

Santa Clarita Housing Element



December 9, 2022 Revised Draft

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>Section I: Introduction & Summary</u> | <u>1</u> |
| 1.1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.2 DEFINITION AND PURPOSE | 1 |
| 1.3 CONSISTENCY WITH STATE LAWS AND GENERAL PLAN | 1 |
| 1.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION | 2 |
| 1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT | 4 |
| 1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS | 5 |
| 1.7 DATA SOURCES | 5 |
| 1.8 COMMUNITY PROFILE | 7 |
| 1.9 CHANGING HOUSING NEEDS AND DEMOGRAPHICS | 8 |
| 1.10 CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSING STOCK | 17 |
| 1.11 SUMMARY OF CONSTRAINTS..... | 20 |
| 1.12 SUMMARY OF FAIR HOUSING ANALYSIS | 21 |
| 1.13 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION | 22 |
| 1.14 2013 SANTA CLARITA HOUSING ELEMENT REVIEW | 23 |
| 1.15 PROGRAM CHANGES IN 2021 HOUSING ELEMENT..... | 27 |
| <u>Section II: Housing Strategy.....</u> | <u>35</u> |
| 2.1 GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES | 35 |
| 2.2 IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS | 43 |
| <u>Section III: Housing Sites</u> | <u>65</u> |
| 3.1 CONTEXT | 65 |
| 3.2 ADU DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS | 66 |
| 3.3 PLANNED, APPROVED, AND PENDING PROJECTS | 67 |
| 3.4 VACANT AND NON-VACANT SITES | 72 |
| 3.5 Adequacy of the Residential Sites Inventory in Meeting RHNA..... | 76 |
| 3.6 RHNA SURPLUS..... | 79 |
| 3.7 REDEVELOPMENT TRENDS..... | 80 |
| 3.8 PROGRAMS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE SITES (NO NET LOSS) | 93 |
| 3.9 INFRASTRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS | 93 |
| 3.10 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS..... | 94 |
| 3.11 FAIR HOUSING CONSIDERATIONS | 97 |
| <u>Section IV: Technical Background Report.....</u> | <u>104</u> |
| 4.1 INTRODUCTION | 104 |
| 4.2 LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS DATA..... | 104 |
| 4.3 LOCAL HOUSING PROGRAMS & RESOURCES | 105 |
| 4.4 HOUSING CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS..... | 120 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.5 ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING | 160 |
| APPENDIX A: SCAG LOCAL HOUSING DATA | 238 |
| APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION | 260 |
| APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MATERIALS | 268 |
| APPENDIX D: HOUSING SITES..... | 286 |

Table of Figures

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 1: Santa Clarita Location within Larger Los Angeles County | 7 |
| Figure 2: Annexation History of Santa Clarita | 8 |
| Figure 3: Current Population by Age and Sex | 9 |
| Figure 4: Employment by Industry | 10 |
| Figure 5: Share of Income Spent on Housing Costs by Housing Tenure* ... | 12 |
| Figure 6: Average Rental Costs in Santa Clarita Over Time..... | 13 |
| Figure 7: Households by Household Size..... | 16 |
| Figure 8: Housing Type | 17 |
| Figure 9: Housing Tenure by Age..... | 18 |
| Figure 10: Household Units by Year Structure Built | 18 |
| Figure 11: Overcrowding by Extent and Tenure | 19 |
| Figure 12: Growth in Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County Median Homes Sale Prices, 2000-2018 | 20 |
| Figure 13: Chronology of Residential Development in Santa Clarita | 66 |
| Figure 14: Sites to Accommodate Lower Income RHNA..... | 77 |
| Figure 15: Sites to Accommodate Moderate Income RHNA | 78 |
| Figure 16: Sites to Accommodate Lower-Income RHNA and Fire Hazard Severity Zones | 96 |
| Figure 17: Sites to Accommodate Moderate-Income RHNA and Fire Hazard Severity Zones | 97 |
| Figure 18: Sites to Accommodate Lower-Income RHNA and TCAC Opportunity Areas | 99 |
| Figure 19: Sites to Accommodate Moderate-Income RHNA and TCAC Opportunity Areas | 99 |
| Figure 20: Housing Choice Vouchers and Opportunity Index Location | 166 |
| Figure 21: TCAC Areas of High Segregation and Poverty | 174 |
| Figure 22: Racial Dot Density Map of Santa Clarita..... | 175 |
| Figure 23: White Non-Hispanic Population Predominance by Census Tract in Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley Region, and Los Angeles County | 176 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 24: Hispanic Population Predominance by Census Tract in Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley Region, and Los Angeles County | 176 |
| Figure 25: HUD Minority Census Tracts and Hispanic/Latino Population Predominance..... | 178 |
| Figure 26: HUD Minority Census Tracts and Female Headed Households by Census Tract in Santa Clarita | 182 |
| Figure 27: Households Living with a Spouse by Census Tract in Santa Clarita | 183 |
| Figure 28: Households Living Alone by Census Tract in Santa Clarita | 184 |
| Figure 29: Households Living with a Disability by Census Tract in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley, and Santa Clarita | 186 |
| Figure 30: Households Living with a Disability by Census Tract in Santa Clarita | 187 |
| Figure 31: Location of Licensed Care Facilities in Santa Clarita..... | 188 |
| Figure 32: Percent of Low- to Moderate-Income Block Groups in Santa Clarita | 190 |
| Figure 33: Percent of Low- to Moderate- Income Block Groups in LA County | 191 |
| Figure 34: Median Income Block Groups in LA County Area | 192 |
| Figure 35: Median Income Block Groups in Santa Clarita | 193 |
| Figure 36: Percent of Households in Poverty in the Last 12 Months in Santa Clarita by Census Tract | 194 |
| Figure 37: TCAC Opportunity Area Index Map of Santa Clarita Census Tracts | 198 |
| Figure 38: TCAC Education Opportunity Index Values in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley Region, and Santa Clarita | 199 |
| Figure 39: Schools and Title 1 Status in Low- and Moderate-Income Areas of Santa Clarita | 200 |
| Figure 40: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Index Scores in Santa Clarita..... | 203 |
| Figure 41: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Index Scores in the LA County Area..... | 205 |
| Figure 42: Bus Lines and Stops (shown as colored lines and dots) in Santa Clarita | 207 |
| Figure 43: Ride-Dependent Population by Block Group in Santa Clarita ... | 209 |
| Figure 44: Affordable Housing Near Public Transit..... | 210 |
| Figure 45: Economic Index Map of Santa Clarita | 211 |
| Figure 46: Economic Index Map of LA County Area | 212 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 47: Inflow and Outflow Analysis of Santa Clarita | 213 |
| Figure 48: HUD Jobs Proximity Index Map of Santa Clarita and Surrounding Areas | 214 |
| Figure 49: Public Transit and Major Employers | 215 |
| Figure 50: Percent of Renters Overpaying for Housing in Santa Clarita by Census Tract | 218 |
| Figure 51: Percent of Owners Overpaying for Housing in Santa Clarita by Census Tract | 219 |
| Figure 52: Percent of Overcrowded Households in Santa Clarita by Census Tract | 220 |
| Figure 53: Overcrowding in Santa Clarita and the Surrounding Areas | 221 |
| Figure 54: Severe Overcrowding in Santa Clarita | 222 |
| Figure 55: Los Angeles County Point-In-Time Homeless Count Results in Santa Clarita | 224 |
| Figure 56: Census Tracts Vulnerable to Displacement in Santa Clarita | 226 |
| Figure 57: Fire Severity Zones in Santa Clarita..... | 227 |
| Figure 58: Subsidized Housing, Mobile Home Parks and Flood Risk in Santa Clarita | 227 |
| Figure 59: Home Value in the City and the County Over Time..... | 228 |
| Figure 60: Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley SCAG Subregion, and Santa Clarita, ACS 5- Year Estimates 2010-2014 | 231 |
| Figure 61: Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley SCAG Subregion, and Santa Clarita, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019 | 232 |
| Figure 62: Percentage of White Population and Median Incomes by Census Block Group | 233 |
| Figure 63: Median Income and Percent of Non-White Population by Block Group in 2010 | 235 |
| Figure 64: Median Income and Percent of Non-White Population by Block Group in 2019 | 236 |

Table of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Change in Racial and Ethnic Composition (2010-2019)..... | 9 |
| Table 2: Santa Clarita Income Groups by Tenure | 10 |
| Table 3: Households by Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost | 11 |
| Table 4: Extremely Low-Income Households in Santa Clarita by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure | 14 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 5: Regional Housing Need Allocation for Santa Clarita | 23 |
| Table 6: Progress in Achieving 2013 Quantified Objectives by Income Group | 26 |
| Table 7: 2013-2021 Housing Element Program Implementation Status | 27 |
| Table 8: Quantified Preservation and Rehabilitation Objectives 2021 - 2029 | 64 |
| Table 9: Quantified New Construction Objectives, 2021 - 2029 | 64 |
| Table 10: Assumed Affordability for 6th Cycle ADUs..... | 67 |
| Table 11: Planned, Approved, and Pending Projects (2021)..... | 69 |
| Table 12: Breakdown of Sites Inventory by Zone | 75 |
| Table 13: Existing Uses of Non-Vacant Sites | 76 |
| Table 14: Housing Site Areas | 78 |
| Table 15: RHNA Surplus by Income Group | 79 |
| Table 16: Housing Site Capacity and AFFH Indicators | 102 |
| Table 17: Assisted Rental Housing Developments | 110 |
| Table 18: Total Preservation Costs for 89 At-Risk Units..... | 112 |
| Table 19: Non-Profit Housing Development Organizations..... | 114 |
| Table 20: ADU Production Opportunity with Locally Amended Incentives . | 117 |
| Table 21: General Plan Land Use and Associated Zoning Districts..... | 123 |
| Table 22: Residential Zoning Districts | 123 |
| Table 23: City of Santa Clarita Development Standards | 128 |
| Table 24: Specific Plan Details and Status | 132 |
| Table 25: Parking Standards for City of Santa Clarita | 133 |
| Table 26: Residential Uses Allowed by Zoning District in Santa Clarita Unified Development Code | 134 |
| Table 27: Current Planning Requirements by Housing Type | 139 |
| Table 28: Santa Clarita Development and Permitting Fees | 145 |
| Table 29: Development and Permitting Fees in Santa Clarita and Comparable Local Jurisdictions | 147 |
| Table 30: Santa Clarita Development Impact Fees | 148 |
| Table 31: Timelines for Permit Procedures | 152 |
| Table 32: Fair Housing Issues, Contributing Factors, and Programs & Actions | 160 |
| Table 33: Fair Housing Complaints, Cases, Findings and Outcomes 2017-2021 | 164 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 34: Trends in Racial and Ethnic Composition of Santa Clarita (2010-2020) | 172 |
| Table 35: Trends in Racial and Ethnic Composition of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, and the State of California 2010-2020 | 172 |
| Table 36: Opportunity Map Domains and Indicators | 173 |
| Table 37: Comparative Percentages of Hispanic or Latino Population | 178 |
| Table 38: Dissimilarity Index Definitions..... | 179 |
| Table 39: Ethnic and Racial Composition Dissimilarity Index for Santa Clarita and LA County | 179 |
| Table 40: Trends in Familial Status in Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, and the State of California | 180 |
| Table 41: Trends in Disability Characteristics | 185 |
| Table 42: Disability Characteristics for Census Tract 9203.30 | 188 |
| Table 43: HUD Opportunity Index Values by Racial and Ethnic Group | 196 |
| Table 44: California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress ... | 200 |
| Table 45: Educational Attainment for Adults 25 and Over..... | 201 |
| Table 46: Indicators for At-Risk of Becoming Disadvantaged Tracts in Santa Clarita | 203 |
| Table 47: Cost Burden & Severe Cost Burden by Tenure in the City and County | 217 |
| Table 48: Substandard Housing and Household Income | 223 |
| Table 49: Minority Concentration Areas and Affordability of Average Rent | 229 |
| Table 50: Summary and Response to Stakeholder Input..... | 262 |
| Table 51: Summary and Incorporation of Community Comments | 266 |
| Table 52: Outreach List 1 | 270 |
| Table 53: Outreach List 2 | 273 |
| Table 54: Outreach List 3 | 273 |
| Table 55: Outreach List 4 | 273 |
| Table 56: Housing Opportunity Sites in Inventory | 286 |

Section I: Introduction & Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the Santa Clarita General Plan presents goals, policies, programs, and supporting information related to the provision of housing for existing and future residents of the City. The purpose of the Housing Element is twofold: 1) to present specific policies and actions for housing development to meet Santa Clarita’s specific, identified housing needs; and 2) to meet regional standards and achieve State certification, pursuant to statutory requirements.

1.2 DEFINITION AND PURPOSE

The Housing Element of the General Plan is a detailed statement of the housing goals, policies, programs, and quantified objectives for the City. The Element is based on a comprehensive technical assessment of existing housing policies and programs; current and projected housing needs, especially related to low-income households and special needs populations; an analysis of market, environmental, governmental, and other factors which constrain housing production; an assessment of ways that the City can affirmatively further fair housing for its residents; an inventory of sites available for housing construction; and an assessment of new programs and policies that can enhance housing production in the City.

The purpose of the Housing Element is to guide decision-making by elected and appointed officials. Specifically, the Housing Element sets forth how the City will address the need for housing, especially by low- and moderate-income families, and special needs families and individuals. The Housing Element also provides housing-related data and information to the public.

1.3 CONSISTENCY WITH STATE LAWS AND GENERAL PLAN

State law requires that the General Plan include an integrated, consistent set of goals and policies. The City of Santa Clarita’s General Plan contains elements relating to land use, circulation, housing, noise, conservation and open space, economic development, and safety. The 2021 Housing Element provides goals, policies, and implementation measures that are consistent with all other elements of the General Plan. As the General Plan is amended in the future, the City will ensure the Housing Element remains consistent with the General Plan.

New State law requires that the Safety Element be updated to address climate adaptation upon revision of the Housing Element. The City will ensure compliance with this requirement by updating and adopting its updated Safety Element concurrent with the 2021 Housing Element. The City will provide a copy of the Housing Element to the water and sewer service providers and has coordinated with these agencies regarding the State-mandated water and sewer service priority for

housing projects that will help Santa Clarita in meeting its regional housing need for lower-income households (Government Code Section 65589.7).

Multiple statewide bills have been passed to address the inequitable distribution of pollution and associated health effects in low-income communities and communities of color. SB 535 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to define disadvantaged communities and SB 1000 requires local governments to identify those disadvantaged communities in their jurisdiction and address environmental justice in their general plans accordingly. As defined by SB 535, Santa Clarita does not currently have any disadvantaged communities; however, two census tracts in the City are within a small margin of meeting the criteria that would trigger requirements for further analysis. As such, these tracts will be analyzed and discussed as part of the Assessment of Fair Housing in **Section 4**.

Additionally, California Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) identified census tracts as disadvantaged unincorporated communities (DUC) per definition in SB 244, including fringe, island, and legacy communities. Santa Clarita has six DUC tracts that are either fully or partially within City boundaries, two of which are also marginally close to being considered disadvantaged per the SB 535 definition. State law requires jurisdictions to address DUCs in the land use element of the General Plan and the City should analyze these in the next General Plan Update.

1.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The 6th cycle Housing Element Update has been undertaken during the COVID-19 global pandemic. Public outreach, which is the cornerstone of the preparation process, had to be adjusted to allow and encourage meaningful public participation and input without the ability to meet or gather in-person. Staff and consultants made use of multiple digital platforms to facilitate public input, including mechanisms that used cell phones so that persons without internet access were still able to fully participate. Community opinion surveys were conducted in multiple languages to ensure that all residents had an opportunity to be heard. Public participation opportunities were provided as outlined in the list below:

- In March 2021, the City established a dedicated website for the Housing Element Update with information on the update process, RHNA, upcoming events, frequently asked questions, and how to get involved. The website also includes a link to the survey in English and Spanish, as well as a dedicated email address, and phone number for more information.
- Beginning on April 19, 2021, an online community opinion survey was conducted in English and Spanish to collect input from Santa Clarita residents, housing and service providers, and other interested parties. The survey asked questions regarding current living situations and opinions on various housing issues and approaches.

- Stakeholder interviews were conducted between February and September of 2021 and included multiple for-profit and non-profit developers, as well as advocacy groups and service providers:
 - Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing
 - Abundant Housing LA
 - Milestone Housing
 - Southland Regional Association of Realtors
 - Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce
 - Boys and Girls Club of Santa Clarita Valley
 - Family Promise
 - Bridge to Home
 - Santa Clarita Valley Senior Center
 - Spicher Group Properties
 - Santa Clarita Homelessness Task Force (Affordable Housing Subcommittee)
- On April 29, 2021, the City conducted a virtual community workshop to introduce major elements of the Housing Element Update process, and outline the City’s current Regional Housing Need Assessment requirements. The public was invited to provide initial comments regarding the Housing Element Update process and general housing needs in the City. Public comments are detailed in Appendix B.
- On June 15, 2021, the City held a public study session meeting with the City of Santa Clarita Planning Commission to introduce the Housing Element process and seek initial input from the Planning Commission. The staff presentation covered important housing topics including affordable housing, Housing Element requirements, RHNA, new housing laws, demographics, project objectives, and survey results. Portions of the Draft Housing Element were introduced at this time.
- The Fair Housing Assessment was made available to stakeholders and community members on September 24, 2021.
- The complete Public Review Draft Housing Element was released, emailed to interested parties, made available on the City’s website on October 29, 2021, and was promoted via social media. All service providers, housing professionals, and community stakeholders identified in Appendix A, including organizations that serve priority communities and lower-income households, received notification that the draft document had been released for public review. No public comments were received during this period.
- The City Council Development Committee met on March 30, 2022 to review the comments issued by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on the Public Review Draft Housing Element and to accept public comment.
- Following HCD’s review of the Draft Housing Element, a Public Hearing Draft incorporating the changes requested by HCD was released on March 31, 2022

and was made available on the City's website. Interested parties, commenters, stakeholders, and the interested parties mailing list were notified of the availability of the Public Review Draft Housing Element at this time.

- On April 5, 2022, the Planning Commission held duly noticed Public Hearing to review the Housing Element and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, and to accept public comment. The Commission recommended that Negative Declaration and Housing Element be adopted by the City Council.
- On May 10, 2022. The City Council held a duly noticed public hearing to adopt the Negative Declaration and the Housing Element, and to accept public comment.

The adopted Housing Element was submitted to HCD for compliance review on May 11, 2022. On June 7, 2022, the City received a letter from HCD outlining additional data, analysis, and program implementation details that would be required to comply with state law. After conducting further research and consultation, the City revised the Element to address the additional HCD comments, and additional information from service providers and developers was sought and integrated. The December 2022 Revised Draft was completed and released for public review on December 9, 2022.

These community outreach efforts and their incorporation into the Housing Element are included in full within Appendix B of the Housing Element.

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT

The Housing Element is organized into four main sections:

- Section 1 introduces the overall Housing Element update effort, a summary of housing needs and constraints, a Fair Housing summary, and a review of the effectiveness of the 2013 Housing Element and the City's progress in its implementation.
- Section 2 sets forth the City's Housing Strategy, which is comprised of the Goals, Policies, and Programs that it intends to implement over the next 8-year planning cycle. The City's Quantified Objectives are also included in Section 2.
- Section 3 presents a detailed Housing Site Inventory, including a discussion of the availability of services, and compares this inventory to the City's projected housing needs.
- Section 4, the Technical Background Report, provides statutorily required data including an assessment of housing needs & programs, an analysis of non-governmental and governmental constraints to affordable housing provision, a discussion of special needs populations, and an assessment of fair housing. Pre-certified housing and demographic data provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is included here.

1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS

Throughout the Housing Element, a variety of technical terms related to income levels are used in describing and quantifying conditions and objectives. The definitions of these terms follow:

Affordable Housing -- Housing which costs no more than 30 percent of a low-, very low-, or extremely low-income household's gross monthly income. For rental housing, the residents may pay up to 30 percent of gross income on rent plus tenant-paid utilities. For homeownership, residents can pay up to 30 percent on the combination of mortgage payments, taxes, insurance, and Homeowners' dues.

Area Median Income (AMI) -- The income figure representing the middle point of Los Angeles County household incomes. Fifty percent of households earn more than or equal to this figure and 50 percent earn less than or equal to this figure. The AMI varies according to the size of the household. For the year 2021, the AMI for a four-person household in Los Angeles County was \$80,000.

Extremely Low-Income Households (ELI) -- Households earning not more than 30 percent of the Los Angeles County AMI.

Very Low-Income Households (VLI) -- Households earning between 31 and 50 percent of the Los Angeles County AMI.

Low-income Households -- Households earning between 51 and 80 percent of the Los Angeles County AMI.

Moderate-income Households -- Households earning 81 to 120 percent of the Los Angeles County AMI.

Above Moderate-Income Households -- Households earning over 120 percent of the Los Angeles County AMI.

1.7 DATA SOURCES


The 2021 Housing Element Update makes full use of the pre-certified data package provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which is contained in its entirety in **Section 4** the Technical Background Report. In addition to the SCAG dataset, the following sources of data were used to help identify historic patterns of segregation, assess constraints to housing and the market conditions in Santa Clarita; and to better identify specific housing needs:

- U.S. Census 2010 and 2020
- 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
- 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates
- Los Angeles Economic Development Commission 2021 Economic Forecast
- City of Santa Clarita 2019 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
- Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority City of Santa Clarita Data

- 2013-2017 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data for Santa Clarita
- CA Department of Housing and Community Development, Housing Needs Data Certification Letter, 2020
- Los Angeles County Development Authority, "About Section 8"
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
- California Tax Credit Allocation Committee
- National Housing Law Project
- Santa Clarita 2021 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Department of Fair Employment and Housing
- Center on Budget and Priorities
- Terner Center, March 2020. "The Hard Costs of Construction: Recent Trends in Labor and Materials Costs for Apartment Buildings in California"
- Terner Center, March 2018. "It All Adds Up: The Cost of Housing Development Fees in Seven California Cities"
- ESRI; ESRI Community Analyst
- AFFH Data Viewer, California Department of Housing and Community Development
- University of Delaware
- Brown University
- California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
- City of Santa Clarita Transit
- On the Map
- California Department of Health and Human Services
- UCLA Urban Displacement Project
- California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress
- Zillow.com
- Realtor.com
- 2017 County Summary Highlights, USDA
- California Important Farmland: 2016, California Department of Conservation
- U.S. Department of Urban and Housing Development, FY 2022 Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA HUD Metro FMR Area FMRs for All Bedroom Sizes
- Affordable Housing Online website
- County of Los Angeles Municipal Code, Code of Ordinances, 2021
- City of Santa Clarita FY 2019 – FY 2023 Consolidated Plan
- City of Santa Clarita Development Standards, 2013

1.8 COMMUNITY PROFILE

Figure 1: Santa Clarita Location within Larger Los Angeles County




Source: City of Santa Clarita Data

Residents launched the City of Santa Clarita Formation Committee in 1985 to allow the City to exercise self-government and to consolidate the historic communities of Newhall, founded in 1876, and Saugus, founded in 1887. Two years later, 39.5 square miles were officially incorporated as the City of Santa Clarita.

Since incorporation, forty communities positioned adjacent to the City have been annexed, adding a total of 31.09 square miles to the City, as shown in Figure 2. The City of Santa Clarita now has the third largest population in Los Angeles County. Compared to other jurisdictions in the Los Angeles County region, the City is unique in its ability to continue greenfield development which furthers opportunities for growth. The City invites sustainable development and expansion while continuing to provide a high quality of life for all residents.

Figure 2: Annexation History of Santa Clarita



Source: City of Santa Clarita Data, 2021

1.9 CHANGING HOUSING NEEDS AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Comparisons between Santa Clarita’s data and that of Los Angeles County and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are covered in this section. As the City ages and demographics change, different housing needs have arisen, and new programs are needed to meet changing demands. This section includes some of the required quantification and analysis of the City’s population. Complete information and analysis are provided within the Technical Background Report (Section 4) and Appendix A. This information helps to provide direction in updating the City’s Housing Element goals, policies, and programs.


1.9.1 Population Characteristics and Trends

Santa Clarita’s population increased 29.7% between 2010 to 2020, from 176,320 to 228,673. In comparison, Los Angeles County’s population increased 2.3% between 2010 and 2020, from 9,787,747 to 10,014,009. Santa Clarita’s annual population growth rate of 3.0% over the last decade is higher than the surrounding SCAG region at 0.7%.

Age Composition

Santa Clarita’s population is younger than the region’s population. The share of the population under 18 years of age is 25.9%, which is higher than the regional share of 23.4%. Santa Clarita's seniors (65 and above) make up 11.3% of the population, which is lower than the regional share of 13%. There is a need to ensure that stable and affordable housing is available for families with children and youth that will be reaching adulthood during this planning period.

Figure 3: Current Population by Age and Sex



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates

Race and Ethnicity

The U.S. Census statistics include the race and ethnicity of a city's population. The most prevalent racial and ethnic categories are as shown in Table 1. The 2010 and 2019 population estimates show that Santa Clarita is experiencing increases in the Asian and Hispanic or Latino populations. Additional discussion of Santa Clarita’s racial and ethnic composition is included in **Section 4**.


Table 1: Change in Racial and Ethnic Composition (2010-2019)

| Racial or Ethnic Group | 2010 | 2019 | Percent Change |
|---|-------|-------|----------------|
| White | 72.7% | 71.0% | -2.3% |
| Black or African American | 2.5% | 3.9% | +56.0% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0.3% | 0.8% | +166.7% |
| Asian | 8.4% | 11.1% | +32.1% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0.1% | 0.1% | +0.0% |
| Some other race | 10.7% | 7.2% | -32.7% |
| Two or more races | 5.3% | 5.9% | +11.3% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 27.8% | 33.5% | +20.5% |
| Totals exceed 100% because all races can include Hispanic or Latino origin. | | | |
| Source: 2010 and 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates | | | |

Employment and Income

According to the American Community Survey 2014-2018, the City of Santa Clarita has 104,338 residents in the workforce. This represents a 20.8% increase from 2010, consistent with the City’s increase in population. The industries with the highest percentage of employees are education and social services with 23,164 employees (22.2% of total), followed by professional services (11.5% of total). As of April 2021, the largest employers were Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital (1,917 employees), Six Flags Magic Mountain (1,900 employees), and William S. Hart Union School District (1,641 employees) (Source: Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corporation). Figure 4 illustrates the breakdown of employment by industry.

Figure 4: Employment by Industry



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates w/ groupings of 2-digit NA/CS codes.

1.9.2 Household Incomes and Housing Affordability

Santa Clarita’s median income is \$99,666, according to the 2015-2019 ACS, which is higher than the Los Angeles County Area Median Income (AMI) of \$80,000. While most Santa Clarita residents have higher incomes than Los Angeles County in general, there are still a considerable number of Santa Clarita households (22,160) with incomes at the “lower” level (80 percent of AMI or less). The distribution of incomes is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Santa Clarita Income Groups by Tenure

| Income Distribution Overview | Owner Households | Renter Households | Total Households | Percentage of Households |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Extremely Low-income (< 30% AMI) | 2,500 | 3,495 | 5,995 | 8.83% |
| Very Low-income (31-50% AMI) | 2,935 | 3,755 | 6,690 | 9.85% |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Low-income (51-80% AMI) | 5,355 | 4,120 | 9,475 | 13.95% |
| Moderate-income (81-120% AMI) | 3,985 | 2,840 | 6,825 | 10.05% |
| Above Moderate (>120% AMI) | 31,195 | 7,730 | 38,925 | 57.31% |
| Total | 45,970 | 21,945 | 67,915 | 100% |

Sources: Consolidated Planning /CHAS Data for Santa Clarita; 2013-2017 ACS
 NOTE: Reported units and household numbers vary due to the differences in data collection years and the City’s recent annexations, which added additional units and households to the City.

Housing Costs and Overpayment


When housing prices are very high, many households must “overpay” for housing. Households are considered housing cost-burdened when their total housing costs exceed 30% of their gross monthly income, and to be severely cost-burdened when their total housing costs exceed 50% of their gross monthly income. Households with very and extremely low incomes are disproportionately housing cost-burdened. Table 3 below shows the number of cost-burdened and extremely cost-burdened households by income level, and Figure 5 shows the number of cost-burdened and extremely cost-burdened households by tenure. While Santa Clarita has a higher median household income than the surrounding region, there are 22,818 households who are overpaying for housing, or approximately 38.6% of households. While the total number of homeowners experiencing cost-burden exceeds the total number of renters experiencing cost-burden, renters are disproportionately affected by this issue.

Table 3: Households by Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost

| Income | Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | < 30% | 30-50% | >50% |
| < 30% AMI | 990 | 575 | 4400 |
| 30-50% AMI | 1400 | 1675 | 3165 |
| 50-80% AMI | 3125 | 3850 | 1735 |
| 80-100% AMI | 3480 | 2470 | 420 |
| > 100% AMI | 27765 | 4155 | 390 |
| Total | 36,760 | 12,725 | 10,110 |

Sources: HUD, CHAS, 2012-2016.

Figure 5: Share of Income Spent on Housing Costs by Housing Tenure*




Source: HUD, CHAS, 2012-2016.

*CHAS Cost Burden data by tenure for Santa Clarita does not include 420 households where cost burden data is not available. There may be discrepancies in total household numbers between this figure and other figures in the Housing Element.

As of January 2022, units offered for rent in Santa Clarita averaged \$1,845 for a one-bedroom unit, \$2,678 for a two-bedroom unit, \$3,309 for a three-bedroom unit, and \$3,810 for a four-bedroom unit. (See Figure 6) This is generally higher than the surrounding area. Santa Clarita’s median rent was considerably higher than the median rent of Los Angeles County as a whole, at \$2,044 and \$1,577 per month respectively; this is partly accounted for by the fact that Santa Clarita has a higher percentage of homes and rentals with three or more bedrooms, making the median higher overall. When compared to other large cities within the Southern California region, rental costs and the overall cost of living are less in Santa Clarita (2019 American Community Survey, 1 Year Estimates; Best Places Cost of Living Estimates).

Figure 6: Average Rental Costs in Santa Clarita Over Time



Source: Zumper Rent Research, Zumper.com, accessed February 4, 2022

Extremely Low-Income Households

Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data from the 2012-2016 period indicate that ten percent of Santa Clarita’s households are extremely low-income, or a total of 5,959 households (See Table 4). This represents a smaller share of the population than the SCAG region, with over seventeen percent of its households in the extremely low-income category. The race or ethnicity with the highest share of extremely low-income households in Santa Clarita is Hispanic, and there are more extremely low-income rental households than owner households. Extremely low-income households make up 17.5% of the total renter-occupied households and 6.5% of total owner-occupied households. The distribution of households by income, race, and tenure is further discussed in the Fair Housing Analysis in Section 4.5 and includes policies and programs to address housing needs and discrepancies in access to housing among different groups and areas. These policies and programs include the following:

- Policy H2.2: Funding Preference to Extremely Low-Income Housing
- Policy H2.10: Affordable Housing Incentives
- Program HP-2.4: Continuing Affordability
- Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers
- Policy H2.12: Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable and Special Needs Housing

Table 4: Extremely Low-Income Households in Santa Clarita by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure

| | Total Households | Households below 30% AMI | Share Below 30% AMI |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| White, non-Hispanic | 36,730 | 3,125 | 8.5% |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1,780 | 205 | 11.5% |
| Asian and other, non-Hispanic | 6,865 | 714 | 10.4% |
| Hispanic | 14,195 | 1,915 | 13.5% |
| Total | 59,570 | 5,959 | 10.0% |
| Renter-occupied | 19,020 | 3,325 | 17.5% |
| Owner-occupied | 40,580 | 2,640 | 6.5% |
| Total | 59,570 | 5,959 | 10.0% |

Source: HUD, CHAS, 2012-2016.

1.9.3 Special Needs Populations

Homeless

The Los Angeles County Community Development Commission conducts bi-annual point-in-time surveys of homeless populations. In 2020, 168 people were reportedly experiencing homelessness in Santa Clarita, a 35 percent decline from 2019 (*Source: Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority*). Services for homeless individuals are available in Santa Clarita, with the primary homeless services provider being Bridge to Home. Bridge to Home operates year-round 24/7 for up to 60 people at any given time and has an approved proposal to expand its services. The Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness also continually works towards completing action items from the Community Plan to Address Homelessness. In 2019, the Task Force identified 148 students in the Newhall District reportedly experiencing homelessness along with an increase in persons seeking resources. Programs and policies included to address these needs include the following:

- Policy H2.12: Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable and Special Needs Housing
- Program HP-4.3: Homeless Case Management
- Program HP-2.1: Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types

Disabled

Census data from the American Community Survey 2014-2018 indicate that Santa Clarita has 7,950 persons with an independent living disability, 4,568 with a self-care disability, 10,771 with an ambulatory disability, 4,093 with a vision disability, 8,211 with a cognitive disability and 6,060 with a hearing disability. These numbers are not exclusive, as some residents have more than one type of disability and some disability types are not recorded for children below a certain age. The most commonly occurring disabilities among seniors 65 and older were ambulatory (24.2%) and independent

living (17.8%). These needs will be addressed through programs and housing strategies that include the following:

- Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers
- Policy H2.12: Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable and Special Needs Housing
- Program HP-3.1: Limit Code Enforcement Activities
- Program HP-4.2: Monitoring of Codes and Ordinances to Remove Barriers
- Program HP-4.7: Administrative Process for Reasonable Accommodations

Elderly

According to the American Community Survey 2014-2018, about 11.4 percent of Santa Clarita’s population is aged 65 and above. (See Figure 3, above). This is lower than the regional average of 13 percent. However, 12.4 percent of the population is in the 55-64 age group, which is projected to increase the population of elderly residents by the end of the Housing Element period. Elderly persons often have fixed incomes and may have additional special needs related to access and care that may require physical improvements to their homes such as ramps, handrails, lower cupboards and counters, creation of a downstairs bedroom, or other modifications to enable them to remain in their homes. They may also need assistance in the form of a part-time or live-in caretaker. According to stakeholder interviews, strategies to serve Santa Clarita’s elderly residents include protecting affordable units from converting to market rate, development of single-story homes, and the development of more affordable senior living communities, especially near amenities such as transportation, grocery stores, and medical care.

Santa Clarita currently has over 1,900 senior residential units, including rental units, ownership units, and assisted living units. Over 827 of these units are deed-restricted affordable. In addition to these units, an additional 901 senior units are pending, approved, or under construction. In addition to the housing available for seniors, there are local organizations and agencies that provide resources and assistance for seniors, including the Senior Resource Alliance Santa Clarita Valley, the Santa Clarita Valley Senior Center, and the Senior Center Friendly Valley.


As noted above and in Section 4, there is a higher rate of disability among the senior residents than in the larger population. Programs and Policies included in this Housing Element that help address the housing needs of this population include the following:

- Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers
- Policy H2.12: Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable and Special Need Housing
- Program HP-3.1 Limit Code Enforcement Activities
- Program HP-3.2 Handyworker Program
- Program HP-4.7 Administrative Process for Reasonable Accommodations

Large Households

In Santa Clarita, the average household size of 2.97 is the same as Los Angeles County (*Source: 2019 ACS 1-Year Estimates*). In Santa Clarita, the most common household size is of two people (29%), followed by three-person, one-person, and four-person households, as seen in Figure 7. Households with five or more persons make up less than 15% of the households in the City. For each household size, there are more home-owners than renters. Compared to the SCAG region, Santa Clarita has a lower share of single-person households (23.4% vs. 18.9%) and 7+ person households (3.1% vs. 1.7%). Santa Clarita has approximately 27,000 residential units with at least four bedrooms (37%), indicating that sufficient housing units are available for large families.

