

## APPENDICES

- A. Definitions and Abbreviations
- B. Housing Needs Data Report
- C. SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary (6/1/22 and 7/17/20)
- D. San Mateo County Multijurisdictional Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (LHMP), 2021
- E. ADU Affordability Report
- F. Housing Development Constraints, Development Costs, and Zoning Analysis
  - F.1 Report on Development Costs and Unit Mix
- G. Adequate Sites Inventory
- H. Public Engagement and Input Summary
- I. ADU Production in Woodside (2015-2021)
  - I.1 Permits Issued for SFRs and ADUs In Woodside between 2015 - 2021
- J. Town of Woodside ADU Ordinances:
  - J.1 Ordinance 2017-585 (Implementing AB 2299 & SB 1069, ADU Laws)
  - J.2 Ordinance 2018-593 (Improving ADU Ingress/Egress)
  - J.3 Ordinance 2018-597 (Implementing AB 2406, Voluntary JADU Law)
  - J.4 Ordinance 2020-610 (Implementing AB 68, AB 881 & SB 13, ADU Laws)
- K. AFFH – Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
- L. Inventory of Shelters and Services for the Homeless in San Mateo County

**APPENDIX A. Definitions and Abbreviations**

## APPENDIX A. Definitions and Abbreviations

**ABAG:** Association of Bay Area Governments, the local regional planning agency in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

**Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs):** See Municipal Code Section 153.005

**Affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH):** Taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity for communities of color, persons with disabilities, and others protected by California law. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws. The duty to affirmatively further fair housing extends to all a public agency's activities and programs relating to housing and community development.

**Disadvantaged Community:** An area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code, or an area that is low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.

**Downzone:** To reduce the number of allowable units on a parcel.

**Equity:** Just and fair inclusion into a society in which all can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential.

**Form Based Code:** Form based codes address the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another and the scale and types of streets and blocks. The regulations and standards in form-based codes are presented in both words and clearly drawn in diagrams and other visuals. They are keyed to a regulating plan that designates the appropriate form and scale (and therefore, character) of development, rather than only distinctions in land use types.

**HCD:** The State Housing and Community Development Department guides preparation of Housing Elements and certifies compliant Housing Elements statewide.

**Integration:** A condition in which there is not a high concentration of persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, having a disability, or a particular type of disability, when compared to a broader geographic area.

***Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs): See Municipal Code Section 153.005***

***Resilience:*** The ability to respond, absorb and adapt to as well as recover from a disruptive event. For structures, resilience is the ability to absorb or avoid damage without suffering complete failure. For people, it is the capacity adapt to difficult situations and recover quickly from difficulties.

***RHNA:*** The Regional Housing Needs Allocation is the number of housing units each jurisdiction is responsible to plan for during a specific Housing Element cycle. The RHNA is determined by the local regional government, in the case of the Bay Area, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), based on an overall allocation from the State Housing and Community Development Department. The allocations used to be considered “targets” for housing production, but they are now required mandates.

***Segregation:*** A condition in which there is a high concentration of persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or having a disability or a type of disability in a particular geographic area when compared to a broader geographic area.

***Upzone:*** To increase the number of units allowed on a parcel. Relaxation of former regulations to allow greater density of housing units, and in some cases, mixed use development.

**APPENDIX B. Housing Needs Data Report prepared by ABAG/MTC  
and Baird + Driskell Community Planning, April 4, 2021**

# HOUSING NEEDS DATA REPORT: WOODSIDE

ABAG/MTC Staff and Baird + Driskell Community Planning

2021-04-02



ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS  
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Technical Assistance  
for Local Planning  
**HOUSING**

## 0.1 Table of content

0.1	Table of content.....	2
0.2	List of figures.....	3
0.3	List of tables.....	3
1	Introduction.....	5
2	Summary of Key Facts.....	6
3	Looking to the Future: Regional Housing Needs.....	9
3.1	Regional Housing Needs Determination.....	9
3.2	Regional Housing Needs Allocation.....	9
4	Population, Employment and Household Characteristics.....	11
4.1	Population.....	11
4.2	Age.....	12
4.3	Race and Ethnicity.....	14
4.4	Employment Trends.....	15
4.4.1	Balance of Jobs and Workers.....	15
4.4.2	Sector Composition.....	19
4.5	Extremely Low-Income Households.....	20
4.6	Tenure.....	24
4.7	Displacement.....	28
5	Housing Stock Characteristics.....	30
5.1	Housing Types, Year Built, Vacancy, and Permits.....	30
5.2	Assisted Housing Developments At-Risk of Conversion.....	33
5.3	Substandard Housing.....	34
5.4	Home and Rent Values.....	35
5.5	Overpayment and Overcrowding.....	38
6	Special Housing Needs.....	46
6.1	Large Households.....	46
6.2	Female-Headed Households.....	47
6.3	Seniors.....	49
6.4	People with Disabilities.....	50
6.5	Homelessness.....	52
6.6	Farmworkers.....	57
6.7	Non-English Speakers.....	58



## 0.2 List of figures

Figure 1: Population Growth Trends .....	12
Figure 2: Population by Age, 2000-2019 .....	13
Figure 3: Senior and Youth Population by Race.....	14
Figure 4: Population by Race, 2000-2019 .....	15
Figure 5: Jobs in a Jurisdiction .....	16
Figure 6: Workers by Earnings, by Jurisdiction as Place of Work and Place of Residence .....	17
Figure 7: Jobs-Worker Ratios, By Wage Group.....	18
Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio .....	19
Figure 9: Resident Employment by Industry.....	20
Figure 10: Households by Household Income Level.....	22
Figure 11: Household Income Level by Tenure.....	23
Figure 12: Poverty Status by Race.....	24
Figure 13: Housing Tenure.....	25
Figure 14: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder .....	26
Figure 15: Housing Tenure by Age .....	27
Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Housing Type .....	28
Figure 17: Households by Displacement Risk and Tenure.....	29
Figure 18: Housing Type Trends .....	30
Figure 19: Housing Units by Year Structure Built .....	31
Figure 20: Vacant Units by Type .....	32
Figure 21: Substandard Housing Issues.....	35
Figure 22: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units .....	36
Figure 23: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) .....	36
Figure 24: Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units.....	37
Figure 25: Median Contract Rent .....	38
Figure 26: Cost Burden by Tenure .....	39
Figure 27: Cost Burden by Income Level.....	40
Figure 28: Cost Burden by Race.....	41
Figure 29: Cost Burden by Household Size.....	42
Figure 30: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level .....	43
Figure 31: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity .....	44
Figure 32: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity .....	45
Figure 33: Overcrowding by Race.....	45
Figure 34: Household Size by Tenure .....	46
Figure 35: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms.....	47
Figure 36: Household Type .....	48
Figure 37: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status.....	49
Figure 38: Senior Households by Income and Tenure .....	50
Figure 39: Disability by Type.....	51
Figure 40: Homelessness by Household Type and Shelter Status, San Mateo County .....	53
Figure 41: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, San Mateo County.....	54
Figure 42: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, San Mateo County.....	55
Figure 43: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, San Mateo County .....	56
Figure 44: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, San Mateo County.....	58
Figure 45: Population with Limited English Proficiency .....	59

## 0.3 List of tables

Table 1: Illustrative Regional Housing Needs Allocation from Draft Methodology.....	10
---	----



Table 2: Population Growth Trends .....	11
Table 3: Housing Permitting.....	32
Table 4: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion .....	33
Table 5: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age.....	52
Table 6: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence .....	52
Table 7: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness .....	57
Table 8: Migrant Worker Student Population .....	57

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The Bay Area continues to see growth in both population and jobs, which means more housing of various types and sizes is needed to ensure that residents across all income levels, ages, and abilities have a place to call home. While the number of people drawn to the region over the past 30 years has steadily increased, housing production has stalled, contributing to the housing shortage that communities are experiencing today. In many cities, this has resulted in residents being priced out, increased traffic congestion caused by longer commutes, and fewer people across incomes being able to purchase homes or meet surging rents.

The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update provides a roadmap for how to meet our growth and housing challenges. Required by the state, the Housing Element identifies what the existing housing conditions and community needs are, reiterates goals, and creates a plan for more housing. The Housing Element is an integral part of the General Plan, which guides the policies of Woodside.

## 2 SUMMARY OF KEY FACTS

- **Population** - Generally, the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region. The population of Woodside increased by 6.1% from 2000 to 2020, which is below the growth rate of the Bay Area.
- **Age** - In 2019, Woodside's youth population under the age of 18 was 1,357 and senior population 65 and older was 1,238. These age groups represent 24.5% and 22.3%, respectively, of Woodside's population.
- **Race/Ethnicity** - In 2020, 79.0% of Woodside's population was White while 0.9% was African American, 7.3% was Asian, and 9.1% was Latinx. People of color in Woodside comprise a proportion below the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.<sup>1</sup>
- **Employment** - Woodside residents most commonly work in the *Financial & Professional Services* industry. Since 2010, the number of jobs located in the jurisdiction increased by 520 (32.5%). Additionally, the jobs-household ratio in Woodside has increased from 1.03 in 2002 to 1.06 jobs per household in 2018.
- **Number of Homes** - The number of new homes built in the Bay Area has not kept pace with the demand, resulting in longer commutes, increasing prices, and exacerbating issues of displacement and homelessness. The number of homes in Woodside increased, 2.9% from 2010 to 2020, which is *below* the growth rate for San Mateo County and *below* the growth rate of the region's housing stock during this time period.
- **Home Prices** - A diversity of homes at all income levels creates opportunities for all Woodside residents to live and thrive in the community.
  - **Ownership** The largest proportion of homes had a value in the range of \$2M+ in 2019. Home prices increased by 102.0% from 2010 to 2020.
  - **Rental Prices** - The typical contract rent for an apartment in Woodside was \$2,150 in 2019. Rental prices increased by 33.6% from 2009 to 2019. To rent a typical apartment without cost burden, a household would need to make \$86,320 per year.<sup>2</sup>
- **Housing Type** - It is important to have a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a community today and in the future. In 2020, 95.4% of homes in Woodside were single family detached, 2.7% were single family attached, 1.2% were small multifamily (2-4 units), and 0.0% were medium or large multifamily (5+ units). Between 2010 and 2020, the number of single-family units increased more than multi-family units. Generally, in Woodside, the share of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Census Bureau's American Community Survey accounts for ethnic origin separate from racial identity. The numbers reported here use an accounting of both such that the racial categories are shown exclusive of Latinx status, to allow for an accounting of the Latinx population regardless of racial identity. The term Hispanic has historically been used to describe people from numerous Central American, South American, and Caribbean countries. In recent years, the term Latino or Latinx has become preferred. This report generally uses Latinx, but occasionally when discussing US Census data, we use Hispanic or Non-Hispanic, to clearly link to the data source.

<sup>2</sup> Note that contract rents may differ significantly from, and often being lower than, current listing prices.



housing stock that is detached single family homes is above that of other jurisdictions in the region.

- **Cost Burden** - The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30% of its income on housing costs. 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.” In Woodside, 10.8% of households spend 30%-50% of their income on housing, while 13.5% of households are severely cost burdened and use the majority of their income for housing.
- **Displacement/Gentrification** - According to research from The University of California, Berkeley, no households in Woodside are in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement, or live in areas at risk of undergoing gentrification. Ninety-eight percent (98.0%) of households in Woodside live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely excluded due to prohibitive housing costs. There are various ways to address displacement including ensuring new housing at all income levels is built.
- **Neighborhood** - 98.2% of residents in Woodside live in neighborhoods identified as “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” areas by State-commissioned research, while 0.0% of residents live in areas identified by this research as “Low Resource” or “High Segregation and Poverty” areas. These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors.<sup>3</sup>
- **Special Housing Needs** - Some population groups may have special housing needs that require specific program responses, and these groups may experience barriers to accessing stable housing due to their specific housing circumstances. In Woodside, 5.3% of residents have a disability of some ~~any~~ kind and may require accessible housing. Additionally, 12.8% of Woodside households are larger households with five or more people, who likely need larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. 5.6% of households are female-headed families, which are often at greater risk of housing insecurity.

**Note on Data**

*Many of the tables in this report are sourced from data 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 are samples and as such, are subject to sampling variability. This means that data is an estimate, and that other estimates could be possible if another set of respondents had been reached. We use the five-year release to get a*

---

<sup>3</sup> For more information on the “opportunity area” categories developed by HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, see this website: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp>. The degree to which different jurisdictions and neighborhoods have access to opportunity will likely need to be analyzed as part of new Housing Element requirements related to affirmatively furthering fair housing. ABAG/MTC will be providing jurisdictions with technical assistance on this topic this summer, following the release of additional guidance from HCD.



*larger data pool to minimize this “margin of error” but particularly for the smaller cities, the data will be based on fewer responses, and the information should be interpreted accordingly.*

*Additionally, there may be instances where there is no data available for a jurisdiction for particular data point, or where a value is 0 and the automatically generated text cannot perform a calculation. In these cases, the automatically generated text is “NODATA.” Staff should reword these sentences before using them in the context of the Housing Element or other documents.*

***Note on Figures***

*Any figure that does not specify geography in the figure name represents data for Woodside.*



## 3 LOOKING TO THE FUTURE: REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS

### 3.1 Regional Housing Needs Determination

The Plan Bay Area 2050<sup>4</sup> Final Blueprint forecasts that the nine-county Bay Area will add 1.4 million new households between 2015 and 2050. For the eight-year time frame covered by this Housing Element Update, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has identified the region's housing need as 441,176 units. The total number of housing units assigned by HCD is separated into four income categories that cover housing types for all income levels, from very low-income households to market rate housing.<sup>5</sup> This calculation, known as the Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND), is based on population projections produced by the California Department of Finance as well as adjustments that incorporate the region's existing housing need. The adjustments result from recent legislation requiring HCD to apply additional adjustment factors to the baseline growth projection from California Department of Finance, in order for the regions to get closer to healthy housing markets. To this end, adjustments focus on the region's vacancy rate, level of overcrowding and the share of cost burdened households and seek to bring the region more in line with comparable ones.<sup>6</sup> These new laws governing the methodology for how HCD calculates the RHND resulted in a significantly higher number of housing units for which the Bay Area must plan compared to previous RHNA cycles.

### 3.2 Regional Housing Needs Allocation

A starting point for the Housing Element Update process for every California jurisdiction is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA - the share of the RHND assigned to each jurisdiction by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). State Housing Element Law requires ABAG to develop a methodology that calculates the number of housing units assigned to each city and county and distributes each jurisdiction's housing unit allocation among four affordability levels. For this RHNA cycle, the RHND increased by 135%, from 187,990 to 441,776. For more information on the RHNA process this cycle, see ABAG's website: <https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/rhna-regional-housing-needs-allocation>

Almost all jurisdictions in the Bay Area have received a larger RHNA this cycle compared to the last cycle, primarily due to changes in state law that led to a considerably higher RHND compared to previous cycles.

In January 2021, ABAG adopted a Draft RHNA Methodology, which is currently being reviewed by HCD. For Woodside, the proposed RHNA to be planned for this cycle is 328 units, a slated increase of nearly 5.3 times the number of units from the last cycle. **Please note that the previously stated figures are merely illustrative, as ABAG has yet to issue Final RHNA allocations. The Final RHNA allocations**

---

<sup>4</sup> Plan Bay Area 2050 is a long-range plan charting the course for the future of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It covers four key issues: the economy, the environment, housing and transportation

<sup>5</sup> HCD divides the RHND into the following four income categories:

Very Low-income: 0-50% of Area Median Income

Low-income: 50-80% of Area Median Income

Moderate-income: 80-120% of Area Median Income

Above Moderate-income: 120% or more of Area Median Income

<sup>6</sup> For more information on HCD's RHND calculation for the Bay Area, see this letter sent to ABAG from HCD on June 9, 2020: [https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/abagrhna-final060920\(r\).pdf](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/abagrhna-final060920(r).pdf)



that local jurisdictions will use for their Housing Elements will be released at the end of 2021. The potential allocation that Woodside would receive from the Draft RHNA Methodology is broken down by income category as follows:

**Table 1: Illustrative Regional Housing Needs Allocation from Draft Methodology**

Income Group	Woodside Units	San Mateo County Units	Bay Area Units	Woodside Percent	San Mateo County Percent	Bay Area Percent
Very Low Income (<50% of AMI)	90	12196	114442	27.4%	25.6%	25.9%
Low Income (50%-80% of AMI)	52	7023	65892	15.9%	14.7%	14.9%
Moderate Income (80%-120% of AMI)	52	7937	72712	15.9%	16.6%	16.5%
Above Moderate Income (>120% of AMI)	134	20531	188130	40.9%	43.1%	42.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>47687</b>	<b>441176</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments Methodology and tentative numbers were approved by ABAG's Executive board on January 21, 2021 (Resolution No. 02-2021). The numbers were submitted for review to California Housing and Community Development in February 2021, after which an appeals process will take place during the Summer and Fall of 2021. THESE NUMBERS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PRELIMINARY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE PER HCD REVIEW

## 4 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

### 4.1 Population

The Bay Area is the fifth-largest metropolitan area in the nation and has seen a steady increase in population since 1990, except for a dip during the Great Recession. 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, Woodside’s population has increased by 6.1%; this rate is below that of the region as a whole, at 14.8%. In Woodside, roughly 8.4% of its population moved during the past year, a number 5.1 percentage points smaller than the regional rate of 13.4%.

Table 2: Population Growth Trends

Geography	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Woodside	5034	5320	5352	5476	5287	5617	5676
San Mateo County	649623	685354	707163	719844	718451	761748	773244
Bay Area	6020147	6381961	6784348	7073912	7150739	7595694	7790537


Universe: Total population

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series

For more years of data, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-01.

In 2020, the population of Woodside was estimated to be 5,676 (see Table 2). From 1990 to 2000, the population increased by 6.3%, while it decreased by 1.2% during the first decade of the 2000s. In the most recent decade, the population increased by 7.4%. The population of Woodside makes up 0.7% of San Mateo County.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> To compare the rate of growth across various geographic scales, Figure 1 shows population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the year 1990. This means that the data points represent the population growth (i.e. percent change) in each of these geographies relative to their populations in 1990.




**Figure 1: Population Growth Trends**

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series Note: The data shown on the graph represents population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the first year shown. The data points represent the relative population growth in each of these geographies relative to their populations in that year. For some jurisdictions, a break may appear at the end of each decade (1999, 2009) as estimates are compared to census counts. DOF uses the decennial census to benchmark subsequent population estimates. For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-01.

## 4.2 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, which can mean more multifamily and accessible units are also needed.

In Woodside, the median age in 2000 was 43.4; by 2019, this figure had increased, landing at around 47 years. More specifically, the population of those under 14 and those 65-and over have both increased since 2010 (see Figure 2).



**Figure 2: Population by Age, 2000-2019**


*Universe: Total population*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-04.*

Looking at the senior and youth population by race can add an additional layer of understanding, as families and seniors of color are even more likely to experience challenges finding affordable housing. People of color<sup>8</sup> make up 12.4% of seniors and 17.2% of youth under 18 (see Figure 3).

<sup>8</sup> Here, we count all non-white racial groups



**Figure 3: Senior and Youth Population by Race**

Universe: Total population

Notes: In the sources for this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity, and an overlapping category of Hispanic / non-Hispanic groups has not been shown to avoid double counting in the stacked bar chart.


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-G)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-02.

### 4.3 Race and Ethnicity

Understanding the racial makeup of a city and region is important for designing and implementing effective housing policies and programs. These patterns are shaped by both market factors and government actions, such as exclusionary zoning, discriminatory lending practices and displacement that has occurred over time and continues to impact communities of color today<sup>9</sup>. Since 2000, the percentage of residents in Woodside identifying as White has decreased - and by the same token the percentage of residents of all *other* races and ethnicities has *increased* - by 10.7 percentage points, with the 2019 population standing at 4,378 (see Figure 4). In absolute terms, the *Hispanic or Latinx* population increased the most while the *White, Non-Hispanic* population decreased the most.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law : a forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY & London, UK: Liveright Publishing.



**Figure 4: Population by Race, 2000-2019**

Universe: Total population

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.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B03002


For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-02.

## 4.4 Employment Trends

### 4.4.1 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. Smaller cities typically will have more employed residents than jobs there and export workers, while larger cities tend to have a surplus of jobs and import workers. To some extent the regional transportation system is set up for this flow of workers to the region’s core job centers. At the same time, as the housing affordability crisis has illustrated, local imbalances may be severe, where local jobs and worker populations are out of sync at a sub-regional scale.

One measure of this is the relationship between *workers* and *jobs*. 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” them. Between 2002 and 2018, the number of jobs in Woodside increased by 6.4% (see Figure 5).



**Figure 5: Jobs in a Jurisdiction**

*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 cross referenced to jurisdictions and summarized.*


*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files, 2002-2018 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-11.*

There are 2,430 employed residents, and 3,410 jobs<sup>10</sup> in Woodside - the ratio of jobs to resident workers is 1.4; Woodside is a *net importer of workers*.

Figure 6 shows the balance when comparing jobs to workers, broken down by different wage groups, offering additional insight into local dynamics. A 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. Such flows are not inherently bad, though over time, sub-regional imbalances may appear. Woodside has more low-wage *jobs* than low-wage *residents* (where low-wage refers to jobs paying less than \$25,000). At the other end of the wage

<sup>10</sup> Employed *residents* in a jurisdiction is counted by place of residence (they may work elsewhere) while *jobs* in a jurisdiction are counted by place of work (they may live elsewhere). The jobs may differ from those reported in Figure 5 as the source for the time series is from administrative data, while the cross-sectional data is from a survey.

spectrum, the city has more high-wage *residents* than high-wage *jobs* (where high-wage refers to jobs paying more than \$75,000) (see Figure 6).<sup>11</sup>



**Figure 6: Workers by Earnings, by Jurisdiction as Place of Work and Place of Residence**

*Universe: Workers 16 years and over with earnings*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2015-2019, B08119, B08519*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-10.*

Figure 7 shows the balance of a jurisdiction’s resident workers to the jobs located there for different wage groups as a ratio instead - a value of 1 means that a city has the same number of jobs in a wage group as it has resident workers - in principle, a balance. Values above 1 indicate a jurisdiction will need to import workers for jobs in a given wage group. At the regional scale, this ratio is 1.04 jobs for each worker, implying a modest import of workers from outside the region (see Figure 7).

<sup>11</sup> The source table is top-coded at \$75,000, precluding more fine grained analysis at the higher end of the wage spectrum.



**Figure 7: Jobs-Worker Ratios, 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.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs); Residence Area Characteristics (RAC) files (Employed Residents), 2010-2018*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-14.*

Such balances between jobs and workers may directly influence the housing demand 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, particularly where job growth has been in relatively lower wage jobs. This dynamic not only means many workers will need to prepare for long commutes and time spent on the road, but in the aggregate it contributes to traffic congestion and time lost for all road users.

If there are more jobs than employed residents, it means a city is relatively jobs-rich, typically also with a high jobs to household ratio. Thus bringing housing into the measure, the *jobs-household ratio* in Woodside has increased from 1.03 in 2002, to 1.06 jobs per household in 2018 (see Figure 8).



**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; households in a jurisdiction*  
*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 cross referenced to jurisdictions and summarized. 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.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs), 2002-2018; California Department of Finance, E-5 (Households)*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-13.*

#### 4.4.2 Sector Composition

In terms of sectoral composition, the largest industry in which Woodside residents work is *Financial & Professional Services*, and the largest sector in which San Mateo residents work is *Health & Educational Services* (see Figure 9). For the Bay Area as a whole, the *Health & Educational Services* industry employs the most workers.



**Figure 9: 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). Categories are derived from the following source tables: Agriculture & Natural Resources: C24030\_003E, C24030\_030E; Construction: C24030\_006E, C24030\_033E; Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation: C24030\_007E, C24030\_034E, C24030\_008E, C24030\_035E, C24030\_010E, C24030\_037E; Retail: C24030\_009E, C24030\_036E; Information: C24030\_013E, C24030\_040E; Financial & Professional Services: C24030\_014E, C24030\_041E, C24030\_017E, C24030\_044E; Health & Educational Services: C24030\_021E, C24030\_024E, C24030\_048E, C24030\_051E; Other: C24030\_027E, C24030\_054E, C24030\_028E, C24030\_055E

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-06.

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). Categories are derived from the following source tables: Agriculture & Natural Resources: C24030\_003E, C24030\_030E; Construction: C24030\_006E, C24030\_033E; Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation: C24030\_007E, C24030\_034E, C24030\_008E, C24030\_035E, C24030\_010E, C24030\_037E; Retail: C24030\_009E, C24030\_036E; Information: C24030\_013E, C24030\_040E; Financial & Professional Services: C24030\_014E, C24030\_041E, C24030\_017E, C24030\_044E; Health & Educational Services: C24030\_021E, C24030\_024E, C24030\_048E, C24030\_051E; Other: C24030\_027E, C24030\_054E, C24030\_028E, C24030\_055E

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-06.

## 4.5 Extremely Low-Income Households

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<sup>12</sup>.

In Woodside, 74.5% of households make more than 100% of the Area Median Income (AMI)<sup>13</sup>, compared to 8.0% making less than 30% of AMI, which is considered extremely low-income (see Figure 10).

Regionally, more than half of all households make more than 100% AMI, while 15% make less than 30% AMI. In San Mateo County, 30% AMI is the equivalent to the annual income of \$44,000 for a family of four. Many households with multiple wage earners - including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers, and healthcare professionals - can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in many industries.

#### Note on Estimating the Projected Number of Extremely Low-Income Households

Local jurisdictions are required to provide an estimate for their projected extremely low-income households in their Housing Elements. HCD's official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making 0-50% AMI) to calculate their projected extremely low-income households. For more information, visit HCD's Building Blocks page on Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs.

This document does not contain the required data point of projected extremely low-income households, as Bay Area jurisdictions have not yet received their final RHNA numbers. Once Woodside receives its 6th Cycle RHNA, staff can estimate the projected extremely low-income households using one of the following three methodologies:

**Option A:** Assume that 59.8% of Woodside's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

According to HCD's Regional Housing Need Determination for the Bay Area, 15.5% of the region's housing need is for 0-30% AMI households while 25.9% is for 0-50% AMI households. Therefore, extremely low-income housing need represents 59.8% of the region's very low-income housing need, as 15.5 divided by 25.9 is 59.8%. This option aligns with HCD's guidance to use U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, as HCD uses U.S. Census data to calculate the Regional Housing Need Determination.

**Option B:** Assume that 71.8% of Woodside's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.


According to the data shown below (Figure 10), 213 of Woodside's households are 0-50% AMI while 153 are extremely low-income. Therefore, extremely low-income households represent 71.8% of households who are 0-50% AMI, as 153 divided by 213 is 71.8%. This option aligns with HCD's guidance to use U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, as the information in Figure 11 represents a tabulation of Census Bureau Data.

**Option C:** Assume that 50% of Woodside's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

<sup>12</sup> Bohn, S. et al. 2020. Income Inequality and Economic Opportunity in California. *Public Policy Institute of California*.

<sup>13</sup> Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. Households making between 80 and 120 percent of the AMI are moderate-income, those making 50 to 80 percent are low-income, those making 30 to 50 percent are very low-income, and those making less than 30 percent are extremely low-income. This is then adjusted for household size.

HCD's guidance notes that instead of using U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, local jurisdictions can presume that 50% of their RHNA for very low-income households qualifies for extremely low-income households.



**Figure 10: Households by Household Income Level**

*Universe: Occupied housing units*


*Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. The data that is reported for the Bay Area is not based on a regional AMI but instead refers to the regional total of households in an income group relative to the AMI for the county where that household is located. Local jurisdictions are required to provide an estimate for their projected extremely low-income households (0-30% AMI) in their Housing Elements. HCD's official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making 0-50% AMI) to calculate their projected extremely low-income households. As Bay Area jurisdictions have not yet received their final RHNA numbers, this document does not contain the required data point of projected extremely low-income households. The report portion of the housing data needs packet contains more specific guidance for how local staff can calculate an estimate for projected extremely low-income households once jurisdictions receive their 6th cycle RHNA numbers.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table ELI-01.*

Throughout the region, there are disparities between the incomes of homeowners and renters. Typically, the number of low-income renters greatly outpaces the amount of housing available that is affordable for these households.

In Woodside, the largest proportion of renters falls in the *Greater than 100% of AMI* income group, while the largest proportion of homeowners are found in the *Greater than 100% of AMI* group (see Figure 11).



**Figure 11: Household Income Level by Tenure**

*Universe: Occupied housing units*


*Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-21.*

Currently, people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to White residents.<sup>14</sup> These economic disparities also leave communities of color at higher risk for housing insecurity, displacement or homelessness. In Woodside, Asian / API (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents experience the highest rates of poverty, followed by White (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents (see Figure 12).

<sup>14</sup> Moore, E., Montojo, N. and Mauri, N., 2019. Roots, Race & Place: A History of Racially Exclusionary Housing the San Francisco Bay Area. *Hass Institute*.



**Figure 12: Poverty Status by Race**

*Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined*


*Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the population for whom poverty status is determined for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled "Hispanic and Non-Hispanic" are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the population for whom poverty status is determined.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17001(A-I)*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table ELI-03.*

## 4.6 Tenure

The number of residents who own their homes compared to those who rent their homes can help identify the level of housing insecurity - ability for individuals to stay in their homes - in a city and region. Generally, renters may be displaced more quickly if prices increase. In Woodside there are a total of 1,799 housing units, and fewer residents rent than own their homes: 10.2% versus 89.8% (see Figure 13). By comparison, 39.8% of households in San Mateo County are renters, while 44% of Bay Area households rent their homes.



**Figure 13: Housing Tenure**


*Universe: Occupied housing units*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-16.*

Homeownership rates often vary considerably across race/ethnicity in the Bay Area and throughout the country. These disparities not only reflect differences in income and wealth but also stem from federal, State, and local policies that limited access to homeownership for communities of color while facilitating homebuying for White residents. While many of these policies, such as redlining, have been formally disbanded, the impacts of race-based policy are still evident across Bay Area communities.<sup>15</sup> In Woodside, homeownership rates were 96.0% for Asian households, 62.7% for Latinx households, and 90.0% for White households. No data was available for homeownership rates among Black residents in Woodside. Notably, recent changes to State law require local jurisdictions to examine these dynamics and other fair housing issues when updating their Housing Elements.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law : a forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY & London, UK: Liveright Publishing.



**Figure 14: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder**


*Universe: Occupied housing units*

*Notes: For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the total number of occupied housing units for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled "Hispanic and Non-Hispanic" are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the total number of occupied housing units.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003(A-I)  
For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-20.*

The age of residents who rent or own their home can also signal the housing challenges a community is experiencing. Younger households tend to rent and may struggle to buy a first home in the Bay Area due to high housing costs. At the same time, senior homeowners seeking to downsize may have limited options in an expensive housing market.

In Woodside, 28.8% of householders between the ages of 25 and 44 are renters, while 0.2% of householders over 65 are (see Figure 15).




**Figure 15: Housing Tenure by Age**

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25007

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-18.

In many cities, homeownership rates for households in single-family homes are substantially higher than the rates for households in multi-family housing. In Woodside, 89.9% of households in detached single-family homes are homeowners, while 0.0% of households in multi-family housing are homeowners (see Figure 16).



## Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Housing Type

Universe: Occupied housing units

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-22.

---

### 4.7 Displacement

Because of increasing housing prices, displacement is a major concern in the Bay Area. Displacement has the most severe impacts on low- and moderate-income residents. When individuals or families are forced to leave their homes and communities, they also lose their support network.


The University of California, Berkeley has mapped all neighborhoods in the Bay area, identifying their risk for gentrification. They find that in Woodside, 0.0% of households live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement or ~~and 0.0% live in neighborhoods at risk of or undergoing~~ gentrification.

Equally important, some neighborhoods in the Bay Area do not have housing appropriate for a broad section of the workforce. UC Berkeley estimates that 98.0% of households in Woodside live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely to be excluded due to prohibitive housing costs.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> More information about this gentrification and displacement data is available at the Urban Displacement Project's webpage: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/>. Specifically, one can learn more about the different gentrification/displacement typologies shown in Figure 18 at this link: [https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/typology\\_sheet\\_2018\\_0.png](https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/typology_sheet_2018_0.png). Additionally, one can view maps that show which typologies correspond to which parts of a jurisdiction here: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/san-francisco/sf-bay-area-gentrification-and-displacement>





**Figure 17: Households by Displacement Risk and Tenure**

Universe: Households

Notes: Displacement data is available at the census tract level. Staff aggregated tracts up to jurisdiction level using census 2010 population weights, assigning a tract to jurisdiction in proportion to block level population weights. Total household count may differ slightly from counts in other tables sourced from jurisdiction level sources. Categories are combined as follows for simplicity: At risk of or Experiencing Exclusion: At Risk of Becoming Exclusive; Becoming Exclusive; Stable/Advanced Exclusive At risk of or Experiencing Gentrification: At Risk of Gentrification; Early/Ongoing Gentrification; Advanced Gentrification Stable Moderate/Mixed Income: Stable Moderate/Mixed Income Susceptible to or Experiencing Displacement: Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement; Ongoing Displacement Other: High Student Population; Unavailable or Unreliable Data Source: Urban Displacement Project for classification, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003 for tenure.


For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-25.

## 5 HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

### 5.1 Housing Types, Year Built, Vacancy, and Permits

In recent years, most housing produced in the region and across the State consisted of single-family homes and larger multi-unit buildings. However, some households are increasingly interested in “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, from young households seeking homeownership options to seniors looking to downsize and age-in-place.

The housing stock of Woodside in 2020 was made up of 95.4% single family detached homes, 2.7% single family attached homes, 1.2% multifamily homes with 2 to 4 units, 0.0% multifamily homes with 5 or more units, and 0.7% mobile homes (see Figure 18). In Woodside, the housing type that experienced the most growth between 2010 and 2020 was *Single-Family Home: Detached*.




**Figure 18: Housing Type Trends**

Universe: Housing units

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-01.

Production has not kept up with housing demand for several decades in the Bay Area, as the total number of units built and available has not yet come close to meeting the population and job growth experienced throughout the region. In Woodside, the largest proportion of the housing stock was built 1960 to 1979, with 607 units constructed during this period (see Figure 19). Since 2010, 3.3% of the current housing stock was built, which is 66 units.



**Figure 19: Housing Units by Year Structure Built**

Universe: Housing units

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-04.


Vacant units make up 10.0% of the overall housing stock in Woodside. The rental vacancy stands at 2.6%, while the ownership vacancy rate is 1.7%. Of the vacant units, the most common type of vacancy is *For Seasonal, Recreational, Or Occasional Use* (see Figure 20).<sup>17</sup>

Throughout the Bay Area, vacancies make up 2.6% of the total housing units, with homes listed for rent; units used for *recreational or occasional use*, and units not otherwise classified (*other vacant*) making up the majority of vacancies. The Census Bureau classifies a unit as vacant if no one is occupying it when census interviewers are conducting the American Community Survey or Decennial Census. 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. It should be noted that Woodside does not permit short-term rentals of less than 30 days. 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.<sup>18</sup> 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

<sup>17</sup> The vacancy rates by tenure is for a smaller universe than the total vacancy rate first reported, which in principle includes the full stock (10.0%). The vacancy by tenure counts are rates relative to the rental stock (occupied and vacant) and ownership stock (occupied and vacant) - but exclude a significant number of vacancy categories, including the numerically significant *other vacant*.

<sup>18</sup> 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>.

in older housing stock could also influence the proportion of “other vacant” units in some jurisdictions.<sup>19</sup>



**Figure 20: Vacant Units by Type**

Universe: Vacant housing units  
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25004  
 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-03.

Between 2015 and 2019, the Town of Woodside issued 81 permits for housing units. Forty-four percent (44.4%) of the permits issued in Woodside were for above moderate-income housing, 6.2% were for moderate-income housing, and 49.4% were for low- or very low-income housing (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Housing Permitting**

Income Group	value
Above Moderate Income Permits	36
Very Low Income Permits	34
Low Income Permits	6
Moderate Income Permits	5

Universe: Housing permits issued between 2015 and 2019  
 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

<sup>19</sup> 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.

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.

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), 5th Cycle Annual Progress Report Permit Summary (2020)

This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table HSG-11.

## 5.2 Assisted Housing Developments At-Risk of Conversion

While there is an immense need to produce new affordable housing units, ensuring that the existing affordable housing stock remains affordable is equally important. Additionally, it is typically faster and less expensive to preserve currently affordable units that are at risk of converting to market-rate than it is to build new affordable housing.

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. There are no assisted units in Woodside in the Preservation Database. Therefore, there are no units at *High Risk* or *Very High Risk* of conversion.<sup>20</sup>

### Note on At-Risk Assisted Housing Developments

HCD requires that Housing Elements list the assisted housing developments at risk of converting to market-rate uses. For more information on the specific properties that are at Moderate Risk, High Risk, or Very High Risk of conversion, local jurisdiction staff should contact Danielle Mazzella, Preservation & Data Manager at the California Housing Partnership, at [dmazzella@chpc.net](mailto:dmazzella@chpc.net).

Table 4: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

Income	Woodside	San Mateo County	Bay Area
Low	0	4656	110177
Moderate	0	191	3375
High	0	359	1854
Very High	0	58	1053
Total Assisted Units in Database	0	5264	116459

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.

<sup>20</sup> 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.

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. Per HCD guidance, local jurisdictions must also list the specific affordable housing developments at-risk of converting to market rate uses. This document provides aggregate numbers of at-risk units for each jurisdiction, but local planning staff should contact Danielle Mazzella with the California Housing Partnership at [dmazzella@chpc.net](mailto:dmazzella@chpc.net) to obtain a list of affordable properties that fall under this designation. 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. Source: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database (2020) This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table RISK-01.

---


### 5.3 Substandard Housing

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 conditions that may be present in Woodside. For example, 0.9% of owners lack plumbing. No renters reported lacking a kitchen or plumbing.

#### Note on Substandard Housing

HCD requires Housing Elements to estimate the number of units in need of rehabilitation and replacement. As a data source for housing units in need of rehabilitation and replacement is not available for all jurisdictions in the region, ABAG was not able to provide this required data point in this document. To produce an estimate of housing needs in need of rehabilitation and replacement, staff can supplement the data below on substandard housing issues with additional local information from code enforcement, recent windshield surveys of properties, building department data, knowledgeable builders/developers in the community, or nonprofit housing developers or organizations. For more information, visit HCD's Building Blocks page on Housing Stock Characteristics.





**Figure 21: Substandard Housing Issues**

*Universe: Occupied housing units*


*Notes: Per HCD guidance, this data should be supplemented by local estimates of units needing to be rehabilitated or replaced based on recent windshield surveys, local building department data, knowledgeable builders/developers in the community, or nonprofit housing developers or organizations.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25053, Table B25043, Table B25049 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-06.*

## 5.4 Home and Rent Values

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. In the Bay Area, the costs of housing have long been among the highest in the nation. The typical home value in Woodside was estimated at \$3,742,660 by December of 2020, per data from Zillow. The largest proportion of homes were valued between \$2M+ (see Figure 22). By comparison, the typical home value is \$1,418,330 in San Mateo County and \$1,077,230 the Bay Area, with the largest share of units valued \$1m-\$1.5m (county) and \$500k-\$750k (region).

The region’s home values have increased steadily since 2000, besides a 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. Since 2001, the typical home value has increased 251.0% in Woodside from \$1,066,170 to \$3,742,660. This change is above the change in San Mateo County, and above the change for the region (see Figure 23).




**Figure 22: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units**

Universe: Owner-occupied units

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-07.



**Figure 23: 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. For unincorporated areas, the value is a population weighted average of unincorporated communities in the county matched to census-designated population counts.

Source: Zillow, Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-08.

Similar to home values, rents 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.

In Woodside, the largest proportion of rental units rented in the *Rent \$2000-\$2500* category, totaling 37.4%, followed by 26.0% of units renting in the *Rent \$1500-\$2000* category (see Figure 24). Looking beyond the Town, the largest share of units is in the *\$3000 or more* category (county) compared to the *\$1500-\$2000* category for the region as a whole.



**Figure 24: Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units**


Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-09.

Since 2009, the median rent has increased by 33.6% in Woodside, from \$1,530 to \$2,150 per month (see Figure 25). In San Mateo County, the median rent has increased 41.1%, from \$1,560 to \$2,200. The median rent in the region has increased significantly during this time from \$1,200 to \$1,850, a 54% increase.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> While the data on home values shown in Figure 23 comes from Zillow, Zillow does not have data on rent prices available for most Bay Area jurisdictions. To have a more comprehensive dataset on rental data for the region, the



**Figure 25: Median Contract Rent**

*Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent*

*Notes: For unincorporated areas, median is calculated using distribution in B25056.*


*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data releases, starting with 2005-2009 through 2015-2019, B25058, B25056 (for unincorporated areas). County and regional counts are weighted averages of jurisdiction median using B25003 rental unit counts from the relevant year.*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-10.*

## 5.5 Overpayment and Overcrowding

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. Spending such large portions of their income on housing puts low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, or homelessness.

rent data in this document comes from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, which may not fully reflect current rents. Local jurisdiction staff may want to supplement the data on rents with local realtor data or other sources for rent data that are more current than Census Bureau data.



**Figure 26: 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.*

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25070, B25091*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-06.*

Renters are often more cost-burdened than owners. While the housing market has resulted in home prices increasing dramatically, homeowners often have mortgages with fixed rates, whereas renters are more likely to be impacted by market increases. When looking at the cost burden across tenure in Woodside, 12.5% of renters spend 30% to 50% of their income on housing compared to 11.8% of those that own (see Figure 26). Additionally, 6.0% of renters spend 50% or more of their income on housing, while 11.6% of owners are severely cost-burdened.

In Woodside, 13.5% of households spend 50% or more of their income on housing, while 10.8% spend 30% to 50%. However, these rates vary greatly across income categories (see Figure 27). For example, 96.4% of Woodside households making less than 30% of AMI spend the majority of their income on housing. For Woodside residents making more than 100% of AMI, just 1.8% are severely cost-burdened, and 88.2% of those making more than 100% of AMI spend less than 30% of their income on housing.



**Figure 27: 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). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-05.*

Currently, people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to White residents. As a result, they often pay a greater percentage of their income on housing, and in turn, are at a greater risk of housing insecurity.

*Asian / API, Non-Hispanic* residents are the most cost burdened with 16.0% spending 30 to 50% of their income on housing, and *Hispanic or Latinx* residents are the most severely cost burdened with 21.3% spending more than 50% of their income on housing (see Figure 28).



**Figure 28: Cost Burden by Race**

*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. 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.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-08.*

Large family households often have special housing needs due to a lack of adequately sized affordable housing available. The higher costs required for homes with multiple bedrooms can result in larger families experiencing a disproportionate cost burden than the rest of the population and can increase the risk of housing insecurity.

In Woodside, 5.5% of large family households experience a cost burden of 30%-50%, while 5.5% of households spend more than half of their income on housing. Some 11.3% of all other households have a cost burden of 30%-50%, with 14.2% of households spending more than 50% of their income on housing (see Figure 29).



**Figure 29: 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.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-09.*

When cost-burdened seniors are no longer able to make house payments or pay rents, displacement from their homes can occur, putting further stress on the local rental market or forcing residents out of the community they call home. Understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance due to their special housing needs, particularly for low-income seniors. 94.2% of seniors making less than 30% of AMI are spending the majority of their income on housing. For seniors making more than 100% of AMI, 87.7% are not cost-burdened and spend less than 30% of their income on housing (see Figure 30).



**Figure 30: 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). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-03.*

Overcrowding occurs when the number of people living in a household is greater than the home was designed to hold. There are several different standards for defining overcrowding, but this report uses the Census Bureau definition, which is more than one occupant per room (not including bathrooms or kitchens). Additionally, the Census Bureau considers units with more than 1.5 occupants per room to be severely overcrowded.

Overcrowding is often related to the cost of housing and can occur when demand in a city or region is high. In many cities, overcrowding is seen more amongst those that are renting, with multiple households sharing a unit to make it possible to stay in their communities. No overcrowding has been reported among renters or owners in Woodside.



**Figure 31: 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.

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-01.

Overcrowding often disproportionately impacts low-income households. In Woodside, no households reported overcrowding (see Figure 32).



## Figure 32: 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). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-04.

Communities of color are more likely to experience overcrowding similar to how they are more likely to experience poverty, financial instability, and housing insecurity. People of color tend to experience overcrowding at higher rates than White residents. In Woodside, there has been no reported overcrowding among racial groups. ~~with the largest overcrowding rate is American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)~~ (see Figure 33)



## Figure 33: Overcrowding by Race

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. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the total number of occupied housing units for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled "Hispanic and Non-Hispanic" are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the total number of occupied housing units.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25014


For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-03.



## 6 SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

### 6.1 Large Households

Large households often have different housing needs than smaller households. If a city's rental housing stock does not include larger apartments, large households who rent could end up living in overcrowded conditions. In Woodside, for large households with 5 or more persons, most units (83.5%) are owner occupied (see Figure 34). In 2017, 2.8% of large households were very low-income, earning less than 50% of the area median income (AMI).




**Figure 34: Household Size by Tenure**

*Universe: Occupied housing units*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table LGFEM-01.*

The unit sizes available in a community affect the household sizes that can access that community. Large families are generally served by housing units with 3 or more bedrooms, of which there are 1,608 units in Woodside. Among these large units with 3 or more bedrooms, 7.3% are renter-occupied and 92.7% are owner occupied (see Figure 35).



**Figure 35: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms**


Universe: Housing units

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-05.

## 6.2 Female-Headed Households

Households 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. In Woodside, the largest proportion of households is *Married-couple Family Households* at 74.8% of total, while *Female-Headed Households* make up 5.6% of all households.



**Figure 36: Household Type**

Universe: Households


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.

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

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-23.

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.

In Woodside, 46.7% of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line, while 12.9% of female-headed households *without* children live in poverty (see Figure 37).



**Figure 37: 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.*


*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table LGFEM-05.*

### 6.3 Seniors

Senior households often experience a combination of factors that can make accessing or keeping affordable housing a challenge. 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 proportion of senior households who rent make *51%-80% of AMI*, while the largest proportion of senior households who are homeowners falls in the income group *Greater than 100% of AMI* (see Figure 38).



**Figure 38: 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. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.*

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


*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-01.*

## 6.4 People with Disabilities

People with disabilities face additional housing challenges. 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.

When it comes to housing, people with disabilities are not only in need of affordable housing but 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. People with disabilities are at a high risk for housing insecurity, homelessness and institutionalization, particularly when they lose aging caregivers. Figure 39 shows the rates at which different disabilities are present among residents of Woodside. Overall, 5.3% of people in Woodside have a disability of some ~~any~~ kind.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> 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.



**Figure 39: 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.*

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

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table DISAB-01.*

State law also requires Housing Elements to examine the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities. Developmental disabilities are defined as severe, chronic, and attributed to a mental or physical impairment that begins before a person turns 18 years old. This can include Down’s Syndrome, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and mild to severe mental retardation. Some people with developmental disabilities are unable to work, rely on Supplemental Security Income, and live with family members. In addition to their specific housing needs, they are at increased risk of housing insecurity after an aging parent or family member is no longer able to care for them.<sup>23</sup>

In Woodside, of the population with a developmental disability, children under the age of 18 make up 25.9%, while adults account for 74.1%.

<sup>23</sup> For more information or data on developmental disabilities in your jurisdiction, contact the Golden Gate Regional Center for Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties; the North Bay Regional Center for Napa, Solano and Sonoma Counties; the Regional Center for the East Bay for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties; or the San Andreas Regional Center for Santa Clara County.

**Table 5: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age**

Age Group	value
Age 18+	20
Age Under 18	7

*Universe: Population with developmental disabilities*

*Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions. 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.*

*Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Age Group (2020)  
This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table DISAB-04.*

The most common living arrangement for individuals with disabilities in Woodside is the home of parent /family /guardian.

**Table 6: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence**

Residence Type	value
Home of Parent /Family /Guardian	13
Community Care Facility	9
Independent /Supported Living	4
Other	1
Foster /Family Home	0
Intermediate Care Facility	0


*Universe: Population with developmental disabilities*

*Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions. The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were cross-referenced 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.*

*Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020)  
This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table DISAB-05.*

## 6.5 Homelessness

Homelessness remains an urgent challenge in many communities across the state, reflecting a range of social, economic, and psychological factors. Rising housing costs result in increased risks of community members experiencing homelessness. Far too many residents who have found themselves housing insecure have ended up unhoused or homeless 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. In San Mateo County, the most common type of household experiencing homelessness is those without children in their care. Among households experiencing homelessness that do not have children, 75.5% are unsheltered. Of homeless households with children, most are sheltered in transitional housing (see Figure 40).



**Figure 40: Homelessness by Household Type and Shelter Status, San Mateo 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.*

*Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019)*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMEELS-01.*

People of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to White residents. Consequently, people of color are often disproportionately impacted by homelessness, particularly Black residents of the Bay Area. In San Mateo County, White (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents represent the largest proportion of residents experiencing homelessness and account for 66.6% of the homeless population, while making up 50.6% of the overall population (see Figure 41).




**Figure 41: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, San Mateo 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. 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.*

*Source: 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) For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMEELS-02.*

In San Mateo, Latinx residents represent 38.1% of the population experiencing homelessness, while Latinx residents comprise 24.7% of the general population (see Figure 42).



