

# **CITY OF SAN MARINO**

## **HOUSING ELEMENT**

---

**FEBRUARY 2014**

**CITY OF SAN MARINO  
2200 HUNTINGTON DRIVE  
SAN MARINO, CALIFORNIA 91108**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| A. City Profile .....  | 1         |
| B. Consistency with State Planning Law.....                      | 1         |
| C. General Plan Consistency .....                                | 1         |
| D. Housing Element Organization .....                            | 2         |
| E. Public Participation .....                                    | 2         |
| F. Data Sources .....  | 2         |
| <b>COMMUNITY PROFILE.....</b>                                    | <b>4</b>  |
| A. Population Trends and Characteristics .....                   | 4         |
| B. Employment Trends.....  | 5         |
| C. Household Characteristics .....                               | 6         |
| D. Housing Inventory and Market Conditions .....                 | 9         |
| A. Existing Needs.....   | 17        |
| B. Growth Needs .....  | 22        |
| C. Conclusions.....  | 24        |
| A. Governmental Constraints.....                                 | 25        |
| B. Non-Governmental Constraints .....                            | 39        |
| A. Residential Sites Inventory.....                              | 41        |
| <b>REVIEW OF HOUSING ELEMENT PERFORMANCE .....</b>               | <b>46</b> |
| A. Progress in Implementing the 2008 Goals and Objectives.....   | 46        |
| <b>GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES .....</b> | <b>51</b> |
| A. Goals, Policies and Objectives .....                          | 51        |
| B. Quantified Objectives.....                                    | 55        |

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Age Distribution (2000-2010).....4  
 Table 2: Racial and Ethnic Composition (2010) .....5  
 Table 3: Jobs By Sector .....5  
 Table 4: Total Households (2000-2010).....6  
 Table 5: Household Characteristics.....7  
 Table 6: Housing Units by Tenure (2010).....7  
 Table 7: Household Income.....8  
 Table 8: Households By Federal Income Group (2012).....8  
 Table 9: Regional Comparison of Total Housing Stock (2000-2010).....9  
 Table 10: Tenure of Occupied Units (2000-2010).....10  
 Table 11: Age of Housing Stock.....11  
 Table 12: Bedrooms per Unit (2010) .....11  
 Table 13: Price of Rental Units (ACS).....14  
 Table 14: Rental Unit Prices 2013 (Rental Listing).....14  
 Table 15: Maximum Affordable Housing Costs (2013).....16  
 Table 16: Overcrowded Housing Units by Tenure.....17  
 Table 17: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households (2005-2009) .....19  
 Table 18: Large Households by Tenure 2010.....20  
 Table 19: Female Heads of Households 2010.....21  
 Table 20: 2014-2021 RHNA Housing Needs by Income Category.....23  
 Table 21: 2006-2013 RHNA Housing Needs by Income Category.....23  
 Table 22: Overall RHNA Obligation by Income Categories .....24  
 Table 23: Residential Land Use Categories .....25  
 Table 24: Development Standards - City Of San Marino.....27  
 Table 25: Residential Parking Requirements.....27  
 Table 26: Planning Department Fee Schedule - City Of San Marino .....33  
 Table 27: Average Plan Check and Permit Fees for a New House.....34  
 Table 28: Average Plan Check and Permit Fees for a Second Unit .....35  
 Table 29: Local Development Processing Time .....36  
 Table 30: Vacant and Potentially Developable Land in San Marino.....43  
 Table 31: Progress in Implementing the 2008-2014 Housing Element Goals and Objectives.....47  
 Table 32: 2008-2014 Housing Element RHNA and Rehabilitation Objectives.....49  
 Table 33: Quantified Objectives by Income Category .....55

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Median Sale Price – Los Angeles County and San Marino.....13  
 Figure 2: Area Median Home Prices (March 2013) .....13

# INTRODUCTION

## A. City Profile

The City of San Marino was incorporated in 1913 and is located in central Los Angeles County. The City is bounded by the Cities of South Pasadena, Alhambra, San Gabriel, Pasadena, and unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County. The City is well accessed by the Southern California freeway network and also contains several major thoroughfares which connect San Marino to surrounding jurisdictions. The City is primarily residential in nature with limited commercial areas. The City is also home to the Huntington Library, Art Collections and Botanical Gardens.

The City's prime Southern California location, large properties and well-maintained homes have resulted in high property values. The City is fully developed with only a handful of vacant parcels. With the City's limited commercial area, most residents work outside of the City.

## B. Consistency with State Planning Law

State law requires that each local government adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city. The Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements of a local general plan and is required so that local governments can adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The Housing Element establishes goals and policies which are intended to further statewide housing goals and guide City decisions. This document will also set forth an implementation plan for these goals and policies.

## C. General Plan Consistency

State law requires that the General Plan contain an integrated, consistent set of goals and policies. The City of San Marino's General Plan contains elements relating to land use, community services, natural resources, safety, housing and circulation. The Housing Element will provide goals, policies and implementation measures that are consistent with all other elements of the existing General Plan. If any portion of the General Plan is amended, the City will ensure the Housing Element remains consistent with the General Plan.

New State law requires that the Safety and Conservation (included in the Natural Resources Element) Elements include an analysis and policies regarding flood hazard and management information upon revisions to the Housing Element. The City will ensure compliance with this requirement by reviewing its Safety and Natural Resources Elements. The City will provide a copy of the Housing Element to the water and sewer service providers and coordinate with these agencies regarding State-mandated water and sewer service priority for proposed housing affordable to lower income households (SB 1087) in the event of a rationing of services.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> No unincorporated disadvantaged communities are located within the City or its sphere of influence. The City is not required to address the availability of services to such communities.

## D. Housing Element Organization

The Housing Element is comprised of the following major components:

- **Introduction** – Provides a brief overview of the purpose and background of the Housing Element
- **Community Profile** – Contains an overview of the City’s population, housing and employment characteristics in the context of regional trends.
- **Housing Needs Assessment** – Presents a discussion of the City’s existing and future housing needs, including special needs such as the elderly and large families, and the City’s fair share of regional growth needs.
- **Housing Constraints** - A review of housing constraints and resources, including governmental and market constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing.
- **Housing Opportunities and Resources** – Identifies opportunities and resources that will assist with the provision of housing in San Marino.
- **Housing Plan** – Identifies the goals, policies and programs that will guide the City’s actions in relation to addressing the housing needs of the community.

## E. Public Participation

On May 31, 2013, the City Council discussed potential challenges for the upcoming 2013-2021 Housing Element update and provided policy direction to staff in formulating strategies for meeting the State Housing Element mandates.

A publically noticed Planning Commission meeting was held on July 31, 2013. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss housing issues in San Marino and to receive comments on the draft housing element. In addition to the meeting being locally noticed, special notices were sent to housing developers and agencies that serve special housing needs. The outreach list includes individuals and agencies on the City’s mailing list for senior services and issues, the San Marino Chamber of Commerce, the Chinese Club of San Marino, and local developers, among others. The complete list is contained in Appendix A. A notice was also published in the San Marino Tribune. A summary of public comments received is also provided in Appendix A.

A publically noticed joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting was held on December 2, 2013. The purpose of this meeting was to present the document that was acceptable to HCD to the community, Planning Commission and City Council. Notices were sent to the outreach list found in Appendix A as well as to residents that had spoken at previous meetings.

## F. Data Sources

The following sources of data were used to help develop the housing needs and assess the market conditions in San Marino:

- U.S. Census 2000 and 2010
- 2007-2011 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
- Realtor.com

- Zillow.com
- SCAG Existing Housing Needs Data Report
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Homeless Count
- City of San Marino Building Permit Data
- HCD and Veronica Tam & Associates
- Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data

# COMMUNITY PROFILE

The housing needs of the City are determined by the demographic characteristics of the population and the characteristics of the housing available to that population. The local housing market is seldom static, constantly changing with dynamic social and economic factors. As city demographics and household socioeconomic conditions change, different housing opportunities arise and/or must be created to meet demand. This section explores the characteristics of the housing needs in the San Marino community. This information helps to provide direction in updating the City's Housing Element goals, policies, and programs.

## A. Population Trends and Characteristics

The City of San Marino is one of 88 cities located in Los Angeles County. The County's population increased slightly between 2000 and 2010, from 9,519,330 to 9,787,747, a 1.02% increase. Between 2000 and 2010, San Marino's population increased slightly from 12,945 to 13,147 residents, a 1.01% increase, which closely matches L.A. County's population trend. The average household size is 3.02 persons per household, down from a household size of 3.03 in the year 2000.

### 1. Age Composition

According to the 2000 Census, the City of San Marino was comprised mostly of persons between the ages of 25 and 54. There were also a significant number of school-aged children and young adults between the ages of 5 and 24. The 2010 Census shows a similar distribution but there is a notable increase in the number of retirement aged citizens and correlating decrease in the 25-54 year old group. These numbers indicate that the City continues to house a large number of working families with children and that the City is experiencing an increase in its retirement aged population. Table 1 illustrates the age distribution of residents in San Marino.

**Table 1: Age Distribution (2000-2010)**

| <i>Age Group/Year</i>     | <i>% of Population</i> |             | <i>% Change</i>  |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
|                           | <i>2000</i>            | <i>2010</i> | <i>2000-2010</i> |
| Preschool (0-4)           | 4.9%                   | 3.9%        | -1.0%            |
| School/Young Adult (5-24) | 27.9%                  | 27.5%       | -0.4%            |
| Prime Working (25-54)     | 39.9%                  | 36.1%       | -3.8%            |
| Retirement (55-64)        | 11.0%                  | 14.9%       | 3.9%             |
| Senior Citizens (65+)     | 16.2%                  | 17.6%       | 1.4%             |

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000-2010

### 2. Race and Ethnicity

The U.S. Census provides statistics regarding the race and ethnicity of a city's population. These statistics are helpful for assessing housing needs as different ethnic groups have varying housing needs and expectations. As of 2010, San Marino was primarily comprised of persons classified as "Asian." The other racial group significantly represented in San Marino was "White, non-Hispanic." These two groups characterized approximately 94.8% of the residents in San Marino. Approximately 6.5% of the City's population was of Hispanic origin. Table 2 highlights the racial and ethnic distribution of residents according to the 2010 Census.

**Table 2: Racial and Ethnic Composition (2010)**

| <i>Racial/Ethnic Group</i>  | <i>Number</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| White   | 5,434         | 41.3%          |
| Black   | 55            | 0.4%           |
| Asian   | 7,039         | 53.5%          |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander   | 2             | 0.02%          |
| American Indian and Alaska Native   | 5             | 0.04%          |
| Other   | 198           | 1.5%           |
| Two or More Races   | 414           | 3.1%           |
| <i>Persons of Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup></i>   | <i>855</i>    | <i>6.5%</i>    |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>13,147</b> | <b>100.0%</b>  |
| <sup>1</sup> The Census does not count persons of Hispanic origin as a distinct race, therefore, this figure is not included in the total.<br>Source: 2010 Census |               |                |

## B. Employment Trends

Employment and income are two important factors in determining a household’s ability to secure housing. According to the 2007-2011 American Community Survey, there were 5,904 residents of the City of San Marino in the labor force. This is down from the 2007 figure of 6,300 residents in the labor force, as estimated by the California Employment Development Department. This reduction in the workforce is consistent with the City’s aging population. The 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates San Marino’s unemployment rate at 2.1%, which is much lower than the L.A. County unemployment rate of 6.4%. The ACS also indicates that members of the San Marino labor force are primarily employed by the following industries: finance, insurance and real estate; professional services; and education, health and social sciences. Employees of these industries make up 64% of the labor force.

**Table 3: Jobs By Sector**

| <i>Industry</i>                                 | <i>% of City Employment</i> | <i>% of Region Employment</i> |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, Mining | 0.0%                        | 0.5%                          |
| Construction                                    | 1.5%                        | 6.0%                          |
| Manufacturing                                   | 10.0%                       | 11.2%                         |
| Wholesale Trade                                 | 6.6%                        | 3.7%                          |
| Retail Trade                                    | 5.3%                        | 10.6%                         |
| Transportation and Warehousing, Utilities       | 1.0%                        | 5.2%                          |
| Information                                     | 2.8%                        | 4.4%                          |
| Finance, Insurance, Real Estate                 | 20.6%                       | 6.7%                          |
| Professional Services                           | 18.1%                       | 12.1%                         |
| Education, Health, and Social Services          | 25.3%                       | 20.2%                         |
| Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Hospitality    | 3.2%                        | 9.9%                          |
| Other Services                                  | 2.5%                        | 6.1%                          |
| Public Administration                           | 2.9%                        | 3.4%                          |
| <b>Total</b>                                    | <b>100%</b>                 | <b>100%</b>                   |
| Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey     |                             |                               |



The City is primarily residential in nature and has four “pockets” of commercial uses. These areas are primarily comprised of small scale retail and professional office space. The City’s largest employers are the San Marino Unified School District with 415 employees and the Huntington Library, Art Collections and Botanical Gardens, with 385 employees.

### C. Household Characteristics

Before current housing problems can be understood and future needs anticipated, the City’s housing occupancy characteristics need to be identified. The following is an analysis of household size, household growth, tenure, and vacancy trends. By definition, a "household" consists of all the people occupying a dwelling unit, whether or not they are related. A single person living in an apartment is a household, just as a couple with two children living in the same dwelling unit is considered a household.

#### 1. Household Formation and Composition

Between 2000 and 2010, the number of San Marino households grew at a slower rate than both Los Angeles County and the State. While Los Angeles County’s total number of households increased 3.4% between 2000 and 2010, San Marino’s total number of households grew only 1.5% during the same period. The total number of households in the City in 2010 was 4,330 representing a net increase of 104 households since 2000. Table 4 compares total household growth in the City, County and State.

**Table 4: Total Households (2000-2010)**

|                              |             |             | <i>% Increase</i> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| <i>Area</i>                  | <i>2000</i> | <i>2010</i> | <i>2000-2010</i>  |
| California                   | 11,512,020  | 12,577,498  | 9.3%              |
| Los Angeles County           | 3,133,774   | 3,241,204   | 3.4%              |
| San Marino                   | 4,266       | 4,330       | 1.5%              |
| Source: 2000 and 2010 Census |             |             |                   |

In 2000, the Census indicated that the average household size within the City was approximately 3.03 persons per household. This has decreased slightly to an estimated 3.02 persons per household in 2010. In comparison, the average household size in Los Angeles County did not change from 2.98 persons per household from 2000-2010.

Understanding the composition of these households is important in planning for future housing stock. San Marino households are comprised primarily of married-couple family households. As indicated in Table 5, among the San Marino households, 12 percent were single-person households, a smaller proportion than is found in neighboring jurisdictions, and approximately half of both the County and State’s overall proportions. Households headed by seniors (65+) comprised 31 percent of all households, while families with children comprised 40 percent of all households. Both senior-headed households and families with children represented a much larger proportion of San Marino’s total households than all neighboring jurisdictions, the County, and the State. In addition, five percent of San Marino households consisted of single parents, a smaller proportion than that found in neighboring jurisdictions and approximately half that of both the County and State’s overall

proportions. San Marino has a significantly higher rate of homeowner large households (89 percent) in comparison to neighboring jurisdictions, the County, and State overall.

**Table 5: Household Characteristics**

| <i>Area</i>        | <i>Single Person Households</i> | <i>Senior Headed Households</i> | <i>Families with Children</i> | <i>Single-Parent Households</i> | <i>Large Households</i> |                        |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|                    |                                 |                                 |                               |                                 | <i>Owner-Occupied</i>   | <i>Renter-Occupied</i> |
| California         | 23.3%                           | 20.4%                           | 33.0%                         | 9.6%                            | 54.7%                   | 45.3%                  |
| Los Angeles County | 24.2%                           | 19.3%                           | 32.5%                         | 10.2%                           | 51.5%                   | 48.5%                  |
| Alhambra           | 22.2%                           | 20.9%                           | 27.7%                         | 8.0%                            | 48.9%                   | 51.1%                  |
| Pasadena           | 34.1%                           | 21.4%                           | 23.0%                         | 6.3%                            | 48.7%                   | 51.3%                  |
| San Gabriel        | 17.0%                           | 20.8%                           | 31.1%                         | 7.2%                            | 53.3%                   | 46.7%                  |
| South Pasadena     | 29.4%                           | 18.6%                           | 33.0%                         | 8.8%                            | 65.0%                   | 35.0%                  |
| San Marino         | 12.3%                           | 30.5%                           | 39.6%                         | 4.5%                            | 89.1%                   | 10.9%                  |

Source: 2010 Census

Table 6 below identifies housing units by tenure. San Marino has a significantly higher home ownership rate than the State, County and surrounding communities. This is likely due to the high household income that will be discussed in the next section. The average household size of a rented unit is 3.38 persons, which is larger than the 2.94 person average for an owner-occupied unit.