Figure 7: Households by Household Size



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Female-headed households

State law requires an analysis of female-headed households to ensure adequate childcare and job training resources are provided. Of Santa Clarita’s 67,583 total households in 2018, 11.3% were female-headed (compared to 14.3% in the SCAG region); of those, 48.8% had children at home and 7.3% had children under age six. Actions that help meet the needs of female-headed households are addressed within the Fair Housing Assessment.

Farmworkers

Statewide, farmworker housing is of unique concern and importance. While only a small number of SCAG jurisdictions have farmworkers living in them, they are essential to the region’s economy and its food supply. According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), more than 80 percent of hired crop farmworkers are not migrant workers but are considered settled and work farm(s) within 75 miles of their residences. This share is up significantly from 41 percent in 1996-1998, reflecting a fundamental change in the nature of the crop farming workforce. The

majority of farmworkers in California reside in metropolitan areas, where the average hourly wage of \$16.05 puts them in the extremely low- to very low-income category (between 30-50 percent of the area median income). Programs and policies to address this need include the following:


- Program HP-2.1: Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types
- Program HP-2.4: Continuing Affordability
- Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers
- Policy H2.12: Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable and Special Needs Housing

1.10 CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSING STOCK

1.10.1 Type

Santa Clarita’s housing stock consists mostly of single-family units (72.8%), compared to 61.7% for the SCAG region. As shown in Figure 8, the City has a smaller proportion of multifamily units and a similar proportion of mobilehomes as the region.

Figure 8: Housing Type




Source: CA DOF E-5 Population and Housing Unit Estimates

1.10.2 Tenure

Housing security can depend heavily on housing tenure (i.e., whether homes are owned or rented). Santa Clarita has a higher rate of owner-occupied homes (67.8%) compared to 32.2% for the SCAG region. The City’s housing stock in 2018 consisted of 67,583 occupied units, with 45,807 owner-occupied and 21,776 renter-occupied units.

Figure 9: Housing Tenure by Age




Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

1.10.3 Age & Condition

Santa Clarita’s housing stock is notably younger than the SCAG regional average (Figure 10). Prior to the 1960s, Santa Clarita saw very little construction. Over 60 percent of the residential development in Santa Clarita occurred between 1980 and 2009, while over 60 percent of SCAG households were built prior to 1980.

Figure 10: Household Units by Year Structure Built



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.


Community Preservation staff occasionally survey housing conditions within areas of the City that are much older and have a history of code enforcement issues. This includes areas of Canyon Country, Newhall, and Saugus. Based on the most recently available data, about 4 percent of these properties needed rehabilitation. Based on this information, around 706 of the 17,627 units within these areas are likely in need of rehabilitation or replacement due to housing conditions and age. This total number of estimated units in need of rehabilitation or replacement has increased due to

annexations of areas such as Canyon Country with an older Housing Stock. The City has successfully established programs targeting housing rehabilitation to address this need, which are continued under Programs HP-3.2 and HP-3.3

1.10.4 Overcrowding

The ACS definition of overcrowding is more than 1.0 occupants per room, where the number of rooms includes all except kitchens, bathrooms, and hallways. Severe overcrowding is defined as more than 1.5 occupants per room. By these definitions, there are 4,276 overcrowded households and 1,354 severely overcrowded households in Santa Clarita. The rate of overcrowding in Santa Clarita’s owner-occupied households is almost 50% lower than the overall SCAG region (2.4% vs 4.9%) and renter-occupied households in the City face similar rates of overcrowding as the SCAG region (14.7% vs 15.6%). In Santa Clarita, rental units were more likely to be overcrowded and severely overcrowded than owner-occupied units.

Figure 11: Overcrowding by Extent and Tenure



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

1.10.5 Vacancy


The vacancy rate is a measure of the general availability of housing. It also shows how well the available units meet the current housing market demand. A low vacancy rate suggests that residents will have difficulty finding housing within their price range. According to the 2014 – 2018 ACS, Santa Clarita’s vacancy rate was 3.7 percent with about 2,743 vacant units, slightly lower than what would be expected for a healthy rental market. In comparison, the vacancy rate for Los Angeles County at that time was 6.2%.

1.10.6 Prices

Santa Clarita's median home sales prices and trends closely match those of the larger region according to the 2014 – 2018 ACS (Figure 12). In 2018, the median home sale price in Santa Clarita was \$538,000. Over the last 20 years, Santa Clarita has

ranged between 87.8 percent to 126.2 percent of the SCAG regional median home sales price.

Figure 12: Growth in Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County Median Homes Sale Prices, 2000-2018



Source: SCAG Local Profiles

1.10.7 Preservation of Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

There are two developments within the City with a high risk of conversion to market rate before 2031. These developments contain a total of 89 units, which are all senior units. Programs to assist in the preservation of at-risk housing are discussed in **Section 2** and **Section 4**.

1.11 SUMMARY OF CONSTRAINTS

As discussed in **Section 4**, governmental and non-governmental constraints directly affect the production of housing in a city. For the Los Angeles County areas, including the City of Santa Clarita, the high costs of land and development pose the largest constraints.

Non-governmental constraints such as land costs and construction expenses can limit the development of affordable housing. Vacant land is available; however, much of it is located in areas with environmental constraints, such as fire hazards, that must be considered in developing housing. In addition, land costs are high. Total development and construction costs, including cost of labor and materials, are also high. Although financing is available, home purchases may be difficult for lower and moderate-income buyers with limited down payments, as lenders are hesitant to finance homebuyers that do not have the down payment or income required to cover minimum mortgage payments. These non-governmental constraints can affect the cost of development in Santa Clarita and serve as barriers to housing production and affordability.

In addition to non-governmental constraints, several policies and regulations at the Federal, State, and local levels affect housing production. Local governmental constraints such as processing requirements for development applications, design and development standards, density limitations, fees and exactions, and the time and uncertainty associated with obtaining permits can affect price and availability of housing. The General Plan and Zoning Code are intended to allow for smart growth with only necessary limitations on development and do not pose a significant constraint.

The most significant constraint to housing development in the City of Santa Clarita is the cost of development – including cost of land, cost of construction, and costs associated with the permitting process. These costs are generally comparable to surrounding jurisdictions and therefore are not likely to pose a unique or significant constraint to housing development. Additionally, the City’s processing time for permits tends to be lower than comparable surrounding jurisdictions, which decreases constraints and cost of development.

1.12 SUMMARY OF FAIR HOUSING ANALYSIS

Assembly Bill 686 (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, or AFFH) requires state and local agencies to take proactive measures to correct any housing inequalities related to race, national origin, color, ancestry, sex, marital status, disability, religion, or other protected characteristics. All Housing Elements due on or after January 1, 2021, must contain an Assessment of Fair Housing including an analysis of impediments to fair housing choice, or AI². Agencies must ensure that their laws and programs affirmatively further fair housing, and that they take no actions that counter those goals.

Under State law, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.” Agencies must include in their Housing Elements a program that promotes fair housing opportunities while identifying areas of racial/ethnic concentration across the socioeconomic spectrum. In the context of a community’s housing needs, AFFH is not just about the *number* of housing units needed, but also about *where* the units are located and *who* has access to them.

AB 686 enacts new requirements for the Assessment of Fair Housing; this assessment is contained in **Section 4** along with a history of Santa Clarita. Per HCD Guidance, the analysis will assess enforcement and outreach capacity, segregation and integration patterns, disparities in access to opportunity, disproportionate housing needs including displacement, and concentrated areas of poverty and affluence across racial/ethnic groups. Data compiled in the Assessment of Fair Housing and a 2019 Analysis of Impediments found high-priority challenges to fair housing and

contributing factors to equal access to affordable housing in high opportunity areas in the City including:

- Concentrations of low- and moderate- income residents in lower resource areas;
- Low rates of community participation and awareness
- Exposure to environmental health hazards
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures;
- Areas of high social vulnerability;
- Single, female head-of-households with children concentrated in lower resource areas; and
- Lack of opportunity for all residents to obtain housing in high resource areas.

While it is common to find enclaves of persons with similar cultural background and values, it is necessary to analyze any area demonstrating ethnic or economic concentration to ensure that the community is not experiencing disparities in access to opportunities such as education, employment, and amenities. Furthermore, health and environmental metrics should be considered in conjunction with economic factors in these communities to determine whether the City contains any disadvantaged communities. As defined by SB 535, Santa Clarita does not currently have any disadvantaged communities; however, two census tracts in the City are very close to meeting the criteria that would trigger requirements for further analysis. These tracts will be analyzed and discussed as part of the Assessment of Fair Housing and environmental justice policies and programs included in this Housing Element.

An in-depth analysis including an Assessment of Fair Housing is included in **Section 4. Section 2** includes specific policies, programs, and actions to be undertaken by the City to address these areas of concentration and to affirmatively further fair housing. **Section 3** contains the housing sites location information and maps as part of the AB 686 requirement that jurisdictions identify sites throughout the community in a manner that is consistent with their duty to affirmatively further fair housing.

1.13 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a requirement of State housing law and is a determination of projected and existing housing needs for all jurisdictions in California. The Southern California Association of Governments, or SCAG, conducts the RHNA process every eight years. Every jurisdiction must plan for its RHNA allocation in its Housing Element by ensuring there are enough sites with appropriate zoning to accommodate their RHNA. The goal is to ensure that local plans have enough appropriately zoned land to accommodate their existing and projected housing needs for all income levels for the entire 8-year planning period. Jurisdictions are not expected to build the housing, but they must plan and zone for it.

The RHNA methodology applies several factors to further the objectives of State law and meet the goals of the Connect SoCal plan. After a RHNA total is calculated, a

social equity adjustment is applied to determine the four income categories. The social equity adjustment is based on household income and access to resources. One of the five objectives of State housing law is to ensure that there is not an overconcentration of households by income group in comparison to the county or regional average. To ensure that the RHNA methodology does not overburden low-income jurisdictions with more low-income households, a social equity adjustment is applied during the Income Group process. The result is that higher income jurisdictions are required to plan for fewer market rate units and more affordable units, while lower income jurisdictions plan for more market rate units and fewer affordable units.

Santa Clarita’s RHNA for the period between October 2021 – October 2029 is 10,031 units, divided between income groups as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Regional Housing Need Allocation for Santa Clarita

| Regional Housing Need Allocation, 2021 - 2029 | | | | | |
|---|----------|-------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Market | Total |
| Santa Clarita | 3,397 | 1,734 | 1,672 | 3,228 | 10,031 |

While the RHNA is assigned based on the four income categories above, the law also requires that communities plan for the needs of extremely low-income households, defined as those making less than 30 percent of the County AMI. The housing need for the extremely low-income group is generally considered to be one-half of the very low-income need. **Section 3** provides an analysis of the sites available to meet the City’s assigned RHNA, the Sites Inventory, and any constraints to development of the listed housing sites.

1.14 2013 SANTA CLARITA HOUSING ELEMENT REVIEW

Santa Clarita had a variety of programs to be implemented in the previous Housing Element, some of which were achieved successfully. An evaluation of the City’s progress toward achieving these programs, including an analysis of the differences between what was projected and what was achieved, provides useful data to determine any new or revised policies and programs for this current Housing Element.

In the 2013-2021 Housing Element Update, the City planned for the expansion of the local housing supply for affordable and market-rate housing as well as maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock. Implementation programs included:

- Providing adequate sites at a range of densities to accommodate future housing needs;
- Assisting in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of extremely low, very low, and moderate-income households;
- Conserving and improving the existing housing stock through Community Preservation rehabilitation loans and a handy worker program;

- Preserving the affordability of existing homes that were at risk of conversion to market-rate during the planning period;
- Addressing and, where appropriate and legally possible, removing government constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing for all income levels; and
- Promoting housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability

1.14.1 Progress Implementing Programs

The City was successful in implementing many of the programs in its 2013 Housing Element and is implementing others with the adoption of this 2021 Housing Element Update. See Table 7 at the end of this section for full program implementation status.

1.14.2 Progress Addressing Needs of Special Needs Populations

The City was able to achieve a number of its goals and objectives related to meeting the housing needs of special needs populations (e.g., elderly, persons with disabilities, large households, female-headed households, farmworkers, and persons experiencing homelessness). Certain goals and objectives like streamlined and expedited review of assisted senior living facilities, collaboration with homeless services providers and developers of supportive housing, offering effective case management services to the homeless, and encouraging the transition of the homeless population to stable housing continue to be accomplished through a series of actions.

During the last planning period, the City issued streamlined approvals for five assisted senior living facilities totaling 617 units and granted approval for 695 senior residential units (49 of which are deed-restricted to lower income households), including construction of 235 senior units. The City also issued planning, building, and occupancy permits for the new 30,000 square-foot Santa Clarita Valley Senior Center. Furthermore, the City issued approval for a 92-bed homeless shelter (Bridge to Home), a five-unit, 6,400 square-foot supportive/transitional housing facility for single-parent households (Family Promise), and a 51,000 square-foot skilled nursing/transitional care facility. Prior to approval of the homeless shelter and the supportive/transitional housing facility, the City donated the respective properties to each of the organizations to help facilitate the construction of these facilities. The City has also awarded various grants to Bridge to Home to assist in the construction of the homeless shelter and in expanded homeless services. Other notable actions included: the establishment of a senior mobilehome park overlay zone that limits the conversion of age-restricted parks to all-ages and enhancing housing options for seniors; implementation of the reasonable accommodations ordinance and regularly issuing expedited approvals for requests for reasonable accommodations within two weeks of application submittal. The City funded several nonprofits during the prior planning period and provided case management services to 4,291 individuals. Grant

funding was also provided to single-mothers outreach towards implementing a subsidized housing program and providing enhanced social work and education services to clients.

During the prior planning period, the City also developed and adopted the Community Plan to Address Homelessness (Community Plan) to combat and prevent homelessness in coordination with the Los Angeles County's Homeless Initiative Plan. The City designed the Community Plan to align local resources, both in the nonprofit and private sectors, with Los Angeles County investments. The Plan resulted in the formation of the Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness, comprised of the City, service providers, government agencies, faith-based organizations, and schools. The task force is an hoc effort to leverage local resources to fulfill goals listed in the Community Plan. The Task Force meets periodically to coordinate action-items related to the Community Plan's priorities including developing a year-round emergency shelter, increasing affordable housing options, enhancing mental health services, and streamlining information sharing and opportunities for collaboration. Accomplishments of the Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness include:

- Creation of a centralized website for all homeless service providers (santaclaritahomelessaction.org);
- Expansion of case management services at several school districts Citywide through the creation of Wellness Centers;
- Over \$122,000 in Measure H funding was provided to six local organizations and non-profits for innovation solutions to address homelessness in Santa Clarita;
- Two comprehensive resource guides were developed and made available on the City and Community Taskforce websites; and
- Creation of GO! Santa Clarita, which provides ride-share services at fixed rates with professional drivers.

When considered cumulatively, these goals, policies, and actions greatly increased and broadened the resources and services available to meet the housing needs of special needs populations. In addition to addressing these needs during the previous planning period, these successes will also facilitate the implementation of programs in this Housing Element by establishing and reinforcing communication networks and mobilization efforts for addressing housing needs of local community members.

1.14.3 Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives

The City was only partially successful in achieving its 5th cycle Quantified Objectives, as shown in below Table 6. The City reached and exceeded its objectives for above-moderate units. A significant number of new Programs have been adopted in Section 2 to help address this imbalance of housing production to housing need seen during the past planning period.

Table 6: Progress in Achieving 2013 Quantified Objectives by Income Group

| Income Group | New Construction Projected/ Actual | Rehabilitation Projected/ Actual | 2013 Quantified Objective | Total Units Realized 2013-2021 |
|--|---|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Very Low | 2208/13 | 503/0 | 2711 | 13 |
| Lower | 1315/141 | 241/0 | 1556 | 141 |
| Moderate | 1410/172 | 0/0 | 1410 | 172 |
| Above Moderate | 3389/3939 | 0/0 | 3389 | 3939 |
| Total | 8322/4265 | 744/0 | 9066 | 4265 |
| NOTE: Quantified objectives reflect totals in the 2013 Housing Element and do not reflect adjusted totals for annexations. | | | | |

1.14.4 Lessons Learned

The City was able to meet a number of its objectives through successful programs such as the Mixed-Use Ordinance, Fair Housing Programs, and the Handyworker Program. The City made progress through other programs that were partially achieved including the Preservation of At-Risk Housing and Mobile Home Rent Adjustment Program. Not all the programs were successful, as shown in Table 7.

The high cost of land and construction is a major constraint to development for all Los Angeles County jurisdictions and has made it a challenge for the City to reach all of its programs and quantified objectives. Significant successes include the Mixed-Use Ordinance, Fair Housing Programs, and the Handyworker Program. The programs that were less successful focused on loans and incentives, including land banking/loan write downs, and the homebuyer assistance programs. The market drives the cost of development and due to the high cost of construction and land in the Santa Clarita Valley, it can be challenging for developers and investors to procure land, build units and then sell or lease them at an affordable rate. These non-governmental factors had the largest effect on the success of the City’s housing policies and programs.

Other factors that led to poor utilization of some of the programs included a lack of information about and promotion of many of the programs. Without a focused effort to promote the availability and ease of application for these programs, few residents were made aware of them. Additional promotion will help the less successful programs reach a wider audience and increase participation.

Additionally, poor utilization of certain programs can help provide useful context into local development conditions. The City’s affordable housing density bonus was not utilized during the planning period. However, the General Plan and Unified Development Code had been recently amended to include land use designation changes and rezonings, including the introduction of mixed-use zoning within older commercial corridor areas. These changes are already providing housing incentives where those were limited before. Feedback received from the development

community indicated the new General Plan land use and zoning designations provided the desired densities without the need for density bonuses. An inclusionary housing requirement without accompanying development incentives may have presented a new constraint to housing development. The updated iteration of the programs (Programs HP-1.5 and HP-1.7) would include the completion of an analysis of pros and cons related to inclusionary housing with examples from other jurisdictions, and the consideration of development incentives and regulatory concessions alongside the inclusionary program to increase the program’s feasibility.

The 2013 Housing Element programs that were most successful were those that were directly administered by the City, such as the Mixed-Use Ordinance, Proactive Community Preservation, and the Handyworker Program. These programs will continue to be implemented in the 2021 Housing Element.

1.15 PROGRAM CHANGES IN 2021 HOUSING ELEMENT

The 2021 Housing Element update is not a comprehensive "new" Housing Element, but rather an update of the 2013 Housing Element. The focus of the update process has been to keep the programs that are working and adding new policies and programs where community needs have changed or where necessary to comply with new State laws. New or revised goals, objectives, policies, and programs are included within the 2021 Housing Element to meet changing needs and legal requirements. Ongoing policies and programs that have been successful are continued in the Housing Element update; limited-term programs that have already been accomplished have not been carried forward.

Table 7 provides an evaluation of the programs from the 5th Cycle Housing Element and the City’s level of success in achieving them.

Table 7: 2013-2021 Housing Element Program Implementation Status

| Program | Timeframe | Progress | Lesson Learned |
|--|-----------|---|---|
| H 1.1 Affordable Housing Density Bonus: Provide a by-right density bonus of 25% or 35% to developers of new housing who make units affordable to households earning specific percentages of the AMI. | Ongoing | Unused. No developers applied for density bonuses between 2014-2020. The affordable housing density bonus program information and requirements are provided online. | Program was never advertised or promoted. Developers expressed that the changes to the General Plan and zoning designations that occurred prior to the planning period provided the desired densities without the need for density bonuses. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | | The new affordable housing density bonus program would include additional advertising, such as advertising on City’s website, to make it more successful. |
| H 1.2 Mixed Use Ordinance: Implement the City's General Plan Mixed Use Zones and the Mixed Use Overlay Zone (MU) to encourage a mix of residential, commercial, employment and institutional opportunities within activity centers along identified corridors throughout the City. | Objective of approving at least 50 housing units within mixed use developments between 2013 and 2021. Accomplished in 2020 | Program Achieved. 243 mixed use units have been approved during this planning period. | Successful Program to be continued. |
| H 1.3 Land Banking/Write-Downs: Establish a strategy to facilitate the development of units for low and very low-income households. Under this program the City would acquire properties and offer the properties to qualified developers through a Request for Proposal/Notice of Funding Availability process. | Ongoing | Tracking is on-going. No available sites were identified during the planning period. | This specific program will be discontinued. The intent of this Program has been implemented through one-on-one meetings with developers, which will continue, but the specific language in H 1.3 will be removed. |
| H 1.5 Inclusionary Housing Program (Mixed Income Housing): Program to adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance where affordable units are produced along with market-rate units to meet the needs of the City’s lower income working families and seniors. | Draft and approve an ordinance and modify the existing Housing Element by 2016 and begin program by 2017 | Although preliminary research into inclusionary housing programs in various jurisdictions was done in 2014 and between 2017-2020, an evaluation of the feasibility of adopting an inclusionary housing program was not completed. | The updated iteration of the program include the completion of an analysis of pros and cons related to inclusionary housing with examples from other jurisdictions, and the consideration of development incentives and |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | | regulatory concessions alongside the inclusionary program to increase the program’s feasibility |
| H 2.1 Affordable Housing Program: Program to assist in the development of new and rehabilitated housing to provide units for households with very low and low incomes. | Program aimed to develop by 2015 an additional 20 very low-income units and 40 low-income units; and by 2017: develop an additional 20 very low-income units and 40 low-income units. | Program partially achieved. Between 2014 and 2020, 154 affordable units were permitted: 13 very low-income units and 141 low-income units. | Program will be expanded to meet new regional housing needs. |
| H 2.2 Homebuyer Assistance - FirstHOME Program: Program provides low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers with a low-interest, second mortgage to be used as a down payment on a residence. Repayment is deferred until the home is sold, changes title, or ceases to be the borrower’s primary residence. | Ongoing | Program not achieved through City efforts, although the FirstHOME Program continues to be available through the County. | Program was unused and will not be carried forward as a program in the 2021 Housing Element. Lenders will still be encouraged to participate in CalHFA lending programs for 1 st -time homebuyer programs. |
| H 2.3 Homebuyer Assistance - CalHFA: Program provides primary and junior mortgage loans to first-time homebuyers at below-market interest rates. The City will continue to coordinate the FirstHOME Program with CalHFA programs in order | Ongoing | Program not achieved through City efforts, but the City remained a participating jurisdiction for CalHFA during the 5 th cycle. CalHFA information remains on the City’s website and is in the current Affordable Housing and Services | Program language will not be continued, but the City will continue to include CalHFA Programs on promotional materials and websites and will continue to |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>to increase the low- and moderate-income homebuyer's opportunity for homeownership.</p> | | <p>Brochure for continued promotion.</p> | <p>encourage lenders to participate.</p> |
| <p>H 2.4 Homebuyer Assistance - Mortgage Credit Certification Program: The City is a participating jurisdiction in the Los Angeles County program, which offers first-time homebuyers a federal income tax credit and allows a lender to reduce the housing expense ratio by the amount of tax savings.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program not achieved through City efforts, but the City remained a participating jurisdiction for MCC during the 5th cycle.</p> | <p>MCC Program was not promoted. City will retain this program and contact local lenders to encourage them to become qualified MCC program lenders.</p> |
| <p>H 2.6 Homeless Case Management: Program to fund homeless case management services connected to local homeless shelter operations.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program achieved. Between 2014-2020, the City funded several nonprofits to provide case management services to 4,291 individuals.</p> | <p>Successful Program will be continued</p> |
| <p>H 2.7 Collaboration with Affordable Housing Non-Profit Developers: Program to continue working with non-profit affordable housing developers to create new affordable housing units. Create a formal Request for Financial Assistance Application process to streamline and clarify this process.</p> | <p>Ongoing (develop a Request for Financial Assistance Application by 2010). Annually evaluate the program and identify sources for funding as they become available</p> | <p>Program consisted of individual preapplication meetings with developers to facilitate affordable housing developments.</p> | <p>Program will be reworded to reflect its implementation and encourage further preapplication meetings with developers of housing projects that include affordable units more closely.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>H 2.8 Extremely low-income Affordable Housing Program: Program to encourage the development of housing for extremely low-income households. Ensure that the Request for Financial Assistance Application, to be developed by 2010, emphasizes the City’s preference for projects that serve the extremely low-income population</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Although some applications for affordable developments had been received by 2020, no projects were approved during this time.</p> | <p>Funding for ELI units continues to be the City's priority. If an inclusionary housing program is implemented, then guidelines would be created to reflect this priority upon creation of a City affordable housing fund funded by inclusionary in-lieu fees.</p> |
| <p>H 3.1 Proactive Community Preservation: Program to conserve and improve the existing housing stock through Community Preservation, rehabilitation loans, and a handy worker program.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program achieved. Starting in 2018, Community Awareness Program (CAP) presentations, meetings and preservation activities have taken place with Code Enforcement, Housing, and Graffiti staff.</p> | <p>Successful Program will be continued.</p> |
| <p>H 3.2 Residential Rehabilitation Program: The program provides grants to low- and moderate-income homeowners to repair their primary residences.</p> | <p>Annual (provide 25 Residential Rehabilitation Grants per year)</p> | <p>Program partially achieved. The City’s Residential Rehabilitation Program served 13 households in 2014. The City transitioned the Program to a nonprofit in 2015. It has been combined with the existing Handyworker Program (H 3.3)</p> | <p>Program has been combined with the Handyworker Program and continued only through that program. (New Program HP-3.2)</p> |
| <p>H 3.3 Handyworker Program: The City will provide financial support to the program, operated by the Santa Clarita Valley Committee on Aging – Senior Center through a grant to provide minor home repairs.</p> | <p>Annual</p> | <p>Program is very successful with the exception of 2020 due to COVID-19</p> | <p>Successful Program will be continued.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>H 3.4 Property Rehabilitation Program: Program to provide grants to low- and moderate-income homeowners for repairs to the grounds surrounding their owner-occupied homes.</p> | <p>Annual</p> | <p>Partially successful. This Program has struggled to find eligible households and appropriate projects. Projects often exceed the amount allowed.</p> | <p>City has raised the amount available for project and has dedicated funding. Program will be continued in the current Housing Element and will be promoted on the City’s webpage.</p> |
| <p>H 4.1 Preservation of At-Risk Housing: Program to preserve units at risk of losing their subsidies and converting to market rents and work with non-profit housing organizations to preserve at-risk units.</p> | <p>Ongoing (preserve 232 units at risk of losing their subsidies and converting to market rents between 2013 and 2021)</p> | <p>Program partially achieved. In 2014 and 2018, 76 affordable units were preserved with HUD assistance. In 2015, 192 affordable units transitioned to market rate. No affordable units were threatened with conversion to market rate between 2016-2017, or between 2019- 2020.</p> | <p>Program updated to reflect current at-risk units</p> |
| <p>H 5.2 Fee Reductions or Deferrals for Affordable Housing Projects: Program to review affordable housing proposals on a case-by-case basis and authorize reduction or deferral of fee payments as deemed appropriate. The City will investigate implementing a fee reduction or deferral ordinance to encourage developers to create affordable units for very low-income households.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program partially achieved. The City continued to review fee reduction and deferral requests on a case-by-case basis but has not carried out an ordinance to do so.</p> | <p>Program HP-2.2 includes an action to defer fee collection for residential developments until final inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy</p> |
| <p>H 5.3 Expedited Processing for Affordable Housing Projects: Continue existing program to expedite processing for affordable housing projects, including one-stop preliminary review, concurrent application review, designation of a</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program achieved; however, relatively few applications for affordable housing developments have been received</p> | <p>Program will be continued within Program HP-2.2</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>primary contact, construction and grading plan review, permitting, and inspection.</p> | | | |
| <p>H 6.1 Fair Housing Programs: The City contracts with a service provider to conduct outreach and education activities, distribute literature, provide housing vacancy listings, and publicize the availability of fair housing services through various media. The contractor also records and investigates inquiries and complaints from residents.</p> | <p>Annual</p> | <p>Program achieved. Between 2014-2020, the City's fair housing contractor participated in fair housing workshops or events and distributed 49,562 pieces of literature. During this time, 523 inquiries were received and 34 cases for discrimination were brought. The contractor provided information using their website, an on-line newsletter, and social media such as Facebook and Twitter. In 2019, Project Place, a monthly listing of rental vacancies, was created. The City also created a dedicated Fair Housing Services webpage available on the City's website.</p> | <p>Successful program will be continued</p> |
| <p>H 6.2 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI): Program to complete the 2014/2015 to 2018/2019 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) in 2014. Implement recommendations of document.</p> | <p>Submit completed AI to HUD by May 15, 2014. Accomplished in 2014</p> | <p>New AI was developed and is currently in place. HUD withdrew the new format in December 2018 and told grantees to go back to the AI until they re-grouped.</p> | <p>Program will be re-worred, updated and expanded to fulfill AB 686 requirements (Program HP-4.5)</p> |
| <p>H 6.4 Mobilehome Rent Adjustment Policies: Continue to implement the regulations contained in the Manufactured Home Park Rent Adjustment Procedures, Municipal Code 6.02</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>2017 update implemented a Hearing Officer model to hear appeals, rather than the elected Rent Board. It has been very successful.</p> | <p>Successful program will be continued (Program HP-3.6)</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>H 7.1 Developmentally Disabled Housing: Program to encourage the provision of housing specifically serving the developmentally disabled population in new affordable housing projects. In addition, the program encourages the development of 50 housing units; establish a process to allow for requests for regulatory incentives; and collaborate with developers of supportive housing.</p> | <p>2015 (objective not reached)</p> | <p>Program only partially achieved. While no feasible sources of dedicated funding for housing for the developmentally disabled were identified, the City does grant Reasonable Accommodations upon request and continues to collaborate with developers of supportive housing.</p> | <p>Portions of this program were ineffective, and it will be reworded and continued as Program HP-4.4: Housing for Persons with Disabilities</p> |
| <p>H 7.2 Developmentally Disabled Services. Program to work with North Los Angeles Regional Center to initiate an outreach program informing families within the City of affordable housing which may be suitable for persons with developmental disabilities.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Program not achieved. No meetings with NLARC were held between 2014-2020.</p> | <p>Program lacked clarity and responsibility. Revised and incorporated into Program HP-4.4.</p> |

Section II: Housing Strategy

2.1 GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES

The City of Santa Clarita, 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.

The collective programs and policies administered by the City of Santa Clarita and set forth in this Housing Element comply with and further the requirements and goals of Government Code Section 8899.50(b). As demonstrated in its Fair Housing programs, , the City is committed to taking meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing and will take no actions that would be materially inconsistent with that goal.

Goal H1: Identify and maintain adequate sites for housing to accommodate the City’s regional housing need throughout the planning period.

Discussion: While the Housing Site Inventory effort has identified an adequate number of sites to meet the (RHNA) housing sites identification requirement, policies are needed to enhance opportunities for affordable housing production on all suitable sites with adequate infrastructure and proximity to services. In addition, SB 166 (No Net Loss) requires that cities maintain an adequate Sites Inventory to meet the remaining regional housing need, by income category, throughout the eight-year housing element period. Appropriate objectives and policies are included below; implementing programs are identified below and detailed following the Goal 4 policies. (Parenthetical notes following objectives, policies and programs explain changes from the 2013 Housing Element.)

Objective H1-1: Maintain adequate site capacity to accommodate Santa Clarita’s regional housing need throughout the planning period, including 5,131 lower-income units, 1,672 moderate-income units, and 3,228 market-rate units. *(Existing – updated to include 6th cycle numbers and no net loss requirements)*

Objective H1-2: Enhance opportunities for affordable housing production on appropriate sites located near transit and services. *(New objective – supports new policies & programs to limit density increases to appropriate areas)*

Objective H1-3: Assist developers, homebuyers, renters, and other interested parties in locating available sites and accessing programs for the development of affordable housing, especially rental housing. *(Moved and revised)*

 The following policies shall be used to accomplish the above objectives:

Policy H1.1: Maintain a sufficient inventory of sites suitably zoned for housing at all income levels throughout the planning period. *(New – to comply with ‘no net loss’)*

Implementing Program: HP-1.1 No Net Loss; HP-1.2 No Reduction of Density without Replacement Sites; HP- 1.14: Sites Identified in Multiple Planning Periods; HP-2.7: Replacement Housing Program

Policy H1.2: Encourage the development of housing affordable to lower income groups in areas well served by public transportation, schools, retail, and other services. *(Moved existing policy to match objective and goal)*

Implementing Programs: HP-1.3 Utility Providers Responsibility to Prioritize Service; HP-1.4 Affordable Housing Density Bonus; HP-1.5 Mixed Use Overlay Zone

Policy H1.3: Affirmatively further fair housing by ensuring that housing opportunities for all income levels are available throughout Santa Clarita while avoiding displacement and providing amenities within low opportunity areas. *(New – AFFH)*

Implementing Programs: HP-1.6 Graduated Density Zoning and Site Consolidation – Old Town Newhall; HP-1.7 Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study Program;

Policy H1.4: Maintain and enforce minimum density requirements for residential and mixed use land use districts in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Implementing Program: HP-1.9 Minimum Residential Densities

Policy H1.5: Publish a readily understood summary that identifies available housing opportunity sites in Santa Clarita and include site-specific development information in order to reduce up-front costs for interested housing developers. *(New – supports new program)*

Implementing Program: HP-1.10 Publish Information about Housing Sites

Policy H1.6: Continue to encourage housing suitable for first-time homebuyers.

Implementing Programs: HP-1.11 Homebuyer Assistance – Mortgage Credit Certification Program; HP-1.12 First Time Homebuyer Programs and Developers

Policy H1.7: Maintain an administrative list of additional sites with appropriate zoning that can be added to the City’s Sites Inventory if and when an analysis provided through the Annual Progress Report indicates that sufficient sites may not exist to accommodate the City’s remaining RHNA, by income level, for the planning period. *(New – to allow inventory to be updated administratively to meet ‘no net loss’ requirements)*

Implementing Programs: HP-1.2 No Reduction of Density without Replacement Sites; HP-1.13 Administrative List of Additional Sites

Policy H1.8: The City will continue to encourage land divisions and specific plans resulting in parcels sizes that facilitate developments affordable to lower income households, including lots set aside for multifamily development or to be donated to a non-profit organization (1 acre minimum); first-time homebuyers including sweat equity ownership projects; lots donated to Habitat for Humanity; and similar programs. Incentives will continue to be offered to projects that include the provision of affordable housing on site. Incentives include but are not limited to priority processing of subdivision maps that include affordable housing units or land to be donated; expedited review where the development application is consistent with the General Plan, applicable Specific Plan and master environmental impact report; financial assistance, based on funding availability; and modification of development requirements, such as reduced parking standards for senior housing, assisted care, and special needs housing. Requests for incentives shall be made with the initial project application and shall be determined on a case-by-case basis, consistent with Government Code 65915.

Goal H2: Promote the production of housing units, including affordable units, to meet the City’s identified housing needs.

Discussion: The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has assigned the City of Santa Clarita a regional housing need (RHNA) of 10,031 dwelling units for this 8-year planning cycle, including 5,131 units affordable to lower-income households. While the City is not obligated to build these units, it is obligated to ensure that sufficient sites with appropriate zoning are available throughout the planning period to accommodate the City’s RHNA, by income group. Only a small fraction of the units constructed in Santa Clarita over the last planning period have been provided as affordable to lower-income households. Certain factors would assist housing developers in developing affordable housing in Santa Clarita including zoning sites with flexible densities and development standards, local financial assistance, better promotion of the sites that are available for the development of housing, and entitlement and development processes that are not unnecessarily difficult or lengthy.

Objective H2-1: Assist in identifying locations for the development of new and rehabilitated housing to provide at least 5,131 units for households with very low and low incomes. *(Existing – updated number)*

Objective H2-2: Eliminate unneeded regulatory constraints to the production of housing, especially affordable housing. *(Existing; moved to locate under applicable goal)*

Objective H2-3: Increase opportunities for the production of affordable housing. *(New – there was no objective supporting some of the policies)*

 The following policies shall be used to accomplish the above objectives:

Policy H2.1: Continue to target one-third of housing subsidies to extremely low-income households in new affordable development.