**Figure 42: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, San Mateo 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. 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.*


*Source: 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) For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMEELS-03.*

Many of those experiencing homelessness are dealing with severe issues - including mental illness, substance abuse and domestic violence - that are potentially life threatening and require additional assistance. In San Mateo County, homeless individuals are commonly challenged by severe mental illness, with 305 reporting this condition (see Figure 11). Of those, some 62.0% are unsheltered, further adding to the challenge of handling the issue.

**Note on Homelessness Data**

Notably all the data on homelessness provided above is for the entire county. This data comes from the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Point in Time count, which is the most comprehensive publicly available data source on people experiencing homelessness. HUD only provides this data at the county-level and not for specific jurisdictions. However, Housing Element law requires local jurisdictions to estimate or count of the daily average number of people lacking shelter. Therefore, staff will need to supplement the data in this document with additional local data on the number of people experiencing homelessness. If staff do not have estimates of people experiencing homelessness in their jurisdiction readily available, HCD recommends contacting local service providers such as continuum-of-care providers, local homeless shelter and service providers, food

programs, operators of transitional housing programs, local drug and alcohol program service providers, and county mental health and social service departments.<sup>24</sup>



**Figure 43: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, San Mateo 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.*

*Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019)*

*For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMEELS-04.*

In Woodside, there were no reported students experiencing homelessness in the 2019-20 school year. By comparison, San Mateo County has seen a 37.5% decrease in the population of students experiencing homelessness since the 2016-17 school year, and the Bay Area population of students experiencing homelessness decreased by 8.5%. During the 2019-2020 school year, there were still some 13,718 students experiencing homelessness throughout the region, adding undue burdens on learning and thriving, with the potential for longer term negative effects.

<sup>24</sup> For more information, see HCD's Building Blocks webpage for People Experiencing Homelessness: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/housing-needs/people-experiencing-homelessness.shtm>

**Table 7: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness**

AcademicYear	Woodside	San Mateo County	Bay Area
2016-17	13	1910	14990
2017-18	13	1337	15142
2018-19	12	1934	15427
2019-20	0	1194	13718

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.

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

This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table HOMEELS-05.

## 6.6 Farmworkers

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 may have temporary housing needs. Finding decent and affordable housing can be challenging, particularly in the current housing market.

In Woodside, there were no reported students of migrant workers in the 2019-20 school year. The trend for the region for the past few years has been a decline of 2.4% in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-17 school year. The change at the county level is a 57.1% decrease in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-17 school year.

**Table 8: Migrant Worker Student Population**

AcademicYear	Woodside	San Mateo County	Bay Area
2016-17	17	657	4630
2017-18	0	418	4607
2018-19	0	307	4075
2019-20	0	282	3976


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.

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

This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table FARM-01.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers, the number of permanent farm workers in San Mateo County has decreased since 2002, totaling 978 in 2017, while the number of seasonal farm workers has decreased, totaling 343 in 2017 (see Figure 44).



**Figure 44: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, San Mateo 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 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table FARM-02.*

## 6.7 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 limit 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 they might be wary to engage due to immigration status concerns. In Woodside, 0.4% of residents 5 years and older identify as speaking English not well or not at all, which is below the proportion for San Mateo County. Throughout the region the proportion of residents 5 years and older with limited English proficiency is 8%.



**Figure 45: 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.

**APPENDIX C. SB 35 Determination (6/1/22 and 7/17/20)**

## SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

### Cities and Counties Not Currently Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

This determination represents Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) data received as of June 1, 2022. The following 38 jurisdictions have met their prorated Lower (Very-Low and Low) and Above-Moderate Income Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the Reporting Period and submitted their latest APR (2021).

These jurisdictions are not currently subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining), but the jurisdictions are still encouraged to promote streamlining. **All other cities and counties beyond these 38 are subject to at least some form of SB 35 streamlining, as indicated on the following pages.**

**For more detail on the proration methodology or background data see the SB 35 Determination Methodology.**

	JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION
1	ATHERTON	20	MILL VALLEY
2	BELL	21	MONTE SERENO
3	BELLFLOWER	22	NEWPORT BEACH
4	BEVERLY HILLS	23	NORWALK
5	BUENA PARK	24	PLUMAS COUNTY
6	CALISTOGA	25	ROHNERT PARK
7	CARPINTERIA	26	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES
8	CORTE MADERA	27	SAINT HELENA
9	EL CERRITO	28	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
10	FOSTER CITY	29	SANTA ANA
11	FOUNTAIN VALLEY	30	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
12	GUADALUPE	31	SANTA MONICA
13	HILLSBOROUGH	32	SIERRA COUNTY
14	INDUSTRY	33	SOLVANG
15	LA HABRA	34	SONOMA COUNTY
16	LA QUINTA	35	UKIAH
17	LAGUNA NIGUEL	36	VILLA PARK
18	MENDOCINO COUNTY	37	WESTMINSTER
19	MENLO PARK	38	WOODSIDE

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 263 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) (2021) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
1	ADELANTO	37	CITRUS HEIGHTS	73	FERNDALE
2	ALAMEDA COUNTY	38	CLAYTON	74	FILLMORE
3	ALISO VIEJO	39	CLEARLAKE	75	FIREBAUGH
4	ALTURAS	40	CLOVERDALE	76	FORT JONES
5	AMADOR	41	COACHELLA	77	FORTUNA
6	AMADOR COUNTY	42	COLMA	78	FRESNO COUNTY
7	APPLE VALLEY	43	COLTON	79	GLENN COUNTY
8	ARCADIA	44	COLUSA	80	GONZALES
9	ARCATA	45	COLUSA COUNTY	81	GRASS VALLEY
10	ARROYO GRANDE	46	COMMERCE	82	GREENFIELD
11	ARVIN	47	COMPTON	83	GRIDLEY
12	AUBURN	48	CONCORD	84	GUSTINE
13	AVALON	49	CORCORAN	85	HALF MOON BAY
14	AVENAL	50	CORNING	86	HANFORD
15	AZUSA	51	COSTA MESA	87	HAWAIIAN GARDENS
16	BAKERSFIELD	52	CRESCENT CITY	88	HAYWARD
17	BANNING	53	CUDAHY	89	HESPERIA
18	BARSTOW	54	DEL NORTE COUNTY	90	HIGHLAND
19	BEAUMONT	55	DEL REY OAKS	91	HOLTVILLE
20	BELVEDERE	56	DELANO	92	HUGHSON
21	BENICIA	57	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	93	HUMBOLDT COUNTY
22	BIGGS	58	DIAMOND BAR	94	HUNTINGTON BEACH
23	BISHOP	59	DORRIS	95	HUNTINGTON PARK
24	BLUE LAKE	60	DOS PALOS	96	HURON
25	BLYTHE	61	DUNSMUIR	97	IMPERIAL
26	BRADBURY	62	EAST PALO ALTO	98	IMPERIAL COUNTY
27	BRAWLEY	63	EL CAJON	99	INGLEWOOD
28	BURBANK	64	EL CENTRO	100	INYO COUNTY
29	BUTTE COUNTY	65	EL MONTE	101	IRWINDALE
30	CALAVERAS COUNTY	66	ESCALON	102	ISLETON
31	CALEXICO	67	ESCONDIDO	103	KERMAN
32	CALIFORNIA CITY	68	ETNA	104	KERN COUNTY
33	CALIPATRIA	69	EUREKA	105	KINGS COUNTY
34	CARSON	70	EXETER	106	KINGSBURG
35	CERES	71	FAIRFAX	107	LA HABRA HEIGHTS
36	CHOWCHILLA	72	FARMERSVILLE	108	LA MIRADA

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 263 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2021) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION
109	LA PUENTE	144	MORRO BAY	179	RICHMOND
110	LAKE COUNTY	145	MOUNT SHASTA	180	RIDGECREST
111	LAKE ELSINORE	146	NATIONAL CITY	181	RIO DELL
112	LAKEPORT	147	NEEDLES	182	RIPON
113	LAKEWOOD	148	NEVADA CITY	183	RIVERBANK
114	LANCASTER	149	NEVADA COUNTY	184	RIVERSIDE
115	LASSEN COUNTY	150	NEWMAN	185	RIVERSIDE COUNTY
116	LAWNDALE	151	NORCO	186	ROLLING HILLS
117	LEMON GROVE	152	NOVATO	187	ROSS
118	LEMOORE	153	OCEANSIDE	188	SACRAMENTO
119	LINCOLN	154	OJAI	189	SACRAMENTO COUNTY
120	LINDSAY	155	ORANGE COVE	190	SALINAS
121	LIVINGSTON	156	ORLAND	191	SAN BERNARDINO
122	LOMA LINDA	157	OROVILLE	192	SAN BRUNO
123	LOMPOC	158	OXNARD	193	SAN DIEGO COUNTY
124	LOOMIS	159	PACIFICA	194	SAN DIMAS
125	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	160	PALMDALE	195	SAN FERNANDO
126	LOS GATOS	161	PARLIER	196	SAN GABRIEL
127	LYNWOOD	162	PASO ROBLES	197	SAN JACINTO
128	MADERA	163	PATTERSON	198	SAN JOAQUIN
129	MADERA COUNTY	164	PERRIS	199	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
130	MARICOPA	165	PICO RIVERA	200	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA
131	MARTINEZ	166	PINOLE	201	SAN LEANDRO
132	MARYSVILLE	167	PLACERVILLE	202	SAN MARINO
133	MAYWOOD	168	PLEASANT HILL	203	SAN MATEO COUNTY
134	MCFARLAND	169	POMONA	204	SAN PABLO
135	MENDOTA	170	PORTERVILLE	205	SAN RAFAEL
136	MERCED COUNTY	171	PORTOLA	206	SAND CITY
137	MILLBRAE	172	POWAY	207	SANGER
138	MODESTO	173	RANCHO CORDOVA	208	SANTA CLARITA
139	MONTAGUE	174	RED BLUFF	209	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
140	MONTEBELLO	175	REDLANDS	210	SANTA MARIA
141	MONTEREY	176	REDONDO BEACH	211	SANTA PAULA
142	MONTEREY PARK	177	REEDLEY	212	SANTA ROSA
143	MORENO VALLEY	178	RIALTO	213	SANTEE

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 263 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2021) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
214	SARATOGA	249	WEST SACRAMENTO
215	SAUSALITO	250	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
216	SEASIDE	251	WESTMORLAND
217	SEBASTOPOL	252	WHEATLAND
218	SELMA	253	WILDOMAR
219	SHAFTER	254	WILLIAMS
220	SHASTA COUNTY	255	WILLITS
221	SHASTA LAKE	256	WILLOWS
222	SIGNAL HILL	257	WINDSOR
223	SISKIYOU COUNTY	258	WOODLAKE
224	SOLANA BEACH	259	YOLO COUNTY
225	SONORA	260	YREKA
226	SOUTH GATE	261	YUBA CITY
227	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	262	YUCAIPA
228	STANISLAUS COUNTY	263	YUCCA VALLEY
229	STOCKTON		
230	SUISUN CITY		
231	SUTTER COUNTY		
232	TAFT		
233	TEHACHAPI		
234	TEHAMA		
235	TEHAMA COUNTY		
236	TORRANCE		
237	TULARE COUNTY		
238	TULELAKE		
239	TUOLUMNE COUNTY		
240	TURLOCK		
241	TWENTYNINE PALMS		
242	VALLEJO		
243	VENTURA COUNTY		
244	VICTORVILLE		
245	VISALIA		
246	WATERFORD		
247	WEED		
248	WEST HOLLYWOOD		

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 50% Affordability**

These 238 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 50% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
1	AGOURA HILLS	36	CHINO HILLS	71	FREMONT
2	ALAMEDA	37	CHULA VISTA	72	FRESNO
3	ALBANY	38	CLAREMONT	73	FULLERTON
4	ALHAMBRA	39	CLOVIS	74	GALT
5	ALPINE COUNTY	40	COALINGA	75	GARDEN GROVE
6	AMERICAN CANYON	41	COLFAX	76	GARDENA
7	ANAHEIM	42	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	77	GILROY
8	ANDERSON	43	CORONA	78	GLENDALE
9	ANGELS CAMP	44	CORONADO	79	GLENDORA
10	ANTIOCH	45	COTATI	80	GOLETA
11	ARTESIA	46	COVINA	81	GRAND TERRACE
12	ATASCADERO	47	CULVER CITY	82	GROVER BEACH
13	ATWATER	48	CUPERTINO	83	HAWTHORNE
14	BALDWIN PARK	49	CYPRESS	84	HEALDSBURG
15	BELL GARDENS	50	DALY CITY	85	HEMET
16	BELMONT	51	DANA POINT	86	HERCULES
17	BERKELEY	52	DANVILLE	87	HERMOSA BEACH
18	BIG BEAR LAKE	53	DAVIS	88	HIDDEN HILLS
19	BREA	54	DEL MAR	89	HOLLISTER
20	BRENTWOOD	55	DINUBA	90	IMPERIAL BEACH
21	BRISBANE	56	DIXON	91	INDIAN WELLS
22	BUELLTON	57	DOWNEY	92	INDIO
23	BURLINGAME	58	DUARTE	93	IONE
24	CALABASAS	59	DUBLIN	94	IRVINE
25	CALIMESA	60	EASTVALE	95	JACKSON
26	CAMARILLO	61	EL DORADO COUNTY	96	JURUPA VALLEY
27	CAMPBELL	62	EL SEGUNDO	97	KING CITY
28	CANYON LAKE	63	ELK GROVE	98	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
29	CAPITOLA	64	EMERYVILLE	99	LA MESA
30	CARLSBAD	65	ENCINITAS	100	LA PALMA
31	CARMEL	66	FAIRFIELD	101	LA VERNE
32	CATHEDRAL	67	FOLSOM	102	LAFAYETTE
33	CERRITOS	68	FONTANA	103	LAGUNA BEACH
34	CHICO	69	FORT BRAGG	104	LAGUNA HILLS
35	CHINO	70	FOWLER	105	LAGUNA WOODS

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include  $\geq$  50% Affordability**

These 238 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 50% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
106	LAKE FOREST	139	MOUNTAIN VIEW	172	RANCHO PALOS VERDES
107	LARKSPUR	140	MURRIETA	173	RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA
108	LATHROP	141	NAPA	174	REDDING
109	LIVE OAK	142	NAPA COUNTY	175	REDWOOD CITY
110	LIVERMORE	143	NEWARK	176	RIO VISTA
111	LODI	144	OAKDALE	177	ROCKLIN
112	LOMITA	145	OAKLAND	178	ROSEMEAD
113	LONG BEACH	146	OAKLEY	179	ROSEVILLE
114	LOS ALAMITOS	147	ONTARIO	180	SAN ANSELMO
115	LOS ALTOS	148	ORANGE	181	SAN BENITO COUNTY
116	LOS ALTOS HILLS	149	ORANGE COUNTY	182	SAN CARLOS
117	LOS ANGELES	150	ORINDA	183	SAN CLEMENTE
118	LOS BANOS	151	PACIFIC GROVE	184	SAN DIEGO
119	LOYALTON	152	PALM DESERT	185	SAN FRANCISCO
120	MALIBU	153	PALM SPRINGS	186	SAN JOSE
121	MAMMOTH LAKES	154	PALO ALTO	187	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
122	MANHATTAN BEACH	155	PALOS VERDES ESTATES	188	SAN LUIS OBISPO
123	MANTECA	156	PARADISE	189	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
124	MARIN COUNTY	157	PARAMOUNT	190	SAN MARCOS
125	MARINA	158	PASADENA	191	SAN MATEO
126	MARIPOSA COUNTY	159	PETALUMA	192	SAN RAMON
127	MENIFEE	160	PIEDMONT	193	SANTA BARBARA
128	MERCED	161	PISMO BEACH	194	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
129	MILPITAS	162	PITTSBURG	195	SANTA CLARA
130	MISSION VIEJO	163	PLACENTIA	196	SANTA CRUZ
131	MODOC COUNTY	164	PLACER COUNTY	197	SANTA FE SPRINGS
132	MONO COUNTY	165	PLEASANTON	198	SCOTTS VALLEY
133	MONROVIA	166	PLYMOUTH	199	SEAL BEACH
134	MONTCLAIR	167	POINT ARENA	200	SIERRA MADRE
135	MONTEREY COUNTY	168	PORT HUENEME	201	SIMI VALLEY
136	MOORPARK	169	PORTOLA VALLEY	202	SOLANO COUNTY
137	MORAGA	170	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	203	SOLEDAD
138	MORGAN HILL	171	RANCHO MIRAGE	204	SONOMA

## SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

### Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions When Proposed Developments Include $\geq$ 50% Affordability

These 238 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very-Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
205	SOUTH EL MONTE	235	WOODLAND
206	SOUTH PASADENA	236	YORBA LINDA
207	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	237	YOUNTVILLE
208	STANTON	238	YUBA COUNTY
209	SUNNYVALE		
210	SUSANVILLE		
211	SUTTER CREEK		
212	TEMECULA		
213	TEMPLE CITY		
214	THOUSAND OAKS		
215	TIBURON		
216	TRACY		
217	TRINIDAD		
218	TRINITY COUNTY		
219	TRUCKEE		
220	TULARE		
221	TUSTIN		
222	UNION CITY		
223	UPLAND		
224	VACAVILLE		
225	VENTURA		
226	VERNON		
227	VISTA		
228	WALNUT		
229	WALNUT CREEK		
230	WASCO		
231	WATSONVILLE		
232	WEST COVINA		
233	WHITTIER		
234	WINTERS		

**APPENDIX C. SB 35 Determination**

# SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

## Cities and Counties Not Currently Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

This determination represents Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) data received as of July 17, 2020. The following 30 jurisdictions have met their prorated Lower (Very-Low and Low) and Above-Moderate Income Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the Reporting Period and submitted their latest APR (2019).

These jurisdictions are not currently subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining), but the jurisdictions are still encouraged to promote streamlining. **All other cities and counties beyond these 30 are subject to at least some form of SB 35 streamlining, as indicated on the following pages.**

**For more detail on the proration methodology or background data see the SB 35 Determination Methodology.**

	JURISDICTION
1	ATHERTON
2	BELL
3	BEVERLY HILLS
4	CALISTOGA
5	CARPINTERIA
6	CORONADO
7	CORTE MADERA
8	EL CERRITO
9	FOSTER CITY
10	GUADALUPE
11	INDUSTRY
12	LAGUNA NIGUEL
13	LEMON GROVE
14	MENDOCINO COUNTY
15	MENLO PARK
16	MILL VALLEY
17	MODOC COUNTY
18	MONTE SERENO
19	NEWPORT BEACH
20	ROHNERT PARK
21	SAINT HELENA
22	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
23	SANTA ANA
24	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
25	SANTA MONICA
26	SOLVANG
27	SONOMA COUNTY
28	UKIAH
29	WEST HOLLYWOOD
30	WOODSIDE

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 289 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) (2019) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
1	ADELANTO	37	CALIPATRIA	73	ESCALON
2	ALAMEDA COUNTY	38	CARMEL	74	ESCONDIDO
3	ALHAMBRA	39	CARSON	75	ETNA
4	ALISO VIEJO	40	CATHEDRAL	76	EUREKA
5	ALPINE COUNTY	41	CERES	77	EXETER
6	ALTURAS	42	CHOWCHILLA	78	FAIRFAX
7	AMADOR	43	CITRUS HEIGHTS	79	FARMERSVILLE
8	ANGELS CAMP	44	CLAYTON	80	FERNDALE
9	APPLE VALLEY	45	CLEARLAKE	81	FILLMORE
10	ARCADIA	46	CLOVERDALE	82	FIREBAUGH
11	ARCATA	47	COACHELLA	83	FORT JONES
12	ARROYO GRANDE	48	COLFAX	84	FORTUNA
13	ARVIN	49	COLMA	85	FOUNTAIN VALLEY
14	ATWATER	50	COLTON	86	FRESNO COUNTY
15	AVALON	51	COLUSA	87	GARDEN GROVE
16	AVENAL	52	COLUSA COUNTY	88	GLENN COUNTY
17	AZUSA	53	COMMERCE	89	GONZALES
18	BAKERSFIELD	54	CONCORD	90	GRAND TERRACE
19	BANNING	55	CORCORAN	91	GRASS VALLEY
20	BARSTOW	56	CORNING	92	GREENFIELD
21	BEAUMONT	57	COVINA	93	GRIDLEY
22	BELL GARDENS	58	CRESCENT CITY	94	GUSTINE
23	BELVEDERE	59	CUDAHY	95	HALF MOON BAY
24	BENICIA	60	DEL NORTE COUNTY	96	HANFORD
25	BIGGS	61	DEL REY OAKS	97	HAWAIIAN GARDENS
26	BISHOP	62	DELANO	98	HAYWARD
27	BLUE LAKE	63	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	99	HEMET
28	BLYTHE	64	DORRIS	100	HERMOSA BEACH
29	BRADBURY	65	DOS PALOS	101	HESPERIA
30	BRAWLEY	66	DUARTE	102	HIDDEN HILLS
31	BURBANK	67	DUNSMUIR	103	HIGHLAND
32	BUTTE COUNTY	68	EAST PALO ALTO	104	HILLSBOROUGH
33	CALAVERAS COUNTY	69	EL CAJON	105	HOLTVILLE
34	CALEXICO	70	EL CENTRO	106	HUMBOLDT COUNTY
35	CALIFORNIA CITY	71	EL MONTE	107	HUNTINGTON BEACH
36	CALIMESA	72	EL SEGUNDO	108	HUNTINGTON PARK

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 289 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2019) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
109	HURON	145	MADERA	181	PACIFICA
110	IMPERIAL	146	MADERA COUNTY	182	PALMDALE
111	IMPERIAL COUNTY	147	MARICOPA	183	PALOS VERDES ESTATES
112	INGLEWOOD	148	MARIPOSA COUNTY	184	PARADISE
113	INYO COUNTY	149	MARTINEZ	185	PARAMOUNT
114	IRWINDALE	150	MARYSVILLE	186	PARLIER
115	ISLETON	151	MAYWOOD	187	PASO ROBLES
116	JURUPA VALLEY	152	MCFARLAND	188	PATTERSON
117	KERMAN	153	MENDOTA	189	PICO RIVERA
118	KERN COUNTY	154	MENIFEE	190	PINOLE
119	KINGS COUNTY	155	MERCED COUNTY	191	PLEASANT HILL
120	KINGSBURG	156	MILLBRAE	192	POMONA
121	LA HABRA HEIGHTS	157	MODESTO	193	PORTERVILLE
122	LA MIRADA	158	MONTAGUE	194	PORTOLA
123	LA PUENTE	159	MONTCLAIR	195	POWAY
124	LA VERNE	160	MONTEBELLO	196	RED BLUFF
125	LAKE COUNTY	161	MONTEREY	197	REDLANDS
126	LAKE ELSINORE	162	MONTEREY PARK	198	REDONDO BEACH
127	LAKEPORT	163	MORENO VALLEY	199	REEDLEY
128	LANCASTER	164	MORRO BAY	200	RIALTO
129	LASSEN COUNTY	165	MOUNT SHASTA	201	RICHMOND
130	LAWNDALE	166	NATIONAL CITY	202	RIDGECREST
131	LEMOORE	167	NEEDLES	203	RIO DELL
132	LINDSAY	168	NEVADA CITY	204	RIPON
133	LIVE OAK	169	NEVADA COUNTY	205	RIVERBANK
134	LIVINGSTON	170	NEWMAN	206	RIVERSIDE
135	LODI	171	NORCO	207	RIVERSIDE COUNTY
136	LOMA LINDA	172	NOVATO	208	ROLLING HILLS
137	LOMPOC	173	OCEANSIDE	209	ROSEMEAD
138	LONG BEACH	174	OJAI	210	ROSS
139	LOOMIS	175	ONTARIO	211	SACRAMENTO
140	LOS ALAMITOS	176	ORANGE COVE	212	SACRAMENTO COUNTY
141	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	177	ORLAND	213	SALINAS
142	LOS GATOS	178	OROVILLE	214	SAN BERNARDINO
143	LOYALTON	179	OXNARD	215	SAN BRUNO
144	LYNWOOD	180	PACIFIC GROVE	216	SAN DIEGO COUNTY

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability**

These 289 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2019) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
217	SAN DIMAS	253	STOCKTON	289	YUCCA VALLEY
218	SAN FERNANDO	254	SUISUN CITY		
219	SAN JACINTO	255	SUSANVILLE		
220	SAN JOAQUIN	256	TAFT		
221	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	257	TEHACHAPI		
222	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	258	TEHAMA		
223	SAN LEANDRO	259	TEHAMA COUNTY		
224	SAN MATEO COUNTY	260	TIBURON		
225	SAN PABLO	261	TORRANCE		
226	SAN RAFAEL	262	TULARE COUNTY		
227	SAND CITY	263	TULELAKE		
228	SANGER	264	TUOLUMNE COUNTY		
229	SANTA CLARITA	265	TURLOCK		
230	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	266	TWENTYNINE PALMS		
231	SANTA MARIA	267	UPLAND		
232	SANTA PAULA	268	VALLEJO		
233	SANTA ROSA	269	VENTURA COUNTY		
234	SANTEE	270	VICTORVILLE		
235	SARATOGA	271	VILLA PARK		
236	SAUSALITO	272	VISALIA		
237	SEASIDE	273	WATERFORD		
238	SEBASTOPOL	274	WEST SACRAMENTO		
239	SELMA	275	WESTLAKE VILLAGE		
240	SHAFTER	276	WESTMORLAND		
241	SHASTA COUNTY	277	WHEATLAND		
242	SHASTA LAKE	278	WHITTIER		
243	SIERRA COUNTY	279	WILLIAMS		
244	SIGNAL HILL	280	WILLITS		
245	SISKIYOU COUNTY	281	WILLOWS		
246	SOLANA BEACH	282	WINDSOR		
247	SOLEDAD	283	WOODLAKE		
248	SONOMA	284	YOLO COUNTY		
249	SONORA	285	YREKA		
250	SOUTH GATE	286	YUBA CITY		
251	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	287	YUBA COUNTY		
252	STANISLAUS COUNTY	288	YUCAIPA		

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include  $\geq$  50% Affordability**

These 220 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
1	AGOURA HILLS	36	COALINGA	71	GLENDALE
2	ALAMEDA	37	COMPTON	72	GLENDORA
3	ALBANY	38	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	73	GOLETA
4	AMADOR COUNTY	39	CORONA	74	GROVER BEACH
5	AMERICAN CANYON	40	COSTA MESA	75	HAWTHORNE
6	ANAHEIM	41	COTATI	76	HEALDSBURG
7	ANDERSON	42	CULVER CITY	77	HERCULES
8	ANTIOCH	43	CUPERTINO	78	HOLLISTER
9	ARTESIA	44	CYPRESS	79	HUGHSON
10	ATASCADERO	45	DALY CITY	80	IMPERIAL BEACH
11	AUBURN	46	DANA POINT	81	INDIAN WELLS
12	BALDWIN PARK	47	DANVILLE	82	INDIO
13	BELLFLOWER	48	DAVIS	83	IONE
14	BELMONT	49	DEL MAR	84	IRVINE
15	BERKELEY	50	DIAMOND BAR	85	JACKSON
16	BIG BEAR LAKE	51	DINUBA	86	KING CITY
17	BREA	52	DIXON	87	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
18	BRENTWOOD	53	DOWNEY	88	LA HABRA
19	BRISBANE	54	DUBLIN	89	LA MESA
20	BUELLTON	55	EASTVALE	90	LA PALMA
21	BUENA PARK	56	EL DORADO COUNTY	91	LA QUINTA
22	BURLINGAME	57	ELK GROVE	92	LAFAYETTE
23	CALABASAS	58	EMERYVILLE	93	LAGUNA BEACH
24	CAMARILLO	59	ENCINITAS	94	LAGUNA HILLS
25	CAMPBELL	60	FAIRFIELD	95	LAGUNA WOODS
26	CANYON LAKE	61	FOLSOM	96	LAKE FOREST
27	CAPITOLA	62	FONTANA	97	LAKEWOOD
28	CARLSBAD	63	FORT BRAGG	98	LARKSPUR
29	CERRITOS	64	FOWLER	99	LATHROP
30	CHICO	65	FREMONT	100	LINCOLN
31	CHINO	66	FRESNO	101	LIVERMORE
32	CHINO HILLS	67	FULLERTON	102	LOMITA
33	CHULA VISTA	68	GALT	103	LOS ALTOS
34	CLAREMONT	69	GARDENA	104	LOS ALTOS HILLS
35	CLOVIS	70	GILROY	105	LOS ANGELES

**SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary**  
**Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions**  
**When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 50% Affordability**

These 220 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>		<b>JURISDICTION</b>
106	LOS BANOS	140	PIEDMONT	175	SAN MARCOS
107	MALIBU	141	PISMO BEACH	176	SAN MARINO
108	MAMMOTH LAKES	142	PITTSBURG	177	SAN MATEO
109	MANHATTAN BEACH	143	PLACENTIA	178	SAN RAMON
110	MANTECA	144	PLACER COUNTY	179	SANTA BARBARA
111	MARIN COUNTY	145	PLACERVILLE	180	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
112	MARINA	146	PLEASANTON	181	SANTA CLARA
113	MERCED	147	PLUMAS COUNTY	182	SANTA CRUZ
114	MILPITAS	148	PLYMOUTH	183	SANTA FE SPRINGS
115	MISSION VIEJO	149	POINT ARENA	184	SCOTTS VALLEY
116	MONO COUNTY	150	PORT HUENEME	185	SEAL BEACH
117	MONROVIA	151	PORTOLA VALLEY	186	SIERRA MADRE
118	MONTEREY COUNTY	152	RANCHO CORDOVA	187	SIMI VALLEY
119	MOORPARK	153	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	188	SOLANO COUNTY
120	MORAGA	154	RANCHO MIRAGE	189	SOUTH EL MONTE
121	MORGAN HILL	155	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	190	SOUTH PASADENA
122	MOUNTAIN VIEW	156	RANCHO ST. MARGARITA	191	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
123	MURRIETA	157	REDDING	192	STANTON
124	NAPA	158	REDWOOD CITY	193	SUNNYVALE
125	NAPA COUNTY	159	RIO VISTA	194	SUTTER COUNTY
126	NEWARK	160	ROCKLIN	195	SUTTER CREEK
127	NORWALK	161	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	196	TEMECULA
128	OAKDALE	162	ROSEVILLE	197	TEMPLE CITY
129	OAKLAND	163	SAN ANSELMO	198	THOUSAND OAKS
130	OAKLEY	164	SAN BENITO COUNTY	199	TRACY
131	ORANGE	165	SAN BUENAVENTURA	200	TRINIDAD
132	ORANGE COUNTY	166	SAN CARLOS	201	TRINITY COUNTY
133	ORINDA	167	SAN CLEMENTE	202	TRUCKEE
134	PALM DESERT	168	SAN DIEGO	203	TULARE
135	PALM SPRINGS	169	SAN FRANCISCO	204	TUSTIN
136	PALO ALTO	170	SAN GABRIEL	205	UNION CITY
137	PASADENA	171	SAN JOSE	206	VACAVILLE
138	PERRIS	172	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	207	VERNON
139	PETALUMA	173	SAN LUIS OBISPO	208	VISTA
		174	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO.	209	WALNUT

## SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

### Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions When Proposed Developments Include $\geq$ 50% Affordability

These 220 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very-Low and Low income) and are therefore subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

	<b>JURISDICTION</b>
210	WALNUT CREEK
211	WASCO
212	WATSONVILLE
213	WEED
214	WEST COVINA
215	WESTMINSTER
216	WILDOMAR
217	WINTERS
218	WOODLAND
219	YORBA LINDA
220	YOUNTVILLE

**APPENDIX D. San Mateo County Multijurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, November, 2021**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 7455

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE ADOPTING VOLUME I AND THE INTRODUCTION, CHAPTER 21 (TOWN OF WOODSIDE JURISDICTIONAL ANNEX), AND THE APPENDICES OF VOLUME II OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY MULTIJURISDICTIONAL LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

**WHEREAS**, all of San Mateo County has exposure to natural hazards that increase the risk to life, property, environment and the County's economy; and

**WHEREAS**, pro-active mitigation of known hazards before a disaster event can reduce or eliminate long-term risk to life and property; and

**WHEREAS**, the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-390) established new requirements for pre- and post-disaster hazard mitigation programs; and

**WHEREAS**, a coalition of San Mateo County, Cities, Towns and Special Districts with like planning objectives has been formed to pool resources and create consistent mitigation strategies within the San Mateo County planning area; and

**WHEREAS**, the coalition has completed a planning process that engages the public, assesses the risk and vulnerability to the impacts of natural hazards, develops a mitigation strategy consistent with a set of uniform goals and objectives, and creates a plan for implementing, evaluating and revising this strategy.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Town of Woodside:

1. Adopts in its entirety, Volume I and the Introduction, Chapter 21 (the Town of Woodside's jurisdictional annex), and the Appendices of Volume II of the San Mateo County Multijurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJLHMP).
2. Will use the adopted and approved portions of the MJLHMP to guide pre- and post-disaster mitigation of the hazards identified.
3. Will coordinate the strategies identified in the MJLHMP with other planning programs and mechanisms under its jurisdictional authority.
4. Will continue its support of the Steering Committee and continue to participate in the Planning Partnership as described by the MJLHMP.
5. Will help to promote and support the mitigation successes of all MJLHMP Planning Partners.

\* \* \* \* \*


**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside, California, at a meeting thereof held on the 16th day of November, 2021, by the following vote of the members thereof:

**AYES**, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Brown, Carvell, Fluet, Shaw, Wall, and Mayor Dombkowski

**NOES**, Councilmembers:

**ABSENT**, Councilmembers: Scott

**ABSTAIN**, Councilmembers:



Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:



Clerk of the Town of Woodside

# 21. TOWN OF WOODSIDE

---

## 21.1 LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING TEAM

### Primary Point of Contact

Sean Rose, Public Works Director  
2955 Woodside Road  
Woodside, CA 94062  
605-851-6790  
srose@woodsidetown.org

### Alternate Point of Contact

Sindhi Mekala, Senior Engineer  
2955 Woodside Road  
Woodside, CA 94062  
650-851-6790  
smekala@woodsidetown.org

This annex was developed by the Town’s local mitigation planning team, whose members are listed in Table 21-1.

**Table 21-1. Local Mitigation Planning Team Members**

Name	Title
Sean Rose	Public Works Director / Town Engineer
Joanne Kurz	Building Official
Sindhi Mekala	Senior Engineer
Kevin Bryant	Town Manager

## 21.2 JURISDICTION PROFILE

### 21.2.1 Location and Features

The Town of Woodside is located on the San Francisco Peninsula, midway between San Jose and San Francisco, in San Mateo County. The town has a total area of approximately 11.7 square miles. Woodside has 18 full time employees with an annual operating budget of approximately \$8 million. The Town owns and operates three buildings, Town Hall and Independence Hall, and a network of roadway and trail infrastructure. The Town also owns the building that houses the Woodside library which is operated by the San Mateo County Library System Woodside Library.

As is true of most of the California coastal areas, weather in Woodside is usually mild during most of the year. Summers are dry and can be hot; winter temperatures rarely dip much below freezing. Average winter temperatures vary from 36 to 60°F and average summer temperatures from 51 to 88°F. Annual rainfall averages 30 inches and falls on an average of 61 days. The record maximum temperature was 114°F on July 22, 2006, and the record minimum temperature was 17°F on February 6, 1989. Hills and mountains between Woodside and the Pacific coast make fog much less prevalent than in nearby San Francisco. As well, during the summer, Woodside’s climate is remarkably hotter than that of San Francisco.

## 21.2.2 History

The Woodside area was originally home to natives belonging to the Ohlone tribe. In 1769, led by Gaspar de Portolá, Spanish explorers searching for San Francisco Bay camped at a site near Woodside.

Woodside is located on the Rancho Cañada de Raymundo Mexican Land grant. Woodside is said to be the oldest English-speaking settlement in the southern part of the San Francisco Peninsula. The first English-speaking settlers arrived in the early 19th century to log the rich stands of redwoods. Charles Brown constructed the first sawmill in Woodside on his Mountain Home Ranch around 1838. His adobe house, built in 1839, still stands today. By mid-century, the Woodside area had a dozen mills producing building materials for a booming San Francisco.

In 1849, during the California Gold Rush, 20-year-old Mathias Alfred Parkhurst purchased 127 acres (0.5 km<sup>2</sup>) of timberland and named it “Woodside”; of course, this name was kept. By the late 19th century, Woodside was home to country estates. The Sequoia Redwood trees in Woodside are currently 3 generation growth. The first generation of the Redwood trees were used to build San Francisco original homes. After the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake, the lumberjacks returned to Woodside to cut the second growth of redwood so they could be used for the rebuilding of San Francisco again.

The Town of Woodside was incorporated in 1956.

## 21.2.3 Governing Body Format

Woodside is a general law Town with a Council-Manager system of government. The Town Council is comprised of seven members who are each elected to represent a geographic district. This provides the Town with public direction from the Town Council and professional administration through the Town Manager. The Town is assisted by a Planning Commission, Architectural Site Review Board, and 11 citizen advisory committees. The Town organization consists of the Planning and Building, Administration and Finance, and Public Works Departments.

The Town’s Council would be responsible for adopting this plan; Town staff will oversee its implementation.

## 21.3 CURRENT TRENDS

### 21.3.1 Population

According to the California Department of Finance, the population of Woodside as of January 2020 was 5,676. Since 2016, the population has grown at an average annual rate of 0.05 percent.

### 21.3.2 Development

Anticipated future development for Woodside is low to moderate, consisting primarily of residential growth. There has been a focus on affordable housing and a push for more accessory dwelling units. Future growth in the City will be managed as identified in the Town’s general plan.

The overwhelming majority of Woodside’s developed land area is dedicated to residential use. The Town is largely built-out in areas with development potential, with a significant portion of the Town’s land area set aside

as permanent open space. Accordingly, most projects reviewed by the Town involve renovation or redevelopment of existing developed parcels including full remodels of obsolete or underutilized sites, or residential infill development on topographically challenging vacant lots. Overall, the level of development activity in Woodside over the past several years has been relatively high due in large part to the overall economic health and activity in the Bay Area region.

Table 21-2 summarizes development trends in the performance period since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan, as well as expected future development trends.

**Table 21-2. Recent and Expected Future Development Trends**

Criterion	Response					
Has your jurisdiction annexed any land since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan? <i>If yes, give the estimated area annexed and estimated number of parcels or structures.</i>	No					
Is your jurisdiction expected to annex any areas during the performance period of this plan? <i>If yes, describe land areas and dominant uses. If yes, who currently has permitting authority over these areas?</i>	No					
Are any areas targeted for development or major redevelopment in the next five years? <i>If yes, briefly describe, including whether any of the areas are in known hazard risk areas</i>	No					
How many permits for new construction were issued in your jurisdiction since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan?	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	
	Single Family	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Multi-Family	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Other (commercial, mixed use, etc.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>
Provide the number of new-construction permits for each hazard area or provide a qualitative description of where development has occurred.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Flood Hazard Areas: Development in these areas is subject to FEMA restrictions regarding development in Floodplain.</li> <li>• Landslide: We don't separately track number of permits in these areas. Projects get reviewed by Town Geologist, Town Engineer, and Building Official for stability and mitigation.</li> <li>• High Liquefaction Areas: We don't separately track number of permits in these areas. Projects get reviewed by Town Geologist, Town Engineer, and Building Official for stability and mitigation.</li> <li>• Tsunami Inundation Area: N/A</li> <li>• Wildfire Risk Areas: The entirety of the Town is within a Wildfire Risk Area. We implement Fire Code and current Building Code requirements related to Fire Hardening, etc.</li> </ul>					
Describe the level of buildout in the jurisdiction, based on your jurisdiction's buildable lands inventory. If no such inventory exists, provide a qualitative description.	The Town is largely built-out in areas with development potential, with a significant portion of the Town's land area set aside as permanent open space					

## 21.4 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section describes an assessment of existing capabilities for implementing hazard mitigation strategies. The introduction at the beginning of this volume of the hazard mitigation plan describes the components included in the capability assessment and their significance for hazard mitigation planning.

Findings of the capability assessment were reviewed to identify opportunities to expand, initiate or integrate capabilities to further hazard mitigation goals and objectives. Where such opportunities were identified and determined to be feasible, they are included in the action plan. The “Analysis of Mitigation Actions” table in this annex identifies these as community capacity building mitigation actions. The findings of the assessment are presented as follows:

- An assessment of planning and regulatory capabilities is presented in Table 21-3.
- Development and permitting capabilities are presented in Table 21-4.
- An assessment of fiscal capabilities is presented in Table 21-5.
- An assessment of administrative and technical capabilities is presented in Table 21-6.
- An assessment of education and outreach capabilities is presented in Table 21-7.
- Information on National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) compliance is presented in Table 21-8.
- Classifications under various community mitigation programs are presented in Table 21-9.
- The community’s adaptive capacity for the impacts of climate change is presented in Table 21-10.

**Table 21-3. Planning and Regulatory Capability**

	Local Authority	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated	Integration Opportunity?
<b>Codes, Ordinances, &amp; Requirements</b>				
Building Code	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Comment: Woodside Municipal Code (WMC) Title XV Chapter 150, Sections 150.01 through 150.99; Effective 1/9/14</i>				
Zoning Code	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title XV, Chapter 153, Sections 153.001 through 153.999; 3/25/99</i>				
Subdivisions	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title XV Chapter 152. Sections 152.001 through 152.999; 4/8/82</i>				
Stormwater Management	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title XV, Chapter 151, Section 151.043; subdivisions subject to WMC Title XV, Chapter 152, Section 152.070. 4/12/84</i>				
Post-Disaster Recovery	No	No	No	No
<i>Comment:</i>				
Real Estate Disclosure	No	No	Yes	No
<i>Comment: CA. State Civil Code 1102 requires full disclosure on Natural hazard Exposure of the sale/re-sale of any and all real property.</i>				
Growth Management	No	No	No	No
<i>Comment: None. Growth in the Town of Woodside is limited by multiple environmental constraints and sewer capacity. Large portions of the Town are zoned for Special Conservation Planning based on the number of these constraints (Zoning Districts SCP-5, SCP-7, and SCP-10).</i>				
Site Plan Review	Yes	No	No	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title XV, Chapter 151, Sections 151.01 through 151.77; and Chapter 153, Sections 153.001 through 153.999; 3/25/99</i>				
Environmental Protection	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title XV Chapter 153, Section 153.001 through 153.999; Woodside General Plan (2012) Conservation Element; and Residential Design Guidelines (2012; Revised 2016); Compliance with CEQA; and CESA; and Fish and Game Code, etc. 3/25/99</i>				
Flood Damage Prevention	Yes	No	No	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title V, Chapter 55, Sections 55.01 through 55.53; the Town enforces FEMA's floodplain administration regulations, which regulate impervious surface coverage and site drainage. 1/22/01</i>				
Emergency Management	Yes	No	No	Yes
<i>Comment: WMC Title III, Chapter 33, Sections 33.01 through 33.0711/22/01</i>				
Climate Change	No	No	No	Yes
<i>Comment:</i>				
Other				
<i>Comment:</i>				
<b>Planning Documents</b>				
General Plan	Yes	No	No	Yes
<i>Is the plan compliant with Assembly Bill 2140? Yes</i>				
<i>Comment: The General Plan currently contains a Natural Hazards and Safety Element that addresses various potential hazards facing the Town and policies and action programs to address these hazards. The Natural Hazards and Safety Element describes the natural and man-made disasters that have occurred since a previous general plan. It has a section on 'Acceptable Risk' and includes tables on Risk Classification of Structures, Occupancies and Land Uses, and a Table on the Location of Structures and Land Uses in Relation to Defined Hazard Areas.</i>				
Capital Improvement Plan	Yes	No	No	Yes
<i>How often is the plan updated? Every 5 years</i>				
<i>Comment: Reviewed yearly as part of Town's budget process</i>				
Disaster Debris Management Plan	No	No	No	No
<i>Comment: Countywide Disaster Debris Management Plan being developed project date May 2022</i>				

	Local Authority	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated	Integration Opportunity?
Floodplain or Watershed Plan <i>Comment:</i>	No	No	No	No
Stormwater Plan <i>Comment: 1978 Storm Drain Master Plan and any subsequent revisions; Town General Plan (2012) Public Utilities Element, includes discussion, policies, and strategies on retaining storm water runoff and utilizing natural drainages.</i>	Yes	No	No	Yes
Urban Water Management Plan <i>Comment: CalWater</i>	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Habitat Conservation Plan <i>Comment: Town of Woodside General Plan (2012) includes a Conservation Element. The Town also has an ongoing Backyard Habitat Program to encourage residents to preserve, restore, and connect natural habitat areas.</i>	Yes	No	No	Yes
Economic Development Plan <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside is almost entirely a residential community and has only two very limited commercial areas. Development within the commercial areas is guided by the Town of Woodside Town Center Area Plan (Adopted 1970; Amended 1977) and the Skylonda Area Plan (Adopted 1985).</i>	Yes	No	No	Yes
Shoreline Management Plan <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside does not have shoreline areas.</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Wildfire Protection Plan <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside Fire Management Plan (2003). Woodside Fire Protection District</i>	No	Yes	No	No
Forest Management Plan <i>Comment: Town of Woodside General Plan (2012), Conservation Elements. Woodside Fire Protection District</i>	No	No	No	No
Climate Action Plan <i>Comment: Town of Woodside Climate Action Plan; 9/22/2015 (Targets set by AB 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)</i>	Yes	No	No	Yes
Emergency Operations Plan <i>Comment: County of San Mateo Emergency Operations Plan 2013</i>	No	Yes	No	Yes
Threat & Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment (THIRA) <i>Comment: Bay Area UASI THIRA</i>	No	No	No	No
Post-Disaster Recovery Plan <i>Comment: Emergency Operations Plan</i>	No	No	No	Yes
Continuity of Operations Plan <i>Comment:</i>	No	No	No	Yes
Public Health Plan <i>Comment: San Mateo County Health</i>	No	Yes	No	No
Other <i>Comment:</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table 21-4. Development and Permitting Capability**

Criterion	Response
Does your jurisdiction issue development permits? • If no, who does? If yes, which department?	Yes Planning, Building & Public Works
Does your jurisdiction have the ability to track permits by hazard area?	No
Does your jurisdiction have a buildable lands inventory?	No

**Table 21-5. Fiscal Capability**

Financial Resource	Accessible or Eligible to Use?
Community Development Block Grants	No
Capital Improvements Project Funding	Yes
Authority to Levy Taxes for Specific Purposes	No
User Fees for Water, Sewer, Gas or Electric Service	Yes (For Sewer)
Incur Debt through General Obligation Bonds	Yes
Incur Debt through Special Tax Bonds	Yes
Incur Debt through Private Activity Bonds	Yes
Withhold Public Expenditures in Hazard-Prone Areas	No
State-Sponsored Grant Programs	Yes
Development Impact Fees for Homebuyers or Developers	Yes
Other	No

**Table 21-6. Administrative and Technical Capability**

Staff/Personnel Resource	Available?	Department/Agency/Position
Planners or engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Yes	Engineering / Planning
Engineers or professionals trained in building or infrastructure construction practices	Yes	Engineering Department: Town Engineer, Deputy Engineer, Contract Engineers (x2) / Building Official, Contract Structural Engineers / Plan Checkers (CSG Consultants)
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Yes	Engineering Department: Town Engineer, Deputy Engineer, Contract Engineers (x2) / Building Official, Contract Structural Engineers / Plan Checkers (CSG Consultants) Contract Geologist
Staff with training in benefit/cost analysis	Yes	Engineering / Planning
Surveyors	Yes	Contract Surveyors (CSG Consultants)
Personnel skilled or trained in GIS applications	Yes	Engineering / Planning
Scientist familiar with natural hazards in local area	Yes	Engineering / Planning / Geology
Emergency manager	Yes	Town Manager
Grant writers	Yes	Engineering (3) / Planning (2)

**Table 21-7. Education and Outreach Capability**

Criterion	Response
Do you have a public information officer or communications office?	Yes. Town Clerk is the Community Information officer, Building Official works closely with CERPP (local CERT program) to provide any necessary updates.
Do you have personnel skilled or trained in website development?	Yes, Contracted IT. Engineering and Planning Departments regularly update the website.
Do you have hazard mitigation information available on your website? <i>If yes, briefly describe.</i>	Yes Emergency Services including Emergency Preparedness, Fire Safety Construction and the Wildland Urban Interface and Rapid Notify Self Registration all have links on the Town website.
Do you use social media for hazard mitigation education and outreach? <i>If yes, briefly describe.</i>	Yes Nextdoor Woodside
Do you have any citizen boards or commissions that address issues related to hazard mitigation? <i>If yes, briefly describe.</i>	Yes Emergency Preparedness Committee and Citizens of Emergency and Preparedness Program (CERPP) promote emergency preparedness and response capability at the citizen and neighborhood level in the event of a disaster. In association with the Woodside Protection Fire District.
Do you have any other programs already in place that could be used to communicate hazard-related information? <i>If yes, briefly describe.</i>	Yes Town website, SMC Alert
Do you have any established warning systems for hazard events? <i>If yes, briefly describe.</i>	Yes. San Mateo County Alert System is an alert notification system used to immediately contact you during urgent or emergency situations with useful information and updates. The Town Clerk is the Community Information officer; the Building Official works closely with CERPP to provide any necessary updates.

