



Housing Element Advisory Committee Meeting

September 9, 2020

Agenda

1. Update on Staff's Presentation to City Council on Site Selection Methodologies
2. Community Engagement Update

1. Update on Staff's Presentation to City Council on Site Selection Methodologies

UNITS BY INCOME LEVELS

	Lower	Moderate	Moderate+
RHNA (gross)	2,095	749	1,029
Current General Plan, planned projects (no rezoning) & ADUs	-1,055	-626	-1,095
RHNA (net)	1,040	123	-876
RHNA (net) w/ buffer	1,354	235	---

Six proposed methodologies

- Mid-range densities
- Up-zone residential
- Proposed projects with rezone
- City-owned properties
- Rezone commercial
- Rezone industrial

Presentation to City Council

- Methodologies, including benefits and drawbacks
- Committee and staff rankings
- Public survey results
- Comments and comparisons
- Request for City Council direction, as needed

City Council Comments

- Use of ADUs as affordable housing
- 1,000-foot buffer between hazardous materials and residential
- Density relative to high fire areas
- Growth Management Plan: housing limits/HCD reply

City Council Comments

- Repurposing commercial centers along El Camino corridor
- Available office and industrial space due to COVID
- Palomar Airport Road corridor: transit, housing potential
- Worker/Workforce housing to support hospitality sector

Next Steps

- Apply methodologies
- Contact property owners
- Continue public engagement
- Initiate environmental review on sites
- Refine data

Housing Element update timeline



FALL 2020:

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT/
ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING



LATE 2020:

PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT
PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL
DOCUMENT



EARLY 2021:

PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR PLAN
ADOPTION



APRIL 2021:

SUBMIT ADOPTED PLAN FOR
FINAL STATE APPROVAL

2. Community Engagement Update

Online Survey

- Gathered public input to get an idea of methods to use when selecting sites for new housing
- More than 4,200 respondents
- Not scientific – feedback similar to public comments at City Council meetings

Public ranking of potential methods of selecting sites for new housing

	Ranking		Rating highest priority = 1 lowest priority = 6
Highest priority	1	At vacant industrial sites that have been converted to residential use.	2.5
	2	Near commercial locations, creating “live-work” neighborhoods.	2.62
	3	On lots that are underutilized (i.e., older buildings that have additional potential).	2.69
	4	On vacant land that is zoned for housing developed, but not yet developed.	2.87
	5	On existing single-family properties as accessory dwelling units (granny flats).	4.08
Lowest priority	6	Areas that are already developed by could be made denser by increasing the number of housing units allowed on each piece of property.	4.63

Public ranking of potential methods of selecting sites for new housing

	Ranking		Rating highest priority = 1 lowest priority = 6
Highest priority	1	New housing should be located where it will have the least impact on the environment overall.	2.66
	2	New housing should be located where it will have the least impact on traffic in Carlsbad.	2.79
	3	New housing should be concentrated in smart growth areas (areas where transit, shops and services already exist).	2.80
	4	New housing should blend in with the character of surrounding neighborhoods.	3.08
	5	New housing should be spread evenly across all parts of the city.	4.01
Lowest priority	6	New housing should be located in areas that are already developed.	4.08

Next Steps

- Create maps using recommended methods provided by staff, Housing Element Advisory Committee and the public
- Gather public input on the maps through online platforms and use feedback to develop a final map

Staff and committee rankings

	Staff	Committee
Assume midrange densities	1	1
Up-zone residential properties	2	5
Count proposals with rezones	3	4
Rezone city-owned properties	4	2
Convert commercial to residential	5	3
Convert industrial to residential	6	6

Summary of committee comments

- Concerned with increased density in lower density neighborhoods
- Appropriateness of R-35 and R-40
- Conflicts with residential in industrial areas
- Supportive of projects proposing a rezone
- One methodology alone cannot meet the city's housing assessment need