Policy H2.2: Require that all rental units developed under the City’s affordable housing programs remain affordable for the longest possible time or at least 55 years. *(Revised - added “rental” in consultation w/City to provide flexibility for 1st-time homebuyer programs)*

Implementing Program: HP-2.4 Continuing Affordability

Policy H2.3: Encourage a variety of housing types such as single-family attached (townhouses), multifamily units, planned unit developments, mixed use housing, board & care facilities and other typologies that make housing more affordable.

Implementing Program: HP-1.4 Affordable Housing Density Bonus

Policy H2.4: Continue to encourage and promote the development of new affordable units through the provision of incentives and density bonuses as provided in Government Code Section 65915.

Policy H2.5: Continue to encourage affordable "infill" projects on underutilized sites by allowing flexibility in development standards as provided in Government Code Section 65915.

Policy H2.6: Promote the construction and retention of shared housing such as group homes, congregate care facilities, residential community care facilities and senior board & care facilities while ensuring the health and safety of residents and ensuring land use compatibility for neighbors. *(New; addresses identified housing needs and CC comments re boarding homes for seniors)*

Policy H2.7: Consider the adoption of an Inclusionary Ordinance that requires a percentage of new units to be provided as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households. Provide exemptions for units meeting identified housing needs and allow developers to provide an equivalent alternative, subject to City Council approval. Offset the increased cost to developers with a flexible density bonus program. *(Revised to increase feasibility of an inclusionary program by requiring data and analysis up front)*

Implementing Program: HP-1.7 Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study Program

Policy H2.8: Continue to expedite application review, permitting, and inspection procedures for accessory dwelling units, junior accessory dwelling units, and affordable housing projects.

Implementing Program: HP-2.6 Provide for Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units

Policy H2.9: Continue to encourage the development of housing for extremely low-income households (households earning at or below 30 percent of median income, based on HUD calculations for the Los Angeles County area). The City will continue to give funding preference to programs and projects that have greater numbers of housing for extremely low-income households.

Implementing Program: Program HP-2.9: Funding Priority to Extremely Low-income Affordable Housing

Policy H2.10: Continue to provide incentives for affordable housing projects including flexibility in development standards without need for a variance or other discretionary review. Ensure that incentives are granted to qualified affordable projects under Section 65915 even if a density bonus is not sought. Consider tying the provision of additional incentives, as allowed under Section 65915, to the level or depth of a project's affordability.

Implementing Program: Program HP-1.8: Affordable Sites Incentive Program

Policy H2.11: The City will continue to expedite processing for affordable housing projects, including one-stop preliminary review, concurrent application review, designation of a primary contact, and fast-tracking of construction and grading plan review, permitting and inspection.

Policy H2.12: The City will continue to review affordable housing proposals on a case-by-case basis and authorize reduction of fee payments as deemed appropriate, and will provide fee deferrals for affordable housing units, as required by law, in order to encourage developers to create more affordable units for lower-income households. The City may include congregate care facilities, group homes, supportive housing, community care facilities and congregate care for seniors for inclusion in the fee deferral program.

Goal H3: Sustain and Improve Existing Housing Units and Programs

Discussion. As Santa Clarita continues to build out, it will become increasingly important to both preserve its existing affordable housing stock and to ensure that all residents, including those with lower incomes, have access to the resources and services that they need to maintain a safe and adequate living environment.

Objective H3-1: Ensure that existing housing units establish and maintain habitability through substantial compliance with government health and safety codes. *(Existing; modified to define habitability)*

Objective H3-2: Encourage the preservation of 89 units at high risk and up to 559 units at lower risk of converting to market rents between 2022 and 2029. *(Existing; figures updated)*

Objective H3-3: Encourage the continuation of permanent affordable housing for lower-income households in existing mobilehome parks. *(Existing; edited)*

 The following policies shall be used to accomplish the above objectives:

Policy H3.1: Ensure safe, decent housing by enforcing habitability standards in a manner that does not discriminate and that protects the occupant’s cultural, socio-economic, and/or accessibility needs. *(Existing policy, updated to address revised objective and Fair Housing requirements)*

Implementing Program: HP-3.1 Limit Code Enforcement Activities

Policy H3.2: Provide grants and loans to eligible homeowners for emergency and minor safety, habitability, and accessibility repairs. *(revised)*

Implementing Programs: HP-3.2 Handyworker Program, HP-3.3 Property Rehabilitation Program

Policy H3.3: Promote energy efficiency in all new and existing residential structures. *(New, required)*

Implementing Program: HP-3.4 Provide Information for Energy Conservation Programs

Policy H3.4: Monitor the status of at-risk units throughout the planning period to identify units at risk of conversion to market rate units, and work with non-profit housing organizations to preserve at-risk units and work with partners in workforce housing to purchase long-term affordability for existing units to serve the local workforce. *(Combined two adjacent policies)*

Implementing Program: HP-3.5 Preservation of At-Risk Housing

Policy H3.5: Encourage the preservation of existing mobilehome parks and the protection of this unique form of affordable housing. *(New; there was no policy to support the objective and program)*

Implementing Program: HP-3.6 Mobilehome Rent Adjustment Policies

Policy H3.6: The City is an active member of both the California Municipal Finance Authority (CMFA) and the California Statewide Communities Development Authorities (CSCDA) and additionally is a member of CMFA’s Special Finance Agency, which is the primary agency used to provide Workforce Housing projects Citywide by CMFA. During the life of this element, City staff will continue to proactively reach out annually to the CMFA and CSCDA to inquire about the status of Workforce Housing in Santa Clarita and the availability of new programs.

Implementing Program: HP-3.7: Workforce Housing Program

Goal H4: Ensure fair access to quality housing and services for all members of the community, including those with special needs.

Discussion: Santa Clarita contains two census tracts that are on the verge of qualifying as disadvantaged communities under SB 1000. Both are located within the Newhall community and have a combined population of almost 14,000 residents. According to HCD’s Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data Mapping Tool, both the Newhall and Canyon Country communities receive lower than average scores on measures of access to opportunities and higher than average scores on linguistic isolation. While the preparation of an Environmental Justice Element is not yet statutorily required to be undertaken simultaneously with this Housing Element, the sharply lower scores in these areas when compared to the rest of Santa Clarita are a concern and must be addressed under SB 686 (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, see **Section 4**). Environmental Justice policies are also included within the Housing Element to reduce the health and safety risks in these areas, notably through access to safe and sanitary housing and the prioritization of these areas for improvements and programs.

Objective H4-1: Reduce or remove governmental constraints and restrictions on housing and housing occupancy while preserving public health and safety. (*Existing; revised to add reference to PH&S*)

Objective H4-2: Promote fair housing practices and prohibit discrimination.

Objective H4-3: Affirmatively further fair housing and promote environmental justice for all residents. (*New to address AFFH and EJ*)

 The following policies shall be used to accomplish the above objectives:

Policy H4.1: Limit regulatory and enforcement actions against tenants in affordable or de facto affordable housing by providing adequate time or extensions to address violations unless there is an imminent threat to public health and safety. (*New – needed for Objective H4-1*)

Implementing Programs: HP-4.1 Monitor Housing Trends, Laws, and Issues; HP-3.1 Limit Code Enforcement Activities; HP-4.2 Monitoring of Codes and Ordinances to Remove Barriers

Policy H4.2: Encourage and facilitate the transition of the homeless population to stable housing (*moved to fall under correct Goal*)

Implementing Program: HP-4.3 Homeless Case Management

Policy H4.3: Continue to provide fee deferrals as required by law, and to consider fee reductions for affordable and special needs housing projects. (*Revised*)

Implementing Program: HP-2.2: Updates to Administrative Procedures

Policy H4.4: Ensure compliance with fair housing laws and prohibit discrimination in housing. Provide fair housing services that include public information, engagement, counseling, and investigation. (*Combined two existing adjacent policies*)

Implementing Programs: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice/Fair Housing Analysis; HP-4.6 Fair Housing Programs; Program HP-2.10: Proactive Outreach Program

Policy H4.5: Continue to implement the City’s reasonable accommodations ordinance to ensure that all persons have access to housing of their choice, regardless of ability. (*Revised; addresses AFFH*)

Implementing Program: HP-4.7 Administrative Process for Reasonable Accommodations

Policy H4.6: Ensure that the City’s programs and policies continue to reduce or eliminate the unique or compounded health risks of disadvantaged communities. (*New; EJ*)

Implementing Programs: HP-4.8 Environmental Justice Objectives and Policies; HP-4.9 Protection from Unnecessary Wildfire Risk; HP-4.10 Proactive Community Preservation

Policy H4.7: Ensure that affected residents have the opportunity to participate in decisions that impact their health. Facilitate the involvement of residents, businesses, and organizations in all aspects of the planning process, utilizing culturally appropriate approaches to public participation and involvement. (*New; AFFH & EJ*)

Implementing Program: Program HP-2.10: Proactive Outreach Program

Policy H4.8: Affirmatively further fair housing by facilitating deliberate action to address and combat disparities, by fostering inclusive communities, and by undertaking only those actions that are consistent with the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, in accordance with state law. (*New; AFFH*)

Implementing Program: HP-2.10: Proactive Outreach Program

Policy H4.9: Continue to encourage the provision of housing to serve the developmentally disabled population in new affordable housing projects. Encourage affordable housing developers to set aside a portion of their units for the developmentally disabled and prioritize funding, permit processing, and requests for fee waivers for projects that do so. Continue to investigate dedicated funding for developmentally disabled affordable housing construction and seek state and federal monies as they become available. Facilitate any necessary HCD Community Care licensing, streamline any required land use approvals, and support construction funding applications for affordable housing serving the developmentally disabled.

Implementing Program: HP-4.4: Housing for Persons with Disabilities

2.2 IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS

Program HP-1.1: No Net Loss of Residential Capacity to Accommodate RHNA

To ensure sufficient residential capacity is maintained to accommodate the RHNA for each income category, staff will develop and implement a formal, ongoing (project-by-project) administrative evaluation procedure pursuant to Government Code Section 65863 within six months of adoption of the Housing Element. The evaluation procedure will track the number of extremely low-, very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income units constructed to calculate the remaining unmet RHNA. The evaluation procedure will also track the number of units built on the identified sites to determine the remaining site capacity, by income category, and will be updated as developments are approved. The Sites Inventory will be updated every year as the Annual Progress Report (APR) is completed, and the APR with the updated inventory will be available on the City’s website. *(New, No Net Loss)*

Timeline: 6 months following adoption; ongoing thereafter
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.2: No Reduction of Density without Replacement Sites

No project approval or other action that reduces the density or development capacity of a site shall be undertaken unless sufficient remaining sites are available or additional adequate sites are identified to meet the City’s RHNA obligation prior to approval of the development and made available within 180 days of approval of the development, as required by Senate Bill 166. Identification of the replacement sites, and the necessary actions to make the site(s) available will be adopted prior to or concurrent with the approval of the development. *(New, No Net Loss)*

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.3: Utility Providers Responsibility to Prioritize Service

The City will notify all public sewer and water providers of their responsibility under State law to give affordable housing projects priority for existing service capacity. The General Plan Housing Element, and any amendments thereto, shall be distributed to providers within 60 days of its adoption. Providers will be encouraged to retain adequate water and/or sewer service capacities to serve developments which provide affordable units. *(Added – statutory requirement)*

Timeline: 60 days following adoption; ongoing thereafter
 Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.4: Affordable Housing Density Bonus

Continue to administer the City’s density bonus program in compliance with Government Code Section 65915 (State Density Bonus Law), as may be amended from time to time, and review annually during preparation of the APR to determine if revisions are necessary within that calendar year to incorporate any changes to state law. Continue to provide additional incentives beyond those required by Government Code Section 65915, as provided in Unified Development Code Section 17.68.030. Developers requesting to use the density bonus must submit applications on a form approved by the Community Development Director at the time of submitting any entitlement application for a housing development where a density bonus is requested. The application shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

- A description of how the proposed project meets the criteria for a density bonus under Section 65915;
- Concession(s), including parking adjustments, requested by the applicant;
- A depiction of the location of the affordable housing units within the proposed development.

In addition to the above, consider adopting a new, extended density bonus program that addresses Santa Clarita’s identified housing needs in conjunction with consideration of an inclusionary ordinance. The City will complete a study to determine the appropriate additional densities and incentives to development projects that meet the City’s identified housing needs, including but not limited to extremely low-income units, senior housing, mixed use zoning, and family housing for first-time homebuyers. Once the study is complete, a report back on the findings will be prepared and presented to the City Council Development Committee , and then to the City Council if directed. If the City Council directs the preparation of a local Density Bonus program, amendments would be finalized and returned to the City Council for consideration and adoption within one year (by early 2026) (Updated, new sub-program to increase feasibility of inclusionary program)

Timeline: Review City Density Bonus Program annually during preparation of the APR. If changes are necessary to comply with State law, update Unified Development Code within one year. Feasibility Study completed by 2024; presentation to Council Development Committee by early 2025; adoption of program, if directed, by early 2026

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget, REAP

Objective: Ensure consistency with State Law, and support the production of affordable housing distributed throughout the City.

Program HP-1.5: Mixed Use Overlay Zone

Continue to implement the City’s Mixed Use provisions as set forth in the General Plan Land Use Element, Mixed Use Zones, and the Mixed Use Overlay Zone (MU) to encourage a mix of residential, commercial, employment and institutional opportunities within activity centers along identified corridors throughout the City.

Incentives for Mixed Use Development are already in place and include accelerated plan check review, increased residential and commercial density opportunities, increased building heights, reduced parking requirements, and reduced setbacks along public streets. The City will include promotion of the Mixed Use Overlay Zone incentives in its proactive outreach program (Program HP-2.10). *(Existing, amended to include outreach component)*

Timeline: Initial outreach to developers in 2023, continuing at least annually thereafter (See HP-2.10: Proactive Outreach Program)

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.6: Graduated Density Zoning and Site Consolidation—Old Town Newhall

Redevelopment of portions of Old Town Newhall is constrained by the small parcel sizes created by small-lot subdivisions in the past. The City will continue the incentives granted to full block development projects in this target area. This tool provides increased density based on the size of the site, thereby encouraging owners of adjoining properties to collaborate in combining parcels to form a larger development site that provides community amenities. This program will be continued as an ongoing, as-needed basis.

In addition, the City will be reviewing and revising the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan (ONSP) to create a permit process that could allow for additional building height above the 35-foot and three-story height limit for projects not involving full block developments.

Timeline: Review and revise the ONSP by the end of 2023 to implement height concessions for partial block developments. The offered full block development incentives are ongoing.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study Program

The City will conduct a two-phased feasibility study to analyze the financial and programmatic feasibility of an inclusionary zoning policy. The City will complete a

detailed analysis of current and projected development patterns and will explore how such requirements could complement existing and proposed incentive programs and illustrate the types of program changes that would be needed to result in more affordable housing while still supporting market-rate production. These incentives could include greater density bonuses, fast-tracking of projects, parking reductions, and granting of automatic concessions and incentives. Once the study is complete, a report back on the findings will be prepared and presented to the City Council Development Committee, and then to the City Council if directed. The report will include recommendations consistent with economic feasibility study requirements of AB 1505, including the percentage of affordable units that might be required, alternate means of compliance, and exempt project types. If the City Council directs the preparation of an Inclusionary Ordinance, amendments would be finalized and returned to the City Council for consideration and adoption within one year (by early 2026).

Timeline: Feasibility Study completed by 2024; presentation to Council Development Committee by early 2025; adoption of Inclusionary program, if directed, by early 2026.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget, REAP

Objective: Support the production of affordable housing distributed throughout the City

Program HP-1.8: Affordable Sites Incentive Program

To facilitate the development of housing for lower income households, the City will continue to encourage land divisions, specific plans, and other discretionary projects to include or set aside parcel sizes suitable to facilitate the development of affordable housing. This program includes setting lots aside for multifamily development or for donation to a non-profit organization (1 acre minimum), for first-time homebuyers including sweat equity ownership projects, and lots donated to Habitat for Humanity for individual homes. This program was used to facilitate the Metrowalk project (see Section 3.7.3, Approved/Entitled Development).

The City will continue offering incentives for projects that include the provision of affordable housing on-site including but not limited to priority processing of subdivision maps that include affordable housing units or land to be donated; expedited review where the development application is consistent with the General Plan, applicable Specific Plan and master environmental impact report; financial assistance, based on funding availability; and modification of development requirements, such as reduced parking standards for seniors, assisted care, and special needs housing. Requests for incentives shall be made with the application and shall be automatically granted in accordance with Government Code 65915. Additional incentives may be requested and shall be granted on a case-by-case basis. (Existing; renamed and edited)

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-1.9: Minimum Residential Densities

Continue to require residential projects to meet the minimum density requirements set forth in the General Plan unless the applicant demonstrates that physical and environmental constraints on the site are so great that the minimum density cannot be achieved, even after the size of the units and the land area devoted to each individual unit has been minimized to the greatest extent feasible. *(New Program to implement existing policy)*

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.10 Publish Information about Housing Sites

Create and publish a summary that identifies available housing sites in Santa Clarita and make the summary available online in both tabular and mapping formats. Provide site-specific development information and support whenever possible in order to reduce up-front costs for interested housing developers. *(New; responds to public comment)*

Timeline: Create summary by 2022; update annually or as sites are developed
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.11: Homebuyer Assistance – Mortgage Credit Certification Program

The Mortgage Credit Certification (MCC) Program offers first-time low- and moderate-income homebuyers a federal income tax credit. This credit reduces the amount of federal taxes the holder of the certificate would pay. It can also help first-time homebuyers qualify for a loan by allowing a lender to reduce the housing expense ratio by the amount of tax savings. The qualified homebuyer who is awarded an MCC may take an annual credit against the federal income taxes paid on the homebuyer's mortgage. The credit is subtracted dollar-for-dollar from the federal income taxes. The qualified buyer is awarded a tax credit of up to 15%, and the remaining 85% is deducted accordingly.

The City will continue to be a participating jurisdiction in this program so that homebuyers in Santa Clarita can benefit from the federal Mortgage Credit Certification Program (MCC Program) operated by the County of Los Angeles.

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.12: First Time Homebuyer Programs and Developers

Demographic data for Santa Clarita indicates a growing need for ownership housing to serve families and individuals purchasing a home for the first time. With a median home price of over \$600,000 in 2020, families and individuals cannot afford to purchase a home without assistance. Non-profit developers and community land trusts help produce housing affordable to first-time homebuyers through a variety of means, including sweat equity programs and the purchase of property to lease back at nominal rates, reducing the cost of home ownership.

Beginning in 2022, the City will complete one proactive outreach per year to local land trusts and housing providers such as Habitat for Humanity to determine available programs for first-time homebuyers, collaborate on measures to advertise and promote these programs, and to facilitate their development on available housing sites. The City would complete one proactive outreach per year to housing providers to determine available programs for first-time homebuyers, to obtain and share information online, and regularly update the City’s website to encourage and/or support first-time homebuyer programs.

Timeline: Contact land trusts and non-profits in 2022, then annually thereafter
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-1.13: Administrative List of Additional Sites

Create and maintain a list of additional sites with appropriate zoning that could be added to the City’s Sites Inventory if and when an analysis provided through the Annual Progress Report indicates that sufficient sites may not exist to accommodate the City’s remaining RHNA, by income level, for the planning period. (*New, No Net Loss – implements new Policy*)

Timeline: Create list by 2022; consider adding sites from this list to inventory on an annual basis
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP- 1.14: Sites Identified in Multiple Planning Periods:

Government Code § 65583 requires analysis and justification of the sites included in the sites inventory of the City’s Housing Element. The Housing Element may only count non-vacant sites included in one previous Housing Element inventory and vacant sites included in two previous Housing Elements if the sites are subject to a program that allows affordable housing by right. Some sites within this Housing Element were used in previous cycles, and this program is included to address the by-right approval requirement. Per Government Code § 65583, the use by-right of these sites during the planning period is restricted to developments in which at least 20 percent of the units in the development are affordable to lower income households. This provision is valid on the condition that these sites have sufficient water, sewer, and other dry utilities available and accessible, or that they are included in an existing General Plan program or other mandatory program or plan to secure sufficient water, sewer, dry utilities supply to support housing development.

Prior to the end of 2022, Community Development Department staff will provide a pop-up “Notice” in Accela for each inventoried parcel subject to these requirements. The Notice will prompt staff to not require a Conditional Use Permit application for a residential development project on that site if at least 20% of the units are provided as affordable. A training session will be held to ensure that all staff are aware of the by-right allowances for projects providing at least 20% of units as affordable on these specific sites. The Unified Development Code will be amended concurrent with the Housing Element to ensure compliance with Government Code § 65583.2(c).

Timeline: Adopt code amendment with Housing Element. Set up Notice in Accela prior to the end of 2022. Within the first three years of the planning period, ensure staff receives training.
Ongoing.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-2.1: Zoning Code Changes for Consistency with State Law

City staff will bring forward Municipal Code amendments to address recent changes to state law. Specific Code amendments to ensure compliance include but are not limited to the following:

- Transitional Housing: Allow transitional and supportive housing in all zone districts that allow residential uses, subject to only those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone. (SB 2, 2007)
- Supportive Housing: Supportive housing, as defined in Government Code Section 65650, to be a by-right use in all zones where multifamily and mixed-uses are permitted. (AB 2162)

- Low Barrier Navigation Centers: to be a use by-right in zones where multifamily and mixed-uses are permitted, including the nonresidential zones where multifamily is permitted. (GC 65660)
- Employee and Ag Worker Housing: employee housing for six or fewer employees is to be treated as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other dwellings of the same type in the same zone. Employee housing consisting of not more than 12 units or 36 beds are to be considered an agricultural use and permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone (AB 1783)
- ADUs: Update Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance pursuant to HCD’s ADU Guidebook, including allowing such units by-right in all residential zones and reduction of side and rear setbacks as well as to reflect changes in these laws made by AB 3182, AB 68, and SB 13.
- Group Homes: Allow group homes for seven or more residents, specifically for people with disabilities, as a permitted use in residential zones. Review current code requirements for all housing types serving people with disabilities for consistency with fair housing laws and make amendments as necessary.
- Design Review: Develop Objective Design and Development Standards for multi-family and mixed-use projects.
- Parking: Adopt the parking requirements for multifamily affordable housing from Government Code Section 65915 into the Code to provide clear standards and expectations for potential developers to use the reduced parking requirements without the need to make a separate request.

Timeline: Review by June 2023; Make necessary amendments by the end of 2023
 Develop Objective Design and Development Standards by 2024

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Objective: Ensure compliance with all State laws for special needs housing types to facilitate the development of these housing types, consistent with quantified objectives

Program HP-2.2: Updates to Administrative Procedures

Prior to the dates specified in each sub-program below, City staff will update the following administrative procedures and materials:

- SB 35: The City will develop an SB 35 application process, including the pre-application and the procedure that will be used to provide a streamlined ministerial approval process to qualified residential and mixed-use development projects. The written procedures and checklists shall be developed and made available on the City’s website no later than January 1, 2023.

- **Development Fees and Transparency Requirements:** The City will meet the new transparency and development fees requirements of AB 602 and SB 319 by 1) posting all required information about development standards and fees to an easily accessed location on the City’s website by January 1, 2023; and 2) ensuring that new development impact fee studies and resulting fees comply with the new AB 602 requirements for fee studies prior to initiation of the next fees study in 2024.
- **Fee Deferrals:** The City will defer fee collection for residential developments until final building inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first, unless the requirements of Government Code 66007(b) have been met.
- **Expedited Processing for Affordable Housing Projects:** The City will continue to expedite processing for affordable housing projects, including one-stop preliminary review, concurrent application review, designation of a primary contact, and fast-tracking of construction and grading plan review, permitting and inspection. Promotion of the Expedited Processing program will occur as a part of Program HP-2.10, the Proactive Outreach Program, to be initiated in 2023 and provided as ongoing throughout the 6th planning cycle.
- **Parking handout:** The City will create and publish explanatory documents to delineate between the different parking requirements for different types of multifamily housing projects and mixed-use projects as updated by AB 2345, including those providing affordable units and those located close to transit.

Timeline: SB 35 Procedures: July 1, 2023;
 Objective Design and Development Standards: end of 2024;
 Fee Transparency: July 1, 2023;
 AB 602 Requirements (Development Fees): 2024;
 Parking Handout: July 30, 2023

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-2.3: Specific Plan Code Review

The City will review its Specific Plans to determine if changes are needed to comply with State laws related to transitional housing, supportive housing, group homes (community care facilities) and Low Barrier Navigation Centers. The review will be completed by the end of 2022, with any needed Specific Plan amendments occurring by the end of 2023.

Timeline: Review by end of 2023; amend by end of 2024

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: Departmental Budget

Program HP-2.4: Continuing Affordability

Ensure that the City’s lending guidelines require long-term affordability of at least 55 years for affordable rental units and through a shared equity or other similar affordability mechanism for affordable ownership units.

Timeline: Review funding guidelines in 2022; then ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: HOME, CDBG, Bonds, PDA/TOD funds

Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers

The City continues to partner with non-profit affordable housing developers for the creation of new affordable housing developments and will continue to be responsive to the proposals of housing developers. The City is committed to supporting proposed projects that show promise to provide affordable housing to meet the City’s identified housing needs, including for seniors, disabled, and families, especially those who are extremely low-income. Currently, affordable housing developers approach the City informally with projects in various stages of development, making it difficult to bring projects to fruition. A formal Request for Qualifications/Proposals (RFP/RFQ) will streamline and clarify this process. The RFP/RFQ will include information on the affordable housing goals of the City, including the provision of housing for large households and extremely low-income households. The RFP/RFQ for this program will be posted by Summer 2023 and will include at least one outreach meeting/event to gauge housing developers’ interest. The RFP/RFQ process, once posted, will be made available to potential respondents for a minimum of 60 days and include interviews with at least the top two firms. Ultimately, the City, at a minimum, will make a concerted effort to execute an agreement with the non-profit developer to identify suitable land within the City for the development of an affordable housing complex consistent with the City’s RNHA needs. Should a proposal be brought forth, at a minimum, the proposal will be presented to the City’s Council Development Committee, Planning Commission, or City Council, whichever is deemed the appropriate group. *(Existing; modified)*

Timeline: RFP/RFQ posted by Summer 2023
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: CDBG; Redevelopment set-aside funds

Program HP-2.6: Provide for Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units

Increase awareness of the by-right opportunities for accessory dwelling units and junior accessory dwelling units by producing an informational brochure/handout, a simplified application, process, and a dedicated phone number and/or email for

questions about and assistance with accessory dwelling units by the end of 2022 in order to promote the development of ADUs and JADUs.

Add an ADU page to the City’s website with all of the above information, as well as with a link to the LA ADU website to provide information about permitting, assistance tools, financing, and lending programs (<https://www.laadu.org/>) by the end of 2023. Annually report out on the City’s successes in the production of ADUs and JADUs with the City’s APR. *(Required by Gov. Code 65583(c)(7))*

Develop a monitoring program to track ADU and JADU creation and affordability levels. Three years into the planning period, review ADU production and evaluate if production and affordability estimates are being achieved. If ADU production is not meeting projections, the City will conduct a study to identify barriers to ADU production. If barriers identified are within City control, the City will take additional actions to remove the barriers within one year.

Timeline: Develop brochure/handout, application, and contact by 2023
Review production in January 2025. If needed, implement changes by January 2026.
Add ADU webpage by 2023
Report out annually

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund

Objective: Streamline the approval process and facilitate the development of ADUs consistent with State Law, including 48 affordable to very low-income households, 85 affordable to low-income households, 22 affordable to moderate income-households, and 95 affordable to above moderate-income households.

Program HP-2.7: Replacement Housing Program

The City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 65915, subdivision (c) (3) on all sites identified in the 6th Cycle Sites Inventory when any new development occurs on a site in the housing Sites Inventory if that site meets the following conditions:

- 1) currently has residential uses or within the past five years has had residential uses that have been vacated or demolished; and
- 2) was subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of low- or very low-income, or
- 3) subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity’s valid exercise of its police power, or
- 4) occupied by low- or very low-income households.

Prior to the end of 2022, Community Development Department staff will provide a pop-up “Notice” in Accela for each inventoried parcel subject to these requirements. A training session will be held to ensure that all staff are aware of applicable replacement housing requirements for all sites occupied by residential uses.

Timeline: Adopt code amendment with Housing Element. Set up Notice in Accela and begin implementing requirements by January 2023. Ensure staff receives training within the first three years of the planning period.

Ongoing.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund

Program HP-2.8: Flexible Development Standards

The City currently and will continue to provide incentives to affordable housing projects including flexibility in development standards without need for a variance or other discretionary review as required by Government Code Section 65915. Incentives will continue to be granted to qualified affordable projects under Section 65915 even if a density bonus is not sought. Consider tying the granting of additional incentives, as provided for in Government Code Section 65915, to the level or depth of a project’s affordability, as described in Program HP-1.4. Outreach to developers about these incentives within the Proactive Outreach Program (Program HP-2.10)

Timeline: Ongoing, as requested, starting in 2023.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund

Program HP-2.9: Funding Priority to Extremely Low-income Affordable Housing

Continue to encourage the development of housing for extremely low-income households (households earning at or below 30 percent of median, based on HUD calculations for the Los Angeles County area). The City will continue to give funding preference to programs and projects that have greater numbers of housing for extremely low-income households. Projects are prioritized by the City Council as opportunities are identified and as project proposals exist, depending on the availability of funding (Existing, modified to reflect adoption of program in 2013 HE and edit name)

Timeline: Ongoing, as project proposals exist

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: HOME, CDBG, Bonds, PDA/TOD Funds

Program HP-2.10: Proactive Outreach Program

In order to affirmatively further fair housing, increase awareness about housing programs, and address local housing needs, the City will establish and implement a proactive outreach program to promote housing programs identified in the Housing Element. Strategies for ongoing outreach will include establishing and maintaining connections with community-based organizations and the development community, and providing information to landlords, tenants, and community members

Development community: The City will build a Developer Interest Group list for builders and developers, including developers of affordable housing and community-based organizations and provide an annual notice to ensure the local development community is aware of opportunities and incentives for housing development in the City, including those to be established by Programs HP-1.5, HP-2.4, HP-2.6, . The City will also proactively outreach to non-profit housing developers through an RFQ/RFP process to identify suitable land within the City for the development of an affordable housing complex (Program HP-2.5). The City will develop its Developer Interest Group email list by the end of 2023 and expand it throughout the planning period. Initial outreach will be in 2023 and updates will be sent out with relevant code changes or at least once per year.

Community Outreach: The City will continue to build and maintain its Housing Interest Group list for community members and community-based organizations and provide a housing information notice at least annually. This notice will be distributed, promoted, and made available on the City's website and include information about tenant rights, loan and funding options for residents and homeowners, State rental and mortgage relief programs, the Shared Housing Program, the Handworker Program (Program HP-3.2), and the Property Rehabilitations Program (Programs HP-3.3). The City will develop an outreach email list by the end of 2023 and expand it throughout the planning period. The City will continue to provide translation services on the City's website, including Spanish translation.

Landlord Outreach: The City will work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs.

Tenant Outreach: The City will develop an outreach strategy that proactively connects tenants and those seeking rental housing with the information and resources they need. The City will seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to government assisted housing.

Vulnerable Communities: The City will continue to work with community-based organizations and request their assistance in distributing housing information to vulnerable and hard to reach populations. The City will proactively promote the services of the Housing Rights Center in communities who are vulnerable to displacement. The City will promote information and resources for disaster

preparedness and safety in neighborhoods that currently experience or environmental injustice. The City will maintain year-round informational postings at community centers and other municipal buildings near these identified communities. The City will facilitate the involvement of affected residents, businesses, and organizations in all aspects of the planning process, utilizing culturally appropriate approaches to public participation and involvement and engage and outreach to residents from lower resource areas to serve on boards, committees, task forces, and other local government decision-making bodies.

Timeline: Develop outreach email list by the end of 2023. Outreach ongoing, at least once annually.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund, CDBG, HOME Funds

Objective: Increase awareness about available housing programs, available opportunities and incentives for housing developments, and the rights and responsibilities of tenants and landlords under fair housing laws.

Program HP-3.1: Limit Code Enforcement Activities

Continue to focus residential code enforcement activities on situations that pose an immediate threat to public health and safety. Such activities do not include minor alterations made to residences without benefit of permit when such alterations are made to accommodate a special need or disability of the resident(s), or for interior alterations made to allow or honor the residents' cultural needs or practices, unless those alterations pose an immediate threat to the safety of the residents or neighborhood. *(New; implements Policy H3.1 and addresses AFFH and EJ)*

Timeline: Ongoing

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund

Program HP-3.2: Handyworker Program

The City will continue to provide financial support to the Handyworker Program, operated by the Santa Clarita Valley Committee on Aging – Senior Center through a grant from the City. The Handyworker Program provides minor home repairs, which are primarily performed by Senior Center staff. Grants up to a total of \$5,000 in repairs are allowed per household, per year. Eligible households are owner-occupied and have incomes at or below 80 percent of the median household income for Los Angeles County, as determined annually by HUD. Typical repairs include plumbing, electrical, windows, walls, doors, and HVAC. Repairs which are beyond the scope of the Handyworker staff are subcontracted to local licensed repair persons. The City will continue to provide financial support for this Program annually, contingent upon the availability of funds and approval from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Upon approval of the annual allocation and authorization from

HUD, the Senior Center and City will conduct one outreach annually including, but not limited to, using social media, mailers, and other news platforms. Results of the Programs’ efforts (i.e. number of households assisted) will be included in the APR. *(Existing – max amount updated)*

- Timeline: Outreach initiated in 2023 and conducted annually through the Proactive Outreach Program (Program HP-2.10).
- Responsibility: Community Development Department through the Santa Clarita Valley Committee on Aging
- Funding: CDBG Funds
- Objective: Assist sixty-five households annually.

Program HP-3.3: Property Rehabilitation Program

The City will continue to administer the Property Rehabilitation Program to provide grants to low- and moderate-income homeowners for repairs to the grounds surrounding their owner-occupied homes. Typical repairs include driveway repair, tree-trimming, fence, wall, and gate repair, and brush clearance. Grants are for up to \$1,500 in repairs. Like the Handyworker Program, the City will continue to provide financial support for this Program annually, contingent upon the availability of funds and approval from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Upon approval of the annual allocation and authorization from HUD, the Senior Center and City will conduct one outreach per year including, but not limited to, using social media, mailers, and other news platforms. Results of the Programs’ efforts (i.e. number of households assisted) will be included in the APR.

- Timeline: Ongoing
- Responsibility: Community Development Department
- Funding: CDBG
- Objective: Assist at least three households annually.

Program HP-3.4: Provide Information for Energy Conservation Programs

The City of Santa Clarita will continue to maintain the “Green Santa Clarita” website as a “one-stop shop” that will provide residents, businesses and builders with programs and products that assist with energy conservation. The website will include available programs for lower income residents. *(Existing; website named, and program modified to “continue” since it was accomplished)*

- Timeline: Ongoing
- Responsibility: Community Development Department
- Funding: Departmental funds

Program HP-3.5: Preservation of At-Risk Housing

During the 2021-2029 planning period, Santa Clarita has 89 affordable senior units at high risk and up to 559 affordable units at lower risk of converting to market rents. The City will work to preserve these units as affordable by undertaking the following specific actions: (*Existing; updated & revised*)

- Annually update the status of at-risk housing beginning in 20222 and provide an annual status update in the City’s APR
- Proactively outreach to owners at least three years before expiration of affordability covenants to inform them of state preservation notice law requirements (Gov. Code Sections 65863.10, 65863.11, 65863.13.)
- Proactively outreach to at least two qualified entities per year to make diligent effort to maintain affordability levels.
- Continue investigating funding options for continuation of affordability agreements and pursue funding as available. (Existing, updated to reflect current figures)

Timeline: Annual monitoring of status and available funding; outreach to owners at least 3 years prior to expiration of affordability restrictions

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: TCAC, CA MFH Program, bonds, mortgage funds

Program HP-3.6: Mobilehome Rent Adjustment Policies

The City currently has a Mobilehome Park rental adjustment policy codified as Municipal Code Chapter 6.02. This ordinance is designed to protect park residents, the majority of which are of lower income, from unreasonable rent increases.