**Table 6: Housing Units by Tenure (2010)**

| <i>Area</i>        | <i>% Owner Occupied</i> | <i>% Renter Occupied</i> |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| California         | 55.9%                   | 44.1%                    |
| Los Angeles County | 47.7%                   | 52.3%                    |
| Alhambra           | 40.8%                   | 59.2%                    |
| Pasadena           | 45.0%                   | 55.0%                    |
| San Gabriel        | 49.2%                   | 50.8%                    |
| South Pasadena     | 45.7%                   | 54.3%                    |
| San Marino         | 93.5%                   | 6.5%                     |

Source: 2010 Census

## 2. Household Income

Household income is an important factor in considering the housing needs of a community as it directly relates to the types of housing a community desires or needs. A higher household income results in a greater likelihood of home-ownership, whereas lower household incomes can limit housing options and quality.

Household income estimates for San Marino are found in Table 7. With a median household income of \$154,692, the City enjoyed a much higher household median income than the countywide median of \$56,266. In fact, San Marino had a significant number of upper-income households with the majority having incomes of \$150,000 or more.

**Table 7: Household Income**

| <i>Household Income</i> | <i>San Marino</i> | <i>LA County</i> |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Less than \$14,999      | 3.7%              | 12.0%            |
| \$15,000 - \$24,999     | 3.2%              | 10.4%            |
| \$25,000 - \$34,999     | 4.9%              | 9.7%             |
| \$35,000 - \$49,999     | 4.4%              | 12.8%            |
| \$50,000 - \$74,999     | 5.1%              | 17.4%            |
| \$75,000 - \$99,999     | 8.5%              | 12.0%            |
| \$100,000 - \$149,999   | 19.0%             | 13.6%            |
| \$150,000 - \$199,999   | 14.5%             | 5.8%             |
| \$200,000+              | 36.8%             | 6.3%             |

Source: 2007 - 2011 ACS

The State of California uses five income categories for the purpose of determining housing affordability and need in communities. These are based on the Area Median Income of a metropolitan area. This method is consistent with definitions of low- and moderate-income households used in various Federal and State housing programs, e.g., Section 8. These categories are:

- Extremely Low Income – 30% of AMI or less
- Very Low Income – 30% to 50% of AMI;
- Low Income—51% to 80% of AMI;
- Moderate Income—81% to 120% of AMI; and
- Above Moderate Income—more than 120% of AMI

Table 8 presents the distribution of household income in the City of San Marino based on the median household income as established by the HUD AMI for Los Angeles County. Many of the lower income residents are likely elderly residents living on fixed incomes. Despite a lower income, these same residents may be in possession of other assets that contribute to a higher net worth.

**Table 8: Households By Federal Income Group (2012)**

| <i>Income Category</i>   | <i>Number of Households</i> | <i>Percent of Households</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Extremely Low Income   | 244                         | 5.75%                        |
| Very Low Income  | 95                          | 2.24%                        |
| Low Income   | 271                         | 6.39%                        |
| Moderate Income  | 183                         | 4.32%                        |
| Above Moderate Income  | 3,449                       | 81.3%                        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>4,242</b>                | <b>100%</b>                  |
| Source: SCAG Existing Housing Needs Data Report 2012 based on 2005-2009 American Community Survey. |                             |                              |

## D. Housing Inventory and Market Conditions

This section summarizes the housing inventory in the City of San Marino and prevailing market conditions. Analysis of past trends in the housing stock provides a method of projecting the future housing needs of San Marino.

### 3. Housing Stock Profile

Data from the US Census indicates that the housing stock in the City increased by 40 units between 2000 and 2010 at a rate of 0.9%. San Marino's proportionally smaller increase in housing stock during this time period is due primarily to its near-capacity build-out. SCAG's 2012 Existing Housing Needs Data Report growth forecast shows a minimal increase in population (200 people) and no change to the projected number of households over the next 20 years. The forecast does not project the future number of housing units. An evaluation of the adequacy of a community's housing stock needs to consider the type and size of housing provided to meet the specific needs of the community, as well as the affordability of these units.

**Table 9: Regional Comparison of Total Housing Stock (2000-2010)**

| <i>Area</i>                  | <i>Units in 2000</i> | <i>Units in 2010</i> | <i>% Change (2000-2010)</i> |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Los Angeles County           | 3,270,909            | 3,445,076            | 5.3%                        |
| San Marino                   | 4,437                | 4,477                | 0.9%                        |
| City of Alhambra             | 30,069               | 30,915               | 2.8%                        |
| City of Pasadena             | 54,132               | 59,551               | 10.0%                       |
| City of San Gabriel          | 12,909               | 13,237               | 2.5%                        |
| City of South Pasadena       | 10,850               | 11,118               | 2.5%                        |
| Source: 2000 and 2010 Census |                      |                      |                             |

Analysis of the housing stock as per 2010 Census reports indicates that 91.9% of San Marino's total housing units are comprised of three bedrooms or more, with only 7.3% of the stock comprised of two-bedroom units. All of the City's housing stock is comprised of single-family detached homes. Assuming similar trends during this planning period, the City's housing stock appears to provide an adequate proportion of housing units with three or more bedrooms to meet the needs generated by large families. The majority of these units, however, are ownership units, and therefore financially unattainable for many lower-income renter households.

#### a. Vacancy Rates

The vacancy rate is a measure of the general availability of housing. It also indicates how well the available units meet the current housing market demand. A low vacancy rate suggests that households may have difficulty finding housing within their price range; a high vacancy rate may indicate either the existence of a high number of units that are undesirable for occupancy, or an oversupply of housing units. A vacancy rate of 3% to 5% is considered normal. San Marino's residential vacancy rate declined slightly from 2000 to 2010 from 3.9% to 3.3%. The homeowner vacancy rate is quite low, at 0.5% and the rental vacancy rate is much higher, at 6.5%. The overall decrease in vacancy rates and negligible increase of new City residents reconciles with the relatively few units created. This indicates that there appears to be an adequate number of housing units available in the City for its current population.

*b. Tenure*

A significant number of the housing units in San Marino are owner-occupied as shown in Table 10. In LA County, the percentage of owner-occupied units is much closer to the number of renter occupied units, at 47.7% and 52.3% respectively. The surrounding cities of Alhambra, Pasadena San Gabriel and South Pasadena have numbers similar to those of LA County and they all have a higher percentage of renter-occupied units than owner-occupied units. San Marino's high ownership rate can be primarily attributed to the city's high household income. The average household size of a renter-occupied unit is larger than that of an owner-occupied unit. The 2010 Census indicates that there were 2.94 persons per owner-occupied and 3.38 persons per renter-occupied unit. In 2000, renter occupied units also had a larger household size than owner-occupied units.

**Table 10: Tenure of Occupied Units (2000-2010)**

| <i>Tenure</i>   | <i>2000</i>   |                | <i>2010</i>   |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
|                 | <i>Number</i> | <i>Percent</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
| Owner Occupied  | 3,909         | 91.6%          | 4,129         | 93.5%          |
| Renter Occupied | 357           | 8.4%           | 287           | 6.5%           |
| Total Occupied  | 4,266         | 100.0%         | 4416          | 100.0%         |

Source: 2010 Census

*c. Housing Stock*

According to the 2010 Census, there were 4,477 housing units in the City. Single-family detached dwellings characterize the City of San Marino. There are some accessory housing units throughout the city. Unfortunately, it is difficult to know with certainty how many properties contain guest houses or second units. Since 2006, there have been three new second units constructed in San Marino. There is no multi-family housing in San Marino; however, there is a private school within the city which has dormitory facilities and a church which provides housing units for clergy and/or church staff.

*d. Age of Housing Stock*

According to the 2007-2011 ACS, approximately 82.7% of the current housing stock in San Marino was constructed before 1960. In 2000, this number was higher, at 87.6%. The City's older housing stock is kept in very good shape and visually, very few homes appear to be in need of major repairs or maintenance. Many of the surrounding communities were developed around the same time and share a similarly aged housing stock. Table 11 illustrates the distribution of age for the housing stock in San Marino.

**Table 11: Age of Housing Stock**

| <i>Year Built</i> | <i>Number of Units</i> | <i>Percent of Units</i> |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Before 1940       | 2,107                  | 44.3%                   |
| 1940 – 1959       | 1,936                  | 40.7%                   |
| 1960 – 1979       | 463                    | 9.7%                    |
| 1980 – 1999       | 158                    | 3.3%                    |
| 2000 or later     | 90                     | 1.9%                    |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>4,754</b>           | <b>100.0%</b>           |

Source: 2007 - 2011 American Community Survey

*e. Housing Conditions*

The only information on housing conditions reported by the Census is the status of kitchen and plumbing facilities. According to the 2010 Census, less than 1% of the total housing stock in the City of San Marino lacked complete kitchen facilities and no housing units lacked complete plumbing facilities. Units that lacked kitchen facilities were most likely second units or guest homes inhabited by live-in domestic staff or family members. It is recognized that there are a number of housing problems that are not included in this definition, such as structural, roofing, heating and electrical deficiencies. However, deferred maintenance or substandard conditions are rarely found in the city. Most residents are able to afford to maintain their properties as well as upgrade their properties. For those that are not able to afford such repairs, the City has limited Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds available to assist homeowners with things such as roofing or electrical repairs. Code enforcement and maintenance of the community is consistently practiced and substandard housing conditions are not a major concern of the city. As mentioned above, most of the City’s housing stock was developed prior to 1960. The main concern for the future would be how the aging housing stock will withstand seismic activity.

*f. Bedrooms Per Unit*

Table 12 shows the number of bedrooms per unit in the city. There are a minimal number of one and two-bedroom units in the city. The majority of homes have three and four bedrooms. It should be noted that the one-bedroom units are likely second units or guesthouses that were occupied or rented by household employees such as nannies or housekeepers, or by other family members.

**Table 12: Bedrooms per Unit (2010)**

| <i>Type of Unit</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>% of Rental</i> |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 0 Bedrooms          | 0             | 0.0%               |
| 1 Bedroom           | 0             | 0.0%               |
| 2 Bedrooms          | 425           | 8.9%               |
| 3 Bedrooms          | 2,031         | 42.7%              |
| 4 Bedrooms          | 1,671         | 35.1%              |
| 5+ Bedrooms         | 627           | 13.2%              |
| <b>TOTAL</b>        | <b>4,754</b>  | <b>100%</b>        |

Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey

## 2. Housing Costs and Rents


This section discusses resale cost of housing as well as the average rental prices in the City. The information was obtained from reliable real estate industry data sources, the 2010 Census and data provided by the City.

### *a. Home Price Trends*

The 2007-2011 ACS documents a median housing unit value of over \$1,000,000 in San Marino, well above the County median of \$478,300. The values indicate that just 5.1% of the houses were valued at less than \$500,000. Over 70% of the units were valued at \$1,000,000 or more.


When looking at housing value, the ACS is useful because it provides a breakdown of price range, as well as units within each price range. However, the ACS data sets do not provide very specific information for most of the City's housing stock because it does not provide a breakdown of units over \$1,000,000, which are the majority of San Marino units. It is more fitting to review contemporary data available through countywide surveys gathered by private data firms. A March 2013 survey compiled by Zillow.com lists San Marino's median sale price at over \$1.6 million, and Los Angeles County's median home sale price at \$369,700. Similar data collected from Zip Realty in 2007 indicates that San Marino's median home price was over \$1.4 million and the County's median sale price was \$574,100. Comparing the City's median with the County's illustrates that the gap has widened between the County and City, and the price of homes in San Marino remains significantly greater than the County median, and beyond affordability for most families. Further, the price of homes in San Marino has not been as affected by the economic highs and lows of the past 10 years as greatly as the price of homes in the County. The San Marino prices retained a general upward trend versus the LA County values which showed a distinct period of decline. The charts below show how San Marino's median sale prices compare with those of LA County and how current median prices compare with surrounding communities.

**Figure 1: Median Sale Price – Los Angeles County and San Marino**



Source: Zillow.com

**Figure 2: Area Median Home Prices (March 2013)**



Source: Zillow.com



b. Rental Prices

The 2007-2011 ACS reported the median contract rent of all rental units in the City is over \$2,000 per month. Table 13 lists the rental ranges per the 2007-2011 ACS and the number of units that rented for within that particular price range.

**Table 13: Price of Rental Units (ACS)**

| <i>Range</i>                 | <i>Total</i> | <i>% Total</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| \$0-\$499                    | 0            | 0%             |
| \$500-\$749                  | 33           | 10.9%          |
| \$750-\$999                  | 0            | 0%             |
| \$1,000 - \$1,499            | 38           | 12.5%          |
| \$1,500+                     | 232          | 76.6%          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                 | <b>303</b>   | <b>100%</b>    |
| No Rent Paid                 | 42           | n/a            |
| <b>Source: 2007-2011 ACS</b> |              |                |

Since the units reported as multi-family in the City are actually units associated with a church and a boarding school, it is assumed that the stock of rental units in the City is comprised of single-family units. An informal survey of available rental units in the City was conducted in the second quarter of 2013. Table 14 lists the rental ranges of selected units by number of bedrooms. It is interesting to note that the majority of units available for rent consist of three and four bedroom units, with a median size of 2,448 square feet and a median rent of \$4,750 per month.

**Table 14: Rental Unit Prices 2013 (Rental Listing)**

| <b>Unit Type<br/>(bedrooms/<br/>bathrooms)</b> | <b>Square Feet</b> | <b>Monthly Rent</b> | <b>Price per<br/>Square Foot</b> |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2/2  | 1,264              | \$2,800             | \$2.22                           |
| 3/2  | 1,686              | \$2,980             | \$1.77                           |
| 3/2  | 1,603              | \$3,850             | \$2.40                           |
| 4/3  | 1,992              | \$3,900             | \$1.96                           |
| 4/3  | 2,066              | \$3,900             | \$1.89                           |
| 4/3  | 2,300              | \$4,500             | \$1.96                           |
| 4/4  | 2,471              | \$4,650             | \$1.88                           |
| 3/2  | 2,425              | \$4,850             | \$2.00                           |
| 3/3  | 2,984              | \$5,000             | \$1.68                           |
| 5/4  | 3,119              | \$6,000             | \$1.92                           |
| 5/5  | 3,237              | \$6,800             | \$2.10                           |
| 4/5  | 3,661              | \$7,500             | \$2.05                           |
| 5/5  | 3,451              | \$9,000             | \$2.61                           |
| 6/7  | 4,852              | \$11,000            | \$2.27                           |
| Median   | 2,448              | \$4,750             | \$1.98                           |
| <b>Source: Realtor.com</b>                     |                    |                     |                                  |

*c. Affordability Gap Analysis*

The costs of home ownership and renting can be compared to a household's ability to pay for housing in order to determine if a household is overpaying for housing. Overpayment refers to renters and homeowners who must pay more than 30% of their gross incomes for shelter. A high cost of housing eventually causes fixed-income, elderly, and lower income households to use a disproportionate percentage of their income for housing. This may cause a series of related financial problems which may result in deterioration of housing stock, because costs associated with maintenance must be sacrificed for more immediate expenses (e.g. food, clothing, medical care, and utilities), or inappropriate housing sizes and types to suit the needs of the household.

Table 15 shows the 2013 maximum affordable rent and purchase prices for housing in the City of San Marino according to income categories and household size. The data indicates that it would not be possible for an extremely low income, very low income, low income, or median income household to afford a rental unit in San Marino. It may be possible for a larger moderate income household to afford a small rental unit, however, this would likely result in overcrowded conditions. It would not be possible for extremely low income, very low income, low income, median income, or moderate income family to afford to purchase a house in San Marino. Only above moderate income households would be able to afford to rent or purchase a home of adequate size for the household in San Marino.