**Table 21-8. National Flood Insurance Program Compliance**

Criterion	Response
What local department is responsible for floodplain management?	Public Works Department
Who is your floodplain administrator? (department/position)	Town Engineer
Are any certified floodplain managers on staff in your jurisdiction?	Town Engineer
What is the date that your flood damage prevention ordinance was last amended?	November 22, 2001
Does your floodplain management program meet or exceed minimum requirements? <i>If exceeds, in what ways?</i>	Meet
When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit or Community Assistance Contact?	Unknown
Does your jurisdiction have any outstanding NFIP compliance violations that need to be addressed? <i>If so, state what they are.</i>	No
Are any RiskMAP projects currently underway in your jurisdiction? <i>If so, state what they are.</i>	No

Criterion	Response
Do your flood hazard maps adequately address the flood risk within your jurisdiction? <i>If no, state why.</i>	Yes
Does your floodplain management staff need any assistance or training to support its floodplain management program? <i>If so, what type of assistance/training is needed?</i>	No
Does your jurisdiction participate in the Community Rating System (CRS)? <i>If yes, is your jurisdiction interested in improving its CRS Classification?</i> <i>If no, is your jurisdiction interested in joining the CRS program?</i>	No N/A No
How many flood insurance policies are in force in your jurisdiction? <sup>a</sup> <i>What is the insurance in force?</i> <i>What is the premium in force?</i>	39 \$13,550,000 \$21.030
How many total loss claims have been filed in your jurisdiction? <sup>a</sup> <i>What were the total payments for losses?</i>	13 \$341,827

a. According to FEMA statistics as of March 31, 2021

**Table 21-9. Community Classifications**

	Participating?	Classification	Date Classified
FIPS Code	Yes	0608186440	May 2019
DUNS#	Yes	004952339	1956
Community Rating System	No	N/A	N/A
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule	No	N/A	N/A
Public Protection	No	N/A	N/A
Storm Ready	No	N/A	N/A
Firewise	Yes	N/A. Council participates on Ad hoc Committee	N/A
Tsunami Ready	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table 21-10. Adaptive Capacity for Climate Change**

Criterion	Jurisdiction Rating <sup>a</sup>
<b>Technical Capacity</b>	
Jurisdiction-level understanding of potential climate change impacts <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside approved a Climate Action Plan in 2015 to better plan for the effects of Climate Change.</i>	High
Jurisdiction-level monitoring of climate change impacts <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside is most affected by increased wildfires. While no jurisdiction-level monitoring occurs, the Town has access to data regarding local and regional fires through CAL FIRE and other entities.</i>	Medium
Technical resources to assess proposed strategies for feasibility and externalities <i>Comment: staff together with the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability consider strategies for feasibility and externalities</i>	Medium
Jurisdiction-level capacity for development of greenhouse gas emissions inventory <i>Comment: The County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability has taken the lead on developing greenhouse gas emissions inventories.</i>	High
Capital planning and land use decisions informed by potential climate impacts <i>Comment: The Town has identified capital funds for EV chargers and hybrid vehicles to reduce greenhouse gases. Improving infrastructure for water/fire flow and storage has been a key priority. Improving road conditions, particularly for evacuation routes has also been a high priority for the Town.</i>	High
Participation in regional groups addressing climate risks <i>Comment: The Town has worked with the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability and has utilized Town specific inventories and region-wide information and resources. The Town is also a member of Peninsula Clean Energy.</i>	High

Criterion	Jurisdiction Rating <sup>a</sup>
<b>Implementation Capacity</b>	
Clear authority/mandate to consider climate change impacts during public decision-making processes <i>Comment: Town decision making related to climate change is guided by the Sustainability Element goals and policies in the General Plan and the Climate Action Plan developed in response to a mitigation measure required for the General Plan.</i>	High
Identified strategies for greenhouse gas mitigation efforts <i>Comment: The Town of Woodside is located within a forested region. The Town balances tree protection with the need for maintaining defensible space around residences.</i>	High
Identified strategies for adaptation to impacts <i>Comment: Strategies for adapting to the impacts of climate change relate to minimizing fire hazard in a wooded environment through maintenance of defensible space, home hardening, and removal of trees particularly prone to ignite in a wildland fire; ensuring adequate infrastructure for fire flow and water storage; and maintaining good road conditions, particularly key evacuation routes.</i>	High
Champions for climate action in local government departments <i>Comment: Staff in the Engineering, Planning and Building Departments work together to mitigate the effects of climate change and implement adaptation strategies. The Environment Committee and Town Manager work together to prioritize strategies.</i>	High
Political support for implementing climate change adaptation strategies <i>Comment: There has been very strong support for the Defensible Space and Home Hardening program as well as for maintaining infrastructure, and other programs to adapt to climate change.</i>	High
Financial resources devoted to climate change adaptation <i>Comment: The Town has provided particularly strong support for the Defensible Space and Home Hardening Program to help residents adapt to increased fire danger.</i>	High
Local authority over sectors likely to be negative impacted <i>Comment: The Town has land use authority over areas within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.</i>	High
<b>Public Capacity</b>	
Local residents knowledge of and understanding of climate risk <i>Comment: The Town has held several forums on Climate Change to increase knowledge and understanding through its Arts &amp; Culture program.</i>	High
Local residents support of adaptation efforts <i>Comment: Residents have been very active in participating in the Defensible Space and Home Hardening program.</i>	High
Local residents' capacity to adapt to climate impacts <i>Comment: In steep, heavily wooded areas of the Town, particularly in the Western Hills, fire hazard remains high, even with adaptation strategies.</i>	Medium
Local economy current capacity to adapt to climate impacts <i>Comment: Throughout the County of San Mateo and its jurisdictions, there are numerous efforts to adapt to climate impacts.</i>	High
Local ecosystems capacity to adapt to climate impacts <i>Comment: With residential development throughout the wooded hillsides, there are some limitations on using tools such as controlled burns to adapt to climate impacts.</i>	Medium

- a. High = Capacity exists and is in use; Medium = Capacity may exist but is not used or could use some improvement; Low = Capacity does not exist or could use substantial improvement; Unsure= Not enough information is known to assign a rating.

## 21.5 INTEGRATION REVIEW

For hazard mitigation planning, “integration” means that hazard mitigation information is used in other relevant planning mechanisms, such as general planning and capital facilities planning, and that relevant information from those sources is used in hazard mitigation. This section identifies where such integration is already in place, and where there are opportunities for further integration in the future. Resources listed at the end of this annex were used to provide information on integration. The progress reporting process described in Volume 1 of the hazard

mitigation plan will document the progress of hazard mitigation actions related to integration and identify new opportunities for integration.

### 21.5.1 Existing Integration

Some level of integration has already been established between local hazard mitigation planning and the following other local plans and programs:

- **General Plan:** The General Plan contains a Natural Hazards and Safety Element. Additionally, it integrates information on pertinent local natural hazards, especially in the Safety Element. The Safety Element includes information on seismic and geologic hazards, flooding and drainage concerns, hazardous materials, and fire hazards. For further compliance, the Town will reference the LHMP in future updates.
- **Town of Woodside Sanitary Sewer Overflow and Backup Response Plan** – To ensure minimal environmental impact to receiving waters of the United States of America and to minimize exposure to the general public and to private property. During a catastrophic event, the Town’s sewer system operation would be evaluated, and a damage assessment would be completed to ensure the function of the necessary utility.
- **Town Emergency Preparedness Committee** – The Emergency Preparedness Committee supports the General Plan policies to institute or participate in education related to natural hazards and to support emergency preparedness education. The Emergency Preparedness Committee works with Town staff to develop and maintain appropriate plans and procedures for responding to disasters, including wildfires, earthquakes, floods, and other emergencies. The Emergency Preparedness Committee supports the work of the Citizens’ Emergency Response and Preparedness Program (CERPP) to develop a network of volunteers to respond to emergencies at the neighborhood level.
- **Capital Improvements Plans** – Staff will continue to evaluate ways in which mitigation strategies can be incorporated into the CIP planning process and selected projects.
- **Defensible Space Matching Fund Program** - The purpose of the Town’s Defensible Space Matching Fund Program is to encourage Woodside residents to create and maintain defensible space for fire protection around their homes and the perimeter of their properties through the provision of a matching fund grant to help offset the cost of this undertaking. The Town reimburses residents 50% of the cost of creating defensible space, up to a maximum of \$3,000.

### 21.5.2 Opportunities for Future Integration

The capability assessment presented in this annex identified the following plans and programs that do not currently integrate hazard mitigation information but provide opportunities to do so in the future:

- **Flood Plain Ordinance Update** – An update of the floodplain ordinance is planned to ensure compliance with and new FEMA requirements.
- **Update Geologic Map**– The Town updated its Town-wide Geologic Map in 2017 which included an updated and more accurate location of seismic faults and associated seismic hazards. The location of the seismic faults and landslides are used to help provide design parameters for new development.
- **Housing Element Update** – The Town is working with 21 Elements, a group working together to update the 21 Housing Elements in San Mateo County. The Housing Element will utilize information from the Hazard Mitigation Plan update to ensure consistency in goals, policies, and programs.

## 21.6 RISK ASSESSMENT

### 21.6.1 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History

Table 21-11 lists past occurrences of natural hazards for which specific damage was recorded in this jurisdiction. Other hazard events that broadly affected the entire planning area, including this jurisdiction, are listed in the risk assessments in Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan.

**Table 21-11. Past Natural Hazard Events**

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster #	Date	Damage Assessment
Storm	DR-4308	2/1/17 – 2/23/17	\$229,797
Fire	N/A	Unknown	Trees downed powerlines and caused fire damaging residential barn
Storm	Portola Road	December 23, 2012	\$112,829
Storm	Kings Mountain Road	December 2005	\$142,000
Wildfire	N/A	August 2002	Fallen trees created large residential fire
Storm	DR-1155	January 1997	California Severe Storms
Landslide	N/A	1988	Large landslides on Summit Springs Road

### 21.6.2 Hazard Risk Ranking

Table 21-12 presents a local ranking of all hazards of concern for which this hazard mitigation plan provides complete risk assessments. As described in detail in Volume 1, the ranking process involves an assessment of the likelihood of occurrence for each hazard, along with its potential impacts on people, property, and the economy. Mitigation actions target hazards with high and medium rankings.

**Table 21-12. Hazard Risk Ranking**

Rank	Hazard	Risk Ranking Score	Risk Category
1	Wildfire	51	High
2	Earthquake	36	High
3	Landslide/Mass Movements	33	High
4	Severe Weather	24	Medium
5	Flood	15	Low
6	Dam Failure	10	Low
7	Drought	9	Low
8	Sea Level Rise/Climate Change	0	Low
9	Tsunami	0	Low

### 21.6.3 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities

Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan provides complete risk assessments for each identified hazard of concern. This section provides information on a few key vulnerabilities for this jurisdiction. Available jurisdiction-specific risk maps of the hazards are provided at the end of this annex.

#### **Repetitive Loss Properties**

Repetitive loss records are as follows:

- Number of FEMA-identified Repetitive-Loss Properties: 0

- Number of FEMA-identified Severe-Repetitive-Loss Properties: 0
- Number of Repetitive-Loss Properties or Severe-Repetitive-Loss Properties that have been mitigated: 0

### **Other Noted Vulnerabilities**

No jurisdiction-specific issues were identified based on a review of the results of the risk assessment, public involvement strategy, and other available resources.

## **21.7 STATUS OF PREVIOUS PLAN ACTIONS**

Table 21-13 summarizes the actions that were recommended in the previous version of the hazard mitigation plan and their implementation status at the time this update was prepared.

**Table 21-13. Status of Previous Plan Actions**

Action Item	Completed	Removed; No longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update	
			Check if Yes	Action # in Update
WS-1—Update Town Geologic Map showing to better show zones of potential geologic hazards. <b>Comment:</b> February 2017	✓			
WS-2— Work with CalWater to expedite review and processing of water tanks for fire suppression in high severity areas. <b>Comment:</b> CalWater has upgraded the water tanks in the Old La Honda area and is currently in the process of upgrading the water tanks in Skyline area. CalWater has and is in the process of upgrading their distribution lines Town-wide.			✓	WDS-7
WS-3— Work with PG&E to promote Vegetation Removal Program and to seek large scale tree removal projects near overhead lines. <b>Comment:</b> PG&E has removed several large scale trees and is continuing to remove trees under overhead lines as identified by the Woodside Fire District. PG&E has an annual vegetation maintenance permit from the Town to trim and/or remove trees under overhead lines.			✓	WDS-8
WS-4—Continued to upgrade equipment for Town Vegetation Removal Program <b>Comment:</b> Town's Public Works department continues to replace and/or upgrade the equipment used for Town's vegetation management and removal program.			✓	WDS-9
WS-5— Provide Sandbag Program and continued educational outreach for storm season. <b>Comment:</b> Sandbags and sand are stocked and are available at Town Hall parking lot for Town's residents. Town's website and newsletter provides information on winter storm watercourse protection and sandbag availability.			✓	WDS-10
WS-6— 5 year CIP for upgrading and maintaining storm drain conveyance facility. <b>Comment:</b> Town has replaced storm drainpipes that were recommended to be replaced immediately in the "Stormwater Facility Prioritized Repair/Replacement Program" in 2016-2017. Town continues to investigate and replace damaged storm drain conveyance facilities.			✓	WDS-11
WS-7—Continue to support Defensible Space Match Fund Program to reduce the threat of wildfire in the community. <b>Comment:</b> Town continues to support Defensible Space Match Fund Program. For approved projects, the Town will reimburse 50% of the cost of creating defensible space and/or home hardening, up to a maximum of \$3,000.			✓	WDS-12
WS-8— Continue to support the Community Emergency Response Training through Citizens Emergency Response Preparedness Program (CERPP) <b>Comment:</b> The Town has emergency preparedness committee. Town's Building Official works closely with the committee to provide support for emergency response and training programs.			✓	WDS-13

Action Item	Completed	Removed; No longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update	
			Check if Yes	Action # in Update
<p><b>WS-9</b>—Upgrade majority of sewer system including providing new Town Center pump station with built in redundancy for natural disasters. (Back generators, overflow wet well capacity, and contract with West Bay Sanitation District to provide emergency backup services.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Town Center pump station was upgraded in December 2017. Town contracts with Westbay for the maintenance of the Town Center sewer system.</p>	✓			
<p><b>WS-10</b>—Obtain good standing and compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). This will be accomplished through the implementation of floodplain management programs that will, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the NFIP: Enforcement of the flood damage prevention ordinance Participate in floodplain identification and mapping updates Provide public assistance/information on floodplain requirements and impacts.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This is an ongoing item.</p>			✓	WDS-4
<p><b>WS-11</b>—Continue to improve water efficiency in all public facilities by installing water efficient fixtures, monitoring the maintenance of Town’s fields, and continued support of the California Department of Water Resources Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for all development projects.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Water efficient fixtures have been installed in Town Library in 2015 and in Town Hall in 2017-2018. Irrigation system at Town fields has been updated to increase water efficiency and is monitored regularly. Town’s planning department enforces State’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for all development projects.</p>			✓	WDS-14
<p><b>WS-12</b>— Continue to support the county wide actions defined in Volume I of the hazard mitigation plan.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Ongoing</p>			✓	WDS-15
<p><b>WS-13</b>— Actively participate in the plan maintenance strategy and protocols outlined in Volume I of the hazard mitigation plan.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Ongoing</p>			✓	WDS-15
<p><b>WS-14</b>— Integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other plans, programs or resources that dictate land use or redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Ongoing</p>			✓	WDS-16
<p><b>WS-15</b>—Improve the development of a post disaster recovery plan and a debris management plan.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Ongoing</p>			✓	WDS-17
<p><b>Action G-1</b>—Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase, or relocation of structures in hazard-prone areas to prevent future structure damage. Give priority to properties with exposure to repetitive losses.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> We support issuance of permits that prevent future damage for properties in hazard prone areas.</p>			✓	WDS-1
<p><b>Action G-2</b>—Consider participation in incentive-based programs such as the Community Rating System, Tree City, and StormReady.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> This is an ongoing item.</p>			✓	WDS-18
<p><b>Action G-4</b>—Where feasible, implement a program to record high water marks following high-water events.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Majority of the streams are on private properties and Town</p>		✓		
<p><b>Action G-5</b>—Integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other plans, programs, or resources that dictate land use or redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Similar to WS-14</p>		✓		

Action Item	Completed	Removed; No longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update	
			Check if Yes	Action # in Update
<b>Action G-7</b> —Provide incentives for eligible non-profits and private entities, including homeowners, to adapt to risks through structural and nonstructural retrofitting.			✓	WDS-19
<b>Comment:</b> Council adopted a program to reimburse for home hardening projects that include replacement of an existing wood shake roof with a non-wood shake roof; Installation of non-combustible ember-resistant vent screens and/or chimney spark arrestors; Installation of an approved seismic gas shut-off device or valve that will shut off gas automatically in an earthquake.				

## 21.8 HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN

Table 21-14 lists the identified actions, which make up the hazard mitigation action plan for this jurisdiction.

Table 21-15 identifies the priority for each action. Table 21-16 summarizes the mitigation actions by hazard of concern and mitigation type.

**Table 21-14. Hazard Mitigation Action Plan Matrix**

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline <sup>a</sup>
<b>Action WDS-1</b> —Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase or relocation of structures located in hazard areas, prioritizing those that have experienced repetitive losses and/or are located in high- or medium-risk hazard areas.						
<u>Hazards Mitigated:</u> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure						
Existing	6, 7, 9, 11, 13	Town of Woodside	Woodside Fire Protection Department	High	Grant funding-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Short-term
<b>Action WDS-2</b> — Integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other plans, ordinances and programs that dictate land use decisions in the community.						
<u>Hazards Mitigated:</u> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Drought, Climate Change						
New & Existing	2, 4, 6,7	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-3</b> —Actively participate in the plan maintenance protocols outlined in Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan.						
<u>Hazards Mitigated:</u> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Drought, Sea Level Rise/Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Short-term
<b>Action WDS-4</b> —Continue to maintain good standing and compliance under the NFIP through implementation of floodplain management programs that, at a minimum, meet the NFIP requirements:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforce the flood damage prevention ordinance.</li> <li>Participate in floodplain identification and mapping updates.</li> <li>Provide public assistance/information on floodplain requirements and impacts.</li> </ul>						
<u>Hazards Mitigated:</u> Flood						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-5</b> —Identify and pursue strategies to increase adaptive capacity to climate change including but not limited to the following:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Items identified in the Town's Climate Action Plan update annually.</li> </ul>						
<u>Hazards Mitigated:</u> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Drought, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Short-term

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline <sup>a</sup>
<b>Action WDS-6</b> — Provide additional ingress/egress route where feasible for neighborhood that only has one ingress/egress route out of the neighborhood.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	Town of Woodside	N/A	Medium	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-7</b> — Work with CalWater to expedite review and processing of water tanks for fire suppression in high severity areas.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,13	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-8</b> — Work with PG&E to promote Vegetation Removal Program and to seek large scale tree removal projects near overhead lines.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,13	Town of Woodside	N/A	Medium	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA, FMAG and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-9</b> —Continue to upgrade equipment for Town Vegetation Removal Program						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire						
New	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,13	Town of Woodside	N/A	Medium	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-10</b> - Provide Sandbag Program and continued educational outreach for storm season.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Severe Weather, Flood, Drought, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,13	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-EMPG and HSGP	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-11</b> — 5 year CIP for upgrading and maintaining storm drain conveyance facility.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Severe Weather, Flood, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	High	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-12</b> — Continue to support Defensible Space Match Fund Program to reduce the threat of wildfire in the community.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Medium	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA,FMAG and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-13</b> — Continue to support the Community Emergency Response Training through Citizens Emergency Response Preparedness Program (CERPP)						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	Town of Woodside	N/A	Medium	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-EMPG and HSGP	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-14</b> - Continue to improve water efficiency in all public facilities by installing water efficient fixtures, monitoring the maintenance of Town's fields, and continued support of the California Department of Water Resources Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance for all development projects.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Drought, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-15</b> - Continue to support the county wide actions and actively participate in the plan maintenance strategy and protocols in Volume I of the hazard mitigation plan.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Drought, Sea Level Rise/Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Ongoing

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline <sup>a</sup>
<b>Action WDS-16</b> - Integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other plans, programs or resources that dictate land use or redevelopment.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-17</b> - Improve the development of a post disaster recovery plan and a debris management plan.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Wildfire, Earthquake, Landslide/Mass Movements, Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure						
New & Existing	1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-EMPG and HSGP	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-18</b> Consider participation in incentive-based programs such as the Community Rating System, Tree City, and StormReady.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Severe Weather, Flood, Dam Failure, Climate Change						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds	Ongoing
<b>Action WDS-19</b> - Provide incentives for eligible non-profits and private entities, including homeowners, to adapt to risks through structural and nonstructural retrofitting.						
<i>Hazards Mitigated:</i> Earthquake, landslide						
New & Existing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14	Town of Woodside	N/A	Low	Staff Time, General Funds, Grant Funds-FEMA HMA (BRIC, FMA and HMGP)	Ongoing

a. Short-term = Completion within 5 years; Long-term = Completion within 10 years; Ongoing= Continuing new or existing program with no completion date

Acronyms used here are defined at the beginning of this volume.

**Table-15. Mitigation Action Priority**

Action #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits Equal or Exceed Cost?	Is Project Eligible for Outside Funding?	Can Project Be Funded Under Existing Programs/ Budgets?	Implementation Priority <sup>a</sup>	Outside Funding Source Pursuit Priority <sup>a</sup>
WDS-1	5	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-2	4	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
WDS-3	14	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
WDS-4	13	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
WDS-5	14	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
WDS-6	11	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-7	12	High	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-8	12	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-9	12	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-10	12	High	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-11	14	Medium	High	No	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-12	11	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-13	10	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-14	13	High	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
WDS-15	14	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-16	13	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-17	6	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-18	13	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
WDS-19	11	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium

a. See the introduction to this volume for explanation of priorities.

**Table 21-16. Analysis of Mitigation Actions**

Hazard Type	Action Addressing Hazard, by Mitigation Type <sup>a</sup>							
	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education & Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects	Climate Resilience	Community Capacity Building
<b>High-Risk Hazards</b>								
Earthquake	WDS-2, 15, 16	WDS-19	WDS-19			WDS-6		WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18
Wildfire	WDS-2, 15, 16	WDS-1, 2	WDS-12	WDS-8, 9, 12		WDS-6,11	WDS-1, 2, 3, 5, 7,12	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17
Landslide/ Mass Movements	WDS-2, 15, 16	WDS-1, 2				WDS-6	WDS-1, 2, 3, 5	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 15, 16, 17
<b>Medium-Risk Hazards</b>								
Flood	WDS-2, 4, 15, 16, 18	WDS-1, 2	WDS-19	WDS-18	WDS-10	WDS-6,11	WDS-1, 2, 3, 5, 10	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18
<b>Low-Risk Hazards</b>								
Drought	WDS-2, 15		WDS-19		WDS-10		WDS-2, 3, 5, 10, 14	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15
Severe Weather	WDS-2, 15, 16, 18	WDS-1, 2	WDS-19	WDS-18	WDS-10	WDS-6,11	WDS-1, 2, 3, 5, 10	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18
Dam Failure	WDS-2, 15, 16, 18	WDS-1, 2		WDS-18		WDS-6	WDS-1, 2, 3,5	2, 3, 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18
Sea Level Rise/ Climate Change	WDS-2, 15, 16, 18		WDS-19	WDS-18	WDS-10	WDS-6,11	WDS-2, 3, 5, 10, 14	WDS-2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18

a. See the introduction to this volume for explanation of mitigation types.

## 21.9 INFORMATION SOURCES USED FOR THIS ANNEX

The following technical reports, plans, and regulatory mechanisms were reviewed to provide information for this annex.

- **Town of Woodside Municipal Code**—The Municipal Code was reviewed for the full capability assessment and for identifying opportunities for action plan integration.
- **Town of Woodside Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance** – For flood hazard assessment and mitigations.
- **Town of Woodside General Plan** – To ensure consistency of this Annex with the Town’s General Plan.
- **Town of Woodside Climate Action Plan.** – For current status of actions and mitigations for climate change.
- **The Town of Woodside Fire Management Plan (2003), Woodside Fire Protection District.** – For concerns relating to fire management and fire mitigation as specified in this annex.

- 
- **Town of Woodside Capital Improvement Plan.** – For review of storm drain projects and other projects addressing hazardous mitigations.

The following outside resources and references were reviewed:

- **Hazard Mitigation Plan Annex Development Toolkit**—The toolkit was used to support the identification of past hazard events and noted vulnerabilities, the risk ranking, and the development of the mitigation action plan.

## **21.10 FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/VULNERABILITY**

- Education regarding communication in the event of disaster and/or evacuation when technology is down (i.e., cell phones, telephones, computers not working)
- Survey of the number of residents that have 3+ days of emergency supplies, Family Management and Communication Plans, including plans for pets.

## **21.11 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**


The Town of Woodside recognizes the need for ongoing education of its residents regarding living with the risks of hazards such as Earthquakes, Wildfire, Landslides, and Liquefaction/Settlement that may affect critical roads and evacuation routes. The Town conducts periodic emergency drills and Office of Emergency Services (OES) operations. The Town might be able to share lessons learned from the drills with the public, so that the drills are an opportunity for ongoing education and preparation.

# Woodside

## Critical Facilities, 1 of 2

- Food, Water, Shelter
- Health and Medical
- Safety and Security
- ▭ Selected City
- ▭ Incorporated Cities
- ▭ County Boundary
- Highways

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., DHS HIFLD




# Woodside

## Critical Facilities, 2 of 2

- Communications (Yellow circle)
- Energy (Red circle)
- Hazardous Materials (Orange circle)
- Transportation (Grey circle)
- Selected City (Yellow outline)
- Incorporated Cities (Dashed outline)
- County Boundary (Grey outline)
- Highways (Red line)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., DHS HIFLD




# Woodside

## Dam Failure Inundation Area Used for Risk Assessment

- Inundation Area
- Dam
- Selected City
- Incorporated Cities
- County Boundary
- Highways

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., CA DWR



# Woodside

## NEHRP Soil Class


- C (Dense soil/soft rock)
- D (Stiff soil)
- E (Soft clay)
- Selected City
- Incorporated Cities
- County Boundary
- Highways

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., CGS




# Woodside

## Liquefaction Susceptibility



Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., ABAG (USGS)




# Woodside

## Butano M6.93 Earthquake Scenario

- Mercalli Intensity Scale**
- VI (Strong/Light)
  - VII (Very Strong/Moderate)
  - VIII (Severe/Moderate-Heavy)
- Selected City**
- Incorporated Cities**
- County Boundary**
- Highways**

Intensity scale described as:  
(perceived shaking / potential damage)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., USGS



# Woodside

## Monte Vista Shannon M7.14 Earthquake Scenario

### Mercalli Intensity Scale

VIII (Severe/Moderate-Heavy)

Selected City


Incorporated Cities

County Boundary

Highways

Intensity scale described as:  
(perceived shaking / potential damage)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., USGS




# Woodside

## 100-Year Probabilistic Earthquake Scenario

- Mercalli Intensity Scale**
- VII (Very Strong/Moderate)
  - Selected City
  - Incorporated Cities
  - County Boundary
  - Highways

Intensity scale described as:  
(perceived shaking / potential damage)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., USGS



# Woodside

## San Andreas Peninsula M7.38 Earthquake Scenario

### Mercalli Intensity Scale

- VII (Very Strong/Moderate)
- VIII (Severe/Moderate-Heavy)

Selected City


Incorporated Cities

County Boundary

Highways

Intensity scale described as:  
(perceived shaking / potential damage)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., USGS



# Woodside

## San Gregorio North M7.44 Earthquake Scenario

### Mercalli Intensity Scale

VII (Very Strong/Moderate)

VIII (Severe/Moderate-Heavy)

Selected City


Incorporated Cities

County Boundary

Highways

Intensity scale described as:  
(perceived shaking / potential damage)

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., USGS




# Woodside

## FEMA Flood Hazard Areas


- 1% Annual Chance Flood (100-Year)
- 0.2% Annual Chance Flood (500-Year)
- Selected City
- Incorporated Cities
- County Boundary
- Highways

Data Sources: ESRI Basemap, San Mateo Co., FEMA




# Woodside

## Susceptibility to Deep-Seated Landslides




Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., CGS




# Woodside

## Wildfire Hazard Severity Zones



Data Sources: ESRI Basemap,  
San Mateo Co., CAL FIRE



**APPENDIX E. Draft Affordability of Accessory Dwelling units (ADUs), prepared by the ABAG Housing Technical Assistance Team with funding from REAP, September 8, 2021. Draft Report being reviewed by HCD.**



# DRAFT Affordability of Accessory Dwelling Units

A report and recommendations for RHNA 6

Prepared by the ABAG Housing Technical Assistance Team with Funding from REAP

9/8/2021

## 1. Overview

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are independent homes on a residential property with their own cooking and sanitation facilities and outside access. They can either be part of or attached to the primary dwelling or can be free standing/detached from the primary dwelling. Given their smaller size, typically between 400-1000 square feet (Source: Implementing the Backyard Revolution), they frequently offer a housing option that is more affordable by design. They also offer infill development opportunities in existing neighborhoods and a potential supplemental income source for homeowners. Similar are Junior ADUs (JADUs), which are even smaller living units enclosed within a single-family structure. JADUs have independent cooking facilities and outside access, however they may share sanitation facilities with the primary home. Both have become an increasingly popular housing type in recent years.

Recent California legislation has facilitated policy changes at the local level that encourage ADU development by streamlining the permitting process and shortening approval timelines. State law requires jurisdictions to allow at least one ADU and JADU per residential lot. These legislative and policy changes have increased ADU development across many California communities.

In 2020, the Center for Community Innovation at the University of California at Berkeley (UC Berkeley) undertook a comprehensive, statewide survey of ADUs, resulting in a document entitled *“Implementing the Backyard Revolution: Perspectives of California’s ADU Homeowners”*, released on April 22, 2021. This memo uses and extends that research, providing a foundation that Bay Area jurisdictions may build upon as they consider ADU affordability levels while developing their Housing Element sites inventory analyses. This report’s affordability research has been reviewed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). While they have not formally accepted it, in initial conversations they did not raise objections to the conclusions. Give HCD’s workload, it is unlikely we will receive additional guidance.

**Figure 1: Affordability of ADUs**






Figure 1 presents a summary of ADU affordability and Table 1 presents a recommendation for assumptions for Housing Elements. See the main body of the report for more information on methodology and assumptions.

We are recommending a conservative interpretation that assumes more moderate and above moderate ADUs than the research found. These assumptions represent a floor for most jurisdictions. If the market conditions in a particular jurisdiction warrant higher assumptions, then additional analysis can be provided to HCD for consideration.

**Table 1: Affordability Recommendations for ADUs for Housing Elements**

Income	Recommendation
Very Low Income (0-50% AMI)	30%
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	30%
Moderate Income (81-120% AMI)	30%
Above Moderate Income (120+ AMI)	10%

Notes: AMI = Area Median Income. See below for more information on assumptions.

### Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Concerns

Although ADUs are often affordable, jurisdictions should be cautious about relying on them too heavily because of fair housing concerns. Many ADUs are affordable to lower and moderate income households *because* they are rented to family and friends of the homeowners. If minorities are underrepresented among homeowners, the families and potentially friends of the homeowners will be primarily white. Therefore, relying too heavily on ADUs could inadvertently exacerbate patterns of segregation and exclusion. Additionally, ADUs often do not serve large families, another important fair housing concern. Conversely, ADUs accomplish an important fair housing goal by adding new homes in parts of the city that are more likely to be areas of opportunity.

Jurisdictions with fair housing concerns may want to use more conservative assumptions based on open market rentals, excluding units made available to family and friends, as summarized below:

**Table 1: Affordability Recommendations for ADUs for Jurisdictions with Fair Housing Concerns**

Income	Recommendation
Very Low Income	5%
Low Income	30%
Moderate Income	50%
Above Moderate Income	15%



## Further Outreach and Data

Although HCD has reviewed this memo and believes the conclusions are generally accurate, it is still important for jurisdictions to ensure the information reflects local conditions. As part of ground truthing the conclusions, jurisdictions should provide opportunity for the stakeholders to comment on any assumptions, including affordability assumptions based on this memo.

## 2. UC Berkeley Survey

In the Fall and Winter of 2020, the University of California at Berkeley's Center for Community Innovation, in collaboration with Baird + Driskell Community Planning, conducted a statewide survey of homeowners who had constructed ADUs in 2018 or 2019<sup>1</sup>. Over 15,000 postcards were mailed to households directing them to an online survey. The overall response rate was approximately 5%, but Bay Area response rates were higher, up to 15% in some counties. In total, 387 ADU owners from the Bay Area completed they survey, with 245 of those units available on the long term rental market.

Key takeaways include:

- Just under 20% of Bay Area ADUs are made available at no cost to the tenant.
- An additional 16% are rented to friends or family, presumably at a discounted rent, though the survey did not ask.
- Market-rate ADUs tend to rent at prices affordable to low and moderate income households in most markets.

## 3. Methodology

ABAG further analyzed the raw data from the UC Berkeley survey, because the authors of *Implementing the Backyard Revolution* did not present their results according to income categories (e.g. very low income, low income, etc.).

This ABAG summary uses the affordability calculator published by the California Department of Housing and Community Development ([link](#)) to define maximum income levels. HCD defines an affordable unit as one where a household pays 30 percent or less of their annual pre-tax income on housing.

The definition of affordable rents shifts with income category (Low, Very Low, etc.), household size/unit size, and geography. The income categories are as follows: Very Low = under 50% of Area Median Income (AMI), Low Income = 50-60% AMI, Moderate = 60-110% AMI.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A summary is available here - <http://www.aducalifornia.org/implementing-the-backyard-revolution/>

<sup>2</sup> Please note, these assumptions are more conservative than is typically used, but match HCD's recommendations.



Because some counties have different median incomes, the results are adjusted accordingly. 2020 AMIs were used because the survey was completed in 2020.

Additionally, ABAG made the following assumptions regarding persons per unit, which matched HCD’s recommendations:

- Studios 1 person
- 1 Bedrooms 2 people
- 2 Bedrooms 3 people
- 3 Bedrooms 4 people

See the following document for information on HCD’s assumptions.

<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/affordability-calculator-2020.xlsx>

#### 4. Summary of ADU Use

Table 2, below, shows the usage of ADUs. Because this report concerns affordability of available dwelling units, those not available for rent (short term rentals, home office and other) are excluded from further analysis.

**Table 3. Usage of Accessory Dwelling Units**

Region	Friend/ Family Rental	Family - No Rent	Long Term Rental (Open Market)	Short Term Rental	Home Office	Other
East Bay	12%	19%	27%	2%	14%	27%
Peninsula	16%	18%	28%	4%	14%	20%
North Bay	13%	16%	33%	2%	8%	28%
Bay Total (9 Counties)	14%	18%	29%	3%	13%	24%
Statewide Total	16%	19%	30%	2%	12%	21%

Other includes homeowners who live in the ADU, needs repairs, empty, used as extra bedroom, etc. The response rate in San Francisco was too low for meaningful comparison so it is not presented separately, but is included in the Bay Area total. East Bay includes Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, Peninsula includes San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, North Bay includes Marin, Sonoma and Napa Counties.




## 5. Affordability of ADUs

### Rental Data

The analysis found that many ADUs are made available to family members, often at no rent. The survey did not query the rent of family/friend rentals, only asking if rent was charged.

Of those ADUs available on the open market (not rented to family or friends), most charged rents between \$1,200 and \$2,200, as shown in in Figure 2.



### Assigning ADUs to Income Categories

This report's affordability analysis has two parts:

1. Market Rate ADUs: Those not rented to friends or family; and
2. Discount Rate ADUs: Those rented to family or friends for discounted or no rent

#### *Market Rate ADUs*

Market rate ADUs were usually affordable to low or moderate income households, based on the methodology identified above. Depending on the part of the region, the ABAG analysis found:

- Very Low Income: 0-7% of market rate units were affordable to very low income
- Low Income: 15-44% of market rate units were affordable to low income
- Moderate income: 40-70% of market rate units were affordable to moderate income households.
- Above moderate: 9-15% of market rate units were affordable to above moderate income households.



The data is summarized in the chart below.

**Table 4. Affordability of Market Rate Units**

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
East Bay	0%	15%	70%	15%
Peninsula	6%	31%	48%	15%
North Bay	7%	44%	40%	9%

This chart only shows ADUs rented on the open market. The response rate in San Francisco was too low for meaningful comparison so it is excluded from this analysis.

*Discount Rate ADUs*

Based on previous HCD precedent, this analysis uses actual rents to determine affordability. The occupant’s relationship to the owner is secondary, the relevant factor is the rent charged. (Please note the potential fair housing concerns that can arise from this approach). Specifically, this analysis assigns units made available to family or friends available at no rent as very low income. Additionally, this analysis assigns units *rented* to family or friends as low income<sup>3</sup>.

*Combined Market and Affordable ADUs*

Table 5, below, combines the information for discounted and market rate ADUs.

**Table 5. Usage of No Rent/Discount Rent ADUs and Affordability - Combined**

Region	Friend/ Family Rental	Family - No Rent	Very Low Income Rents	Low Income Rents	Moderate Income Rents	Above Mod. Income Rents
East Bay	20%	33%	0%	7%	33%	7%
Peninsula	24%	28%	3%	15%	23%	7%
North Bay	20%	25%	4%	24%	22%	5%
Bay Total (9 Counties)	22%	28%	2%	14%	26%	7%
State-Wide Total	24%	28%	1%	9%	23%	14%

The response rate in San Francisco was too low for meaningful comparison so it is not presented separately, but is included in the Bay Area total.

<sup>3</sup> The survey did not ask the rent of units that were rented to family members.




Assigning the family/friends ADUs to income categories produces the following results:

**Table 6. Affordability Including Family/Friends Rentals**

Region	Very Low Income Rents	Low Income Rents	Moderate Income Rents	Above Mod. Income Rents
East Bay	33%	27%	33%	7%
Peninsula	31%	39%	23%	7%
North Bay	29%	44%	22%	5%
Bay Total (9 Counties)	30%	36%	26%	7%
Statewide Total	29%	33%	23%	14%

This chart combines ADUs made available for free with Very Low Income and ADUs available for a discount with the Low Income category. The response rate in San Francisco was too low for meaningful comparison so it is not presented as its own line, but is included in the SF Bay Area Total.

Figure 2 shows affordability levels for the region. It is a graphical representation of the Bay Area as a whole.



**Figure 2:** Results shown for 9-county Bay Area. “Very low” rents include units available to family or friends at no cost. “Low” rents include discounted family rentals.



## 6. Additional Research and Considerations

In general, ADUs are affordable for several reasons:

- Many units are available for no or low cost rent to family members or friends. Additionally, a smaller number of owners intentionally rent their ADUs below market because they believe affordable housing is important. Source: Implementing the Backyard Revolution
- ADUs tend to be fewer square feet than units in apartment buildings after controlling for bedroom size, which results in lower prices. Source: Wegmann & Chapple (2012)
- ADU owners tend to prefer their choice of tenant versus maximizing rent. Additionally, they will often not significantly raise rents once they have a tenant they like. Source: Baird + Driskell homeowner focus groups.
- ADU owners often do not know the value of their unit so they may underprice it unintentionally. Source: Baird + Driskell homeowner focus groups.

A number of other studies have found that many ADUs are used as housing for friends or family for free or very low cost, consistent with the UC Berkeley Report. A selection of these are outlined below:

- A 2012 UC Berkeley publication entitled “Scaling up Secondary Unit Production in the East Bay” indicates that approximately half of all secondary dwelling units are available for no rent.<sup>4</sup>
- A 2018 report entitled “Jumpstarting the market for ADUs” surveyed ADUs in Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver and found that approximately 17% of ADUs were occupied by a friend or family member for free.<sup>5</sup>
- A 2014 analysis entitled “Accessory dwelling units in Portland, Oregon: evaluation and interpretation of a survey of ADU owners” found that “18% of Portland ADUs are occupied for free or extremely low cost.”<sup>6</sup>

## 7. Notes

This report was funded by the Regional Early Action Grant, which the state legislature provided to ABAG and other council of governments. Analysis was conducted by Baird + Driskell Community Planning. Please contact Josh Abrams, [abrams@bdplanning.com](mailto:abrams@bdplanning.com) for more information.

<sup>4</sup>[https://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/scaling\\_up\\_secondary\\_unit\\_production\\_in\\_the\\_east\\_bay.pdf?width=1200&height=800&iframe=true](https://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/scaling_up_secondary_unit_production_in_the_east_bay.pdf?width=1200&height=800&iframe=true)

<sup>5</sup> [http://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/uploads/ADU\\_report\\_4.18.pdf](http://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/uploads/ADU_report_4.18.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <https://accessorydwellings.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/adusurveyinterpret.pdf>

## APPENDIX F. Housing Development Constraints, Development Costs, and Zoning Analysis

### *Housing Development Constraints*

Housing development constraints mentioned by members of the public during the public engagement process include the high cost of land in Woodside; permit costs; project design and construction costs; existing regulations; lack of ability to connect to sewer or accommodate an onsite septic system; and associated studies required to comply with the Building Code, such as geotechnical analyses.

- **Natural Hazards:** Natural hazard areas are widespread throughout Woodside, which include, but are not limited to: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ); steep slopes; underlying active and dormant landslides; heavily wooded areas; earthquake fault zones, including the San Andreas Fault; expansive soils; and FEMA flood zones.
- **Environmentally Sensitive Areas:** General Plan designated streams and buffers on either side of them (25 feet from the top of bank or 50-feet from the center line of the stream, whichever is further) are protected throughout the Town as sensitive riparian areas and wildlife corridors. General Plan designated streams; blue-lined streams on USGS maps; and other non-designated drainage channels may be subject to Regional, State, and Federal environmental regulations. In addition to designated streams and drainage channels, other bodies of water and land areas include habitat for local flora and fauna, furthering constraints on local housing development.
- **Land Costs:** The cost of land in Woodside ranges from a low of \$150,000 to a high of \$2,000,000 for lots that are one acre or less (Appendix F.1)<sup>i</sup>. Land costs are an impediment to building affordable housing projects in Woodside. Partnerships between landowners and housing developers could be created to address land costs and development of higher density units.
- **Construction Costs:** The total development costs in San Mateo County for a small single-family residence (2,600 square feet) is \$2,487,000. The total development cost for a large single-family residence (5,000 square feet) is \$3,610,000 (Appendix F.1. Exhibit 1). Project costs vary by geography, topography, site conditions, finish level, and contractor type, and time among other factors.
- **Fees:** Fees in Woodside, including entitlement, building permit, and impact fees are approximately \$70,957 for single-family residences, with a range in the county of \$6,760 to \$104,241. Fees in Woodside for “small multi-family” (main residence with one or more ADUs) are \$82,764, with a range in the county from \$6,824-\$167,210, as indicated in Table F-1, below. Data on fees was provided by jurisdictions in San Mateo County and summarized by 21 Elements.

- **Availability of Sewer:** Approximately 60-70 percent of the properties in Woodside utilize septic systems. The Town is served by two sewer districts. The Town Center Assessment District has available capacity in the central area of Woodside. The Redwood Creek Assessment District currently has limited available capacity. Sewer service may be extended to eligible properties contiguous to sewer districts. Lack of access to sewer is a development constraint for properties served by septic. The Town is exploring both expansions to the sewer districts and negotiations for additional sewer capacity.
- **Septic Feasibility:** The San Mateo County Environmental Health Department primarily regulates installation of septic systems. The primary difference between County and Town regulations is that the Town Municipal Code does not permit septic systems in slopes >35%, while the County allows septic systems in slopes up to 50%. Meeting the space requirements for traditional systems can be a constraint to developing additional units on parcels.
- **Height Restrictions in the Town Center (Measure J):** A citizen initiative passed in 1988 (Measure J) restricts building height in the Town Center: "...buildings on commercially zoned parcels immediately adjacent to Woodside Road may not be constructed or altered to exceed one story facing Woodside Road. They may include a basement, as defined in Section 9-2.105(g) of the Municipal code on June 1, 1988." This measure does not affect residential properties but is a constraint to adding housing over commercial buildings in the Town Center Community Commercial District.

**Development Costs**

A Summary of Development Costs and Fees for San Mateo County and its jurisdiction is included in Appendix F.1.

21 Elements surveyed local jurisdictions and summarized fees by jurisdiction as shown in Tables F-1 through F-4, below. Jurisdiction fees (entitlement fees, building permits, impact fees) contribute to the overall cost of development, as indicated below.

**Table F-1. Total Fees (includes entitlement, building permits, and impact fees) per Unit**

	Single Family	Small Multi-Unit (SFR with ADUs in Woodside)	Large Multi-Unit
<b>Atherton</b>	\$15,941	No Data	No Data
<b>Brisbane</b>	\$24,940	\$11,678	No Data
<b>Burlingame</b>	\$69,425	\$30,345	\$23,229
<b>Colma</b>	\$6,760	\$167,210	\$16,795

Daly City	\$24,202	\$32,558	\$12,271
East Palo Alto	\$104,241	No Data	\$28,699
Foster City	\$67,886	\$47,179	\$11,288
Half Moon Bay	\$52,569	\$16,974	No Data
Hillsborough	\$71,092	No Data	No Data
Millbrae	\$97,756	\$6,824	\$55,186
Pacifica	\$33,725	\$40,151	No Data
Portola Valley	\$52,923	No Data	No Data
Redwood City	\$20,795	\$18,537	\$62,696
San Bruno	\$58,209	\$72,148	\$39,412
San Mateo	\$99,003	\$133,658	\$44,907
South San Francisco	\$81,366	\$76,156	\$32,471
Unincorporated San Mateo	\$36,429	\$27,978	\$10,012
Woodside	\$70,957	\$82,764	No Data

**Table F-2. Total Fees per Unit - Distribution of Fees Charged by San Mateo County Jurisdictions**

	Single Family	Small Multi-Unit (SFR with ADUs in Woodside)	Large Multi-Unit
Quartile 1	\$27,136	\$20,897	\$14,533
Median Fee Charged	\$55,566	\$36,355	\$28,699
Quartile 3	\$71,058	\$75,154	\$42,160
Interquartile Range	\$71,057	\$75,153	\$42,159
Total Range	\$97,481	\$160,387	\$52,684

**Table F-3. Total Fees as a Percentage of Total Development Costs**

	<b>Single-Family Residence</b>	<b>Small Multi-Family (SFR with ADUs in Woodside)</b>	<b>Large Multi-Family</b>
<b>Atherton</b>	0%	No Data	No Data
<b>Brisbane</b>	1%	1%	No Data
<b>Burlingame</b>	3%	4%	3%
<b>Colma</b>	0%	17%	2%
<b>Daly City</b>	1%	4%	2%
<b>East Palo Alto</b>	4%	No Data	4%
<b>Foster City</b>	3%	6%	2%
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>	2%	2%	No Data
<b>Hillsborough</b>	3%	No Data	No Data
<b>Millbrae</b>	2%	8%	7%
<b>Pacifica</b>	1%	5%	No Data
<b>Portola Valley</b>	1%	No Data	No Data
<b>Redwood City</b>	1%	2%	8%
<b>San Bruno</b>	2%	8%	5%
<b>San Mateo</b>	4%	14%	6%
<b>South San Francisco</b>	3%	9%	4%
<b>Unincorporated San Mateo</b>	1%	3%	1%
<b>Woodside</b>	2%	9%	No Data

**Note:** The above table was calculated using average soft costs (including an average of jurisdiction charged fees) and average land costs for the County. A more precise determination of fees as a percentage of total development costs can be calculated using *jurisdiction specific* land costs and fees.

**Table F-4. Permit Processing Times (in months)**

	<b>ADU Process</b>	<b>Ministerial By-Right</b>	<b>Discretionary By-Right</b>	<b>Discretionary (Hearing Officer if Applicable)</b>	<b>Discretionary (Planning Commission)</b>	<b>Discretionary (City Council)</b>
<b>Atherton</b>	1 to 2	1 to 3	2 to 4	N/A	2 to 4	2 to 6
<b>Brisbane</b>	1 to 2	2 to 6	N/A	N/A	4 to 12	6 to 14
<b>Burlingame</b>	1 to 2	2 to 3	2 to 3	N/A	3-4 standard project; 12 major project	13 months
<b>Colma</b>	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 3	2 to 4	N/A	4 to 8
<b>Daly City</b>	1 to 2	2 to 4	N/A	N/A	4 to 8	8 to 12
<b>East Palo Alto</b>	1 to 3	8 to 12	6 to 14	20 to 40	20 to 40	20 to 40
<b>Foster City</b>	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2		3 to 6	6 to 12
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>		1 to 2	2 to 4	3 to 6	4 to 12	6 to 15
<b>Hillsborough</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Millbrae</b>	0 to 2	3 to 6	1 to 3	3 to 8	3 to 8	4 to 9
<b>Pacifica</b>	1 to 2	2 to 3	4 to 5	5 to 6	5 to 6	7 to 8
<b>Redwood City</b>	2 to 3	3 to 4	N/A	8 to 10	12 to 18	18 to 24
<b>San Bruno</b>	2	3 to 6	N/A	3 to 6	9 to 24	9 to 24
<b>San Mateo</b>	4 to 8	1 to 2	4 to 7	N/A	9 to 12	9 to 13
<b>South San Francisco</b>	1	1	2 to 3	2 to 3	3 to 6	6 to 9
<b>Unincorporated San Mateo</b>	1 to 3	3 to 6	4 to 9	6 to 12	6 to 18	9 to 24
<b>Woodside</b>	1 to 2	1 to 2	N/A	N/A	2 to 6	3 to 8

## Zoning Analysis

### Existing Zoning – Single-Family

The Town of Woodside has **six single-family** residential zoning districts including: Single-Family Residential (R-1); Suburban Residential (SR); Rural Residential (RR); Special Conservation Planning - 5 acre minimum (SCP-5); Special Conservation Planning – 7.5 acre minimum (SCP-7.5); **and** Special Conservation Planning - 10-acre minimum (SCP-10).