The ordinance restricts the allowable annual space rent increases at mobilehome parks within the City limits to the following:

- An adjustment limited to the percentage of the Consumer Price Index increase over the previous year (not to exceed 5%), along with a pass-through of increases in the cost of government-required services and increases in utility costs;
- An increase to pay for allowable capital projects substantiated by the park owner through supporting documentation; and
- An adjustment designed to provide a fair and reasonable rate of return, substantiated by the park owner through supporting documentation.

Park owners are subject to significant notification requirements, and the ordinance puts into place a rent increase appeal process which can be initiated by the park residents. (*Existing; updated*)

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-3.7: Workforce Housing Program

The City is authorized to enter into a joint powers authority for the purpose of bringing Workforce Housing to the City, specifically targeted to assist middle income households earning between 80% and 120% of the Area Median Income. City staff will continue to consider developer proposals. As there is developer interest, a proposal would go before the City Council to enter into the agreement. The units would be deed-restricted, giving local families the ability to afford rent and avoid housing insecurity. The program can also be applied to new builds, whereby the joint powers authority finances the construction of a brand new apartment building and rents the units below market rate, per the restrictions of the deed. This program will be promoted to housing developers through the Proactive Outreach Program (Program HP-2.10)

Timeline: Outreach initiated in 2023 and conducted annually through the Proactive Outreach Program (Program HP-2.10). Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: Governmental, tax-exempt bonds issued by the Joint Powers Authority

Program HP-4.1: Monitor Housing Trends, Laws, and Issues

The City will continue to monitor legislation, trends, and policy issues related to the development and maintenance of affordable housing in the City of Santa Clarita. Ongoing efforts include but are not limited to:

- Attending housing and legislative review conferences;
- Attending training workshops;
- Training on new legislation, state requirements, policies and procedures pertaining to housing programs.
- The City will also participate in regional planning efforts coordinated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and interfacing with other local jurisdictions, the County of Los Angeles, and the public.

Timeline: Ongoing
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.2: Monitoring of Codes and Ordinances to Remove Barriers

As necessary, or at least every four years, the City will continue to monitor the implementation of ordinances, codes, policies, and procedures, including reasonable accommodations, to ensure that they do not pose an unreasonable barrier to housing access. If barriers to access that are within the City’s control are identified, they will be modified within one year from identification. Annual updates of monitoring activities and any needed updates will be included within the APR.

Timeline: Modify Reasonable Accommodations procedures by 2023 (See Program HP-4.7). Monitor all ordinances, codes, policies, and procedures in 2026; if barriers are identified, modify by 2027.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.3: Homeless Case Management

Provide financial assistance as funding is available to facilitate ongoing case management to address the issues leading to homelessness and assist them with the transition to stable, permanent housing. Effective case management services may include counseling, transportation assistance, job search assistance, and referrals to legal, health care, and substance abuse services. Assistance in locating transitional shelter or subsidized housing may also be provided. The City will provide annual funding from its Public Services portion of its annual CDBG Entitlement allocation for case management services, which includes, but is not limited to, support services, counseling, transportation assistance, referrals for various services, and educational programs, among others, contingent upon the availability of funds and approval from HUD. (*Existing; moved*)

Timeline: Ongoing. Apply for funding on an annual basis consistent with application deadlines.

Responsibility: Community Development Department

Funding: CDBG Funds

Program HP-4.4: Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Continue to encourage the provision of housing specifically serving the developmentally disabled population in new affordable housing projects. Prioritize funding to affordable housing developers who set aside a portion of their units for the developmentally disabled. Include outreach to developers about this incentive through the Proactive Outreach Program (HP-2.10) Investigate dedicated funding for developmentally disabled affordable housing construction and support applications for construction funding for affordable housing for the developmentally disabled as described below:

- The City will continue to encourage development of projects targeted for persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.

- The City shall seek State and Federal monies, as funding becomes available, in support of housing construction and rehabilitation targeted for persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.
- Continue to allow for applicants to request regulatory incentives, such as expedited permit processing and fee waivers and deferrals, to projects targeted for persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities.
- Continue to assist applicants as needed in the identification of locations, facilitate obtaining the necessary HCD Community Care licensing, and streamline City land use approvals for housing for persons with disabilities.

Timeline: Annually and ongoing, consistent with funding cycles
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.5: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice/Fair Housing Analysis

Continue to develop an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI/Fair Housing Assessment) every five years or as otherwise legally required, to include but not limited to: *(existing; added updated FHA title)*

- Demographic data on housing, income, household make-up, employment, and a housing profile;
- Evaluation of current City policies and regulations;
- Evaluation of public sector impacts such as lending practices;
- Description of potential impediments and conclusions;
- Recommendations to address identified impediments.

Timeline: Ongoing, every 5 years
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.6: Fair Housing Programs

The City will continue to provide training to City staff on fair housing laws and responsibilities and will continue to provide funding to contract with a service provider to provide and coordinate fair housing services for residents. The fair housing services provider conducts outreach and education activities, records and investigates inquiries and complaints from residents, distributes literature, provides housing vacancy listings, and publicizes the availability of fair housing services through various media. Outreach will be conducted through two outreach events per year. Trainings and/or other items related to housing would be completed on an as-needed basis. *(Existing; format modified)*

Timeline: Ongoing; Continue annual allocations
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: CDBG

Program HP-4.7: Administrative Process for Reasonable Accommodations

Continue to implement the City's Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance through an administrative process (unless related entitlements are sought) that is inexpensive and easy to apply for. Process these requests in 30 days or less where no other entitlements are applied for. Review typical processing costs eliminate the reasonable accommodation application fee (currently \$872) by 2024. *(New – AFFH)*

Timeline: Eliminate fee by 2024. Ongoing as requested
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: CDBG

Program HP-4.8: Environmental Justice Objectives and Policies

When amending the Elements within this General Plan, identify objectives and policies to reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities by means that include, but are not limited to, the reduction of pollution exposure, including the improvement of air quality, and the promotion of public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activity. Review all General Plan Elements in 2023 to ensure that there are no conflicting objectives or policies. *(New, EJ)*

Timeline: First review in 2023; as Elements are amended thereafter
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.9: Protection from Unnecessary Wildfire Risk

Limit exposure of new households to wildfire risks by ensuring that all new residential developments located within the VHFHSZ (Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone) have at least two points of access, an emergency evacuation plan, and meet all applicable Fire Safe Standards. Grant priority in processing and funding of affordable housing projects to those that are located outside of the VHFHZ. *(New, needed to provide consistency with Safety Element policies to meet SB 1241)*

Timeline: Ongoing as projects are processed and reviewed
 Responsibility: Community Development Department
 Funding: General Fund

Program HP-4.10: Proactive Community Preservation

Continue to conduct proactive Community Preservation activities related to property maintenance and public safety issues in selected neighborhoods of Canyon Country and Newhall to forestall decline of these neighborhoods and help maintain them in a clean, safe, healthy, and secure manner that contributes to community vitality. Activities include but are not limited to:

- Maintenance and improvement of existing homes.
- Revitalization of neighborhoods in decline.
- Measures to combat crime, graffiti, and gang activity.

Staff from Community Preservation, Housing, Planning, Building and Safety, Recreation and Community Services, Neighborhood Services, and Public Works work in close partnership with the affected neighborhoods, local law enforcement, fire, emergency services and local contractors to achieve code compliance. The East Newhall, Old Town Newhall, and Canyon Country neighborhoods will be prioritized for these services, with other areas as needed and as funding allows.

As part of Santa Clarita 2025 Strategic Plan, staff from the Community Preservation Division will lead a Neighborhood Rehabilitation and Beautification Program, a proactive approach to community preservation. The actions items will be completed by the end of 2025, and will include, at a minimum, one bilingual outreach event held at a public facility, and open to the public, for the rehabilitation and preservation of pre-selected areas of the Newhall and Canyon Country communities. These communities were identified based on data from historical code enforcement cases and data collected from Community Awareness Program meetings held in the same communities during calendar years 2017-2019, and this action is a key action item in Santa Clarita 2020, the City’s previous five-year strategic plan. Funding for this project will come from a mix of CDBG, HOME, and General Fund dollars, as well as services in-kind. Starting in 2023, the Program will aim to assist a minimum of 10 households per year and will continue through the completion of Santa Clarita 2025. Progress will be reported annually through the APR.

Timeline: 2023 -2025

Responsibility: Community Development Department, Community Preservation

Funding: General Fund, CDBG, HOME Funds

Quantified Objectives

State law requires the City to establish quantified objectives for development of new housing and the preservation or rehabilitation of existing affordable housing over the eight-year planning period. Table 9 summarizes Santa Clarita’s projected new construction of affordable and market rate units during the period 2021 - 2029.

The City of Santa Clarita plans to fund Handyworker grants to 520 households to help ensure that low-income residents living in older homes in the City can maintain those homes in a safe and sanitary condition. (Program HP-3.2)

The City will strive to preserve all affordable units at high risk for conversion during the 2021 - 2029 Housing Element period. (Program HP-3.5)

The programs identified in **Section 2** will assist the City in meeting its identified housing needs as quantified in Table 8 and Table 9 below.

Table 8: Quantified Preservation and Rehabilitation Objectives 2021 - 2029

| Housing Type | Extremely Low 30% or less of median income | Very Low 50% or less of median income | Low 51% to 80% of median income | Total |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|-------|
| Handyworker Rehab Program | 80 | 285 | 155 | 520 |
| Rehabilitation | 20 | 30 | 30 | 80 |
| Preservation | 14 | 35 | 40 | 89 |
| Total | 114 | 350 | 225 | 689 |

Table 9: Quantified New Construction Objectives, 2021 - 2029

| Housing Type | Extremely Low 30% or less of median income | Very Low 31% to 50% of median income | Low 51% to 80% of median income | Moderate 81% to 120% of median income | Above Moderate >120% of median income | Total |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|--|--------|
| RHNA | 1,699 | 1,698 | 1,734 | 1,672 | 3,228 | 10,031 |

Section III: Housing Sites

3.1 CONTEXT

Jurisdictions are required by law to identify sufficient adequate sites of suitable land within its boundaries to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These sites can include vacant sites zoned for residential use, vacant sites that allow residential development, and underutilized sites that are capable of being redeveloped to increase the number of residential units. These sites must have the realistic potential for new residential development within the Housing Element planning period. Santa Clarita is meeting its RHNA through the following means:

- ADU development projections (See Section 3.2);
- Planned, approved, and pending projects projected to develop during the planning period (See Section 3.3); and
- Adequate sites identified in the Sites Inventory, including sites on vacant and non-vacant land (See Sections 3.4).


Legislation passed since the last Housing Element update has added more stringent requirements for the Sites Inventory. Assembly Bill 1397 addresses standards for the adequacy of inventoried housing sites, including non-vacant sites and sites that were identified in previous housing elements. Senate Bill 166, the “No Net Loss” law, requires a jurisdiction to ensure a Housing Element Sites Inventory with continual capacity to accommodate the RHNA by income group throughout the Housing Element planning period. Because of this requirement, HCD recommends an increased buffer of at least 15 to 30 percent more capacity than required, especially for the lower-income RHNA, or projecting a lower density capacity than is allowed. This Sites Inventory includes a 24 percent buffer for very low-income units, a 30 percent buffer for low-income units, and a 42 percent buffer for moderate-income units and utilizes conservative estimates for development capacity in order to account for this need. Additionally, programs are included within the Housing Element to ensure the City complies with new ‘No Net Loss’ requirements and maintains sufficient sites in inventory.

Santa Clarita has a younger housing stock than the region and is a growing community with vacant land available for infill and greenfield development, as well as a history of annexing new land. While over 60 percent of housing units in the SCAG region were built prior to 1980, less than one-third of Santa Clarita’s housing units were built during that time.

Because of the age of the housing stock, the City has more recent experience with housing development. Recent residential development projects approved or under construction in the city include mixed use projects, age-restricted senior housing, single-family subdivisions, multifamily development including apartments and detached condominiums, student housing, and transitional housing. Recent

residential development is used to make reasonable development capacity assumptions that reflect patterns of development in the city.

Figure 13: Chronology of Residential Development in Santa Clarita



Source: Los Angeles Office of the Assessor Data

The Sites Inventory accommodates 60 percent of sites for lower income households on vacant sites. Overall, the Sites Inventory contains a large buffer with a surplus of 8,527 units, including 1,244 lower-income units.

3.2 ADU DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS

An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is a secondary dwelling unit located on residentially zoned property that has an existing single-family or multifamily residence. Due to their small square footage, ADUs can provide affordable housing options for family members, friends, students, the elderly, in-home health care providers, the disabled, and others.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has conducted a survey of ADU rents and has issued pre-certified affordability assumptions for ADUs. Based on local conditions and development trends, the City decreased the proportion of

projected lower-income ADUs and increased the proportion of Moderate and Above Moderate ADUs to be consistent with what is reasonably expected to develop in the City (see Table 10). These numbers may be credited towards Santa Clarita’s RHNA.

Table 10: Assumed Affordability^f for 6th Cycle ADUs

| Income Category | SCAG Affordability Assumption for ADUs | Santa Clarita Affordability Assumption for ADUs | Santa Clarita ADUs Assumed |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Extremely Low | 15% | 19% | 48 |
| Very Low | 9% | | |
| Low | 45% | 34% | 85 |
| Moderate | 2% | 9% | 22 |
| Above Moderate | 30% | 38% | 95 |
| Total | 100%* | 100%* | 250 |
| *Due to rounding, percentages may not always appear to add up to 100% (Source: SCAG survey) | | | |

Recent trends indicate that ADU permit applications have been increasing in recent years. The City of Santa Clarita permitted 13 new ADU units in 2018, 25 new ADU units in 2019, 47 new ADU units in 2020, and 40 new ADU units in 2021 (average of 31.25 ADUs per year). The increase in ADU permits beginning in 2019 is likely due to recent California legislation that makes it easier to build and permit ADUs on single-family and multifamily zoned property. Additionally, Program HP-2.6 within this housing element will assist the City in meeting their ADU targets. Consistent with HCD guidance and safe harbor numbers, the ADU assumptions for RHNA credits assume that 31.25 ADUs will be permitted per year, resulting in 250 ADUs permitted between 2021 and 2029.

3.3 PLANNED, APPROVED, AND PENDING PROJECTS

Housing units approved, permitted, or in receipt of a certificate of occupancy as of June 30, 2021, can be credited towards meeting the City’s latest RHNA. These units can count towards the RHNA based on affordability and unit count provided it can be demonstrated that the units can be built within the planning period of October 2021 through October 2029. Affordability (income category) is based on the actual or projected sale prices, rent levels, or other mechanisms establishing affordability of the units within the project.

Based on Los Angeles regional market rents and sales prices, apartments, condominiums, and townhomes are typically affordable to moderate-income households. Single-family homes are generally affordable only to above moderate-income households. Subsidized housing developments that offer housing at below market rates are made affordable to lower income households.

Table 11: Planned, Approved, and Pending Projects (2021)

identifies the approved or pending projects that are credited towards meeting the City’s RHNA. Five of these projects will be available to lower-income households based on deed restrictions: Metrowalk Specific Plan (49 low-income units), Family Promise Supportive Transitional Housing (four low-income units), Salazar 11th Street Mixed Use (one very low-income unit), Salazar 14th Street Mixed Use (2 very low-income units), and an affordable housing project located on Flying Tiger Drive (102 low- and 26 very low-income units). Projects that are currently in the pipeline achieve an average density of approximately 32 units per acre and achieve an average of 78 percent of the maximum allowable density, as reflected in Table 11. All projects are anticipated to be completed during the planning period.

Table 11: Planned, Approved, and Pending Projects (2021)

| Project Name | Zone | Max. Density Allowed (du/ac) | Approved/Proposed Density | % Of Max Density Achieved | # Of Units | Income Category | Est. Completion Date |
|--|------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Entitled | | | | | | | |
| Sand Canyon Plaza ² | MX-N & UR3 | 18 | 16.1 | 89.4% | 580 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| Dockweiler 21 ¹ | UR3 | 11 | 4.8 | 43.6% | 93 | Above Moderate | 2024 |
| 'aster's University Master Plan ² | UR3 | 11 | 9.3 | 84.5% | 42 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| River Walk Mixed Use Project ² | CP | 30 | 25.2 | 84.0% | 136 | Above Moderate | 2024 |
| Veluzat Condos ¹ | UR4 | 18 | 7.5 | 41.7% | 9 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| Canyon Brook ² | UR2 | 5 | 4.6 | 92.0% | 35 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| Sand Canyon Ranch ² | NU4 | 0.5 | 0.34 | 68.0% | 22 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| Bouquet Canyon Project ² | UR5 & UR2 | 5 to 30 | 12.7 | 42.3% | 375 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| MetroWalk Specific Plan ² | SP | 24.5 | 24.5 | 100.0% | 449 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| | | | | | 49 | Low | |
| Golden Triangle Apartments ² | CC | 18 | 16.5 | 91.7% | 164 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| Vista Canyon Specific Plan ¹ | SP | Varies | 12.3 | 100.0% | 477* | Above Moderate | 2024 |
| Galloway Five Knolls ¹ | UR3 | 11 | 8.5 | 77.3% | 44* | Above Moderate | 2022 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|------|--------|-------|----------------|------|
| Porta Bella Specific Plan ² | SP | Varies | 2.9 | N/A | 2,911 | Above Moderate | 2029 |
| Skyline Ranch ¹ | UR1 | 2 | 2.6 | 130.0% | 678* | Above Moderate | 2024 |
| Sierra Victoria ¹ | UR4 | 18 | 6.2 | 34.4% | 48* | Above Moderate | 2022 |
| Family Promise Supportive Transitional Housing ² | CC | 18 | 7.2 | 40.0% | 1 | Above Moderate | 2024 |
| | | | | | 4 | Low | |
| Sand Canyon Plaza Assisted Living ² | MX-N | 18 | 30.9 | 171.7% | 115 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| Sierra West Assisted Living ² | MX-C | 30 | 13.7 | 45.7% | 54 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| Pending | | | | | | | |
| Mancara ³ | UR1, NU5 | 2 | 1.2 | 60.0% | 109 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| Princessa Crossroads (+Sikand) Specific Plan ³ | SP | Varies | 17.7 | N/A | 710 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| Park Vista ³ | UR2 | 5 | 3.9 | 78.0% | 182 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| Ted Robinson ³ | UR1 | 2 | 1.6 | 80.0% | 48 | Above Moderate | 2027 |
| Sand Canyon Villas ³ | UR5 | 30 | 12.2 | 40.7% | 20 | Above Moderate | 2028 |
| Smiser/Wiley Canyon ³ | MX-N | 18 | 17.7 | 98.3% | 375 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| Smiser/Wiley Canyon Assisted Living ³ | MX-N | 18 | 17.7 | 98.3% | 190 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| Bouquet Canyon IHOP Mixed Use ³ | MX-C | 30 | 25 | 83.3% | 30 | Above Moderate | 2026 |
| | SP | | 56.9 | N/A | 12 | Above Moderate | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------|
| Salazar 11th Street Mixed Use ³ | | Form Based Code | | | 1 | Very Low | 2025 |
| Salazar 14th Street Mixed Use ³ | SP | Form Based Code | 53.9 | N/A | 34 | Above Moderate | 2025 |
| | | | | | 2 | Very Low | |
| Flying Tiger Drive ³ | CC | 18 | 32.2 | 45.3% | 102 | Low | 2025 |
| | | | | | 26 | Very Low | |
| Annexed & Entitled | | | | | | | |
| Singh/Somerset Summit ² | UR2 | 5 | 1.3 | 26.0% | 95 | Above Moderate | 2028 |
| West Creek CH18 ² | UR4 | 18 | 30.5 | 169.4% | 320 | Above Moderate | 2028 |
| Total | | | | 78.4% | 8,542 | | |
| <p><i>*Remaining number of units in projects that are under construction</i></p> <p>¹ <i>Projects that are under construction and/or have recorded final maps.</i></p> <p>² <i>Projects that include an active tentative map and/or entitlement. Total number of units are approved to be built.</i></p> <p>³ <i>Projects currently undergoing development review and/or environmental review.</i></p> | | | | | | | |

Based on the status of these projects and development trends in the city, these projects are likely to be constructed and occupied during the planning period. After subtracting these anticipated units, the City must demonstrate its ability to meet the remaining housing needs through the identification of specific parcels or sites. After accounting for units planned and approved as of June 30, 2021, and anticipated ADUs, there is a remaining need of 6,464 units. This total includes 3,320 very low-income, 1,494 low-income and 1,650 moderate-income units. The City must demonstrate the availability of sites with appropriate zoning and development standards that can facilitate and encourage the development of 6,464 units.

3.4 VACANT AND NON-VACANT SITES

3.4.1 Density and Size Requirements

California law requires that jurisdictions demonstrate in their Housing Element that the land inventory is adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional growth. California law has established "default" density standards in estimating potential units by income range:

- A density standard of 0 to 14 units per acre (primarily for single-family homes) is assumed to facilitate housing in the above moderate-income category;
- A density standard of 15 to 29 units per acre (primarily for medium density multifamily developments) would facilitate housing in the moderate-income category; and
- A density standard of 30 or more units per acre (primarily for higher density multifamily developments) would facilitate housing in the lower income category.

In addition to default density standards, the California Legislature established size requirements for parcels intended to support the development of lower income units. Very small parcels, even when zoned for high densities, may not facilitate the scale of development required to access competitive funding resources. Conversely, typically lower-resource affordable housing developers may be unable to finance the scale of project necessitated by very large parcels. Government Code § 65583.2 establishes that sites between 0.5 and 10 acres in size which are zoned for residential development at greater than 30 units per acre are suitable for lower-income projects.

3.4.2 Site Selection and Capacity

When identifying potential capacity for more development, Geographic Information Systems data was used to identify vacant and non-vacant properties within the city in zoning districts that allow for residential use. Non-vacant parcels were chosen as sites likely to be redeveloped during the next eight years based on the following criteria:

- **Improvement to Land Value Ratio:** A parcel’s improvement-to-land value (ILV) ratio can help identify properties that are potentially underutilized. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the land value itself has a higher value than the improvements built on that land. These underutilized parcels represent opportunities for property owners and developers to invest in further improvements that increase the overall value of the property;
- **Existing use vs. zoned use:** A comparison of the current use of a site to the use for which it is officially zoned can identify underutilized or non-conforming properties. For example, a parcel currently occupied by a parking lot or single-family home which is zoned for high density housing or high intensity commercial development represents an opportunity for the property owner to convert the property to a higher value use;
- **Age of structure:** The age of a structure is useful in demonstrating likelihood of a site to redevelop. New construction on a site indicates that a property owner is unlikely to invest in additional improvements or redevelop the site in the near future even though other factors may indicate a higher likelihood of redevelopment;
- **Floor-to-area ratio:** A low floor-to-area ratio (FAR) can indicate underutilization. Any potential development on parcels with higher floor-to-area ratio buildings may incur higher land acquisition and demolition costs;
- **Likelihood of redevelopment:** Sites were identified if they align with local and regional development trends. Uses such as surface parking and marginally operating commercial uses have a high likelihood of redevelopment. Sites with existing multi-family uses are less likely to redevelop and have been removed from consideration as opportunity sites.

3.4.3 Realistic Development Capacity

The City used conservative assumptions to estimate the development capacity of each site. Specifically, the Sites Inventory assumed 75 percent of the maximum allowable density of all parcels, instead of the full development potential allowed under the applicable zoning district. This density assumption is lower than the average densities achieved by the planned and approved projects (See Section 3.3). For the sites designated for mixed use, the allowable density was assumed to be 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and would be developed with both residential and commercial uses. These assumptions are based on development trends in the city as shown in

Table 11: Planned, Approved, and Pending Projects (2021)

above and with the detailed redevelopment trends and analysis provided in Section 3.6. These historical regional development patterns were used to approximate a variety of site-specific constraints that would reduce the ability for property owners to meet the maximum allowed density allowance. For the smaller lots in the inventory, a minimum of one dwelling unit is assumed for each legal lot.

The City has made assumptions for residential development on sites that allow nonresidential uses based on recent development trends in the city. The following recent residential projects are described more in detail in Section 3.6. All of these projects are located in zones that allow 100 percent commercial and achieve greater than 75 percent of the maximum residential density allowed:

Mixed-use projects:

- Monticello (43.5 units/acre; 87% of maximum density achieved)
- Newhall Crossings (56.6 units/acre; 100% of maximum density achieved)
- River Walk (25.2 units/acre; 84% of maximum density achieved)
- Salazar 11th Street (56.9 units/acre; 100% of maximum density achieved)
- Salazar 14th Street (53.9 units/acre; 100% of maximum density achieved)

100 percent residential projects:

- Three Oaks (18.5 units/acre; 102% of maximum density achieved)
- Golden Triangle Residential (16.5 units/acre; 92% of maximum density achieved)

In addition, a couple of examples of projects with developer interest that would propose residential development in areas that allow 100 percent commercial include Flying Tiger residential (32 units/acre) and River Walk-adjacent residential (25 units/acre). These prospective projects would achieve over 100% and 84% of the maximum density allowed. These recent development projects and pre-development projects reflect the strong demand for housing sites within the city, including those that also allow commercial development. Based on these trends and on the actual average percentage of residential density (95%) achieved by projects on commercially zoned properties, the assumed capacity of 75 percent of the maximum allowable density is a reasonable expectation.

3.4.4 Land Use Controls

In addition to realistic development capacity, other land use controls such as density and allowable use were considered through the site selection process. The Sites Inventory identified parcels in several zoning districts that allow for medium and high density residential. As shown on Table 12, zones that support sites allow between 18 and 50 dwelling units per acre. These zones support the densities and potential uses identified on the Sites Inventory.

Table 12: Breakdown of Sites Inventory by Zone

| Zone | Allowable Density | Total Acres | Number of Units | Allowable Uses |
|-------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| CC | ≤18 dwelling units per acre | 17.47 | 235 | Multi-family dwellings, retail and service uses, restaurants, and office uses. |
| CP | ≤18 dwelling units per acre | 15.22 | 315 | Specific allowable uses are determined by the adopted corridor plan and may include multi-family residential, commercial, and office uses. |
| UR4 | ≤18 dwelling units per acre | 12.65 | 171 | Single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings. |
| CN | ≤18 dwelling units per acre | 33.54 | 452 | Multi-family dwellings, neighborhood serving commercial, retail uses, restaurants, and office uses. |
| UR5 | 18-30 dwelling units per acre | 125.27 | 2,603 | Single-family dwellings and medium to high-density multi-family dwellings. |
| MX-C | 11-30 dwelling units per acre | 86.0 | 2,547 | Single-family dwellings, multi-family dwellings, neighborhood serving commercial, retail uses, restaurants, and office uses. |
| CR | 18-50 dwelling units per acre | 92.32 | 3,443 | Multi-family dwellings, retail and service uses, restaurants, and office uses. |
| Total | | 382.46 | 9,766 | |

As shown on the Table 12, many of the units are located in the CR zone. This zone predominately comprises the Valencia Town Center (VTC) and areas along State Route 14. The City anticipated that these areas will develop with a mix of high density residential and commercial uses due to a demand for commercial and residential development in the areas. The City assumes that sites in these areas would realistically develop at 37.5 units per acre to meet anticipated demand.

3.4.5 Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites

The Sites Inventory primary identifies vacant parcels as sites suitable for future housing. Approximately 47 percent of the total units are located on sites with no existing uses. Additionally, approximately 60 percent of the City’s lower-income RHNA allocation is accommodated on vacant sites. Because there are no improvements on these vacant sites, it is assumed that existing uses would not impede residential development. For non-vacant sites, the housing element must analyze the extent that existing uses may impede additional residential development.

As discussed previously, a suitability analysis was conducted to determine the likelihood of redevelopment. All parcels identified on the Sites Inventory have a FAR of less than 1.0 and the improvements on these parcels are all at least 20 years old while the majority of sites have an ILV of less than 1.0. Additionally, sites are focused in Moderate to High Resources areas as determined by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC). This indicates that sites in these areas have moderate to high access to good schools, employment opportunities, and a healthy environment. FAR values, ILV, and Resource Levels are included for each site in Appendix D.

Table 13 shows the existing uses of the non-vacant parcels identified on the Sites Inventory. Sites were identified with uses that could be converted to a higher value use such as older commercial and industrial uses, excess surface parking, and low-density residences on larger parcels that could support high density residential. Citywide development trends indicate that these existing uses are likely to redevelop. Santa Clarita has a demonstrated track record of conversion of these uses to high density residential and mixed-use development (see section 3.6). As a result of this analysis, the City determined that existing uses would not impede conversion to additional residential development.

Table 13: Existing Uses of Non-Vacant Sites

| Existing Use | Total Acres | Number of Sites | Number of Units |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Vacant | 227.68 | 62 | 4,621 |
| Commercial/retail | 101.67 | 44 | 3,708 |
| Industrial | 7.85 | 2 | 175 |
| Parking | 17.21 | 5 | 642 |
| Residential | 28.05 | 12 | 620 |
| Total | 382.46 | 125 | 9,766 |

Lot Consolidation

To meet HCD’s 0.5-acre minimum size requirement for lower-income sites, the City assumes that some parcels could be consolidated into one larger parcel to accommodate lower-income units in accordance with Government Code § 65583.2. Of the City’s lower-income RHNA share, 187 lower-income units are located on sites where lot consolidation is assumed. The City conservatively assumed that no more than three adjacent parcels would realistically consolidate to meet HCD’s size requirement for lower-income sites. Development trends indicate that lot consolidation is feasible in the region (see Section 3.6). The remaining 5,871 lower-income units are located on sites that meet minimum lot size requirements

3.5 Adequacy of the Residential Sites Inventory in Meeting RHNA

A total of 9,766 residential units can be accommodated on vacant and non-vacant sites in the city based on residential densities and floor area ratio standards per existing land use designations and zoning districts. The sites are located in zoning

districts that accommodate densities between 18 to 50 dwelling units per acre. The sites identified for new housing were separated into discrete areas within the City and are shown geographically in Figure 14 and Figure 15.

As shown in Figure 14, sites to accommodate the lower income RHNA are spread out throughout the city and are in areas with moderate to highest resource areas as categorized by TCAC.

Table 14 provides the size, realistic capacity, income category, and resource area of each site. An analysis of these sites relating to fair housing can be found in Section 4.5 and a table providing attributes for all sites can be found in Appendix D.

Figure 14: Sites to Accommodate Lower Income RHNA




Figure 15: Sites to Accommodate Moderate Income RHNA




Table 14: Housing Site Areas

| Map # | Acres | Realistic Capacity (Units) | Income Category | TCAC Resource Area |
|-------|-------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 95.73 | 1,313 | Lower, Moderate | Moderate Resource |
| 2 | 28.74 | 453 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 3 | 23.74 | 514 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 4 | 3.39 | 74 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 5 | 1.92 | 71 | Lower | Highest Resource |
| 6 | 14.79 | 552 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 7 | 4.50 | 168 | Lower | Highest Resource |
| 8 | 27.95 | 625 | Lower | Highest Resource |
| 9 | 15.03 | 338 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 10 | 14.51 | 323 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 11 | 1.56 | 20 | Moderate | Moderate Resource |
| 12 | 13.48 | 181 | Moderate | Highest Resource |
| 13 | 0.43 | 5 | Moderate | High Resource |

| | | | | |
|----|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 14 | 8.66 | 117 | Moderate | Moderate Resource |
| 15 | 4.97 | 66 | Moderate | Moderate Resource |
| 16 | 20.06 | 271 | Moderate | Moderate Resource |
| 17 | 12.65 | 171 | Moderate | Highest Resource |
| 18 | 11.28 | 249 | Lower, Moderate | High Resource |
| 19 | 12.60 | 283 | Lower, Moderate | Highest Resource |
| 20 | 3.92 | 88 | Lower | High Resource |
| 21 | 5.65 | 123 | Lower | Moderate Resource |
| 22 | 7.85 | 175 | Lower | Highest Resource |
| 23 | 35.20 | 792 | Lower, Moderate | High Resource |
| 24 | 4.15 | 90 | Lower | High Resource |
| 25 | 22.67 | 847 | Lower | Highest Resource |
| 26 | 48.44 | 1,805 | Lower, Above Moderate | Highest Resource |
| 27 | 3.84 | 52 | Moderate | Moderate Resource |

3.6 RHNA SURPLUS

Santa Clarita is identifying sufficient suitable sites to accommodate its entire RHNA through existing sites under existing zoning. Of the City’s 10,031-unit total RHNA obligation, 317 lower-, 22 moderate-, and 8,453 above moderate-income units will be accounted for by planned and approved units and through ADU development. After those units, there is a sum of 6,464 units needed to accommodate the City’s RHNA including 3,320 units affordable at the very low and extremely low-income levels and 1,494 units affordable at the low-income level. The City has identified suitable sites to realistically accommodate an additional 9,766 units under current zoning, with an approximately 26 percent buffer for the very low and low-income categories and a 42 percent buffer for the moderate-income category. More than 50 percent of the City’s lower-income RHNA obligation can be met on vacant sites.

Table 15: RHNA Surplus by Income Group

| | Very Low-income | Low-income | Moderate-income | Above Moderate-income | Total |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|
| RHNA Allocation | 3,397 | 1,734 | 1,672 | 3,228 | 10,031 |
| Planned and Approved Units | 29 | 155 | 0 | 8,358 | 8,542 |
| ADUs | 48 | 85 | 22 | 95 | 250 |
| Remaining RHNA After Credits | 3,320 | 1,494 | 1,650 | 0 | 6,464 |
| Vacant Units | 1,956 | 920 | 1,724 | -- | 4,600 |
| Non-vacant Units | 2,164 | 1,018 | 625 | 1,359 | 5,166 |
| Total Units After Credits | 4,119 | 1,939 | 2,349 | 1,359 | 9,766 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Total Unit Surplus | 799 | 445 | 699 | 6,584 | 8,527 |
| Buffer above Remaining RHNA After Credits | 24% | 30% | 42% | >100% | |

3.6.1 Sites Used in Previous Cycles

Vacant parcels from both the 4th and 5th Cycles and non-vacant parcels from the 5th Cycle may be reused in this Housing Element to accommodate lower-income housing, provided they are rezoned to allow projects that have at least 20 percent of the units set aside to be affordable for lower-income households to be allowed by-right (i.e., can be approved administratively without requiring Planning Commission or City Council approval). 37 of the vacant or non-vacant parcels identified on the Sites Inventory are subject to this by-right requirement. Program H-1.13 is included to rezone previous cycle sites identified for lower-income development consistent with Government Code § 65583.

3.7 REDEVELOPMENT TRENDS

Some suitable sites identified in Appendix D rely on the redevelopment (or “recycling”) of underutilized properties or underperforming commercial sites. Examples of recent existing, under construction, and approved/entitled recycling trends include the following:

3.7.1 Existing Development

Monticello

Monticello is a mixed-use development consisting of 60 residential units and 10,300 square feet of ground-floor commercial located on a 1.38-acre site at 26701 McBean Parkway and within the Regional Commercial zone. The development consists of an overall density of 43.48 units per acre and achieves 87 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of Monticello was completed in 2020. The site was previously used for overflow parking. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size and existing use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2861-058-079 and 2861-058-080.