**Table 15: Maximum Affordable Housing Costs (2013)**

| Annual Income Limits   |          | Affordable Housing Cost |            | Utilities, Taxes and Insurance |            |                 | Affordable Price |           |
|--|----------|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|
|  |          | Rent                    | Owner-ship | Rent                           | Owner-ship | Taxes/Insurance | Rent             | Sale      |
| <b>Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)</b>  |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |
| 1-Person   | \$17,950 | \$449                   | \$449      | \$76                           | \$82       | \$90            | \$373            | \$64,468  |
| 2-Person   | \$20,500 | \$513                   | \$513      | \$88                           | \$96       | \$103           | \$425            | \$73,079  |
| 3-Person   | \$23,050 | \$576                   | \$576      | \$106                          | \$117      | \$115           | \$470            | \$80,061  |
| 4 Person   | \$25,600 | \$640                   | \$640      | \$127                          | \$142      | \$128           | \$513            | \$86,112  |
| 5 Person   | \$27,650 | \$691                   | \$691      | \$146                          | \$165      | \$138           | \$545            | \$90,301  |
| <b>Very Low Income (30-50% AMI)</b>  |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |
| 1-Person   | \$29,900 | \$748                   | \$748      | \$76                           | \$82       | \$150           | \$672            | \$120,091 |
| 2-Person   | \$34,200 | \$855                   | \$855      | \$88                           | \$96       | \$171           | \$767            | \$136,848 |
| 3-Person   | \$38,450 | \$961                   | \$961      | \$106                          | \$117      | \$192           | \$855            | \$151,743 |
| 4 Person   | \$42,700 | \$1,068                 | \$1,068    | \$127                          | \$142      | \$214           | \$941            | \$165,707 |
| 5 Person   | \$46,150 | \$1,154                 | \$1,154    | \$146                          | \$165      | \$231           | \$1,008          | \$176,413 |
| <b>Low Income (50-80% AMI)</b>   |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |
| 1-Person   | \$47,850 | \$1,196                 | \$1,196    | \$76                           | \$82       | \$239           | \$1,120          | \$203,643 |
| 2-Person   | \$54,650 | \$1,366                 | \$1,366    | \$88                           | \$96       | \$273           | \$1,278          | \$232,037 |
| 3-Person   | \$61,500 | \$1,538                 | \$1,538    | \$106                          | \$117      | \$308           | \$1,432          | \$259,034 |
| 4 Person   | \$68,300 | \$1,708                 | \$1,708    | \$127                          | \$142      | \$342           | \$1,581          | \$284,867 |
| 5 Person   | \$73,800 | \$1,845                 | \$1,845    | \$146                          | \$165      | \$369           | \$1,699          | \$305,115 |
| <b>Median Income (80-100% AMI)</b>   |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |
| 1-Person   | \$45,350 | \$1,134                 | \$1,323    | \$76                           | \$82       | \$265           | \$1,058          | \$227,188 |
| 2-Person   | \$51,850 | \$1,296                 | \$1,512    | \$88                           | \$96       | \$302           | \$1,208          | \$259,228 |
| 3-Person   | \$58,300 | \$1,458                 | \$1,700    | \$106                          | \$117      | \$340           | \$1,352          | \$289,367 |
| 4 Person   | \$64,800 | \$1,620                 | \$1,890    | \$127                          | \$142      | \$378           | \$1,493          | \$318,847 |
| 5 Person   | \$70,000 | \$1,750                 | \$2,042    | \$146                          | \$165      | \$408           | \$1,604          | \$341,732 |
| <b>Moderate Income (100-120% AMI)</b>  |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |
| 1-Person   | \$54,450 | \$1,361                 | \$1,588    | \$76                           | \$82       | \$318           | \$1,285          | \$276,605 |
| 2-Person   | \$62,200 | \$1,555                 | \$1,814    | \$88                           | \$96       | \$363           | \$1,467          | \$315,433 |
| 3-Person   | \$70,000 | \$1,750                 | \$2,042    | \$106                          | \$117      | \$408           | \$1,644          | \$352,903 |
| 4 Person   | \$77,750 | \$1,944                 | \$2,268    | \$127                          | \$142      | \$454           | \$1,817          | \$389,171 |
| 5 Person   | \$83,950 | \$2,099                 | \$2,449    | \$146                          | \$165      | \$490           | \$1,953          | \$417,487 |
| Assumptions: 2013 HCD income limits; 30.0% gross household income as affordable housing cost; 20.0% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10.0% downpayment; and 4.0% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Utilities based on Los Angeles County Utility Allowance.<br>Sources: HCD (2013); and Veronica Tam and Associates (2013). |          |                         |            |                                |            |                 |                  |           |

# HOUSING NEEDS

## A. Existing Needs

State housing policy recognizes that cooperative participation of the private and public sectors is necessary to expand housing opportunities to all economic segments of the community. A primary State goal is the provision of decent housing and suitable living environments for Californians of all economic levels. Historically, the private sector generally responds to the majority of the community's housing needs through the production of market-rate housing. However, the percentage of the population on a statewide basis who can afford market rate housing is declining. In addition, there are other factors that affect a household or person's ability to find adequate housing. The following sections analyze the households in San Marino which experience some sort of problem in their housing situation as well as discusses the special housing needs of certain disadvantaged groups.

### 1. Households Experiencing Overcrowding

As defined by State housing policy, overcrowding is a unit that contains more than one person per room. Overcrowding places a strain on physical facilities, does not provide a satisfying environment, and eventually causes conditions that contribute both to deterioration of the housing stock and neighborhoods in general. Table 16 shows the number of persons per room in all units in the City of San Marino by tenure.

According to the 2007-2011 ACS, only 0.8% of the total households in San Marino were overcrowded. Numerically, this represents only 35 households. The SCAG Existing Housing Needs Data Report contains slightly different numbers and identifies 0.72% of San Marino households as overcrowded, which is equal to 31 households. This is still quite low and severe overcrowding (more than 1.5 persons per room) was not documented in any San Marino household. Table 16 breaks down overcrowded housing units by tenure. The data shows that all of the overcrowded units were owner-occupied. Given the generally large size of housing units in San Marino, overcrowding is not a prevalent problem in the city.

**Table 16: Overcrowded Housing Units by Tenure**

| <i>Persons Per Room</i>                | <i>Owner Occupied</i> | <i>% of Total</i> | <i>Renter Occupied</i> | <i>% of Total</i> | <i>Total Households</i>  |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Up to 1.00                             | 4,014                 | 94.4%             | 233                    | 5.4%              | 4,427                    |
| 1.01 to 1.50                           | 31                    | 0.72%             | 0                      | 0%                | 31                       |
| 1.51 or more                           | 0                     | 0%                | 0                      | 0%                | 0                        |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>4,045</b>          | <b>95.1%</b>      | <b>233</b>             | <b>5.4%</b>       | <b>4,278<sup>2</sup></b> |
| Source: SCAG Housing Needs Data Report |                       |                   |                        |                   |                          |

<sup>2</sup> SCAG estimates a total of 4,278 households, which is 52 less than the Census estimate of 4,330 households.

## 2. Households Overpaying for Housing

For policy and general planning purposes, local and state governments use the following criteria for affordability: "Affordable housing costs with respect to very low, low and moderate income households shall not exceed 30% of gross household income." (Health and Safety Code, Section 50052.9). The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) developed by the Census Bureau for HUD, however, provides detailed information on housing needs by income level for different types of households in San Marino. Detailed CHAS data based on the 2005-2009 ACS data is displayed in (Table 17). Housing problems considered by CHAS include:

- Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom);
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room);
- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30 percent of gross income; or
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50 percent of gross income.

Overall, the majority of households in San Marino pay less than 30 percent for housing costs. The majority of lower income households pay more than 30 percent of their gross income and are overpaying for housing. When looking at overpayment by tenure, Table 17 shows that overpayment was more widespread in owner households (39.3%) than in renter households (14.9%). Lower income (less than 80 percent of median income) households comprise approximately 15 percent of all owner-occupied households, and lower income households comprise approximately 23 percent of all renter households.

A distinction between renter and owner housing overpayment is important because while homeowners may overextend themselves financially to afford the option of a home purchase, there are benefits to owning a home. Overpayment among the moderate and above moderate income categories is not much of a concern. Some owner households choose to allocate a higher percentage of their disposable income on housing costs because this allocation is justified in light of investment qualities of ownership.

Purchase prices in the City are extremely high at the present time, and it is unlikely that a household in the lower income range would be able to purchase a home without overextending themselves. It is clear that lower income households in particular will have difficulty finding housing affordable for purchase in the existing housing stock.

**Table 17: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households (2005-2009)**

| Household by Type, Income, and Housing Problem   | Renters   |                |                |               | Owners       |                |              | Total Households |
|--|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|
|  | Elderly   | Small Families | Large Families | Total Renters | Elderly      | Large Families | Total Owners |                  |
| <b>Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)</b>          | <b>10</b> | <b>-</b>       | <b>15</b>      | <b>35</b>     | <b>90</b>    | <b>-</b>       | <b>190</b>   | <b>225</b>       |
| With any housing problem                         | 0.0%      | n.a.           | 0.0%           | 0.0%          | 100.0%       | n.a.           | 97.4%        | 82.2%            |
| With cost burden >30%                            | 0.0%      | n.a.           | 0.0%           | 0.0%          | 100.0%       | n.a.           | 97.4%        | 82.2%            |
| With cost burden > 50%                           | 0.0%      | n.a.           | 0.0%           | 0.0%          | 100.0%       | n.a.           | 97.4%        | 82.2%            |
| <b>Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)</b>              | <b>10</b> | <b>10</b>      | <b>-</b>       | <b>20</b>     | <b>54</b>    | <b>-</b>       | <b>99</b>    | <b>119</b>       |
| With any housing problem                         | 100.0%    | 100.0%         | n.a.           | 100.0%        | 100.0%       | n.a.           | 100.0%       | 100.0%           |
| With cost burden >30%                            | 100.0%    | 100.0%         | n.a.           | 100.0%        | 90.7%        | n.a.           | 94.9%        | 95.8%            |
| With cost burden > 50%                           | 100.0%    | 0.0%           | n.a.           | 50.0%         | 35.2%        | n.a.           | 54.5%        | 53.8%            |
| <b>Low Income (51-80% AMI)</b>                   | <b>-</b>  | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>       | <b>-</b>      | <b>95</b>    | <b>10</b>      | <b>300</b>   | <b>300</b>       |
| With any housing problem                         | n.a.      | n.a.           | n.a.           | n.a.          | 68.4%        | 100.0%         | 80.0%        | 80.0%            |
| With cost burden >30%                            | n.a.      | n.a.           | n.a.           | n.a.          | 57.9%        | 100.0%         | 78.3%        | 78.3%            |
| With cost burden > 50%                           | n.a.      | n.a.           | n.a.           | n.a.          | 47.4%        | 100.0%         | 38.3%        | 38.3%            |
| <b>Moderate &amp; Above Income (&gt;80% AMI)</b> | <b>25</b> | <b>120</b>     | <b>35</b>      | <b>180</b>    | <b>1,005</b> | <b>465</b>     | <b>3,445</b> | <b>3,625</b>     |
| With any housing problem                         | 60.0%     | 0.0%           | 0.0%           | 8.3%          | 15.4%        | 32.3%          | 31.5%        | 30.3%            |
| With cost burden >30%                            | 60.0%     | 0.0%           | 0.0%           | 8.3%          | 15.4%        | 29.0%          | 31.1%        | 29.9%            |
| With cost burden > 50%                           | 60.0%     | 0.0%           | 0.0%           | 8.3%          | 4.5%         | 11.8%          | 10.3%        | 10.2%            |
| <b>Total Households</b>                          | <b>45</b> | <b>130</b>     | <b>50</b>      | <b>235</b>    | <b>1,244</b> | <b>475</b>     | <b>4,034</b> | <b>4,269</b>     |
| With any housing problem                         | 55.6%     | 7.7%           | 0.0%           | 14.9%         | 29.3%        | 33.7%          | 39.9%        | 38.5%            |
| With cost burden >30%                            | 55.6%     | 7.7%           | 0.0%           | 14.9%         | 28.1%        | 30.5%          | 39.3%        | 37.9%            |
| With cost burden > 50%                           | 55.6%     | 0.0%           | 0.0%           | 10.6%         | 16.0%        | 13.7%          | 17.6%        | 17.2%            |

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), based on 2005-2009 ACS data.

### 3. Special Needs Groups

State Housing Law requires that the special needs of certain disadvantaged groups be addressed. The needs of the elderly, disabled, large families, female heads of households, the homeless and farm workers are discussed below.

#### *a. Elderly Persons*

According to the 2010 Census, there were 2,099 persons in the City (16.2%) aged 65 and above. The Census reports 30.4% of all of the City's households were headed by persons 65 years or older. Elderly persons often have fixed incomes in addition to other special needs related to housing. The elderly often require physical improvements to their homes such as ramps, handrails, lower cupboards and counters, etc. They may also need additional assistance in the form of a part-time or live-in caretaker. In most instances the elderly prefer to stay in their own dwellings rather than relocate to a retirement community. Of all of the City's 2,099 senior households, only 47 households, or 2.2%, were renter-occupied housing units. In San Marino, and particularly among the Asian community, it is very common for multiple generations of a family to remain together as one household. Many new houses and addition projects have first story master suites to accommodate elderly parents or grandparents who will also be living in the home.

#### *b. Large Families*

Table 18 displays the number of large households by tenure for the City of San Marino. Large households are defined as five or more persons and are included as a special needs group because they require larger dwellings with more bedrooms. According to the Census, large households represent 14% of all households in San Marino. The data indicates that there were 607 large households in the City in 2010. Proportionately, rental units had a larger percentage of large families than owner-occupied units; numerically, there were a greater number of large owner-occupied households. The 2007-2011 ACS shows that 48.7% of all housing units have four or more bedrooms. The rental unit survey found in Table 14 shows that over half of the units available for rent had four or more bedrooms. These units appear to be sufficient to accommodate the percentage of large household renters as no renter-occupied households reported overcrowded conditions. Although there are resources available to meet the needs of large families, there may not be sufficient numbers at the price range affordable to all large households. Available units may be out of the affordable price range for a number of households, and a number of larger bedroom units may be rented or owned by smaller households or those able to afford the market price.

**Table 18: Large Households by Tenure 2010**

| <i>Number of Persons in Unit</i>    | <i>Owner Occupied</i> | <i>Renter Occupied</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Less than Five                      | 3,418                 | 305                    | 3,723        |
| Five or More                        | 541                   | 66                     | 607          |
| Large Household Percent of Total    | 12.4%                 | 17.7%                  | 14%          |
| <b><i>TOTAL</i></b>                 | 3,959                 | 371                    | 4,330        |
| Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2010 |                       |                        |              |

c. *Female-headed Households*

Female-headed households are included as a special needs group because of the low rate of homeownership, lower incomes, and high poverty rates experienced by this group. According to the 2010 Census, females head 756 households, or 17.4% of total households. Table 19 illustrates the percentage of female-headed households for the City of San Marino. The data shows that the majority of female-headed households have no children under the age of 18. The 2010 Census also reports that 7.4% of female headed households have an income below the poverty level. However, this data is reported with a large margin of error of +/- 8.8%.

**Table 19: Female Heads of Households 2010**

| <i>Household Type</i>                                  | <i>Total</i> | <i>Percentage of Total Households in San Marino</i> |
|--|--------------|---|
| Female Headed Family Households                        | 217          | 5.0%  |
| Female Headed Family Households with children under 18 | 150          | 3.4%  |
| Non-family Female Householder                          | 389          | 11.3%   |
| <b>TOTAL FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS</b>                  | <b>756</b>   | <b>17.4%</b>  |
| Source: U.S. Census, 2010.                             |              |   |

d. *Disabled Persons (Including Persons with Developmental Disabilities)*

Given San Marino’s small population, both the 2010 Census and American Community Surveys do not document updated data on persons with disabilities in the City.

The State Department of Developmental Services provides data regarding developmentally disabled residents of San Marino. The Department breaks down the data into five categories by type of residence (home of parent/family/guardian or residential care facility) and age group. However, if the data set contains less than 25 people, the actual number of residents is not shown. As of November 2012, the data extracted for the 91108 zip code identified less than 25 residents in four of the five categories that are tabulated. The data identified 46 children under the age of 18 that are living with a parent, family or guardian. Therefore, the exact number of developmentally disabled residents cannot be identified. Assuming up to 24 residents in each of the four other categories, we can determine that there are not more than 142 developmentally disabled residents.