The SCP Zones, which can be developed with housing, are characterized by several constraints, which include steep slopes, unstable slopes, high fire hazard, earthquake fault zones, low soil permeability, high ground water, expansive soils, and areas within the 100- or 500-year flood zone. To protect public health and safety and minimize the effects of hazards on more constrained properties, the following zoning classifications for SCP Districts minimum lot sizes were developed based on the number of identified constraints throughout each area:

SCP-5	1-2 constraints
SCP-7.5	3 constraints
SCP-10	4+ constraints

### Existing Zoning – Multi-Family

The Town’s multi-family zoning is the Multi-Family Residential Development Overlay Zone (MFRD). The development standards for this zone are summarized in Municipal Code Table C Section 153.110. The following is an analysis of the key standards that may constrain multi-family development:

- Currently applies only to the Cañada College property.
- Lot coverage by buildings is limited to 60% of the lot area.
- Maximum unit density is one unit per 2,400 square feet of lot area, or approximately 18 units per acre (less than the 20 units per acre suburban standard for affordable housing per State law).
- Building height is restricted to 35 feet, or approximately three stories.
- Parking standard requires one space per bedroom.
- Permitting process requires both Architectural and Site Plan review and Planning Commission approval of a use permit with findings.

### Special Housing Types

*Emergency Shelters* are permitted in the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district.

*Transitional Housing* is permitted in all residential districts, except the Multi-Family Residential District (MFRD) Overlay Zone. It is also permitted in the Community Commercial (CC) District.

*Manufactured Homes (Mobile Homes)* are permitted in all residential zoning districts, except the Multi-Family Residential District (MFRD) Overlay Zone.

*Residential Care Homes* are allowed within all residential districts, except the Multi-Family Residential District (MFRD) Overlay Zone.

*Since Room Occupancy Units* are not specifically mentioned in the Zoning Code; however, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs) are allowed in single family (owner-occupied) dwellings.

### **Proposed Zoning**

The Town of Woodside is proposing a new **higher density single-family zone** or multi-family zone district to accommodate projects of 20 units per acre. Multi-Family sites identified in the RHNA Plan will be rezoned **within one year following the approval of the Housing Element**.

### **Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)**

The Town of Woodside, as a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), intersects with a variety of interests and State of California goals. It is situated between the California coast and more urbanized areas. The Town's character has long preserved equestrian and other livestock uses, while being located in a County and region that has experienced an influx of people from various parts of the nation and world due to the mild climate, significant job growth (more recently in the higher paying technology sector), widespread acceptance of various cultures, and natural beauty. The State has many competing goals, such as preservation of natural resources and habitats for endangered species, water conservation among increasing climate change and droughts, and housing for the increasing population. Woodside's location serves as an intersection of all State goals, which historically was focused on conservation of environmental resources. Pressures for increased housing development in an area with various existing natural and infrastructure constraints make the Town of Woodside less viable for increased housing densities than nearby communities within the Bay Area Peninsula. Simply changing zoning for increased housing throughout Woodside is not a viable option without sacrificing commitments to other State goals. Therefore, while zoning changes for increased housing density is important to meet State objectives, sites for such increases in density are not abundant.

---

<sup>i</sup> Baird + Driskell retained Century Urban, LLC to prepare a research memo on San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties Development Costs and San Mateo County Unit Mix (April 7, 2022). Land costs for Woodside are based on minimal data points, so actual costs may be higher.

## APPENDIX G. Adequate Sites Inventory

The Housing Element must include an inventory of land suitable and available for residential development to meet the Town's regional housing need by income level. The site inventory is then used to identify and analyze specific sites that are available and suitable for residential development to determine the jurisdiction's capacity to accommodate residential development to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The available and suitable sites are referred to as adequate sites.

### The Town's Cycle 6 RHNA Allocation

The Town's Cycle 6 RHNA base allocation is 328 units. The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) guidelines recommend including a buffer of additional units to adequately plan to meet the allocation. Woodside has elected to include a 20% buffer in addition to the base allocation. The buffer equals 65 units for a total of 393 planned units (see Table G-1).


### The Town's Cycle 5 RHNA Allocation

In previous RHNA cycles, the Town met its affordable housing allocations through the development of ADUs.

ADUs have been an effective housing type to supply affordable units in the Town's rural residential setting which has been planned and developed in a manner that conserves environmentally sensitive areas, including habitats for endangered and threatened species, such as the California Red Legged Frog and San Francisco Garner Snake. As a rural residential community with significant environmental constraints, the Town anticipates that ADUs will continue to provide a majority of the affordable housing units within the Town of Woodside. The community overwhelmingly supports increasing the production of ADUs; therefore, the Housing Element Programs seek to identify ways to increase ADU and JADU production, including but not limited to, allowing additional ADUs where feasible, reducing regulatory constraints, conducting ADU workshops (*first set of workshops completed October 2022*), developing an amnesty program for units built without permits prior to 2020, and developing information materials to promote ADU development.

The location of both single-family residences (53) and ADUs (82) for which building permits were issued in Cycle 5 (through 2021), are identified in Figure G-1.

**Figure G-1. The Location of Single-Family Residences and ADUs for which building permits were issued during RHNA Cycle 5 (2015-2021)**



## Woodside Site Inventory

In order to identify sites to accommodate additional housing for Cycle 6, the Town of Woodside prepared a full Site Inventory in accordance with the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Site Inventory Guidebook (Government Code Section 65583.2).


### ***Characteristics and Mapping of Vacant and Underutilized Sites***

The Town identified a total of 149 Vacant and Underutilized sites in its Site Inventory (see Table G-1). Of these sites, 105 are Vacant, and 44 are Underutilized (Non-vacant single-family). Vacant sites do not have improvements. Underutilized sites have some structures and improvements such as sheds, solar panels, animal enclosures, vineyards, parking lots or driveways, or old barns which do not represent significant barriers to housing development. None of the underutilized sites have a single-family residence, other type of residential unit, or substantial improvement(s). In some cases, the Underutilized parcels adjoin a parcel with a single-family residence and are used for additional yard space. There are an additional 30 units in the approval pipeline which consist of single-family residences only, or single-family with an ADU.

The Town's consultant used Google Maps, which shows improvement footprints, and Google Satellite Imagery, to identify level of improvements on the different sites. 'Ground-truthing' of sites and their improvements was conducted by Town staff, to the extent that improvements were visible from public roadways. Several additional sites were added based on the site visits.

As discussed in the following section, the site inventory was updated and sites were categorized by affordability level, taking into account the State policy that sites under a half-acre or larger than 10 acres may not be suitable for affordable housing. Figure G-2 shows Vacant and Underutilized sites with environmental constraints and suitability for various income levels.

**Figure G-2. Housing Sites and Environmental Constraints** [updated map]



### ***HCD Reporting Requirements for Site Inventory***

HCD requires the submittal of the Site Inventory on a specific HCD Excel Site Inventory spreadsheet. This form is **attached to this appendix. The spreadsheet consists of three tables (tabs).** Table A includes general characteristics, such as parcel size, zoning (Column G), maximum density (Column I), infrastructure (Column L), and income level distribution (Columns P, Q and R), and additional parcel characteristics, e.g., site improvements, slope, etc. (Column T).

#### **Infrastructure (Column L)**

With respect to infrastructure, sewer service is the primary limiting factor for higher density development in the community. Between 60-70 percent of all residential parcels within Woodside rely on septic systems (or would rely on septic systems if developed). Sites within or immediately adjacent to Sewer Districts may be connected if certain criteria are met. Water service and dry utilities are available throughout the community; therefore, with sewer service being the limiting factor, if the site is within or immediately adjacent to a sewer district, it is listed as “Yes-Current” for sewer service in Column L of the Site Inventory.

#### **Distribution Methodology by Income Level (Columns P, Q and R)**

This section describes how income levels are distributed in the Site Inventory.

All single-family residential parcels, by right, are allowed one single-family residence, an 800 square foot ADU, and a Junior ADU – for a total of 3 units.

Single-family residences in Woodside are all identified as Above Moderate-Income units; therefore, each single-family residential property was allocated one Above Moderate-Income unit.

For ADU income distribution, the Town utilizes research developed by 21 Elements and ABAG (Housing Element, Appendix E – Draft Affordability of ADUs) in which 30% of ADUs are allocated for Very Low-Income households; 30% are allocated for Low-Income households; 30% are allocated for Moderate-Income households; and 10% are allocated for Above Moderate-Income households. This distribution is referred to as the “30-30-30-10 ADU Distribution”. **The distribution is used to allocate ADU units in Tables G-2 and 3-4 – Proposed RHNA Plan but is not included in in the HCD Excel Site Inventory spreadsheet for a site-based allocation.**

#### **Optional Information (Column T)**

Optional Information included in Column T describes improvements or conditions that are visible from public roadways. In some cases, sites have solid fences, so visibility is limited. In other cases, sites are landlocked or are located along private rather than public roadways, where access is not permitted. Additionally, flag lot configurations preclude visibility of some sites. Given the limited visibility of many sites, the San Mateo County GIS Portal and Google Earth were also viewed. Where there was apparent instability of some slopes, the Town Geologic Map was also consulted.

Table B of the Woodside Site Inventory spreadsheet identifies **three** sites proposed for **higher density** rezoning using a new higher density zone that would allow **20** units per acre.

Table C describes allowable density in each of the existing zoning districts where residences are permitted.

### **Site Considerations**

The California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) encourages consideration of the following factors when considering opportunity sites that can accommodate different income levels and densities:

- Proximity to transit;
- Access to high performing schools and jobs;
- Access to amenities, such as parks and services;
- Access to health care facilities and grocery stores;
- Locational scoring criteria for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (TCAC) Program funding;
- Proximity to available infrastructure and utilities;
- Sites that do not require environmental mitigation;
- Presence of development streamlining processes, environmental exemptions, and other development incentives.

While the State encourages sites be identified to increase housing density in high opportunity neighborhoods, the Town has very limited public transportation, services, business (jobs), and amenities.

General characteristics for suitable sites for increased housing density include sites located outside of highly constrained areas which include underlying landslides, earthquake fault zones, environmentally sensitive areas, and high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) that do not have easy access to arterial roadways and freeways.

Sixty (60) to 70 percent of properties in Woodside utilize onsite septic systems for sewage disposal; therefore, combined with environmental constraints, possible sites for increased housing density are limited. Sites and areas considered for medium to higher housing densities are properties that have or could access sewer.


### **Lower and Moderate Income RHNA Sites**

Given the extent of environmental constraints in Woodside and the predominantly rural residential character of the community, there are relatively few sites that meet the adequacy criteria stipulated in State law for lower income RHNA sites. To meet the Cycle 6 RHNA Plan, the Town has identified **four** sites to accommodate lower and moderate income RHNA, as shown on Figure G-2. Site suitability and projected capacity for each site is described below.

Cañada College

San Mateo County Community College District adopted a Districtwide Facilities Master Plan (FMP) in June 2022 that envisions the construction of affordable faculty and staff housing units on the Cañada College site in Woodside. Figure G-3 shows an excerpt from the FMP with the planned location of housing on a portion of the Cañada College campus. As described in Chapter 3, the District intends to proceed with Phase 2 of the FMP as early July 2023, and the faculty/staff housing would be constructed during this phase. The MFRD Overlay Zone that currently applies to the site permits housing as envisioned in the FMP, and to further facilitate residential development at the site, Chapter 3 includes Program H3.1a, under which the Town will assist the District in obtaining financing, and Program H3.1b, under which the Town commits to reducing the complexity of the entitlement process for this overlay zone. The site is served by public transit, including SamTrams Route 278 with service to the Redwood City Transit Center, as well as by water, sewer, and stormwater facilities. In conversations with Town staff, the District has indicated that construction of 75-80 units that would be affordable to households making less than 80 percent of the San Mateo County AMI is a reasonable assumption. Therefore, the inventory assumes 75 lower income RHNA units on this site over the planning period.

**Figure G-3 Cañada College Multi-Family Housing Plan [new plan]**



Source: San Mateo Community College District FMP (June 2022)

### 773 Cañada Road

This approximately 5-acre site (APN 68100220) located north of Cañada College is under private ownership. The property owner is actively exploring residential development opportunities, including the development of town homes on the 1-acre portion of the site that fronts Cañada Road. Water service is available, and the site is adjacent and eligible to connect to the Town Center Sewer District; therefore, adequate utilities are available and accessible. To facilitate residential development at this location, Chapter 3 includes Program H2.1a, under which the Town will rezone the site to permit residential development at 20 du/ac on the 1-acre portion. In conversations with Town staff, the owner has indicated a willingness to make the new housing units available to households making less than 120 percent of the San Mateo County AMI through long-term affordability agreements. Therefore, the inventory assumes 16 moderate income RHNA units on this site over the planning period.

### Town-Owned Sites

The Town has identified two sites under public ownership which will be rezoned to help accommodate lower and moderate income RHNA requirements for the planning period: the Raymundo Drive site and the High Road site, shown on Figure G-2.

The Raymundo site (APN 72041040) is 1.97 acres in size and currently zoned Open Space (OS). The eastern portion of the site is currently used as a corporate yard for staging of materials. The western side of the property is a fenced pasture. The Hermit Fault runs along the western boundary of the site, and the Hermit Fault setback zone extends into the site. A site-specific fault investigation and other geotechnical studies would be required to facilitate development on the site. Water and sewer service are accessible for the site. Existing single-family development in the vicinity is on septic. The estimated cost for connection to the sewer system is \$2.6 million.

The High Road site (APN 69170450) is 1.06 acres in size, vacant, and currently zoned Open Space for Preservation of Natural Resources (OSN). The southern portion of the site is sloped as it abuts Highway 84/Woodside Road, but the site is otherwise free from environmental constraints. It is located approximately 0.5 miles from Woodside High School, which is accessible via striped Class III bicycle lanes on Woodside Road. The site is located within the CalWater Service Area and the Redwood Creek Sewer Services District. Therefore, water and sewer service are accessible for the site.

Chapter 3 includes two programs to facilitate development of housing on these Town-owned sites. Through Program H2.1a, the Town will rezone the sites to permit residential development at 20 du/ac, and through H4.2c, the Town will partner with non-profit developers for the construction of workforce housing to meet the needs of lower and moderate-income households in Woodside with the goal of releasing an RFP by early 2025. Town staff has had preliminary conversations with non-profit housing developers, who have expressed interest in the development of affordable housing on these two sites. Therefore, the inventory assumes 23 lower income units and 10 moderate income units on these sites over the planning period.

### **Above Moderate Income RHNA Sites**

The inventory identifies 149 sites with current zoning that permits single-family residential development, including 105 vacant sites and 44 non-vacant sites. The non-vacant sites typically have animal enclosures, paved parking areas, solar panels, or smaller outbuildings that do not represent a significant barrier to housing development. None of the non-vacant sites have active winery or animal keeping uses on them. The location of these sites is shown on Figure G-2.

Zoning districts applicable to these sites include Rural Residential (RR), Residential (R-1), Suburban Residential (SR), and Special Conservation Planning (SCP-5, SCP-7.5, and SCP-10), which have a minimum lot size requirement that ranges from 20,000 square feet to 10 acres. The majority of the 149 sites are of substandard lot size; however, all of the lots were legally formed and therefore the owners are allowed to develop one housing unit on each site. Between 2015 and 2022, the Town permitted 53 new single-family homes, many of which were on lots of substandard size. The Town has already revised development standards in The Glens to reduce setback requirements and allow for increased floor area ratio, and through Program H6.2c in Chapter 3, the Town will evaluate a similar revision to development standards, including minimum lot size, in the Western Hills to help facilitate development of vacant and underutilized residential parcels as needed to meet RHNA obligations.

As shown in Figure G-2, vacant and underutilized residential sites in the western and northern parts of Woodside are located within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as delineated by the Office of the State Fire Marshall. Additionally, several vacant and underutilized residential sites are located within Alquist Priolo Special Study Zones. To address wildfire risk, the Town has adopted Chapter 7A of the California Building Code into the Municipal Code (Sec. 150.01(G) through (H)), including standards for materials and construction methods for exterior wildfire exposure; roofing requirements; and automatic fire-extinguisher systems into the Town Code and made these standards applicable townwide. To address seismic risk, the Town has adopted standards into the Town Code (Sec. 153.423 - Sec. 153.424), which require special measures recommended by a soils engineer and geologist to mitigate the hazards and which establish building setback requirements from known and inferred fault traces. While mitigation to address wildfire and seismic risk adds to the cost of development, as evidenced by the development trend for single-family housing in Woodside between 2015 and 2022, this has not proven to be a major development constraint. Therefore, based on past performance trends and the implementation of Program H6.2c, the inventory projects a total of 149 housing units for above moderate-income households as the realistic capacity for these sites.

Additionally, there are 30 projects currently under review in Woodside. These projects, listed in Table G-1 and shown on Figure G-4, all propose new single-family residences and all but one also involves construction of at least one ADU. According to HCD Guidance, projects that have been approved, permitted, or received a Certificate of Occupancy during the projection period (June 30, 2022 – January 15, 2031) can be counted toward the 2023-31 cycle RHNA. Therefore, these pipeline projects are also included in the RHNA Plan (see Table G-2).

**Table G-1 Pipeline Projects** [new table]

Address	APN(s)	Development Type	Project Status	Acreage	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
10 Still Creek RD	75020100	SFD/ADU	Under Review	9.66	2			1	3
175 Josselyn LN	72052090	SFD/ADU	Under Review	3.65		2		1	3
152 Alta Mesa RD	73044300	SFD/ADU	Under Review	0.42			1	1	2
125 Sheridan WY	69150060	SFD/ADU	Under Review	1.29			1	1	2
145 Northridge LN	69041200	SFD/ADU	Under Review	1.16				2	2
2155 Greenways Dr.	69259450	SFD/ADU	Under Review		1			1	2
180 Fox Hollow Road	72370200	SFD	Approved	3.05				1	1
221 Highland Terrace	73041480	SFD/ADU	Approved					2	2
111 Hillside Drive	73062070	SFD/ADU	Approved	0.17		1		1	2
111 La Questa Way	73101270	SFD/ADU	Approved	1.1			1	1	2
3902 Sand Hill Road	72380070	SFD/ADU	Approved					2	2
310 Kings Mountain Road	72112050	SFD/ADU	Approved	3.01				2	2
132 Alta Vista Road	73032160	SFD/ADU	Approved	0.39				2	2
387 Moore Road	73133400	SFD/ADU	Under Review					3	3
					<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>30</b>


### Cycle 6 RHNA Plan

The Cycle 6 Housing Element includes a goal to meet the RHNA allocation, with a 20% buffer for a total of 393 units.

### Meeting the Town's RHNA Allocation

The RHNA Plan is described in Table G-2. As shown, the Town projects a total of **423** new housing units over the planning period, including sites to be rezoned, pipeline project, ADUs, and development under existing zoning. **This is sufficient to meet the Town's RHNA allocation with a buffer of at least 20 percent.** The Housing Element Programs in Chapter 3 outline rezoning of specific sites, and policies that encourage ADU development, to provide varied housing types that will meet AFFH goals and RHNA targets. A detailed list of sites is included on the attached HCD Excel Site Inventory spreadsheet.

Figure G-4 Pipeline Projects



**Table G-2 Proposed RHNA Plan [new table]**

	<b>Low and Very Low Income</b>	<b>Moderate Income</b>	<b>Above Moderate Income</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Current Zoning Sites</b>				
Vacant Single-Family Sites			105	105
Non-Vacant Single-Family sites			44	44
Pipeline Projects	6	3	21	30
Cañada College	75			75
ADUs @ 15 units annually	72	36	12	120
<b>Rezoning Sites</b>				
773 Cañada Site @ 20 units/acre		16		16
High Rd. @ 20 units/acre	11	5		16
Raymundo @ 20 units/acre	12	5		17
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>423</b>
<b>RHNA Allocation - Base</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>328</b>
<b>RHNA Buffer @ 20%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Total RHNA + Buffer</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>393</b>
<b>Surplus/Deficit</b>	<b>+6</b>	<b>+3</b>	<b>+21</b>	<b>+30</b>

**Assumptions for Table G-2**

- There are 105 legally formed vacant parcels of substandard size with zoning that allows for single family residential development in the Town. Under State law, property owners would be allowed to develop one housing unit on each site, so these units have been counted toward the Above Moderate RHNA requirement.
- There are 44 legally formed non-vacant parcels of substandard size with zoning that allows for single family residential development in the Town. These parcels are not in use for winery or animal keeping, but they may contain structures such as outbuildings which do not inhibit development with housing. Under State law, property owners would be allowed to develop one housing unit on each site, so these units have been counted toward the Above Moderate RHNA requirement.
- Pipeline projects which are expected to receive permits within the projection period may also be counted toward RHNA. Any projects currently in review, recently approved, or under construction will also be counted toward RHNA.
- In July 2022, the San Mateo County Community College District adopted the *2022 Districtwide Facilities Master Plan (FMP)*, which was developed to guide short- and long-term planning for the District's three campuses. The District is now actively seeking funding for student and family housing at its campuses. As a first phase, the District is in the process of applying for a State grant to support housing at the College of San Mateo campus. If successful, the District would

move to a second phase to obtain grant funding to support student and family housing at one of its other two campuses, including Cañada College. The second phase application submittal could take place as soon as July 2023. The District has indicated that 75-80 units at Cañada College is a reasonable assumption.

- Safe harbors under State law (Government Code Section 65583.1(a)) allow the Town to project development of at least 15 ADUs per year over the 8-year planning period, based on recent production trends since 2018. Based on the average annual rate of construction permits issued for ADUs in Woodside since 2018 (see Chapter 2, Table 2-3), the inventory assumes 15 ADUs per year over the planning period, for a total of 120. The units have been allocated to RHNA categories consistent with the findings of the regional ADU affordability study prepared by ABAG discussed above and are allocated according to the 60/30/10 distribution assumption.
- 773 Cañada Road is assumed at 16 units available to households making less than 120 percent of the San Mateo County median income for the Moderate RHNA requirement. A portion of this site will be developed for higher density housing re-zoned to 20 units per acre.
- The Town-owned sites on Raymundo Drive and High Road will be rezoned to 20 units per acre, and the disposition agreements for these parcels will provide for a portion of the units to be restricted as affordable to lower income and moderate-income households.

## **HCD SPREADSHEET INVENTORY OF SITES**

[see new table submitted with this Appendix]

Site Inventory Forms must be submitted to HCD for a housing element or amendment adopted on or after January 1, 2021. The following form is to be used for satisfying this requirement. To submit the form, complete the Excel spreadsheet and submit to HCD at [sitesinventory@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:sitesinventory@hcd.ca.gov). Please send the Excel workbook, not a scanned or PDF copy of the tables.

<b>General Information</b>	
Jurisdiction Name	WOODSIDE
Housing Element Cycle	6th
<b>Contact Information</b>	
First Name	Sage
Last Name	Schaan
Title	Planning Director
Email	<a href="mailto:SSchaan@woodsidetown.org">SSchaan@woodsidetown.org</a>
Phone	
<b>Mailing Address</b>	
Street Address	<u>2955 Woodside Road</u>
City	WOODSIDE
Zip Code	94062

Table A: Housing Element Sites Inventory, Table Starts in Cells A2

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Consolidated Sites	General Plan Designation (Current)	SR Zoning Designation (Current)	Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre)	Mix 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: Additional Detail of Existing Land Use	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
WOODSIDE	Next to 2833 Skyline Blvd.	94062	7609140		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.21	Vacant	No	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Climbs steeply from roadway		
WOODSIDE	Next to 640 Southdale Way	94062	6844000		R-1	R-1	0	1.1	0.21	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Open grassland, sloping		
WOODSIDE	Next to 833 Canada Rd.	94062	6825300		R-1	R-1	0	2.1	0.22	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Small, heavily vegetated lot. Good access.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 231 Hillside Drive	94062	7306200		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.24	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated lot.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 640 Southdale Way	94062	6844000		R-1	R-1	0	2.1	0.24	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Open grassland, graded site at intersection of Southdale and Woodside Way.		
WOODSIDE	489 Woodside Drive	94062	6915010		R	R-1	0	0.1	0.26	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Site has slight drainage area, shaped like a gentle bowl.		
WOODSIDE	Summit Road	94062	7609100		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.28	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Heavily vegetated area. Property lines difficult to discern.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 7 Montecito Road	94062	7528110		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.3	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Small wooded structure		
WOODSIDE	Next to 4248 Jefferson Ave.	94062	6825200		R-1	R-1	0	2.1	0.31	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep site.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 625 West Glen Way	94062	6883180		R	SR	0	1	0.32	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 View lot, open grassland		
WOODSIDE	Next to 642 Woodside Way	94062	6882330		R-1	R-1	0	2.1	0.36	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Confirmed vacant		
WOODSIDE	Next to 580 Espinosa way	94062	7511230		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.33	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Non-adjacent site. Not visible from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 4240 Jefferson Ave.	94062	6824360		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.34	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep lot with scattered oaks.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 441 Glen Way	94062	6883110		R	SR	0	1	0.35	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Open, grassy hillside view lot.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 260 Lindenbrog Road	94062	7397120		R-ESA	SCP-5	0	0.2	0.35	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Not visible from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 809 W. California	94062	6823290		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.36	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Confirmed vacant		
WOODSIDE	Next to 214 Southview Way	94062	6823260		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.36	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Functions as yard to adjacent property.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1240 Jefferson Ave.	94062	6824200		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.36	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep hillside lot with scattered oaks.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 611 W. California Way	94062	6813200		R	SR	0	1	0.37	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated lot.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 7 Montecito Road	94062	7528160		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.38	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Very old wood structure, mostly vacant.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 2833 Skyline Blvd.	94062	7609110		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.38	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated. Difficult to view from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 655 Glenway Way	94062	6814100		R	SR	0	1	0.39	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, uphill lot.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 355 Old La Honda Rd.	94062	7523050		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.4	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Confirmed vacant		
WOODSIDE	Next to 17300 Skyline Blvd.	94062	7510200		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.41	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Heavily vegetated.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 654 Woodside Way	94062	6824210		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.42	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated lot with drainage.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 775 W. California Way	94062	6827260		R	SR	0	1	0.43	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Road, steep lot. Top portion not visible.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 193 Ows Ave.	94062	7396100		R-1	R-1	0	2.1	0.43	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Not visible from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 110 Lower Lake Rd.	94062	7523040		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.43	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Difficult to view from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Summit Road	94062	7672900		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.45	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Lots not discernible. Generally wooded and mostly level near top of hill.		
WOODSIDE	Across from 302 Old La Honda Road	94062	7528200		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.46	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Vacant. Lots heavily vegetated. Difficult to discern.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 4140 Jefferson Ave.	94062	6823340		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.48	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Not adjacent to Jefferson Ave. Difficult to see from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 2 Skyline Blvd.	94062	7601060		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.5	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep parcel extending up from Midglen Way. Some solar panels.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 185 Bear Gulch Road	94062	7218010		R	R-1	0	2.1	0.51	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Narrow parcel along Bear Gulch Road at intersection of Woodside Road		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1391 La Honda Road	94062	7511010		R-ESA	SCP-5	0	0.2	0.53	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep parcel at bend in road.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 2511 Old La Honda Road	94062	7523010		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.57	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated. Difficult to view from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 425 Family Farm Rd.	94062	7529410		R-ESA	SCP-5	0	0.2	0.57	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Small Creek bed, heavily vegetated. Difficult to discern.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 110 Lower Lake Rd.	94062	7523200		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.6	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Difficult to view from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 110 Lower Lake Rd.	94062	7523210		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.61	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Difficult to view from roadway.		
WOODSIDE	11 Hacienda Drive	94062	7398260		R	RR	0	0.33	0.86	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant				1	1 Not visible from 11 Hacienda.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 2915 Woodside Rd.	94062	7399250		R	RR	0	0.33	0.9	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Prior Housing Element - Non-Vacant				1	1 Parcel forms basin. Small drainage extending through it.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 15 Montecito Road	94062	7528600		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.91	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Confirmed vacant. Appears to have old driveway cut.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 52 Trip Court	94062	7209160		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.93	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Confirmed vacant. Appears to have old driveway cut.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 26 Meadow Rd.	94062	7604200		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.93	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep site with some bench area below.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 2833 Skyline Blvd.	94062	7609110		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	0.94	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated terrain.		
WOODSIDE	Narrow site along Narrows Rd., bisected by red-line creek corridor.	94062	6901000		R	R-1	0	0.13	0.94	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Narrow lot along steeply incised red-lined stream corridor.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 735 Old La Honda Road	94062	7507030		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.02	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep drop off into roadway ravine.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 485 Summit Springs Road	94062	7289300		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.04	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep ravine, heavily wooded, blue Agaves. Fine creek and red line streams.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1439 Portola Road	94062	7528230		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.05	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Somewhat of a bench, but still generally a very steep site.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1975 Portola Road	94062	7529220		R-ESA	SCP-5	0	0.2	1.06	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep canyon adjacent to La Honda Road.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1980 Portola Road	94062	7289310		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.15	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 A bit of a bench area, but drops off steeply.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 1440 Partion Road	94062	7209360		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.15	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep canyon adjacent to La Honda Road.		
WOODSIDE	870 Patrol Road	94062	7207150		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.2	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Very steep ravine, heavily wooded		
WOODSIDE	559 Patrol Road (next to 573)	94062	7289240		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.22	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Vacant but site appears to have unstable slopes.		
WOODSIDE	Summit Road	94062	7605160		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.3	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Not visible from road.		
WOODSIDE	Summit Road	94062	7609150		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.31	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Heavily wooded. Site not visible.		
WOODSIDE	Adjacent (west) to 575 Moore Road	94062	7311310		R-ESA	SCP-5	0	0.2	1.32	Vacant	YES - Current	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Within viewshed of 1280.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 580 Espinosa Way	94062	7511240		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.32	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Open site under roadways.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 45 Big Tree Road	94062	7607160		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.34	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Site appears to drop off quickly.		
WOODSIDE	Next to 573 Patrol Road	94062	7289260		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13	1.39	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Steep, heavily vegetated		
WOODSIDE	Next to 802 Glenway Way	94062	6810030		R	R-1	0	2.1	1.4	Vacant	NO	NO - Privately-Owned	Available	Used in Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant				1	1 Heavily wooded. Not visible from red line stream.		
WOODSIDE	Summit Road*	94062	7607170		R-ESA	SCP-7.5	0	0.13													

Table B: Candidate Sites Identified to be Rezoned to Accommodate Shortfall Housing Need, Table Starts in Cell A2

Jurisdiction Name	Site Address/Intersection	5 Digit ZIP Code	Assessor Parcel Number	Very Low-Income	Low-Income	Moderate-Income	Above Moderate-Income	Type of Shortfall	Parcel Size (Acres)	Current General Plan Designation	Current Zoning	Proposed General Plan (GP) Designation	Proposed Zoning	Minimum Density Allowed	Maximum Density Allowed	Total Capacity	Vacant/ Nonvacant	Description of Existing Uses	Optional Information1	Optional Information2	Optional Information3
WOODSIDE	Raymundo	94062	72041040	6	6	5		Shortfall of Sites	1.97	OS	OS	R	MFRD-10	1	10	17	Vacant	Corp Yard, corral			
WOODSIDE	High Road	94062	69170450	6	5	5		Shortfall of Sites	1.181	OS	OSN	R	MFRD-10	1	10	16	Vacant	Open space			
WOODSIDE	773 Canada Road(1.280 (1 acre at SW corner)	94062	68100220			16		Shortfall of Sites	5.01	R	SR	R	MFRD-10	1	10	16	Non-Vacant	Residential,1		As described in Appendix G, the property owner has expressed interest in developing a portion of this 5-acre site that fronts Canada Road with 16 unit that will be made available to Moderate income households.	
<b>49</b>																					

**Table C: Land Use, Table Starts in A2**

Zoning Designation (From Table A, Column G)	General Land Uses Allowed
R-1	Manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per 20,000 sq. foot lot
SR	Manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per acre
RR	Manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per 3 acres (.33 units per acre)
SCP-5	manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per 5 acres (.20 units per acre)
SCP-7.5	Manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per 7.5 acres (.13 units per acre)
SCP-10	Manufactured homes (mobile homes), residential care homes, single-family residential use, supportive housing, transitional housing, attached AND detached ADUs. 1 unit per 10 acres (.1 units per acre)
OS	1,500 sq. foot unit
MFRD Overlay Zone (at Cañada College)	Multi-family residential uses. 9.68-18.15 units/acre
MFRD Zone (Proposed Higher Density Sites)	Multi-family residential uses, 10 units/acre
CC (Community Commercial)	SFR and accessory uses, in addition to the primary commercial use.

## APPENDIX H. Summary

The Town of Woodside participated in/held a variety of public engagement opportunities soliciting important community feedback on the Housing Element update to meet the Cycle 6 housing targets. Some parts of the process were coordinated by 21 Elements, a consortium of San Mateo’s 21 jurisdictions that work together collaboratively to address Housing Element requirements. The focus of the local Town process was to share the requirements of the Housing Element in a series of public meetings and obtain comments from the public and decision makers about how best comply with the State’s housing mandates. Key events, meetings, study sessions, and informational webinars—both Countywide and local—that provided opportunities for engagement are described below:

<b>Table H-1. Public Engagement Summary</b>				
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Virtual Meetings and Webinars:</b>	<b>Town Council:</b>	<b>Planning Commission:</b>	<b>RHNA Subcommittee:</b>
December 15, 2020		RHNA Meeting		
April 14, 2021	‘Let’s Talk Housing!’ (LTH) Introduction with Woodside Break-out Session			
June 8, 2021		RHNA 5 Progress & RHNA 6 Allocation		
June 16, 2021			RHNA 5 Progress & RHNA 6 Allocation	
October 13, 2021	LTH: “Why Affordability Matters”			
October 26, 2021		Joint TC/PC/ASRB Study Session on SB 9		
October 27, 2021	LTH: “Housing & Racial Equity”			
November 4, 2021	ADU Workshop with Woodside Break-out Session			
November 10, 2021	LTH: “Housing in a Climate of Change”			

<b>Table H-1. Public Engagement Summary</b>				
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Virtual Meetings and Webinars:</b>	<b>Town Council:</b>	<b>Planning Commission:</b>	<b>RHNA Subcommittee:</b>
November 17, 2021			SB 9 Code Amendment, Subdivisions	
December 1, 2021	LTH: "Putting it all Together for a Better Future"			
December 1, 2021			SB 9 Code Amendment, Zoning	
December 14, 2021		SB 9 Code Amendment, Subdivisions & Zoning		
January 12, 2022			Cycle 6 Housing Element	
January 25, 2022		Mayor appoints a RHNA Subcommittee		
February 2, 2022			Housing Study Session	
February 16, 2022			Housing Study Session	
February 17, 2022				RHNA Introduction
February 24, 2022				RHNA Planning
March 2, 2022			Review Draft HE Chapters 1 and 2	
March 8, 2022		Review Draft HE Chapters 1 and 2		
March 10, 2022				Final RHNA Recommendation
March 16, 2022			Review RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation	
March 22, 2022		Review RHNA Subcommittee Recommendations		
April 25, 2022			Review of Draft HE Chapter 3	

<b>Table H-1. Public Engagement Summary</b>				
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Virtual Meetings and Webinars:</b>	<b>Town Council:</b>	<b>Planning Commission:</b>	<b>RHNA Subcommittee:</b>
May 10, 2022		Review of Draft HE for public comment and HCD submittal		
May 18, 2022 – July 1, 2022 (44-day Public Comment Period)				
July 12, 2022		Formal Response to Comments		
December 13, 2022		Review HCD Comment Letter and Response to Comments memo		
January 10, 2023		Review HCD response regarding Town-owned sites		
January 31, 2023		Review revised Housing Element documents for submittal to HCD for second review		
March 7, 2023 – March 13, 2023 – 7-day Public Comment period				

**Public Engagement– Chronology of Meetings, Study Sessions, and Informational Webinars**

Given The Town of Woodside’s Cycle 6 Housing Element need to plan for approximately 5.3 times the amount of housing as the previous Cycle 5, concerns from the community have been expressed on how best to meet the requirement, with a desire to focus on increased ADU production. While ADUs alone may not be able to reach the RHNA target, the Town has engaged the public in a series of meetings, events, and webinars to share ideas and concerns.

A chronology of these events, meetings, study sessions, and informational webinars, is described below:

***Town Council Meeting, December 15, 2020***

The Town Council reviewed and discussed the Cycle 6 ABAG RHNA distribution, and its upcoming distribution to individual jurisdictions.

***Webinar - ‘Let’s Talk Housing!’ Meeting and Break-out Session, April 14, 2021***

The Town of Woodside joined the cities of Atherton, Daly City, Half Moon Bay, and Pacifica, and the Unincorporated areas of San Mateo County, in a community workshop that was designed as a “kick-off” event to introduce the Housing Element process and describe ways for members of the public to get involved. Each municipality conducted its own break-out session to encourage participants to share their housing related views, ideas, and concerns, and solutions.

At Woodside’s Break-out session, members of the public raised issues regarding the complexity of regulations they encounter as they construct housing in Woodside and the time involved. They also mentioned that many were drawn to Woodside because of its rural character and natural environment, while noting the challenge of building in the Town with its many environmental constraints. Other comments included the need to streamline the development process and encourage the Town to work with the County Department of Environmental Health to adopt sewer regulations that allow for alternative septic technologies.

***Town Council Meeting, June 8, 2021***

Planning staff provided an overview of the Town’s Cycle 5 RHNA (2015-2023) compliance, noting that only nine Moderate Income units were still needed to meet the 62-unit allocation. Staff further explained that the Cycle 6 (2023-2031) allocation would likely be 328 units, which is nearly 5.3 times the Cycle 5 allocation. Given the current State housing deficit and the Governor’s focus on increasing housing stock at all income levels, staff conveyed that the upcoming Cycle 6 Housing Element would likely receive more scrutiny than past Housing Elements. Staff noted that the Town is working with 21 Elements to ensure all required components are included in the Housing Element update.

***Planning Commission Meeting, June 16, 2021***

Planning staff forwarded the Town Council Report on the Housing Element to the Planning Commission for its review and comments. Staff indicated that given the much higher RHNA allocation for the Cycle 6 Housing Element, there needs to be more done to aggressively promote ADUs. Ideas to promote ADUs included: ADU workshops and an ADU workbook specifically tailored to Woodside. Staff noted that there can also be targets for niche ADUs,

such as encouraging people who have barns to add an ADU for equestrian workers, or developing ADUs for multi-generational living, or aging in place.

***'Let's Talk Housing!' Series of Webinars - October 13, 2021– December 1, 2021***

A second set of workshops in the form of issue-based webinars was conducted during the Fall of 2021. The workshops were designed to provide information about key issues affecting affordable housing so that participants would have information and resources to draw from as they work(ed) to find solutions to provide affordable housing in each jurisdiction. The webinars included:

- (1) Why Affordability Matters:** Why housing affordability matters to public health, community fabric and to county residents, families, workers and employers;
- (2) Housing and Racial Equity:** Why and how our communities have become segregated by race, why it is a problem and how it has become embedded in our policies and systems;
- (3) Housing in a Climate of Change:** What is the connection between housing policy and climate change and a walk through the Housing & Climate Readiness Toolkit; and,
- (4) Putting it All Together for a Better Future:** How design and planning for much-needed new infill housing can be an opportunity to address existing challenges in our communities.

***Joint Meeting of the Town Council, Planning Commission, Architectural and Site Review Board (ASRB), October 26, 2021***

The Town held a joint public hearing of its Town Council, Planning Commission, and Architectural and Site Review Board (ASRB), for a study session on implementation of SB 9. Key issues discussed related to: whether or not SB 9 projects are allowed in a high fire severity zone; clarification on demolition of more than 25% of an existing structure; minimum unit size and whether it should be increased from 800 square feet; developing design standards that use “shall” as opposed to “should”; whether the Town can do anything to enforce the affidavit required to be signed by the property owner that they will live in one of the units for three years; parking requirements; setback requirements; HOA/CC&R requirements; septic/sewer availability; topography; tax reassessment after construction; and Proposition 13 tax assessment impacts.

***Webinar - Building Second Units, November 4, 2021***

With increased interest in building ADUs, and increased numbers of units required by the State for the Cycle 6 Housing Element, the Town of Woodside is getting the word out about opportunities for constructing ADUs in Woodside. On November 4, 2021, the Town of Woodside joined the County of San Mateo and the cities of Brisbane, San Carlos, and East Palo Alto in conducting an informational workshop on constructing second units. Woodside

Planning staff presented a PowerPoint on the Town’s process for developing ADUs (second units) and the numbers and types of units permitted on different sized lots. Staff also explained that, as of January 1, 2020, all property owners of single-family parcels are permitted to construct an 800 square foot ADU by-right, with ministerial approval, maintaining minimum rear and side setbacks of 4 feet, and a height not exceeding 16 feet. Property owners are also permitted by-right to construct a 500-square foot Junior ADU (an ADU that utilizes one of the existing bedrooms of the main residence). Participants had questions regarding the type of ADUs that could be built on different sizes of parcels. Staff explained that the Town has generous regulations regarding ADUs, allowing at least one 800 square foot ADU and a 500 square foot Junior ADU by-right. In Woodside, lots that are 1 acre in size or greater are permitted up to two ADUs.

***Planning Commission Meeting, November 17, 2021***

The Planning Commission considered amendments to Chapter 152 (Subdivisions) to bring the Woodside Municipal Code into compliance with SB9.

Commissioners and members of the public provided a broad range of comments. Some members of the public expressed concerns with increased development in areas with substandard roads in high fire risk areas.

***Planning Commission Meeting, December 1, 2021***

Planning Commissioners considered amendments to Chapters 151 (Site Development) and 153 (Zoning) to comply with SB9. Residents expressed concerns regarding the setback of these units from barns, given health and safety issues that may arise living immediately adjacent to animal housing.

***Town Council Meeting, December 14, 2021***

The Town Council reviewed an Ordinance to amend chapters 152 (Subdivisions) and 153 (Zoning) to bring the Municipal Code into compliance with SB9. Much of the Council and community discussion focused on fire risk. The Fire Marshal read a letter dated December 13, 2021, to the Town Council: *“The topography of Woodside is capable of producing wind conditions that promote extreme wildfire behavior; these conditions make swift evacuation critical for residents within and adjacent to these areas; many of these areas are adjacent to and amongst unmitigated non-fire resilient open space lands containing extreme fuel loads which only make matters worse. Many residents only have a single route out of the area; a large portion of the roads in these areas are narrow and winding, having the potential to cause life threatening traffic congestion during an evacuation as residents try to leave the area and firefighters try to enter to fight the fire. Allowing additional density in these areas at the levels proposed through SB 9 would result in a threat to the health and safety of residents in that area; due to mountainous terrain within these areas and existing development, there is no feasible way to improve evacuation routes that would sufficiently mitigate the threat to the*

*public safety due to increased density during an evacuation and it is beyond an individual applicant's ability to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact."*

The Council adopted Municipal Code changes that allowed for SB9 Lot Splits and SB9 development consistent with State law.

***Planning Commission Meeting, January 12, 2022***

Planning staff provided an overview of the Cycle 6 RHNA allocation encouraging recommendations to support achieving the goals of the next Housing Element. Staff noted that by the end of 2021, the Town had exceeded the target number of 62 units by an additional 62 units in Cycle 5, the majority of which (42 units) are Above Moderate units; while 20 are Very Low, Low, and Moderate units. Staff also noted that HCD does not permit these additional units to be carried over to the next Housing Element cycle. (HCD subsequently clarified that units may be counted in the next RHNA cycle if they have not been "finalized" by June 30, 2022). Staff indicated that 21 Elements is providing guidance and assistance in preparing for the increased requirements for an Adequate Sites Analysis for future housing. The Adequate Sites Inventory must now, e.g., identify each property by its assessor parcel number and describe whether the property either currently has access to sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities or is scheduled to have such access according to an adopted plan.

Planning staff also provided an overview of new State housing laws, and the Town's implementation of these laws, and new laws requiring coordination between the Housing Element and the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) or Safety Element.

***Town Council Meeting, January 25, 2022***

On January 25, 2022, the Town's Mayor formed a RHNA Subcommittee to discuss and recommend strategies to meet required housing targets for all income levels, and AFFH goals. The subcommittee conducted meetings on February 17, 2022, February 24, 2022, and March 10, 2022.

***Planning Commission Meeting, February 2, 2022***

The Planning Commission Study Session included an overview on ADUs, ADU Development Standards, and ADU Affordability.

***Planning Commission Meeting, February 16, 2022***

The Planning Commission conducted an additional study session to discuss recent State housing mandates and the Town's compliance with appropriate zoning code changes. The Commission also discussed requirements for the Cycle 6 Housing Element.

***RHNA Subcommittee Meeting, February 17, 2022***

RHNA Subcommittee members received a packet including information about highly constrained areas, vacant land, and parcels that are currently connected to, or have the potential to be, connected to sewer service. The Subcommittee considered criteria for selecting sites, such as more level terrain and access to services. The Subcommittee also reviewed the demographic trends in the community and considered special needs groups such as seniors, and students attending Cañada College. They also considered HCD's preference that projects be available to all people rather than specific groups, such as seniors or students. The Subcommittee brainstormed about potential sites near the Cañada College, Town Center, and Interstate-280 corridor. In looking at potential sites, the RHNA Subcommittee indicated that rezoning for high density should be conducted with willing property owners, to every extent possible.

***RHNA Subcommittee Meeting, February 24, 2022***

Planning staff provided an overview of the Virtual Tour with HCD conducted earlier in the day, discussing comments on HCD's approach to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. It was explained that HCD staff focused on ensuring designated sites for increased housing density will realistically develop if the Town changes regulations to allow increased density. The RHNA Subcommittee acknowledged the challenges to meet the new, increased housing unit targets, while understanding that either ADUs, or high-density housing (20 units/acre) would be the only housing types that could use HCD acceptable income distributions for the Cycle 6 Housing Element Plan. The Subcommittee expressed a need to identify sites that could accommodate high density housing with property owner agreement for such rezoning.

***Planning Commission Meeting, March 2, 2022***

Planning Commission reviewed drafts of Housing Element Chapters 1 (Introduction, Demographics, Recent State Housing Laws and Town Implementation) and 2 (Analysis of previous Housing Element).

***Town Council Meeting, March 8, 2022***

The Town Council reviewed comments received from the Planning Commission on Housing Element Chapters 1 and 2 and provided minor additional comments for changes.

***RHNA Subcommittee Meeting, March 10, 2022***

The RHNA Subcommittee acknowledged the challenge to accommodate a significant increase in housing units in the Town given the various constraints identified and recommend sites that could be rezoned for high density housing with support from the property owners.

***Planning Commission Meeting, March 16, 2022***

The Planning Commission reviewed the recommendations of the RHNA Subcommittee on potential sites for increased housing density. The Planning Commission noted that such increases in housing density would be a significant change to the long-standing goals of Woodside to conserve natural resources, provide accommodations for horses and other livestock, but that it could be difficult to meet new RHNA numbers and AFFH goals without constructing multi-family housing.

***Town Council Meeting, March 22, 2022***

Staff provided the Town Council with an overview of the recommendations of the RHNA Subcommittee and Planning Commission. There was considerable public concern with rezoning that would allow any high-density housing. Town residents expressed a desire to meet RHNA targets with increased development of ADUs.

The Town Council recognized the concerns expressed from the public while acknowledging the need to meet State mandated housing requirements. The Town Council did not remove any of the sites proposed for higher density development but expressed the desire to provide Housing Element Programs that could increase production of ADUs as a priority before rezoning sites for higher densities.

***Planning Commission Meeting, April 25, 2022***

The Planning Commission reviewed draft Housing Element Chapter 3 which included Programs to further encourage construction of ADUs and zoning changes to properties near the Town Center to allow for medium density housing referred to as the Missing Middle, which would help achieve AFFH goals. Many residents continued to express concerns with the high-density sites and the proposal for medium density overlays near the Town Center. The Planning Commission was divided on a recommendation to rezone the identified sites for high-density housing.

***Town Council Meeting, May 10, 2022***

The Town Council reviewed the draft Housing Element and the RHNA Plan and considered extensive public comment. The Council also reviewed changes to the RHNA Plan submitted by Councilmembers Shaw and Dombkowski. After listening to extensive public comments on both proposals, Councilmembers focused on the RHNA Plan submitted by Shaw-Dombkowski Plan which was more widely supported by the residents than the RHNA Plan recommended by the Planning Commission.

The Town Council made modifications to the RHNA Plan based on public input, and approved release of the Housing Element for a 30-day Public Review and comment period with

direction to staff to update the narrative in the Housing Element to align with the Council’s RHNA Plan.

***Public Comment Period on Housing Element (rev. May 18, 2022): May 18, 2022 – July 1, 2022***

In accordance with State law, the Town posted the draft Housing Element on the Town website on May 18, 2022; and posted for 44 days (exceeding the 30-day required comment period). During the comment period, the Town also sent courtesy radius notices to all properties within 300 feet of the sites proposed for higher density development.