Existing: Looking Northwest



Existing: Looking South

Newhall Crossings

Newhall Crossings is a mixed-used development consisting of 47 residential units and 20,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial, located on a 0.83-acre site at 24450-24480 Main Street and within the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan – Arts & Entertainment zone. The development consists of an overall density of 56.62 units per acre and achieves 100 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of Newhall Crossings was completed in 2020. The site was previously used as an auto repair establishment. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2825-015-015, 2844-001-072, 2844-001-046, 2844-001-034, 2844-001-033, and 2844-001-032 (Parcels ending in -072, -046, -034, -033, and -032 share lot lines and have potential to be consolidated).



Existing: Looking Southeast



Existing: Looking Northeast

Three Oaks

Three Oaks is a multifamily residential development, deed-restricted to lower income households, consisting of 30 units within three buildings on a 1.62-acre site and located in the Community Commercial zone. The development consists of a density of 18.52 units per acre and achieves 102 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The development includes a community recreation center and children’s play area. Project entitlements included a Development Review Permit, and Oak Tree Permit, as well as a 3 percent density bonus increase and one concession for building height, pursuant to the state density bonus ordinance. Construction of Three Oaks was completed in 2017. The site was previously used as a park & ride parking lot. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2827-005-046, 2836-009-905, 2844-041-003, and 2844-041-002.



Existing: Looking North



Existing: Looking Northeast

Habitat for Heroes

Habitat for Heroes is a 78-unit affordable housing development, consisting of 11 single-story, detached units and 67 two-story duplex units on a 9.4 acre-site, generally located at Harrybell Place and Centre Pointe Parkway and in the Urban Residential 3 zone. The project provides housing for low- and very low-income veterans. The project includes passive green spaces and one central community play area with a children’s play area, gazebo and community green space. The development consists of an overall density of 8.29 units per acre and achieves 76 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of Habitat for Heroes was completed in 2018. The site was previously undeveloped. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size and existing use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2836-014-056, 2859-001-046, and 2859-004-023.



Existing: Looking Northeast



Existing: Looking Northwest

Villa Metro

The Villa Metro development consists of 315 detached residential condominium units, 22 live/work units, and 8,000 square feet of commercial, located on a 30-acre site at the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Prima Way, within the Urban Residential 5 and Neighborhood Commercial zones. The development includes 16 units that are deed-restricted to moderate income households, consists of a density of 11.23 units per acre, and achieves 62 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of Villa Metro was completed in 2015. The site was previously undeveloped. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2836-013-135 and 2836-013-919.



Existing: Looking Northeast



Existing: Looking West

Kansas Street Apartments

The Kansas Street apartments consist of 10 residential units located on a 0.56-acre site at 24514 Kansas Street and within the Urban Residential 4 zone. The development consists of an overall density of 17.85 units per acre and achieves 99 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of the Kansas Street apartments was completed in 2015. The site was previously used as a single-family residence. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, development standards, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2830-016-020, 2839-020-004, 2839-020-005, 2839-020-006, 2839-020-007 and 2839-020-008 (APNs ending in -004, -005, -006, and -007, and -008 share lot lines).



Existing: Looking East



Existing: Looking Southwest

Walnut Street Residential

The Walnut Street residential development consists of 11 detached condominium units located on a 1.1-acre site at 22750-22779 Walnut Park Lane and within the Urban Residential 3 zone. The development consists of an overall density of 10 units per acre and achieves 91 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. Construction of the Walnut Street residential development was completed in 2017. The site was previously used as a single-family residence. The pre-development status of this site had similar existing use, surrounding use and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2839-020-001, 2839-020-002, 2839-020-003 (APNs ending in -001, -002, and -003 share lot lines).



Existing: Looking Northeast



Existing: Looking Southwest

3.7.2 Development Under Construction

Plum/Whites Canyon Apartments

The Plum/Whites Canyon Apartments consist of 228 residential units located on an 8.68-acre site along Whites Canyon Road, at Maybrook Lane and within the Urban Residential 4 zone. The development would include 34 deed-restricted units affordable to lower- and moderate- income households. The development was approved in conjunction with Sierra and Victoria at Plum Canyon, would consist of an overall combined density of 12.07 units per acre, and would achieve 67 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The **projecurrently** under construction. The site was previously undeveloped. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, surrounding use, and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2833-014-043, 2859-001-046 and 2859-004-023.



Existing: Looking Northeast



Existing: Looking East

Sierra and Victoria at Plum Canyon

The Sierra and Victoria at Plum Canyon development consists of 183 detached condominium units located on a 25.38-acre site at the southeast corner of Skyline Ranch Road and Whites Canyon Road, within the Urban Residential 4 zone. The development was approved in conjunction with the Plum/Whites Canyon Apartments, would consist of an overall combined density of 12.07 units per acre, and would achieve 67 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The project is currently under construction. The site was previously undeveloped. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, surrounding use, and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2836-014-067 and 2836-014-056.



Valley Street Residential

The Valley Street Residential development consists of 5 residential units located on a 0.49-acre site at 24753 Valley Street and within the Urban Residential 3 zone. The development would consist of an overall density of 10.2 units per acre and would achieve 93 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The project is currently under construction. The site was previously used as a single-family residence. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, surrounding use, and development standards to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2839-019-026, 2839-019-027, 2839-019-013, 2839-019-014, and 2839-019-018 (APNs ending in -026, -027, -013, -014, and -018 share lot lines).



Existing: Looking West



Existing: Looking West

3.7.3 Approved/Entitled Development


MetroWalk

The MetroWalk Specific Plan and residential development project established a Specific Plan for a 498-unit multifamily residential project on 20.4-acre site, located at the southeast corner of Lost Canyon and Harriman Drive. The site is also located adjacent to the future Vista Canyon Metrolink rail line station and bus transfer station, within the Specific Plan zone. The development would include 49 deed-restricted units affordable to lower income households, would consist of an overall density of 24.5 units per acre, and would achieve 100 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site was previously undeveloped. Project entitlements included a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change (GPA/ZC), a Tentative Tract Map (TTM), a Development Review, and an Architectural Design Review. A Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA) was prepared for the Project. Prior to formal submittal, the applicant was encouraged to incorporate project components in benefit of the community in consideration of the entitlement request for a GPA/ZC and TTM. The project was approved in March 2021. The developer, prospective home builders, and the City have met to discuss next steps and a final map application is anticipated this year. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2844-023-808, 2844-022-806, 2844-023-006, 2844-042-002 and 2844-022-014 (these parcels have potential to be consolidated).



Golden Triangle Residential


Golden Triangle Residential is a development consisting of 164 multifamily residential units, located on a 9.9-acre site at 20600 Golden Triangle Road, within Community Commercial zone. The development would consist of an overall density of 16.5 units per acre and would achieve 92 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site is partially developed with a parking lot and auto parts store. The project was approved in March 2021 and a final tract map is currently under review by the City. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2827-005-037, 2844-001-068, and 2811-002-069.



River Walk

Riverwalk is a development consisting of 136 multifamily residential units and 10,000 square feet of commercial space, located on a 5.4-acre site at 18300 Soledad Canyon Road, within the Soledad Corridor Plan – Urban Center zone. The development would consist of an overall density of 25.2 units per acre and would achieve 84 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site was previously developed with 23 mobile home units, which have since been removed. The project was approved in



May 2020. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size and existing use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2833-015-005 and 2833-015-031.



3.7.4 Pending Development

Salazar 11th Street Mixed Use

The Salazar 11th Street Mixed Use project is a development proposal currently pending entitlement review. The project consists of 13 residential units, including one deed-restricted unit affordable to very low-income households, and 2,200 square feet of ground-floor commercial, located on a 0.21-acre site at 24605 Railroad Avenue, within the Corridor zone of the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan. The development would consist of an overall density of 61.9 units per acre and would achieve 100 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site was previously developed with an auto repair establishment, which has since been removed. The project is anticipated to be scheduled for a public hearing in 2022. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2803-032-034, 2827-004-026 and 2827-004-009.

| | |
|---|--|
|  |  |
| <p>Existing: Looking West</p> | <p>Rendering</p> |

Salazar 14th Street Mixed Use

The Salazar 14th Street Mixed Use project is a development proposal currently pending entitlement review. The project consists of 36 residential units, including 2 deed-restricted units affordable to very low-income households, and 5,800 square feet of ground-floor commercial, located on a 0.59-acre site at 24747 Railroad Avenue, within the Corridor zone of the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan. The development would consist of an overall density of 61 units per acre and would achieve 100 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site is currently developed with commercial and office uses. The project is anticipated to be scheduled for a public hearing in 2022. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2803-032-043, 2803-032-042, and 2827-004-008.

| | |
|---|--|
|  |  |
| <p>Existing: Looking West</p> | <p>Rendering</p> |


Bouquet Canyon IHOP Mixed

The Bouquet Canyon IHOP Mixed Use project is a development proposal currently pending entitlement review. The project consists of 30 residential units and 7,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial, located on a 1.2-acre site at 26135 Bouquet Canyon Road, within the Mixed-Use Corridor zone. The development would consist of an overall density of 25 units per acre and achieves 83 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The site is currently developed with a restaurant and a parking lot. The project is anticipated to be scheduled for a public hearing in 2022. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2803-032-026 and 2827-005-046.



Creekside Commons (Flying Tiger)

The Creekside Commons project is currently pending entitlement review. The project consists of 128 residential units on a vacant, 3.96-acre site located on the north side of Flying Tiger Drive within the Community Commercial zone. The project request includes an 80 percent density bonus and would achieve 180 percent of the maximum density allowed in that zone. The project would set aside 100 percent of the residential units for lower income households. Concessions and waivers are requested and seeking to reduce the required parking and relief from the building height allowance, and to reduce the amount of private outdoor and common area recreational facilities. The project would consist of an overall density of 32.3 units per acre. The project is anticipated to be scheduled for a public hearing in early 2023. The pre-development status of this site had similar parcel size, existing use, and surrounding use to the following suitable sites identified in Appendix D: APNs 2836-009-076 and 2859-004-023.



3.7.5 Affordable Housing Development Trends

Although Santa Clarita has an established redevelopment trend of underutilized non-vacant uses to high density residential, the majority of these residential units have developed at market rate. The following list includes residential projects that would be developed with deed restricted affordable housing:

- MetroWalk Specific Plan: 49 low-income units
- Family Promise Supportive Transitional Housing: four low-income units
- Sala^{zar} 11th Street Mixed Use: one very low-income unit
- Sala^{zar} 14th Street Mixed Use: two very low-income units
- Flying Tiger Drive: 102 low income- and 26 very low-income units

In order to supplement Santa Clarita’s lack of affordable housing development and to facilitate the construction of future affordable housing projects, the City will implement the following programs as part of the Housing Strategy (see Section 2.2):

- Program HP-1.3: Utility Providers Responsibility to Prioritize Service
- [Program HP-1.4: Affordable Housing Density Bonus](#)
- [Program HP-1.5: Mixed Use Overlay Zone](#)
- [Program HP-1.6: Graduated Density Zoning and Site Consolidation—Old Town Newhall](#)
- [Program HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study Program](#)
- [Program HP-1.9: Minimum Residential Densities](#)
- [Program HP-1.12: First Time Homebuyer Programs and Developers](#)
- [Program HP-1.14: Sites Identified in Multiple Planning Periods](#)
- [Program HP-2.2: Updates to Administrative Procedures](#)
- [Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers](#)
- [Program HP-2.6: Provide for Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units](#)

3.8 PROGRAMS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE SITES (NO NET LOSS)

In order to ensure the sites listed in inventory continue to be available for development, especially for lower income housing, programs have been included to maintain an adequate Sites Inventory, throughout the 8-year planning period. The programs are included in their entirety in **Section 2** and summarized here:

- **No Net Loss of Residential Capacity to Accommodate RHNA (Program HP-1.1):** Staff will develop and implement a project-by-project administrative evaluation procedure to track units built and remaining site capacity to accommodate the City’s remaining RHNA.
- **No Reduction of Density without Replacement Sites (Program HP-1.2):** No action shall be undertaken that reduces the density or development capacity of a site unless sufficient remaining sites are available in inventory to accommodate the City’s remaining RHNA.
- **Administrative List of Additional Sites (Program HP-1.13):** City will maintain a list of additional sites with appropriate zoning that could be added to the City’s Sites Inventory if and when sufficient sites may not exist to accommodate the City’s remaining RHNA.
- **Publish Useful Information about Housing Sites (Program HP-1.9):** City will publish a summary of available sites for housing to interested housing developers.

3.9 INFRASTRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS

This subsection provides information about the availability of infrastructure to serve new housing and addresses any infrastructure limitations within the City that may affect the development of housing during the planning period. As required, this section includes information on the availability of water, sewer, and dry utilities. This Housing Element and Sites Inventory does not require or include any rezoning or land use changes that may increase infrastructure demands past the level already analyzed under CEQA. All sites listed in the inventory that are appropriate for lower income residential development have available infrastructure.

3.9.1 Water

The City of Santa Clarita is served by the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water). SCV Water is made up of three interconnected water distribution systems: Newhall Water Division (NWD), Santa Clarita Water Division (SCWD) and Valencia Water Division (VWD). SCV Water plans for long-term availability of water resources through an Urban Water Management Plan, Water Shortage Contingency Plan, and a Water Use Efficiency Strategic Plan. As new housing is developed in the City, upgrades to water facilities may be required. This determination would be made as part of the standard City development review process, and upgrades or new connections would require additional development review. Overall, SCV Water’s water resources, safeguards, and water resource planning efforts are projected to be

sufficient to provide water supply to the projected new housing development throughout the planning period.

3.9.2 Sewer

Wastewater treatment in the City of Santa Clarita is currently provided by the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant (Valencia WRP) and Saugus Water Reclamation Plant (Saugus WRP), operated by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles (SCVSD). Wastewater is addressed in the Recycled Water Master Plan and Urban Water Master Plan, which identified increased demand due to population growth. Two new facilities, the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant (Newhall WRP) and the Vista Canyon Ranch Water Factory (Vista Canyon RWF), have been planned to meet increased demand. Existing and planned wastewater infrastructure is projected to be sufficient to provide sewage infrastructure to new housing development.

3.9.3 Other Utilities

In addition to water and sewer, the Sites Inventory must discuss the availability of dry utilities. Dry utilities include electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication infrastructure. In the City of Santa Clarita, electricity is provided by SoCal Edison, natural gas is provided by SoCalGas, and telecommunications are provided by AT&T, Viasat, Spectrum, or other providers. These utilities are available in the project area and can accommodate the RHNA, including the buffer.

3.10 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The analysis of sites must include a general description of known environmental features with the potential to impact the development viability of the identified sites. Some areas within the City are environmentally sensitive or hazard prone. Provisions within the Building Code and Unified Development Code consider these conditions in establishing standards for development, and these standards were considered in the identification of suitable sites. Further discussion on environmental constraints to residential development is located in **Section 4**.

3.10.1 Sensitive Habitats and Species

The planning area contains a wide range of vegetation, wildlife, and habitats, including several of specific environmental concern. As the sites listed in inventory are focused on infill sites near previously developed sites and on underutilized sites that have been previously developed and disturbed, the presence of sensitive habitats and species within the City does not affect the development viability of these sites.

3.10.2 Seismic

There are several active and potentially active earthquake faults and fault zones within the City of Santa Clarita, and the City contains Alquist-Priolo Fault Special Studies zones. Additionally, some sites are at increased risk for other seismic

hazards, including liquefaction and seismically induced landslides. Only sites 19 and 23 are within Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones. These sites are identified to have capacity for both lower- and moderate- income units. Standards for development in these areas are found within the City’s Building Code, Unified Development Code, and seismic design standards. The sites identified in this inventory were selected considering these development standards and conditions, and the conditions do not affect development viability.

3.10.3 Flooding

There are several flood hazard areas and dam inundation zones within the City of Santa Clarita, primarily found along the Santa Clara River and its tributary streams. Sections of development in the City are served by levees, reducing their flood risk.

Additionally, Santa Clarita has taken measures to mitigate both urban flooding risk from stormwater and floodplain flood hazards, through implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program, the City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance, and portions of the Unified Development Code. Flood risk is mitigated both through emergency preparedness planning and through hazard mitigation efforts, including development standards. Portions of Sites 6, 9, and 14 are within the flood hazard area surrounding Newhall Creek, Site 17 is within the flood hazard area surrounding the South Fork Santa Clara River, and Site 27 is partially within the flood hazard area along Sierra Highway. Of these, only Sites 6 and 9 are identified to have capacity for lower-income residential development, and they are only partially within the hazard area. The sites identified in this inventory were selected considering these development standards and conditions, and the conditions do not affect development viability.

3.10.4 Fire Hazards

The City of Santa Clarita is located in a fire-prone region and large areas of the City are designated as fire hazard severity zones. Development in these areas is subject to various codes, guidelines, and programs to reduce risk from wildfire, including County fuel modification requirements and standards in the Building Code, Fire Code, and Unified Development Code. These standards meet the State standards for development within fire hazard severity zones and minimize risk for new developments within this area. In order to promote public health and safety, the inventory of sites minimized land within hazardous areas where feasible. Some sites within fire hazard severity zones were identified as suitable land for residential development (see Figure 16 and Figure 17), and development in these areas will be subject to development standards mentioned above. These standards may increase development costs overall but are not expected to impact the viability of residential development. There are a total of 2,817 lower-income units and 2,035 moderate-income units in inventory located within fire hazard areas. Of these 4,852 units, 68% of them are located on vacant sites. These sites are shown below in Figure 16 and Figure 17.

Program HP-4.9 (See **Section 2**) includes provisions to prioritize development outside of fire hazard severity zones as criteria for distributing funds and incentives for residential development.

Figure 16: Sites to Accommodate Lower-Income RHNA and Fire Hazard Severity Zones






Figure 17: Sites to Accommodate Moderate-Income RHNA and Fire Hazard Severity Zones



3.11 FAIR HOUSING CONSIDERATIONS

The Housing Element must demonstrate that there are adequate sites zoned for the development of housing sufficient to accommodate the number of new housing units needed at each income level, as identified in the RHNA. In the context of AFFH, the site identification requirement involves not only an analysis of site capacity to accommodate the RHNA, but also must analyze whether the identified sites serve the purpose of replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity.

3.11.1 Opportunity Areas

HCD and TCAC have created opportunity maps to identify areas throughout the state whose characteristics support positive economic (low poverty, high employment, high median household income), educational (reading and math proficiency, high school graduation rates, low student poverty rates), and environmental outcomes (low exposure to pollution) for low-income families, particularly long-term outcomes for

children. The HCD/TCAC Opportunity Areas Map ranks Census tracts in Highest Resource to Low Resource based on these outcomes. A Census tract with a designation of High Resource would indicate that the Census tract has strong educational and economic opportunities for current and future residents.

The City limits partially or fully encompasses 56 Census tracts, which are categorized by the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map as a mix of moderate to highest resources areas. No Census tracts were identified as Low Resource in the City. This categorization of the 56 Census tracts in the City of Santa Clarita indicates that, across most of the City, residents have high to highest access to positive economic, educational, and environmental outcomes, with exception to the areas of Newhall and Canyon Country which have moderate access. The 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map maps influenced the locations of potential lower income sites in the City.

The Sites Inventory utilizes both vacant and underutilized or underdeveloped non-vacant sites distributed throughout the City. Of the nineteen housing sites identified to meet the lower-income RHNA, eleven are in high or highest resource areas. The majority of the unit capacity for lower-income sites are located on high or higher resource areas. Figure 18 and Figure 19 show the distribution of lower- and moderate- income sites in relation to the TCAC Opportunity Areas.

Figure 18: Sites to Accommodate Lower-Income RHNA and TCAC Opportunity Areas





Figure 19: Sites to Accommodate Moderate-Income RHNA and TCAC Opportunity Areas



3.11.2 Fair Housing Assessment and Distribution of Sites

The following analysis addresses the location and capacity of identified housing site in relationship to all the components of the assessment of fair housing. Table 16 below contains detailed information about the number of sites and units by all income groups in relationship to AFFH indicators, to complement the narrative analysis.

Integration and Segregation

Census tracts with the highest concentration of minority races and low-to-moderate households (LMI) populations are located in the Newhall area and some portions of Canyon Country. There are several housing sites identified in each of these areas for lower- and moderate- income housing. These sites are primarily vacant sites and are within census tracts are categorized as moderate resource areas. While there are some areas with slight concentrations of people with disabilities, identified housing sites are generally outside of these areas. Some sites are located in areas with higher concentrations of female-headed households and include lower-income and moderate-income sites. Generally, sites are spread around the City on vacant and non-vacant sites and are not concentrated in segregated areas.

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

While Santa Clarita has no racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (per HUD’s definition), some tracts with a high concentration of minorities and LMI populations were found in the areas of Canyon Country and Newhall. Areas in Valencia, Saugus, Central Santa Clarita, and the Fair Oaks Ranch Community of Canyon Country have large proportions of white populations and the highest ranges in median income in the City and can be considered a concentrated area of affluence. Sites are spread around the City and lower- and moderate- income sites are located in both areas with higher concentrations of minorities and LMI populations as well as within concentrated areas of affluence, promoting integration and balanced living patterns.

Access to Opportunity

The City limit partially or fully encompasses 56 Census tracts. The majority of these census tracts are categorized as high to highest resource while tracts in Newhall portions of Canyon Country are categorized as moderate resource areas (See Figure 18 and Figure 19 above). Housing units in the sites inventory are not disproportionately concentrated in different resource areas, and there are no low resource areas within the City. Access to opportunity is generally higher within the City than in the surrounding region. Student performance the school districts serving housing sites above that of the County and State. Lower-income housing sites are focused in areas with a higher job proximity index, and ongoing development projects will bring more employment to other areas of the City. Most housing sites are located along bus lines and will improve access to transportation. While the City’s environmental conditions are better than those in the region, areas in Newhall and Canyon Country have higher rates of exposure to environmental contaminants. There are several sites located in these areas for lower- and moderate-income housing. Place-based programs are included to address these environmental health hazards.

Disproportionate Housing Needs

The fair housing assessment found a need for more affordable housing in the Newhall and Canyon Country areas, based on rates of cost burden, overcrowding, displacement vulnerability, and housing prices. The City incentivizes the development of extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing while including programs to prevent displacement (Programs HP-1.6, HP-2.7, and HP-2.10,). The Sites Inventory includes sites within these areas that can assist in addressing these needs.

Table 16: Housing Site Capacity and AFFH Indicators

| Census Tract Number | Number of Existing Households | Sites Inventory Capacity | | | AFFH Indicators | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | Lower-Income | Moderate-Income | Above Moderate-Income | Percent Non-white | TCAC Opportunity Area | Percent Overpayment by Renters | Percent Overcrowded Households | Displacement Sensitivity | CalEnviro-Screen Pollution Burden Percentile |
| 920031 | 2,545 | 925 | 958 | 0 | 21 – 40% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 50 |
| 920035 | 2,123 | 123 | 20 | 0 | 41 -60% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | 8.3 – 12% | Other | 34 |
| 920037 | 2,299 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 41 -60% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | Greater than 20% | Vulnerable | 31 |
| 920038 | 1,570 | 514 | 52 | 0 | 41 -60% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | Less than 8.2% | Vulnerable | 44 |
| 920042 | 2,914 | 323 | 0 | 0 | 21 – 40% | High Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 47 |
| 920107 | 872 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 41 -60% | Highest Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 84 |
| 920115 | 1,189 | 1,247 | 58 | 0 | 21 – 40% | Highest Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 81 |
| 920312 | 1,677 | 715 | 5 | 0 | Less than 20% | High Resource | 60 – 80% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 63 |
| 920313 | 1,281 | 337 | 0 | 0 | Less than 20% | High Resource | 20 – 40% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 92 |
| 920314 | 933 | 225 | 787 | 0 | Less than 20% | High Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 77 |
| 920328 | 787 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 21 – 40% | Highest Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 78 |
| 920329 | 2,211 | 446 | 0 | 1,359 | 21 – 40% | Highest Resource | 40 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 76 |
| 920331 | 1,518 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 21 – 40% | Highest Resource | 41 – 60% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 21 |
| 920337 | 1,942 | 338 | 117 | 0 | 41 -60% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | Greater than 20% | Vulnerable | 33 |
| 930200 | 201 | 552 | 0 | 0 | 21 – 40% | Moderate Resource | 60 – 80% | Less than 8.2% | Other | 65 |
| Total | | 6,058 | 2,349 | 1,359 | | | | | | |

Source: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC)/California Housing and Community Development (HCD), Opportunity Maps (2020); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019).

3.11.3 Improved and Exacerbated Conditions

Improved Conditions

The Sites Inventory improves conditions by promoting integration and balanced distributions of residential development, and by increasing the availability of lower- and moderate-income housing where it is needed. Several of the sites have been identified to have capacity for multiple income categories, and the only site identified to include capacity for Above Moderate-income units also includes lower-income sites. In addition, sites for all income levels are scattered throughout the City. There is no significant concentration of one income category in any one area included in the inventory.

Exacerbated Conditions

Newhall and Canyon Country have census tracts with concentrated minorities, cost burdened households, and lower access to opportunities. The Sites Inventory includes some sites within these areas, primarily on vacant land. To ensure these sites do not exacerbate current conditions, these sites are accompanied by place-based strategies within policies and programs to improve conditions in these areas. Environmental conditions will be mitigated through the Handyworker Program and Proactive Community Preservation Program, which include place-based strategies for areas of highest need. The Old Town Newhall Specific Plan includes a revitalization strategy, implemented through physical and policy initiatives, that aim to transform the area to better meet the needs of the community while reducing the risk of displacement. The Specific Plan is guided by design principles for transit-oriented development and will create a more diverse set of housing choices. Likewise, recent investment in Canyon Country has brought new development to the community including the opening of the Canyon Country Community Center which offers multi-generational services, programs, activities to the community.

Section IV: Technical Background Report

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The Technical Background Report (TBR) of the 2021 Santa Clarita Housing Element includes statutorily required data, information on local resources and programs, and an analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints to the provision of housing. As part of the new AB 686 requirements to affirmatively further fair housing, the TBR contains an analysis of the socioeconomic make-up of the City and its neighborhoods. **Section 1** of the Housing Element includes a brief history of Santa Clarita’s history of annexation, a summary of fair housing issues, demographic information, and further analysis where new policies or programs are needed to overcome socioeconomic segregation and to respond to changing demographics and housing needs.

This Technical Background Report includes pre-certified data on housing data needs and conditions compiled by SCAG, as well as locally acquired information and data including an analysis of fair housing, special needs, local knowledge of the housing stock, local housing resources, and an analysis of housing constraints.

4.2 LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS DATA

Demographic data and information related to housing needs and the current housing stock in Santa Clarita are summarized in **Section 1** of the Housing Element and included here with more thorough information and analysis.

4.2.1 Pre-Certified SCAG Dataset

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has compiled a housing needs data package for each jurisdiction. These housing data packages have been pre-certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to meet statutory requirements for the quantification of existing and projected housing needs including:

- Identification of population and employment trends;
- Household characteristics (i.e., existing households by tenure, existing extremely low-income households, total, lower, and extremely low-income households overpaying, overcrowded households);
- Special needs (i.e., number of persons with disabilities, number of persons with developmental disabilities, elderly households by tenure, large households by tenure and female headed households); and
- Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) by income group, including extremely low-income households.

The Santa Clarita 2020 Pre-Certified Local Housing Data Packet includes the requisite data on population and employment trends, household characteristics, and special

housing needs in the jurisdiction. The packet also includes some analysis of the data; further analysis is provided herein and throughout the Housing Element (*Source: Housing Needs Data Certification Letter from HCD*).

The SCAG Housing Needs Dataset is included in Appendix A of this section in its entire original form.

4.2.2 Farmworker Housing Needs

Statewide, farmworker housing is of unique concern and importance. While only a small number of SCAG jurisdictions have farmworkers living in them, they are essential to the region’s economy and its food supply. According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), more than 80 percent of hired crop farmworkers are not migrant workers but are considered settled and work farm(s) within 75 miles of their residences. This share is up significantly from 41 percent in 1996-1998, reflecting a fundamental change in the nature of the crop farming workforce.

The 2015-2019 ACS identified 190 Santa Clarita residents employed in the agricultural industry, representing 0.26% of the Santa Clarita workforce and 0.004% of its residents, and 0.004% of the region’s farmworkers. According to the USDA, the average age of the agricultural workforce has risen significantly in the last few years and now stands at 41.6 years. A growing percentage (26.1%) are women. While the median farm size in Los Angeles County is only four acres, there are 25 “large” farms of 500 acres or more that rely on farmworkers (2017 County summary highlights, USDA). Most of the large farms in Los Angeles County are located in or near the Palmdale-Lancaster area, and not near Santa Clarita. (California Important Farmland: 2016, CA DOC. Lands identified here are indicated as being used for agriculture in the last four years in the Farmlands Mapping and Monitoring Program.)

Most farmworkers in California reside in metropolitan areas, where the average hourly wage of \$16.05 puts them in the extremely low- to very low-income category (between 30-50 percent of the area median income).

4.3 LOCAL HOUSING PROGRAMS & RESOURCES

4.3.1 Resources: Housing Assistance Programs

The following programs include Federal-, State-, and locally run programs providing funding for construction, rehabilitation, or rental assistance for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. This section describes programs that may be locally available and potentially applicable within the City.

Housing Assistance Programs for Homeowners, Renters

- **Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV Program)** is the federal government’s major program for assisting very low-income families, the elderly, and the disabled to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market. Participants may choose any housing that meets the

requirements of the program. The Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) pays a housing subsidy directly to the landlord, and the participant pays the difference between the actual rent charged and the amount subsidized by the program. (*Source: LACDA*) The availability of this program depends on LACDA funding, efforts, and priorities. This program is not utilized frequently in the City, as discussed further in Section 4.5.2.

- **Home Investment Partnerships (HOME)** are grants provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to fund a wide variety of projects that implement local housing strategies and create affordable housing for low-income households including building, buying, rehabilitating affordable housing, or providing direct rental assistance (*Source: HUD*).
- **California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)** Established in 1975, CalHFA was chartered as the state's affordable housing lender. The agency's Multifamily Division finances affordable rental housing through partnerships with jurisdictions, developers and more, while its Single-Family Division provides first mortgage loans and down payment assistance to low- and moderate- income first-time homebuyers.
- **Home Ownership Program (HOP)** which is administered by LACDC (LA Community Development Corporation) and financed with HOME funds provided through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Designed to meet the needs of low-income families, HOP provides loans of up to 20% of the purchase price for down payment and closing costs assistance not to exceed \$85,000. Each loan is a second Trust Deed loan provided at 0% interest with all payments deferred until sale, transfer, refinancing, no longer owner-occupied, or full repayment of the first mortgage. HOP loans are available to first-time homebuyers in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and cities, such as Santa Clarita, participating in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Urban County Program.
- **Mortgage Credit Certification (MCC) Program** offers first-time homebuyers a federal income tax credit. This credit reduces the amount of federal taxes the holder of the certificate would pay. It can also help first-time homebuyers qualify for a loan by allowing a lender to reduce the housing expense ratio by the amount of tax savings. The qualified homebuyer who is awarded an MCC may take an annual credit against their federal income taxes paid on the homebuyer's mortgage.

Programs for Residential Rehabilitation and Proactive Community Preservation

- **Preservation Assistance** is available through City implementation of "Preservation of At-Risk Housing" (HP-3.5) where the City monitors at-risk housing units and investigates and pursues funding options for continuation of affordability agreements. Through this program, the City was able to achieve the preservation of 76 affordable units during the previous Housing Element planning period.

- **The Handyworker Program** (HP-3.2) is managed by the Santa Clarita Valley Committee on Aging and helps low- and moderate- income residents obtain grants to pay for necessary repairs to their homes. The program is funded by Community Development Block Grants.
- **Property Rehabilitation** is available through the City’s “Property Rehabilitation Program” (HP-3.3). The City provides grants to low- and moderate-income homeowners for repairs to the grounds surrounding their homes, such as driveway repair, tree-trimming, and brush clearance, up to \$1,500.
- **Section 203(k) Rehab Mortgage Insurance**, a HUD program, facilitates the rehabilitation and repair of single-family residential properties by insuring a home loan for the purchase or refinance of property that needs significant repairs. It can also be used for a variety of other improvements, including conversion of properties up to a four-unit structure, enhance accessibility for a disabled person, or elimination of health and safety hazards.
- **The Proactive Community Preservation** (HP-4.10) utilizes staff from City departments including Community Preservation, Planning, and Public Works to facilitate partnerships between affected neighborhoods and local law enforcement, fire, emergency services, and local contractors to achieve code compliance. Additionally, City staff conduct meetings to present information to the public code enforcement, graffiti, and various other quality of life issues.

Programs for Housing Development

- **California Self-Help Housing Program (CSHHP)** is a California Department of Community Development program that provides technical assistance and funding for the training and supervision of low- and moderate-income self-help homebuilders. Funding is provided through sponsor organizations, either local government agencies or non-profit corporations.
- **Section 202 funding** provided by HUD finances construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of structures for supportive housing for very low-income elderly persons through interest-free capital advances and rental assistance funds. This funding is only available to private non-profit organizations and consumer cooperatives and is highly competitive.
- **Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program** provides State and Local LIHTC- allocating agencies the equivalent of approximately \$8 billion in annual budget authority to issue tax credits based on population for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of rental housing targeted to lower-income households.
- **California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC)** allocates federal and state tax credits to the developers of projects based on priorities they set each year. Interested developers may apply for a 9% tax credit (which is often competitive) or a 4% tax credit. The developers who have been awarded the credits sell the credits to investors. This creates cash equity which provides a significant portion of the funds that developers need to build

affordable housing. Buildings eligible for the LIHTC must either have 20% of units rent-restricted and occupied by tenants with incomes no higher than 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) or 40% of units rent restricted and occupied by tenants with incomes no higher than 60% of AMI.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) designates Qualified Census Tracts (QCTs) and Difficult Development Areas (DDAs) that have increased eligibility. QCTs must have 50 percent of households with incomes below 60 percent of the area median income (AMI) or have a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. There are two QCTs in Santa Clarita, one of which was added in 2021.

DDAs are areas with high land, construction, and utility costs relative to the area median income. All of Santa Clarita is in a DDA. Santa Clarita is partially within a 'Highest Resource' designation which provides an eligibility bonus when applying for these credits; however, even with the tax credit, affordable housing projects in a high-cost area can be difficult to fund because of the high cost of land. The ability to apply for this program depends on the level of interest from developers, developable sites, constraints imposed by development standards, and the level of competition in the region for LIHTC funding. *(Sources: California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, National Housing Law Project, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development)*

- **Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program** is managed by HUD and provides funding through interest-free capital advances, operating subsidies, and/or project rental assistance for eligible projects developing affordable housing for persons with disabilities. This program is highly competitive and requires a non-profit housing sponsor.
- **Affordable Housing Program (AHP)** is administered by the Federal Housing Finance Agency. AHP funds are granted to financial institutions on behalf of a housing sponsor and may be used to finance the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing for low- or moderate-income households and the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of rental housing where at least 20 percent of the units are affordable for and occupied by very low-income households. Local development costs may deter local developers from applying for this program.