The City of San Marino is home to one Adult Care Facility which was last known to staff to house visually impaired adults. The property is located within a residential zone and it houses no more than six individuals.

e. *Homeless Population*

Due to the nature of homelessness, an accurate count of the homeless population is difficult at best. In addition, homelessness is a transitory condition (i.e., a person may be homeless one week, but not the next). The very definition of homeless varies by person. There are those who are without housing of their own and live on streets, in vehicles, etc. There are also those who are temporarily sleeping in homes or apartments of friends or relatives. Every two years, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority organizes volunteers to canvas the streets of Los Angeles County and count the homeless population over the course of three days in January. In 2011 and 2013, San Marino has participated in this count and each year there have been zero homeless observed in San Marino.



*f. Farmworkers*

Farmworkers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through seasonal agricultural work. Farmworkers have special housing needs because they earn lower incomes than many other workers do and move throughout the season from one harvest to the next. According to the ACS, 44 residents (.8% of the total population) were employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, or mining occupations. Currently, there are no active agricultural field operations in the City, so it is likely that persons reporting such occupations are employed at locations outside of the City. The data indicates that there is not a need for farmworker housing in the City.

**4. Preservation of Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion**

There are no existing assisted housing units deed-restricted for lower income households in the City and therefore, no units are at risk of conversion to market-rate housing in San Marino.

**B. Growth Needs**

**1. Overview of the SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment**

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is a key tool for SCAG and local governments to plan for anticipated growth. The RHNA quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction for each Housing Element update cycle. Communities then determine how they will address this need through the process of completing the Housing Element of their General Plan. The RHNA does not necessarily encourage or promote growth, but rather allows communities to anticipate growth, so that they can grow in ways that enhance quality of life, improve access to jobs, transportation, and housing, and not adversely impact the environment.

*a. RHNA Methodology*

The RHNA allocation methodology takes into account existing and projected housing needs. Projected housing needs are determined by three components: projected household growth, healthy market vacancy need, and housing replacement need. The future need for housing is determined primarily by the forecasted growth in households in a community. Each new household, created by a child moving out of a parent's home, by a family moving to a community for employment, and so forth, creates the need for a housing unit. The housing need for new households is then adjusted to maintain a desirable level of vacancy needed to promote housing choice and mobility. In the SCAG region, many communities currently have more than the ideal number of vacancies; the vacancy adjustment, therefore, results in a net reduction in total housing need. Finally, a second adjustment is made to account for units expected to be lost due to demolition, natural disaster, or conversion to non-housing uses. The sum of these factors—household growth, vacancy need (which may be a negative number), and replacement need—determines the construction need for a community.

Finally, the RHNA considers how each jurisdiction might grow in ways that will decrease the concentration of low income households in certain communities. The need for new housing is distributed among income groups so that each community moves closer to the regional average income distribution.

*b. Fifth Housing Element Update Cycle (October 15, 2013 through October 15, 2021)*

For the fifth Housing Element update, the RHNA covers a slightly different planning period – from January 1, 2014 through October 31, 2021. The RHNA fair share housing needs analysis for the City of San Marino is provided in Table 20. Household growth during the 2014-2021 planning period is expected to be 2 households. A base vacancy need and total replacement need of zero was assigned to San Marino. The City was also not given a vacancy credit. This results in the following housing needs for the city:

**Table 20: 2014-2021 RHNA Housing Needs by Income Category**

| <i>Income Category</i>         | <i>Number of Units</i> |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Very Low /Extremely Low Income | 1                      |
| Low Income                     | 1                      |
| Moderate Income                | 0                      |
| Above Moderate Income          | 0                      |
| Total RHNA Allocation          | 2                      |

*c. RHNA Penalty for Fourth Housing Element Update Cycle (July 1, 2008 through October 15, 2013)*

AB 1233 amended the State Housing Element law to promote the effective and timely implementation of local housing elements. If a jurisdiction fails to implement programs in its Housing Element to identify adequate sites or fails to adopt an adequate Housing Element, this bill requires local governments to zone or rezone adequate sites by the first year of the new planning period. The rezoning of sites is intended to address any portion of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) that was not met because the jurisdiction failed to identify or make available adequate sites in the previous planning period.

For the fourth cycle update of the Housing Element (July 1, 2008 through October 15, 2013, as amended by State law), the City of San Marino was allocated a RHNA of 26 units. The RHNA planning period is slightly different than the Housing Element planning period, covering from January 1, 2006 through October 15, 2013. Based on the RHNA methodology released by SCAG on November 2, 2006, the City’s RHNA for the fourth Housing Element update was comprised primarily (90%) of replacement units. New construction need represented only 7% of the RHNA and vacancy need another 3%.

**Table 21: 2006-2013 RHNA Housing Needs by Income Category**

| <i>Income Category</i>        | <i>Number of Units</i> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Extremely Low/Very Low Income | 7                      |
| Low Income                    | 4                      |
| Moderate Income               | 5                      |
| Above Moderate Income         | 10                     |
| Total RHNA Allocation         | 26                     |

Housing units constructed during the RHNA planning period can be credited toward the RHNA. Between 2006 and 2012, 31 housing units were constructed in the City. Given the market conditions in the city, these units were affordable only to above moderate income households.

In addition, there have been three new second units constructed in the City since 2006. City staff contacted the property owners. One of the units is occupied by extended family members at a low rent of \$500 per month. The other two units are used as office and guest housing, not as permanent housing. Therefore at least one second unit can be credited toward the very low income RHNA.

*d. Overall RHNA Obligations*

Based on the above information, the City has an overall RHNA obligation of 17 units in the lower and moderate income categories, as shown in Table 22

**Table 22: Overall RHNA Obligation by Income Categories**

| <i>Income</i>                 | <i>Remaining<br/>4<sup>th</sup> Cycle RNHA</i> | <i>5<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Extremely Low/Very Low Income | 6  | 1                                | 7            |
| Low Income                    | 4  | 1                                | 5            |
| Moderate Income               | 5  | 0                                | 5            |
| Above Moderate Income         | 0  | 0                                | 0            |
| Total                         | 15   | 2                                | 17           |

**C. Conclusions**

Three general categories of housing needs are discussed in this section: existing needs, growth needs, and special needs. Some of the most important findings are:

- Overpayment. It is estimated that 38% of all San Marino households are overpaying for housing. Over 39% of lower-income owners are overpaying.
- Overcrowding. About 0.72% of all households in the City are considered to be overcrowded.
- Female-Headed Households. Approximately 17.4% of all households are headed by females, the majority of which do not include children under 18.
- Growth Needs. San Marino’s overall “fair share” housing need is 17 units in the lower and moderate income categories.

## HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

This section of the Housing Element examines the constraints that could hinder the City’s achievement of its objectives and the resources that are available to assist in the production, maintenance and improvement of the City’s housing stock.

### A. Governmental Constraints

Governmental constraints are policies, standards, requirements or actions imposed by the various levels of government upon land and housing ownership and development. Although federal and state agencies play a role in the imposition of governmental constraints, these agencies are beyond the influence of local government and are therefore not addressed in this document.

#### 1. General Plan and Zoning Code

Every city must have a General Plan that establishes policy guidelines for development within the city. The General Plan is the foundation of land use controls in a jurisdiction. The Land Use Element identifies the location, distribution and density of land uses in the city. In implementing the General Plan, the City of San Marino utilizes Zoning Regulations and the Subdivision Ordinance. General Plan densities are expressed as dwelling units per acre. The San Marino General Plan provides for three residential land use designations in the City, as shown in Table 23.

**Table 23: Residential Land Use Categories**

| <i>Designation</i> | <i>Density Range<sup>1</sup></i> | <i>Description</i>                             | <i>Acreage</i> | <i>Maximum DU's</i> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|---------------------|
| Low Density        | 0 - 2 du/ac                      | Low-density single family residential uses     | 585.29         | 1,170               |
| Medium Density     | 2.1 - 4 du/ac                    | Medium-density single` family residential uses | 1,032.95       | 4,131               |
| High Density       | 4.1 - 6 du/ac                    | High-density single family residential uses    | 411.04         | 2,466               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       |                                  |  |                | <b>7,767</b>        |
| Second Units       | Min. 150 to Max. 600 sq. ft.     | Permitted on lots of 12,000 sq. ft.*           |                |                     |

<sup>1</sup> Density range expressed in dwelling units per gross acre.

Source: City of San Marino General Plan.

Hypothetically, a total of 7,767 dwelling units could be accommodated within the corporate City limits, based on build-out of all residentially designated acreage at the maximum of the density range. This, however, is not the case in the City. The Census identifies 4,477 dwelling units currently developed within the City. The amount of housing stock within the City is not expected to increase beyond the stated maximum build-out of the General Plan.

Density is a critical factor in the development of affordable housing. In theory, maintaining low densities typically increases the cost of construction per unit while higher density lowers the per unit land cost and facilitates efficient construction retaining the overall density assignment of the entire property. However, the City’s vision of the community is a high quality, low density residential

character, which does not lend itself to higher density mechanisms such as zero lot line and clustered development. There are no residential designations in the City which permit a density of development that will accommodate certain types of housing that might be affordable to Very Low and Low income households. In addition, the City is considered built-out, and therefore there are essentially no vacant parcels that could be re-designated to a higher density, nor are there areas that are anticipated to be appropriate for recycling to higher density residential uses.

Zoning, which must be consistent with the General Plan, establishes more specific development standards, allowable uses, and limitations. Zoning regulations control development by establishing requirements related to height, density, lot area, yard setbacks, and minimum parking spaces. Site development standards are comparable to other community requirements and ensure a quality living environment for all household groups in the City. Design standards such as roofing materials, architectural enhancements, and landscaping also increase the costs of housing. The City's perspective is that all housing should meet the same fundamental high quality design standards.

The City of San Marino's Zoning Code contains eight residential district classifications within the Residential R-1 Zone that accommodate a range of densities and lot size requirements from 60,000 square feet to 9,000 square feet per unit, as shown in Table 24.

The Zoning Code permits residential uses in Commercial districts with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). There are no specified development standards or criteria for the development of residential units in a Commercial zone, except for a section that requires a minimum of 5,000 square feet of land area per family in the C-1 Zone. This requirement is a constraint to the development of residential uses in the C-1 Zone, but relief from this Code section can be requested through a variance process.

In response to State mandated requirements and local needs, the City has regulatory mechanisms allowing for further development of second units. Second dwelling units are permitted on certain single family residential lots without a CUP. A lot greater than 12,000 square feet is allowed to construct a second-unit without discretionary approval. Any lot less than 12,000 square feet would require discretionary review.

**Table 24: Development Standards - City Of San Marino**

| <i>Zone</i> | <i>Permitted Uses</i>   | <i>Minimum Lot Area</i> | <i>Maximum Height</i> | <i>Front Setback</i> | <i>Interior Setback</i> | <i>Rear Setback</i> | <i>Minimum Avg. Width of Lot</i> | <i>Minimum Street Frontage</i> |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| R1 – IE     | Single-family dwellings | 60,000                  | 35 ft.                | 40 ft.               | 20 ft.                  | 40 ft.              | 125 ft.                          | 100 ft.                        |
| R1- I       | Single-family dwellings | 30,000                  | 35 ft.                | 40 ft.               | 20 ft.                  | 40 ft.              | 125 ft.                          | 100 ft.                        |
| R1 - II     | Single-family dwellings | 20,000                  | 35 ft.                | 40 ft.               | 12 ft.                  | 40 ft.              | 100 ft.                          | 80 ft.                         |
| R1- III     | Single-family dwellings | 17,000                  | 30 ft.                | 40 ft.               | 12 ft.                  | 40 ft.              | 100 ft.                          | 80 ft.                         |
| R1 – IV     | Single-family dwellings | 15,000                  | 30 ft.                | 35 ft.               | 10 ft.                  | 35 ft.              | 85 ft.                           | 70 ft.                         |
| R1 – V      | Single-family dwellings | 12,000                  | 30 ft.                | 30 ft.               | 8 ft.                   | 30 ft.              | 80 ft.                           | 70 ft.                         |
| R1 – VI     | Single-family dwellings | 10,000                  | 30 ft.                | 25 ft.               | 5 ft.                   | 25 ft.              | 70 ft.                           | 60 ft.                         |
| R1 – VII    | Single-family dwellings | 9,000                   | 30 ft.                | 25 ft.               | 5 ft.                   | 25 ft.              | 60 ft.                           | 60 ft.                         |

## 2. Parking Requirements

Parking requirements in San Marino are typical for a city of its size and character, as shown in Table 25. The number of parking spaces required for a single-family unit is related to number of bedrooms. These characteristics do not constrain the development of housing directly, although greater amount of acreage is required for meeting parking requirements as the number of bedrooms increase.

For residential uses within a Commercial zone, the parking requirements will be determined by the Planning Commission, based upon either the requirements for the most comparable use specified in the Zoning Code, or upon a special study of parking requirements for that use. The City does have joint use provisions subject to approval of a CUP. The requirements for parking do not directly constrain the development of housing.

**Table 25: Residential Parking Requirements**

| <i>Type of Residential Development</i>   | <i>Required Parking Spaces<sup>1</sup></i> | <i>Comments</i>  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Single Family Residential</b>   |  |  |
| 1 – 4 bedrooms   | 2 spaces                                   |  |
| 5 – 6 bedrooms   | 3 spaces                                   |  |
| 7 and above bedrooms   | 4 spaces                                   | Plus one space per every 2 additional bedrooms   |
| Residential Units in the C-1 Zone  | Not Specified                              | To be determined by special parking study or application of requirements for a similar use |
| <sup>1</sup> All required spaces must be within an enclosed garage; carports are prohibited.<br>Source: City of San Marino Zoning Code |  |  |

### 3. Density Bonus Law

In general, this state law provides developers with density bonuses or other incentives in exchange for the provision of affordable housing which meets certain requirements. San Marino does not have its own density bonus ordinance and will comply with the provisions of the State Density Bonus law when or if such a project arises. Given that there is no multi-family housing in San Marino, the City has not yet received an application for a project that would be subject to these laws.

### 4. Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types

#### *a. Second Units*

In response to state mandated requirements and local needs, the City of San Marino allows for the development of a second dwelling unit. Second units primarily serve to augment resources for senior housing, guest quarters, and domestic help living quarters, though they may serve the needs of other segments of the population. Accessory dwelling units are permitted within R1 districts with lots of 12,000 square feet or more (typically within Area Districts IE, I, II, III, IV, and V), without CUP approval. Prior to 2003, the required lot size was 15,000 square feet. There are approximately 2,143 residential lots in the City that exceed 12,000 square feet. This represents approximately 46% of all City lots. Cooking facilities are permitted in second units. Conditions in the Zoning Code require:

- The minimum floor area shall not be less than 150 square feet; the maximum floor area of the unit shall not exceed 600 square feet, exclusive of garage;
- The lot currently contains an existing single family dwelling;
- The unit may be rented but not sold separately from the primary unit on the lot – a second unit shall at all times be held under the same ownership as the remainder of the lot;
- The unit shall conform to the same development standards as that set forth for the zone and area district in which the second unit is to be located.
- The unit shall have its own entrance;
- Common walls separating dwelling units shall be properly soundproofed. Details of the proposed means of soundproofing shall be submitted with the application;
- The design of the second unit shall be consistent with that of the main building; and
- The unit must be served by its own parking space.
- A second unit may not have separate utility services.

In order to increase the options available to homeowners, the required development standards could be further modified to make a second unit feasible on a greater number of lots. In addition, the City could provide financial incentives to property owners who propose to rent the unit out (i.e. not intending to use it as a no-rent, live-in domestic help residence or as a guesthouse). Incentives could include a reduction or deferment of processing fees, or priority processing for second unit applications. The City may consider setting a condition of approval requiring the owner to rent the unit at costs affordable to lower or moderate income, and/or senior households. There may also be unpermitted accessory structures that are currently being used as second units. It is unlikely that these units were counted by the Census and therefore not used in RHNA calculations. San Marino is a city of single-family homes on relatively large lots. It would be very difficult for an illegal second

unit to be noticeable from public view. The City will explore an amnesty program whereby these units may be converted to legal second units without penalty.