***Town Council Meeting, July 12, 2022***

The Town Council reviewed (65) comments received on the draft Housing Element (rev. May 18, 2022) by the comment period deadline of July 1, 2022, at 5pm; and staff’s formal response to comments. Three additional comments, received after July 1, 2022, were transmitted as a staff report attachment. Six comments received after the posting of the staff report we transmitted to the Town Council as desk items. The Town Council also heard and considered a significant amount of public comment at the meeting, including opposition to all of the higher density development sites included in the draft Housing Element. In response to the comments, the Town Council directed staff to revise the RHNA Plan (increase ADU projection to 20 per year, increase the SB9 projection to 16 units/cycle, redistribute the income level for all higher density development sites, delete the “Commercial Corridor” sites from the higher density site list, reduce the 773 Cañada Road site density to 10 units/acre, and change the rezoning from “post-adoption” to “pre-adoption”); add five additional programs described in the staff report; revise Appendix G, Site Inventory, to include additional narrative and a full Site Inventory Map, as attached to the staff report; and conduct a final check of the Housing Element and Appendices to ensure consistency with all other Town Council direction. **After revisions were made to the Housing Element per Council direction, the document was submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the first formal review for HCD certification.**

***Town Council Meeting, December 13, 2022***

**The Town Council reviewed comments received from HCD and a draft Response to Comments. The extensive HCD list of comments and desired revisions included all aspects of the Housing Element including special needs housing, affirmatively furthering fair housing, assumed density for sites proposed for rezoning, assumed rate of ADU production, and zoning for a variety of housing types. Public testimony was received from residents in opposition to including Town-owned sites that were designated in the Housing Element for higher density**

zoning for affordable housing. The Town Council directed staff to submit a discussion draft of the RHNA Plan that removed the Town owned sites from the plan.

***Town Council Meeting, January 10, 2023***

The Town Council reviewed comments from HCD that were not supportive of removing the Town-owned sites and the reliance on ADU production assumptions that exceed the historical ADU approval rate. Staff recommended the Council reconsider including at least one of the Town-owned sites, lower the number of assumed ADUs, and increasing the density of sites to be rezoned to meet the RHNA. Additional public testimony was received in opposition to including any of the Town-owned sites in the RHNA Plan. The Town Council directed staff to return with an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of including each of the Town-owned sites and revising the assumption for ADU production.

***Town Council Meeting, January 31, 2023***

The Town Council reviewed the analysis of options for the inclusion of Town-owned sites in the RHNA Plan, as well as rezoning density and ADU production assumptions. The Town sent courtesy notices to residents and comments from residents were received prior to the Council meeting.

***Public Comment Period on Housing Element – March 7, 2023, through March 13, 2023***

Per Government Code Section 65585 (b) the Town of Woodside made available a second draft of the Housing Element for a period of seven days for public review and comment, following the Town Council authorization to submit the second draft, and prior to submitting the second draft to HCD for approval.

## APPENDIX I. Summary of ADU Production in Woodside (2018-2022)

### ADU Production

The Town of Woodside produced an average of 15 ADUs between 2018 and 2022. The average of the highest three years is 17 ADUs. As the Town streamlined review and modified regulations for ADUs, starting at the end of 2017, production of ADUs increased substantially as shown below.

Town of Woodside – Building Permits issued for ADUs between 2015 - 2021	
Year	ADUs
2015	6
2016	7
2017	9
2018	15
2019	16
2020	9
2021	20
2022	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Average of recent 4-year period</b>	15
<b>Average of recent highest 3-year period</b>	17

ADU permit issuance dramatically lowered in 2020, from recent years before, and the following year. This may be attributed to the Covid-19 Federal shutdown, which reduced owner intent to construct, architect/designer availability, local municipality permit processing, access to contractors, etc.

In early April 2022, Town staff developed and distributed a survey to measure Town residents' interest in constructing an ADU or ADUs on their property as well as understanding what residents believe are the barriers to their construction.

As of May 3, 2022, the Town had received 260 responses to the survey. Of the respondents, 188 indicated that they are interested in constructing an ADU or ADUs on their property between now and 2031. The majority of the 188 respondents (64%) indicated that they would be interested in constructing one ADU. Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents said they would be interested in constructing 2 ADUs, and the remaining 11% indicated an interest in building 3 or more ADUs, should the Town allow additional ADUs in the future. The total number of ADUs for which interest has been expressed is 264.

The Town Housing Element includes programs to increase the number of ADUs built within the community, including developing an Amnesty Program for ADUs that were built before 2020 without permits; developing brochures on the development of ADUs and JADUs; conducting workshops and periodic educational seminars and providing resource materials for ADU development; providing information on companies that specialize in ADU construction; continuing to amend the Municipal Code to remove barriers to ADU construction, such as restrictions on septic system locations, and additional ADU exceptions to maximum lot floor area standards; and considering reducing fees for ADU construction.

## **APPENDIX J. Town of Woodside ADU Ordinances**

### **Attachments:**

- J.1 Ordinance 2017-585
- J.2 Ordinance 2018-593
- J.3 Ordinance 2018-597
- J.4 Ordinance 2020-610

ORDINANCE NO. 2017 - 585

ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE TO AMEND CHAPTER 151, SITE DEVELOPMENT, AND CHAPTER 153, ZONING (ZOAM2017-0001), RELATED TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU'S) TO BRING THE WOODSIDE MUNICIPAL CODE INTO COMPLIANCE WITH RECENTLY ENACTED STATE LEGISLATION (AB 2299, SB 1069 AND AB 2406), WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2017. THIS LEGISLATION IS DESIGNED TO STREAMLINE THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR ADU'S; REMOVE BARRIERS TO THEIR CONSTRUCTION; AND EXPAND THE CAPACITY OF JURISDICTIONS TO PROVIDE MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside to amend the Woodside Municipal Code as follows:

**SECTION ONE:** The Town Council finds that the Municipal Code amendment set forth herein is consistent with the General Plan of the Town of Woodside and is required for the public convenience and to achieve the health, safety, and welfare of the Town of Woodside.

**SECTION TWO:** Chapter 151, Site Development, and Chapter 153, Zoning, of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended pursuant to **Exhibit A**.

**SECTION FOUR:** In the event that any provision of this ordinance is in conflict with any other ordinances of the Town of Woodside or the Woodside Municipal Code, the provisions of this ordinance shall prevail.

**SECTION FIVE:** If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of the Ordinance or any part thereof. The Town Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective.


**SECTION SIX:** Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after its final passage.

**SECTION SEVEN:** The Town Clerk shall cause this Ordinance to be published in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.


\* \* \* \* \*

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance is a full, true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 2017-585 of the Town of Woodside entitled as above; that it was introduced on the 14<sup>th</sup> of March, 2017, and was passed and adopted by the Town Council on the 28<sup>th</sup> of March, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES, Councilmembers: Gordon, Kasten, Mason, Shaw, Yost, and Mayor Livermore  
NOES, Councilmembers: None  
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Tanner  
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

  
Clerk of the Town of Woodside

APPROVED:

  
Mayor of the Town of Woodside

## EXHIBIT A

### § 151.44 DRIVEWAYS.

All Driveways shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the following:

(A) *Number of entrances.* All residential lots shall have only one Driveway with only one opening which shall be from only one public or private serving Road. Second Driveway Exceptions may be granted by the Planning Commission if the following findings can be made:

(1) The proposed additional ingress and egress point meets Town standards for the line of sight, case of public identification, and any other traffic safety consideration; and

(2) The proposed additional ingress and egress point does not detract from the scenic and rural quality of the Town.

(3) The proposed additional ingress and egress point cannot be accommodated off of the primary driveway.

(4) The proposed additional ingress and egress is not the only vehicular access to a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit.

(B) Driveways for Accessory Dwelling Units. Any lots that have two or more existing permitted driveways shall use the Principal Access Driveway, as defined in Chapter 153, as the primary access to any proposed Accessory Dwelling Units. Any additional existing driveways other than the Principal Access Driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed Accessory Dwelling Units.

~~(C)~~ *Alignment.* ...

~~(D)~~ *Gradients.* ...

~~(E)~~ *Design and construction standards.* ...

### § 153.005 DEFINITIONS

~~**ACCESSORY LIVING QUARTERS.** A living area that is: (1) within or attached to a main dwelling or within or attached to a detached building or structure, subordinate to the main dwelling; and (2) designed, built or used for human habitation. **ACCESSORY LIVING QUARTERS** shall include but not be limited to, a rental unit as defined in this section.~~

**ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU).** An attached or a detached residential dwelling unit which provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons. It shall include permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as the single-family dwelling is situated. An Accessory Dwelling Unit also includes the following:

- An efficiency unit, as defined in Section 17958.1 of the Health and Safety Code.
- A manufactured home, as defined in Section 18007 of the Health and Safety Code.

**EXISTING STRUCTURE.** "Existing Structure" for the purposes of defining an allowable space that can be converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit means within the walls and roofline of any legal structure existing on or after January 1, 2017 that can be made safely habitable under local building codes at the determination of the Building Official, regardless of any noncompliance with zoning standards.

§ 153.026 PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL, AND ACCESSORY USES IN ZONING DISTRICTS

Uses	Zone Districts					
	SCP	RR	SR	R-1	CC	MFRD
<u>Accessory Uses</u> <u>Attached Accessory Dwelling Units</u> accessory living quarters, within or attached to the main dwelling, or within a building in the CC zone. (See Section 153.026(B)(1)(e) to determine the number of accessory dwelling units permitted on a lot.) No more than one rental unit shall be permitted for each parcel.	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guests provided the occupancy of any individual or group of guests does not exceed an aggregate of three months in any 12-month period.	X	X	X	X	X	
Family Members	X	X	X	X	X	
Bona fide caretakers or employees working on the property and their spouses and minor or dependent children.	X	X	X	X	X	
One rental unit, provided a certificate of registration is obtained from the Town.	X	X	X	X	X	
<u>Detached Accessory Dwelling Units</u> living quarters detached from the main dwelling. (See Section 153.026(B)(1)(e) to determine the number of accessory dwelling units permitted on a lot, and lot size requirement for detached Accessory Dwelling Units on lots in the R-1 District.); limited to no more than two	X	X	X	X		X

accessory living quarters of any of the following categories for each parcel. No more than one rental unit shall be permitted for each parcel. No more than one attached and one detached living quarters shall be permitted on parcels equal to or greater than 1.0 acre and less than 1.5 acres in size. No more than one accessory living quarters, whether attached or detached, is permitted on parcels less than 1.0 acre in size.						
Guests provided the occupancy of any individual guest or group of guests does not exceed an aggregate of three months in any 12-month period.	X	X	X			
Family members	X	X	X			
Bona fide caretakers or employees working on the property and their spouses and minor or dependent children.	X	X	X			
One rental unit, provided a registration is obtained from the Town.	X	X	X			

(B) Accessory Dwelling Units Living Quarters. All of the above living quarters Accessory Dwelling Units, whether internal, attached to, or detached from the main dwelling unit, shall conform to the following requirements:

(1) Requirements applicable to all Accessory dwelling units accessory living quarters:

(a) Building and Fire Safety. Conformance with all applicable building, housing, zoning, and site development laws, codes, and regulations shall be required, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be required to provide

fire sprinklers if they are not required for the primary residence and may employ alternative methods for fire protection.

(b) Parking and Driveway Access. Off-road parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of §§ 153.115 through and 153.119, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units; and specifically as follows:

- i. Parking Requirements. Parking requirements for accessory dwelling units shall not exceed one parking space per bedroom, with a maximum of two required spaces per Accessory Dwelling Unit. Off-street parking shall be permitted in setback areas in locations determined by the Town, or through tandem parking, unless specific findings are made that parking in setback areas or tandem parking is not feasible based upon specific site or regional topographic or fire and life safety conditions.
- ii. Parking Waiver. Parking is not required in the following instances:
  - The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one-half mile of public transit, including transit stations and bus stations;
  - The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within an architecturally and historically significant historic district;
  - The Accessory Dwelling Unit is part of the existing primary residence or an existing accessory structure;
  - The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located in an area where parking permits are required, but are not offered to the occupant of the Accessory Dwelling Unit; or
  - The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one block of a car share vehicle.
- iii. Replacement Parking: When a garage, carport, or covered parking structure is demolished or converted in conjunction with the construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Town requires that those parking spaces be replaced. The replacement spaces may be located in any configuration on the same lot as the Accessory Dwelling Unit, including but not limited to, as covered spaces, uncovered spaces, or tandem spaces, or by the use of mechanical automobile parking lifts.
- iv. Driveway Access. Any lots that have two or more existing permitted driveways shall use the Principal Access Driveway as the primary access to any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Any additional existing driveways other than the Principal Access Driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Pursuant to Municipal Code § 151.44, a Second Driveway Exception shall not be granted if the second driveway is the primary access for a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit.

(c) Design Review. All plans for Accessory Dwelling Units accessory living quarters shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Director. In addition, all plans for the new construction or exterior modification of Accessory Dwelling Units accessory living quarters, including rental units, shall also, prior to the issuance of any

permit, be subject to review according to § 153.221. In considering architectural review, the Planning Director shall be required to find that the Accessory Dwelling Units accessory living quarters are subordinate to the main dwelling, and compatible with the neighboring property and uses in height, bulk, location, appearance, color, materials, and landscaping.

(d) General Accessory Structure Regulations and Setback Exception. The requirements of § 153.049 related to accessory buildings shall apply. Additionally, development standards contained in this Chapter, including, but not limited to: height, setbacks, floor area, lot coverage, and landscaping shall apply. Refer to Section 153.050.B.5 for reduced setback allowances for garages converted to Accessory Dwelling Units.

(e) Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed. No more than two Accessory Dwelling Units accessory living quarters, including Accessory Dwelling Units-accessory living quarters in barns, are permitted on a parcel. ~~No more than one accessory living quarters used as a rental unit shall be permitted for each parcel.~~ For parcels equal to or greater than 1.0 acre in size, but less than 1.5 acres in size, a maximum of one detached and one attached accessory living quarter dwelling units shall be permitted. For parcels less than 1.0 acre in size, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, whether attached or detached, shall be permitted. In the R-1 District, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters is permitted, and detached Accessory Dwelling Units may only be permitted if the Lot Area is at least 20,000 square feet., and detached accessory living quarters are not permitted.

(f) Attached Accessory Dwelling Units. The floor area of an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters shall not exceed ~~25%~~ 50% of the size of the main residence, including the Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, or 1,500 square feet, whichever is less.

(g) Detached Accessory Dwelling Units. The floor area of a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, including the floor area of any attached garage, shall not exceed 1,500 square feet.

(h) Basement Accessory Dwelling Units. Basement area used for an Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, or a portion thereof, shall be calculated as floor area pursuant to the provisions of § 153.055. limited to the unit sizes prescribed in § 153.026.B.1.f-g.

~~(i) No rent shall be paid for any accessory living quarters except as set forth in division (3) applying to rental units.~~

(i) Rental Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory Dwelling Units which are rented shall not be rented for less than 30 consecutive days.

(j) Processing Requirements:

i. Accessory Dwelling Units within an Existing Structure. An Accessory Dwelling Unit within an Existing Structure (including the primary structure, attached or detached garage, or other accessory structure) shall be permitted ministerially with a Building Permit, and within 120 days of application, in

compliance with other standards within the Chapter, if complying with the following codes and requirements:

- Building and safety codes;
- Independent exterior access from the existing residence;
- Sufficient side and rear setbacks for fire safety, as set forth in the Building Code; and,
- A minimum 5' setback for a second-story Accessory Dwelling Unit.

ii. Denial. In order to deny an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Planning Director shall find that the Accessory Dwelling Unit would be detrimental to the public health and safety or would introduce unreasonable privacy impacts to the immediate neighbors.

(2) Accessory Dwelling Units within Barns. In addition to the requirements applicable to all Accessory Dwelling Units ~~accessory living quarters~~, any such Accessory Dwelling Units ~~accessory living quarters~~ located within barns shall conform to the following additional requirements:

(a) No more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~accessory living quarters~~ within a barn shall be permitted on a parcel with the following exception: up to two Accessory Dwelling Units ~~accessory living quarters~~ may be permitted within a barn located on a property containing a town-approved ~~commercial professional~~ stable. Such additional Accessory Dwelling Units ~~accessory living quarters~~ shall only be permitted after approval of a conditional use permit by the Planning Commission, in accordance with applicable conditional use permit procedures.

(b) The floor area of the Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~accessory living quarters~~ within a barn shall be no greater than 40% ~~50%~~ of the footprint area of the barn, or 1,000 ~~1,200~~ square feet, whichever is less. ~~If the footprint area of the barn is less than 1,000 square feet, however, the living quarters may be up to 400 square feet in size.~~

(c) The Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~accessory living quarters~~ and the barn shall contain an automatic fire sprinkler system, and the Accessory Dwelling Unit ~~accessory living quarters~~ shall be separated from the other portions of the barn with a one-hour firewall, in accordance with the Town's Building Code.

(3) ~~In addition to all other requirements, the following requirements apply to only rental units:~~

~~(a) The floor area of an attached rental unit shall not exceed 25% of the size of the main residence, including the rental unit, but shall not exceed 1,000 square feet. The floor area of a detached rental unit, including the floor area of any attached garage, shall not exceed 1,000 square feet.~~

~~(b) For any accessory living quarters constructed prior to January 12, 1985, where an owner wishes to convert its use to a rental unit:~~

~~1. The floor area shall not exceed 1,200 square feet, excluding garage facilities.~~

~~2. Units shall be set back a minimum distance of 50 feet from a front property line and ten feet from a side or rear property line, except in the R-1 District, where the minimum front setback shall be 20 feet.~~

~~3. The California Health and Safety Code and the Uniform Housing Code shall be applied in lieu of the Uniform Building Code in certifying rental units for occupancy.~~

~~(c) For any unit constructed after January 12, 1985, and used as a rental unit, the floor area shall not exceed 1,000 square feet, including the floor area of any attached garage.~~

~~(d) The minimum floor area for all rental units shall be 400 square feet.~~

~~(e) Rent may be charged for rental units.~~

~~(f) Occupancy certification shall be required for all rental units prior to the rental thereof.~~

~~1. Applications for certification shall be accompanied by a fee set by resolution by the Council.~~

~~2. The application for occupancy certification shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.~~

## § 153.031 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE

### (C) Development standards and requirements.

(1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, all MFRD projects shall be subject to the goals policies, standards and requirements of the General Plan.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the applicant shall designate a "MFRD lot" or "MFRD lots" as the site(s) of the MFRD. Each "MFRD lot" may be a legal parcel, or it may be a portion of a legal parcel within the defined Cañada College campus that will accommodate MFRD. Each "MFRD lot shall not include any other buildings, or uses such as parking or open space that supports other buildings not on the MFRD lot.

(3) The following standards shall be met by any proposed MFRD (see Table A: MFRD Development Standards):

(a) *Lot dimensions.* Lots accommodating MFRD shall be no less than 75 feet in any dimension.

(b) *Lot coverage.* No more than 60% of the lot shall be covered by buildings.

(c) *Unit density.* The minimum unit count on the lot shall be at least one unit per 4,500 square feet of lot area. The maximum unit count on the lot shall be no more than one unit per 2,400 square feet.

(d) *Building height.* No residential structure shall exceed 35 feet in height, and no accessory structure shall exceed 17 feet in height.

(e) *Setback requirements.* For the purposes of this section, setbacks shall be measured from 1) the legal parcel boundary, 2) the edge of the "MFRD lot" defined in division (C)(2) of this Section, or 3) the edge of any internal roadway on the Cañada College site, whichever is more restrictive. The Planning Director shall determine the location of the front, side, and rear setbacks.

1. Required front-yard setbacks: Front yards shall have a minimum setback of 15 feet, and provide further that no garage or carport space shall have its entrance located within 20 feet of any property or "MFRD lot".

2. Required side-yard setbacks:

a. Side-yard setback: Side yards shall have a minimum setback of six feet, provided that the horizontal distance to the side lot line of any point on any building face shall not be less than one-half its height above the side lot line.

b. Wherever a main entrance to a building containing three or more units opens into an interior side yard, the minimum side-yard setback shall be 15 feet to the entrance of that portion of the building.

c. Exterior side yards. Wherever a side yard is adjacent to a street, such side yard shall have a minimum yard setback of 15 feet.

d. Multiple-story dwellings and additions: Multiple-story structures shall maintain a minimum side yard of 25% of the lot depth or 35 feet, whichever is less. Remaining portions of a multiple-story structure shall have a minimum setback equal to one half the height measured at the plateline or ridge beam, whichever is highest.

e. For Accessory Dwelling Units, no setback shall be required for an existing garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a setback of no more than five feet from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a garage.

3. Required rear-yard setbacks: Rear yard setbacks shall have a minimum yard setback of 20 feet.

(af) Minimum pervious area and stormwater requirements. A minimum of 20% of each lot shall be pervious area, to be composed of landscaping, vegetated open space, or natural state.

(bg) Required pervious area in front yard. A minimum of 60% of the area of the front yard shall be pervious area, primarily comprised of pervious landscaped material. Area devoted to public sidewalks shall not be included in the calculations.

(ch) MFRD projects may deviate from the standards in this division (C)(3) of this section if it is determined by the Planning Commission that the project requires deviations in order to promote the most appropriate use and design, and if the other requirements of this section are met.

Table A: MFRD Development Standards

<i>Regulation</i>	<i>Requirement</i>			
<b>Lot Dimensions</b>	75 feet minimum (in any dimension)			
<b>Lot Coverage</b>	60% of lot (maximum)			
<b>Unit Density</b>	Minimum		Maximum	
	1 unit/4,500 sq. ft.		1 unit/2,400 sq. ft.	
<b>Building Height</b>	Main Structure		Accessory Structure	
	35 ft. maximum		17 ft. maximum	
<b>Front-Yard Setbacks</b>	Main Structure		Garages/Carports	
	15 ft. minimum		20 ft. minimum	
<b>Side-Yard Setbacks</b>	Interior Side Yard	Where Main Entrance Opens Onto Side Yard	Exterior Side Yard	Multiple Story Side Yard
	Minimum is 6 ft. or ½ of building height	15 ft. minimum	15 ft. minimum	Minimum setback is required for 25% of lot depth or 35 ft., whichever is less; Remainder shall be setback ½ of building height at plateline or ridge beam, whichever is higher
<b>Rear-Yard Setbacks</b>	20 ft. minimum			
<b><u>Setbacks for Accessory Dwelling Units on MFRD lots</u></b>	<u>No setback shall be required for an existing garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a setback of no more than five feet from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a garage.</u>			
<b>Pervious Area</b>	Total Lot		Front Yard	
	20% of lot minimum		60% of yard minimum	
<b>Parking</b>	1 space per bedroom			
<b><u>Parking for</u></b>	<u>Shall not exceed one parking space per bedroom, with a maximum of two</u>			

<p><b><u>Accessory Dwelling Units on MFRD lots</u></b></p>	<p><del>required spaces</del> Accessory Dwelling Unit. These spaces may be provided as tandem parking, including on an existing driveway or in setback areas, <u>excluding the non-driveway front yard setbacks. Parking is not required when the Accessory Dwelling Unit is located:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>within ½ mile of public transit, including transit stations and bus stations;</u></li> <li>▪ <u>within an architecturally and historically significant district;</u></li> <li>▪ <u>when on-street parking permits are required but not offered to the occupant of the accessory dwelling unit; or,</u></li> <li>▪ <u>when there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the Accessory Dwelling Units.</u></li> </ul>
--	---

...

(D) *Evaluation criteria.* The evaluation criteria for reviews of MFRD by the ASRB and Planning Commission shall be as follows:

(1) The criterion enumerated in § 153.220 shall apply, except that criterion 1.4 entitled “Equestrian Lifestyle” shall not apply and criterion 1.1 entitled “Rural Character and Community Aesthetics” shall be interpreted with the understanding that MFRD projects are typically multi-story buildings.

(2) The chosen architectural style shall be applied in its simplest form.

(3) Project design, massing, and color shall be chosen with consideration for visibility from Interstate 280.

(E) *Review process.* MFRD development in the Canada College Residential Overlay Zone shall be reviewed by the Town following the process outlined in § 153.221 and the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines, and shall include both conceptual review by the ASRB, as well as formal review by both the ASRB and the Planning Commission, except for the conversion of existing space for an Accessory Dwelling Units, and/or construction of a new addition or structure for an Accessory Dwelling Units, which shall be by the Planning Director.

(F) *Findings.* In addition to the findings required by §153.221 and the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines, the ASRB and Planning Commission shall make all of the findings required by §153.251 for use permits.

(G) *Amendment of an approved MFRD.* Any change to an approved MFRD, shall be processed and reviewed following the same evaluation criteria and process described for MFRD review and approval in division (D) and (E) of this section, except for the conversion of existing space for an Accessory Dwelling Units, and/or construction of a new addition or structure for an Accessory Dwelling Units, which shall be by the Planning Director.

**§ 153.047 BUILDING LIMITATIONS**

(A) Tables B and C ~~The table set forth in this section~~ sets forth the basic lot area, minimum width, setback area, and building and paved area coverage regulations which apply to all zoning districts. Setback exceptions for Accessory Dwelling Units within residential zoning districts are set forth in § 153.050.B.5. Such basic regulations are further defined and supplemented by the additional requirements and exceptions set forth in §§ 153.049 through 153.057 of this subchapter.

(B) *Prior approvals.* The building limitations for development applications that have been approved by the Architectural and Site Review Board, Planning Commission, or Town Council before March 25, 1999, or those for Building Permit applications that ~~were have been~~ deemed complete by the Planning Director before March 25, 1999, shall be determined by the Zoning Code in effect at the time of approval, provided that no changes that would impact building limitations are made to the approved plans on or after March 25, 1999. Unless a Building Permit for construction of an approved development is issued by March 25, 2000, the exemption granted herein for such application shall be lost.

**Table C – Required Setbacks**<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

Zones	Height in Feet	Basic Setbacks			Minimum Setbacks with Exceptions <sup>7</sup>		
		Front	Rear	Side	Front	Rear	Side
R-1	<17	30	25	15	20	17	10
	17-28	30	25	22.5	25	20	17.5
SR	<17	50	25	20	30	20	15
	17-30	*	30	30	*	30	20
RR	<17	50	50	50	30	30	30
	17-30	*	50	50	*	30	30
SCP-5, 7.5, 10	<17	50	50	50	30	30	30
	17-30	*	50	50	*	30	30
OS <sup>4</sup>	NA	75	75	50	NA	NA	NA
CC	NA	<sup>5</sup>	25	<sup>6</sup>	NA	NA	NA

1. Refer to § 153.050 for additional setback regulations.
2. Refer to § 153.061 for special setbacks along Skyline Boulevard or I-240 applicable for parcels located on Moore Road, Valley Road, Valley Court, Lawler Ranch Road, and Cañada College.
3. Refer to §§ 153.026(B)(1)(n)(11) and 153.050 (B)(5) for setback provisions related to Accessory Dwelling Units.
4. OS refers to OSH, OSL, OSRL, OSN and OSM
5. See § 153.047
6. See § 153.050
7. Refer to §153.062

\* Any portion of a structure having a height in excess of 17 feet above ground elevation measured at the front setback line shall be set back and additional two feet from the property line for each foot of height in excess of 17 feet, except in the R-1 zone. Height shall be measured from the existing or finished grade, whoever presents the lower building profile.

**§ 153.049 ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND USES**

Except as otherwise provided in this chapter:

(A) No accessory use shall be permitted in a district where such use is not provided for in this chapter or which accessory use effectively converts a principal use to a use not permitted in the district.

- (B) Detached accessory buildings and structures shall conform with the setback height, and coverage requirements set forth in §§ 153.050 through 153.057.
- (C) No accessory building or structure shall be used for human habitation, except in accordance with regulations set forth in this chapter for Accessory Dwelling Units ~~accessory living quarters~~.
- (D) The area of all accessory buildings shall be considered in calculating building coverage.
- (E) ...
- (F) ...
- (G) ...
- (H) ...
- (I) ...
- (J) Setback requirements shall be as contained in § 153.047, except as modified in division (G) of this section as to livestock.
- (K) (1) The gross floor area of any accessory building shall not exceed 1,500 square feet, except barns and stables, which shall not exceed 2,500 square feet unless the barn or stable is located in the OS or SCP Districts, where barns may not exceed 3,000 square feet.  
  
(2)...
- (L) The maximum height of any accessory building shall be limited to one story and shall not exceed 11 feet from the exterior grade to the highest ceiling plate height and shall not exceed 17 feet from the exterior grade to the highest point on the structure, except barns and stables, which shall not exceed a maximum 24-foot height, and covered equestrian areas, which shall not exceed a maximum 30-foot height, measured from the exterior grade to the highest point on the structure, and except for any structures existing on the date of passage of the amendment codified in this division.

**§ 153.050 SETBACK REQUIREMENTS, EXCEPTIONS**

(A) *Requirements...*

(B) *Exceptions...*

(1)...

(2)...

(3)...

(4)...

(5) No setback shall be required for an existing garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a setback of no more than five feet or the setback of the existing garage, whichever is greater, from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an Accessory

Dwelling Unit that is constructed above an attached garage, as long as access and egress requirements as prescribed by the Building Code and WMC height requirements are met.

(6.5) ...

(7.6) ...

**§ 153.117 MINIMUM NUMBER OF REQUIRED AUTOMOBILE PARKING SPACES**

(A) The number of off-road parking spaces required shall be as set forth in the following table, except that additional spaces may be required as a condition of any conditional use permit when the Planning Commission finds that the characteristics of the particular use require additional parking.

<i>Use</i>	<i>Parking Spaces Required</i>
Dwellings, main	4 for each unit, minimum
<del>Accessory Dwelling Units</del> <del>accessory living quarters</del>	1 for each <u>Accessory Dwelling Unit</u> . (See Section 153.026(B)(1)(b) for exceptions.)
Churches and other houses of worship	2 for each 5 seats in the main worship unit. For fixed seating, each 20 horizontal inches shall be counted as one seat
Elementary schools	2 for each classroom, plus one for each 100 square feet in the auditorium or any space used for assembly
Places of assembly without fixed seats	1 for each 100 square feet of floor area used for assembly
Places of assembly with fixed seats not otherwise provided for in this section	1 for each 3 seats. Each 20 horizontal inches of such seating shall be counted as 1 seat
Retail and consumer service establishments	1 for each 150 square feet of floor area, plus one for every three employees
Medical and dental clinics	5 spaces for each doctor
Banks and business and professional offices	1 for each 200 square feet of floor area, plus 1 for every 3 employees
Establishments for the sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages, food or refreshments	1 for each 2 ½ seats, stools, or standing spaces

**§ 153.221 REQUIRED REVIEW**

(B) No building or other permit shall be issued by the Town for buildings, structures, or uses until approval from the required reviewing bodies is obtained in accordance with §§ 153.220 and 153.227(C) pursuant to the table below.

(C) When a project includes multiple components and levels of review, the highest review required shall be the final decision-making body for the project.

(D) Project size and scope shall be considered cumulatively for architectural and site review when Building Permits are open, except for Accessory Dwelling Units.

(E) The square footage of proposed Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be included in the square footage review threshold in the table below.

[Revisions to Table on pp. XV-164 and XV-165.]

	Staff	Architectural and Site Review Administrator	Architectural and Site Review Board		Planning Commission
			Conceptual	Formal	
Other:					
Accessory Living Quarters Dwelling Unit, if no Planning Commission entitlement is required (§ 153.026)	X	X			
Accessory Living Quarters Dwelling Unit, if a Planning Commission entitlement is required	X	X			X

**153.300 LIMITATIONS ON MODIFICATIONS**

- (A) ...
- (B) ...

(C) *Nonconforming structures or buildings.*

- (1) Nonconforming structures or buildings shall not be altered in any way that would increase or create an additional nonconforming attribute, except as allowed by § 153.301.
- (2) In CC zoning districts, nonconforming structures or buildings may be altered as provided in this subchapter to accommodate any permitted use, or conditional use allowed in that district.
- (3) In R-1, SR, RR, and all SCP and all OS districts, nonconforming structures or buildings may be altered as provided in this subchapter, only if such alteration does not result in a change of use, other than ministerial conversion of nonconforming structures or buildings to an Accessory Dwelling Units, of the nonconforming portion of the building or structure, unless it is determined by the Planning Commission that:
  - (a) The proposed new use will conform to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
  - (b) The proposed new use will not create adverse impacts on adjacent properties or properties across a public or private roadway, including but not limited to, impacts related to privacy, noise, odors, parking and traffic; ~~and~~
  - (c) The proposed new use will not negatively impact development potential on adjacent properties by, including, but not limited to, encroaching into the required separation

of structures; or impacting the ability to house or maintain livestock fowl and small animals; and

- (d) The Planning Director shall notify by first class mail, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property of the exception request, at least ten days prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

**§ 153.301 LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALTERATIONS, ADDITIONS, REPLACEMENT, OR PAVED AREA AND SURFACE COVERAGE**

(A) *Alterations.* Alterations to a nonconforming structure, including the complete rebuilding of such structures are allowed, provided they do not increase or create additional nonconforming attributes and all of the following conditions are met:

- (1) A Building Permit for the proposed alterations shall be obtained;
  - (a) Where alterations significantly modify the exterior of the structure, the architectural style and all other aspects of the structure shall be reviewed pursuant to §§ 153.220 through 153.231 and shall be approved in accordance with ordinances that would be applicable if the structure were to be constructed new or if the structure were conforming;
- (2) The footprint and plate heights of the nonconforming portions of the structure shall not be increased. Additionally, the overall height of the nonconforming portions shall not be increased above a maximum height of 17 feet;
- (3) An encroachment permit has been granted for any structure or building located within the Town's road right-of-way; and
- (4) If the structure is for human habitation, the structure shall not be located in:
  - (a) A flood hazard zone,
  - (b) An earthquake fault setback zone, or
  - (c) A landslide as defined on the Town's geologic map or an otherwise identified landslide, unless the location of such structures shall be permitted by the Town Engineer in his/her sole discretion.
- (5) Notwithstanding the above, if the alteration involves the relocation of a building that is deemed to qualify for the California Register of Historical Resources, and the purpose of the relocation is for restoration consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards, the qualifying building may be placed on any lot despite exceeding the maximum size limitations; provided all other provisions of this chapter are met, and the building was originally built in and is currently located in Woodside.

(B) *Additions.*

- (1) Additions to a nonconforming structure or building are prohibited unless such additions shall conform to the provisions of all applicable ordinances, including, but not limited to, those ordinances prescribing setbacks and height limits.
- (2) Notwithstanding the provisions of division (B)(1) above, an exception to permit an addition to a nonconforming main residence to encroach into a setback may be granted by the Planning Director, provided all of the following are satisfied:
  - (a) The total floor area of the encroaching portion of the addition to the nonconforming main residence shall not exceed 10% of the maximum house size allowed for the lot on which the nonconforming main residence is located;
  - (b) The total area of the nonconforming main residence after the addition is made shall not exceed 95% of the maximum house size allowed for the lot on which the nonconforming main residence is located;
  - (c) No part of the proposed additions(s) shall encroach into the setback to a greater extent than the furthest encroachment of the nonconforming main residence prior to the addition, or so as to create a side setback of less than ten feet or a rear setback of less than 17 feet.
  - (d) The addition that extends into the setback shall not exceed a 17-foot overall height maximum as measured from natural or finished grade, whichever is lower;
  - (e) The addition shall conform to all applicable ordinances and regulations except those relating to setback; ~~and~~
  - (f) The existing setback encroachment was not created through a variance granted by the Town;
  - (g) In the R-1 zoning district, the new encroachments of the addition are limited to the front setback area; and
  - (h) Appropriate landscape screening shall be installed, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director.
- (3) The Planning Director has notified, by first class mail, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property of the exception request, at least 10 days prior to the Planning Director's final determination.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2018-593**

ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE AMENDING MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 153 (ZONING), TO INCLUDE PROVISIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF, AND ADEQUATE INGRESS/EGRESS FOR, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU'S) ABOVE GARAGES AND WITHIN BARNES (FILE NO. **ZOAM2017-0006**).

**WHEREAS**, in 2016, the Town Council requested that staff continue to make minor changes to the Municipal Code to remove barriers for small development projects, which would not result in adverse impacts;

**WHEREAS**, Town staff has identified Zoning Code amendments needed to clarify the allowable development of ADU's above existing garages and within barns;

**WHEREAS**, the current Zoning Code is silent with respect to the provision of adequate ingress/egress for ADU's constructed above existing garages, an ADU type supported by new State law and the Town's State-compliant ADU ordinance, thus creating an implementation challenge;

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodside is committed to inclusive public participation and involvement in matters pertaining to the General Plan and its Elements, and the Zoning Code;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission recommends that the Town Council find that the adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) (no possibility that the activity may have a significant impact on the environment), of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations);

**WHEREAS**, on October 4, 2017, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to initiate the amendment of Municipal Code Chapter 153, at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Planning Commission for their review and consideration; and it requested additional information from staff;

**WHEREAS**, on October 18, 2017, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to initiate the amendment of Municipal Code Chapter 153, at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Planning Commission for their review and consideration; and it reviewed the additional information requested from staff;

**WHEREAS**, on October 18, 2017, the Planning Commission approved a Resolution of Intent and recommendation to the Town Council (PC Resolution No. 2017-035) to include provisions for the development of, and adequate ingress/egress for, accessory dwelling units (ADU's) above garages and within barns;

**WHEREAS**, on December 12, 2017, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to

the Town Council for this review and consideration, and the Town Council directed staff to study the matter further, and return with additional information; and

**WHEREAS**, on February 13, 2018, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing (study session) at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Town Council for this review and consideration, and the Town Council directed staff to make further refinements to the draft ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 13, 2018, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Town Council for this review and consideration, and provided a first reading and introduction of this ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 27, 2018, the Town Council conducted a public meeting, and provided a second reading of this ordinance.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside to amend the Woodside Municipal Code as follows:

**SECTION ONE: FINDINGS.**

The Town Council finds that the proposed code amendments clarify the allowable development of ADU's above existing garages and within barns;

The Town Council finds that the proposed code amendments include provisions for adequate ingress/egress for ADU's constructed above existing garages, an ADU type supported by new State law and the Town's State-compliant ADU ordinance, thus resolving a current implementation challenge;

The Town Council finds the changes to the Municipal Code consistent with the current General Plan; and,

The Town Council finds that based on the findings above and the Town Council Staff Reports of December 12, 2017, February 13, 2018, and March 13, 2018, the adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) (no possibility that the activity may have a significant impact on the environment), of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations).

**SECTION TWO: AMENDMENT.** Chapter 153 of the Municipal Code is amended as follows as identified by underlined and ~~strikethrough~~ text:

**§ 153.206 FLOOR AREA.**

**TABLE F-1: Floor Area Exclusion and Credits**

<i>Feature</i>	<i>Multiplier</i>
Dormers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Up to 25 square feet of an individual dormer</li> <li>- Greater than 25 square feet of an individual dormer</li> </ul> If the total length of dormers on a roof section is more than 30% of the length of that roof section, Floor Area shall be calculated based on Plate heights measured to the dormers, per Table F.	0.00  1.00
Dormers (for ADU’s above detached garages, pursuant to § 153.211 and § 153.110): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Up to 50% of the length of the roof</li> </ul>	0.00

**§ 153.211 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS.**

All Accessory Dwelling Units, whether internal, attached to, or detached from the Main Dwelling unit, shall conform to the following requirements:

(A) Requirements applicable to all Accessory Dwelling Units:

(1) *Building and Fire Safety.* Conformance with all applicable building, housing, zoning, and site development laws, codes, and regulations shall be required, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be required to provide fire sprinklers if they are not required for the primary residence and may employ alternative methods for fire protection.

(2) *Parking and Driveway Access.* Off-road parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of §§ 153.221 through 153.225, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units; and specifically as follows:

(a) *Parking Requirements.* Parking requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units shall be one parking space per Accessory Dwelling Unit. Off-street parking shall be permitted in Setback areas in locations determined by the Town, or through tandem parking, unless specific findings are made that parking in Setback areas or tandem parking is not feasible based upon specific site or regional topographic or fire and life safety conditions.

(b) *Parking Waiver.* Parking is not required in the following instances:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one-half mile of public transit, including transit stations and bus stations;

2. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within an architecturally and historically significant historic district;

3. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is part of the existing primary residence or an existing Accessory Structure;

4. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located in an area where parking permits are required, but are not offered to the occupant of the Accessory Dwelling Unit; or

5. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one block of a car share vehicle.

(c) *Replacement Parking*: When a Garage, Carport, or covered parking Structure is demolished or converted in conjunction with the construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Town requires that those parking spaces be replaced. The replacement spaces may be located in any configuration on the same Lot as the Accessory Dwelling Unit, including but not limited to, as covered spaces, uncovered spaces, or tandem spaces, or by the use of mechanical automobile parking lifts.

(d) *Driveway Access*. Any Lots that have two or more existing permitted Driveways shall use the Principal Access Driveway as the primary access to any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Any additional existing Driveways other than the Principal Access Driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Pursuant to Municipal Code § 151.44, a Second Driveway Exception shall not be granted if the second Driveway is the primary access for a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit.

(3) *Design Review*. All plans for Accessory Dwelling Units shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Director. In addition, all plans for the new construction or exterior modification of Accessory Dwelling Units shall also, prior to the issuance of any permit, be subject to review according to § 153.912. In considering architectural review, the Planning Director shall be required to find that the Accessory Dwelling Units are subordinate to the Main Dwelling, and compatible with the neighboring property and Uses in Height, bulk, location, appearance, color, materials, and landscaping.

(4) *General Accessory Structure Regulations*. All requirements related to Accessory Buildings contained in this Chapter, including, but not limited to: Height, Setbacks, Floor Area, lot coverage, and landscaping shall apply.

(5) *Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed*. No more than two Accessory Dwelling Units, including Accessory Dwelling Units in Barns, are permitted on a Parcel. For Parcels equal to or greater than 1.0 acre in size, but less than 1.5 acres in size, a maximum of one detached and one attached Accessory Dwelling Units shall be permitted. For Parcels less than 1.0 acre in size, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, whether attached or detached, shall be permitted. In the R-1 District, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit is permitted, and detached Accessory Dwelling Units may only be permitted if the Lot Area is at least 20,000 square feet.

(6) *Attached Accessory Dwelling Units*. The Floor Area of an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not exceed 50% of the size of the main residence, including the Accessory Dwelling Unit, or 1,500 square feet, whichever is less.

(7) *Detached Accessory Dwelling Units.* The Floor Area of a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit, including the Floor Area of any attached Garage, shall not exceed 1,500 square feet.

(8) *Basement Accessory Dwelling Units.* Basement area used for an Accessory Dwelling Unit, or a portion thereof, shall be limited to the unit sizes prescribed in divisions (A)(6) and (A)(7) of this section.

(9) *Rental Accessory Dwelling Units.* Accessory Dwelling Units which are rented shall not be rented for less than 30 consecutive days.

(10) *Existing Garages converted to Accessory Dwelling Units.* No Setback shall be required for an existing Garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a Setback of no more than 5 feet or the Setback of the existing Garage, whichever is greater, from the side and Rear Lot Lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a Garage, as long as access and egress requirements, as prescribed by the Building Code and Municipal Code Height requirements are met.

(11) *Processing Requirements:*

(a) *Accessory Dwelling Units within an Existing Structure.* An Accessory Dwelling Unit within an Existing Structure (including the primary Structure, attached or detached Garage, or other Accessory Structure) shall be permitted ministerially with a Building Permit, and within 120 days of application, in compliance with other standards within the Chapter, if complying with the following codes and requirements:

1. Building and safety codes;
  2. Independent exterior access from the existing residence;
  3. Sufficient Side and Rear Setbacks for fire safety, as set forth in the Building Code;
- and,
4. A minimum 5' Setback for a second-story Accessory Dwelling Unit above an existing nonconforming garage.

(5) Construction of a new access stair a minimum of five feet from the side or rear property line, or the existing setback, whichever is greater, to access a new ADU built above an existing, legal nonconforming garage is allowed. Additionally, the Planning Director will review the design of such an access stair to ensure that: an access stair cannot be accommodated within the existing nonconforming garage because it would reduce the parking in the garage to less than two spaces or would eliminate the only feasible required parking on site. An existing garage located at the required setback shall be allowed an access stair which may encroach a maximum of five feet into the required setback.

(b) *Denial.* In order to deny an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Planning Director shall find that the Accessory Dwelling Unit would be detrimental to the public health and safety or

would introduce unreasonable privacy impacts to the immediate neighbors.

(B) *Requirements applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units within Barns.* In addition to the requirements applicable to all Accessory Dwelling Units, any such Accessory Dwelling Units located within Barns shall conform to the following additional requirements:

(1) No more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit within a Barn shall be permitted on a Parcel with the following exception: up to two Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted within a Barn located on a property containing a Town-approved Professional Stable. Such additional Accessory Dwelling Units shall only be permitted after approval of a Conditional Use permit by the Planning Commission, in accordance with applicable Conditional Use permit procedures.

(2) The Floor Area of the Accessory Dwelling Unit within a Barn shall be no greater than 50% of the Footprint area of the barn, or 1,200 square feet, whichever is less.

(3) The Accessory Dwelling Unit and the Barn shall contain an automatic fire sprinkler system, and the Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be separated from the other portions of the Barn with a one-hour firewall, in accordance with the Town's Building Code.

(4) An Accessory Dwelling Unit in a barn may be located on either a first or second floor, of that portion of the barn adheres to required setbacks.

#### **§ 153.110 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE**

...

(C) Development standards and requirements.

(1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, all MFRD projects shall be subject to the goals policies, standards and requirements of the General Plan.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the applicant shall designate a "MFRD lot" or "MFRD lots" as the site(s) of the MFRD. Each "MFRD lot" may be a legal parcel, or it may be a portion of a legal parcel within the defined Cañada College campus that will accommodate MFRD. Each "MFRD lot shall not include any other buildings, or uses such as parking or open space that supports other buildings not on the MFRD lot.

(3) The following standards shall be met by any proposed MFRD (see Table A: MFRD Development Standards):

(a) *Lot dimensions.* Lots accommodating MFRD shall be no less than 75 feet in any dimension.

(b) *Lot coverage.* No more than 60% of the lot shall be covered by buildings.

(c) *Unit density.* The minimum unit count on the lot shall be at least one unit per 4,500 square feet of lot area. The maximum unit count on the lot shall be no more than one unit per 2,400 square feet.

(d) *Building height.* No residential structure shall exceed 35 feet in height, and no accessory structure shall exceed 17 feet in height.

(e) *Setback requirements.* For the purposes of this section, setbacks shall be measured from 1) the legal parcel boundary, 2) the edge of the "MFRD lot"

defined in division (C)(2) of this Section, or 3) the edge of any internal roadway on the Cañada College site, whichever is more restrictive. The Planning Director shall determine the location of the front, side, and rear setbacks.

1. Required front-yard setbacks: Front yards shall have a minimum setback of 15 feet, and provide further that no garage or carport space shall have its entrance located within 20 feet of any property or “MFRD lot”.

2. Required side-yard setbacks:

a. Side-yard setback: Side yards shall have a minimum setback of six feet, provided that the horizontal distance to the side lot line of any point on any building face shall not be less than one-half its height above the side lot line.

b. Wherever a main entrance to a building containing three or more units opens into an interior side yard, the minimum side-yard setback shall be 15 feet to the entrance of that portion of the building.

c. Exterior side yards. Wherever a side yard is adjacent to a street, such side yard shall have a minimum yard setback of 15 feet.

d. Multiple-story dwellings and additions: Multiple-story structures shall maintain a minimum side yard of 25% of the lot depth or 35 feet, whichever is less. Remaining portions of a multiple-story structure shall have a minimum setback equal to one half the height measured at the plateline or ridge beam, whichever is highest.

e. For Accessory Dwelling Units, no setback shall be required for an existing garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a setback of no more than five feet from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a garage. See § 153.211(A)(11)(5) for setback exception provision for access stairs for Accessory Dwelling Units above garages.

3. Required rear-yard setbacks: Rear yard setbacks shall have a minimum yard setback of 20 feet.

(a) Minimum pervious area and stormwater requirements. A minimum of 20% of each lot shall be pervious area, to be composed of landscaping, vegetated open space, or natural state.

(b) Required pervious area in front yard. A minimum of 60% of the area of the front yard shall be pervious area, primarily comprised of pervious landscaped material. Area devoted to public sidewalks shall not be included in the calculations.

(c) MFRD projects may deviate from the standards in this division (C)(3) of this section if it is determined by the Planning Commission that the project requires deviations in order to promote the most appropriate use and design, and if the other requirements of this section are met.

Table A: MFRD Development Standards

<i>Regulation</i>	<i>Requirement</i>			
<b>Lot Dimensions</b>	75 feet minimum (in any dimension)			
<b>Lot Coverage</b>	60% of lot (maximum)			
<b>Unit Density</b>	Minimum		Maximum	
	1 unit/4,500 sq. ft.		1 unit/2,400 sq. ft.	
<b>Building Height</b>	Main Structure		Accessory Structure	
	35 ft. maximum		17 ft. maximum	
<b>Front-Yard Setbacks</b>	Main Structure		Garages/Carports	
	15 ft. minimum		20 ft. minimum	
<b>Side-Yard Setbacks</b>	Interior Side Yard	Where Main Entrance Opens Onto Side Yard	Exterior Side Yard	Multiple Story Side Yard
	Minimum is 6 ft. or ½ of building height	15 ft. minimum	15 ft. minimum	Minimum setback is required for 25% of lot depth or 35 ft., whichever is less; Remainder shall be setback ½ of building height at plateline or ridge beam, whichever is higher
<b>Rear-Yard Setbacks</b>	20 ft. minimum			
<b><u>Setbacks for Accessory Dwelling Units on MFRD lots</u></b>	No setback shall be required for an existing garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a setback of no more than five feet from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a garage. See § 153.211(A)(11)(5) for setback exception provision for access stairs for Accessory Dwelling Units above garages.			
<b>Pervious Area</b>	Total Lot	Front Yard		
	20% of lot minimum	60% of yard minimum		
<b>Parking</b>	1 space per bedroom			
<b><u>Parking for Accessory</u></b>	Shall not exceed one parking space per Accessory Dwelling Unit. These spaces may be provided as tandem parking, including on an existing			

<b><u>Dwelling Units on MFRD lots</u></b>	driveway or in setback areas, excluding the non-driveway front yard setbacks. Parking is not required when the Accessory Dwelling Unit is located: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• within ½ mile of public transit, including transit stations and bus stations;</li> <li>• within an architecturally and historically significant district;</li> <li>• when on-street parking permits are required but not offered to the occupant of the accessory dwelling unit; or,</li> <li>• when there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the Accessory Dwelling Units.</li> </ul>
---	--

...