4.3.2 Resources: Homeless Population

Individuals are considered homeless when they lack fixed and regular nighttime residences. Homeless individuals may be unsheltered, including those living in tents, cars, makeshift shelters, or on the street, or sheltered, including those in emergency shelters or transitional shelters. According to the most recent 2020 count, there are 168 people experiencing homelessness in Santa Clarita, representing a 35 percent decline from the previous year. It is important to note that the count does not include unsheltered unaccompanied minors or youth, persons in domestic violence shelters, or persons receiving motel vouchers. Additionally, gathering accurate data remains a challenge and it is likely that the numbers are higher. *(Source: Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2020).*

The Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness is made up of members from more than 30 local organizations. The Task Force meets monthly and works to complete action items identified in the Community Plan to Address Homelessness developed in 2018 in partnership with Los Angeles County. In a 2019 survey conducted by the Task Force, 148 students in the Newhall District reported experiencing homelessness and service providers had reported uptick in persons seeking resources. To address the challenges involved with gathering accurate data on persons experiencing homelessness, the Task Force has prioritized the development of a homeless person's registry to allow for easy identification, and evaluation of services homeless individuals need and have accessed. These metrics will help the City better understand the effectiveness of services offered to the homeless community.

4.3.3 Resources: Homeless Shelters

Homeless shelters provide temporary shelter for the homeless population. Bridge to Home, the primary homeless services provider in the City, has recently transitioned their emergency winter shelter into a year-round 24/7 operation with expanded services to those in need. Located at 23850 Pine Street, the shelter can accommodate up to 60 people at any given time. Additionally, the City has approved Bridge to Home's proposal to construct an approximately 18,680 square-foot, two-story, permanent housing facility located at 23031 Drayton Street. The site will accommodate up to 92 individuals, including 60 dormitory-style beds, and four attached single-family apartment units, and contain ancillary services for its occupants. The property where the permanent homeless shelter will be located was donated by the City to Bridge to Home.

4.3.4 Resources: Transitional Housing

Transitional housing provides temporary lodging and is designed to move individuals and families into permanent housing within a specified period of time, generally no longer than 24 months. The Unified Development Code allows transitional housing as a permitted use in all Non-Urban (NU) and Urban Residential (UR) zones and is conditionally permitted in Community Commercial (CC) and Regional Commercial (CR) zones. The City of Santa Clarita has one transitional housing community, Family Promise of Santa Clarita Valley (Family Promise), which offers housing to eligible families in their Transition House for 30-90 days while they find employment and/or housing. Additionally, Family Promise provides lodging services by housing families in motels. Family Promise does not receive motel vouchers. In 2021, the City approved Family Promise's proposal to construct and operate a 6,419 square-foot supportive and transitional housing facility at 23652 Newhall Avenue. The facility will include five residential units and four office units to provide temporary living arrangements and transitional housing services. The property where the transitional housing facility will be located was donated by the City to Family Promise.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City participated in the federally funded Project Roomkey Program. The purpose of Project Roomkey was to provide non-congregate shelter options for people experiencing homelessness, to protect human life, and to minimize strain on health care system capacity. A local hotel offered 50 rooms for occupancy under the program. The short-term program expired in late 2020.

4.3.5 Resources: Supportive Housing

Supportive housing is defined as “housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to onsite or offsite service that assists 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” (Gov Code, § 65582 (g)).

- **Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority** provides Safe Haven housing as temporary supportive housing for hard-to-reach homeless persons with severe mental illness that have been unwilling or unable to participate in supportive services, as well as Permanent Supportive Housing to assist homeless individuals with a disability or families in which one adult or child has a disability to live independently.
- **Sober Living Environments** are facilities that provide safe housing and supportive, structured living conditions for people in sobriety programs. Sober living homes serve as transitional environments between such programs and mainstream society. The City of Santa Clarita has at least two known two Sober Living Environments, including Ark-1 LA, located on Fourl Road and The Action SCV Sober Living Ranch, located on Soledad Canyon Road.

4.3.6 At-Risk Assisted Housing Developments

In compliance with Government Code Section 65583(a)(9), this section summarizes the inventory of assisted rental housing developments. Table 17 below shows a total of 89 low-income units that are at risk of converting to market rate within the Housing Element planning period.

SCAG data found in Appendix A is supplemented by locally available knowledge and both are included in the table to give the most accurate data possible.

Table 17: Assisted Rental Housing Developments

| Project Name | Address | Tenant Type | # Low-income Units | Funding Program | Earliest Conversion Date |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| High Risk of Conversion to Market Rate within 5-10 Years | | | | | |
| Hideaway Apartments | 27077 Hideaway Avenue | Elderly Units | 14 | LA County FHA Loan | 2024 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Valencia Villas | | Elderly Units | 75 | | 2024 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------|
| | 24857 Singing Hills Drive | Non-Elderly Units | X | Project Based Rental Assistance | |
| High Risk of Conversion Total | | Elderly Units | 89 | | |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 0 | | |
| Moderate Risk of Conversion to Market Rate in 5-10 Years | | | | | |
| Riverpark Apartments | 27303 Sara Street | Elderly Units | X | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2031 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 105 | | |
| Moderate Risk of Conversion Total | | Elderly Units | 0 | | |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 105 | | |
| Low Risk of Conversion | | | | | |
| The Village Apartments | 23700 Valle Del Oro | Elderly Units | X | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2036 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 39 | | |
| Whispering Oaks Apartments | 22816 Market Street | Elderly Units | 78 | LA County Loan | Permanent |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Sand Canyon Ranch | 28856 North Silver Saddle Circle | Elderly Units | X | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2033 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 50 | | |
| Sand Canyon Villas & Townhomes | 28923 Prairie Lane | Elderly Units | X | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2032 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 43 | | |
| Canyon Country Villas | 26741 North Isabella Parkway | Elderly Units | 66 | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2032 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Canyon Country Senior Apartments | 18701 Flying Tiger Driver | Elderly Units | 198 | Tax Credits Bond | 2058 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Three Oaks Apartments | 23610 Newhall Avenue | Elderly Units | X | LIHTC | 2069 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 29 | | |
| Orchard Arms | 23520 Wiley Canyon Road | Elderly Units | 75 | Project Based Rental Assistance | N/A ¹ |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| HumanGood Senior Apartments | 23420 Avenida Rotella | Elderly Units | 64 | HUD Section 202 | 2036 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Bouquet Canyon Senior Apartments | 26705 Bouquet Canyon Road | Elderly Units | 263 | Tax Credits Bond | 2069 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Fountain Glen Apartments | 23941 Decoro Drive | Elderly Units | 8 | Conditions of Approval with City | Permanent |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | X | | |
| Diamond Park Apartments | 27940 Solamint Road | Elderly Units | X | Multi Family Revenue Bond | 2032 |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 50 | | |
| Low Risk of Conversion Total | | Elderly Units | 754 | | |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 211 | | |
| Table Total | | Elderly Units | 843 | 1159 Total Units | |
| | | Non-Elderly Units | 316 | | |
| ¹ Orchard Arms is owned and operated by the County of Los Angeles / Housing Authority of the County of LA. It was built as conventional public housing, and is considered affordable in perpetuity. | | | | | |

Quantified Analysis between Cost of Preservation and Cost of New Construction

In compliance with State housing law requirements, the following analysis covers the 10-year period between 2021 and 2031.

Costs for rehabilitation, acquisition, and tenant-based rental subsidies must be determined in order to analyze costs for preserving at-risk units. Acquisition and rehabilitation costs depend on the building condition, size, location, existing financing, and availability of governmental and market financing. Additionally, rehabilitation costs allow for the preservation of existing units that are in substandard living conditions. Rental subsidies and other financing options depend on the resident’s income, shelter costs, and timeframe of assistance provided. Table 18 below shows the estimated preservation costs for high-risk units that are anticipated to convert to market rate within the housing cycle.

Table 18: Total Preservation Costs for 89 At-Risk Units

| Fee/ cost Type | Cost per Unit | Total Cost At-Risk Units |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Acquisition | \$231,690 | \$20,620,410 |
| Rehabilitation | \$16,299 | \$1,450,611 |
| Rental Subsidies (Annual) | \$10,296 | \$18,326,880 |

Transfer of Ownership

If the current organizations managing the at-risk units are no longer able to maintain the project, transferring ownership of the affordable units to a non-profit housing organization can be a viable way to preserve affordable housing for the long term. The per-unit estimate market value for a multifamily

residence is around \$380,000 (Zillow). The at-risk units are older and will likely cost less than the average market value. Nevertheless, transferring ownership or purchasing replacement units would require significant resources.

Cost for Preservation

Affordable units within Santa Clarita are under public-private agreements with Los Angeles County or the State of California. Acquisition costs in the area are estimated to be around \$231,690 to \$265,010 per unit (*Sources: City of Los Angeles Housing Authority, 2020; Realtor, 2021*). One of the high-risk housing developments mentioned in Table 13 include funding from the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). According to the FHA, the base amount per unit defined as substantial rehabilitation range from \$15,000 (2016) to \$16,299 (2021) (*Source: U.S. Housing and Urban Development, 2021*).

Rental Subsidy

A tenant's actual monthly payment is influenced by multiple factors including deductions from utility allowances, property's physical condition, comparable rents in the surrounding area, and other local housing policies. In Los Angeles County, the average Fair Market Rent (FMR) for a two-bedroom, two-bathroom home is estimated at \$2,058 (*Source: HUD, 2021*). The federal government sets standards for the amount a household should pay for housing at no more than 30% of their gross income for rent or mortgage, including utility costs. For a household making 60% of the area median income, the maximum monthly housing cost should be \$1200. Utilizing the factors mentioned above, public financing sources would cover the remaining costs at approximately 70%, estimating monthly per-unit costs at \$858. The total annual rental subsidy for the 89 at-risk units would be approximately \$916,344. Over a period of twenty years, this would total \$18,326,880.

Cost of Replacement

Estimated replacement costs for affordable housing in the Santa Clarita Valley are \$154,294 per unit or \$174 per sq. ft. of gross building area (Los Angeles County Municipal Code Title 22, Div. 9, Ch. 22.268.020). Replacing all 89 at-risk units would require approximately \$13,732,166 in replacement costs. Given the increase of construction costs, this amount is likely to increase over the planning period.

Comparison of Preservation and Replacement Costs

Based on quantitative costs analyses above, rehabilitation and financing are less costly than new construction or acquisition. Therefore, programs to fund upgrades and rental subsidies are preferable for preserving at-risk units. Partnering with non-profit agencies can aid in the preservation of at-risk units, as described in Table 19 below.

Qualified Organizations for Preservation or Replacement of At-Risk Units

Table 19: Non-Profit Housing Development Organizations

| Organization | Contact name | Address | Phone |
|---|---|--|--------------|
| Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation | Rodney Fernandez | 702 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003 | 805-659-3791 |
| Mercy Housing, Inc. | Mark Trinidad | 1500 South Grand Ave, #100, Los Angeles, CA 90015 | 213-743-5820 |
| National Community Renaissance | Rebecca Clark, Executive Director | 9065 Haven Ave, Suite 1000, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 | 909-483-2444 |
| Presbyterian Homes | Kim Heinzelman, Project Development Assistant | 516 Burchett Street, Glendale, CA 91203 | 818-247-0420 |
| Telacu Homes, Inc. | Tom Provencio | 5400 East Olympic Blvd, #300, Los Angeles, CA 90022 | 323-832-5411 |
| Habitat for Humanity | Donna Deutchman | 21031 Ventura Blvd, Suite 1101, Woodland Hills, CA | 818-981-4900 |

The organizations listed above include entities located in the Southern California area, not specific to Santa Clarita.

Other Qualified Non-Profit Entities

Standard Communities is the affordable housing division of parent company Standard Property Company, Incorporated. The organization is active and successful in developing affordable housing in low-income communities.

Standard Property Company, INC.
 (DBA Standard Communities)
 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite
 395 Los Angeles CA 90067
 (310) 553-5711

Thomas Safran & Associates Development, Incorporated is a real estate development firm that manages and develops affordable rental properties around Southern California.

Thomas Safran & Associates Development, Inc.
 11812 San Vicente Blvd. #600
 Los Angeles CA 90049
 (310) 820-4888

Funding Sources

The City recognizes the improvement, maintenance, and expansion of affordable housing as a high priority. As such, funding is received through various County and State programs such as Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Public Housing Capital and Operating Funds, HOME programs, Housing Choice vouchers,

Section 202 for Elderly, Section 811 for persons with disabilities, and other project-based assistance programs such as Section 8. These funding sources are further discussed in Section 4.3.1, Housing Resources.

In 2019, City contributed \$280,000 in CDBG funds to the Handyworker and Property Rehabilitation Programs to assist low-income single-family homeowners. Although these units are not made affordable, and therefore do not meet preservation objectives, the program is an important aspect to protecting existing housing stock and continues to be successful in providing safe and decent living conditions (Goal H.3).

4.3.7 Planning and Zoning Programs

Density Bonus and Other Programs

The Density Bonus Law requires a city or county to provide a developer with density bonuses and other incentives or concessions for the production of lower income housing units. The developer may also request donation of land if the developer agrees to construct a specified percentage of units for very low-income, low-income, or moderate-income households, or qualifying residents and meets other requirements. Existing law provides for the calculation of the amount of density bonus for each type of housing development that qualifies under these provisions.

AB 2345 provides developers with density bonuses or other incentives in exchange for the provision of affordable housing that meets certain requirements. As of January 2021, up to a 50 percent density bonus can be approved for housing projects if 24 percent of units are reserved for low-income individuals. Density bonus law also applies to moderate-income housing, very low-income housing, senior housing, childcare facilities, and student housing. Entitlements for additional units are allowed in the event that the developer donates land to the local jurisdiction. The legislation also reduces specific thresholds for obtaining approvals and allowances from local jurisdictions that provide fee waivers and expedited review, require density bonus reporting, and reduce parking obligations for many projects qualifying for a density bonus. Since November 1992, the City has an adopted density bonus ordinance within Unified Development Code.

AB 2345 made important revisions to the existing Density Bonus Law that increase how much additional density a predominantly market-rate project can obtain. As of January 2021, the maximum density bonus increased from 35% to 50%, based on an updated sliding scale of housing affordability. The policy also clarifies how to measure the area within a half-mile of a major transit stop (for purposes of qualifying additional benefits and bonuses), reduces parking requirements for larger dwellings, and defines specifications for annual reporting. Program HP-2.1 and Policy H2.2 are included to ensure compliance with AB 2345.

The City of Santa Clarita allows for the construction of residential uses within commercially zoned properties and along transportation corridors, as reflected in

their Zoning Code Section 17.38.050. The Zoning Code allows development of between 11-30 units per acre for Urban Residential Zones UR3, UR4 and UR5, with an option to apply a 50 percent density bonus to the project for affordable housing. The City also has the following incentives for development of mixed-use properties: accelerated plan check review, increased residential and commercial density opportunities, reduced parking requirements, increased building heights, and a reduction in setbacks along public streets. The Old Town Newhall Specific Plan was adopted to encourage mixed use and transit-oriented development. In addition to encouraging housing production through subdivisions and mixed-use development, local ordinances allow accessory dwelling units in single-family residential zones consistent with state law.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Since the adoption of the last Housing Element in 2013, the State of California has made a concerted effort to expand the production of accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

Accessory dwelling units are allowed in single-family neighborhoods citywide in Santa Clarita, pursuant to state housing law. These laws allow for up to two additional rental units on all single-family parcels, with incentives for homeowners to add an ADU including streamlined approval, waived fees, reduced parking requirements, and financing opportunities. The City of Santa Clarita has permitted an increasing number of ADUs: 13 in 2018, 25 in 2019, and 47 in 2020. Additionally, the City is on pace to approve approximately 75 ADUs and permit 50 ADUs in 2021.

ADUs are comprised of detached and attached structures, whether conversions or additions. Junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) allow Santa Clarita homeowners to convert excess space in an existing home to a unit under 500 feet without fees, and flexible requirements include the option of shared space with the main unit. 66 percent of ADUs permitted in Santa Clarita in 2020 were JADU conversions of existing square footage, primarily garages.

Santa Clarita has many single-family homes governed by homeowners' associations (HOAs). Civil Code 4751.a, established by Assembly Bill 670, ensures that HOAs can not impede a homeowner from adding an ADU to their property: "...any provision of a governing document, that either effectively prohibits or unreasonably restricts the construction or use of an accessory dwelling unit or junior accessory dwelling unit..., is void and unenforceable."

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) created a Housing Element Parcel Tool (HELPR) estimating the opportunity for amendments to ADU policy to optimize conditions for development across the region. Table 20 represents individual variables to streamline the production of ADUs in Santa Clarita. SCAG's projections illustrate the potential impact that ADUs can provide in addressing regional housing needs.

Table 20: ADU Production Opportunity with Locally Amended Incentives

| Local amendment of state ADU policy | Eligible Parcels | Additional Parcels |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| Baseline Assumptions | 18,606 | status quo |
| Smaller ADU (from 800 to 600 sf) | 19,725 | +1,119 |
| Removed parking space (200 sf) | 19,485 | +879 |
| Reduced setback and smaller ADUs | 20,019 | +1,413 |
| Reduced setback and removed parking space | 19,895 | +1,289 |
| Smaller ADU and removed parking | 19,755 | +1,149 |
| Reduced setback, smaller ADU, and removed parking | 20,025 | +1,419 |

Source: Housing Element Parcel Tool

Missing Middle Zoning

“Missing middle” is a commonly used term that refers to the range of housing types that fit between single-family detached homes and mid-to-high-rise apartment buildings, such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes. The California legislature has passed several bills to facilitate this development in current single-family zones to increase housing production statewide.

On September 16, 2021, the governor signed two housing bills that went into effect on January 1, 2022. Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) allows lot splits of qualifying parcels, and a duplex on each lot, thereby allowing for up to four dwellings on existing parcels zoned single-family. The UC Berkeley Turner Center estimated that out of 38,500 single-family parcels in Santa Clarita, 23,900 (62%) are eligible for a lot split under SB 9. The study further estimates 2,500 new units could be produced in total under market-feasible conditions.

Senate Bill 10 (SB 10) allows cities to opt-in to zoning provisions that streamline the process to build small apartment complexes of 10 or fewer units. Together, SB 9 and SB 10 give the City an opportunity to help address the need for a greater supply of “missing middle” housing developments and units affordable to first-time homebuyers.

Additionally, Policy H3.6 facilitates the development of workforce housing through a joint powers authority. Housing acquired and developed through this program is meant to assist middle income households earning between 80% and 120% of the Area Median Income by acquiring or developing deed restricted apartment buildings.

Regional Planning Funding

Regional funding encourages cities to optimize planning efforts for housing, transit-oriented communities, and sustainable development. These funds are incorporated into the state’s budget and distributed regionally by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) grants totaled \$47 million for the SCAG region in 2020. Santa Clarita stands to benefit from the program’s focus on three broad areas: partnerships and outreach, regional housing policy solutions, and Sustainable Communities Program strategic integration. The latter focuses on Priority Growth Areas (PGAs) including Newhall and Santa Clarita’s transit centers and cites opportunity for transit-oriented development at Metrolink stations. Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) companion grants provide technical assistance to local entities.

Local Provisions

The City of Santa Clarita has adopted provisions for mixed use development to encourage revitalization of commercial corridors. These provisions, found in the Unified Development Code, allow residential uses within proximity to retail, office, and other commercial use areas to promote integrated, walkable neighborhoods that are compatible with the intent of such mixed use zones. Mixed use sections include a corridor zone (Section 17.35.010), neighborhood zone (Section 17.35.020) and urban village zone (Section 17.35.030). Additional development standards and permitted residential and commercial uses for the mixed-use zones are provided in Chapter 17.35 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code. These standards include allowable residential dwelling units per acre, nonresidential floor area ratio range, building setbacks, surface parking setback, and maximum height.

The City of Santa Clarita passed a Senior Mobilehome Park Overlay Zone (SMHP) in January 2018 to preserve the maintenance and viability of existing senior mobilehome parks consistent with the City’s goal of meeting the housing needs of senior residents. The overlay zone prioritizes affordable senior housing facilities in limiting conversion of such zones to other land uses. This zone ensures 80 percent senior occupancy and applies to Canyon Palms Mobilehome Park, Greenbrier Mobile Estates, and Sierra Park Mobilehome Park. The zoning ordinance also stipulates that once 90 percent of units are occupied by one (1) senior, the remaining units are available for non-senior occupancy, thus enhancing affordable housing options within local jurisdictional boundaries.

The Jobs Creation Overlay Zone (JCOZ), adopted in 2019, supports the attraction of higher-paying and higher-quality jobs in the City’s four targeted industries of aerospace, biomedical, entertainment, and technology to enhance the City of Santa Clarita’s overall jobs and housing balance and provide greater job opportunities (Section 17.38.015). The JCOZ provides additional design standards, incentives (parking reductions, fee waivers, ministerial reviews), architectural review, public noticing processes, and permitted uses. Additional design standards, including height, are outlined in Ordinance 19-4 § 3. The creation of greater job opportunities locally through the JCOZ allows more residents to work locally, thus improving proximity to higher quality jobs, and helps reduce the housing cost burden within the City.

The City has adopted an Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance that serves the purpose of protecting and preserving oak trees in the City and providing regulatory measures

designed to accomplish this purpose. The removal of any oak trees as a result of any proposed development activity must be mitigated by the developer either planting trees on-site or by paying a fee into the City's oak tree preservation fund in an amount consistent with the International Society of Arborists dollar value established by a certified arborist for any trees removed. This ordinance does not serve as a constraint to development because landscape plans which mitigate for any loss of oak trees are approved as a part of the project entitlements.

The City has also adopted a hillside development ordinance that serves to regulate the development and alteration of hillside areas, to minimize the adverse effects of hillside development while allowing for the reasonable development of hillside areas and protecting the public health and safety of residents. A key component of the ordinance is to provide hillside development standards to maximize the positive impacts of site design, grading, landscape architecture and building architecture, and provide development that is commensurate with the degree of average slope. Hillside areas are a naturally occurring constraint to development, that require more grading and site engineering due to topography. The ordinance does not serve as further impediment to development.

Additional local ordinances address subdivision requirements, lot line adjustments, parcel merging, regulation of permitted uses, and protection of biological resources and water quality. The ordinances provide details for developers to consider during the permit application phase and may aid in permit streamlining efforts for housing development. The ordinances aim to protect public health & safety, enhance commercial and residential use, and preserve aesthetic views of the area. The City does not have either a short-term housing ordinance or a growth management ordinance. The adopted ordinances aim to reduce constraints to housing development in the local jurisdiction.

4.3.8 Opportunities for Energy Conservation in Residential Development

The City of Santa Clarita actively implements a variety of policies and programs that encourage green building practices, higher density projects, compact infill development and energy efficiency. These policies and programs are found within the City of Santa Clarita's Unified Development Code (UDC), the implementation of various specific and corridor plans, the City's implementation of the California Green Building Code, and via the City's Green Santa Clarita Program.

The City of Santa Clarita's UDC defines specifications and provides design standards for three distinct mixed-use zones. Mixed-use zones provide design incentives for projects that include both commercial and residential improvements. The design incentives prescribe a mix of commercial square footage and allow for as many as 50 residential units per acre. All three of these mixed-use zones allow all-residential projects.

In addition to the mixed-use zones, the City has also adopted several specific plans and two corridor plans. Each plan provides design standards and allows land uses

that focus on improving underutilized sites with more dense, compact infill development, a rich mixture of uses, enhanced pedestrian connectivity and access, and more efficient traffic circulation.

For purposes of energy conservation, the City of Santa Clarita fully implements the requirements of the California Green Building Code. This code standard roughly equates to a LEED Silver certification for each new residential structure permitted and built. Importantly, it requires each new single-family housing unit to have rooftop solar panels fully installed prior to first occupancy. Further, the City works closely with local utilities and other partner agencies via the Green Santa Clarita program to provide energy efficiency upgrades and incentives to residents. These programs can be found at www.greensantaclarita.com.

4.4 HOUSING CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS

This section of the Housing Element examines the constraints that could hinder the City's achievement of its housing objectives and the resources that are available to assist in the production, maintenance, and improvement of the City's housing stock. In compliance with Government Code Section 65583, sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 identify and analyze potential non-governmental and governmental constraints to the production and retention of housing.

4.4.1 Non-Governmental Constraints

Availability and Location of Vacant Land

Santa Clarita has a significant number of sites that are currently vacant. However, some of these vacant sites are within environmentally sensitive areas and may face increased risk from natural hazards such as landslides, flooding, and fire. Natural disasters impact all community members; however, the impacts typically affect vulnerable populations disproportionately. The lack of suitably-located vacant land will increasingly be a constraint in Santa Clarita as the City builds out.

Land Costs

Similar to the rest of the Los Angeles area, high land costs are a significant constraint to the development of affordable and middle-income housing in the City of Santa Clarita. Land cost is a large component of residential development costs. The price of land varies depending on its location within the City, development constraints, and availability of utilities. The cost of vacant land allowing residential development ranges from approximately \$40,000 per acre for large vacant lots in low density areas to above \$2,000,000 per acre for small vacant lots within hillside gated estate communities. The median cost of vacant residential land for sale in Santa Clarita is about \$240,000 per acre. This figure mainly reflects the price of land zoned for single family residential uses. The average sale price for vacant land zoned for multifamily is around \$200,000 per acre. (*Source: Redfin.com, Accessed March 7, 2022*). Stakeholders have noted that the cost of land is the top constraint to housing

development in the City. However, this constraint is not unique to Santa Clarita, as cost of land is a similar constraint in all comparable jurisdictions nearby.

The median home value in Santa Clarita was \$538,000 as of 2018 (*Source: SCAG Local Profiles*) and had climbed to over \$620,000 by the end of 2020 (Santa Clarita Valley Housing Market Forecast, 2020-2022). As noted above, the area of the home's location is a significant factor in its market value. The high cost of housing, and of the land needed to build housing, is one of the significant non-governmental constraints to housing in Santa Clarita.

Construction Costs

Residential construction costs include material and labor costs and depend on various factors including size and type of development, location, and availability of labor. On average, construction costs in California account for about 63 percent of total development costs in multifamily development. The average cost of construction in the Los Angeles-Long Beach region is over \$250/square foot, and more than 15 percent higher than the State average (*Source: Terner Center, 2020*). Stakeholders in the Santa Clarita area have indicated that while construction costs are an important consideration in considering development, they are not typically a major constraint to market rate housing production in comparison to land costs. However, when considered together with all development costs, construction costs can affect the feasibility of residential development, especially affordable development. Labor shortages and increases in the costs of materials also increase construction costs.

Financing

Home financing is not considered to be a significant constraint to the provision and maintenance of housing for the current population in Santa Clarita. Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates. California Housing Finance Agency and Los Angeles Community Development Corporation offer low interest mortgage programs, down payment assistance, and federal mortgage tax credits.

In the past decade, mortgage interest rates ranged from 2.65% to 4.94% for a fixed rate 30-year loan (*Source: Freddie Mac*). From January 2019 to December 2020, the 30-year fixed rate mortgage rate fell from 4.51% to 2.67% and is currently at 2.88% (*Source: Freddie Mac 9/23/2021*). Although mortgage rates are currently low, they will change, and even a modest increase impacts affordability.

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.

Community Opposition

Community opposition has at times posed a constraint to housing development, but the level of any such opposition depends on the type of housing proposed and its location within the City. Residents of Santa Clarita have at times expressed uncertainty about housing developments that may change the community character or appearance of their neighborhoods, especially in single-family areas. Community members appear to be generally supportive of senior housing developments and high-density developments near transit. Community opposition within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process can also pose a constraint to housing development, and the CEQA process can add additional review time and cost to the approval process for housing.

4.4.2 Potential 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. Among the options available to cities to promote housing affordability is the authority to facilitate construction of new dwellings by removing the constraints imposed by local government. Such constraints may include processing requirements for development applications, design and development standards, density limitations, fees and exactions, and the time and uncertainty associated with obtaining construction permits.

State law requires each city undertaking a Housing Element to analyze the governmental constraints imposed on new development that may result in making housing unavailable or unaffordable. If any such constraints are identified that curtail the production of affordable housing and are not necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare, then the element should evaluate alternative measures that will allow housing to be built to serve the community's needs. The purpose of this section of the Housing Element is to review the governmental constraints applied to various types of housing in the City of Santa Clarita, and to identify any constraints that may reasonably be modified or removed to promote housing development and affordability.

General Plan and Zoning Code

Land uses allowed within the City are determined by the General Plan Land Use Map and the Unified Development Code (UDC). The General Plan contains many principles that are collectively known as smart growth, including transit-oriented development, access to services, non-motorized mobility options, promotion of balanced jobs and housing, live/work units, and mixed use development. These provisions are typical and apply across most of the region's larger cities.

Table 21 shows the residential General Plan land use designations for the City of Santa Clarita. The land use designations support a variety of housing types, ranging from very low-density development, which generally includes single-family homes on large lots, to high-density development, which includes multifamily development. Mixed use and commercial designations are also provided; these designations allow residential densities of 50 units per acre in the case of the Mixed-Use Urban Village (UXUV), Mixed-Use Overlay (MU) and Regional Commercial (CR) designations. Maximum densities per acre are allowed within Non-Urban Rural Residential (NU) and Open Space (OS) designations.

Table 21: General Plan Land Use and Associated Zoning Districts

| General Plan Land Use | Associated Zoning District(s) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Urban Residential | UR1-5 |
| Non-Urban Residential | NU1-5 |
| Mixed Use | MX-C, MX-N |
| Commercial | CC, CN, CR |
| Open Space | OS-NF, OS-A, OS-BLM, OS |
| Industrial | BP, I |
| Specific Plan | SP, CP |
| Other | PI |

Zoning Districts in Unified Development Code

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. Zoning within the City is regulated by the Unified Development Code (UDC), which includes both Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance) and Title 16 (Subdivisions) of the City’s Municipal Code. Zone districts are described in UDC Division 17.30 and Table 22 below. The UDC is updated regularly to maintain compliance with new State statutes and current City policies.

The City of Santa Clarita’s Zoning Code currently contains ten residential and four mixed-use zones that allow housing. These zones accommodate a range of densities, with minimum lot size requirements ranging from 4,500 square feet to 20 acres. Additionally, three commercial zones allow housing in mixed-use projects with a conditional use permit or minor use permit. The number and types of residential and mixed-use zoning districts in Santa Clarita do not pose a constraint to housing.

Table 22: Residential Zoning Districts

| Zoning District | Description of Zones | Zoning District Density |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Non-Urban Residential 1 (NU1) | Single-family homes in low density, rural environment. | 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Non-Urban Residential 2 (NU2) | Single-family homes in low density, rural environment. | 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres |
| Non-Urban Residential 3 (NU3) | Single-family homes in low density, rural environment. | 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres |
| Non-Urban Residential 4 (NU4) | Single-family homes in low density, rural environment. | 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres |
| Non-Urban Residential 5 (NU5) | Single-family homes in low density, rural environment. | 1 dwelling unit per acre |
| Urban Residential 1 (UR1) | Single-family homes on large lots, at interface between rural and urban areas. Clustering of units encouraged to preserve natural features and open space. Supportive institutional uses allowed per zoning. | ≤2 dwelling units per acre |
| Urban Residential 2 (UR2) | Single-family homes in neighborhoods of medium density typical of suburban development patterns. Clustering of units encouraged to preserve natural features and open space. Supportive institutional uses allowed per zoning. | ≤5 dwelling units per acre |
| Urban Residential 3 (UR3) | Single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, and small-scale multifamily dwellings consistent with predominantly single-family residential neighborhood. | ≤11 dwelling units per acre |
| Urban Residential 4 (UR4) | Single-family detached and attached homes, and multifamily dwellings. Supportive institutional uses allowed per zoning. | ≤18 dwelling units per acre |
| Urban Residential 5 (UR5) | Multifamily dwellings including apartments and condominiums up to three stories. Supportive institutional uses allowed per zoning. | 18-30 dwelling units per acre |
| Mixed Use Neighborhood (MXN) | Multifamily dwellings in combination with commercial and office uses along major arterial corridors. | 6-18 dwelling units per acre |
| Mixed Use Corridor (MXC) | Multifamily dwellings in combination with commercial and office uses along major arterial corridors. | 11-30 dwelling units per acre |
| Mixed Use Urban Village (MXUV) | Multifamily dwellings within transit-oriented urban centers, in combination with commercial, office, and public uses. | 19-50 dwelling units per acre |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Mixed Use Overlay (MU) | Single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, and small-scale multifamily dwellings. The regulations encourage a mix of residential, commercial, employment and institutional opportunities within identified centers of activity along identified transportation corridors. May be subject to CUP. | 11- 50 dwelling units per acre |
| Regional Commercial (CR) | Housing may be approved in the context of a mixed use project, subject to discretionary review (MUP). | 18-50 dwelling units per acre |
| Community Commercial (CC) | Housing may be approved in the context of a mixed use project, subject to discretionary review (CUP). | ≤18 dwelling units per acre |
| Commercial Neighborhood (CN) | Housing may be approved in the context of a mixed use project, subject to discretionary review (CUP). | ≤18 dwelling units per acre |
| Business Park (BP) | Mixed employment districts in areas accessible to transportation and visible from freeways and major arterials. | No residential |
| Industrial (I) | Industrial districts in areas with adequate access, infrastructure, and services and is intended to accommodate the most intensive types of industrial uses allowed in the planning area | No residential |
| Open Space (OS) | Single-family homes in low density environment on lands identified. Supportive and institutional uses allowed per zoning. | One unit for every 40 acres |
| Open-Space-Agriculture (OS-A) | Single-family homes in low density environment on privately owned lands within the National Forest. Supportive and institutional uses allowed per zoning. | One unit for every 5 acres |
| Open Space- National Forest (OS-NF) | Single-family homes in low density environment on lands within the National Forest. Supportive and institutional uses allowed per zoning. | One unit for every 40 acres |
| Open Space–Bureau of Land Management (OS-BLM) | Single-family homes in low density environment on lands owned by the US Bureau of Land Management. Supportive and institutional uses allowed per zoning. | One unit for every 40 acres |
| Public/Institutional (P/I) | Single-family homes on lands that are used for various types of public or/and community serving facilities owned and operated by public agencies, special districts, nonprofit organizations, and other entities. | N/A |
| Specific Plan (SP) | Lands in the planning area that are governed by an adopted specific plan. Specific allowable uses, maximum intensity standards, and | Varies by plan, See Table 24 |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| | development standards shall be determined by the adopted specific plan. | |
| Corridor Plan (CP) | Lands in the planning area that are governed by an adopted corridor plan. Specific allowable uses, maximum intensity standards, and development standards shall be determined by the adopted corridor plan | Lyons Corridor: 11-30 dwelling units per acre Soledad Canyon Corridor: 11-30 dwelling units per acre |

*CUP indicates requirement for a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to UDC Section 17.24, approved by Planning Commission after a public hearing. Other projects require Minor Use Permit (UDC Section 17.23). Other uses are permitted by right in the zone district, provided that all new construction requires Development Review pursuant to UDC Chapter 17.23.

Density

The City of Santa Clarita is a large city in northern Los Angeles County, accessed by the greater Los Angeles area by Interstate Highway 5, State Route-14, bus, or by rail. Metrolink serves the City with three stops and Santa Clarita Transit provides bus service along various transit corridors throughout the City. Densities surrounding these stops and transit corridors are generally higher than those in non-transit areas.

Single-family lots generally vary in size from approximately 5,000 to 12,000 square feet in the low- to medium-density zones. Built multifamily residential densities are generally at 18 to 60 units per acre, with the lower densities located within medium-density areas and the highest densities within the transit areas. In the previous planning period, no sites identified to accommodate the lower-income RHNA in the inventory were developed below the minimum allowable density of the underlying zone, and the City did not receive any requests to develop below the assumed capacity in the sites inventory.

The Land Use Element states that the maximum allowable density will be determined by physical constraints such as topography, environmental resources, and infrastructure; existing development patterns and potential for land use conflicts; and the public health, safety, and welfare. The upper range of residential density can be achieved only in conformance with all other applicable General Plan policies, codes, and requirements.