Overall, the level of interest among property owners is still low. Since 2008, the City of San Marino has had three second units constructed, one of which is being rented to elderly parents at a rate of \$500 per month. A fourth second unit was recently approved via a reasonable accommodation permit to house a disabled person. Much more frequently, applications are submitted for “pool houses” which typically consist of one large room with a full bathroom. This type of structure does not provide complete, independent living facilities and therefore, does not qualify as a second unit. Pool houses require a CUP but have less restrictive development standards. Staff has found that this type of use is preferred by owners over a second unit and may be a reason few second units are being proposed. Second units can be a maximum of 600 square feet regardless of the lot size or maximum allowable livable area and lot coverage. Second units also require the same setbacks that are required for the main house. A pool house has no maximum size and the required rear yard setback would be equal to the required side yard setback. For example, a pool house in Area District V would require an eight-foot side and rear yard setback. A second unit on this same lot would require an eight foot side yard setback and 30 foot rear yard setback. The setback and maximum size restrictions that apply to second units but not pool houses end up making the pool house option much more appealing to homeowners. Between 2008 and 2013, 20 pool houses were approved in the City. Most have already been constructed with just the most recent ones in the plan check and permitting process. In contrast, during the same time period only three second units have been built with one recently approved. Changes to the second unit ordinance regarding the maximum allowable size and required setbacks will help to reconcile the difference in these numbers. A comprehensive review of previous approvals and existing Code requirements will help staff determine how to update the Code in a way that encourages the construction of second units and the conversion of pool houses into second units.

Given the existence of a large number of existing pool houses and lots over 12,000 square feet in the City, which typically can accommodate a second unit under flexible development standards, there is potential for this option to produce affordable rental housing opportunities.

#### *b. Manufactured Housing*

The City has allowed manufactured, prefabricated and mobile home construction in R-1 zones since 1996. No manufactured housing currently exists in the City. It is subject to the same development standards as otherwise required for that zone. Certain additional requirements are included in the City Code:

- Minimum Dimensions: Thirty feet (30') (excluding garage).
- Roof: Pressure treated, fire retardant wood shake or shingle, 300# or heavier composition shingle, clay or cement tile, rock, or gravel; shaped, rolled or reflective roofs are prohibited.
- Eaves: Minimum sixteen inch (16") eave protection unless otherwise approved by the Commission.
- Exterior Wall Treatment:
  - Permitted Materials: Wood siding, stucco, brick or as approved by the Commission.
  - Color: Natural earth tones, white, with complementary trim color.



- Prohibited Materials: No reflective, glossy, polished, roll-formed, stamped, extruded, plastic, PVC or similar type of materials shall be used for roofing or siding.
- Foundation Required: All manufactured homes shall be installed on a foundation system, pursuant to section 18551 of the California Health and Safety Code, and no more than ten (10) years shall have elapsed between the date of manufacture of the home and the date of the application for issuance of a permit to install the manufactured home in the City.
- Design Review: Such manufactured homes shall meet all other requirements of this Code and are subject to design review as provided in Section 23.15.03 of this Chapter. (Ord. 096-1093, 7-10-1996)

*c. Emergency Shelters*

State law (SB2) requires cities to provide at least one zoning category in which emergency shelters can be located without discretionary approval. At least one site within this zone must be able to accommodate an emergency shelter. Alternatively, a City may satisfy this requirement by entering into an agreement with up to two other adjacent local governments to provide a joint facility. The City currently has not designated a zone for emergency shelters. San Marino essentially has four zoning categories – R-1 (which includes eight Area Districts within the R-1 designation), C-1, Parks and Recreation (P&R), and Historic and Cultural Zones (H&C). The P&R and H&C Zones only contain one parcel each and therefore would not be appropriate zones for the development of emergency shelters. The C-1 Zone has the potential to support emergency shelter uses and contains parcels of sufficient size to accommodate the development of new shelters or conversion of existing space to a shelter. C-1 properties are primarily located along Huntington Drive, the major traffic route in the City. Public transportation linking the City to surrounding communities (such as Pasadena) is available along Huntington Drive. Some of the vacant and underutilized C-1 properties are identified in Table 30.

*d. Transitional Housing*

The City Code currently prohibits “Transitory Residential Uses” in the R-1 zone. The Code defines “Transitory Residential Uses” as any residential use where the average tenancy or stay is usually less than ninety (90) days, including, without limitation, new parolee-probationer homes, safe houses, residential care facilities not licensed by the state, and other residential uses similarly transitory in nature.

*e. Supportive Housing*

According to the California Health and Safety Code, supportive housing means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the homeless or disabled population, and that is linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Currently, the City’s Zoning Code does not address supportive housing.

*f. Residential Care Facility*

Licensed residential care facilities are state licensed facilities maintained and operated to provide non-medical residential care, day treatment, or foster agency services for six or fewer adults,

children, or adults and children. State law requires that these facilities be treated as a single housekeeping unit for zoning purposes. Licensed residential care facilities are permitted in the R-1 Zone in accordance with state law. The City currently has one residential care facility in the R-1 Zone.

*g. SRO Housing*

The City of San Marino does not specifically address this use within the zoning code. The C-1 Commercial zone allows residential uses with the issuance of a conditional use permit, but it does not allow for hotel or motel uses. The Code currently allows one residential unit per 5,000 square feet of land. Market conditions and the relatively small size of C-1 zoned parcels are the likely factors as to why higher density housing has not been pursued in the city.

*h. Farmworker Housing/Employee Housing*

The 2007-2011 ACS identifies zero agricultural employees living within San Marino. There is no agricultural land in or near San Marino. Therefore, there does not appear to be a need for farmworker housing. However, the State Health and Safety Code stipulates that housing for six or fewer employees is considered a single-family residential structure and permitted by right where such housing is permitted. The City will amend its Zoning Code to comply with State law.

## **5. Building Codes and Enforcement**

A variety of building and safety codes, while adopted for purposes of preserving public health and safety, and ensuring the construction of safe and decent housing, have the potential to increase the cost of housing construction or maintenance.

The City of San Marino has adopted the 2010 edition of the California Building, Residential, Plumbing, Mechanical and Electrical Codes, with amendments, which establish construction standards as applied to all residential buildings. In January of 2014, the City plans to adopt the 2013 California Codes. The Codes are based on regulations necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare. The Building Codes and related amendments do not seem to impede the development of housing. Many newer requirements such as fire safety systems and green building requirements had been implemented by residents prior to being required.

Code enforcement is conducted by way of Code Enforcement Officers patrolling the city and investigating complaints received. The main issue that Code Enforcement addresses is construction or remodeling without permits. Very rarely are substandard housing conditions or other health and safety issues identified. The City's older housing stock is very well maintained.

## **6. Housing for People with Disabilities**

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions include requirements for a minimum percentage of units in new developments to be fully accessible to the physically disabled. Development of fully accessible units may also increase the overall project costs. Enforcement of ADA requirements is not at the discretion of the City, but is mandated under federal law. However, the City does not currently have any multi-family units. The provisions of the ADA would apply only to potential residential components of a mixed-use project in a Commercial zone.

Compliance with building codes and the ADA may increase the cost of housing production. However, these regulations provide minimum standards that must be complied with in order to

ensure the development of safe and accessible housing. Therefore, the local enforcement of these codes does not significantly constrain the development of housing.

The City has seen an increase in projects such as handicapped accessible bathrooms, elevators, and first floor master suites. These items are treated in the same manner as any other project in terms of fees, permitting, and processing. Residential Care Facilities are also treated in the same manner as a single-family home. There is no additional hindrance on the development of housing for the disabled. No distance requirements have been adopted.

The City has also recently adopted a reasonable accommodation ordinance. Under the ADA, cities must reasonably modify policies when necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of disability, unless they can show that the modifications “would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program or activity.” (28 Code of Federal Regulations 35.130(b)(7).) Generally speaking, under these laws, local agencies retain their ability to regulate land uses and to apply neutral, non-discriminatory regulations, but are required to make accommodations to allow persons with disabilities an equal opportunity to use and enjoy housing in the community. The City’s recent reasonable accommodation ordinance establishes a process for considering these types of accommodations. It provides certain findings that must be met in order for an application to be approved as a reasonable accommodation. This process should make it easier for a resident to obtain approval for an accommodation, such as a wheelchair ramp or front yard parking space, that may not otherwise meet the Code requirements. A potential constraint to this process is the one- to two-month processing time. The City will monitor the implementation of the reasonable accommodation ordinance to determine its effectiveness.

The City’s Zoning Code defines “family” as “an immediate family related by blood, marriage or adoption, or a group of individuals who are unrelated and live together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit. This shall not include an individual paying rent to a landlord for the purpose of temporarily residing in a dwelling unit.” This definition is inclusive and does not serve to constrain housing for persons with disabilities.

## **7. Development Fees**

Various fees and assessments are charged by the City and other agencies to cover the cost of processing development permits and providing local services. These fees help ensure quality development and the provision of adequate public services. The City is legally required to set permit and development fees in amounts that are no more than equal the cost of providing services associated with these fees. The City recently conducted a comprehensive fee study to ensure the cost of providing the services was consistent with the required fee for those services. San Marino is a largely developed, suburban jurisdiction with most of its necessary infrastructure such as streets, electrical, sewer and water facilities in place. Aside from fees collected to offset public school impacts, required staff training costs, and General Plan maintenance, the City does not require impact fees to make the necessary land improvements to accommodate development. The City does not maintain a different fee schedule for single family or multi-family units. The fees charged by the City are based on a square footage basis or contract price of the job, depending on the type of permit application. Development fees are not believed to be a constraint to housing development in the City. In fact, based on informal input from local contractors, San Marino has reasonable permit fees that are lower than other surrounding cities. Table 26 displays the San Marino Planning Department Fee Schedule. This is a comprehensive list of fees. The City does not charge any development impact fees. School fees are required per State law.

**Table 26: Planning Department Fee Schedule - City Of San Marino**

| <i>Item/Permit Type</i>   | <i>Base Fee</i>  | <i>Basis for Valuation/Square Foot Cost</i>   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Planning Fees</b>  |  |   |
| Design Review Committee<br>- Major<br>- Minor   | \$715<br>\$575   | N/A   |
| Variance Application<br>- Minor Variance<br>- Major Variance<br>- Creation of 300-foot Radius Ownership List<br>- Minor Exception | \$1,260<br>\$2,450<br>\$65<br>\$145                                | N/A   |
| Conditional Use Permit Application<br>- Minor CUP<br>- Major CUP<br>- Creation of 300-foot Radius Ownership List                  | \$1,420<br>\$3,165<br>\$65   | N/A   |
| Subdivisions or Lot-Splits  | \$2,175 + \$2,000 deposit  | N/A   |
| Rezone or Boundary Change   | \$5,000 deposit + hourly costs                                     | N/A   |
| Lot Line Adjustment   | \$295 + \$2,000 deposit  | N/A   |
| Modification to Variance or Conditional Use Permit  | \$955  | N/A   |
| Appeals<br>- To Planning Commission<br>- To CC  | \$1,205<br>\$805   | N/A   |
| Negative Declaration Fee  | \$830  | N/A   |
| <b>Inspection Fees</b>  |  |   |
| Residential Compliance Inspection Reports   | \$65   | N/A   |
| Special Inspections   | \$160 each   | N/A   |
| Certificate of Use and Occupancy  | \$95 each  | N/A   |
| <b>Permits, Plan Check, &amp; School Facility Fees</b>  |  |   |
| Building Permit – Dwellings<br>- Processing<br>- Microfilming   | Based on square footage/<br>valuation of work<br>\$40.00<br>\$3.00 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type V Wood Frame Additions or Alterations - \$125.00/sq. ft.</li> <li>• Basements - \$83/sq. ft.</li> <li>• Private Garages - \$36.00/sq. ft.</li> <li>• Patio Covers - \$36.00/sq. ft.</li> <li>• Block Walls - \$11.00 - 13.00/sq. ft., depending on height.</li> </ul> |
| Electrical Permit<br>- Processing<br>- Microfilming<br>- Other Fees   | \$40.00<br>\$3.00<br>Per electrical permit schedule                | Per fixture charge  |
| Mechanical Permit<br>- Processing<br>- Microfilming<br>- Other Fees   | \$40.00<br>\$3.00<br>Per mechanical permit schedule                | Per fixture charge  |
| Plumbing Permit<br>- Processing   | \$40.00  |   |

**Table 26: Planning Department Fee Schedule - City Of San Marino**

| <i>Item/Permit Type</i>  | <i>Base Fee</i>                                   | <i>Basis for Valuation/Square Foot Cost</i>         |
|--|---|---|
| - Microfilming<br>- Other Fees   | \$3.00<br>Per plumbing permit schedule            | Per fixture charge                                  |
| Swimming Pool or Spa<br>- Processing<br>- Microfilming                                   | \$40.00<br>\$3.00                                 | Swimming Pool - \$120.00 each<br>Spa - \$60.00 each |
| Plan Check Fee   | Based on valuation of work                        | N/A   |
| Grading<br>- Plan Check<br>- Permit  | Hourly rate from consultant<br>Based on valuation | N/A   |
| Solar Panel System   | \$500   | Flat fee (permit and plan check)                    |
| School Facility Fees (applies only to increase in square footage of 500 sq. ft. or more) | \$3.20/sq. ft. for projects over 500 sq. ft.      | N/A   |
| Education Fee  | 3% of building permit cost                        | N/A   |
| General Plan Maintenance Fee   | 7% of building permit cost                        | N/A   |
| Source: City of San Marino   |   |   |

To understand what these fees amount to for a development project, Table 27 identifies the averages of the costs incurred by the nine (9) new single-family houses constructed in 2012. The average livable area of these nine homes was 4,490 square feet with an average garage size of 821 square feet.

**Table 27: Average Plan Check and Permit Fees for a New House**

| <b>Fee</b>                             | <b>Average Fees for a New Single Family House (2012)</b> |
|--|--|
| Plan Check (Building)                  | \$4,319  |
| Plan Check (Planning)                  | \$200  |
| Grading (Plan Check and Permit)        | \$757.44   |
| Demo                                   | \$191.69   |
| Building Permit                        | \$4,280.23   |
| Mechanical Permit                      | \$298.11   |
| Electrical Permit                      | \$249.46   |
| Plumbing Permit                        | \$385.44   |
| Fire Sprinkler (Plan Check and Permit) | \$473.25   |
| Fire Alarm (Plan Check and Permit)     | \$531.96   |
| School Fees                            | \$5286.13  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           | <b>\$16,973.26</b>                                       |

Contrary to new houses, second units are fairly standard in size. Instead of calculating average costs, a typical one-bedroom second unit of 600 square feet was considered for the fees below.

**Table 28: Average Plan Check and Permit Fees for a Second Unit**

| <b>Fee</b>                             | <b>Approximate fees for a new second unit</b> |
|--|---|
| Plan Check (Building)                  | \$818.75                                      |
| Plan Check (Planning)                  | \$200   |
| Building Permit                        | \$966.56                                      |
| Mechanical Permit                      | \$84.50                                       |
| Electrical Permit                      | \$47.00                                       |
| Plumbing Permit                        | \$89  |
| Fire Sprinkler (Plan Check and Permit) | \$473.25                                      |
| Fire Alarm (Plan Check and Permit)     | \$531.96                                      |
| School Fees                            | \$1,920                                       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           | <b>\$5,131.02</b>                             |

These appear to be reasonable fees given the large scope of work for projects in San Marino. Development fees do not seem to impede development in San Marino. The much larger cost involved in purchasing and developing homes is the high cost of land in San Marino.

### **8. Local Processing and Permit Procedures**

The City of San Marino's development approval process is designed to accommodate, not hinder, development. Other than legally required public hearing notice and environmental review periods, developers and property owners are not hindered by “down time” in case processing. All new homes require Design Review Committee approval, which is a public hearing process. This helps ensure that new homes are compatible with the neighborhood and do not negatively impact the neighbors. The City has Residential and Commercial Design Guidelines which encourage the use of certain design features and materials. The Guidelines are not requirements but assist applicants in designing a project that will move more quickly through the approval process. The Design Review Committee also holds “open forum” sessions where applicants can get informal, preliminary feedback on a design, which will also help facilitate the approval process.

The design review process consists of the applicant filing an application, processing fee (\$715) and one set of plans. Staff then reviews the proposal and responds with a letter indicating any code issues or design concerns that should be addressed. After the applicant addresses the comment letter, they submit eight sets of plans which are distributed to the Design Review Committee for their review. The applicant must also present their plans to their neighbors as part of this process. The Code dictates that the notified neighbors must include two neighbors on each side of the subject property; all properties adjoining the rear of the subject property and one on either side of those properties; and the properties across from the subject property and one on either side of those properties. This usually comprises about 10-12 neighbors depending on how the lots are arranged. This is primarily to make sure neighbors are aware of the proposed project and to give them an opportunity to ask questions or provide comments. Even if all neighbors approve of or object to the project, it would still proceed to the Design Review Committee for their review. Once the eight sets of revised plans are submitted and the neighbor notification process is completed, staff assigns the project to the next available agenda and notices the project for a public hearing. This process

typically takes about 8 weeks in total. Once the project is approved, the applicant could submit for building plan check after the 15 day appeal period has expired.