(D) *Evaluation criteria.* The evaluation criteria for reviews of MFRD by the ASRB and Planning Commission shall be as follows:

(1) The criterion enumerated in § 153.220 shall apply, except that criterion 1.4 entitled “Equestrian Lifestyle” shall not apply and criterion 1.1 entitled “Rural Character and Community Aesthetics” shall be interpreted with the understanding that MFRD projects are typically multi-story buildings.

(2) The chosen architectural style shall be applied in its simplest form.

(3) Project design, massing, and color shall be chosen with consideration for visibility from Interstate 280.

(E) *Review process.* MFRD development in the Canada College Residential Overlay Zone shall be reviewed by the Town following the process outlined in § 153.221 and the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines, and shall include both conceptual review by the ASRB, as well as formal review by both the ASRB and the Planning Commission, except for the conversion of existing space for an Accessory Dwelling Units, and/or construction of a new addition or structure for an Accessory Dwelling Units, which shall be by the Planning Director.

(F) *Findings.* In addition to the findings required by §153.221 and the Town’s Residential Design Guidelines, the ASRB and Planning Commission shall make all of the findings required by §153.251 for use permits.

(G) *Amendment of an approved MFRD.* Any change to an approved MFRD, shall be processed and reviewed following the same evaluation criteria and process described for MFRD review and approval in division (D) and (E) of this section, except for the conversion of existing space for an Accessory Dwelling Units, and/or construction of a new addition or structure for an Accessory Dwelling Units, which shall be by the Planning Director.

**§ 153.236 LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALTERATIONS, ADDITIONS, REPLACEMENT, OR PAVED AREA AND SURFACE COVERAGE**

(A) *Alterations.* Alterations to a nonconforming structure, including the complete rebuilding of such structures are allowed, provided they do not increase or create additional nonconforming attributes and all of the following conditions are met:

- (1) A Building Permit for the proposed alterations shall be obtained;
  - (a) Where alterations significantly modify the exterior of the structure, the architectural style and all other aspects of the structure shall be reviewed pursuant to §§ 153.911 through 153.918 and shall be approved in accordance with ordinances that would be applicable if the structure were to be constructed new or if the structure were conforming;
- (2) The footprint and plate heights of the nonconforming portions of the structure shall not be increased; with the exception that the plate height of an Accessory Dwelling Unit constructed above an existing, nonconforming garage, may be increased to a maximum of 11 feet. Additionally, the overall height of the nonconforming portions shall not be increased above a maximum height of 17 feet;
- (3) An encroachment permit has been granted for any structure or building located within the Town's road right-of-way; and
- (4) If the structure is for human habitation, the structure shall not be located in:
  - (a) A flood hazard zone,
  - (b) An earthquake fault setback zone, or
  - (c) A landslide as defined on the Town's geologic map or an otherwise identified landslide, unless the location of such structures shall be permitted by the Town Engineer in his/her sole discretion.
- (5) Notwithstanding the above, if the alteration involves the relocation of a building that is deemed to qualify for the California Register of Historical Resources, and the purpose of the relocation is for restoration consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards, the qualifying building may be placed on any lot despite exceeding the maximum size limitations; provided all other provisions of this chapter are met, and the building was originally built in and is currently located in Woodside.

(B) *Additions.*

- (1) Additions to a nonconforming structure or building are prohibited unless such additions shall conform to the provisions of all applicable ordinances, including, but not limited to, those ordinances prescribing setbacks and height limits.
- (2) Notwithstanding the provisions of division (B)(1) above, an exception to permit an addition to a nonconforming main residence to encroach into a setback may be granted by the Planning Director, provided all of the following are satisfied:
  - (a) The total floor area of the encroaching portion of the addition to the nonconforming main residence shall not exceed 10% of the maximum house size allowed for the lot on which the nonconforming main residence is located;
  - (b) The total area of the nonconforming main residence after the addition is made shall not exceed 95% of the maximum house size allowed for the lot on which the nonconforming main residence is located;
  - (c) No part of the proposed additions(s) shall encroach into the setback to a greater extent than the furthest encroachment of the nonconforming main residence prior to the addition, or so as to create a side setback of less than ten feet or a rear setback of less than 17 feet.
  - (d) The addition that extends into the setback shall not exceed a 17-foot overall height maximum as measured from natural or finished grade, whichever is lower;
  - (e) The addition shall conform to all applicable ordinances and regulations except those relating to setback;
  - (f) The existing setback encroachment was not created through a variance granted by the Town;
  - (g) In the R-1 zoning district, the new encroachments of the addition are limited to the front setback area; and
  - (h) Appropriate landscape screening shall be installed, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director.
- (3) The Planning Director has notified, by first class mail, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property of the exception request, at least 10 days prior to the Planning Director's final determination

**SECTION THREE:** In the event that any provision of this ordinance is in conflict with any other ordinance of the Town of Woodside or the Woodside Municipal Code, the provisions of this ordinance shall prevail.

**SECTION FOUR:** If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of the Ordinance or any part thereof. The Town Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective.


**SECTION FIVE:** Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after its final passage.

**SECTION SIX:** The Town Clerk shall cause this Ordinance to be published in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.

\* \* \* \* \*

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance is a full, true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 2017- 593 of the Town of Woodside entitled as above; that it was introduced on the 13<sup>th</sup> of March, 2018, and was passed and adopted by the Town Council on the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 2018, by the following vote:

AYES,	Councilmembers:	Gordon, Livermore, Tanner, Yost, and Mayor Shaw
NOES,	Councilmembers:	None
ABSENT,	Councilmembers:	Kasten
ABSTAIN,	Councilmembers:	None

  
Clerk of the Town of Woodside

APPROVED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor of the Town of Woodside

**ORDINANCE NO. 2018-597**

ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE TO AMEND CHAPTER 153 (ZONING) OF THE WOODSIDE MUNICIPAL CODE (WMC) TO ADD PROVISIONS FOR EFFICIENCY ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (EADUs) (FILE NO. **ZOAM2018-0002**).

**WHEREAS**, on September 28, 2016, the Governor signed into law AB2406, concerning Junior ADUs (JADUs);

**WHEREAS**, this legislation is designed to: encourage a small ADU type which can be readily created from a converted portion of an existing residence, streamline the approval process for Junior ADUs, remove barriers to their construction, and provide more affordable housing units and choices in the State of California;

**WHEREAS**, AB2406 allows for voluntary, rather than mandated, adoption;

**WHEREAS**, on April 3, 2018, the Town Council supported the exploration of Junior ADU regulations, and directed staff to proceed to the Planning Commission for further study;

**WHEREAS**, on April 18, 2018, May 16, 2018, and June 20, 2018, the Planning Commission held study sessions on Junior ADUs, at which it heard public comment, had discussion, and weighed the advantages and disadvantages of the various parameters for JADUs set forth in AB2406; a full record of which is on file with the Town of Woodside;

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodside is committed to inclusive public participation and involvement in matters pertaining to the General Plan and its Elements, and the Zoning Code;

**WHEREAS**, on July 25, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to initiate the amendment of Municipal Code Chapter 153, Zoning, as it pertains to text changes related to JADUs (renamed to Efficiency ADUs to distinguish from all State regulations pertaining to JADUs with full adoption of AB 2406), at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Planning Commission for their review and consideration;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission recommends that the Town Council find that the adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) (no possibility that the activity may have a significant impact on the environment), of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations);

**WHEREAS**, on July 25, 2018, the Planning Commission adopted a Resolution of Intention and recommendation to the Town Council (PC Resolution 2018-025) to amend Chapter 153 (Zoning) of the Woodside Municipal Code (WMC) to codify new provisions for Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Units (EADUs), the preferred descriptor for Town of Woodside JADUs, with increased flexibility beyond AB2406, as detailed in **Exhibit A**;

**WHEREAS**, on September 11, 2018, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which time all oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Town Council for its review and consideration, and provided a first reading and introduction of this ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, on September 25, 2018, the Town Council conducted a public meeting, and provided a second reading of this ordinance.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside to amend the Woodside Municipal Code as follows:

**SECTION ONE:** The Town Council finds that the Municipal Code amendments set forth herein is consistent with the General Plan of the Town of Woodside and is required for the public convenience and to achieve the health, safety, and welfare of the Town of Woodside.

**SECTION TWO:** Chapter 153, Zoning, of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended pursuant to **Exhibit A**.

**SECTION THREE:** In the event that any provision of this ordinance is in conflict with any other ordinances of the Town of Woodside or the Woodside Municipal Code, the provisions of this ordinance shall prevail.

**SECTION FOUR:** If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of the Ordinance or any part thereof. The Town Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective.

**SECTION FIVE:** Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after its final passage.

**SECTION SIX:** The Town Clerk shall cause this Ordinance to be published in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.

\* \* \* \* \*

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance is a full, true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 2018-597 of the Town of Woodside entitled as above; that it was introduced on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September, 2018, and was passed and adopted by the Town Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September, 2018, by the following vote:

AYES, Councilmembers: Gordon, Kasten, Livermore, Tanner, Yost, and Mayor Shaw  
NOES, Councilmembers: None  
ABSENT, Councilmembers: None  
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

  
Clerk of the Town of Woodside

APPROVED:

  
Mayor of the Town of Woodside

**Attachments**  
Exhibit A

**§ 153.211 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS.**

All Accessory Dwelling Units, whether internal, attached to, or detached from the Main Dwelling unit, shall conform to the following requirements:

**(A) Requirements applicable to all Accessory Dwelling Units:**

(1) *Building and Fire Safety.* Conformance with all applicable building, housing, zoning, and site development laws, codes, and regulations shall be required, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units. Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be required to provide fire sprinklers if they are not required for the primary residence and may employ alternative methods for fire protection.

(2) *Parking and Driveway Access.* Off-road parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of §§ 153.221 through 153.225, as applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units; and specifically as follows:

(a) *Parking Requirements.* Parking requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units shall be one parking space per Accessory Dwelling Unit. Off-street parking shall be permitted in Setback areas in locations determined by the Town, or through tandem parking, unless specific findings are made that parking in Setback areas or tandem parking is not feasible based upon specific site or regional topographic or fire and life safety conditions.

(b) *Parking Waiver.* Parking is not required in the following instances:

1. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one-half mile of public transit, including transit stations and bus stations;

2. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within an architecturally and historically significant historic district;

3. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is part of the existing primary residence or an existing Accessory Structure;

4. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located in an area where parking permits are required, but are not offered to the occupant of the Accessory Dwelling Unit; or

5. The Accessory Dwelling Unit is located within one block of a car share vehicle.

(c) *Replacement Parking:* When a Garage, Carport, or covered parking Structure is demolished or converted in conjunction with the construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Town requires that those parking spaces be replaced. The replacement spaces may be located in any configuration on the same Lot as the Accessory Dwelling Unit, including but not limited to, as covered spaces, uncovered spaces, or tandem spaces, or by the use of mechanical automobile parking lifts.

(d) Baseline Parking: Regardless of the parking requirement for any Accessory Dwelling Unit, the parking requirement for the main residence must be met to develop any Accessory Dwelling Unit.

*(e) Driveway Access.* Any Lots that have two or more existing permitted Driveways shall use the Principal Access Driveway as the primary access to any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Any additional existing Driveways other than the Principal Access Driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit. Pursuant to Municipal Code § 151.44, a Second Driveway Exception shall not be granted if the second Driveway is the primary access for a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit.

*(3) Design Review.* All plans for Accessory Dwelling Units shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Director. In addition, all plans for the new construction or exterior modification of Accessory Dwelling Units shall also, prior to the issuance of any permit, be subject to review according to § 153.912. In considering architectural review, the Planning Director shall be required to find that the Accessory Dwelling Units are subordinate to the Main Dwelling, and compatible with the neighboring property and Uses in Height, bulk, location, appearance, color, materials, and landscaping.

*(4) General Accessory Structure Regulations.* All requirements related to Accessory Buildings contained in this Chapter, including, but not limited to: Height, Setbacks, Floor Area, lot coverage, and landscaping shall apply.

*(5) Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed.* No more than two Accessory Dwelling Units, including Accessory Dwelling Units in Barns, are permitted on a Parcel. For Parcels equal to or greater than 1.5 acres in size, a maximum of two Accessory Dwellings Units, whether attached or detached, shall be permitted. For Parcels equal to or greater than 1.0 acre in size, but less than 1.5 acres in size, a maximum of one detached and one attached Accessory Dwelling Units shall be permitted. For Parcels less than 1.0 acre in size, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit accessory living quarters, whether attached or detached, shall be permitted. In the R-1 District, no more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit is permitted, and detached Accessory Dwelling Units may only be permitted if the Lot Area is at least 20,000 square feet. Further restrictions apply to Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Units, see to § 153.912(C)(1).

**TABLE L: Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed**

<u><i>Parcel Size or Zoning</i></u>	<u><i>Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed</i></u>
<u>Equal to, or greater than, 1.5 acres</u>	<u>A maximum of two, whether attached or detached.</u>
<u>Equal to, or greater than, 1.0 acre; but less than 1.5 acres</u>	<u>A maximum of one detached and one attached.</u>
<u>Less than 1.0 acre</u>	<u>No more than one, whether attached or detached.</u>

<u>In the R-1 District</u>	<u>No more than one, and detached may only be permitted if the Lot Area is at least 20,000 square feet.</u>
----------------------------	---

(6) *Attached Accessory Dwelling Units.* The Floor Area of an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not exceed 50% of the size of the main residence, including the Accessory Dwelling Unit, or 1,500 square feet, whichever is less.

(7) *Detached Accessory Dwelling Units.* The Floor Area of a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit, including the Floor Area of any attached Garage, shall not exceed 1,500 square feet.

(8) *Basement Accessory Dwelling Units.* Basement area used for an Accessory Dwelling Unit, or a portion thereof, shall be limited to the unit sizes prescribed in divisions (A)(6) and (A)(7) of this section.

(9) *Rental Accessory Dwelling Units.* Accessory Dwelling Units which are rented shall not be rented for less than 30 consecutive days.

(10) *Existing Garages converted to Accessory Dwelling Units.* No Setback shall be required for an existing Garage that is converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and a Setback of no more than 5 feet or the Setback of the existing Garage, whichever is greater, from the side and Rear Lot Lines shall be required for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is constructed above a Garage, as long as access and egress requirements, as prescribed by the Building Code and Municipal Code Height requirements are met.

(11) *Processing Requirements:*

(a) *Accessory Dwelling Units within an Existing Structure.* An Accessory Dwelling Unit within an Existing Structure (including the primary Structure, attached or detached Garage, or other Accessory Structure) shall be permitted ministerially with a Building Permit, and within 120 days of application, in compliance with other standards within the Chapter, if complying with the following codes and requirements:

1. Building and safety codes;
2. Independent exterior access from the existing residence;
3. Sufficient Side and Rear Setbacks for fire safety, as set forth in the Building Code;
4. A minimum 5' Setback for a second-story Accessory Dwelling Unit above an existing nonconforming garage; and,
5. Construction of a new access stair a minimum of five feet from the side or rear property line, or the existing setback, whichever is greater, to access a new ADU built above an existing, legal nonconforming garage is allowed. Additionally, the Planning Director will review the design of such an access stair to ensure that: an access stair cannot be accommodated within

the existing nonconforming garage because it would reduce the parking in the garage to less than two spaces or would eliminate the only feasible required parking on site. An existing garage located at the required setback shall be allowed an access stair which may encroach a maximum of five feet into the required setback.

(b) *Denial.* In order to deny an Accessory Dwelling Unit, the Planning Director shall find that the Accessory Dwelling Unit would be detrimental to the public health and safety or would introduce unreasonable privacy impacts to the immediate neighbors.

**(B) Requirements applicable to Accessory Dwelling Units within Barns.** In addition to the requirements applicable to all Accessory Dwelling Units, any such Accessory Dwelling Units located within Barns shall conform to the following additional requirements:

(1) No more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit within a Barn shall be permitted on a Parcel with the following exception: up to two Accessory Dwelling Units may be permitted within a Barn located on a property containing a Town-approved Professional Stable. Such additional Accessory Dwelling Units shall only be permitted after approval of a Conditional Use permit by the Planning Commission, in accordance with applicable Conditional Use permit procedures.

(2) The Floor Area of the Accessory Dwelling Unit within a Barn shall be no greater than 50% of the Footprint area of the barn, or 1,200 square feet, whichever is less.

(3) The Accessory Dwelling Unit and the Barn shall contain an automatic fire sprinkler system, and the Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be separated from the other portions of the Barn with a one-hour firewall, in accordance with the Town's Building Code.

(4) An Accessory Dwelling Unit in a Barn may be located on either a first or second floor, of that portion of the barn that adheres to required setbacks.

(Ord. 2017-589, effective 8-24-17; and Ord. 2018-593, effective 4-26-18)

**(C) Requirements applicable to Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Units.** Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Units, a unit that is no more than 500 square feet in size and contained entirely within an existing single-family structure, shall be allowed the following provisions and shall conform to the following requirements:

(1) Only one Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit is allowed per lot.

(2) Owner occupancy is required in any residence that contains an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit. The owner may reside in either the remaining portion of the structure or in the newly created Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit. Owner-occupancy shall not be required if the owner is a governmental agency, land trust, or housing organization.

(3) An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be constructed within the existing walls of the structure, and shall include an existing bedroom.

(4) An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit may include separate sanitation facilities, or may share sanitation facilities with the existing structure.

(5) An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit shall include a separate entrance from the main entrance to the structure, with an interior entry to the main living area. An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit may include a second interior doorway for sound attenuation.

(6) An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit shall have an Efficiency Kitchen, which shall include all of the following:

(a) A sink with a maximum waste line diameter of 1.5 inches;

(b) A cooking facility with appliances that do not require electrical service greater than 120 volts, or natural or propane gas; and,

(c) A food preparation counter and storage cabinets that are of reasonable size in relation to the size of the junior accessory dwelling unit.

(7) An Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit does not require additional parking, however, the main residence in which it is contained shall meet the Town parking requirement.

(8) This subdivision shall not be interpreted to prohibit the requirement of an inspection, including the imposition of a fee for that inspection, to determine whether the Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit is in compliance with applicable building standards.

(9) An application for a permit pursuant to this section shall, notwithstanding Section 65901 or 65906 or any local ordinance regulating the issuance of variances or special use permits, be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or a hearing. A permit shall be issued within 120 days of submission of an application for a permit pursuant to this section. A local agency may charge a fee to reimburse the local agency for costs incurred in connection with the issuance of a permit pursuant to this section.

(10) For the purposes of any fire or life protection ordinance or regulation an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit unit shall not be considered a separate or new dwelling unit. This section shall not be construed to prohibit a city, county, city and county, or other local public entity from adopting an ordinance or regulation relating to fire and life protection requirements within a single-family residence that contains an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit so long as the ordinance or regulation applies uniformly to all single-family residences within the zone regardless of whether the single-family residence includes an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit or not.

(11) For the purposes of providing service for water, sewer, or power, including a connection fee, an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not be considered a separate or new dwelling unit.

(12) This section shall not be construed to prohibit a local agency from adopting an ordinance or regulation, related to parking or a service or a connection fee for water, sewer, or power, that applies to a single-family residence that contains an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit, so long as that ordinance or regulation applies uniformly to all single-family residences regardless of whether the single-family residence includes an Efficiency Accessory Dwelling Unit.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2020 - 610**

ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE AMENDING WOODSIDE MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 151: SITE DEVELOPMENT; AND, CHAPTER 153: ZONING, RELATED TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU'S) TO BRING THE WOODSIDE MUNICIPAL CODE INTO COMPLIANCE WITH RECENTLY ENACTED STATE LEGISLATION (AB68, AB881, AND SB13), WHICH BECAME EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2020 (**ZOAM2020-0001**).

**WHEREAS**, the Woodside Municipal Code includes provisions regarding accessory dwelling units in compliance with State Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) law in effect through the end of 2019;

**WHEREAS**, in 2019, the California Legislature passed three bills regarding accessory dwelling units: Assembly Bill 68, Assembly Bill 881, and Senate Bill 13 (the "ADU Bills"), all of which took effect January 1, 2020;

**WHEREAS**, the ADU Bills amended existing requirements for accessory dwelling units, including the maximum setback allowed on new and existing structures, minimum parking requirements, minimum sizes for accessory dwelling units, ministerial approval for accessory dwelling units, and a shorter timeline for approval;

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodside needs to remain in compliance with State law;

**WHEREAS**, Municipal Code Chapters 151, Site Development, and 153, Zoning, provides definitions, development standards, access, and required reviews concerning ADU's which are now inconsistent with State law;

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodside is committed to inclusive public participation and involvement in matters pertaining to the General Plan and its Elements, and the Zoning Code;

**WHEREAS**, on February 19, 2020, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to initiate the amendment of Municipal Code Chapter 151, Site Development, and Chapter 153, Zoning, as it pertains to text changes related to ADU's, at which time oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Planning Commission for their review and consideration;

**WHEREAS**, on February 19, 2020, the Planning Commission adopted a Resolution of Intention and recommendation to the Town Council (PC Resolution 2020-001) to amend Chapters 151(Site Development) and 153 (Zoning) of the Woodside Municipal Code (WMC) to codify these amendments, as detailed below;

**WHEREAS**, on March 10, 2020, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which time all oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented

to the Town Council for its review and consideration, and the Town Council requested additional information and continued consideration of this ordinance to March 24, 2020; and,

**WHEREAS**, on March 17, 2020, a Covid-19 shelter in place order went into effect, and the Town Council continued the consideration of this ordinance until felt that the public was comfortable participating in online public hearings; and,

**WHEREAS**, on June 23, 2020, the Town Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which time all oral and written comments and a staff recommendation were presented to the Town Council for its review and consideration, and provided a first reading and introduction of this ordinance; and,

**WHEREAS**, on July 14, 2020, the Town Council conducted a public meeting, and provided a second reading of this ordinance.

**WHEREAS**, the Town Council finds that the adoption of this ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 21080.17 (CEQA is not applicable to local ordinances regulating the construction of Accessory Dwelling Units).

**IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED** by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside to amend the Woodside Municipal Code Chapters 151 and 153 of the Municipal Code, as identified by underlined and ~~strikethrough~~ text.

**SECTION ONE:** Chapter 151, Zoning, Sections 151.40(B), of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 151.40 - GRADING.

(A) **General.**

(1) All finished *grading* shall be blended with the *existing grade* to form a smooth transition where possible.

(2) *Cuts* and *fills* pursuant to §§ 151.20(A)(1) through 151.20(A)(10) shall be balanced on *site*, unless an exception is granted by the *Town Engineer* and *Planning Director*. *Basement grading* is exempt from this requirement.

(B) **Excavations.**

(1) **Steepness.** No surface *grading* shall be made with a *cut* face steeper than two horizontal to one vertical unless allowed by the *Town Engineer* and *Town Geologist* in accordance with the approved *grading* specifications.

(2) **Setback from property lines.** The tops and toes of all *cuts* and *fills* shall be at least ten feet from any property line, except for grading necessary to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit as defined in Chapter 153 that complies with required building setbacks from property lines that do not require approval of a Variance or Setback Exception and five feet from a proposed building.

(3) **Contour grading.** *Contour grading* of all tops and toes shall be required for a minimum of ten feet horizontal distance.

(4) **Stricter standards.** The *Town Engineer* may require an *excavation* to be made with a *cut* face flatter in slope than two horizontal to one vertical if he/she finds the material in which the *excavation* is to be made is subject to significant *erosion* or if other conditions make such flatter *cut* slope necessary for stability or safety to adjoining property.

**SECTION TWO:** Chapter 151, Zoning, Sections 151.44(A) and (B), of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 151.44 - DRIVEWAYS.

All *driveways* shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the following:

(A) **Number of entrances.** All residential lots shall have only one *driveway* with only one opening which shall be from only one public or private serving *road*. Second *driveway* exceptions may be granted by the *Planning Commission* if the all of the following findings can be made:

(1) The proposed additional ingress and egress point meets *Town* standards for the line of sight, ease of public identification, and any other traffic safety consideration; and

(2) The proposed additional ingress and egress point does not detract from the scenic and rural quality of the Town.

(3) The proposed additional ingress and egress point cannot be accommodated off of the primary *driveway*; or, if could be accommodated, would be more environmentally damaging than the proposed second *driveway*, such as crossing a stream corridor or developing significant portions of slopes that are in excess of 35%.

(3)(4) The site would not have more than two *driveway* openings with approval of the Second *Driveway* Exception.

~~(4) The proposed additional ingress and egress is not the only vehicular access to a proposed accessory dwelling unit.~~

~~(B) **Driveways for accessory dwelling units.** Any lots that have two or more existing permitted *driveways* shall use the principal access *driveway*, as defined in Chapter 153, as the primary access to any proposed accessory dwelling units. Any additional existing *driveways* other than~~

~~the principal access driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed accessory dwelling units.~~

**SECTION THREE:** Chapter 153, Zoning, Section 153.005, of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

153.005 – DEFINITIONS

**ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU).** An attached or a detached residential *dwelling unit* which provides complete *independent living facilities* for one ore more persons. It shall include a *kitchen* and permanent provisions for living, sleeping, and sanitation on the same *parcel* as the *single-family dwelling* is situated. An *accessory dwelling unit* also includes the following:

- (1) An efficiency unit, as defined in Cal. Health and Safety Code § 17958.1.
- (2) A manufactured home, as defined in Cal. Health and Safety Code § 18007.

**EFFICIENCY KITCHEN.** A kitchen with a cooking facility with appliances, and a food preparation counter and storage cabinets that are of reasonable size in relation to the size of the junior accessory dwelling unit.

**JUNIOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT.** An accessory dwelling unit that is no more than 500 feet in size, is contained entirely within an existing or proposed main dwelling, includes an efficiency kitchen, has a separate exterior entry form the main dwelling, and maintains an interior connection to the main living area of the main dwelling.

**SECTION FOUR:** Chapter 153, Zoning, Section 153.206(A) and (D), of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

153.206 - FLOOR AREA

**(A) Floor area requirements.**

(1) Table E sets forth the basic *floor area* requirements which apply to all zoning districts. Such basic regulations are further defined and supplemented by the additional requirements and exceptions set forth in this section.

TABLE E: Floor Area Requirements				
Zone District	Total Floor Area (TFA) Allowed	Maximum Size of Main Residence <sup>3</sup>	Barns and Stables <sup>6</sup>	Accessory Structures <sup>5</sup>
R-1	(1.4) (10% of <i>lot area</i> +1000 sq. ft., up to a maximum of 3,000 sq.	<u>Outside the Glens:</u> 10% of <i>lot area</i> + 1,000 sq. ft., up to a maximum of	2,500 square feet	1,500 square feet

TABLE E: Floor Area Requirements

Zone District	Total Floor Area (TFA) Allowed	Maximum Size of Main Residence <sup>3</sup>	Barns and Stables <sup>6</sup>	Accessory Structures <sup>5</sup>
	ft.), <i>up to a maximum of 4,200 sf</i>	3,000 sq. ft. (subject to TFA limit) Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 4,200 square feet  <u>In the Glens:</u> Lots < 3,500 sf: 10% of <i>lot area</i> + 1,000 sq. ft. Lots ≥3,500 sf to <14,000 sf: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 3,000 sf Lots ≥14,000 sf: 3,000 sf  Lots ≥20,000 sf: Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 4,200 square feet		
SR	18.0% of <i>lot area</i>	4,000 square feet Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 5,500 square feet	2,500 square feet	1,500 square feet
RR	9.00% of <i>lot area</i> <sup>2</sup>	6,000 square feet <sup>4</sup> Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 8,800 square feet	2,500 square feet	1,500 square feet
SCP-5	5.50% of <i>lot area</i> <sup>2</sup>	6,000 square feet <sup>4</sup> Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 8,800 square feet	3,000 square feet	1,500 square feet
SCP-7.5	3.50% of <i>lot area</i> <sup>2</sup>	6,000 square feet <sup>4</sup> Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 8,800 square feet	3,000 square feet	1,500 square feet

TABLE E: Floor Area Requirements				
Zone District	Total Floor Area (TFA) Allowed	Maximum Size of Main Residence <sup>3</sup>	Barns and Stables <sup>6</sup>	Accessory Structures <sup>5</sup>
SCP-10	2.75% of <i>lot area</i> <sup>2</sup>	6,000 square feet <sup>4</sup> Maximum with exception: Sliding scale <sup>3</sup> up to 8,800 square feet	3,000 square feet	1,500 square feet
OSH <sup>1</sup>	2.75% of <i>lot area</i>	1,500 square feet	3,000 square feet	N/A
OSRL <sup>1</sup>	2.75% of <i>lot area</i>	1,500 square feet	3,000 square feet	N/A
OSRM <sup>1</sup>	2.75% of <i>lot area</i>	1,500 square feet	3,000 square feet	N/A
OSN <sup>1</sup>	2.75% of <i>lot area</i>	1,500 square feet	3,000 square feet	N/A
OSM <sup>1</sup>	2.75% of <i>lot area</i>	1,500 square feet	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup> See §153.202(1) of the Woodside Mun. Code.  
<sup>2</sup> Adjusted TFAs for legal *nonconforming lots* in the SCP and RR zone districts are listed in §153.206(A)(1)(a)(Tables E-1 through E-4) of the Woodside Mun. Code.  
<sup>3</sup> For exceptions to maximum residence size limitations, see §153.206(C) of the Woodside Mun. Code.  
<sup>4</sup> *Maximum size of a main residence* may be limited by the adjusted TFA allowed for legal *nonconforming lots*, see footnote 2.  
<sup>5</sup> See §§153.107—153.108 of the Woodside Mun. Code, for size requirements related to greenhouses and covered *equestrian riding arenas*.  
<sup>6</sup> See §153.206(A)(2) of the Woodside Mun. Code, for size limitations on barns with an ADU that exceeds 50% of the total barn square footage.

(a)...

Table E-1 – Table E-4....

- (2) The gross *floor area* of any accessory building shall not exceed 1,500 square feet, except barns and stables, which shall not exceed 2,500 square feet unless the barn or stable is located in the OS or SCP Districts, where barns and stables may not exceed 3,000 square feet; Buildings that include barns or stables, and an accessory dwelling unit having floor area that exceeds 50 percent of the building footprint, may not have building footprint that exceeds 1,500 square feet.

(D) – Exceptions to floor area requirements: Accessory Dwelling Units.

- (1) Up to the first 800 square feet of one accessory dwelling unit or, up to 800 square feet of the combined square footage of two accessory dwelling units, shall not count toward the maximum size of the main residence and/or Total Floor Area permitted on a property.

(E) – Exceptions to floor area requirements: Junior Accessory Dwelling Units.

- (1) An expansion of no more than 150 square feet to the size and physical dimensions of an existing main residence, which retains sufficient setback for fire and safety access, shall be allowed to provide separate exterior access for the junior accessory dwelling unit.

**SECTION FIVE:** Chapter 153, Zoning, Section 153.208(A)(1)(Table I-1) and (Table I-2), of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

153.207– HEIGHT

(A) - Height requirements.

- (1) Table I-1 through I-3 set forth the basic *height* requirements which apply to all zoning districts. Such basic regulations are further defined and supplemented by the additional requirements and exceptions set forth in this section.

Table I-1: Height Requirements in Residential Zone Districts					
Zone District	Buildings (Permitted and Conditional)	Barns and Stables <sup>1</sup>	Covered Equestrian Riding Arenas	Accessory Structures	Accessory Structure Plate Height (Not applicable to barns, stables, or covered equestrian riding arenas) <sup>1</sup>
R-1	28 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
SR	30 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
RR	30 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet

Table I-1: Height Requirements in Residential Zone Districts					
Zone District	Buildings (Permitted and Conditional)	Barns and Stables <sup>1</sup>	Covered Equestrian Riding Arenas	Accessory Structures	Accessory Structure Plate Height (Not applicable to barns, stables, or covered equestrian riding arenas) <sup>1</sup>
SCP-5	30 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
SCP-7.5	30 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
SCP-10	30 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
<sup>1</sup> <u>Barns and stables including an accessory dwelling unit having floor area that exceeds 50 percent of the barn or stable footprint may not have plate heights that exceed 11 feet tall or an overall height that exceeds 17 feet tall.</u>					
Table I-2: Height Requirements in Open Space Zone Districts					
Zone District	Buildings (Permitted and Conditional)	Barns and Stables <sup>1</sup>	Covered Equestrian Riding Arenas	Accessory Structures	Accessory Structure Plate Height (Not applicable to barns, stables, or covered equestrian riding arenas) <sup>1</sup>
OSH	24 feet	N/A	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
OSRL	24 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
OSRM	24 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
OSN	24 feet	24 feet	30 feet	17 feet	11 feet
OSM	24 feet	24 feet	N/A	17 feet	11 feet
<sup>1</sup> <u>Barns and stables including an accessory dwelling unit having floor area that exceeds 50 percent of the barn or stable footprint may not have plate heights that exceed 11 feet tall or an overall height that exceeds 17 feet tall.</u>					

**SECTION SIX:** Chapter 153, Zoning, Section 153.211, of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

153.211 - ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS.

**(A) - Requirements applicable to all accessory dwelling units.**

All *accessory dwelling units*, whether internal, attached to, or detached from the *main dwelling unit*, shall conform to the following requirements:

(1) **Building and fire safety, and septic.** Conformance with all applicable building, housing, zoning, and site development laws, codes, and regulations shall be required, as applicable to *accessory dwelling units*. *Accessory dwelling units* shall not be required to provide fire sprinklers if they are not required for the primary residence and may employ alternative methods for fire protection.

(2) **Parking and driveway access.** Off-road parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Sections 153.221 through 153.225, as applicable to *accessory dwelling units*; and specifically as follows:

(a) **Parking requirements.** Parking requirements for *accessory dwelling units* shall be one parking space per *accessory dwelling unit* that has one or more bedrooms. No parking spaces shall be required for units that do not have a separate bedroom, such as a studio accessory dwelling unit. Off-street parking shall be permitted in *setback* areas in locations determined by the *Town*, or through tandem parking, unless specific findings are made that parking in *setback* areas or tandem parking is not feasible based upon specific site or regional topographic or fire and life safety conditions.

(b) **Parking waiver.** Parking is not required in the following instances:

1. The *accessory dwelling unit* is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, including transit stations and bus ~~stations~~ stops;
2. The *accessory dwelling unit* is located within an architecturally and historically significant historic district;
3. The *accessory dwelling unit* is part of the existing primary residence or an existing *accessory structure*;
4. The *accessory dwelling unit* is located in an area where parking permits are required, but are not offered to the occupant of the *accessory dwelling unit*; or
5. The *accessory dwelling unit* is located within one block of a car share vehicle.

~~(c) **Replacement parking:** When a *garage, carport,* or covered~~

~~parking structure is demolished or converted in conjunction with the construction of an accessory dwelling unit, the Town requires that those parking spaces be replaced. The replacement spaces may be located in any configuration on the same lot as the accessory dwelling unit, including but not limited to, as covered spaces, uncovered spaces, or tandem spaces, or by the use of mechanical automobile parking lifts.~~

~~(d) **Baseline parking.** Regardless of the parking requirement for any accessory dwelling unit, the parking requirement for the main residence must be met to develop any accessory dwelling unit.~~

~~(ec) **Driveway access.** Any lots that have two or more existing permitted driveways shall use the principal access driveway as the primary access to any proposed accessory dwelling unit. Any additional existing driveways other than~~ When feasible, the principal access driveway shall not be used as the primary access for any proposed accessory dwelling unit, unless, Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 151.44, a second driveway exception shall not be granted be subject to review by the Planning Commission and the findings required for approval if the a second driveway is the primary access for proposed for an proposed accessory dwelling unit is approved.

(3) **Design Application review.** All plans for accessory dwelling units shall be subject to ministerial review and approval or denial by the Planning Director within 60 days of submitting a complete application. However, if an accessory dwelling unit is proposed in conjunction with the construction of a new main dwelling, the Planning Director need not act on the accessory dwelling unit prior to the issuance of the permit for the main dwelling. In addition, all plans for the new construction or exterior modification of accessory dwelling units shall also, prior to the issuance of any permit, be subject to review according to Section 153.912. In considering architectural review, the Planning Director shall be required to find that the accessory dwelling units are subordinate to the main dwelling, and compatible with the neighboring property and uses in height, bulk, location, appearance, color, materials, and landscaping.

(4) **General accessory dwelling unit structure regulations.** All requirements related to accessory buildings contained in ~~this chapter~~ the Municipal Code, including, but not limited to: height, setbacks, floor area, lot coverage, natural state, environmentally sensitive areas, slopes in excess of 35%, second driveways, grading, and landscaping shall apply. The following ministerial exceptions shall apply to accessory dwelling units:

(a) **Exceptions to Setbacks.**

1. **Detached Accessory Dwelling Units.** New detached accessory dwelling units may have a side and/or rear setback of four feet from the side and rear property lines (no exceptions to the required front setback are permitted by this Section).

2. Attached Accessory Dwelling Units. *New accessory dwelling units attached to the main residence may have a side and rear setback of four feet from the side and rear property lines, but no portion of the main residence may be located within the required setbacks outlined in Municipal Code Section 153.207(A)(Table H) (no exceptions to the required front setback are permitted by this Section). Portions of attached accessory dwelling units located within the required setbacks outlined in Municipal Code Section 153.207(A)(Table H) shall have an 11-foot maximum plate height and a 17-foot maximum overall height, except as permitted by Municipal Code Section 153.211(A)(10) and (11).*

3. Two Accessory Dwelling Units. *Properties with two accessory dwelling units, attached or detached, may only have one unit with a side and/or rear setback of four feet. A second accessory dwelling unit shall comply with the required setbacks outlined in Municipal Code Section 153.207(A)(Table H).*

4. Size Limitation. *An ADU with the minimum 4 foot side and rear yards shall be limited to 800 square feet.*

(b) Exceptions to WMC Regulations. *If it is not feasible to comply with all regulations of the Municipal Code to construct one 800 square foot accessory dwelling unit on a property, the applicant shall provide all necessary information requested by the Town (e.g., a topographic survey, septic feasibility study, etc.) to demonstrate that it is infeasible to construct one 800 square foot accessory dwelling unit while complying with all applicable regulations for review by the Town. Once the complete feasibility study is reviewed by the Town, the Planning Director shall determine which Municipal Code regulations may be reduced and/or waived by evaluating feasible locations for the accessory dwelling unit that create the fewest impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as stream corridors, wetlands, and steep slopes.*

(c) Noticing Requirements for Exceptions. *Accessory dwelling units which utilize the ministerial exceptions in Section 153.211(A)(4)(a) and/or Section 153.211(A)(4)(b) shall be noticed to any property owner of property adjacent to the proposed accessory dwelling unit, including lots located across an abutting public or private road. The notice shall be sent within five business days of receipt of the application and shall clearly state that an accessory dwelling unit application is ministerial and therefore there are no appeal rights.*

**(5) Number of accessory dwelling units allowed.** *No more than two accessory dwelling units, including accessory dwelling units in barns and junior accessory dwelling units, are permitted on a parcel subject to Table L-1. For parcels equal to or greater than 1.5 acres in size, a maximum of two accessory dwellings units, whether attached or detached, shall be permitted. For parcels equal to or greater than 1.0 acre in size, but less than 1.5 acres in*

~~size, a maximum of one detached and one attached accessory dwelling units shall be permitted. For parcels less than 1.0 acre in size and/or located within the R-1 District, no more than one accessory dwelling unit accessory living quarters, whether attached or detached, and one junior accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted.~~

~~In the R-1 District, no more than one accessory dwelling unit is permitted, and detached accessory dwelling units may only be permitted if the lot area is at least 20,000 square feet. Further restrictions apply to efficiency accessory dwelling units, see to Section 153.912(C)(1).~~

TABLE L-1: Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed	
Parcel Size or Zoning	Number of Accessory Dwelling Units Allowed
Equal to, or greater than, 1.5 acres	A maximum of two, whether attached or detached.
Equal to, or greater than, 1.0 acre; but less than 1.5 acres	A maximum of one detached and one attached.
Less than 1.0 acre	No more than one, whether attached or detached, and one <i>junior accessory dwelling unit</i> .
In the R-1 District	No more than one, <u>whether attached or detached, and one <i>junior accessory dwelling unit</i>. and detached may only be permitted if the lot area is at least 20,000 square feet.</u>

(6) **Attached accessory dwelling units.** The floor area of an attached accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed 50 percent of the size of the main residence, including the accessory dwelling unit, or 1,500 square feet, whichever is less.

(7) **Detached accessory dwelling units.** The floor area of a detached accessory dwelling unit, including the floor area of any attached garage, shall not exceed 1,500 square feet.

(8) **Basement accessory dwelling units.** Basement area used for an accessory dwelling unit, or a portion thereof, shall be limited to the unit sizes prescribed in divisions (A)(6) and (A)(7) of this section.

(9) **Rental accessory dwelling units.** Accessory dwelling units which are rented shall not be rented for less than 30 consecutive days.

(10) **Existing detached garages and other existing accessory structures converted to accessory dwelling units.** No new setback shall be required for an existing detached garage or other existing accessory structure that is converted to an accessory dwelling unit and a setback of no more than five four feet or the setback of the existing detached garage, whichever is greater, from the side and rear lot lines shall be required for an accessory dwelling unit that is constructed above an existing detached garage, as long as access and egress requirements, as prescribed by the Building Code and Municipal Code height requirements are met.

(11) Existing attached garages converted to accessory dwelling units. No new setback shall be required for an existing attached *garage* that is converted to an *accessory dwelling unit* and a *setback* of no more than five four feet or the *setback* of the existing attached *garage* , whichever is greater, from the side and *rear lot lines* shall be required for an *accessory dwelling unit* that is constructed above an existing attached *garage*, as long as access and egress requirements, as prescribed by the Building Code and Municipal Code *height requirements* are met.

**(12) Processing requirements:**

(a) ***Accessory dwelling units within an existing structure.*** An *accessory dwelling unit* within an *existing structure* (including the *primary structure* , attached or detached *garage* , or other *accessory structure* ) shall be permitted ministerially with a *building permit* , and within 60 120-days of application, in compliance with other standards within the chapter, if complying with the following codes and requirements:

1. Building and safety codes;
2. Independent exterior access from the existing residence;
3. Sufficient *side* and *rear setbacks* for fire safety, as set forth in the Building Code; and,
4. A minimum five-four foot *setback* for a second-story *accessory dwelling unit* above an existing nonconforming *garage*.
5. Construction of a new access stair a minimum of five feet from the side or rear property line, or the existing *setback*, whichever is greater, to access a new ADU built above an existing, legal nonconforming *garage* is allowed. ~~Additionally, the Planning Director will review the design of such an access stair to ensure that: an access stair cannot be accommodated within the existing nonconforming garage because it would reduce the parking in the garage to less than two spaces or would eliminate the only feasible required parking on site.~~ An existing *garage* located at the required *setback* shall be allowed an access stair which may encroach a maximum of five feet into the required *setback*.

(b) **Denial.** In order to deny an *accessory dwelling unit*, the *Planning Director* shall find that the *accessory dwelling unit* would be detrimental to the public health and safety ~~or would introduce unreasonable privacy impacts to the immediate neighbors.~~

~~(13) A percolation test completed within the last five years, or last 10 years if the test has been recertified, is required if an existing on-site septic system serving the main dwelling will serve a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit.~~

**(B) - Requirements applicable to accessory dwelling units within barns.**

In addition to the requirements applicable to all *accessory dwelling units*, any such *accessory dwelling units* located within *barns* shall conform to the following additional requirements:

- (1) No more than one *accessory dwelling unit* within a *barn* shall be permitted on a *parcel* with the following exception: up to two *accessory dwelling units* may be permitted within a *barn* located on a property containing a *Town-approved professional stable*. Such additional *accessory dwelling units* shall only be permitted after approval of a *conditional use* permit by the *Planning Commission*, in accordance with applicable *conditional use* permit procedures.
- (2) The *floor area* of the *accessory dwelling unit* within a *barn* shall be no greater than 50 percent of the *footprint area* of the *barn*, or 1,200 square feet, whichever is less, but in no instance will such an ADU be limited to less than 850 square feet or 1,000 square feet for *accessory dwelling units* that include more than one bedroom.
- (3) The *accessory dwelling unit* and the *barn* shall contain an automatic fire sprinkler system, and the *accessory dwelling unit* shall be separated from the other portions of the *barn* with a one-hour firewall, in accordance with the *Town's Building Code*.
- (4) An *accessory dwelling unit* in a *barn* may be located on either a first or second floor, of that portion of the *barn* that adheres to required *setbacks*.

**(C) - Requirements applicable to ~~efficiency~~junior accessory dwelling units.**

~~Efficiency~~A *junior accessory dwelling unit*, is a unit that is no more than 500 square feet in size, and is contained entirely within an existing or proposed *main dwelling structure*, ~~single-family structure~~, includes an *efficiency kitchen*, has a separate exterior entry from the *main dwelling*, and maintains an interior connection to the main living area of the *main dwelling*. *Junior accessory dwelling units* shall be allowed the following provisions and shall conform to the following requirements:

- (1) Only one ~~efficiency~~*junior accessory dwelling unit* is allowed per *lot*.
- (2) Owner-occupancy is required in any residence that contains an ~~efficiency~~ *junior accessory dwelling unit*. The owner may reside in either the remaining portion of the *structure* or in the newly created ~~efficiency~~ *junior accessory dwelling unit*. Owner-occupancy shall not be required if the owner is a governmental agency, land trust, or housing organization. Notwithstanding the foregoing, owner occupancy is not required if the *junior accessory dwelling unit* is constructed or permitted for construction during the

~~calendar years of 2020 through 2025.~~

(3) ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ shall be constructed within the existing *walls* of the *structure*, and shall include an existing bedroom.

(4) ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ may include separate sanitation facilities, or may share sanitation facilities with the existing *structure*.

(5) ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ shall include a separate entrance from the main entrance to the *structure*, with an interior entry to the main living area. ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ may include a second interior doorway for sound attenuation.

(6) ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ shall have an *efficiency kitchen*, which shall include all of the following:

(a) ~~A sink with a maximum waste line diameter of one and one-half inches;~~

(ba) ~~A cooking facility with appliances that do not require electrical service greater than 120 volts, or natural or propane gas; and,~~

(eb) ~~A food preparation counter and storage cabinets that are of reasonable size in relation to the size of the junior accessory dwelling unit.~~

(7) ~~An *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit*~~ does not require additional parking; however, ~~the main residence in which it is contained shall meet the *Town* parking requirement.~~

(8) This subdivision shall not be interpreted to prohibit the requirement of an inspection, including the imposition of a fee for that inspection, to determine whether the *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit* is in compliance with applicable building standards.

(9) An application for a permit pursuant to this section shall, notwithstanding Section 65901 or 65906 or any local ordinance regulating the issuance of variances or *special use permits*, be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or a hearing. A permit shall be issued within ~~60~~<sup>120</sup> days of submission of an **complete** application for a permit pursuant to this section. A local agency may charge a fee to reimburse the local agency for costs incurred in connection with the issuance of a permit pursuant to this section.

(10) For the purposes of any fire or life protection ordinance or regulation ~~an *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit* unit~~ shall not be considered a separate or new dwelling unit. This section shall not be construed to prohibit a city, county, city and county, or other local public entity from adopting an ordinance or regulation relating to fire and life protection requirements within a single-family residence that contains an *efficiency junior accessory dwelling unit* so long as the ordinance or regulation applies uniformly to all single-family

residences within the zone regardless of whether the single-family residence includes an ~~efficiency junior~~ accessory dwelling unit or not.

(11) For the purposes of providing service for water, sewer, or power, including a connection fee, an ~~efficiency junior~~ accessory dwelling unit shall not be considered a separate or new dwelling unit.

(12) This section shall not be construed to prohibit a local agency from adopting an ordinance or regulation, related to parking or a service or a connection fee for water, sewer, or power, that applies to a single-family residence that contains an ~~efficiency junior~~ accessory dwelling unit, so long as that ordinance or regulation applies uniformly to all single-family residences regardless of whether the single-family residence includes an ~~efficiency junior~~ accessory dwelling unit.

**SECTION SIX:** Chapter 153, Zoning, Section 153.223, of the Woodside Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 153.223 - Minimum number of required automobile parking spaces.