The last update to the General Plan Land Use Element changed the allowable densities in certain land use designations. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance allows up to 30 dwellings per acre in Urban Residential 5 (UR-5) and up to 50 dwellings per acre in Mixed Use Urban Village (MXUV) and Regional Commercial (CR) areas. Subject to Chapter 17.51 (Development Standards), in hillside areas the maximum allowable density will fluctuate due to the average slope percentages. For example, a 10% average slope will allow 30 dwellings per acre in UR5 zones whereas a 50%+ average slope would only allow 0.60 dwellings per acre. The CR zone generally occurs within

existing developed areas and thus is not subject to density slope ratio limitations. These land use designations increase opportunities for compact residential development in urban areas that are supported by services, infrastructure, and transportation, and to remove governmental constraints imposed by the more stringent density limits in the prior General Plan. Density limits no longer pose a constraint to development.

Subdivision Standards

Subdivision standards include certain on- and off-street improvements, including road and sewer improvements, for lot owners within the subdivision and for general neighborhood traffic and drainage.

The subdivider is responsible for construction of these road and drainage improvements including improvements to the curb and gutter, base and paving, street lights, street trees, sidewalk and parkway, and landscape medians (if applicable) per the applicable roadway cross section. Generally, required street widths are as follows:

- Residential Collector: 64' including 2 travel lanes, 2 parking lanes, and sidewalks/parkway strips on both sides
- Residential Through Street: 60' including 2 travel lanes, 2 parking lanes, and sidewalks/parkway strips on both sides
- Residential Street: 58' including 2 travel lanes, 2 parking lanes, and sidewalks/parkway strips on both sides

While total right-of-way for large public residential arterials and collectors may exceed the requirements made by other communities, in Santa Clarita's case there are few remaining parcels that would accommodate large residential streets with parkways. Most remaining subdivisions are anticipated to consist of mainly local residential streets with lesser right of way requirements, or of exempt private streets in planned developments. Additionally, the City's UDC allows the City Engineer to grant a modification to the required road dedication and relieve the applicant from compliance with all or a portion of the provisions if certain conditions are met, if the construction of additional roadway improvements is deemed to be unnecessary, or if the requirement of additional improvements is deemed to constitute an unreasonable hardship.

Development Standards

The Residential Development Standards in the City's UDC articulate expectations regarding the character of the built environment and are intended to promote design that will protect neighborhood character, enhance safety, and increase the quality of life in the City. Standards for architecture, rear yard coverage, building and structure height, roofing, driveways, front yard landscaping, and setbacks among others are included in the City's development standards. The UDC establishes specific development standards which are summarized below in Table 23 and are also available on the City's website.

Table 23: City of Santa Clarita Development Standards

| | Min lot size | Front setback | Side setback ^{1,2} | Rear setback | Max height main structure/ accessory | Max Lot coverage (w/o a CUP) | Max density |
|--------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| NU-1 | 20 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.05 |
| NU-2 | 10 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.1 |
| NU-3 | 5 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.2 |
| NU-4 | 2 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.5 |
| NU-5 | 43,560 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 1.0 |
| UR-1 | 20,000 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 2.0 |
| UR-2 | 5,000 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/20' | - | 5.0 |
| UR-3 | 5,000 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/20' | - | 11.0 |
| UR-4 | 4,500 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/20' | - | 18.0 |
| UR-5 | 4,500 sq. ft. | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/20' | - | 30.0 |
| MXC | - | 5'/0' ³ | - | - | 50' | - | 30.0 |
| MXN | - | 5'/0' | - | - | 50' | - | 18.0 |
| MXUV | - | 5'/0' | - | - | 50' | - | 50.0 |
| CR | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35' | 90% | 50.0 |
| CC | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35' | 80% | 18.0 |
| CN | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35' | 75% | 18.0 |
| BP | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35' | 90% | n/a |
| I | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35' | 90% | n/a |
| OS | 20 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.025 |
| OS-A | 5 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.2 |
| OS-NF | 20 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.025 |
| OS-BLM | 20 acres | 20' | 5' | 15' | 35'/35' | - | 0.025 |
| PI | - | 10'/5' | - | - | 35'/35' | - | - |

Source: City of Santa Clarita Municipal Code Title 17, Division 4

¹ Reverse Corner Lots: 20' for NU1-5 and OS zones, 10' for UR1-5 zones

² 25' for 100% residential buildings adjacent to commercial or mixed-use property lines

³ Building setback from major or secondary highway / setback from non-major or secondary highway for commercial or mixed-use properties

Note: Development standards for Corridor Plans and Specific Plans are subject to the standards laid out in their respective specific plans.

Some development standards, such as required landscaping, architectural enhancements, roofing materials, and rear yard coverage can increase the costs of

housing. The standards are typical, however, and interviews with local stakeholders revealed that the City’s current development standards do not pose a significant constraint to the development of housing.

The land use controls in each zone have a different impact on housing development. For example, lower densities and minimum lot sizes in Non-Urban and lower density Urban Residential zones impact the types and affordability of housing that could be developed there. However, the City has a wide variety of zones, which facilitate housing variety, affordability, and supply, with multiple zones allowing 50 units per acre, many zones with no set maximum lot coverage, and many zones with no set minimum lot size. In addition to these zones, the City also has a variety of Specific Plan areas with more choices for developers in areas where different development is suitable. Land use controls, in conjunction with the permitting procedures of the City, positively impact approval certainty by providing clear rules and a streamlined process. Cumulatively, land use controls on housing in the City do not pose a constraint to housing production and enable the development of a wide variety of housing at a variety of costs.

Specific Plans and Corridor Plans

In addition to the zone districts summarized in Table 22, the City’s UDC contains a Specific Plan and Corridor Plan category that allows for development of large, master-planned communities in which residential unit types and densities may be flexible, as specified in the approved planning document.

The Specific Plan zone provides for the preparation of comprehensive, long-range planning documents called specific plans, stipulated in State law to establish uses and standards for master-planned developments, including infrastructure, financing, and implementation. The allowed uses and densities are specified in the adopted specific plan and corridor plan document and serve to facilitate rather than constrain development. The City contains many specific and corridor plan areas, and new State laws have passed regarding zones where certain uses must be allowed by right. Program HP-2.3 has been included to review these plans and modify existing plans where necessary to comply with State law, including those related to residential care facilities, transitional and supportive housing, emergency shelters, and low-barrier navigation centers.

Within the City of Santa Clarita, the following specific plans and corridor plans incorporating residential uses have been adopted:

- **Porta Bella Specific Plan** approved in 1995 for the 996-acre Whittaker Bermite site, located in the center of the City. The site was used for over 80 years for production of military explosives and flares by various manufacturers before operations ended in 1987. During those years manufacturing and testing of various chemicals on the site involved use and improper disposal of hazardous materials, resulting in chemical contamination of both soil and groundwater. Directly beneath the site lies the Saugus Aquifer, a significant

groundwater source for the Valley. Since manufacturing operations ended, remediation of soil and groundwater contamination (including per-chlorate) has been on-going. The Porta Bella Specific Plan allows for the re-use of the property for mixed uses, including 1,244 single-family units, 1,667 multifamily units, 96 acres of commercial and office uses, 407 acres of open space, and 42 acres of recreational use. Under the supervision of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the site's soil remediation has been completed and groundwater remediation is ongoing.

- **Old Town Newhall Specific Plan** adopted by the City in December 2005 as a foundation for facilitating redevelopment and enhancement of the area. The specific plan encompasses twenty blocks (550 acres, including Hart Park) and provides opportunities for mixed use and transit-oriented development. Approximately 700 new dwelling units and 250,000 square feet of new commercial space are projected by the specific plan, in addition to existing housing and businesses in the area. Both new development and redevelopment are accommodated in the specific plan. Various residential and commercial development projects have been built since the adoption of the plan.
- **North Valencia Specific Plan** adopted in 1998. The project encompassed 707 acres bordered by Newhall Ranch Road, Bouquet Canyon Road, and Magic Mountain Parkway, east of San Francisquito Creek. The Specific Plan provides for a mix of residential and commercial uses, open space, and an industrial center. A significant segment of the Santa Clara River was preserved as open space as part of the specific plan. The residential portions of this project have since been constructed.
- **North Valencia 2 Specific Plan** adopted in 2000 for 596 acres in the northern portion of the City located north of Newhall Ranch Road west of McBean Parkway. The Specific Plan calls for mixed use development, including residential, industrial, and commercial uses. A major component of this project was preservation of open space in environmentally sensitive areas along San Francisquito Creek. The residential portions of this project have since been constructed.
- **Canyon Park (Fair Oaks Ranch) Specific Plan** adopted by Los Angeles County in 1986 for 988 acres in the eastern portion of the City located north and south of State Route 14 and Via Princessa. The Specific Plan area was annexed to the City in 2012. The Specific Plan calls for primarily residential development, with up to 4,763 multifamily units and 637 single-family units. The last phase of construction was completed during the last planning period and includes the residential community of Crestview in the northeast portion of Fair Oaks Ranch.
- **Vista Canyon Specific Plan** adopted in 2011 is located between State Route 14 and Sand Canyon and north of the Union Pacific railroad lines. The site consists of 185 acres. The project is approved for 1,100 residential units with a variety of housing types. The project includes a new Metrolink commuter rail

station and thereby creates a transit-friendly project. Vista Canyon is currently under construction.

- **MetroWalk Specific Plan**, directly south of the Vista Canyon Specific Plan, was adopted in 2021 to expand a transit-oriented community at Vista Canyon Town Center centered around the new Metrolink Vista Canyon Station. The MetroWalk development plans for 498 units of market-rate, senior-restricted market-rate, and affordable senior housing.
- **Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital (HMNH) Specific Plan** adopted in 2016, is located north of the McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road intersection. Built in 1975, HMNH spans 30.4 acres and is a non-profit, community-based hospital that serves as the only existing emergency services facility in the Santa Clarita Valley. The Specific Plan was amended in 2020 to allow for expanded development of up to 200,000 square feet of new buildings and supplemental parking structures. Requirements were established for building setbacks between the hospital campus and adjacent residential neighborhoods, including preservation of existing natural buffers and enhancement of landscaping. Unintended use of residential streets as hospital parking will be monitored and addressed as needed. To mitigate construction views, appropriate screening will be implemented for the adjacent residential communities. The project is currently under construction.
- **Lyons Corridor Plan** proposed in 2013 to be consistent with Santa Clarita’s General Plan to uphold the “Valley of Villages” concept for standards of growth and development. The project area incorporates 102-acres of land, located between Interstate 5 and Newhall Avenue, and is within a 10-minute vicinity of nearly 8,000 residential homes. Most homes surrounding Lyons Avenue are single-family and multifamily units. Future development of walkable communities is emphasized in correlation to the 1,326,000 square feet of building space and the adjacent neighborhoods. In the Lyons Corridor Plan, creating four new distinct zones, developing streetscape standards, improving architectural features, and modifying existing properties were addressed. In December 2020, the project plan was amended.
- **Soledad Canyon Road Corridor Plan** proposed in 2013 to be consistent with Santa Clarita’s General Plan to uphold the “Valley of Villages” concept for standards of growth and development. The project area incorporates 181-acres of land, located between eastward of Camp Plenty Road and westward of Solamint Road, and is within a 10-minute vicinity of 5,300 residential homes. This area is part of the largest community in Santa Clarita and is primarily commercial, consisting of around 1,453,000 square feet of building space. Most homes planned within the project are single-family and multifamily units. Future development of walkable communities is emphasized, and planning development will be based on a parcel-by-parcel basis. This plan addresses specific transect zones, regulations of developing zones, measurement standards of buildings, streetscapes, and architectural features.

Table 24: Specific Plan Details and Status

| Specific Plan | Status | Last Updated | Housing Types Allowed | Density Allowed |
|--|---|---------------------|--|---|
| Porta Bella Specific Plan | Development on hold. Land use plan in place until amended or replaced by future entitlement granted by City Council | 1995 | Single and multifamily zoning | Single-family allows 2-8 dwelling units/acre. Multifamily allows 8-42 dwelling units/acre. |
| Old Town Newhall Specific Plan | Newhall Crossings mixed use development constructed in 2020; Specific Plan to be updated in 2021 | 2020 | Mixed use and transit-oriented development | Form based code, no density guidelines |
| North Valencia Specific Plan | Fully developed | 1998 | Single and multifamily zoning | Single-family allows 5-12 dwelling units/acre. Multifamily allows 7-35 dwelling units/acre. |
| North Valencia 2 Specific Plan | Fully developed | 2000 | Single and multifamily zoning | Single-family allows 5-14 dwelling units/acre. Multifamily allows 7-35 dwelling units/acre. |
| Canyon Park (Fair Oaks Ranch) Specific Plan | Fully developed | 1986 | Single-family zoning | 4,763 multifamily units and 637 single-family units on approximately 308 acres |
| Vista Canyon Specific Plan | Currently under construction | 2011 | Residential and mixed use | Up to 1,100 residential units with variable densities based on the specific planning area. |
| MetroWalk Specific Plan | Not developed | 2021 | Residential transit-oriented development | Up to 498 residential units with variable densities based on the specific planning area. |
| Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital (HMNH) Specific Plan | Mostly developed | 2021 | Non-residential uses | N/A |
| Lyons Corridor Plan | Long range plan for corridor enhancement and redevelopment. | 2020 | Mixed use residential and commercial zoning. | Not to exceed the General Plan. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|--|---------------------------------|
| Soledad Canyon Road Corridor Plan | Long range plan for corridor enhancement and redevelopment. | 2020 | Mixed use residential and commercial zoning. | Not to exceed the General Plan. |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|--|---------------------------------|

Parking Requirements

Planning for sufficient vehicle parking is an integral part of planning in Southern California. At the same time, excessive parking requirements can detract from the feasibility of developing new housing at the range of densities necessary to facilitate affordable housing. The City’s UDC establishes residential parking standards, as summarized in Table 25. In addition to these standards, the City currently requires at least one parking space for every staff member in emergency shelters, in compliance with California Government Code Section 65583(a)(4)(A)(ii), and one parking space for every 10 temporary residents for emergency shelters. The parking standards included in Table 25 have already factored in the need for guest parking.

Communities that require excessive parking spaces per dwelling unit can negatively impact the feasibility of producing affordable housing or housing for special needs groups by reducing the achievable number of dwelling units per acre and increasing development costs, thus restricting the range of housing types constructed in a community. The parking standards for the City of Santa Clarita are presented in Table 25.

Santa Clarita’s parking requirements for seniors and persons with disabilities are substantially lower than parking requirements for other residential uses, and the requirement for studio multifamily units is smaller than the requirement for larger multifamily units. AB 2345 (2020) made significant changes to the State Density Bonus Law for projects providing affordable units, including requirements for the granting of a larger density bonus, more incentives, and reduced parking requirements. Programs HP-2.1 and HP-2.3 obligate the City to review and amend its UDC to adopt the parking requirements from Governmental Code 65915, and amend Specific Plans as necessary to comply with new State laws, and Program HP-2.2 obligates the City to create and publish explanatory documents to detail the different parking requirements for multifamily housing projects, including those providing affordable units and those located close to transit.

Table 25: Parking Standards for City of Santa Clarita

| Unit Type | | Required Parking |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Single-family | | 2 fully enclosed spaces per unit |
| Two-family | | 2 fully enclosed spaces per unit |
| Multi- Family | Studios | 1 enclosed space per unit |
| | 1+ bedroom | 2 enclosed spaces per unit |
| | Projects with 3+ units | 1 guest space per 2 units |
| Mobilehome Park | | 2 covered spaces per unit |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | 1 guest space per 2 units |
| Senior/disabled | 0.5 space per unit + guest parking |
| Mixed Use | 2 covered or enclosed spaces per two-bedroom unit 1 covered or enclosed space per one-bedroom or studio unit 1 guest space per 2 units, which can be shared |
| Specific Plans | Parking may be reduced |
| Residential services/ care services | 2 spaces |
| Accessory Dwelling Units | 1 space per unit (maximum) |
| Junior Accessory Dwelling Units | Not Required |
| Residential Health Care | 0.5 spaces per unit and/or bed |
| Community Care | 0.5 spaces per room, plus 1 guest space per 8 rooms/units |
| Shared Parking | Allowed with a Minor Use Permit |
| Tandem Parking | Allowed in multifamily developments with Minor Use Permit. Allowed in mixed use developments. |

Residential parking standards are not deemed to be a constraint to the development, improvement, and maintenance of housing. The current standards match current vehicle ownership patterns of residents and do not have an impact on the cost or supply of housing. The requirement to provide enclosed parking for multifamily housing could pose a constraint. However, parking for multifamily projects that qualify under Government Code 65915 are not required to provide covered or enclosed parking. Further reductions and eliminations of parking requirements are available for projects located near transit, due to recent changes in State law. The City is preparing a handout to explain the different parking requirements for different parts of the City and different types of projects.

Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types

To ensure fair housing choice in a community, the City’s Unified Development Code provides for a range of housing types, including single-family, multiple-family, accessory dwelling units, mobile and manufactured homes, residential care facilities, emergency shelters, supportive housing, transitional housing, joint living and working quarters (live/work units), and family daycare homes. The Unified Development Code provides for and ensures a variety of housing opportunities, as demonstrated in Table 26.

Table 26: Residential Uses Allowed by Zoning District in Santa Clarita Unified Development Code

| Zoning District | Residential Uses Allowed (Type of Permit*) |
|-----------------|--|
| NU1 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Mobilehome Park (C) |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| NU2 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| NU3 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| NU4 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| NU5 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| UR1 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| UR2 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| UR3 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Fraternity and Sorority Houses (C) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Health Care Facility (M) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Rooming House (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| UR4 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Fraternity and Sorority Houses (C) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Health Care Facility (M) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Rooming House (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| UR5 | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Health Care Facility (M) |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Fraternity and Sorority Houses (C) | Residential Service/Care Home (P) Rooming House (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| MXC | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) Model Homes (T) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Residential Service/Care Home (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) Short Term Temporary Residence (T) Long Term Temporary Residence (M) |
| MXN | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Fraternity and Sorority Houses (C) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Residential Service/Care Home (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) Short Term Temporary Residence (T) Long Term Temporary Residence (M) |
| MXUV | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Residential Service/Care Home (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) Short Term Temporary Residence (T) Long Term Temporary Residence (M) |
| MU Overlay | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Two-Family Dwelling (Duplex) (P) Multifamily Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Residential Health Care Facility (C) Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Residential Service/Care Home (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) |
| CR | Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Multifamily Dwelling (M) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (M) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) |
| CC | Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Multifamily Dwelling (C) Family Day Care Homes (P) Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) | Mobilehome Park (C) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Supportive Housing (C) Transitional Housing (C) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| CN | Caretaker’s Residence (P) Community Care Facility (C) Multifamily Dwelling (C) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) Residential Health Care Facility (C) Single Room Occupancy (C) |
| BP | Caretaker’s Residence (P) Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) | Residential Health Care Facility (C) |
| I | Caretaker’s Residence (P) | Joint Living and Working Quarters (Live/Work Units) (C) |
| OS | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Adult Day Care Homes (P) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| OS-A | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Adult Day Care Homes (P) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| OS-NF | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Adult Day Care Homes (P) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| OS-BLM | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) | Adult Day Care Homes (P) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| P/I | Accessory Dwelling Unit (P) Caretaker’s Residence (P) Single-Family Dwelling (P) Family Day Care Homes (P) Adult Day Care Homes (P) | Fraternity/Sorority Houses (C) Residential Service/Care Home (P) Supportive Housing (P) Transitional Housing (P) |
| Specific Plan (SP) | Subject to the standards of the Specific Plan | |
| Corridor Plan (CP) | Subject to the standards of the Corridor Plan | |
| <p>* Permitting Types are indicated as follows: (P): Permitted where the symbol “P” appears; (C): Permitted subject to a conditional use permit (CUP) where the symbol “C” appears; (M): Permitted subject to a minor use permit (MUP) where the symbol “M” appears; (T): Permitted subject to a temporary use permit (TUP) where the symbol “T” appears</p> | | |

Single and Multifamily Uses

Single-family and multifamily housing types include detached and attached single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, town homes, condominiums, and rental apartments. The City’s Unified Development Code (UDC) identifies a variety of zones

where these uses are permitted by right. The variety of housing types allowed within the City does not pose a constraint to development.

The UDC allows development of single-family dwellings in zones intended for higher density multifamily uses. This could potentially limit the amount of lower-cost multifamily residential uses in a community and be a potential constraint to higher-density housing and to fair housing choice. However, permitting significantly lower density projects in a zone intended for higher-density uses is regulated by State law (AB 2292). This regulation requires that before the City approves a lower density use, it determines that adequate land remains available for higher-density housing to accommodate the City's remaining share of regional housing needs. This Housing Element includes a new policy and program to ensure that the approval of projects at lower densities does not pose a constraint to development.

Table 27: Current Planning Requirements by Housing Type

| Housing Type | Planning Requirements |
|---|---|
| Single-family home on existing lot | Allowed in all residential zones with approval of Administrative Permit. Allowed in mixed use zones with approval of Development Review Permit. |
| Two-family home on existing lot | Allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 zones with approval of Development Review Permit. Allowed in mixed use zones with approval of Development Review Permit. |
| Multifamily home | Allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 with Development Review Permit; in CN and CC with a Conditional Use Permit; in CR with an MUP. Allowed in mixed use zones with approval of Development Review Permit. |
| Accessory Dwelling Unit | Allowed in zones NU1, NU2, NU3, NU4, NU5, UR1, UR2, UR3, UR4, UR5, MXC, MXN, MXUV, PI, OS, OS-A, OS-NF, or OS-BLM on parcels that include a proposed or existing residential unit. May be attached or detached. Floor area may not exceed 50% of primary unit; architecture must be compatible with primary unit, and separate entrance provided. A Class I ministerial permit is required. |
| Manufactured housing | Individual manufactured housing units allowed on residential lots if units are less than 10 years old, on permanent foundations, with roof eaves of at least 16 inches, roof slopes of at least 2:12, and non-metal siding. |
| Single room occupancy | Allowed in CC and CN with CUP |
| Emergency Shelters | Allowed by right in the P/I and Homeless Shelter Overlay Zone. Allowed in CC with CUP Allowed in BP and I with MUP |
| Transitional and supportive housing | Allowed in all residential zones with approval of Development Review Permit for new structures; in CR and CC with a CUP. |
| Residential care home (residence for up to 6 persons) | Allowed within existing structures in all residential zones with no review. If new construction, requires Administrative Permit. |
| Community care facility (residential facility for elderly/disabled, with meals, housekeeping, and activities) | Allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 and in commercial zones with CUP. |
| Rooming house (dwelling with bedrooms rented to multiple persons; may include meals) | Allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5, except regulated in neighborhoods that are comprised predominantly of single-family detached residential units. |
| Residential health care facility (convalescent homes for elderly, sick, disabled) | Allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 with an MUP; CR, CC, CN and BP with a CUP. |

Accessory Dwelling Units

In response to state mandated requirements and local needs, the City of Santa Clarita allows for the development of accessory dwelling units. The City strives to ensure the availability of affordable housing for family members, students, and the elderly, among others in the City, while mitigating impacts to traffic, utilities, public health, and safety. ADUs and JADUs are permitted on parcels that are zoned to allow single-family or multifamily residential use and that include a proposed or existing residential unit. Any application for an ADU that meets the location and development standards contained in Unified Development Code Section 17.57.040(L) is approved following a ministerial review for compliance and requires a Class I ADU development application. The City's Accessory Dwelling Unit provisions do not pose a constraint to development. Program HP-2.6 will further facilitate and enable the development of ADUs in the City and ensure compliance with State law.

Manufactured Housing

State law requires local governments to permit manufactured or mobile homes meeting federal safety and construction standards on a permanent foundation in all single-family residential zoning districts (Section 65852.3 of the California Government Code). Because these units can be a source of housing for lower income individuals, including seniors and the disabled, overly restrictive regulation of these uses can indirectly impede housing choice. The Santa Clarita UDC includes requirements and development standards for manufactured homes on residential lots in sections 17.42 and 17.57.020Q, which clarifies that manufactured homes shall be installed on permanent foundations on individual lots. The City allows manufactured housing as a single-family residence subject to the development standards in the UDC, is compliant with Section 65852.3 of the California Government Code and does not pose a constraint to development.

Emergency Shelters and Low-Barrier Navigation Centers

An emergency shelter provides housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons and is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay (Health and Safety Code Section 50801[e]). State law requires jurisdictions to identify adequate sites for housing which will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all income levels, including emergency shelters and transitional housing (Government Code Section 65583[c][1]). Changes to State law (SB 2) in 2008, require that local jurisdictions make provisions in the zoning code to permit emergency shelters by right and with a ministerial approval process in at least one zoning district where adequate capacity is available to accommodate at least one year-round shelter. Local jurisdictions may, however, establish limited and objective standards to regulate the development of emergency shelters. The City's UDC is compliant with SB 2 and accommodates emergency shelters by right in the PI (Public/Institutional) and Homeless Shelter

Overlay zones. The Homeless Shelter Overlay Zone is located within a Highest Resource TCAC Opportunity Area and in the highest proximity area within the City to jobs., Sites zoned PI are distributed throughout the community. In the CC (Community Commercial) zone a CUP is required, and in the BP (Business Park) and I (Industrial) zones, a MUP is required. The development standards for homeless shelters permit maximum occupancy of sixty individuals by-right. Additionally, the City's UDC is compliant with AB 139 and requires homeless shelters to provide one parking space per employee or staff member plus one space per five temporary residents. Homeless shelters in the PI zone are subject to the development standards of that zone, which designate a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1, a maximum building height of 35 feet, and setbacks of ten feet from a major or secondary highway, five feet from public right-of-way not on a major or secondary highway, and twenty-five feet from a residential property line. These provisions for emergency shelters do not pose a constraint to development. The City's UDC does not currently contain a separate definition for low-barrier navigation centers defined by Government Code section 65660. While this use would be permitted by-right in the PI zone and the Homeless Shelter Overlay Zone, it must allow low-barrier navigation centers by-right in zones where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones. Program HP-2.1 is included in this Housing Element to modify the City's UDC to be compliant with the requirements of Government Code Section 65660 as amended by SB 48.

Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing

State law also requires local jurisdictions to address the provisions for transitional and supportive housing.

Transitional housing is defined as buildings configured as rental housing developments but operated under program requirements that call for the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at some predetermined future point in time, which shall be no less than six months (California Health and Safety Code Section 50675.2[h]).

Supportive housing is defined as housing with no limit on length of stay that is occupied by a target population and that is linked to on-site or off-site services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving their health status, and maximizing their ability to live and, when possible, work in the community (California Health and Safety Code 50675.14 [b]). Target population includes persons with disabilities, and families who are "homeless," as defined by Section 11302 of Title 42 of the United States Code, or who are "homeless youth," as defined by paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 11139.3 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to SB 2, transitional and supportive housing constitutes a residential use and therefore local governments cannot treat it differently from other types of residential uses (e.g., requiring a use permit when other residential uses of similar function do not require a use permit). Supportive and transitional housing provides additional housing options for people with disabilities. In addition to these

requirements, jurisdictions now must allow supportive housing by-right in zones where multifamily and mixed-uses are permitted if the proposed housing development meets specified criteria outlined in AB 2162.

The City's UDC currently accommodates transitional and supportive housing by permitting transitional and supportive housing in all residential zones (UDC Section 17.42.010) and does not pose a constraint to development. Program HP-2.1 is included in this Housing Element to modify the City's UDC to be compliant with the requirements of Government Code Section 65583(a)(5) as amended by SB 2 and Government Code 65651 as amended by AB 2126.

The City of Santa Clarita has one transitional housing community operated by Family Promise and at least two supportive housing communities operating as sober living environments.

Employee Housing

The Employee Housing Act was amended by AB 107 in 2020, changing the definition of 'agricultural employee housing' and establishing new zoning, application, and review requirements for agricultural employee housing. Santa Clarita's Unified Development Code currently does not include a definition for agricultural employee housing. Program HP-2.1 is included in this Housing Element to modify the City's UDC to be compliant with the requirements of the Employee Housing Act in Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 12021.6. The 2015-2019 ACS identified 190 individuals employed in the agricultural, forestry, fishing, and hunting industries in Santa Clarita. There is currently no known farmworker housing in the City however, if farmworker housing were to be proposed under the Employee Housing Act, it would be allowed as a residential use so long as the program was licensed and administered by HCD.

Residential Care Facilities

The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Sections 5115 and 5116 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code) declares that mentally and physically disabled persons are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings and that the use of property for the care of six or fewer disabled persons is a residential use for zoning purposes. A state-authorized, certified, or licensed family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a-day basis is considered a residential use that is permitted in all residential zones. No local agency can impose stricter zoning or building and safety standards on these homes (commonly referred to as "group" homes) than are required of the other permitted residential uses in the zone. The Lanterman Act covers only licensed residential care facilities. The City of Santa Clarita UDC is compliant with the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act.

Building Codes and Enforcement

Building and safety codes have been adopted for purposes of preserving public health and safety and ensuring the construction of safe and decent housing. These building and safety codes have the potential to increase the cost of housing construction and maintenance but aim to ensure resilient and stable development for current and planned buildings and structures.

As of 2021, The City of Santa Clarita has adopted the *2019 California Building Code* along with local amendments which regulate all construction projects submitted on or after January 1, 2020. The State codes have been amended by the City of Santa Clarita to address local topographic, climatic, and/or geologic conditions, and to include provisions pertaining to the administration of these codes. These ordinances and codes are enforced by the City of Santa Clarita Community Preservation Division, who patrol the City for noncompliance and investigating complaints received. Key issues that Code Enforcement officers examine are unpermitted construction and/or remodeling, and substandard housing conditions. Building codes affect the cost of construction but are necessary to ensure public health and safety and do not hinder residential development. The regulations established by the City's adopted Building Code set the minimum costs for materials. These costs include materials, labor, development fees and permitting.

Housing for People with Disabilities

Persons with special needs, such as the elderly and those with disabilities, must also have access to housing. Community care facilities provide a supportive housing environment to persons with special needs in a group environment. The City allows these facilities in the following zones:

- **Residential Care Home:** Residence for up to six persons allowed within existing structures in all residential zones with no administrative review. New construction requires residential permits only.
- **Community Care Facility:** Residential facility for elderly/disabled persons with meals, housekeeping and activities allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 and in commercial zones with a CUP. Areas with appropriate access to amenities and services are the most suitable for residential community care facilities. The majority of these areas are located within these allowed zones. These facilities require a CUP as allowed by law to ensure land use compatibility and protect public health and safety.
- **Residential Health Care Facility:** Convalescent homes for elderly, disabled, and sick persons allowed in UR-3, UR-4, and UR-5 with an MUP; in CR, CC, CN, and BP with a CUP.

The City's Unified Development Code uses the following definition of family:

"Family" means one (1) or more individuals living together as a single housekeeping unit in a single dwelling unit. "Family" shall also mean the persons living together in a licensed "residential facility" as that term is defined in California Health and Safety

Code Section 1502(a)(l), which services six (6) or fewer persons, excluding staff.” Permitting requirements, land use requirements, and UDC definitions generally do not pose a constraint to housing persons with disabilities. Under Program HP-2.1, the City will amend its code to allow large community care facilities (for seven or more residents with disabilities) as a permitted use, subject only to transparent, objective criteria.

Americans with Disabilities Act

Multifamily residential buildings are required to comply with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Fair Housing Act Accessibility Guidelines, regardless of whether they are rental or for sale units. These policies require minimum percentages of ADA compliant units in new multifamily developments and that public and common use areas at housing developments are accessible. All Federally assisted new construction housing developments with 5 or more units must design and construct 5 percent of the dwelling units, or at least one unit, whichever is greater, to be accessible for persons with physical and mobility disabilities. Enforcement of ADA requirements is not at the discretion of the City but is mandated under federal law.

Generally, ADA compliant building codes and ordinances can pose increased cost to housing construction and production. However, this policy ensures safe, equitable, and accessible housing. Therefore, local ADA compliant code enforcement does not hinder residential housing development in the City of Santa Clarita.

Reasonable Accommodation

The City of Santa Clarita adopted its reasonable accommodation ordinance in Section 17.23.180, *Requests for Reasonable Accommodations*, of the City of Santa Clarita Municipal Code. The Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act implement part of the City’s General Plan Housing Element and provides a procedure for individuals with disabilities to request reasonable accommodation. The Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance states that that an individual(s) with disabilities have an equal opportunity to use and enjoy housing by allowing accommodation(s) with respect to certain City regulations, policies, procedures, and standards. The ordinance is enforced, if said accommodation(s) are both reasonable and necessary to provide such equal opportunity without compromising the City commitment to protecting community character and environmental quality. The City does provide reasonable accommodation for various scenarios, including but not limited to allowances for a wheelchair ramp in a required setback; an increase in building height to permit an elevator installation; or providing an applicant with additional time to submit material, if deemed reasonable under the Acts.

Requests for Reasonable Accommodations are subject to an administrative permit fee and are approved through an administrative permit process that takes approximately two weeks to process. Upon review of an application, the Director of Community Development will grant the request based on the following findings:

- That the requested accommodation is intended to be used by an individual with a disability who resides or will reside on the property;
- That the requested accommodation is necessary to afford an individual with a disability equal opportunity to use and enjoy a residential use;
- The requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City; and
- That the requested accommodation will not require a fundamental alteration in the nature of the land use and zoning.

While the process for requesting reasonable accommodations does not pose a constraint, the permit fee for these requests may pose a constraint to housing for persons with disabilities. Program HP-4.7 has been included to reduce/remove this fee and address this constraint.

Development and Permitting Fees

Various fees, shown in Table 28, are charged by the agencies within the City of Santa Clarita to cover the cost of processing, evaluating, and ensuring compliance. The City of Santa Clarita is legally required to set permit and development fees in amounts that do not exceed and are equal to the cost of providing services associated with these fees.

Table 29 compares selected permitting fees from Santa Clarita with jurisdictions of similar populations within Los Angeles County. While there is significant variation between different types of permits in different jurisdictions, the fees required by the City of Santa Clarita are generally within the range of fees required by comparable jurisdictions and therefore are not likely to pose a unique or significant constraint to housing development. Fees increase annually by approximately 0.1% to 1.5% to account for inflation and are typical across other jurisdictions. Therefore, fee increases do not pose a significant constraint to housing development.