The City has adopted Residential Design Guidelines to guide residents as well as review by the DRC. The purpose of these design guidelines is to provide a clear concise summary of the City’s design policies for projects within the City’s residential neighborhoods. The guidelines address neighborhood compatibility, site development, physical design components, and landscaping.

Certain projects that exceed Code allowances or otherwise require an additional level of review will require either a Variance or Conditional Use Permit (CUP). These applications are heard by the Planning Commission. If the project also requires Design Review, the Planning Commission will review both actions. City staff tries to work with applicants ahead of time to determine the feasibility of their proposed project. Staff attempts to guide applicants toward a solution that has the best chances of approval. Depending on the complexity of the project, initial Planning Department review for new construction requiring Design Review Committee (DRC) or Planning Commission review averages approximately three to four weeks. Table 29 illustrates the approximate local processing times for developments in San Marino.

**Table 29: Local Development Processing Time**

| <i>Item</i>                                | <i>Approximate Length of Time from Submittal to Public Hearing</i> |
|--|--|
| Conditional Use Permit                     | 30-60 days   |
| Design Review                              | 7-45 days  |
| Tentative Tract Map/Parcel Map/Subdivision | 30-90 days   |
| Variance                                   | 30-60 days   |
| Zoning Amendments or Zone Change           | 30-60 days   |
| General Plan Amendment                     | 30-60 days   |
| Environmental Initial Study                | 30 days  |
| Source: City of San Marino                 |  |

Table 29 identifies the approximate time from submittal to the initial public hearing. Since projects may require more than one hearing before the Planning Commission or DRC, it is also important to consider the length of time between submittal and approval or denial. For 2011, City staff reviewed the total amount of time it took for a project to go from the initial submittal by the applicant to an approval or denial from the DRC or Planning Commission. Staff found that the average time to process a variance application was 56 days, the average time to process a CUP application was 61 days, and the average time to process a DRC application was 68 days. These time frames include the time that the applicant spends correcting or modifying plans at the direction of staff or the approving body, as well as multiple hearings, if necessary.

Once projects have completed the public hearing process, or once staff determines the project does not require a hearing, the applicant may submit for building plan check. The City of San Marino contracts with an outside plan checker for this service. Once the plans are structurally approved, they are reviewed by both the Planning and Fire Departments. Informal conversations with architects and contractors indicate that the City processes plans in a reasonable time frame.

It is difficult to significantly reduce these timelines due to a recent increase in construction activity coupled with the City's small staff. However, streamlining the development process and making it more user-friendly is a very important goal of the current City Council. The community has a perception that it is difficult to improve their property due to the City's strict guidelines and policies. It is important to the City to reverse this mind set. As part of an initial effort to do this, the City has participated in community outreach events so that residents can meet City staff and learn more about our processes in an informal setting. The City does not feel that the development time line is a constraint to developing housing, but will continue to try to improve the process for property owners.

## 9. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints

### *a. Environmental Constraints*

Environmental hazards affecting housing units include geologic and seismic conditions that provide the greatest threat to the built environment. The City has identified areas where land development should be carefully controlled. The following hazards may impact future development of residential units in the City:

- **Seismic Hazards:** Like the entire Southern California region, the City of San Marino is located within an area of high seismic activity. The Raymond Hill fault passes through the City in a northeasterly direction, which subjects the area to surface rupture, ground shaking, and ground failure. The greatest potential danger is the collapse of older residential units constructed from unreinforced masonry and explosions of petroleum and fuel lines. The City regulates the construction of new habitable structures within the identified Proximal Fault Study Zone through the requirement of setbacks and construction standards.
- **Flooding:** No major water courses traverse the City. There is no threat of water damage from either a seiche or a tsunami condition.
- **Dust and High Wind Hazards:** This condition results in property damage from high winds, wind tunneling and channeling effects of buildings, soil erosion, and unpleasant living conditions. The severe winds San Marino experienced in 2011 have prompted the City and homeowners to consider high wind hazards. For example, properly maintained trees are an important factor in reducing property damage during wind events.
- **Toxic and Hazardous Wastes:** In San Marino, air pollution is the main area of concern relative to toxic substances. Major point sources of air pollution come from the variety of industrial uses throughout the region. The primary source, however, is automobile traffic.
- **Fire Hazards:** Brush fires have been significantly reduced as a major hazard due to the increased development of open land. The critical problem areas in residential buildings include structural fires due to aged or faulty electrical wiring, lack of separations in highly combustible structures, toxic material contained within buildings, building design, and poor maintenance. The City's 2010 amendments to the California Fire Code address the need for fire sprinklers and fire alarms in residential buildings as well as brush clearance for homes in the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.
- **Noise:** Residential land uses are considered the most sensitive to loud noise. Noise is not considered a significant problem in the City. The principal noise sources in San Marino generate from local traffic.



*b. Infrastructure Constraints*

San Marino is a fully developed city and therefore, there are very few on or off-site improvements that are required as part of the development of housing. Most housing construction involves the demolition of an existing housing unit and the construction of a replacement unit, meaning almost all infrastructure is already in place. As part of the building permit process, the City will occasionally require the provision of on-site and off-site improvements necessitated by the development, such as improvements to curbs and gutters, alleys, streets, sidewalks, street lights, and utility undergrounding. The cost of such improvements may increase the cost of development, which would ultimately be passed through to future tenants or owners. While these costs may not render a project infeasible, they contribute to the range of factors that affect the affordability of a project.

Since the City is built-out, the only additional development would come from the subdivision of existing, larger properties. Chapter 22 of the San Marino City Code identifies the following minimum street widths for streets created as part of a subdivision:

1. The width of all primary streets shall be one hundred feet (100'), and the width of all secondary streets shall be eighty feet (80'); except, that a primary street divided into two (2) drives by a parkway or railway shall have a width of sixty feet (60') on each side thereof, and secondary streets so divided shall have a width of forty five feet (45') on each side thereof.
2. All local streets shall be at least sixty feet (60') in width; provided, that dead-end streets may be fifty feet (50') in width.
3. All dead-end streets shall have a turning circle with a diameter of not less than eighty four feet (84').
4. Alleys shall be provided at the rear of all lots zoned as business property and shall have a width of not less than twenty feet (20').
5. Dead-end alleys shall have a turning circle with a diameter of not less than forty feet (40').

This chapter also requires sidewalks on all primary and secondary streets. Whether or not a sidewalk is required on local streets is dependent on the amount of pedestrian traffic and is at the discretion of the Council.

Compliance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code on the use of energy efficient appliances and insulation has reduced energy demand stemming from new residential development. Southern California Edison also offers public information and technical assistance to developers and homeowners regarding energy conservation measures and programs. The City has seen an increased interest in permits for solar panels, electric car chargers, and other energy efficient home improvements.

The California America Water Company provides water services for the City of San Marino. Adequate water is available to serve existing and projected residences through 2021 (17 additional units, according to the City's Regional Housing Needs obligations). The Los Angeles County Sanitation District provides sewer services for the City of San Marino. The entire City is currently only utilizing about 25 to 30 percent of its sewer capacity. Adequate remaining capacity (approximately 70 percent) is available to the projected residences through 2021 (17 additional units per the City's obligations under the Regional Housing Needs Allocation).

## **B. Non-Governmental Constraints**

### **1. Vacant Land**

The City's vacant land supply is extremely small. There six (6) vacant residential lots remaining in the City and one (1) vacant commercial lot. The City has an established pattern and character of development of high design standards and low densities. It is the established policy of the City to maintain this community character for all new development. Based on this principle, and given the limited amount of non-contiguous vacant land in the City, there is little potential to develop new affordable housing units on vacant land within current City limits. It is likely that these lots will be developed with market rate single family homes that will increase the City's housing supply. Owners of two of these lots have already applied for new construction.

### **2. Land Costs**

The cost of land directly influences the cost of housing. In turn, land prices are determined by a number of factors, most important of which are land availability and allowable development density. As land becomes scarcer, the price for land increases. In terms of development density (see discussion of the City of San Marino's zoning regulations), land prices are positively related to the number of units permitted on each lot. Relative to surrounding jurisdictions, as well as the region, land prices in San Marino significantly constrain the production of housing.

### **3. Construction Costs**

The cost of construction depends primarily on the cost of materials and labor, but it is also influenced by market demand and market-based changes in the cost of materials. The cost of construction depends on the type of unit being built and on the quality of the product being produced. Labor saving materials and construction techniques are available but they tend to reduce the quality of the finished product.

The type of product largely determines the cost of construction. The cost of labor is based on a number of factors, including housing demand, the number of contractors in an area and the unionization of workers, but it is generally two to three times the cost of materials. Thus the cost of labor represents an estimated 17% to 20% of the cost of building a unit, which is a substantial portion of the overall cost of construction. Most residential construction in Southern California is performed with non-union contractors, and as a result, labor costs are responsive to changes in the residential market. Recent figures published by the International Code Council (ICC) report that a typical wood frame residence costs approximately \$107.08 per square foot for labor and materials, not inclusive of land. Construction costs in the City of San Marino would exceed this figure based on the high quality of living and design standards embraced by the community. Construction costs for San Marino are closer to \$250-\$300 per square foot. The construction cost of housing affects the affordability of new housing and may be considered a constraint to affordable housing in the San Marino area that is outside of the City's control.

### **4. Financing**

Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates. Jurisdictions can, however, offer interest rate write-downs to extend home purchase opportunities to lower income households. In addition, government insured loan programs may be available to reduce mortgage down payment requirements.

First time homebuyers are the group impacted the most by financing requirements. Mortgage interest rates for new home purchases ranged from 3% to 4% for a fixed rate 30-year loan in 2013. Lower initial rates are available with other mortgage types. However, variable interest rate mortgages on affordable homes may increase to the point of interest rates exceeding the cost of living adjustments, which is a constraint on the affordability. Although rates are currently low, they can change significantly and substantially impact the affordability of the housing stock.

Interest rates at the present time are not a constraint to affordable housing. Financing for both construction and long term mortgages is generally available in San Marino subject to normal underwriting standards. However, a more critical impediment to homeownership involves both the affordability of the housing stock and the ability of potential buyers to fulfill down payment requirements. Typically, conventional home loans will require 5% to 20% of the sale price as a down payment, which is the largest constraint to first time homebuyers. This indicates a need for flexible loan programs and a method to bridge the gap between the down payment required and a potential homeowner's available funds. Recently, there has been an influx of all cash offers for homes in San Marino. This makes it more difficult for first time home buyers with minimal down payments to compete for a home. The availability of financing for developers under current economic conditions may also pose a constraint on development outside of the City's control.

## **HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES**

This section examines the opportunities and resources that are available to assist in the production, maintenance and improvement of the City's housing stock.

### **A. Residential Sites Inventory**

State law requires that a city must identify adequate sites for development of a variety of housing types for all income levels. The Growth Needs section identified San Marino's RHNA figure. As a way to plan for the additional units, an analysis of the various available housing resources must be conducted. Land availability in San Marino is scarce. Opportunities for residential development in the City fall into one of four categories:

- Vacant land that is either designated for residential use or is likely to be designated for residential use in the future;
- Residentially designated land with lot sizes exceeding 12,000 square feet which can accommodate second units;
- Underutilized non-residential sites where infrastructure needs for recycling to residential development can be met by existing or proposed systems; and
- Mixed use or stand-alone residential development on non-residentially designated sites.

Table 30 identifies the vacant and potentially developable sites in the City.

#### **1. Vacant Sites**

There are six parcels of currently vacant residential land in the City that are designated for single-family units. The new single-family units constructed would likely only be affordable to the above-moderate income group. There is one parcel of vacant commercially zoned land. As mentioned previously, the Zoning Code allows for residential uses in the C-1 Zone but does not establish any standards or densities for residential uses in the commercial zone, except to require 5,000 square feet per residential unit in the C-1 Zone. Even with this requirement, it is possible that the commercial lot could still be developed with up to two units as part of a mixed-use project which may be accessible to a wider range of income groups.

It is possible that a complete build-out of the residentially designated vacant land within the City by the end of the 2013 to 2021 planning period may be realized. Although the development of mixed-use projects with a residential component on commercially zoned property is provided for through provisions in the Zoning Code, pursuit of mixed-use projects with a residential component may not be easily realized. In General, the C-1 zoned lots are relatively small in size and lack sufficient parking. However, in recent months, staff has been approached by two separate parties who expressed interest in pursuing a mixed use development. While these may not result in a significant number of units, it would at least provide an additional housing type choice in San Marino. It is also possible for single family homes to be developed in the C-1 Zone provided they have a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet. There is also the option of people further developing their single-family lots with a second unit in accordance with the City's second unit ordinance. Likewise, a commercial property owner maintains the option to apply for a CUP to add or convert a portion of the building into a residential use.

## 2. Potentially Developable Sites

In examining potentially developable sites, larger and/or underutilized commercial properties were considered. Mixed use projects do not currently exist in the City and based on community input, they are not a compatible use with the existing character of the community. However, the City's current code allows one residential unit per 5,000 square feet of land in the C-1 Zone, resulting in a density of approximately 8.7 units per acre. Table 30 identifies how many units could be accommodated on each lot under the current requirements. Even if a portion of the potential units were realized, it would provide San Marino with additional housing choices for a wider range of income levels.

The potentially developable sites were selected for their size and ongoing vacancy issues. Very few commercial parcels in the City have ample off-street parking. Of those that do, some tend to have businesses that do not need that much parking, resulting in a lot of underutilized space. Three of the four selected sites fell into this category<sup>3</sup>. The remaining site at 2995 Huntington sits at a very busy intersection and has been vacant for about six months. The existing building is designed as an oil change facility. Another benefit to this site is that it is surrounded by non-residential uses, making higher density development more feasible.

---

<sup>3</sup> Since the time the data for Table 30 were collected, sites 9 and 11 no longer have vacancy problems as indicated in the table.

**Table 30: Vacant and Potentially Developable Land in San Marino**

|                                      | ADDRESS/APN                                  | LOT SIZE<br>(sq. ft.) | GENERAL PLAN<br>DESIGNATION/ ZONE            | EXISTING USE/REASON<br>FOR SELECTION  | DENSITY<br>FACTOR<br>(units/ acre) | POTENTIAL<br>UNITS<br>(EXISTING<br>CODE) | AFFORDABILITY                      |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Vacant Land</b>                   |  |                       |  |   |                                    |  |                                    |
| 1                                    | 5323-016-032<br>Winthrop Rd                  | 5,359                 | Low Density Residential/<br>R-1 District VII | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 4-6                                | 1  | Above Moderate                     |
| 2                                    | 5323-016-030<br>Winthrop Rd                  | 5,395                 | Low Density Residential/<br>R-1 District VII | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 4-6                                | 1  | Above Moderate                     |
| 3                                    | 5323-017-054<br>Wilson Ave                   | 9,260                 | Low Density Residential/<br>R-1 District VII | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 4-6                                | 1  | Above Moderate                     |
| 4                                    | 5323-017-053<br>Wilson Ave                   | 9,646                 | Low Density Residential/<br>R-1 District VII | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 4-6                                | 1  | Above Moderate                     |
| 5                                    | 5328-017-001<br>1285 Circle Drive            | 12,849                | Estate Residential/R-1<br>District I         | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 0-2                                | 2 (main house +<br>2nd unit)             | Above Moderate and<br>Lower Income |
| 6                                    | 5328-006-025<br>1001 Rosalind Rd             | 59,589                | Estate Residential/R-1<br>District IE        | Vacant lot, requires grading and<br>site prep   | 0-2                                | 2 (main house +<br>2nd unit)             | Above Moderate and<br>Lower Income |
| 7                                    | 5335-007-001<br>810 Huntington Dr            | 11,879                | Commercial/ C-1                              | Vacant lot, ready for<br>development  | 8.7                                | 2  | Moderate Income                    |
| <b>Potentially Developable Sites</b> |  |                       |  |   |                                    |  |                                    |
| 8                                    | 5323-020-035<br>415 Huntington Dr            | 49,882                | Commercial/C-1                               | Large lot with consistent<br>vacancy problems; partially<br>completed TI              | 8.7                                | 9  | Moderate Income                    |
| 9                                    | Multiple Parcels 2950<br>Huntington Dr       | 71,005                | Commercial/C-1                               | Large corner lot with ample<br>parking area; long term vacancy<br>problems            | 8.7                                | 14                                       | Moderate Income                    |
| 10                                   | 5331-018-005<br>2995 Huntington Dr           | 12,433                | Commercial/C-1                               | Lot contains newly developed<br>(2004) oil change center that is<br>currently vacant; | 8.7                                | 2  | Moderate Income                    |
| 11                                   | Multiple Parcels 2000-<br>2020 Huntington Dr | 69,335                | Commercial/C-1                               | Three adjacent lots with a large<br>amount of parking; long term<br>vacancy problems  | 8.7                                | 13                                       | Moderate Income                    |

### **3. Affordability Assumptions**

Of the six (6) vacant residential lots, there is the potential to develop six main residential dwellings and two (2) second units. The six main units would only be affordable to the above moderate income category. The second units have the potential to serve lower income households. However, as with all second units, this is dependent on how the owner utilizes the space.