(A) The number of off-road parking spaces required shall be as set forth in the following table, except that additional parking spaces may be required as a condition of any conditional use permit when the Planning Commission finds that the characteristics of the particular use require additional parking:

TABLE M: Minimum Number of Required Parking Spaces	
Use	Parking Spaces Required
<i>Dwellings, main</i>	4 for each unit, minimum
<i>Accessory dwelling units</i>	1 for each <i>accessory dwelling unit</i> <b>that has one or more bedrooms. No parking spaces shall be required for units that do not have a separate bedroom, such as a studio accessory dwelling unit.</b> (See § 153.211(A)(2) for exceptions.)
Churches and other houses of worship	2 for each 5 seats in the main worship unit. For fixed seating, each 20 horizontal inches shall be counted as one seat
Elementary schools	2 for each classroom, plus one for each 100 square feet in the auditorium or any space used for assembly
Places of assembly without fixed seats	1 for each 100 square feet of <i>floor area</i> used for assembly
Places of assembly with fixed seats not otherwise provided for in this section	1 for each 3 seats. Each 20 horizontal inches of such seating shall be counted as 1 seat
Retail stores and consumer	1 for each 150 square feet of <i>floor area</i> , plus one for every 3

service establishments	employees
Medical and dental clinics	5 spaces for each doctor
Banks and business and professional offices	1 for each 200 square feet of <i>floor area</i> , plus 1 for every 3 employees
Establishments for the sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages, food or refreshments	1 for each 2½ seats, stools, or <i>standing spaces</i>

(B) For any *use* not specified in this section, the same number of off-road parking spaces shall be provided as are required for the most similar specified *use* as determined by the *Planning Director*. Where the computation of required parking spaces produces a fractional result, fractions of one-half or greater shall require the provision of one full parking space.

**SECTION SEVEN:** In the event that any provision of this ordinance is in conflict with any other ordinances of the Town of Woodside or the Woodside Municipal Code, the provisions of this ordinance shall prevail.

**SECTION EIGHT** If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of the Ordinance or any part thereof. The Town Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective.

**SECTION NINE:** Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after its final passage.

**SECTION TEN:** The Town Clerk shall cause this Ordinance to be published in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.


\* \* \* \* \*

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance is a full, true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 2020-610 of the Town of Woodside entitled as above; that it was introduced on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June, 2020, and was passed and adopted by the Town Council on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCIL MEMBERS: Brown, Dombkowski, Livermore, Scott, Shaw, Yost, and Mayor  
Fluet  
NOES, COUNCIL MEMBERS: None  
ABSENT, COUNCIL MEMBERS: None  
ABSTAIN, COUNCIL MEMBERS: None

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Town Clerk of the Town of Woodside

# **Appendix K**

## **Fair Housing Assessment**

# Table of Contents

**K Assessment of Fair Housing ..... I**

    K.1 Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach ..... I

        Fair Housing Services..... I

        Brokerage Services..... 3

        Fair Housing Legal Cases And Inquiries ..... 3

        Housing Specific Policies Enacted Locally ..... 5

    K.2 Segregation and Integration..... 6

        Lending Services..... 9

        Race and Ethnicity ..... 9

        Persons with Disabilities ..... 16

        Familial Status ..... 19

        Income Level..... 23

    K.3 Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence ..... 31

    K.4 Disparities in Access to Opportunity ..... 35

        Regional Context..... 35

        Local Context..... 36

    K.5 Disproportionate Housing Needs & Displacement Risk..... 47

        Cost Burden ..... 47

        Overcrowding ..... 48

        Displacement Risk ..... 52

        Homelessness and Substandard Housing..... 59

        Natural Hazards and Displacement Risk..... 59

    K.6 Sites Inventory ..... 60

    K.7 Summary and Conclusions ..... 63

# List of Figures

Map K-1: Woodside Neighborhood Segregation ..... 17

Map K-2: Woodside Diversity Index..... 18

Map K-3: Persons with Disabilities ..... 20

Map K-4: Percent of Children in Female Households ..... 21

Map K-5: Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households ..... 22

Map K-6: Low- to Moderate-Income Population, Block Group ..... 25

Map K-7: Poverty Status (2014), Woodside..... 26

Map K-8: Poverty Status (2019), Woodside.....27

Map K-9: Income Dot Map of Woodside.....30

Map K-10: R/ECAP and RCAA Locations, Woodside Region.....33

Map K-11: TCAC Opportunity Areas, Composite Score, Woodside Region .....38

Map K-12: TCAC Opportunity Areas, Composite Score, Woodside .....39

Map K-13: TCAC Opportunity Areas, Economic Score, Woodside.....44

Map K-14: TCAC Opportunity Areas, Education Score, Woodside.....45

Map K-15: TCAC Opportunity Areas, Environmental Score, Woodside .....46

Map K-16: Homeowner Cost Burden, 2019 .....49

Map K-17: Renter Cost Burden, 2019 .....50

Map K-18: Overcrowded Households, Woodside .....51

Map K-19: Sensitive Communities in Woodside.....53

Map K-20: Gentrification and Displacement Typologies, Woodside.....54

Map K-21: Census Block Groups, Woodside .....61

## List of Tables and Charts

Chart K-1: Summary of Fair Housing Complaints and Inquiries.....5

Chart K-2: Segregation Policy Timeline.....8

Chart K-3: HMDA Loan Denial Rates by Race/Ethnicity .....10

Table K-1: Change in Population, 2000-2020.....10

Chart K-4: Population by Race in Woodside, 2000-2019 .....11

Table K-2: San Mateo County Subdivisions by Share of Race/Ethnicity 2021 .....11

Table K-3: San Mateo County by Race/Ethnicity, 2021.....12

Table K-5: Racial Isolation Index Values for Segregation .....13

Table K-4: Block Groups in the Town of Woodside by Race/Ethnicity, 2021 .....14

Table K-6: Racial Dissimilarity Index Values for Segregation .....15

Chart K-5: San Mateo County Dissimilarity Index, 1990-2019.....15

Chart K-6: Households by Type, 2019 .....19

Table K-7: Households by Household Income Level, 2017.....24

Table K-8: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months by Race/Ethnicity, Woodside, 2021 .....24

Chart K-7: Income Dissimilarity .....28

Chart K-8: Income Segregation .....28

Table K-9: Income Ranges .....29

Table K-10: ABAG Housing Policy Database, 2017.....34

Table K-11: Domain and Indicators for HCD/TCAC Opportunity Maps.....35

Chart K-9: Opportunity Indices, Total Population .....37

Chart K-10: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity in Woodside .....48

Table K-12: Gentrification and Displacement Census Tract Typologies.....55

Table K-13: Risk of Displacement by Tenure, Woodside.....56

Table K-14: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion .....56

Chart K-11: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) Over Time.....57

Chart K-12: Median Contract Rent, 2009-2019 .....58

Table K-15: Housing Types, 2020 .....58

Table K-16: 2031 AFFH Housing Element Sites Analysis .....62

Table K-17: Fair Housing Analysis Findings.....64

## K Assessment of Fair Housing

California Assembly Bill (AB) 686, passed in 2018, amended California Government Code Section 65583 to require all public agencies to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH). AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. AB 686 requires an assessment of fair housing in the Housing Element which includes the following components: a summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the Town’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity; an analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities, an assessment of contributing factors, and an identification of fair housing goals and actions.

The Town of Woodside is a member of the San Mateo County HOME Consortium (Consortium), which jointly plans for the housing and community development needs of the County. This includes the allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the production of associated documents, like San Mateo County’s Analysis of Fair Housing (AFH) and Consolidated Plan (CP). Public outreach, including within Woodside, was conducted during the preparation of these documents. Where necessary, additional data sources are used to provide an up-to-date assessment of fair housing in Woodside including AFFH Mapping and Data Resources provided by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Associated Bay Area Government (ABAG) Data Workbooks.

### K.1 Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach

---

Fair housing services are an essential component of AFFH. They ensure that housing options are accessible to State and federally protected groups, including those based on race, color, gender, religion, national origin, familial status, disability, age, marital status, ancestry, source of income, sexual orientation, genetic information, or other arbitrary factors. Fair housing services help Woodside residents understand and protect their right to access housing.

#### **FAIR HOUSING SERVICES**

Town of Woodside residents have several local organizations active in providing fair housing services such as the Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County and Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto. Woodside along with the County of San Mateo, contracts with Project Sentinel to handle complaints of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing and for the mediation of tenant/landlord disputes. Complaints and requests can be made in English or Spanish by phone, email or in person at one of their six offices. The closest office to Woodside is in Redwood City (about a five-mile distance). In addition to investigating complaints and advocating for those who have experienced housing discrimination in Woodside, Project Sentinel provides education and counseling to Woodside community members, housing providers, and tenants about fair housing laws in both English and Spanish.

Many of the methods used to perform outreach to and engage protected groups in Woodside originate at the County level because priorities for funding are formed by the Consortium led by San Mateo County. The population of Woodside is small (around 5,000 people) with less capacity to address fair housing

programs and services than the County. Developed every five years by the Consortium, the Consolidated Plan establishes the priorities and goals for the allocation of funding for the HUD formula block grant programs (CDBG, HOME, and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG)). Funds from these programs are used to assist with a variety of housing and community development activities including but not limited to the building and renovating of affordable housing of the jurisdictions belonging to the Consortium. In 2022, the County produced its FY 2022-23 Consolidated Plan which stated it would fund Project Sentinel to assist 26 individuals with housing services needs for the next financial year. As a HOME Consortium member, Woodside participated in public outreach activities and the development of the Consolidated plan and Assessment of Fair Housing.

One of the services the San Mateo County Department of Housing offers is low-interest loans to rehabilitate homes for those eligible. These loans cover moderate (less than \$25,000) to substantial (\$25,000 or more) rehabilitation to single family owner-occupied residences. Loans are available to low or very low-income homeowners, and owners of multi-unit rental properties that benefit low or very low-income families. They also offer a Home Sharing Program in partnership with regional non-profit Human Investment Project (HIP). Home Sharing is a living arrangement in which two or more unrelated people share a home or apartment, and allows interested participants a pre-screened process to find a safe group living environment. Over ninety percent of those using the HIP are low to extremely low income. Partnering with SMCHousingSearch.org, the County also runs a website to help people find homes filtering for needs and budget. Seniors in Woodside have the option of taking advantage of the San Mateo County Affordable Housing Services for Seniors program which offers senior age-restricted affordable apartment for those on fixed income or annual income that is no more than 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI).

HCD guidance on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing requires an analysis of compliance with existing fair housing laws and regulations. Examples of State fair housing laws include:

- California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Part 2.8 (commencing with Section 12900) of Division 3 of Title 2)
- FEHA Regulations (California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 2, sections 12005-12271)
- Government Code section 65008 covers actions of a city, county, city and county, or other local government agency, and makes those actions null and void if the action denies an individual or group of individuals the enjoyment of residence, landownership, tenancy, or other land use in the state because of membership in a protected class, the method of financing, and/or the intended occupancy.
- Government Code section 8899.50 requires all public agencies to administer programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner to affirmatively further fair housing and avoid any action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing.
- Government Code section 11135 et seq. requires full and equal access to all programs and activities operated, administered, or funded with financial assistance from the state, regardless of one's membership or perceived membership in a protected class.
- Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code, § 65915.)
- Housing Accountability Act (Gov. Code, § 65589.5.)
- No-Net-Loss Law (Gov. Code, § 65863)
- Least Cost Zoning Law (Gov. Code, § 65913.1)
- Excessive subdivision standards (Gov. Code, § 65913.2.)

- Limits on growth controls (Gov. Code, § 65302.8.)
- Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65583, esp. subds. (c)(5), (c)(10).)

The Town of Woodside complies with State fair housing laws, including but not limited to California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA); FEHA Regulations; and Government Code sections 65008, 8899.50, and 11135 et seq.

In summary, Woodside contracts with Project Sentinel through its partnership with the County Consortium to investigate complaints, obtain remedies, and engage in fair housing testing. As a member of the San Mateo County Consortium, Woodside receives access to programs for protected groups in need of housing, expanding its capacity for outreach and engagement.

## **BROKERAGE SERVICES**

In order for families to have protected choice they need to access housing options without discrimination. In a 2016 housing discrimination study, researchers found that compared to households without children, households with children were shown slightly fewer units and were commonly told about units that were slightly larger, and as a result, slightly more expensive to rent. This differential treatment is considered discrimination and a type of steering, which occurs on a racial basis as well.<sup>1</sup> Within San Mateo County, there are no findings from the San Mateo County Analysis of Fair Housing (AFH) related to steering.

Brokerage services operating at the national, state, and local level have initiatives and practices around preventing steering and other forms of discrimination. Real estate brokers or salespersons whose business is in the Woodside may belong to one of several associations, but most likely belong to the San Mateo County Association of REALTORS (SAMCAR). Like all associations, SAMCAR has a Multiple Listing Service (MLS)—MLSListings Inc—and is part of the NORCAL MLS ALLIANCE, an MLS data integration project across the seven leading MLSs in Northern California. SAMCAR is bound by the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of the National Association of REALTORS (NAR), which explicitly states in Article 10 that members shall not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, national origin, sexual orientation, or gender identity. In addition to adopting the ethics standards set by the NAR, the state branch promotes its own diversity and inclusion programs, such as the Latino Initiative Voices in Action program, which provides educational materials for members on homeownership opportunities and fraud prevention.

## **FAIR HOUSING LEGAL CASES AND INQUIRIES**

The Department of Fair and Equal Housing (DFEH) receives, evaluates, and investigates fair housing complaints. DFEH plays a particularly significant role in investigating fair housing complaints against protected classes that are not included in federal legislation and therefore not investigated by HUD. DFEH's website provides detailed instructions for filing a complaint, the complaint process, appealing a decision, and other frequently asked questions. Fair housing complaints can also be submitted to HUD for

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information see HUD's December 2016 study, "Discrimination Against Families with Children in Rental Housing Markets: Findings of the Pilot Study" available at: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/HDSFamiliesFinalReport.pdf>.

investigation. Additionally, Project Sentinel, the Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, and Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto accept complaints.

From 2017 to 2021, 57 fair housing complaints in San Mateo County were filed with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Most of the County complaints cited disability status as the bias (56 percent) followed by race (19 percent), and familial status (14 percent). Countywide, no cause determination was found in 27 complaints followed by successful conciliation or settlement with 22 complaints. Fair housing inquiries in 2020 were primarily submitted to HCD from the City of San Mateo, Redwood City, Daly City, and Menlo Park. Fair housing complaints filed with HUD by San Mateo County residents have been declining since 2018, when 18 complaints were filed. In 2019, complaints dropped to 5, increased to 11 in 2020, and reaching 6 by mid-2021.


Between 2017 and 2021, a disproportionate share (56 percent) of all housing discrimination complaints in San Mateo County were filed based on disability. In Woodside, only two complaints were filed in this time frame, biases unknown. Although it is unknown if the two cases were filed based on disability or not, the regionally high share of disability housing complaints and the high percentage of seniors residing in Woodside (28.0 percent in Woodside compared to 22.6 percent in the county and 16.7 percent in the region as of 2021) indicate this form of fair housing discrimination might be the most relevant to Woodside even though there is a small number of fair housing cases. It could also indicate there is less discrimination based on disability in Woodside than surrounding jurisdictions because of the low number of cases and high percentage of senior residents.

Nationally, the National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) reported a “negligible” decrease in the number of complaints filed between 2019 and 2020. The primary bases for complaints nationally were similar to San Mateo County’s: disability (55 percent) and race (17 percent). Familial status represented 8 percent of complaints nationally, whereas this basis comprised 14 percent of cases in the County.

NFHA identifies three significant trends in 2020 that are relevant to San Mateo County:

- First, fair lending cases referred to the Department of Justice from federal banking regulators have been declining, indicating that state and local government entities may want to play a larger role in examining fair lending barriers to homeownership.
- Second, NFHA identified a significant increase in the number of complaints of harassment—1,071 complaints in 2020 compared to 761 in 2019.
- Finally, NFHA found that 73 percent of all fair housing complaints in 2020 were processed by private fair housing organizations, rather than state, local, and federal government agencies—reinforcing the need for local, active fair housing organizations and increased funding for such organizations.

**Chart K-1: Summary of Fair Housing Complaints and Inquiries**



**HOUSING SPECIFIC POLICIES ENACTED LOCALLY**

The Town of Woodside is a rural residential community, with zoning that is predominantly for low density housing. Local policies in place to encourage development of housing for households of all incomes in Woodside include streamlined permitting processes and a second unit ordinance. There are no public housing projects in Woodside and no multifamily apartment buildings. To further increase the diversity the local housing stock and expand housing choice for for seniors, single-parent households, employees of Town Center businesses; property maintenance workers, caretakers, equestrian managers, people with disabilities, and students teachers, teacher families and employees at Cañada College, the Housing Program and Action Plan (Section 3.9) incorporates the following:

- Encourages residents to develop ADUs; and make ADUs and JADUs or extra bedrooms available to students at Cañada College and service providers in the community; and,

- Identifies four parcels for higher density housing development: the previously rezoned Cañada College and three new parcels for rezoning at 20 units per acre.

## K.2 Segregation and Integration

---

Patterns of segregation within a community may arise from both public and private housing discrimination, whether intentional or unintentional. Although racial and ethnic segregation is perhaps the most common and well-known form, other protected classes may also experience segregation. This section explores patterns and trends of segregation based on race and ethnicity, disability, familial status, and income level in Woodside and the surrounding region. These groups are not mutually exclusive, and there may be considerable overlap across each protected class.

The United States' oldest cities have a history of mandating segregated living patterns—and Northern California cities are no exception. ABAG, in its recent Fair Housing Equity Assessment, attributes segregation in the Bay Area to historically discriminatory practices—highlighting redlining and discriminatory mortgage approvals—as well as “structural inequities” in society, and “self segregation” (i.e., preferences to live near similar people).

Researcher Richard Rothstein’s 2017 book *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* chronicles how the public sector contributed to the segregation that exists today. Rothstein highlights several significant developments in the Bay Area region that played a large role in where the region’s non-White residents settled.

Pre-civil rights San Mateo County faced resistance to racial integration, yet it was reportedly less direct than in some Northern California communities, taking the form of “blockbusting” and “steering” or intervention by public officials. These local discriminatory practices were exacerbated by actions taken by the Federal Housing Administration to exclude low-income neighborhoods, where the majority of people of color lived, from its mortgage loan program.

According to the San Mateo County Historical Association, San Mateo County’s early African Americans worked in a variety of industries, from logging, to agriculture, to restaurants and entertainment. Expansion of jobs, particularly related to shipbuilding during and after World War II attracted many new residents into the Peninsula, including the first sizable migration of African Americans. Enforcement of racial covenants after the war forced the migration of the county’s African Americans into neighborhoods where they were allowed to occupy housing—housing segregated into less desirable areas, next to highways, and concentrated in public housing and urban renewal developments.

The private sector contributed to segregation through activities that discouraged (blockbusting) or prohibited (restrictive covenants) integrated neighborhoods. In the City of San Mateo, builders of the Hillsdale neighborhood in the mid-1900s recorded deeds that specified that only “members of the Caucasian or White race shall be permitted” to occupy sold homes—the exception being “domestics in the employ[ment] on the premises.” This developer went on to develop many race-restricted neighborhoods in the Bay Area, became president of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), became national president of the Urban Land Institute (ULI), and was inducted into California’s Homebuilding Foundation Hall of Fame.


The segregatory effect of blockbusting activities is well-documented in East Palo Alto. In 1954, after a White family in East Palo Alto sold their home to an African American family, the then-president of the California Real Estate Association set up an office in East Palo Alto to scare White families into selling their homes (“for fear of declining property values”) to agents and speculators. These agents then sold these homes at over-inflated prices to African American buyers, some of whom had trouble making their payments. Within six years, East Palo Alto—initially established with “whites only” neighborhoods—became 82 percent African American. The FHA prevented re-integration by refusing to insure mortgages held by White buyers residing in East Palo Alto.

Throughout San Mateo County, neighborhood associations and city leaders attempted to thwart integration of communities. Although some neighborhood residents supported integration, most did not, and it was not unusual for neighborhood associations to require acceptance of all new buyers. Builders with intentions to develop for all types of buyers (regardless of race) found that their development sites were rezoned by planning councils, required very large minimum lot sizes, and/or were denied public infrastructure to support their developments or charged prohibitively high amounts for infrastructure.

The timeline of major federal Acts and court decisions related to fair housing choice and zoning and land use is presented in Chart 3-2. As shown in the timeline, exclusive zoning practices were common in the early 1900s. Courts struck down only the most discriminatory and allowed those that would be considered today to have a “disparate impact” on classes protected by the Fair Housing Act. For example, the 1926 case *Village of Euclid v. Amber Realty Co.* (272 U.S. 365) supported the segregation of residential, business, and industrial uses, justifying separation by characterizing apartment buildings as “mere parasite(s)” with the potential to “utterly destroy” the character and desirability of neighborhoods. At that time, multifamily apartments were the only housing options for people of color, including immigrants.

The Federal Fair Housing Act was not enacted until nearly 60 years after the first racial zoning ordinances appeared in U.S. cities. This coincided with a shift away from federal control over low-income housing toward locally-tailored approaches (block grants) and market-oriented choice (Section 8 subsidies)—the latter of which is only effective when adequate affordable rental units are available.

**Chart K-2: Segregation Policy Timeline**



## LENDING SERVICES

Discrimination in lending practices can be a major contributor to segregation in a community, as this limits the ability of individuals to live in a location of their choosing. Uneven or high loan denial rates among racial/ethnic groups may indicate outreach and capacity to particular groups is insufficient. This information can be derived from data provided by lending institutions in compliance with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). As seen in Chart 3-3 over the last ten years, non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Asian, non-Hispanic Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander applicants in Woodside had higher loan denial rates than in San Mateo County while Hispanic or Latino and non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native applicants had lower denial rates in Woodside than San Mateo County. Notably, between 2011 and 2021, 2018 was the only year in which people identifying as non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native applied for a loan while during the nine other years zero applied. Similarly, those identifying as non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander only applied for loans in 2014.


Among groups in Woodside, the non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander group has the highest average loan denial rate (100 percent) which might be related to the low applicant numbers. The group with the lowest loan denial rate is the American Indian or Alaska Native (0 percent) which also might be related to there only being one year in which this group had applicants. The group with applicants almost every year and a low denial rate is the Hispanic or Latino group (12 percent) followed by the non-Hispanic Asian group (15 percent), the non-Hispanic White group (18 percent), and Black or African American applicants (33 percent). Non-White groups with years of consistent applicant numbers (non-Hispanic Asian and Hispanic or Latino applicants) had lower loan denial rates than non-Hispanic White applicants.

The data does not indicate the grounds for denial, and it cannot be proven on the basis of this data that the denials were not justified on the basis of standard financial criteria; however, the trend suggests a potential for bias within the financial system and a need for financial literacy training among non-White applicants, particularly Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander and Black or African American applicants in Woodside, to help those groups better understand how to improve their credit scores and how to apply for loans.

## RACE AND ETHNICITY

Racial and ethnic patterns of segregation in Woodside should be understood in the context of changing regional and local demographics. Generally, the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region. The population of Woodside increased by 6.1 percent from 2000 to 2020, which is below the growth rate of the Bay Area (see Table K-1). In 2019, 79.0 percent of Woodside's population was White while 0.9 percent was African American, 7.3 percent was Asian, and 9.1 percent was Latinx. People of color in Woodside comprise a proportion below the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole. Since 2000, the percentage of residents in Woodside identifying as White has decreased and by the same token the percentage of residents of all other races and ethnicities has increased by 10.7 percentage points, with the 2019 population standing at 5,542 (see Chart 3-4). In absolute terms, the Hispanic or Latinx population increased the most while the White, Non-Hispanic population has decreased the most.

**Chart K-3: HMDA Loan Denial Rates by Race/Ethnicity**




Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Data, 2011-2021

**Table K-1: Change in Population, 2000-2020**

Geography	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Woodside	5,034	5,320	5,352	5,476	5,287	5,617	5,676
County	649,623	685,354	707,163	719,844	718,451	761,748	773,244
Region	6,020,147	6,381,961	6,784,348	7,073,912	7,150,739	7,595,694	7,790,537

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 Series

**Chart K-4: Population by Race in Woodside, 2000-2019**



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B03002

The geographical distribution of race and ethnicity throughout San Mateo County is uneven. San Mateo County is divided into three County Census Divisions (CCDs) for the purpose of demographic analysis by the Census Bureau: San Mateo County CCD (which includes Woodside), Half Moon Bay CCD (along the coast) and South San Francisco CCD (the northern part of the County). As shown in Table K-2, 60.1 percent of non-Hispanic Asian San Mateo County residents live in South San Francisco CCD while only 42.3 percent of the County’s total population live there. Half Moon Bay CCD is much smaller in population size (3.4 percent of the County’s population live in this area), but 7.0 percent of its population is non-Hispanic White. San Mateo CCD is 62.7 non-Hispanic White and its population is 54.3 percent of the County’s population. This data shows most non-Hispanic White residents in the County live in San Mateo CCD (where Woodside is located), in addition to most Hispanic or Latino residents and non-Hispanic Other Races.

**Table K-2: San Mateo County Subdivisions by Share of Race/Ethnicity 2021**

Race/Ethnicity	San Mateo CCD	Half Moon Bay CCD	South San Francisco CCD
White (NH)	62.7%	7.0%	30.3%
Hispanic or Latino	55.9%	4.0%	40.0%
Asian (NH)	39.4%	0.5%	60.1%
Black or African American (NH)	58.9%	0.3%	40.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NH)	60.8%	0.3%	38.8%
Some Other Race (NH)	45.5%	1.7%	52.8%
Two or More Races (NH)	60.6%	3.2%	36.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54.8%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 ACS Estimates, Table DP05

Most of the non-Hispanic Asian population (60.1 percent) lives in the South San Francisco CCD even though fewer people live in this area than San Mateo CCD. The South San Francisco CCD as seen in Table 3-3, is also the only CCD without a non-Hispanic White majority; instead, it has a non-Hispanic Asian majority. Table K-3 shows each CCD's, the County's, and the Town's individual shares of race and ethnicity, illuminating how each compare to each other without considering the different population sizes of the CCDs. The Town's breakdown of race and ethnicity show it has a greater proportion of non-Hispanic White residents than all the other geographies in the Table, including the CCD it resides in, San Mateo CCD. This indicates the Town is a non-Hispanic White concentration amongst its surrounding cities that comprise the more immediate areas of San Mateo CCD and more broadly San Mateo County. In 2019 according to 5-year estimates, White residents (both Hispanic and non-Hispanic) made up 87.6 percent of the Town. In 2021 this percentage stayed the exactly the same. This estimate (87.6) is one piece of data used to qualify Woodside as a Racially Concentrated Area of Affluence as discussed in section 3.3. Table K-3 shows the most recent year available for five-year ACS estimates for the non-Hispanic White group while Chart K-4 only shows data up to 2019.

**Table K-3: San Mateo County by Race/Ethnicity, 2021**

Race/Ethnicity	San Mateo CCD	Half Moon Bay CCD	South San Francisco CCD	San Mateo County	Town of Woodside
White (NH)	43.9%	67.3%	27.1%	37.8%	77.3%
Hispanic or Latino	25.1%	24.6%	22.9%	24.1%	7.2%
Asian or Other Pacific Islander (NH)	21.6%	3.9%	42.1%	29.6%	8.3%
Other Races (NH)	9.5%	4.3%	7.9%	8.6%	7.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 ACS Estimates, Table DP05

The Town of Woodside including its SOI is made up of three census tracts. One of them (6133) belongs entirely to the Town, another (6134) is shared with the Town's Sphere of Influence to the northwest and southeast, and the third is almost entirely SOI (6132). Two of the three census tracts are split into block groups which helps to further understand the geographic variation and distribution of groups in the Town. The breakdown of the differing shares of race and ethnicity between the areas of the Town are found in Table K-4. The areas with the greatest concentrations of non-Hispanic White residents are in the westernmost part of the Town (census tract 6134) while the areas of the Town towards the northeast bordering Redwood City have the lowest concentration of non-Hispanic White residents (67.4 percent in census tract 6133, block group 1 compared to 89.4 percent in census tract 6134, block group 3).

Compared to the County, the Town has seen more dramatic shifts in the percent change for some groups, potentially because of its smaller population. Indicated by Table K-5, there were no non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander residents in the Town in either 2010 or 2020 and a decrease by almost a thousand residents at the County level. Some groups that saw growth at the Town level did not see growth at the County level. For example, non-Hispanic Black or African American residents quadrupled in size while the County saw a 13.6 percent decrease in this group's population. The County saw greater growth amongst non-Hispanic Some Other Race than the Town (67.5 percent and -10.5 percent respectively). Otherwise, both jurisdictions saw the non-Hispanic White population and American Indian or Alaska Native populations decrease. The non-Hispanic Asian saw a large increase in both jurisdictions.

Racial/ethnic groups are seeing different rates of growth and differing patterns of growth between the County and Town levels. As discussed, the breakdown of the County Subdivisions by race/ethnicity

illuminates the County has concentrations of racial groups such as the Asian group outside of the Town. Although the Town is majority White, it is seeing greater increases in the last ten years of non-White groups and a decrease in non-Hispanic White residents, particularly non-Hispanic Asian, Black or African American, and Two or More Races.

To further understand how race and ethnicity are distributed geographically in Woodside, the isolation index and dissimilarity index can provide insight. The isolation index is interpreted as the probability that a randomly drawn minority resident shares an area with a member of the same minority, it ranges from 0 to 100. Higher numbers indicate that a particular group is more isolated from other groups. The average isolation index value for White residents across all Bay Area jurisdictions is 0.491, meaning that on the average in the Bay Area, a White resident lives in a neighborhood that is 49.1 percent White.

The isolation index values for all racial groups in Woodside for the years 2000, 2010, and 2020 can be found in Table K-5. Within the Town, the most isolated racial group is White residents. Woodside's isolation index of 0.769 for White residents means that the average White resident lives in a neighborhood that is 76.9 percent White. Other racial groups are less isolated, meaning they may be more likely to encounter other racial groups in their neighborhoods. Among all racial groups in this jurisdiction, the White population's isolation index has changed the most over time, becoming less segregated from other racial groups between 2000 and 2020. The average isolation index value for White residents across all Bay Area jurisdictions is 0.491, meaning that in the average Bay Area jurisdiction a White resident lives in a neighborhood that is 49.1 percent White. Although isolation has decreased in the last ten years, Woodside has higher isolation scores than the Bay Area indicating the region is more integrated than Woodside.

**Table K-5: Racial Isolation Index Values for Segregation**

Race/Ethnicity	Woodside			Bay Area
	2000	2010	2020	2020
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.055	0.066	0.088	0.245
Black/African American	0.004	0.005	0.007	0.053
Latinx	0.052	0.071	0.079	0.251
White	0.877	0.857	0.769	0.491

Source: IPUMS National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, 2020 Census of Population and Housing, Table P002. Data from 2010 is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, Table P4. Data for 2000 is standardized to 2010 census tract geographies and is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004.

**Table K-4: Block Groups in the Town of Woodside by Race/Ethnicity, 2021**

Race/Ethnicity	60816133001		60816133002		60816134001		60816134002		60816134003	
	Number	Percent								
White (NH)	1,175	67.4%	759	74.2%	835	85.0%	859	82.2%	938	89.4%
Black or African American (NH)	53	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native (NH)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian (NH)	284	16.3%	62	6.1%	49	5.0%	27	2.6%	32	3.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NH)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Some Other Race (NH)	17	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Two or More Races (NH)	112	6.4%	73	7.1%	98	10.0%	46	4.4%	5	0.5%
Hispanic or Latino	102	5.9%	129	12.6%	0	0.0%	113	10.8%	74	7.1%

Note: Block Group 60816113002 excluded because it is mostly contained within Redwood City while all other Block Groups are fully contained within Woodside

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 ACS Estimates, Table A04001


The Dissimilarity Index, or DI, is a common tool that measures racial segregation in a community. The DI is an index that measures the degree to which two distinct groups are evenly distributed across a geographic area. The DI represents the percentage of a group’s population that would have to move for each area in the County to have the same percentage of that group as the County overall. DI values range from 0 to 100—where 0 is perfect integration and 100 is complete segregation. Dissimilarity index values between 0 and 39 generally indicate low segregation, values between 40 and 54 generally indicate moderate segregation, and values between 55 and 100 generally indicate a high level of income segregation. As presented in Table K-6, Woodside has a lower Dissimilarity Index (16) than the Bay Area average (43), indicating there is less neighborhood level income segregation in Woodside than in the average Bay Area city. Compared to the County (see Chart K-5), Woodside has lower dissimilarity scores as well.

**Table K-6: Racial Dissimilarity Index Values for Segregation**

Race/Ethnicity	Woodside			Bay Area
	2000	2010	2020	2020
Asian/Pacific Islander vs. White	0.206*	0.197	0.131	0.185
Black/African American vs. White	0.096*	0.117*	0.044*	0.244
Latinx vs. White	0.089*	0.133*	0.083	0.207
People of Color vs. White	0.111	0.124	0.043	0.168

Source: IPUMS National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, 2020 Census of Population and Housing, Table P002. Data from 2010 is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, Table P4. Data for 2000 is standardized to 2010 census tract geographies and is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004. Note: If a number is marked with an asterisk (\*), it indicates that the index is based on a racial group making up less than 5 percent of the jurisdiction population, leading to unreliable numbers.

**Chart K-5: San Mateo County Dissimilarity Index, 1990-2019**



Source: HUD Exchange, AFFHT0006

The shortcoming of the dissimilarity and isolation indices is they may not capture the nuances of segregation between minority groups within the Town. To capture these nuances, HCD has provided neighborhood segregation typologies for 2022 developed by the Urban Displacement Project (UDP) at UC


Berkeley. These typologies identify tracts based on which racial/ethnic groups have more than 10 percent representation within a given census tract. The typologies consider five racial/ethnic groups—including Black, Latinx, White, Asian, and Other. As indicated by Map K-2, Mostly White is the most represented area in the Town’s Planning Area (SOI included) and to the south in Portola Valley. Woodside is a part of an island of Mostly White within San Mateo County with the closest and largest concentration of Mostly White being south in Santa Cruz County and Santa Clara County. Adjacent to the Town to the east across the 280 Freeway, areas are Asian-White, Latinx-White, with some 3 Group Mixed, and very little Black-Latinx. To the west of the Town and the 280 Freeway, areas are entirely Latinx-White all the way to the coast until Pacifica to the north. Map K-1 presents the Town is a significant concentration of Mostly White residents within its region.

Another tool available to understand the geographical distribution of race and ethnicity over time is the 2010 and 2018 ESRI Diversity Indices. Each year of the index captures the racial and ethnic diversity of a geographic area in a single number, from 0 to 100 determined by the likelihood that two people selected at random are of the same race. The most diverse block groups have scores 85 or greater while the least diverse have scores of 55 or less. In 2010, all of Woodside (all block groups) are labeled as Lower Diversity (a score below 40) and in 2018 the score still fell below 40. Comparatively, the surrounding areas are also between 2010 and 2018 labeled as Low Diversity. Map K-2 presents the Esri Diversity Index for Woodside in 2018.

Taken together, the data on changing demographics over the years, the dissimilarity index, the neighborhood segregation typologies, and the ESRI diversity index point to Woodside having low segregation but low diversity within the Town. No single area has a substantially higher concentration of White residents than another in Woodside. In relation to the County, Woodside and its neighboring jurisdictions within San Mateo CCD are considered Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs), meaning they all are predominantly White with high incomes. Further, within San Mateo CCD, Woodside is more White than the other jurisdictions. Although the Town is majority White, it is seeing increases in the last ten years of non-White groups (particularly non-Hispanic Asian, Black or African American, and Two or More Races) and a decrease in non-Hispanic White residents.


## **PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Persons with disabilities may face discriminatory housing practices based on their disability, including the lack of accessible dwellings and refusal by housing providers to provide reasonable accommodations. The share of the population living with at least one disability is 5 percent in the Woodside compared to 8 percent in San Mateo County. No census tracts in the community have a concentration of people with a disability though the tract to the immediate northeast of Woodside does have a 10 percent to 20 percent share of the population living with a disability, as does a nearby tract extending into Half Moon Bay. Geographic concentrations of people living with a disability may indicate the area has ample access to services, amenities, and transportation that support this population. As of 2021, 15.6 percent of the Bay Area, 22.6 percent of San Mateo, and 28.0 percent of Woodside was 65 years or older. The higher percentage of elderly residents in Woodside than the county and region indicate Woodside is a regional concentration of aging people. While the overall number is low, 94.2% of seniors making less than 30% of AMI (69 people) are spending more than 50% of their income on housing. Elderly people often need resources to modify homes and accommodate their disabilities as they age. With less to spend on these needs, the elderly community albeit small in Woodside could benefit from increased access to Town and County housing resources.



Neighborhood Segregation, 2019

Town of Woodside



Map K-3 shows the presence of disability in Woodside geographically. Indicated by AFFH Data from the ACS, 2010—2014 Estimates, less than ten percent of the populations in all census tracts in the Town had a disability. At the local level, there were no significant changes in the demographics of Woodside between 2014 and 2021 to change this percentage.


## FAMILIAL STATUS

Familial status may be another basis for discriminatory housing practices, including discrimination against families with children. Such discrimination may limit the choices of where families can live and lead to geographic concentrations within a community. Female householders with children in particular may be targets of discrimination. In Woodside, 5.63 percent of households are female headed-households while 74.7 percent of households are married-couple family households. In comparison, 10.1 percent of households in the County are headed by a female (see Chart K-6). In 2019, 2.7 percent of married-couple families and 23.0 percent of female householders lived below the poverty line in Woodside.


Within the Town, there are no census tracts with greater than 20 percent of children living in a female headed household and most households are headed by married couples (see Map K-4 and Map K-5). And according to 2015-2019 ACS Estimates, the area with the highest percentage (10.5 percent) of female headed households is Census Tract 6134, Block Group 3 and the area with the lowest percentage (1.1 percent) of female headed households is Census Tract 6134, Block Group 2.


The County has a higher percentage of female headed households than Woodside but similar to the Bay Area (see Chart K-6). There are census tracts within the County with 20 to 40 percent of children living in households headed by females and one tract located in Redwood City (the City adjacent to Woodside) with 40-60 percent of children living in a household headed by a female. Relative to the rest of the County and the Bay Area, the Town has fewer households headed by females, fewer single-person households, and around 20 percent more married-couple family households.

**Chart K-6: Households by Type, 2019**




Source: ABAG-MTC Housing Needs Data Workbook (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD))





**Percent of Children in Female Householder, No Spouse/Partner Present Households, 2019**

**Town of Woodside**



**Percent of Children in Married-Couple Households, 2019**

**Town of Woodside**

## INCOME LEVEL

Geographic concentration by income, including concentration of poverty, is another type of segregation that may exist within a jurisdiction. The concentration of low- or moderate-income (LMI) individuals provides one method to gauge the extent of segregation within the Town. HUD defines an LMI area as a census tract or block group where over 51 percent of the population is LMI – based on the HUD income definition of up to 80 percent area median income (AMI). As shown on Map K-6, there are no Census block groups in Woodside meeting the HUD definition of an LMI area. Areas within both the Town limit and the SOI, all have less than 25 percent of the population falling into the LMI category. Further, as shown on Table K-7, 75 percent of households in Woodside have an income greater than 100 percent of AMI, and as shown in Table K-8, only approximately 5 percent of the total population lives below the poverty line. While those who identify as Asian or Some Other Race appear to experience relatively higher rates of poverty than other races, this may well be due to the small sample size and does not reflect a wider trend in the county.

The AFFH Data from the ACS, 2010-2014 Estimates shows all the Town and its immediate surrounding areas west of the Junipero Sierra Freeway have ten percent or less of their populations falling below the poverty level in the past twelve months. Map K-7 shows that less than ten percent of the population in all of Woodside fell below the poverty level. This AFFH Data ACS Estimate from 2014 also identified Woodside and all areas immediately bordering it as having greater than \$100,000 AMI in the past twelve months. Poverty status for the ACS, 2014-2019 Estimates shows no change to the Woodside poverty status but to the southeast of the Town in West Menlo Park there was a slight uptick to between 10 and 20 percent of those with poverty status (see Map K-8). For the ACS 2014-2019 AMI findings, Woodside remained in the highest AMI category but there were some lapses in data in areas outside of the Town and its SOI to the east and south (see Map K-6).

More households (75.0 percent) in Woodside earn greater than 100 percent AMI than in the County (49.0 percent). As demonstrated in Table K-7, Woodside and its neighboring jurisdictions (listed places in Table K-7 are almost all immediately adjacent to Woodside) are near the County's percentage or greater. This shows much of the wealth in the County is concentrated in Woodside and its surrounding jurisdictions, mostly inland of the Bay.

The Above Moderate-income resident in Woodside lives in a neighborhood that is 67.9 percent Above Moderate-income. Among all income groups, the Very Low-income population's isolation index has changed the most over time, becoming more segregated from other income groups between 2010 and 2015. The average isolation index value for very low-income residents across Bay Area jurisdictions is 0.269, meaning that in the average Bay Area jurisdiction a very low-income resident lives in a neighborhood that is 26.9 percent very low-income.

**Table K-7: Households by Household Income Level, 2017**


<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>0%-30% of AMI</i>	<i>31%-50% of AMI</i>	<i>51%-80% of AMI</i>	<i>81%-100% of AMI</i>	<i>Greater than 100% of AMI</i>
Woodside	8%	3%	5%	9%	75%
Redwood City	16%	12%	16%	9%	47%
Menlo Park	12%	8%	15%	7%	59%
Portola Valley	7%	7%	8%	4%	73%
Atherton	6%	6%	5%	4%	79%
San Mateo County	13%	11%	16%	10%	49%
Bay Area	15%	11%	13%	9%	52%

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

**Table K-8: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months by Race/Ethnicity, Woodside, 2021**


<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Total Population</i>		<i>Population Below Poverty Level</i>	
White Alone (NH)	4110	77.3%	204	5.0%
Black or African American (NH)	53	1.0%	0	0.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native (NH)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian (NH)	439	8.3%	63	14.4%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NH)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Some Other Race (NH)	17	0.3%	11	64.7%
Two or More Races (NH)	312	5.9%	0	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino	385	7.2%	11	2.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 ACS Five-Year Estimates (Tables B04001 and A13001A-1)



Low to Moderate Income Population, 2019

Town of Woodside








Chart K-7 and K-8 shows how dissimilarity index values for income segregation in Woodside compare to values in other Bay Area jurisdictions. In these charts, each dot represents a Bay Area jurisdiction. For each income group pairing, the spread of dots represents the range of dissimilarity index values among Bay Area jurisdictions. Additionally, the black line within each income group pairing notes the dissimilarity index value in Woodside, and each dashed red line represents the Bay Area average for the dissimilarity index for that pairing.

**Chart K-7: Income Dissimilarity**



Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, American Community Survey 5-Year 2011-2015 Low- and Moderate-Income Summary Data.

**Chart K-8: Income Segregation**



Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, American Community Survey 5-Year 2011-2015 Low- and Moderate-Income Summary Data.

Table K-9 provides the dissimilarity index values indicating the level of segregation in Woodside between residents who are lower-income (earning less than 80 percent of AMI) and those who are not lower-income (earning above 80 percent of AMI). This data aligns with the requirements described in HCD’s AFFH Guidance Memo for identifying dissimilarity for lower-income households. Segregation in Woodside between lower-income residents and residents who are not lower-income decreased between 2010 and 2015. This supplementary data point provides additional nuance to an analysis of income segregation, as this index value indicates the extent to which a jurisdiction’s lowest and highest income residents live in separate neighborhoods.

**Table K-9: Income Ranges**


Income	Woodside	Bay Area	
	2010	2015	2015
Below 80 percent AMI vs. Above 80 percent AMI	0.12	0.08	0.198
Below 50 percent AMI vs. Above 120 percent AMI	0.02	0.02	0.253

Source: Data for 2015 is from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, American Community Survey 5-Year 2011- 2015 Low- and Moderate-Income Summary Data. Data for 2010 is from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, American Community Survey 5-Year 2006-2010 Low- and Moderate-Income Summary Data.

Table K-9 also indicates that the average dissimilarity index between lower-income residents and other residents in a Bay Area jurisdiction is 0.198, so on average 19.8 percent of lower-income residents in a Bay Area jurisdiction would need to move to a different neighborhood within the jurisdiction to create perfect income group integration in that jurisdiction.

Income segregation can be measured using similar indices as racial segregation. Income dot maps, are useful for visualizing segregation between multiple income groups at the same time. The income dot map of Woodside in Map K-9 below offers a visual representation of the spatial distribution of income groups within the jurisdiction. When dots in a map show lack of a pattern or clustering, income segregation measures tend to be lower, and conversely, when clusters are apparent, the segregation measures may be higher as well. In Woodside, the dots appear to not cluster indicating a lower income segregation than nearby areas.

**Map K-9: Income Dot Map of Woodside**



Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, American Community Survey 5-Year 2011-2015 Low- and Moderate- Income Summary Data.

Note: The plot shows the income group distribution at the census block group level for Town of Woodside and vicinity. Dots in each block group are randomly placed and should not be construed as actual placement of individuals

### K.3 Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

---

To assist communities in identifying racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has developed a census tract-based definition: R/ECAPs must have a non-white population of 50 percent or more, and the poverty rate must exceed 40 percent or be three or more times the average tract poverty rate for the metropolitan/micropolitan area, whichever threshold is lower. According to HUD estimates provided by HCD, during the 2009-2013 period there were no R/ECAPs in the Town of Woodside. Further, based on 2019 HUD AFFH data there were still no R/ECAPs in the Town. For this study, the poverty threshold used to qualify a tract as an R/ECAP was three times the average census tract poverty rate countywide—or 19.1 percent. In addition to R/ECAPs that meet the HUD threshold, this study includes edge or emerging R/ECAPs which hit two thirds of the HUD defined threshold for poverty—emerging R/ECAPs in San Mateo County have two times the average tract poverty rate for the county (12.8 percent). In 2010 there were three census tracts that qualify as R/ECAPs (19.4 percent poverty rate) in the county and 11 that qualify as edge R/ECAPs (13 percent poverty rate). And in 2019 there were two census tracts that qualify as R/ECAPs (19.1 percent poverty rate) in the county and 14 that qualify as edge R/ECAPs (12.8 percent poverty rate)—which means they are majority minority and have a poverty rate two times higher than the countywide census tract average.

Additionally, there are no census tracts identified as High Segregation and Poverty tracts on the TCAC/HCD Composite Opportunity Map (Map K-10) within Woodside. Instead of a threshold for race, the TCAC/HCD approach uses a location quotient for racial segregation. The poverty threshold is 30 percent of the population living below the poverty line and the location quotient is essentially a measure of the concentration of race in a small area compared to the county level. As indicated by the HCD, a High Segregation and Poverty category can be used to analyze the presence of R/ECAPs in a community.

While there is no standard definition for Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) provided by either HUD or HCD, they are generally considered to be areas with high concentrations of wealthy, non-Hispanic white residents. An article by Edward G. Goetz, et al. published in HUD's *Cityscape* journal defines an RCAA as a "census tract in which 80 percent or more of the population is White and has a median income of at least \$125,000."<sup>2</sup> Map K-10 displays the locations of RCAAs under this definition; all census tracts in Woodside are identified as RCAAs and all neighboring cities within San Mateo County to the west of the Junipero Sierra Freeway are as well. To the east of the Freeway, most jurisdictions are still entirely identified as RCAAs except for Bair Island, Foster City, San Mateo, Redwood City, East Palo Alto, and Stanford. Although not neighboring Woodside but still in the County, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco, and Daly Cities are some jurisdictions not identified as RCAAs. For one Woodside's census tract (60816133), the AMI was \$250,001 while the County's in comparison was \$122,651 (ACS Estimates, 2015-2019). The other two census tracts forming the Town had AMIs of \$250,001 (60816134) and \$237,163 (60816132).

Town has historically retained a low-density character due to a combination of environmental constraints and the desire of residents to retain a rural character. Environmental constraints are described in the


---

<sup>2</sup> Edward G. Goetz, et al. "Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation" (*Cityscape*, Vol. 21 No. 1, 2019), pp. 99-123.

Housing Element Sites Inventory and Assessment to Accommodate Housing Units including “very high fire hazard zones, steep topography, limited access to sewer, and environmentally protected habitats (e.g., stream corridors that contain habitats for endangered or threatened species such as the San Francisco Garner Snake and California Red legged Frog) widespread through the Town of Woodside. Housing development in Woodside is additionally constrained by geologic conditions such as known and inferred earthquake faults, including the San Andreas Fault, and active landslide areas in the Western Hills.” This text is geographically illustrated in maps featured in the housing sites inventory section of the housing element: Map NH2 Fault Zones, Map NH 3 Flood Zones and Map LUE Western Hills and Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

The Town has amended its Municipal Code to support the creation of ADU’s as a source of affordable housing that is feasible with the area’s high land cost. Discussion of ADU’s is found in the Housing Element Strategies to Meeting RHNA Cycle 6 section, Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units. These units are discussed in various sections of the element as a means of increasing housing opportunity and mobility, and creating inclusive affordable housing geographically dispersed throughout the community. Further, in the Cycle 5 Housing Element the Town created a Multi-Family Overlay Zone for the Cañada College site to allow higher density development with greater affordability for teachers and students.

Compared to other jurisdictions in the County, Woodside has not adopted as many policies related to housing affordability. ABAG compiled a Bay Area Metro Housing Policy Database in 2014 and updated it upon jurisdictions’ request through 2016. In February 2017, staff conducted a region-wide survey to perform a comprehensive update to the existing directory and facilitate information sharing of new policies and programs. The directory has data from 2016 for Woodside. Table K-10 summarizes the directory, comparing Woodside to its immediate surroundings with RCAAs and non RCAAs. The number of policies in the jurisdictions identified as having fewer RCAAs or none have a greater number of policies in place than the jurisdictions identified as entirely or having many RCAAs. Atherton and Woodside are the two jurisdictions with the lowest number of policies (two each) as of 2017. These two policies are discussed in the fair housing enforcement and outreach section. This table illustrates the potential relationship in the region between not having polices in place to improve housing affordability and concentrations of racial affluence; it also highlights Woodside as less active compared to other jurisdiction in terms of enacting affordable housing policy. To address this, Program H4.2c has been added to the Chapter 3.0. Under this program, the Town will seek to partner with non-profit developers for the construction of affordable housing on two Town-owned properties over the planning period.



Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAA) Locations (ACS)

# Town of Woodside

**Table K-10: ABAG Housing Policy Database, 2017**

Housing Policies and Programs	No or Few RCAAs			Many or Entirely RCAAs			
	Redwood City	East Palo Alto	San Mateo	Menlo Park	Portola Valley	Atherton	Woodside
Acquisition/Rehabilitation/Conversion	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO*
By-Right Strategies	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO*
Commercial Development Impact Fee	YES	UC	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO*
Condominium Conversion Ordinance	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Flexible Parking Requirements	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO*
Form-Based Codes	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
General Fund Allocation	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Graduated Density Bonus		YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Homeowner Repair or Rehabilitation	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES*
Home Sharing Programs	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES*
Housing Development Impact Fee	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO*
Housing Overlay Zones		NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO*
Implementation of SB743	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO*
Inclusionary Housing Ordinance	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO*
In-Lieu Fees (Inclusionary Zoning)	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO*
Just Cause Eviction	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Locally-Funded Homebuyer Assistance	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Mobile Home Conversion Ordinance	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
One-to-One Replacement	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Preservation of Mobile Homes (Rent Stabilization Ordinance)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Reduced Fees or Permit Waivers	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO*
Rent Stabilization	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
SRO Preservation Ordinance	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*
Streamlined Permitting Process	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO*
Surplus Public Lands Act	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO*
Tenant-Based Assistance	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO*

\*indicates data is from 2014-2016 instead of 2017

Source: ABAG Housing Policy Database V.2, 2017

## K.4 Disparities in Access to Opportunity

To help quantify access to opportunity within a jurisdiction, HCD and TCAC convened in the California Fair Housing Task Force to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD).” The Task Force developed a series of Opportunity Maps to determine areas with the highest and lowest resources by census tract. Highest resource tracts are the top 20 percent of census tracts with the highest index scores relative to the region, while high resource tracts are the next 20 percent. The remaining tracts are then evenly divided into the low resource and moderate resource categories. Index scores are compiled by domain, as outlined in Table K-11 below. The economic, environmental and education domains were further aggregated to create a composite index, which determines each tract’s resource level (see Map K-11).

### REGIONAL CONTEXT

**Table K-11: Domain and Indicators for HCD/TCAC Opportunity Maps**

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Indicator</i>
Economic	Poverty Adult Education Employment Job Proximity Median Home Value
Environmental	CalEnviroScreen 4.0 indicators
Education	Math Proficiency Reading Proficiency High School Graduation Rates Student Poverty Rate
Filter	Poverty and Racial Segregation

*Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for the 2022 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map, December 2021*

Understanding disparities in access to opportunity within a community requires an assessment of the regional as well as the local context. The following section provides a summary of regional opportunity at the County level and the greater Bay Area Region when applicable, in addition to opportunity in the Town. Townwide opportunity is broken down into the distinct categories of educational, economic, and environmental opportunity based on metrics provided by HCD.

The HUD AFFH tool provides assesses five types of opportunity: educational, employment, transportation, access to low poverty neighborhoods, and access to environmentally healthy neighborhoods. The higher the index score, the better an area’s access to opportunity. The indices are defined as follows:

- Environmental Health — Summarizes potential exposure to harmful toxins at a neighborhood level.
- Jobs Proximity — Quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA).

- Labor Market — Provides a summary description of the relative intensity of labor market engagement and human capital in a neighborhood.
- Low Poverty — A measure of the degree of poverty in a neighborhood, at the Census tract level.
- Low Transportation Cost — Estimates of transportation costs for a family that meets the following description: a 3-person single-parent family with income at 50 percent of the median income for renters for the region.
- School Proficiency — School-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on state exams to describe which neighborhoods have high-performing elementary schools nearby and which are near lower performing schools.
- Transit — Trips taken by a family that meets the following description: a 3-person single-parent family with income at 50 percent of the median income for renters.


Chart K-9 below shows index scores based on the July 2020 HUD data release, focused on the regional perspective. Most Town opportunity indices were not available because Woodside was not listed as jurisdiction and most opportunity index scores were not available at the census tract or block group level. The indices are a useful tool to gauge opportunity at regional scale, but they do not identify opportunity by geographic distribution. Based on the 2021 TCAC Opportunity Areas composite score, as shown in Map K-11, access to opportunity is lowest in the northeastern section and along the San Francisco Bay in the County—including the cities of San Bruno, City of San Francisco, Redwood City, and East Palo Alto and highest in the central section of the county—including cities like Portola Valley, San Carlos, Belmont, Atherton, Hillsborough, and Burlingame.


## **LOCAL CONTEXT**


According to the 2021 TCAC Opportunity Areas composite score (see Map K-12), all tracts in Woodside are classified as highest resource or high resource. As seen in Map K-11, this is typical of cities in the County, including the neighboring cities. Lower resources areas are located east of the Town towards the San Francisco Bay. To the west there are tracts classified as high resource and moderate resource where there are less dense jurisdictions located along the coast.

Non-Hispanic white Woodside residents are more likely to live in highest resource areas compared to racial and ethnic minorities. Only around one quarter (22 percent) of the population living in highest resource areas are racial/ethnic minorities, compared to one-third (34 percent) in high resource areas. Woodside does not include any census tracts that are designated as moderate or low resource areas.

**Chart K-9: Opportunity Indices, Total Population**







**TCAC Opportunity Areas - Composite Score** **Town of Woodside**

## Economic Opportunity

TCAC's 2021 Economic Opportunity Score is comprised of poverty, adult educational attainment, employment, job proximity, and median home value. The entirety of Woodside scores more than 0.75 for economic opportunity, whereas tracts immediately west of the Town have very low scores (less than 0.25). The lack of population in these areas explains the lower score as factors that comprise the score are based on population characteristics. As these areas are parkland or a Very High Fire Hazard Area, there is no reason to add policies that would increase the population thereby raising the low score. Map K-13 presents access to economic opportunity in Woodside. Like the composite score, the Town experiences high economic outcomes similar to its surrounding communities but higher than communities along the San Francisco Bay and coastal tracts to the west.

The top three industries by number of jobs in Woodside include health and educational services, professional and managerial services, and arts and recreation services. The town has a low job-to-household ratio when compared to the County at 1.06 and 1.59 respectively which means there are fewer employment opportunities per household in Woodside. This trend, combined with low unemployment, indicates relatively high out-commuting and retired households.

HUD's job proximity index shows Woodside to have a low to moderate proximity to jobs. On a scale from zero to 100 where 100 is the closest proximity to jobs, most block groups within the town score between 40 and 80, though a small portion of town (northeast corner) scores lower (20-40 index value).

Potentially having an impact on the high economic score despite the few employment opportunities per household is the high level of educational attainment and high median home values in Woodside. In the Town, 34.8 percent of the population 25 years and over has a bachelor's degree or greater while 14.6 percent in the County and 14.5 percent in the Bay Area does. Additionally in 2021, the median house value for owner-occupied units was \$2,000,001 in Woodside, \$1,225,900 in the County, and \$933,300 in the Bay Area.

## Educational Opportunity

TCAC's 2021 education score is based on math proficiency, reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and the student poverty rate. According to TCAC's educational opportunity map, most of Woodside scores higher than 0.75 (which is the most positive education outcomes) with a small portion of the town scoring between 0.5 and 0.75—opportunity scores are presented on a scale from zero to one and the higher the number, the more positive the outcomes. Map K-14 presents there are no over concentrations of educational opportunity in Woodside.

There are four school districts serving Woodside. Woodside and Portola Valley School Districts serve the majority of the Town, but there are also neighborhoods served by Redwood City and Las Lomas School Districts. Sequoia Union High School increased enrollment by 18 percent from 2010 to 2020 but the Woodside Elementary district enrollment decreased by 19 percent over the same time. Both schools lost students during the COVID pandemic.

Portola Valley Elementary School District (66 percent) and Woodside Elementary School District (64 percent) had the highest share of White students, making them among the least racially and ethnically diverse districts in the County. Overall, 29 percent of public-school students in San Mateo County qualify for reduced or free lunch. This rate was substantially lower in districts like Hillsborough Elementary, San

Carlos Elementary, Portola Valley Elementary, Las Lomas Elementary, Belmont-Redwood Shores, Menlo Park City Elementary, and Woodside Elementary where each had 10 percent or less of students qualify for free or reduced lunch. This means that these districts serve very few low-income students.

Woodside Elementary is a very high performing district but proficiency gaps are particularly apparent for English learners in the district:

- Just 27 percent of English learners at Woodside Elementary met or exceeded math standards compared to 84 percent of the overall student body.
- Just 18 percent of English learners at Woodside Elementary met or exceeded English testing standards compared to 84 percent of the overall student body.
- Woodside Elementary and Sequoia Union High School districts both had 14 percentage point gaps between absenteeism rates of English learners and the overall student body.

Many high schoolers in the county met admission standards for a University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU) school. Of the high school districts in San Mateo County, Sequoia Union had the highest rate of graduates who met such admission standards at 69 percent followed by San Mateo Union High with 68 percent. Pacific Islander, Black, and Hispanic students in the Sequoia Union district were substantially less likely to meet the admission standards, with rates of 38 percent, 50 percent, and 55 percent respectively.

Overall, Sequoia Union High School has one of the highest drop-out rates, (10 percent of students) compared to other districts in the County. Still, drop-out rates among Hispanic (16 percent), Black (12 percent), and Pacific Islander (20 percent) students are even higher.

The disparity in access to academic success between non-White students, English learners, and non-Hispanic White students can be attributed to Woodside's status as an RCAA as discussed in section 3.3. Those who are not White or don't have high incomes in Woodside might lack the same resources as other students.

### **Environmental Opportunity**

As depicted in Map K-15, areas northeast of Cañada Road and Whiskey Hill Road have less positive environmental outcomes than to the southwest. But all of Woodside and most of its immediate surroundings scored More Positive Environmental Outcomes with very little difference in each block group's score. Within the County as discussed in the segregation and integration section there is an uneven geographic distribution of race and ethnicity. And as depicted in Chart K-9, there is slight variation in environmental health scores amongst different races and ethnicities in the County. Even though the County is not a proxy for the Town, the groups with the lowest scores in the County for environmental health are worth identifying. It is also worth noting that because Woodside is an RCAA (mostly white and with high incomes), has few policies as of 2017 to support affordable housing, and is also identified as having very high environmental opportunity scores, it is a community that might be difficult to gain access to and could contribute to groups having to live where there is less environmental opportunity nearby such as Redwood City. Reasons for why Woodside has high environmental scores are best indicated by looking at the CalEnviroNS 4.0 data. Socioeconomic factors contribute to the total environmental scores and Woodside's education, linguistic, poverty, unemployment, and housing burden scores are in some of the lowest percentiles relative to the rest of the region. But, it also has lower pollution burden percentiles than cities

located between the 101 and the San Francisco Bay such as San Mateo, Redwood City, Menlo Park, and East Palo Alto. By having a location more inland of where there is closer proximity to both harbors and busier freeways, Woodside avoids pollution relative to nearby cities.

### **Transportation Opportunity**

This section provides a summary of the transportation system that serves the broader region including emerging trends and data relevant to transportation access in the Town. The San Mateo County Transit District acts as the administrative body for transit and transportation programs in the county including SamTrans and the Caltrain commuter rail. SamTrans provides bus services in San Mateo County, including Redi-Wheels paratransit service.

As indicated by Chart K-9, most of the County experiences low transportation cost and high transit trip scores, outperforming the Bay Area. Within the County, SamTrans operates 76 bus routes and into parts of San Francisco and Palo Alto. The Redwood City Caltrain has a couple routes with stops in Woodside (the 278 route to Canada College and the 78 route to Woodside High School) but Woodside does not have its own transit system throughout the Town. The 87 also runs from Woodside High to Portola Valley. To accommodate youth, bus fare costs less for them than adults (over 18). With a large elderly population, ensuring transportation opportunity for those who cannot drive should be a priority in Woodside. In addition to paratransit options, seniors are eligible for a discount on fare with SamTrans. SamTrans also offers services such as Mobility Ambassadors to assist in learning how to use transit and a Senior Mobility Guide available.

In 2018, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which covers the entire Bay Area, adopted a coordinated public transit and human services transportation plan. While developing the coordinated plan, the MTC conducted extensive community outreach about transportation within the area. That plan was developed by assessing the effectiveness of how well seniors, persons with disabilities, veterans, and people with low incomes are served. It was reviewed to determine gaps in services in San Mateo and the county overall. Below is a summary of comments relevant to San Mateo County; no comments specific to Woodside were included in the report.

“San Mateo’s [Paratransit Coordinating Council] PCC and County Health System, as well as the Peninsula Family Service Agency provided feedback. The most common themes expressed had to do with pedestrian and bicycle needs at specific locations throughout the county, though some covered more general comments such as parked cars blocking sidewalk right-of-way and a desire for bike lanes to accommodate motorized scooters and wheelchairs. Transportation information, emerging mobility providers, and transit fares were other common themes.

While some comments related to the use of car share, transportation network companies (TNCs), or autonomous vehicles as potential solutions, other comments called for the increased accessibility and affordability of these services in the meantime.” A partnership between the World Institute on Disability and the MTC created the research and community engagement project TRACS (Transportation Resilience, Accessibility & Climate Sustainability). The project’s overall goal is to, “stimulate connection and communication between the community of seniors and people with disabilities together with the transportation system—the agencies in the region local to the San Francisco Bay, served by MTC.” As part of the TRACS outreach process, respondents were asked to share their compliments or good experiences


with MTC transit. One respondent who had used multiple services said, “it is my sense that SamTrans is the best Bay Area transit provider in terms of overall disability accommodation.”

The San Mateo County Transit District updated their Mobility Plan for Older Adults and People with Disabilities in 2018. According to the district, the county’s senior population is expected to grow more than 70 percent over the next 20 years and the district is experiencing unprecedented increases in paratransit ridership. The plan is targeted at developing effective mobility programs for residents with disabilities and older adults including viable alternatives to paratransit, partnerships, and leveraging funding sources.

MTC also launched Clipper START—an 18 month pilot project— in 2020 which provides fare discounts on single transit rides for riders whose household income is no more than double the federal poverty level.


### **Access to Opportunity for Persons with Disabilities**

The most common disabilities in the town are ambulatory (2.6 percent), hearing (2.3 percent), and independent living (1.7 percent). For the population 65 and over, the share of the population with a disability including an ambulatory or independent living difficulty increases. The data show 0 percent unemployment among residents living with a disability in Woodside, compared to 4 percent among residents without a disability. Countywide, the unemployment rate for residents with a disability is 4 percent, compared to 3 percent for residents without a disability.




TCAC Opportunity Areas - Economic Score

Town of Woodside



**TCAC Opportunity Areas - Education Score**

**Town of Woodside**



**TCAC Opportunity Areas - Environmental Score Town of Woodside**

## K.5 Disproportionate Housing Needs & Displacement Risk

---

According to HCD’s AFFH Guidance Memo, disproportionate housing need “generally refers to a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing need when compared to the proportion of members of any other relevant groups, or the total population experiencing that category of housing need in the applicable geographic area.” Consistent with HCD guidance, this analysis evaluates disproportionate housing need in Woodside through the assessment of cost burden, overcrowding, and displacement risk.

According to ABAG, the population of Woodside increased by 6 percent from 2000 to 2020, which is below the growth rate of the county (9 percent) and the Bay area overall (15 percent). Despite slower growth, population trends in Woodside have generally been in line with the county: slower steady growth between 2000 and 2008 following by population decline during the Great Recession and a fairly rapid population rebound between 2011 and 2016. ABAG also reports that number of homes in Woodside increased 2.9 percent from 2010 to 2020, below the growth rate for San Mateo County and the broader region.

A total of 81 building permits were issued in Woodside between 2015 and 2019, with 44 percent or 36 for above moderate-income units. Another 42 permits of permits (34 permits) were issued for very low-income units and likely reflect either publicly-assisted units or non-profit created units (non-deed restricted ADUs, determined to be affordable by Baird+Driskell Study (2014)). Even so, housing prices in Woodside remain extremely high: median rent exceeds \$2,000 per month and median home value exceeds \$3.5 million. Woodside is dominated by homes priced over \$1 million: 94 percent of all owner-occupied homes exceed \$1 million, compared to 58 percent countywide. Seventy-nine percent of Woodside’s owner-occupied homes are valued over \$2 million, compared to just 19 percent countywide. Though Woodside has long been a luxury home community, home prices have experienced remarkable growth over the past eight years in particular (according to the Zillow home value index) outpacing gains in the county and region.

Rents have increased at a slower pace compared to the for-sale market—however, median rents increased by 36 percent over the past 5 years. Rent increases have likely been dampened by the COVID-19 pandemic. Compared to the county, the Woodside has a similar proportion of units with rents over \$2,000 (62 percent in Woodside and 60 percent in the county) but far fewer units renting for less than \$1,000 (0 percent in Woodside vs. 7 percent in the county).

The majority of the housing inventory in Woodside was constructed prior to 1980. As such, the city’s units are older, lack energy efficiency, could be costly to adapt for disability accessibility.

### **COST BURDEN**

Over one-quarter (28 percent) of renter households in Woodside are cost burdened, spending more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing costs. And one in ten are extremely cost burdened, spending more than 50 percent of their gross income on housing costs. In household numbers, 379 owners and 34 renters are cost burdened while 1,194 owners and 89 renters are not cost burdened. Cost burdened households have less money to spend on other essentials like groceries, transportation, education, healthcare, and childcare. Extremely cost burdened households are considered at risk for homelessness. Data from the AFFH viewer show there is a lower number of cost burdened owners in Woodside in the


eastern tract bordering Atherton, around Interstate-280 (29 percent) than the tract to the southwest (38.9 percent). Most of the Town east of Canada Road and Whisky Hill Road has a higher percentage of renters experiencing cost burden (40 to 60 percent) than west of these roads (20 to 40 percent) as presented in Map K-17.

A smaller portion of households in Woodside (25 percent) struggle with cost burden compared to the County (37 percent). Lower income households are much more likely to experience housing cost burden. Ninety six percent of households earning less than 30 percent AMI (considered extremely low-income households) are severely cost burdened as are 62 percent of households earning between 30 percent and 50 percent of AMI, compared to only 2 percent of households earning more than 100 percent of AMI. As presented in Chart K-10, fewer Woodside residents exceed using 30 percent of their income for housing than the County and Bay Area.

As presented in Chart K-10, disparities in housing cost burden in Woodside by race and ethnicity are minimal, though Hispanic households are more likely to be severely cost burdened (21 percent) than non-Hispanic White households (14 percent).

Large family households (households with five or more persons) experience cost burden at a rate of 12 percent compared to all other households at 25 percent.


**Chart K-10: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity in Woodside**





Source: ABAG-MTC Housing Needs Data Workbook (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD))

## OVERCROWDING

According to data from ABAG, overcrowding is a non-issue in Woodside: no households are indicated as overcrowded (defined as more than one occupant per room). As indicated by Map K-18, there is no overconcentration of overcrowding in Woodside.







## DISPLACEMENT RISK


As housing costs rise, displacement is a major concern in the Bay Area. Low- and moderate-income residents and households of color are most impacted by rising housing costs, and thus these groups are more likely to be displaced from their communities. When individuals or families are forced to leave their homes and communities, they also lose their support network.

Displacement trends may be evaluated by both mobility trends (how often residents move) and by expiring contracts on income-restricted affordable units. Woodside households appear to have greater stability than households in the County overall; eight percent of Woodside residents moved in the past year compared to 12 percent of county residents. Owner households generally experience a greater amount of housing stability whereas renter households are more mobile (i.e., move more frequently).

UDP at UC Berkeley defines residential displacement as “the process by which a household is forced to move from its residence - or is prevented from moving into a neighborhood that was previously accessible to them because of conditions beyond their control.” Displacement is often associated with gentrification, a process where both capital and wealthier residents enter a previously working-class neighborhood. This process is typically characterized by a racial/ethnic component, where the wealthier newcomers tend to be white while the neighborhood predominantly consists of residents of color.


UDP has mapped all neighborhoods in the Bay area, identifying “sensitive communities” with populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased redevelopment and drastic shifts in housing cost. In Woodside, there are no sensitive communities (Map K-19). Additionally, they mapped gentrification and displacement risk across neighborhoods (Map K-20). The typologies for the map are described in Table K-12. Zero percent of households live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement and zero percent live in neighborhoods at risk of or undergoing gentrification. The nearby communities along the San Francisco Bay such as Redwood City and East Palo Alto however are identified as sensitive communities. UDP also identified different displacement groups at varying levels of risk for displacement by tenure for Bay Area communities.

In Woodside, most rental and homeowner units fall under “At Risk of or Experiencing Exclusion” with some falling under “Stable Moderate/Mixed Income.” According to UDP, “about 30 percent of all tracts in the region are either at risk or becoming exclusive, or already stable/advanced exclusive, to low income households. This includes 61 tracts that were labeled as in early or advanced stages of gentrification in 2015, reflecting continued shifts in housing market accessibility for low income households. Exclusive tracts are concentrated in suburban counties, including Marin and San Mateo (nearly 70 percent and 50 percent are of tracts were classified as such respectively); wealthy enclaves in eastern Oakland and Berkeley; and pockets of San Francisco (making up 30 percent of all tracts).”



# Sensitive Communities

# Town of Woodside



**Estimated Displacement Risk -  
Overall Displacement**

**Town of Woodside**

**Table K-12: Gentrification and Displacement Census Tract Typologies**

<i>Typology</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low- or mixed-income tract in 2018</li> </ul>
Ongoing Displacement of Low-Income Households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low- or mixed-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Absolute loss of low-income households, 2000-2018</li> </ul>
At Risk of Gentrification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low or mixed-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Housing affordable to low- or mixed-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Did not gentrify 1990-2000 or 2000-2018</li> <li>• Marginal Change in housing costs or Zillow home or rental value increases in the 90th percentile between 2012-2018</li> <li>• Local and nearby increases in rent were greater than the regional median between 2012-2018 or the 2018 rent gap is greater than the regional median rent gap</li> </ul>
Early/Ongoing Gentrification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low or mixed-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Housing affordable to low- or mixed-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Increase or rapid increase in housing costs or above regional median change in Zillow home or rental values between 2012-2018</li> <li>• Gentrified in 1990-2000 or 2000-2018</li> </ul>
Advanced Gentrification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate-, mixed-moderate-, mixed-high-, or high-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Housing affordable to middle-, high-, mixed-moderate-, and mixed-high-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Marginal change, increase, or rapid increase in housing costs</li> <li>• Gentrified in 1990-2000 or 2000-2018</li> </ul>
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate-, mixed-moderate-, mixed-high-, or high-income tract in 2018</li> </ul>
At Risk of Becoming Exclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate-, mixed-moderate-, mixed-high-, or high-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Housing affordable to middle-, high-, mixed-moderate-, and mixed-high-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Marginal change or increase in housing costs</li> </ul>
Becoming Exclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate-, mixed-moderate-, mixed-high-, or high-income tract in 2018</li> <li>• Housing affordable to middle-, high-, mixed-moderate-, and mixed-high-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Rapid increase in housing costs</li> <li>• Absolute loss of low-income households, 2000-2018</li> <li>• Declining low-income in-migration rate, 2012-2018</li> <li>• Median income higher in 2018 than in 2000</li> </ul>
Stable/Advanced Exclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High-income tract in 2000 and 2018</li> <li>• Affordable to high- or mixed-high-income households in 2018</li> <li>• Marginal change, increase, or rapid increase in housing costs</li> </ul>

**Table K-13: Risk of Displacement by Tenure, Woodside**

<i>Displacement Group</i>	<i>Owner Occupied</i>	<i>Renter Occupied</i>
Susceptible to or Experiencing Displacement	0	0
At risk of or Experiencing Gentrification	0	0
Stable Moderate/Mixed Income	24	12
At risk of or Experiencing Exclusion	1614	194
Other	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1639</b>	<b>206</b>

Source: Urban Displacement Project for classification, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003 for tenure.

Note: Displacement data is available at the census tract level. Staff aggregated tracts up to jurisdiction level using census 2010 population weights, assigning a tract to jurisdiction in proportion to block level population weights. Total household count may differ slightly from counts in other tables sourced from jurisdiction level sources.

According to HUD, there are no low-income affordable units located in Woodside (see Table K-14). As such, displacement due to expiring HUD contracts is less of a concern than access to the community for low-income households.

**Table K-14: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion**


	<i>Low</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>Total Assisted Units</i>
Woodside	0	0	0	0	0
San Mateo County	4656	191	359	58	5264
Bay Area	110177	3375	1854	1053	116459

Source: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database (2020)

Although Woodside is not identified as a sensitive community, UDP does identify much of the Town's units as being at risk or already experiencing exclusion. In the last ten years the cost of housing has risen faster relative to the rest of the County and Bay Area (see Chart K-11) and has the potential to exclude those without the ability to afford homes to own there. As presented in Chart K-12, between 2009 and 2019 median rent in the Bay Area and San Mateo County followed a very similar trend but rents in San Mateo County were consistently higher than in the Bay Area. Comparatively, Woodside's median rent took a plunge in 2011 through 2013 before matching the county and region's rent prices in 2014 through 2019. Woodside and San Mateo County between 2014 and 2019 had similar median rents with Woodside's higher in 2017 but lower in 2019.

Another way affluence excludes and displaces is through maintaining a limited stock of housing types. Compared to the County and neighboring Redwood City, Woodside has a much higher share of single-family housing. In Woodside, 95.4 percent of homes as of 2020 were single-family detached homes while in Redwood City 44.5 percent of homes were single-family detached, and 58.6 percent were in San Mateo County (see Table K-14). Single family homes are typically more difficult to afford than multifamily housing units.

**Chart K-1 I: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) Over Time**




Source: Zillow, Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> 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

-For unincorporated areas, the value is a population weighted average of unincorporated communities in the county matched to census-designated population counts

**Chart K-12: Median Contract Rent, 2009-2019**



Source: Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data releases, starting with 2005-2009 through 2015-2019, B25058, B25056 (for unincorporated areas). County and regional counts are weighted averages of jurisdiction median using B25003 rental unit counts from the relevant year.

Note: For unincorporated areas, median is calculated using distribution in B25056.

**Table K-15: Housing Types, 2020**

Building Type	Woodside	Redwood City	San Mateo County
Single-Family Home: Attached	2.7%	12.9%	9.6%
Single-Family Home: Detached	95.4%	44.5%	58.6%
Multifamily Housing: Two to Four Units	1.2%	6.0%	6.8%
Multifamily Housing: Five-plus Units	0.0%	34.5%	29.2%
Mobile Homes	0.7%	2.0%	1.2%
Totals	2,219	31,536	269,417

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series, 2020

Further, all multifamily units in Woodside are protected by the State’s Tenant Protections Act of 2019 (AB 1482), which includes an annual rent cap and just-cause protections. The Town does not have any additional local rent stabilization or just-cause eviction policies in place. Counseling and legal tenant services are offered by nonprofit organizations such as Bay Area Legal Aid.

## HOMELESSNESS AND SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

In 2019, 1,512 people were experiencing homelessness in the County during the One-Day Count, with 40 percent of people in emergency or transitional shelter while the remaining 60 percent were unsheltered. The majority of unsheltered people experiencing homelessness were in households without children. The majority of people in transitional housing were in households with children.

People who identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native (6 percent of the homeless population compared to less than 1 percent of the total population), Black (13 percent, 2 percent), White (67 percent, 51 percent), and Hispanic (38 percent, 28 percent) are overrepresented in the homeless population compared to their share of the general population. People struggling with chronic substance abuse (112 people), severe mental illness (305), and domestic violence (127) represented a substantial share of the homeless population in 2019.

Data on housing condition are very limited, with the most consistent data available across jurisdictions found in the American Community Survey (ACS)—which captures units in substandard condition as self-reported in Census surveys. In Woodside, fewer than 1 percent of households are indicated as substandard.

## NATURAL HAZARDS AND DISPLACEMENT RISK

Fire, flood, earthquake, and tsunami hazards in California can cause displacement and some communities are at greater risk than others. The State classifies Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) into three classifications: moderate, high, and very high. Portions of Woodside, including the Western Hills and Emerald Hills are classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (see Figure G-2). According to the Woodside adopted fire map recommended by CAL FIRE. The last significant wildfire to cause the loss of homes in the region was in 2020 named the CZU Lightning Complex fire. San Mateo County's 2021 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan ranks the risk of Woodside having a "high" severity wildfire as 51 and as Woodside's top hazard risk.

Although there are portions of Woodside within the 100 year flood plain (see Figure G-2), the town is not ranked as a high risk concern in the 2021 San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Because the San Andreas Fault runs directly through Woodside, the Town is at high risk of a large earthquake. ABAG estimates a potential loss of 159,000 housing units in Bay Area communities after a large earthquake. According to the 2021 San Mateo County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, this loss would have disastrous effects on local and regional economies. It also means that recovery, repair, and rebuilding time for each household would be very lengthy because of the number of homes that would need repairs or replacement. The Plan ranked flood as a 15 and as low risk, severe weather as a 24 and medium risk, landslide/mass movements as a 33 and high risk, and earthquakes as a 36 and high risk in Woodside.


## K.6 Sites Inventory

---

State law requires a jurisdiction to identify sites to meet its RHNA obligations throughout the community in a manner that is consistent with its duty to affirmatively further fair housing. This includes ensuring that sites are located in portions of the jurisdiction to replace any patterns of segregation and increase access to opportunity for previously disadvantaged neighborhoods, including those with high levels of poverty. This will allow households at all income levels, especially lower-income households, to enjoy an equitable distribution of opportunity and close proximity to jobs, transit, a high-quality education, and environmental benefits.

To satisfy this requirement, an analysis of the effects of buildout of the Sixth Cycle Housing Element inventory on existing patterns of segregation and access to opportunity was conducted. The Town of Woodside, including all three Census tracts wholly or partially within its corporate limits, is classified as a Racially Concentrated Area of Affluence. Further, all tracts in the Town are classified as either High or Highest Resource, indicating that all provide exceptional economic, educational, and environmental opportunities for residents. Therefore, this analysis focuses on how buildout of the inventory would affect the balance and distribution of lower and moderate income households in Woodside. As described more fully in Appendix G, the inventory identifies four sites with a combined capacity for 26 moderate and 98 lower income units, and it projects construction of 36 moderate and 72 lower income ADUs and JADUs based on permitting trends in Woodside since 2018. The analysis was conducted by Census block groups in Woodside in order to provide a more granular level of evaluation. There are six Census block groups wholly or partially within the Town limit (see Map K-21). The results of the analysis are shown in Table K-16 below.

Table K-16 shows the total number of housing units in each block group and the percent of lower and moderate income households for the base year of 2018, based on data made available from HCD. Additionally, the table shows the projected number of new units in each block group by income category, the projected total housing units in 2031, and the resulting percentage of lower and moderate income households in 2031. On this basis, three of the six block groups (60816133001, 60816133002, and 60816134001) within Woodside would see an increase in the share of lower and moderate income households, representing a better balance of income categories and improved access to High and Higher Resource areas as a result of Sixth Cycle Housing Element implementation. By contrast, in two of the six block groups (60816134002 and 60816134003) there would be a slight decrease in the share of lower and moderate income households, while in one block group (60816113002) there would be no change. However, these results do not reflect the projected construction of 120 new ADUs and JADUs on single-family properties throughout the Town, 60 percent of which are anticipated to provide housing opportunities for lower income households and 30 percent of which are anticipated to provide housing opportunities for moderate income households, based on the findings of the ABAG ADU Affordability study. While it is not possible to project precisely where new ADUs and JADUs will be built, there is opportunity for their construction in all block groups within Woodside, and as such, when the effect of buildout of the inventory sites and ADUs/JADUs is considered together, the balance of income groups would improve and access to High and Highest Resource areas would be expanded in all block groups. Additionally, adding housing opportunities for lower and moderate income households in tracts with higher rates of rent burden will also help to address the risk of displacement for current residents experiencing housing cost burden.



# Census Block Group Boundaries

# Town of Woodside

**Table K-16: 2031 AFFH Housing Element Sites Analysis**

<i>Block Group</i>	<i>Base Year Households</i>	<i>Low Income Capacity</i>	<i>Moderate Income Capacity</i>	<i>Above Moderate Capacity</i>	<i>2031 Households</i>	<i>Base Year Low-Moderate Income</i>	<i>2031 Low-Moderate Income</i>	<i>BIPOC</i>	<i>2021 TCAC Opportunity Score</i>	<i>Rent Burdened</i>	<i>Over-Crowded</i>	<i>Urban Displacement Project Typology</i>
60816113002	623	0	0	0	623	42.0%	42.0%	42.8%	High Resource	18.7%	5.5%	Stable Moderate/Mixed Income
60816133001	590	86	21	37	734	17.9%	29.0%	29.6%	Highest Resource	0.0%	0.0%	Stable/Advanced Exclusive
60816133002	325	0	0	22	347	21.9%	20.5%	27.6%	Highest Resource	77.2%	0.0%	Stable/Advanced Exclusive
60816134001	381	0	0	21	402	11.9%	11.2%	12.6%	Highest Resource	10.2%	0.0%	Stable/Advanced Exclusive
60816134002	279	12	5	17	313	17.1%	20.8%	19.6%	Highest Resource	0.0%	0.0%	Stable/Advanced Exclusive
60816134003	362	0	0	59	421	30.1%	25.9%	20.3%	Highest Resource	27.0%	0.0%	Stable/Advanced Exclusive

## K.7 Summary and Conclusions

---

State law requires that jurisdictions identify fair housing issues as well as contributing factors and priority levels for each factor. Further, a jurisdiction must identify specific goals and actions it will take to reduce the severity of fair housing issues within that jurisdiction. This section fulfills these requirements based on the assessment provided above. Goals and actions related to AFFH are incorporated into the broader Housing Action Plan contained within Chapter X of this Housing Element.

Based on the findings of this assessment, Table K-17 presents a summary of existing fair issues and their contributing factors, as well as a description for each. Issues that are primarily related to environmental justice or economic development and do not have a direct bearing on fair housing will be addressed in the respective element of the General Plan update. Priority levels were assigned as follows:

- High – Designates contributing factors that limit or deny fair housing choice (i.e., has the potential to violate the Fair Housing Act).
- Medium – Designates contributing factors which should be addressed in the near term. These issues do not violate the Fair Housing Act but may increase fair housing issues in the city. These factors may be beyond the City’s immediate capabilities to address.
- Low – Designates contributing factors that either do not need to be or cannot be addressed immediately by the City, but should be addressed later on during the eight-year planning period

**Table K-17: Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors**

Priority Level	Fair Housing Issue	Description	Contributing Factor(s)	Meaningful Actions	Geographic Targeting	2023-2031 Metrics
High	Segregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Like its neighboring communities in San Mateo County, all of Woodside is designated as a Racially Concentrated Area of Affluence (RCAA) by the State, meaning it is primarily comprised of White households earning more than \$125,000 annually. Under State law, the Town is required to incorporate programs into its Housing Element to redress this pattern over time by expanding options for lower income households (a demographic disproportionately comprised of people of color).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current zoning provides limited opportunity for development of housing likely to be affordable to L/VL RHNA households. There is a preponderance of single-family zoning (Woodside is 98.1 percent single-family homes while the county is 68.2 percent single-family homes).</li> <li>Affordability of housing (for sale and rental): 94 percent of all owner-occupied homes in Woodside exceed \$1 million, (compared to 58 percent countywide).</li> <li>Limited availability of rental housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administer and support new independent housing at Cañada College (H3.1a)</li> <li>Streamline Cañada College housing development standards (H3.1b)</li> <li>Rezone sites identified in the housing element, Table 3-5 (H3.2a)</li> <li>Amend MFRD zone maximum lot size to 2,200 square feet = du/ac (H3.2b)</li> <li>Consider reducing town fees for higher density housing (H3.3a)</li> <li>Expedite processing of higher density housing (H3.3b)</li> <li>Adopt density bonus ordinance (H3.3c)</li> <li>Provide incentives including development standards modification (H3.4a)</li> <li>Provide private sector housing resources (H4.2a)</li> <li>Support employee housing (H4.2b)</li> <li>Collect information on use of ADUs and JADUs, and provide outreach (H1.1a-b)</li> <li>Promote ADUs and JADUs as an opportunity for affordable housing (H1.2a-d)</li> <li>Continue to remove barriers to constructing ADUs and JADUs (H1.3a-f)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cañada College</li> <li>Townwide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75 or more units (H3.1a)</li> <li>75 or more units (H3.1b)</li> <li>Meet RHNA targets (H3.2a)</li> <li>Ordinance adoption (H3.2b)</li> <li>Town's ability to increase financial subsidies for ADU and JADU permit fees (H3.3a)</li> <li>Reduce Town plan check time (H3.3b)</li> <li>Ordinance adoption (H3.3c)</li> <li>Number of projects assisted (H3.4a)</li> <li>Information added to Town website and property owner mailouts (H4.2a)</li> <li>Number of local workers able to access housing in Town (H4.2b)</li> <li>Survey response rate (H1.1a)</li> <li>Response rate (H1.1b)</li> <li>Number of new ADU and JADU applications approved (H1.2a)</li> <li>Number of residents reached/participating (H1.2b)</li> <li>Number of residents participating (H1.2c)</li> <li>Revision of ordinance (H1.2d)</li> <li>Increase development of new ADUs (H1.3a)</li> <li>Increase development of new ADUs (H1.3b)</li> <li>Town's ability to increase financial subsidies for ADU</li> </ul>

**Table K-17: Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors**

Priority Level	Fair Housing Issue	Description	Contributing Factor(s)	Meaningful Actions	Geographic Targeting	2023-2031 Metrics
				<p>Proposed New Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program to facilitate home sharing between seniors and families in Woodside and students at Canada College (H.2.1.f)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and JADU permit fees (H1.3c)</li> <li>Reduce Town plan check time from the State Permit streamlining deadline of 30 days to 20 days (H1.3d)</li> <li>Number of residents using program (H1.3e)</li> <li>Number of ADU and JADU applications processed (H1.3f)</li> <li>10 home sharing matches over the planning period</li> </ul>
High	Enforcement and Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander and Black or African American applicants in Woodside have high denial rates and low application rates. Countywide, these groups are also denied loans at a higher rate than the average (in 2021, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander applicants had a 20.4 percent denial rate, Black or African American applicant had a 14.3 percent denial rate, and White applicants had a 8.7 percent denial rate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial literacy of affected groups</li> <li>Lending discrimination</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul> <p>Proposed New Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program to collaborate with Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, and Project Sentinel on targeted fair housing outreach to realtors and lenders. (H.2.1.g)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of workshops/seminars conducted</li> <li>Percent change in denial rates</li> <li>Increase awareness of fair housing practices among real estate professionals and lenders</li> </ul>
Medium	Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although there is no significant geographic overconcentration, renters are more cost burdened northeast of Canada and Whisky Hill Road than the rest of Town (40 to 60 percent northeast of Canada Road and Whisky Hill Road and 20 to 40 percent southwest). And although not by a large difference, more Hispanic residents experience cost burden than non-Hispanic White residents (21 percent compared to 14 percent) and are more likely to live northeast of Canada Road and Whisky Hill Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of affordable units in a range of sizes</li> <li>Land use and zoning laws</li> <li>Knowledge of renter assistance resources</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote ADUs and JADUs as an opportunity for affordable housing (surveys, brochures, ordinance revisions, modify regulations, reduce town fees, develop amnesty program, and monitor production) (H1.1-3)</li> <li>Provide rental availability information (H2.2.a)</li> </ul> <p>New Proposed Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program promoting availability of county rental assistance programs with targeted outreach to residents in affected areas (H.2.2.g)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> <li>Northeast of Canada Road and Whiskey Hill Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response rate, number of residents reached, reduction of plan check time, and number of residents using new program (H1.1-3)</li> <li>Number of inquiries (H2.2a)</li> <li>Increase housing security for renters northeast of Canada and Whiskey Hill Road</li> </ul>

**Table K-17: Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors**

Priority Level	Fair Housing Issue	Description	Contributing Factor(s)	Meaningful Actions	Geographic Targeting	2023-2031 Metrics
Medium	Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the overall number is low (69 seniors), 94.2% of seniors making less than 30% of AMI are spending more than 50% of their income on housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rising rents and housing affordability</li> <li>Awareness of and ability to access rental assistance</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide rental availability information (H2.2a)</li> </ul> <p>New Proposed Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program promoting availability of county rental assistance programs with targeted outreach to residents in affected areas (H.2.2.g)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> <li>Northeast of Canada Road and Whiskey Hill Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of inquiries (H2.2a)</li> <li>Increase housing security for renters northeast of Canada and Whiskey Hill Road (H.2.2.g)</li> </ul>
Medium	Access to Opportunity (Education)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodside Elementary English learners having lower test scores and greater absenteeism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic and linguistic factors in the home</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul> <p>Proposed New Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program to support after school language learning programs offered by San Mateo County Libraries (H.2.2.h)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support skills development in non-native English speaking youth in Woodside (H.2.2.h)</li> </ul>
Low	Access to Opportunity (Education)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to educational opportunity is high throughout the Town but its school districts are the least diverse racially and ethnically in the county.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordability of housing locally, given that people of color are disproportionately likely to be lower income</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reducing town fees for higher density housing (H3.3a)</li> <li>Expedite processing of higher density housing (H3.3b)</li> <li>Adopt density bonus ordinance (H3.3c)</li> <li>Provide incentives including development standards modification (H3.4a)</li> <li>Provide private sector housing resources (H4.2a)</li> <li>Support employee housing (H4.2b)</li> <li>Collect information on use of ADUs and JADUs, and provide outreach (H1.1a-b)</li> <li>Promote ADUs and JADUs as an opportunity for affordable housing (H1.2a-d)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town's ability to increase financial subsidies for ADU and JADU permit fees (H3.3a)</li> <li>Reduce Town plan check time (H3.3b)</li> <li>Ordinance adoption (H3.3c)</li> <li>Number of projects assisted (H3.4a)</li> <li>Information added to Town website and property owner mailouts (H4.2a)</li> <li>Number of local workers able to access housing in Town (H4.2b)</li> <li>Survey response rate (H1.1a)</li> <li>Response rate (H1.1b)</li> <li>Number of new ADU and JADU applications approved (H1.2a)</li> </ul>

**Table K-17: Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors**

Priority Level	Fair Housing Issue	Description	Contributing Factor(s)	Meaningful Actions	Geographic Targeting	2023-2031 Metrics
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to remove barriers to constructing ADUs and JADUs (H1.3a-f)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of residents reached/participating (H1.2b)</li> <li>Number of residents participating (H1.2c)</li> <li>Revision of ordinance (H1.2d)</li> <li>Increase development of new ADUs (H1.3a)</li> <li>Increase development of new ADUs (H1.3b)</li> <li>Town's ability to increase financial subsidies for ADU and JADU permit fees (H1.3c)</li> <li>Reduce Town plan check time from the State Permit streamlining deadline of 30 days to 20 days (H1.3d)</li> <li>Number of residents using program (H1.3e)</li> <li>Number of ADU and JADU applications processed (H1.3f)</li> </ul>
Medium	Enforcement and Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the number of fair housing cases within the last ten years is low (only two cases) in Woodside, there is a disproportionate share of fair housing cases based on disability bias (56 percent) within the county.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property manager knowledge/compliance levels</li> <li>Access to funding for ADA retrofits</li> </ul>	<p>Existing Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul> <p>Proposed New Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New program to partner with Center for Independence for Individuals with Disabilities (CID) to promote the availability of programs and services for individuals with disabilities in Woodside (H4.1.d)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Townwide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25% increase in participation in CID programs and services by Woodside residents (2023-31) (H4.1.d)</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX L. Inventory of Shelters and Services for the Homeless in San Mateo County**

## APPENDIX L. Inventory of Shelters and Services for the Homeless in San Mateo County

### Department of Housing – Main Office

264 Harbor Boulevard  
Belmont, CA 94002

**Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM):** (650) 802-3300

**Housing and Community Development (HCD):** 650-802-5050; [housing@smchousing.org](mailto:housing@smchousing.org)

**The Center on Homelessness** coordinates homeless services throughout San Mateo County.

[Contact Us | County of San Mateo, CA \(smcgov.org\)](http://smcgov.org)

San Mateo County Core Service Agencies:			
Daly City Community	350 - 90th St., Daly City	(650) 991-8007	Daly City, Colma, Broadmoor
Samaritan House South	1852 Bay Road, East Palo Alto	(650) 294-4312	East Palo Alto, Menlo Park
Coastside Hope	99 Ave. Alhambra, El Granada	(650) 726-9071	Half Moon Bay, Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada
Pacifica Resource Center	1809 Palmetto Avenue, Pacifica	(650) 738-7470	Pacifica
Samaritan House	4031 Pacific Blvd., San Mateo	(650) 347-3648	San Mateo, Belmont, Burlingame, Foster City, Hillsborough, Millbrae, San Carlos
Puente de la Costa Sur	620 North Street, Pescadero	(650) 879-1691	Pescadero, La Honda, Loma Mar, San Gregorio
Fair Oaks Community Center	2600 Middlefield Rd., Redwood City	(650) 780-7500	Redwood City, North Fair Oaks, Portola Valley, Woodside, Atherton
YMCA Resource Center	1486 Huntington Ave, South San Francisco	(650) 276-4101	South San Francisco, Brisbane, San Bruno

### Other Resources Available:

- Second Harvest Food Bank – For information about grocery and meal programs throughout the County, contact the Food Connection Hotline at 800-984-3663 or visit: <https://www.shfb.org/>
- Public Assistance Programs – For connections to Medi-Cal, CalFresh, CalWORKs, and General Assistance, visit: [www.mybenefitscalwin.org](http://www.mybenefitscalwin.org) or email: [hsa\\_ess\\_questions@smcgov.org](mailto:hsa_ess_questions@smcgov.org) or call 800-223-8383.
- General Information – For information and referral for health and human services or for non-medical questions about COVID-19, contact 211 at: 2-1-1 (or 800-273-6222) or text your zip code to: 898211.

### Community Services Agencies

#### Clara-Mateo Alliance

795 Willow Road, Building 323-D  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Phone: (650) 853-7065

The Clara-Mateo Alliance Shelter provides shelter and supportive services to the homeless and those in need of help to obtain stable housing and become self-sufficient. CMA serves both Santa Clara and San Mateo counties as well as homeless from the surrounding Bay Area.

#### St. Vincent de Paul

50 North B Street  
San Mateo CA 94401  
Phone: (650) 343-4403  
<https://svdpsm.org>

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul of San Mateo County provides person-to-person services of time, talent, and resources to help neighbors in need. They provide safety-net services for families and individuals in the community. SVDP works to feed, clothe, house, and heal people in need.

#### Second Harvest Food Bank of Silicon Valley

1051 Bing Street  
San Carlos, CA 94070  
Phone: (650) 610-0808  
<https://www.shfb.org>

Second Harvest Food Bank of Silicon Valley is a private non-profit organization that collects and distributes millions of pounds of food each year to low-income children, adults, and seniors. They distribute food at local not-for-profit agencies serving low-income families and individuals, including the Core Service Providers; provide food and nutritional services to member agencies;

supplement the diets of low-income elderly by direct distribution of a weekly grocery bag; and coordinate a holiday food drive with County employees. Through a variety of programs and services, the Food Bank provides food to people in need where they live, learn, and work, and connect people with resources such as CalFresh.

### **Service League of San Mateo County**

727 Middlefield Road  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 364-4664  
<https://serviceleague.org>

The Service League of San Mateo County is a non-profit agency that develops, coordinates, and delivers in-custody program, services and other activities within all San Mateo County jails and delivers after-release programs and services at four program sites in the community. Agency programs provide humanitarian, educational, spiritual, and personal growth services for jail inmates, ex-offenders released from jail or prison, and the families of either.

### **LifeMoves – First Step for Families**

325 Villa Terrace  
San Mateo, CA  
Phone: (650) 340-8814  
<https://www.lifemoves.org>

LifeMoves (formerly Shelter Network) provides emergency shelter, transitional and long-term transitional housing under seven programs: Family Crossroads (transitional housing for families) in Daly City; First Step for Families (emergency shelter and transitional housing for families) in San Mateo; East Palo Alto House (transitional housing for families in Redwood City; Maple Street Shelter (emergency shelter and transitional housing for men and women) in Redwood City; Haven Family House (transitional housing for families) in Menlo Park; and Bridges (long-term transitional housing) at locations throughout the County.

### **Emergency Assistance Agencies**

#### **Fair Oaks Community Center**

2600 Middlefield Road  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 780-7500  
<https://www.smc-connect.org/locations/fair-oaks-community-center>

The Fair Oaks Community Center is a multi-service facility offering a variety of services to the broader Redwood City Community. Services are offered by a combination of City staff and

representatives from public and private non-profit agencies. Services are available in Spanish and English.

The following types of services are available:

- Child Care and Pre-School
- Crisis Intervention
- Education
- Emergency Food
- Shelter Referrals
- Housing Assistance
- Holiday Food and Toy/Book Programs
- ESL classes/Immigration and Citizenship
- Information and Referral
- Legal Services including Housing & Employment
- Older Adult Services including lunch program and computer classes
- Translation and Forms Assistance