bring it into conformance with SDBL, and to implement the Housing Action Plan.

The Housing Action Plan directs the City to utilize the density bonus program as a key incentive for affordable housing production in Santa Rosa. The Action Plan also directs the City to adopt a supplemental density bonus program that provides for density bonuses of up to 100% where feasible and appropriate in the City.

Based on input from City staff, this White Paper focuses on several key aspects of SDBL for consideration in updating the City's ordinance. These topic areas include:

- Preparing an overview of SDBL
- Identifying updates to the SDBL that are not reflected in local ordinance
- Evaluating SDBL implementation in land use designations with no maximum, base density
- Clarifying density bonus application requirements
- Clarifying the relationship between the City's inclusionary housing ordinance and SDBL
- Understanding opportunities for density bonuses beyond 35% (the SDBL maximum)
- Understanding the bases for denying incentives, concessions, waivers, or reductions
- Clarifying the implementation of SDBL locally with respect to environmental review, preservation districts and landmarks, and neighborhood compatibility.

Density Bonus Application Requirements

One of the issues that SDBL proponents identified and sought to address through AB 2501 is that several communities—deliberately or inadvertently—had restricted access to density bonuses through onerous application requirements and costly reports that were designed to substantiate applications for bonuses. While AB 2501 inserted provision 65915(a)(2) into the Density Bonus Law to prevent frivolous application requirements, interviews with jurisdictions conducted for this white paper indicate that confusion remains about what local jurisdictions can and cannot require as part of a density bonus application. Section 65915(a)(2) reads that the SDBL “does not prohibit a local government from requiring an applicant to provide *reasonable documentation*”⁶ (emphasis added) to establish eligibility for a density bonus, incentives, concessions, waivers, reductions, or parking ratios. Some local governments interpret this language to require developers to submit pro formas showing the amount of profit they will make on a project. However, amendments adopted through AB 2501 are intended to presume that incentives and concessions provide cost reductions, and therefore contribute to affordable housing development. A municipality has the burden of proof of demonstrating that a concession or incentive would not generate cost savings.

Inclusionary Housing Policies

Section 65915(b)(1) outlines the eligibility requirements for density bonuses. The section clarifies that a local jurisdiction must grant a density bonus and associated concessions, incentives, waivers, and/or reductions “*when an applicant for a housing development seeks and agrees to construct a housing development, excluding any units permitted by the density bonus awarded pursuant to this section*” that contains affordable units consistent with the schedule outlined in the law. Inclusionary affordable housing units are not units permitted by the density bonus; therefore, inclusionary units have been consistently interpreted as contributing to qualifying a project under SDBL. This interpretation was confirmed in 2013 by the California Court of Appeals in *Latinos Unidos del Valle de Napa y Solano v. County of Napa*.

Density Bonus Beyond 35%

Density Bonus Law Section 65915(n) stipulates that local governments have the option to grant density bonuses in excess of 35% for projects that meet the SDBL, or to grant smaller density bonuses for projects that do not meet minimum qualification thresholds in the SDBL. In other words, projects that either fail to fully meet, or projects that exceed the eligibility requirements of the SDBL may be granted proportionate density bonuses at the discretion of the local government. The City of Santa Rosa Housing Action Plan directs the City to develop a supplemental density bonus program for the City that provides a bonus of up to 100% (see Program #1 in the Action Plan, outlined in the following chapter).

Several communities have adopted local ordinances that support density bonus allowances above 35%. Generally, supplemental density bonuses are permitted for projects that provide additional community benefits or amenities that communities have identified as potentially:

⁶ See Section 65915(a)(2)

5. Adopt expanded definitions or procedural clarifications to ambiguous or narrowly-defined policy language in the SDBL, including:
 - Clarifying what constitutes a significant, adverse impact when reviewing concession and waiver requests. Recommendations include:
 - The development project is proposed within a Preservation District and the proposed concession would irreparably alter a historic resource, either individual or district, in a manner that is inconsistent with the *Secretary of The Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.
 - The development project is proposed on land which does not currently have adequate water or wastewater facilities to service the development, or the provision of such services infeasible at the level of residential density proposed in the development.
 - Pursuant to the SDBL amendments adopted in SB-2501, the City is prohibited from conditioning the submission, review, or approval of a density bonus application on additional reports or studies not described in the SDBL. Santa Rosa may require "reasonable documentation" to **establish eligibility** for incentives or concessions, waivers or reductions, or reduced parking ratios. To clarify application requirements, the City of Santa Rosa should not require a pro forma in conjunction with applications for concessions and incentives unless the City furnishes—in writing—a rationale for questioning the financial support that the concession or incentive will provide toward the production of affordable housing.