As stated previously, the City has very limited information in the Code relating to development standards for residential units in the Commercial Zone. Table 30 identifies the currently allowable number of units.

### **4. Infrastructure Availability**

All of the vacant and potentially developable sites would be infill development. All necessary infrastructure is either already in place or readily available. This includes all utilities such as electricity, gas, water, sewer, telephone, and cable/data services. Also included are physical improvements such as roads and sidewalks. San Marino is a full service city with its own Fire, Police, Recreation, Public Works, Library, Planning, Building and Administrative Services. The San Marino Unified School District services the entire City.

### **5. Environmental Constraints**

There are no apparent environmental constraints that would impede the development of these units.

## **B. Financial Resources for Housing**

Development of affordable housing in San Marino is extremely limited, except in the case of second units. This is due to the built out nature of the City coupled with very high land costs. San Marino does not currently offer any financial resources for the development of affordable housing. Limited Community Development Block Grant funds are available for the repair and maintenance of housing for lower and moderate income households.

### **C. Administrative Resources**

#### *a. City of San Marino Planning and Building Department*

The City's Planning and Building Department provides the front line resource for the development of new housing. The Planning Department provides Zoning Code reviews and updates. The Planning Department also administers the Planning Commission and Design Review Committee processes and meetings. The Building Department handles plan check and permitting issues in association with plan check consultant.

#### *b. Los Angeles County Community Development Commission*

The Los Angeles County Community Development Commission (CDC) handles the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG). As mentioned above this provides funding for lower and moderate income households to improve and maintain their homes.

#### **D. Opportunities for Energy Conservation**

Energy conservation is an important consideration in the development of housing. Despite increased up front construction costs, energy efficient homes have long term benefits of decreased utility costs and decreased consumption of energy. State Building Codes mandate certain levels of energy efficiency for construction projects. In addition to this, the City of San Marino recently developed an Energy Action Plan to chart a path for energy efficiency in the community. The following resources have been identified for homeowners or developers to utilize:

- *Energy Upgrade California* – Homeowners in Los Angeles County are eligible for energy efficiency rebates up to \$4,500 by completing a comprehensive energy upgrade on their house which may include things such as attic insulation, duct sealing or a more efficient HVAC system. Homeowners work with Home Energy Professionals identified by the program and are eligible for special financing options. Low and Moderate income households may qualify for financial assistance through the Energy Savings Assistance Program which works with the local energy provider or through the Weatherization Assistance Program and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which are federally-funded programs administered by the California Department of Community Services & Development. The Energy Savings Assistance Program, Weatherization Assistance Program and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program are available independent of the Energy Upgrade California program and provide no-cost energy upgrades for income-qualified residents to help increase the energy efficiency of their homes.
- *Southern California Edison (SCE) Rebate Programs* – SCE offers a multitude of rebate programs to assist homeowners. These include, among other things, rebates for energy efficient appliances, installation of solar panels, and reducing power consumption.



## **REVIEW OF HOUSING ELEMENT PERFORMANCE**

### **A. Progress in Implementing the 2008 Goals and Objectives**

State housing law requires communities to assess the achievements under past housing programs as part of the update to their housing elements. These results should be quantified wherever possible, but may be qualitative where necessary. In addition, these results need to be compared with what was projected or planned in the earlier element. Where significant shortfalls exist between what was planned and what was achieved, the reasons for such differences should be discussed. The results of the analysis should provide the basis for developing the comprehensive housing program strategy or the future planning period. Table 31 illustrates the City's progress in implementing the 2008 Housing Element programs.

The City's 2008 Housing Element established a housing production objective of 26 new housing units. Table 32 identifies the quantified objectives for the 2008-2014 Housing Element period by income classification. The chart identifies the construction of 31 new homes. The City made progress in meeting its new construction objectives, although the executive level character of the City is evident in the achievement of goals by income classification. Although 31 units were constructed, the shortfall occurred in the lower and moderate income categories, as no new units were constructed, and subsequently, the objectives were not met. The City's goal is to rehabilitate two homes per year with CDBG money. Specific income level goals are not assigned.

Table 31 and Table 32 are found on the following pages.

**Table 31: Progress in Implementing the 2008-2014 Housing Element Goals and Objectives**

| <i>Program</i>  | <i>Intent</i>   | <i>Objectives</i>   | <i>Progress</i>   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Goal #1 The Provision of Housing Opportunities to meet executive level market demand</b> |   |   |   |
| Land Use Element/Site Availability  | Provide residential development opportunities through land use and zoning designations for adequate sites to meet the RHNA in the City                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitate construction of one market rate residence on remaining vacant R-1 lots</li> </ul>   | For the last housing element, one vacant lot was identified. This was incorrect - seven (7) R-1 lots should have been identified. One of these seven vacant lots was developed with a market rate residence over the past planning period.  |
| Second Units  | Promote affordable housing opportunities to lower income households. Maintain the ordinance which permits second units on residential lots greater than 12,000 square feet. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Target units over the planning period.</li> <li>- Fast-track all second unit applications through the permit process</li> <li>- Develop and distribute a brochure on second unit requirements and development standards</li> </ul> | <p>Three (3) second unit projects were developed over the planning period. Two of the three requested deviations from the code and therefore required a Planning Commission hearing, making them difficult to fast track. The remaining unit was quickly approved. A brochure has not been developed to promote second units.</p> <p>Based on the last planning period, it appears that a change to the second unit requirements would be more appropriate than promoting the concept of second units. People are aware of second units and choose not to build them.</p> |
| Density Bonus Program   | Provide an incentive for development of housing for lower income households in the City through provision of density bonus as required by State law                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopting an implementing ordinance, including a procedure for evaluation preliminary application, for density bonus law.</li> </ul>  | A density bonus ordinance has not been adopted. The target date for this program was 2014.  |
| <b>Goal #2: Prevent the Deterioration of Existing Housing</b>                               |   |   |   |
| Code Enforcement/Nuisance Abatement   | Preserve the existing housing stock and correct code violations   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain the Code Enforcement Program</li> <li>- Continue to implement the “abatement of nuisances” ordinance</li> <li>- Strive toward correction of all conditions cited.</li> </ul>  | The Code Enforcement program has been maintained and additional staff resources have been dedicated to Code Enforcement. Nuisances and violations continue to be abated.  |

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Seismic Retrofitting                      | Ensure the safety of the City's population residing in older homes through establishment of a Seismic Retrofit Program, utilizing available City, FEMA and State Funds. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopt a comprehensive set of seismic upgrade regulations.</li> <li>- Require retrofitting of potentially hazardous structures within 5 years, depending on the building's occupancy load and condition</li> </ul>   | Such a program has not been adopted by the City.  |
| Housing Rehabilitation Program            | Preserve existing stock and correct minor and deferred home repairs   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establish a Housing Rehabilitation program and identify public sources of funds for such a program.</li> <li>- Target assistance in a pilot program of 4 units</li> </ul>   | <p>The City has an active CDBG program which provides assistance to homeowners for repairs or upgrades to their homes which may have otherwise been a financial burden on the owner.</p> <p>Since 2008, the City has assisted seven (7) homeowners with projects such as new electrical wiring, HVAC system and reroofing projects.</p> |
| <b>Goal #3: Equal Housing Opportunity</b> |   |  |   |
| Equal Housing Opportunities               | Promote equal housing opportunity for all economic, racial and social groups residing in the City.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establish liaison with Fair Housing Council</li> <li>- Utilize CDBG monies to contract with local fair housing agencies to ensure that procedures are in place if a complaint of housing discrimination is made. IF a complaint is made to the City, the City will refer the complaint to that agency and that agency will investigate the incident and contact the property owner.</li> <li>- Provide materials and regular inserts in community mailings regarding housing discrimination and what to do if a person is the subject of housing discrimination.</li> </ul> | Fair housing services are provided to the City as part of the Los Angeles Urban County  |
| Emergency Shelters                        | Provide shelter for the homeless populations which reside in the City.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with local church organizations or non-profits to facilitate a program for providing emergency shelters whether permanent or temporary.</li> </ul>   | No such programs have been established.   |

|                        |  |   |   |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| Regulatory Constraints | Compliance with Federal Fair Housing Act and ADA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Require compliance with ADA standards in any new senior project.</li> <li>- Revise applicable Zoning Code ordinances as necessary to ensure that any residential development is not restrictive because of method of financing , sex, religion, national origin, marital status or disability of its owners or intended occupants</li> </ul> | <p>The City has not had any senior housing projects constructed. Many newly developed single-family homes include handicapped restrooms, first floor master suites and/or elevators in attempt to accommodate future needs.</p> <p>In 2012, the City adopted a Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance which establishes a formal process for reasonable accommodations to be made in the City's zoning and land use regulations when reasonably necessary to provide an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling</p> |
|------------------------|--|---|---|

**Table 32: 2008-2014 Housing Element RHNA and Rehabilitation Objectives**

|                  | <i>Very Low</i> |               | <i>Low</i>  |               | <i>Moderate</i> |               | <i>Above Moderate</i> |               | <i>Total</i> |               |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|                  | <i>Goal</i>     | <i>Actual</i> | <i>Goal</i> | <i>Actual</i> | <i>Goal</i>     | <i>Actual</i> | <i>Goal</i>           | <i>Actual</i> | <i>Goal</i>  | <i>Actual</i> |
| New Construction | 7               | 0             | 4           | 1             | 5               | 0             | 10                    | 31            | 26           | 32            |
| Rehabilitation   | --              | 1             | --          | 3             | --              | 3             | --                    | 0             | 6            | 7             |

Analysis of housing trends and population growth in the City during this period indicate that there is limited possibility for the construction of enough housing to accommodate needs, particularly within the moderate and lower income groups. First, the RHNA methodology did not differentiate between primarily built out cities like San Marino with substantial investment in existing housing resources, and newer communities that can accommodate substantial additional growth through absorption of vacant land. The City has extremely limited resources in terms of vacant residential land, and no vacant land designated at densities appropriate for construction of housing affordable to lower and moderate income households. Although the Code allows for it, mixed use projects have never been pursued by a developer. In terms of second units, there have only been three applications submitted to the City during this period.

The stringent development standards and lot size minimums have been established for second units in order to guard against “mansionization” (where homes are expanded to the point where they are significantly larger and more lot intensive than surrounding homes). Although second units may serve as an affordable rental resource, they are primarily utilized by residents in the City to provide living accommodations for relatives or domestic employees. Recent years have demonstrated a strengthening economy yet second unit production has not increased. It appears that this is not a desirable option for many homeowners who instead choose to construct larger homes that are intended to house multiple generations. The Chinese community has previously indicated that multi-generational households could be accommodated in existing homes and this continues to be the trend.

During this planning period, the City has adopted a Reasonable Accommodation ordinance and has already approved two such requests under the new ordinance. Other accomplishments include strengthening the Code Enforcement program through additional staff resources and the continuation of seismic retrofitting of homes. The City also continues to rehabilitate homes through the CDBG program and provide necessary repairs to the homes of low and moderate income residents.

# GOALS, POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

## A. Goals, Policies and Objectives

The City of San Marino, in adopting the Housing Element, adopts the goals that follow as the framework for implementing its housing policies and programs over the timeframe of the Element. A housing survey will be performed to evaluate legalizing existing second units.

**GOAL 1: Provide a range of housing opportunities for all income levels.**

### POLICIES:

- Policy 1.1** Encourage the development of housing on vacant R-1 land to meet market-rate housing demand.
- Policy 1.2:** Continue to encourage the development of second units as a housing resource.
- Policy 1.3:** Encourage the construction of attached second units to house multi-generational families, and as a source of affordable housing for extremely low and lower income households and persons with disabilities (including those with developmental disabilities).
- Policy 1.4** Continue to allow residential uses in the C-1 zone as a conditionally permitted use.
- Policy 1.5:** Allow for development of housing for lower income households and seniors in the City through provision of density bonus as required by State law.

### IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS:

- Program 1.1:** Fast track all second unit applications through the permitting process.  
*Timeline: Ongoing*
- Program 1.2:** Facilitate second unit construction by revising the Second Unit Ordinance so that the development standards are more similar to those for a “pool house”, or accessory structure containing livable area. Specifically, undertake a comprehensive review of the City Code and identify barriers to the construction of second units and how they can be eliminated. Specific considerations include:
- a. Setbacks – Consider changing the required setbacks for second units so that they are similar to those required for a pool house, or other accessory structure with livable area. The current Code requires a second unit to have the same setbacks as a main house, whereas a pool house allows for a much less restrictive rear yard setback.
  - b. Maximum allowable size - Consider increasing the maximum allowable size of a second unit in relation to the lot size. Currently, the maximum allowable size for

a second unit is 600 square feet for all lots. A second unit size of 800-1,200 square feet may be more appropriate for larger lots.

- c. Parking – The Code currently requires a dedicated, enclosed parking space for a second unit. Consider allowing an open parking space or pad that is not visible from public view as an alternative.
- d. Definitions – Consider amending the Code definition for “kitchen” so that the requirements for cooking devices in a second unit may be met by portable cooking devices.

Other possible actions to increase second unit construction include:

- Amend the Zoning Code to allow the conversion of pool houses into second units.
- Waive permit fees for both new construction of second units and conversion of existing accessory structures (legal or illegal) into second units. This provision shall be valid for three years from the date of adoption of the revised second unit ordinance.
- Allow conversion of unpermitted, existing, accessory structures into second units without penalty, provided that all other applicable Code requirements are met. This provision shall be valid for three years from the date of adoption of the revised second unit ordinance.
- Contact property owners to educate them about second units and encourage conversion of their pool house or illegal second unit into a legal second unit.

Annually monitor the effectiveness of the City’s strategy for facilitating second unit construction and pool house conversion. If the City is not meeting its objectives, evaluate factors that may enhance the program effectiveness or develop alternative strategies, within one year, as appropriate in order to accommodate the City’s RHNA obligations. These policies shall consider appropriate time frames and reporting requirements to consider how units are being used.

*Timeline: Revise Second Unit Ordinance in 2014 and monitor effectiveness annually*

**Program 1.3:** Distribute information on second units and the required development standards with the goal of achieving two second units annually for a total of 16 second units over the eight-year planning period, through new construction and conversion from pool houses. Information on second units will be posted on the City website, available at public counters, and published at least once a year in the City newsletter.

*Timeline: 2014 or after Program 1.2 is implemented*

**Program 1.4** Three years from the date of adoption of the Housing Element, evaluate the City Code as it relates to residential development in the C-1 Zone. Assess possible barriers to this type of development and re-evaluate the City’s policies as necessary.

**Program 1.5:** Encourage the use of second units for senior housing and housing for persons with disabilities (including persons with developmental disabilities)  
*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 1.6:** Adopt an implementing ordinance for density bonus law.  
*Timeline: 2015*

**Program 1.7:** Continue community outreach and education regarding the development process.  
*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Responsible Agencies:** San Marino Planning Department

**Funding Sources:** Departmental budget

## **GOAL 2: Maintain the existing housing stock.**

### **POLICIES:**

**Policy 2.1:** Ensure that currently sound housing is maintained through code enforcement activities and nuisance abatement procedures.

**Policy 2.2:** Pursue housing programs offered by the State and Federal governments to provide monetary assistance to lower and moderate income households (including extremely low income households) for maintenance of their homes.

### **IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS**

**Program 2.1:** Maintain code enforcement activities to ensure building safety and integrity of neighborhoods.  
*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 2.2:** Continue to implement the “abatement of nuisance” ordinance which seeks to ensure the continued maintenance and good appearance of the City’s residential structures and neighborhoods.  
*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 2.3:** Continue to implement the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program that offers assistance to income-qualified households for home repairs. Target limited resources to extremely low income households and persons with disabilities (including developmental disabilities). Annually pursue other State and Federal programs that offer funding and other incentives for housing rehabilitation, energy efficiency improvements, and affordable housing development. In 2014, update the City’s website to provide information on assistance available for home repairs for income-qualified households.  
*Timeline: Ongoing*



**Program 2.4:** Gather and distribute information to homeowners on the use rebates and incentives for making their homes more energy efficient.

*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 2.5:** Continue to encourage seismic retrofitting.

*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Responsible Agencies:** Planning Department, Administration (Code Enforcement and CDBG), Police Department (Code Enforcement)

**Funding Sources:** Departmental budget and CDBG

**GOAL 3: Ensure the accessibility to housing for all segments of society.**

**POLICIES:**

**Policy 3.1:** Promote equal housing opportunity for all economic, racial, and social groups currently residing in the City.

**Policy 3.2:** Promote housing that meets the special needs of elderly and disabled (including those with developmental disabilities).

**Policy 3.3:** Allow for housing opportunities for the homeless and special needs populations.

**IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS:**

**Program 3.1:** Continue implementation of the reasonable accommodation ordinance and allow for exceptions to the zoning code when necessary to provide an equal opportunity for housing. Monitor the effectiveness of this ordinance; identify and address any constraints to accommodating the housing needs of persons with disabilities.

*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 3.2:** Work with the fair housing service providers to ensure that procedures are in place if a complaint of housing discrimination is made. In 2014, update the City's website to include fair housing resources, including a link to the fair housing service provider's website. Annually contact the fair housing service provider to obtain updated contact information for questions and referrals.

*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 3.3:** Distribute information at City counters and other community locations regarding housing discrimination and what to do if it occurs.

*Timeline: Ongoing*

**Program 3.4:** Update the Zoning Code to allow for emergency shelters by right without discretionary action in the C-1 zone subject to certain development and operational standards.

*Timeline: 2014 (within one year of Housing Element adoption)*

**Program 3.5:** Update the Zoning Code to address the provision of transitional housing and supportive housing as residential uses, to be permitted in the same manner as similar uses in the same zones.

*Timeline: 2014 (within one year of Housing Element adoption)*

**Program 3.6:** Update the Zoning Code to address the provision of single-room occupancy housing as a conditionally permitted use in the C-1 zone.

*Timeline: 2014 (within one year of Housing Element adoption)*

**Program 3.7:** Update the Zoning Code to address the provision of employee housing pursuant to the State Employee Housing Act.

*Timeline: 2014 (within one year of Housing Element adoption)*

**Responsible Agencies:** San Marino Planning Department in conjunction with selected the Fair Housing Agency contracted by the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission.

**Funding Sources:** Departmental budget and CDBG

## B. Quantified Objectives

The following table summarizes the City’s quantified objectives for the 2013-2021 planning period.

**Table 33: Quantified Objectives by Income Category**

| <i>Income Category</i>        | <i>RHNA Obligations</i> | <i>New Construction</i> | <i>Rehabilitation</i> | <i>Conservation/ Conversion</i> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Extremely Low/Very Low Income | 7                       | 6                       | 5                     | 2                               |
| Low Income                    | 5                       | 6                       | 5                     | 2                               |
| Moderate Income               | 5                       | 0                       | 0                     | 0                               |
| Above Moderate Income         | 0                       | 6                       | 0                     | 0                               |
| Total RHNA Allocation         | 17                      | 23                      | 10                    | 4                               |

### 1. New Construction

- a. Achieve construction of six (6) new single family homes on the remaining vacant residential lots.
- b. Achieve construction of 12 second units (new construction) that will be used for family members, household staff, or rented as an affordable housing option for lower income households. With the modifications to second unit requirements, the objective is to increase the number of second units compared to past trends.

## **2. Rehabilitation**

- a.* Rehabilitate 10 homes belonging to low income families (up to 80 percent AMI) over the planning period using CDBG money. The City anticipates being about to rehabilitate one to two homes per year.

## **3. Conservation**

- a.* Preserve the existing housing stock through implementation and enforcement of existing codes.
- b.* There are no affordable units in the City that are at risk of being converted to market rate units.
- c.* Facilitate conversion of four pool houses into second units.

## Appendix A: Public Participation

This appendix summarizes the City’s outreach efforts in developing the 2013-2021 Housing Element.

### A. Outreach List

| TYPE  | ORGANIZATION                          | CONTACT                   | STREET                             | CITY, ZIP                |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Advocacy/Service                              | Chinese Club of San Marino            | Calvin Lo, President      | 2425 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Architect interested in mixed use in the City |                                       | Stephen Ball              | 3057 Sunrise Road                  | West Covina, CA 91791    |
| Advocacy/Service                              | San Marino Chamber of Commerce        | Joanna Jimenez, President | 1800 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Special Needs                                 | Silverado Senior Living               | Vita Gwinn                | 1118 N. Stoneman Avenue            | Alhambra, CA 91024       |
| Realty/Lending                                | Bank of the West                      | Marlene Sanchez           | 2395 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | Chinatrust Bank (U.S.A.)              | Tim Wang                  | 2956 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | Citizens Business Bank                | Anna Aivazian             | 980 Huntington Drive               | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | East West Bank                        | Anita Wong                | 2090 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | One West Bank                         | Arlene Romero             | 900 E. Huntington Drive            | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | Wells Fargo Bank                      | Diana Feroyan             | 2355 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Advocacy/Service                              | Rotary Club of San Marino             | Isaac Hung                | PO Box 80301                       | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Advocacy/Service                              | San Marino City Club                  | Andrew Yip                | PO Box 80122                       | San Marino, CA           |
| Advocacy/Service                              | South Pasadena-San Marino YMCA        | Susan Marasco             | 1605 Garfield Avenue               | South Pasadena, CA 91030 |
| Realty/Lending                                | Pasadena Service Federal Credit Union | Dina Lopez                | 670 N. Rosemead Blvd.              | Pasadena, CA 91107       |
| Advocacy/Service                              | Stepping Stones to Learning           | Anna & George Hasbun      | 2233 Huntington Drive, Suite #1    | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Special Needs                                 | Care 4 You - In Home Care             | Mark Barrett              | 470 S. San Dimas Avenue            | San Dimas, CA 91773      |
| Advocacy/Service                              | Simple Registration Services          | Michael Frias             | 1405 San Marino Avenue, Suite 100C | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Advocacy/Service                              | Friends of The Crowell Public Library | Maryann Seduski           | 1890 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Advocacy/Service                              | Crowell Public Library                | Ann Dallavalle            | 1890 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Realty/Lending                                | First Capital Mortgage Corporation    | Steve Kenilvort           | 2065 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108     |
| Property Management                           | ICM Resources, Inc.                   | Isaac Hung                | 2555 Huntington Drive, #A          | San Marino, CA 91108     |

| <b>TYPE</b>         | <b>ORGANIZATION</b>                                | <b>CONTACT</b>                              | <b>STREET</b>                      | <b>CITY, ZIP</b>              |
|---------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Property Management | NMN Enterprises                                    | Bob Nuccio                                  | 1613 Chelsea Road, PMB #346        | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Coldwell Banker                                    | Carson English                              | 2065 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Compass Real Estate Team/Keller Williams           | Teri Barton                                 | 445 S. Fair Oaks Avenue            | Pasadena, CA 91105            |
| Realty/Lending      | Dilbeck Realtors/The Middleman Team                | Meg Middleman                               | 1499 Huntington Drive              | South Pasadena, CA 91030      |
| Realty/Lending      | Prudential California Realty                       | Nina Kirkendall                             | 540 S. Lake Avenue                 | Pasadena, CA 91106            |
| Realty/Lending      | Region 1 Realty                                    | Eugene Sun                                  | 1428 Ridgeway Road                 | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Roycroft Realty/C I Management                     | Dave Melford                                | 2566 Mission Street                | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Soma Warna Real Estate Services                    | Soma Warna                                  | 2515 Lorain Road                   | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Dilbeck Realtors Christie's Great Estates          | Ray Hayes                                   | 2486 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | RE/MAX Premier Properties                          | Pete & Lisa Loeffler                        | 2375 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Realty/Lending      | Real Estate Heaven                                 | Paul Argueta                                | 2491 Huntington Drive              | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Education           | San Marino Unified School District                 | Loren Kleinrock                             | 1665 West Drive                    | San Marino, CA 91108          |
| Special Needs       | Assisted Transition                                | Frank Cunningham                            | 7220 N. Rosemead Blvd.             | San Gabriel, CA 91775         |
| Utilities           | California American Water Company                  | Brian Barreto                               | 8657 E. Grand Avenue               | Rosemead, CA 91770            |
| Utilities           | Southern California Edison                         | Ronald Garcia                               | 1440 S. California Avenue          | Monrovia, CA 91016            |
| Special Needs       | East San Gabriel Valley Coalition for the Homeless | Olivia                                      | P.O. Box 93256                     | Industry, CA 91715            |
| Government          | Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles     |   | 700 W. Main Street                 | Alhambra, CA 91801            |
| Advocacy/Service    | Housing Rights Center                              | Chancela Al-Mansour                         | 520 S. Virgil Ave, Suite 400       | Los Angeles, CA 90020         |
| Developer           | A Community of Friends                             | Dora Leong Gallo, Chief Executive Officer   | 3701 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700 | Los Angeles, CA 90010         |
| Developer           | Abode Communities                                  | Robin Hughes, President & CEO               | 701 East 3rd Street, Suite 400     | Los Angeles, California 90013 |
| Special Needs       | Bienvenidos  | <i>Ritchie L. Geisel, President and CEO</i> | 316 West 2nd Street, Suite 800     | Los Angeles, CA 90012         |
| Advocacy/Service    | Center For Community & Family Services             |   | 2650 E Foothill Blvd               | Pasadena, CA 91107            |
| Special Needs       | CHAP   | Margaret B. Martinez, CEO                   | 1855 N. Fair Oaks Ave.             | Pasadena, CA 91103            |
| Special Needs       | California Drug Counseling, Inc.                   | Dr. Carl Rowe, Executive Director           | 659 E. Walnut St.                  | Pasadena, CA 91101            |

| <b>TYPE</b>      | <b>ORGANIZATION</b>                        | <b>CONTACT</b>                             | <b>STREET</b>                      | <b>CITY, ZIP</b>           |
|------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Advocacy/Service | Catholic Big Brothers Big Sisters          | Kenneth Martinet, President/CEO            | 363 East Villa Street, 2nd Floor   | Pasadena, CA 91104         |
| Special Needs    | The Center for Aging Resources             | Vatche Kelartinian, CEO                    | 447 N. El Molino Ave.              | Pasadena, CA 91101         |
| Special Needs    | Step by Step                               |  | 2611 Woodlyn Road,                 | Pasadena, CA 91107         |
| Special Needs    | Foothill Family Service                    | Helen Morran-Wolf, CEO                     | 2500 E. Foothill Blvd., #300       | Pasadena, CA 91107         |
| Special Needs    | Hope Through Housing Foundation            | George Searcy, Executive Director          | 9421 Haven Avenue                  | Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 |
| Developer        | San Gabriel Valley Habitat for Humanity    | Dr. Sonja Yates, Executive Director        | 400 S. Irwindale Ave               | Azusa, CA 91702            |
| Special Needs    | IDEPSCA                                    | <i>Rebeca Ronquillo, Interim President</i> | 1565 W. 14th Street                | Los Angeles, CA 90015      |
| Special Needs    | Journey House                              | Fred Wong, President                       | 1232 N Los Robles Ave              | Pasadena, California 91104 |
| Special Needs    | Mothers' Club Family Learning Center       | HECTOR LAFARGA, JR., Executive Director    | 980 North Fair Oaks Avenue         | Pasadena, CA 91103         |
| Special Needs    | OBA, Inc.                                  | Gabrielle Wood, Development Manager        | P.O. Box 202                       | Pasadena, CA 91102         |
| Special Needs    | Pacific Clinics                            | Susan Mandel, President & CEO              | 800 South Santa Anita Avenue       | Arcadia, CA 91006          |
| Special Needs    | Peace Over Violence                        | Patricia Giggans, Executive Director       | 1015 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 200 | Los Angeles, CA 90017      |
| Special Needs    | Shelter Partnership, Inc.                  | Ruth Schwartz, Executive Director          | 523 W. 6th Street, Suite 616       | Los Angeles, CA 90014-1224 |
| Special Needs    | Rosemary Children's Services               | Greg Wessels, CEO                          | 36 S. Kinneloa Ave., Suite 200     | Pasadena, California 91107 |
| Special Needs    | Union Station Homeless Services            | Rabbi Marvin Gross, CEO                    | 825 E. Orange Grove Boulevard      | Pasadena, CA 91104         |
| Realty/Lending   | W.J. Bradley Mortgage Captial              |  | 1055 E. Colorado Blvd. #500        | Pasadena, CA 91106         |
| Realty/Lending   | Dolan & Knight Property Management         |  | 180 S Lake Ave                     | Pasadena, CA 91101         |
| Realty/Lending   | Kennedy Capital                            | K. Kenji Tatsuno, President                | 553 S Marengo Ave                  | Pasadena, CA 91101         |
| Realty/Lending   | PNC Mortgage                               |  | 301 N. Lake Ave., Suite 110        | Pasadena, CA 91101         |
| Realty/Lending   | Rate One Financial, Inc.                   |  | 150 E. Colorado Blvd #215          | Pasadena, CA 91105         |
| Realty/Lending   | Diamond Point                              |  | 33 S. Catalina                     | Pasadena, CA 91106         |
| Realty/Lending   | Pasadena-Foothills Association of Realtors |  | 1070 E Green Street, Suite 100     | Pasadena, CA 91106         |
| Special Needs    | Arthritis Club of San Gabriel Valley       |  | P.O. Box 1175                      | Temple City, CA 91780      |

| <b>TYPE</b>  | <b>ORGANIZATION</b>                          | <b>CONTACT</b>           | <b>STREET</b>             | <b>CITY, ZIP</b>         |
|--|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Special Needs  | Greater Los Angeles Agency on Deafness, Inc. | Dr. Patricia Hughes, CEO | 2222 Laverna Avenue       | Los Angeles, CA 90041    |
| Special Needs  | Better Living Homecare Services              |                          | 307 N Santa Anita Ave. #E | Arcadia, CA 91006        |
| Special Needs  | HomeCare 1                                   |                          | 1510 Oxley St., Suite B   | South Pasadena, CA 91030 |
| City of San Marino Recreation Department Senior Citizen Mailing List (51 names)                        |  |                          |                           |                          |
| People who have spoken at meetings regarding the Housing Element are also notified of future meetings. |  |                          |                           |                          |

## B. Summary of Public Comments from 7/31/13 Planning Commission Meeting

| Comments  | Housing Element Responses  |
|---|--|
| <p>Several residents expressed concerns for meeting the State Housing Element requirements. They moved to San Marino because of its single-family neighborhood, school district, and low-profile character. The City should not make changes that would jeopardize the City's quality of life.</p>  | <p>The City seeks the most appropriate strategies in meeting the Housing Element mandate. One approach is to modify the City's second unit requirements to those similar to pool houses.</p>   |
| <p>There is a need for other housing options in the community. Many elderly households have moved out of the community in order to look for smaller units with less demand on upkeeps. (An example was given that many elderly households have purchased condominium/townhome units on Orange Grove in Pasadena.) Many younger people who have lived with their parents in the community for a long time also have to move out when they begin to raise a family as they are unable to find affordable housing in the City.</p> | <p>Many residents opted to construct pool houses rather than second units because of the less stringent requirements.</p>  |
| <p>A developer indicated that he had previously been approached by two owners of commercial properties along Huntington Drive. Both owners were interested in exploring adding residential units on their properties. However, due to the stringent development standards, it was not feasible to pursue the mixed use option.</p>  | <p>Another strategy is to modify the mixed use development standards. Currently, mixed use is allowed in the Commercial zone along Huntington Drive. However, there is a 5,000 square feet of lot area per unit requirement, essentially limiting the feasibility of such development. The City will be looking into revising the standards to provide opportunities for mixed use development. Following citizen comments at subsequent meetings, the policy to encourage mixed-use projects has been removed from the Housing Element.</p> |