Table 28: Santa Clarita Development and Permitting Fees

| Item/Permit Type | Fee (effective 09/08/2021) |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) | \$382 |
| Administrative Permit (AP) | \$872 |
| Annexation Processing | \$26,136 |
| Appeals | |
| To Planning Commission | \$3,750 |
| To City Council | \$2,927 |
| Within 500 feet of project | 50% of cost for appeal to City Council |
| Architectural Design Review (ADR) | \$1,296 plus any outside costs |
| Conditional Use Permit (CUP) | \$7,552 per application |
| Condominium Conversion Review | \$57 per unit |
| Cottage Food (CF) | \$119 |
| Development Agreement (DA) | \$22,999 deposit to be used for staff hours, attorney costs, or contract costs |

| | |
|--|---|
| Development Review (DR) | \$5,658 per application |
| Environmental Review - Environmental Initial Study - Environmental Impact Report (EIR) | \$2,895 \$45,583 or 10% of contract value, whichever is higher OR \$45,675 deposit with charges at the fully allocated hourly rates for all personnel involved as determined by staff |
| General Plan Amendment (GPA) -Zone Change -Zone Change with GPA or Specific Plan | \$20,152 \$23,778 \$35,231 |
| Hillside Development Review (HR) | \$3,584 per application for Staff Review \$4,970 per application for Planning Commission Review |
| Home Occupation Permit (HOP) | \$69 per application |
| Initial Study (IS) | \$2,895 per application, plus any consultant cost if additional studies required |
| Landscape Plan Review (LPR) & Inspection Expedite Landscape Plan Check | \$987 per application 30% Surcharge |
| Minor Use Permit (MUP) | \$2,691 per application |
| Mitigation Monitoring | Varies staff hours + consultant costs |
| Oak Tree Permit (OTP) -Trimming -Encroachments and Retroactive Trimmings* -Removal of 1-3 trees or 1-5 on existing SFR -Removal of 4+ trees, or 6+ on existing SFR, or any Heritage Oak | \$161 \$851 \$851 \$2,701 *plus staff charges for Oak Tree Specialist time over 1 hour |
| One Stop Review (Preliminary Plan Review) | \$1,515 per application - fee credited toward other processing fees if project goes forward |
| Ridgeline Alteration Permit (RAP) | \$11,452 |
| Sign Review (SR) | \$1,050 per application |
| Sign Variance (SV) | \$2,424 |
| Temporary Banner Permit (TB) | \$83 |
| Temporary Use Permit (TUP) -Standard -Extended | \$360 per application \$2,310 per application |
| Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) -Revision | \$16,251 per application 30% of original fee |
| Tentative Tract Map (TTM) -1-24 lots -25+ lots -Revision | \$22,502 \$22,502 + \$260 each additional lot 30% of original fee |

| | |
|---|--|
| Time Extension (TEX) | \$219 per application for Staff Review \$3,334 per application for Planning Commission Review |
| Variance Review -Adjustment (ADJ) -Variance (VAR) | \$1,593 per application \$6,721 per application |
| Zoning Letter (ZL) | \$134 |

Table 29: Development and Permitting Fees in Santa Clarita and Comparable Local Jurisdictions

| City | Administrative Permit | Conditional Use Permit | Residential Design Review | Development Agreement |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Santa Clarita | \$872 | \$7,552 | \$1,296 plus any outside costs | \$22,999 deposit to be used for staff hours, attorney costs, or contract costs |
| Glendale | \$ 1,898 | \$4,599-\$11,760, depending on units | \$2,155-\$8,343 depending on type and size | \$3,080 |
| Lancaster | \$654-\$957 | \$12,845 | \$957 for model homes | Deposit determined by Staff. |
| Long Beach | \$3,380.22 | \$4,485.60 or \$7,812.42 (Major or Minor) | N/A | \$38,779.08 deposit, \$554.29/hour after initial deposit is drawn down |
| <i>Sources: City of Santa Clarita, 2021; City of Glendale, 2021; City of Lancaster, 2021; City of Long Beach, 2021; accessed 07/13/2021</i> | | | | |

Additionally, development impact fees are collected during the development process (Municipal Code Section 17.51.010). These fees (shown in Table 30) are regularly reviewed and must be set to not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of the impact. For certain fees, the City may also accept substitute consideration in lieu of all or a portion of the fees, such as land dedication in lieu of the Park Fee. As the type of development impact fees charged varies widely by jurisdiction, so do the total costs of the fees. In a 2018 study on development fees in several cities in California, impact fees ranged from under \$20,000 per unit to above \$140,000 per unit for single-family homes and from around \$10,000 per unit to above \$70,000 per unit for multifamily residential development (*Source: Terner Center, 2018*).

Development impact fees are not the same for single-family and multifamily developments, as certain impact fees are typically lower for multifamily developments. Certain impact fees are discounted for multifamily as compared to single-family developments, such as bridge and thoroughfare fees, school fees, fire facility fees, law enforcement fees, and sewer connection fees. In Santa Clarita, the typical single-family home requires \$70,060 in development impact fees, and the

typical multifamily unit requires \$53,261 in development impact fees. Based on recent development information, the average cost of impact and permit fee as a percentage of the total cost of development is 10.9%, and does not pose a constraint. In the City’s outreach and interviews of stakeholders, these stakeholders did not identify development impact fees as an impediment or constraint to housing construction and considered them to be comparable to those of nearby jurisdictions. Developers did not consider the typical fees for single-family or multifamily development as a percentage of total development costs to be an impediment or constraint to housing development.

The development impact fees for multifamily development are on the higher end and could pose a constraint. Stakeholders identified development impact fees as a major cost to consider in development but did not express that fees posed a unique or significant constraint to housing development in the City. Program HP-2.2 establishes consistency with State requirements related to impact fees as outlined in AB 602 and further ensures that fees do not constitute a constraint to development.

Table 30: Santa Clarita Development Impact Fees

| Type of Development Impact Fee | Applicability | Amount for Typical Dwelling | Responsible Agency |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Major Bridge and Thoroughfare Fees | Required by the City to be paid prior to final map recordation or building permit issuance (whichever occurs first), in order to fund any bridges or thoroughfares serving the projects that are not otherwise improved by the developer; set by City Council based on cost and area of benefit: | \$21,883 average per single-family dwelling unit; \$15,318 average per multifamily dwelling unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| | Multifamily Residential B&T Fee | 70% of typical fee based on district | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| | Accessory Dwelling Units B&T Fee | 40% of typical fee based on district | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| | Bouquet Canyon B&T District | \$19,590 per residential unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| | Eastside B&T District | \$20,270 per residential unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| | Valencia B&T District | \$26,280 per residential unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | Via Princessa B&T District | \$21,390 per residential unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| Traffic signal timing fee | Required by the City to be paid prior to occupancy, in lieu of synchronizing signals affected by the project | \$336 per dwelling unit | City of Santa Clarita Traffic Engineering |
| Park Fees | Requirement for payment of fee or land dedication is applied at time of tentative map approval; for projects of less than 50 units, fee is required; for 50 or more, land and/or fee may be required. Dedication may include cost of improvements; fees include 20% for cost of improvements. Fee is calculated based on fair market value of land at 3 acres/1000 people generated, plus 20%. The General Plan does have an overall goal of 5 acres/1,000 people. Credit allowed for private open space up to 30%. Dedication or fee payment is required prior to final map recordation or building permit issuance (whichever occurs first). | \$15,500 per dwelling unit Based on current market conditions | City of Santa Clarita Open Space Division |
| Transit fee | Required by Santa Clarita Transit to be paid at time of final map recordation or building permit issuance (whichever occurs first); fees pay for the procurement and construction of infrastructure improvements to the transit system. | \$200 per dwelling unit | City of Santa Clarita Transit |
| School fees | Required by school districts to be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund new school facilities. Castaic Union SD: \$2.47/sq.ft Newhall SD: \$2.47/sq.ft Saugus Unified SD: \$3.18 - \$3.99/sq.ft Sulphur Springs SD: \$3.18 - \$3.99/sq.ft Wm S. Hart SD: \$2.47 – 3.99/sq.ft. | \$18,050 per single-family dwelling unit; \$11,180 per multifamily dwelling unit | Various School Districts |
| Library Facilities and Technology Fee | Required by the City’s Public Library to be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund new library facilities and capital equipment | \$911 per dwelling unit | City of Santa Clarita Library Services |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Fire Facilitates Fee | Required by Los Angeles County Fire Department prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund fire station facilities and capital equipment. | \$1.3120/sq. ft. Single-family unit \$3,280 Multifamily unit \$1,312 | Los Angeles County Fire Department |
| Law Enforcement Fee | Required by Los Angeles County Sheriff prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund station facilities and capital equipment. | \$863 per single-family unit \$652 multifamily unit | Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department |
| Sewer connection fee | Required by Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts to be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund treatment plant expansion. | Single-family unit: \$2,961; Condominium: \$2,220; Multifamily unit: \$1,776 | Los Angeles County Sanitation District |
| Water connection fees | Required by Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency to be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit to fund water treatment and distribution facilities. | \$6,076/ unit Varies by service area and meter size | Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency |
| Total Impact Fees For Typical Dwelling | Typical single-family home: 2,500 square feet, 3-bedroom home. Typical multifamily home: 1,000 square feet, 2-bedroom apartment. | Single-Family Unit: \$70,060 Multifamily Unit: \$53,261 | |
| <i>Source: City of Santa Clarita, 2021</i> | | | |

Local Processing and Permit Procedures

The City of Santa Clarita processes applications and permits both in person at the Permit Center Public Counter and online through the designated eService website. The City website also hosts a Virtual Planning Counter containing information on applications, permitting processes, frequently asked questions, and contact information. The website includes an online Permit Guide, where interested parties can select the parcel and type of residential project they are considering and see information on general requirements, the planning process, phases of site work, required plan review, and other required fees and permits for the project.

The permitting process for a typical single-family or multifamily residential development project depends primarily on whether a subdivision is requested and whether building height proposed exceeds 35 feet or three stories, which is subject to a CUP.

If neither a subdivision nor building height above 35 feet (three stories) is proposed, then the development would be subject to a development review permit process and approval by the Director of Community Development and would not require public hearings. The development review process is a staff-level process, which includes

review of plans to ensure compliance with typical development standards of the zoning code

If a subdivision or building height above 35 feet/three stories is proposed, then a review by the Planning Commission would be required for a tentative map and a CUP for residential building height. In addition to a staff-level development review process, as noted above, one public hearing would be required.

Findings for approval for residential projects at either permitting level include:

- Consistency with the General Plan;
- Compliance with zoning code requirements;
- The project would not constitute a hazard to public health, safety, or general welfare;
- The project site is physically suitable for the project.

As discussed in Table 30, the typical timeline for Development Review (Class II) project is 4-6 months. A CUP falls under Class IV application type and typically takes 5-8 months. Other entitlements can be processed concurrently, and processing times for single-family and multifamily developments would be similar, and range from 4-8 months depending on permitting level.

Approval certainty for typical development projects is straightforward provided the project's compliance with typical development standards of the zoning code. Approval certainty and cost reductions are realized through the City's one stop/preliminary plan review process, where inconsistencies with the code can be identified and application fees can be applied toward future entitlement fees.

The City adopted updated "Santa Clarita Community Character and Design Guidelines" in 2009 and requires applicants to submit a completed "Community Character and Design Guidelines Questionnaire" with an application. This questionnaire addresses the project's consistency with the Guidelines and includes architectural character, site design, circulation, landscaping, and building design. Consistency with these guidelines is determined by Planning Department staff and architectural consultants. This process ensures that applicants have clear expectations for their projects and increases certainty of approval.

The City does not have a Design Review Board. The Director can grant design review approval if the following findings can be made pursuant to SCMC 17.23.110(D):

1. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan;
2. The proposal is allowed within the applicable underlying zone and complies with all other applicable provisions of this code;
3. The proposal will not endanger, jeopardize, or otherwise constitute a hazard to the public convenience, health, interest, safety, or general welfare, or be materially detrimental or injurious to the improvements, persons, property, or uses in the vicinity and zone in which the property is located; and

4. The proposal is physically suitable for the site. The factors related to the proposal’s physical suitability for the site shall include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. The design, location, shape, size, and operating characteristics are suitable for the proposed use;
 - b. The highways or streets that provide access to the site are of sufficient width and are improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such proposal would generate;
 - c. Public protection services (e.g., Fire protection, Sheriff protection, etc.) are readily available; and
 - d. The provision of utilities (e.g., potable water, schools, solid waste collection and disposal, storm drainage, wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal, etc.) is adequate to serve the site.

In order to mitigate possible constraints associated with this process, the City will develop Objective Design and Development Standards for multifamily and mixed-use projects (Program HP-2.1).

Overall, Santa Clarita’s development review process has been streamlined to minimize costs and promote development certainty. Santa Clarita’s permitting process is generally faster than other jurisdictions in the region, which decreases constraints to residential development.

The City of Santa Clarita’s Planning Division organizes applications based on the proposed project scope. Table 31 below illustrates applications that are organized from Class I, ministerial approvals that typically involve interior and exterior tenant improvements to Class VII, entitlements that typically involve legislative changes and require a discretionary review process. Class III applications, both development projects and land use projects, require public noticing and a fifteen-day appeal period once the project has been tentatively approved by the Director of Community Development (Director). Class IV applications require public hearing and planning commission decisions. Class V and VII applications require a public hearing, Planning Commission review and City Council decision. Additionally, Class VII applications require at least two public hearings and become effective thirty days after approval from the second reading of the associated ordinance. Each classification application contains process time flowcharts and a checklist of supplemental documents required for application submittal. In addition, the City’s "One Stop Review" process allows applicants to consult with the City departments prior to formal entitlement submittal. Applicants would be able to obtain preliminary insight from City departments that potentially minimize delays during Design Review.

Table 31: Timelines for Permit Procedures

| Type of Approval or Permit | Typical Processing Time |
|--|-------------------------|
| Class I Exterior additions of pools/spas, solar equipment, patio covers, signs/ banners, fences, landscaping | 1 to 24 hours |

| | |
|--|--|
| Zoning referrals and other tenant improvements | |
| <p>Class II</p> <p>Administrative Permit (AP)</p> <p>Architectural Design Review (ADR)</p> <p>Development Review (DR)</p> <p>Hillside Development Review (HDR) - less than 15% average cross slope</p> <p>Home Occupation Permit (HOP)</p> <p>Landscape Plan Review (LPR)</p> <p>Lot Line Adjustment (LLA)</p> <p>Oak Tree Permit (OTP) - encroachments, removal of less than 3 trees</p> <p>Requests for Reasonable Accommodations</p> <p>Sign Review (SR)</p> <p>Temporary Use Permit (TUP) - less than one year</p> | <p>Land use projects: 4 to 6 weeks</p> <p>Development projects: 4 to 6 months</p> <p>Requests for Reasonable Accommodations: 2 weeks</p> |
| <p>Class III</p> <p>Adjustment (ADJ)</p> <p>Minor Use Permit (MUP) (See an Example MUP Application)</p> <p>Administrative Sign Variance</p> <p>Historic Sign Designation</p> | <p>Land use projects: approximately 6-8 weeks</p> <p>Development projects: 4 to 6 months</p> |
| <p>Class IV</p> <p>Conditional Use Permit (CUP)</p> <p>Hillside Development Review (HDR) - greater than 15% average cross slope</p> <p>Oak Tree Permit (OTP) - removal of more than 3 trees or of any heritage trees</p> <p>Temporary Use Permit (TUP) - longer than one year</p> <p>Tentative Parcel/Tract Map (TPM/TTM) Variance (VAR)</p> | <p>Land use projects: 12 to 16 weeks</p> <p>Development Projects: 5 to 8 months</p> |
| <p>Class V</p> <p>General Plan Amendment</p> <p>Master Plan</p> <p>Ridgeline Alteration Permit</p> | <p>6 to 12 months</p> |
| <p>Class VI</p> <p>Pre-Annexation Agreements are Class VI entitlements</p> | <p>6 to 12 months</p> |
| <p>Class VII</p> <p>Development Agreement</p> <p>Specific Plan</p> <p>Zone Change</p> | <p>6 to 12 months</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Initial Study (Environmental Questionnaire) | 3 to 6 months |
| Environmental Impact Report (EIR) | Depending on scope of project – requires additional 3-9 months for a Negative Declaration and approximately 18-24 months for a draft and final EIR |
| <i>Source: City of Santa Clarita Planning Division website, 2021</i> | |

City permit processing times for residential entitlement applications will vary depending on City staff workload and the project’s scope of work. Residential projects that are exempt from permit requirements include, but are not limited to, accessory structures at or less than 120 sq. ft., exterior hardscape features, tenant improvements, and minimal grading on site that would not alter the drainage pattern of the property. Such project scopes may receive clearance over the counter and can take anywhere from twenty or thirty minutes to a few hours. Residential projects that go beyond the scope of work mentioned above will be reviewed by the City Planning Division and Building and Safety Division, as necessary.

Development Review (DR) is a ministerial review by the Director and does not require a public hearing, to ensure that the project complies with all of the provisions of the code, the General Plan, and other applicable requirements. In order to achieve this, the Director is empowered to grant approval with conditions for uses in zones as prescribed in this code, and to impose reasonable conditions upon the granting of a development review.

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is a discretionary process requiring a public hearing before the Planning Commission. The approving authority may impose conditions that may involve any pertinent factors affecting the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the use for which such conditional use permit is requested.

Both permit types must be found in compliance with the following findings:

1. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan;
2. The proposal is allowed within the applicable underlying zone and complies with all other applicable provisions of this code;
3. The proposal will not endanger, jeopardize, or otherwise constitute a hazard to the public convenience, health, interest, safety, or general welfare, or be materially detrimental or injurious to the improvements, persons, property, or uses in the vicinity and zone in which the property is located; and
4. The proposal is physically suitable for the site. The factors related to the proposal’s physical suitability for the site shall include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. The design, location, shape, size, and operating characteristics are suitable for the proposed use;
 - b. The highways or streets that provide access to the site are of sufficient width and are improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such proposal would generate;

- c. Public protection services (e.g., Fire protection, Sheriff protection, etc.) are readily available; and
- d. The provision of utilities (e.g., potable water, schools, solid waste collection and disposal, storm drainage, wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal, etc.) is adequate to serve the site.

The City Planning Division will conduct a minor Development Review process for smaller-scale projects such as infill development, single-family residences, accessory structures, development with 1 to 4 units, and development in approved subdivisions. These projects are typically reviewed by the Director and can take approximately four to six weeks to be approved. If the Director's decision is appealed, then the Planning Commission will hear the appeal. Additionally, any projects reviewed by Director may be elevated to the Planning Commission if the Director finds that the project:

- significantly affects neighboring properties and additional public notification is required;
- requires an Initial Environmental Review and/or Environmental Impact Review (EIR), which may take an additional 24 months and may pose a constraint to housing development;
- is generally controversial within the community; or
- requires a variance.

Properties located within a Specific Plan area require Development Review to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with design guidelines. This process takes approximately four to six weeks. The Director reviews the application and plans submitted and must make findings that the project complies with the Santa Clarita General Plan and the applicable Specific Plan. A list of Specific Plans within the City of Santa Clarita is listed below:

- Old Town Newhall
- Porta Bella
- North Valencia
- North Valencia II
- Vista Canyon
- Canyon Park
- Henry Mayo
- MetroWalk
- Lyons Corridor Plan
- Soledad Corridor Plan

There is a 15-day appeal period in which members of the public may appeal the project to the Planning Commission. If no appeals are filed, the decision from the Director becomes final.

The time between entitlement approval and submittal of building permit applications is developer-driven and varies between projects. Motivated developers have the

opportunity to assess comments and draft Conditions of Approval through the City's Development Review Committee process. In some cases, developers have applied for building permits at their own risk prior to final project approvals. In the case of the recently approved Golden Triangle apartment project (164 units), the applicant submitted a rough grading permit application and final map approximately one month following the entitlement of the project. The 2015 Kansas Street 10-unit multi-family complex submitted building permit applications within a month of entitlement approval. In some other cases, especially those involving a subdivision map, developers who have received a project entitlement do not build right away, but seek applicable extensions of the entitlement before submitting applications for building permits.

Additional constraints for residential development include existing privately controlled covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs), which impose additional development standards and requirements that are more restrictive than the City's development standards. In addition, some residential development may also require additional review and permit fees such as biological studies that analyze potential impacts to significant ecological areas, development impact fees, parkland dedications, in-lieu fees, trail/ bike path/ paseo system plans for subdivision projects, and review through the Los Angeles County's Fire Department. These requirements apply to large tracts of residential development or subdivisions and may be considered as constraints to providing multiple unit housing developments within the City's jurisdiction. However, the City has enhanced processing time through a permit classification model and provides a preliminary review process in order to streamline the permit process, thus promoting housing development certainty.

In addition to the efforts described to ensure that information is available to prospective development applicants, State law now requires cities to present certain information on their website, including:

- A current schedule of fees, exactions, and affordability requirements that apply to each parcel;
- All zoning ordinances and development standards, including zoning, design, and development standards that apply to each parcel;
- The current and five previous annual fee reports of the current and five previous annual financial reports; and
- An archive of impact fee nexus studies, cost of service studies, or equivalent, conducted on or after January 1, 2018.

While the City's current website includes up to date information related to fees, zoning, and development standards, along with a user-friendly online permit guide that allows members of the public to see permitting requirements by parcel, Program HP-2.2 ensures that the City will review this information to ensure it complies with State law. and will ensure the City develops and publishes written standards for the SB 35 streamlined ministerial process.

Historic Preservation

The City of Santa Clarita is dedicated to preserving the heritage of the Santa Clarita Valley and its historic resources. The municipal code, the City of Santa Clarita, and the Hart Park & Historical Society facilitates their own designation program for local historic landmarks and structures. These assets are governed at the local level by Chapter 17.64, Historic Preservation, of the City's UDC. This chapter serves as the local statute to protect the buildings and neighborhoods from destruction or defective rehabilitation. It also establishes a minor use permit and review process by the Director of Community Development or Planning Commission, as applicable, that is important for securing historic district designation(s) in the City of Santa Clarita. In 2013, an amended ordinance reduced the City's number of designated landmarks from 43 to 11. Due to the small number of historically designated landmarks, this statute does not provide a constraint to housing.

Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints

Environmental Constraints

Environmental and geologic conditions in Santa Clarita make certain regions in the City more vulnerable to hazards, including geologic and seismic, wildfires, and flooding. The City has established standards to reduce risk from these hazards within the Unified Development Code and as part of the development approval process. These standards may require certain construction materials, additional plan checks, and additional access requirements. Because of these development standards, these environmental factors may serve as a constraint to housing. However, these constraints are not unique to Santa Clarita. The following environmental conditions are present within areas of Santa Clarita. They are summarized here as they relate to housing. A more comprehensive explanation of these hazards is included within the Safety Element of this General Plan.

Flooding: Areas of Santa Clarita, particularly those alongside major rivers, are vulnerable to flood hazards. Drainage requirements and other flood mitigation measures are addressed in the Unified Development Code (UDC) and building code. The Safety Element includes policies to implement flood safety measures in new development, and to limit risks to existing developed areas from flooding. These may create additional costs for developers but are necessary to preserve life, safety, and property. Additionally, these measures will help preserve the existing housing stock.

Fire Hazards: Areas of Santa Clarita are within CAL FIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zones and are subject to additional development standards that address access, construction materials, water supply, and vegetation. These standards may create additional costs for developers but are necessary to preserve life, safety, and property. Additionally, these measures will help preserve the existing housing stock.

Earthquakes/Seismic Hazards: Several active earthquake fault zones traverse the City of Santa Clarita and are subject to additional State requirements due to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972, which limits where development

may occur. Additionally, the City is at an increased risk for other seismic and geologic hazards including liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides. These risks are mitigated by seismic design requirements that include construction techniques to ensure building stability. Additionally, developments in certain areas of the City may require soil or geotechnical investigations. These standards may create additional costs for developers but are necessary to preserve life, safety, and property. Additionally, safety and retrofit measures will help preserve the existing housing stock.

Infrastructure Constraints

Development constraints can occur when new projects require the City to make updates to its existing infrastructure, including updates to streets, water and sewer lines, or emergency services. New public infrastructure is typically funded by the developer and then passed to the City for maintenance and improvements. Costs of new infrastructure are eventually passed on to residents in the form of higher rental rates or sales prices. New residential developments will be evaluated for adequacy of utility infrastructure as part of the standard City development review process, but it is unlikely that infrastructure will pose a significant constraint to housing development. Stakeholders involved with residential development in the area did not identify infrastructure as a significant constraint. Information on specific infrastructure constraints is provided here:

Energy: Electrical services for the City of Santa Clarita are provided by Southern California Edison and natural gas services are provided by Southern California Gas Company. All residential projects are required to meet state building codes, which also include energy conservation standards. Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Efficiency Standards, contains a set of requirements for energy conservation, green design, construction maintenance, safety, and accessibility. Title 24 applies to all buildings in California and requires residential construction to meet minimum energy conservation standards. Compliance with the Title 24 California Administrative Code on the use of energy efficient appliances and insulation has reduced energy demand stemming from new residential development.

New residential developments will be evaluated for adequacy of energy infrastructure as part of the standard City development review process. It is unlikely that energy infrastructure will pose a constraint to housing development, and existing infrastructure will be adequate to meet the RHNA.

Water and Wastewater: The City of Santa Clarita is currently served by the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water). SCV Water is made up of three water divisions: Newhall Water Division, Santa Clarita Water Division, and Valencia Water Division. The Draft Housing Element was made available to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District and SCV Water. Feedback from the District indicates that the planned capacity of wastewater facilities is based on the growth forecast adopted by SCAG.

The City has various plans to address water availability. The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) identifies water resources available through 2050. The Water Shortage Contingency Plan outlines actions to reduce water demands in the case of a drought or water shortage. Additionally, SCV Water has prepared Water Use Efficiency Strategic Plan, conservation measures, and public education plans to address water demand security. The Recycled Water Master Plan, along with the UWMP, identified a need for new water reclamation plants to accommodate increases in wastewater demand due to population growth. The Vista Canyon Water Reclamation Plant has been completed as part of the Vista Canyon Specific Plan, and the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant will be built out as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. This falls outside of the City's jurisdiction but will increase the wastewater management capacity of the County Sanitation District that serves the City.

State and local standards set water and wastewater standards. Municipal stormwater standards are set by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit system and issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City is required to maintain infiltration infrastructure, storm drainage facilities, and an Enhanced Watershed Management Plan with monitoring programs to meet the Water Board requirements.

State law requires a water supply assessment for larger subdivisions to ensure adequate long-term water supply for single-year and multi-year drought conditions prior to issuance of a building permit. New residential developments will be evaluated for adequacy of utility infrastructure as part of the standard City development review process. These requirements and processes are not unique to Santa Clarita and are unlikely to pose a constraint to housing development given the availability of water infrastructure, and current water and wastewater facilities are sufficient to meet the RHNA.

Communications: Telecommunications services are provided by AT&T, Viasat, Spectrum, or other providers, at the discretion of future tenants. Telecommunications are generally available in the project area, and facility upgrades would not likely be necessary, and current infrastructure is adequate to meet the RHNA.

Fire and Police Services: Fire and Police services in the City of Santa Clarita are provided under contract by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD). As of 2021, Santa Clarita is served by 15 fire stations and one Sheriff's station. The LACFD maintains a 5-Year Master Fire Station Plan in order to plan for service need in areas of growth and urban expansion, including the Santa Clarita Valley, and maintains contracts with nearby stations that will provide automatic support as needed. Additionally, development impact fees help maintain fire protection service levels. These fees to maintain service levels do contribute to the cost of development overall but are not likely to pose a constraint to development as they are a small portion of total costs.

4.5 ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

4.5.1. Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Assembly Bill 686 (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, or AFFH) was adopted into law in 2018 and became effective on January 1, 2019. The law requires state and local agencies to take proactive measures to correct any housing inequalities related to race, national origin, color, ancestry, sex, marital status, disability, religion, or other protected characteristics. Agencies must ensure that their laws and programs affirmatively further fair housing, and that they take appropriate actions to do so.

Under State law, affirmatively furthering fair housing, or AFFH, means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.” Agencies must include in their Housing Elements a program that promotes fair housing opportunities for all persons. In the context of a community’s housing needs, AFFH is not just about the *number* of units needed, but also about *where* the units are located and *who* has access to them. At the time of this draft, HCD guidance was to provide this analysis in five different subsections:

- Enforcement and Outreach Capacity
- Segregation and Integration Patterns and Trends
- Disparities in Access to Opportunity
- Disproportionate Housing Needs
- Areas of Concentrated Poverty and Affluence Across Racial and Ethnic Groups.

Contributing Factors

Data compiled in this Assessment of Fair Housing and the 2019 Analysis of Impediments found high-priority challenges to fair housing in the City. In order to focus resources, maximize impact in the planning period, and strongly connect factors to goals and actions, this housing element prioritizes the contributing factors that most limit or deny fair housing choice or access to opportunity or negatively impact fair housing or civil rights compliance. Using input from the Community Preservation Division and their experience with local service providers, the following fair housing issues were identified as the highest priority issues locally. These identified issues were prioritized as outlined in Table 31 below. The table also identifies the contributing factors associated with each priority issue and the programs and actions to overcome the challenges they present.

Table 32: Fair Housing Issues, Contributing Factors, and Programs & Actions

| Prioritized Fair Housing Issues and Contributing Factors (CFs) | Meaningful Actions |
|--|---|
| Issue: Low rates of community participation | The City will undertake strategies to proactively promote housing resources and fair housing information, especially to |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>CF: Awareness of fair housing issues, participation opportunities, and lack of language access Priority: High</p> | <p>historically underrepresented and underserved communities and areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will engage and outreach to residents from lower resource areas to serve on boards, committees, task forces, and other local government decision-making bodies. (Program HP-2.10) • The City will work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs. (Program HP-2.10) • The City will seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to available assisted housing. (Program HP-2.10) |
| <p>Issue: Environmental Health Hazards in older housing stock, mainly in in Newhall and Canyon Country CF: Age of housing stock Priority: High</p> | <p>The City will implement the following programs to address environmental health hazards, including place-based strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will continue to fund and proactively promote the Handyworker Program which includes lead abatement and education and the property rehabilitation program. (Program HP-2.10, 3.2, 3.3) • The City will continue to dedicate funding to prioritize basic infrastructure improvements in Newhall and Canyon Country through the Proactive Community Preservation Program (Program HP- 4.10) • When amending the Elements within this General Plan, the City will identify objectives and policies to reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities by means that include, but are not limited to, the reduction of pollution exposure, including the improvement of air quality, and the promotion of public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activity. (Program HP- 4.8) |
| <p>Issues: Lower Resource areas in Newhall and Canyon Country have higher rates of segregation, overcrowding, and overpayment CF: Availability, location, size, and access to affordable housing Priority: High</p> | <p>The City will take the following actions to address these issues by increasing the supply of affordable housing and better integrating affordable housing within the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will prepare a feasibility study for an inclusionary housing ordinance (Program HP-1.7), which would provide affordable units within market-rate developments. • The City will encourage collaboration between local governments and community land trusts as a mechanism to develop affordable housing in higher-opportunity areas and increase opportunities for community ownership of housing. (Program HP-2.10) |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs. (Program HP-2.10) • The City will develop an outreach strategy that proactively connects tenants and those seeking rental housing with the information and resources they need. The City will seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to government assisted housing. (Program HP-2.10) • |
| <p>Issue: Communities (especially Newhall) sensitive to investment-driven displacement</p> <p>CF: Displacement of residents due to economic pressures</p> <p>Priority: High</p> | <p>The City will take actions to increase the availability of affordable housing, while implementing anti-displacement programs, including place-based strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City will review the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan, which governs land-use decisions where there are identified populations that are vulnerable to displacement, to ensure it includes anti-displacement measures (e.g. relocation assistance for projects which displace lower income residents and first right of return to existing residents). (Program HP-1.6) • The City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 65915(c)(3) for sites on the City’s Sites Inventory (Program HP-2.7) • The City will continue to promote the State’s rental and mortgage relief programs on the City website. (Program HP-2.10) • The City will proactively promote the services of the Housing Rights Center in communities who are vulnerable to displacement, and maintain year-round informational postings at community centers and other municipal buildings near vulnerable communities (Program HP-2.10) • The City will implement programs designed to increase the supply of affordable units in a range of sizes. (Programs HP-1.4: Affordable Housing Density Bonus, HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, HP- 2.1: Code Changes for Consistency with State Law, HP-3.7: Workforce Housing Program) |

4.5.2 Fair Housing Enforcement and Public Outreach

Federal and State Regulations and Enforcement

Federal, state, and local laws make it illegal to discriminate based on a person's protected class. At the federal level, the Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, and disability. In California, the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and the Unruh Civil Rights Act also make it illegal to discriminate based on marital status, ancestry, sexual orientation, source of income, or any other arbitrary forms of discrimination. Federal and state fair housing law both prohibit intentional housing discrimination and prohibit any actions or policies which may have a discriminatory effect on a protected group of people. Examples of policies or practices with discriminatory effects include exclusionary zoning and land use policies, mortgage lending and insurance practices, and residential rules that may indirectly inhibit religious or cultural expression. Both the state and the federal government have structures in place to process and investigate fair housing complaints. In California, the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) maintains the authority to investigate complaints of discrimination related to employment, housing, public accommodations and hate violence. The agency processes complaints online, over the phone and by mail. At a federal level, HUD also processes, investigates, and enforces any complaints in violation of the Federal Fair Housing Act.

Fair Housing Services and Enforcement at a Local Level

The City of Santa Clarita maintains compliance with all federal and state fair housing laws and is committed to ensuring access to fair housing services. In general, fair housing services include the investigation and resolution of housing discrimination complaints, discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars.

Los Angeles County jurisdictions are served by three fair housing service providers, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County, and The Housing Rights Center. These service providers investigate and resolve discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. These service providers also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords.

The City of Santa Clarita is serviced by The Housing Rights Center, which has been providing fair housing services to residents since 2017. In the past, the City had contracted with the Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley (FHCSFV) to provide fair housing services in the community. However, in fiscal year 2016, the City was

not able to reach an agreement with FHCSGV despite multiple attempts to complete the contracting process. In fiscal year 2017, the City was able to retain a new fair housing contractor – the Housing Rights Center (HRC).

HRC provides a minimum of two fair housing trainings for the City of Santa Clarita each year. At least one is for the public (landlords and tenants), and one may be for either the public or City staff, per the City’s preference. HRC advertises these workshops variously through direct postcard mailings, social media, its email list, its website, media contacts, and by leveraging relationships with City agencies and community-based organizations. The workshops are normally held at City-provided facilities such as the senior center or library, but in the last two years have been held virtually.

These workshops provide an overview of fair housing under federal, state, and local law, including protected classes, prohibited practices, and reasonable accommodations and modifications for tenants with disabilities. For the last two years, all workshops have also covered emergency COVID-19 housing protections and resources.

Fair Housing Discrimination Complaints

Between July 2017 and June 2021 HRC provided general fair housing information to 375 clients. During this time, 71 complaints of housing discrimination were reported by Santa Clarita residents. Of the 71 complaints, 23 were deemed significant and turned into fair housing cases (Table 33). Over half of these fair housing cases were brought upon the basis of source of income discrimination. Seven of those cases were found to have evidence to sustain the allegation of discrimination. Two of these were ultimately referred to the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, including one with the basis of discrimination being physical disability and the other being familial status. The City Attorney verified that there have been no recent lawsuits against the City related to fair housing discrimination.

Table 33: Fair Housing Complaints, Cases, Findings and Outcomes 2017-2021

| | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | Total | Percent |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| Allegations | 8 | 16 | 22 | 25 | 71 | 100% |
| Cases | 2 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 23 | 32.4% |
| Findings | | | | | | |
| Allegation Sustained | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 30.4% |
| Inconclusive Evidence | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 39.1% |
| No Evidence of Discrimination | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 4.3% |
| Pending | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 17.3 |
| Disposition | | | | | | |
| Successful Conciliation | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | 8.7% |
| No Enforcement Possible | | | 5 | 1 | 6 | 26.1% |
| Client Withdrew Allegation | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 | 8.7% |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| Pending | | 5 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 47.8% |
| Referred to Other Agency/Department | | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 8.7% |
| Basis of Discrimination | | | | | | |
| Physical Disability | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | 4 | 17.4% |
| Familial Status | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 8.7% |
| Mental Disability | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | 8.7% |
| Race | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 8.7% |
| Source of Income | - | - | 9 | 3 | 12 | 52.2% |
| Gender | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 4.3% |

Source: The Housing Rights Center, 2022

Public Housing

The City of Santa Clarita does not own or operate any public housing. Orchard Arms, a public housing development with 183 affordable units, is owned and operated by the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles (HACoLA).


HACoLA holds a “High Performer” status under HUD’s Section 8 Management Assessment Program (SEMAP); therefore, it is not designated as a “troubled” agency. Units are inspected, repaired, and maintained on a regular basis. According to HACoLA, the physical condition of its public housing stock is good. It is the goal of HACoLA to maintain each home, whether the unit is a single-family residence, or in an apartment complex. High Performer status will allow HACoLA to apply for additional programs and funding, allowing for an increased level of service for families in Los Angeles County.

Housing Choice Vouchers

The Housing Choice Voucher Program, also known as Section 8, is the nation’s largest federal rental assistance program, assisting people in low-income households find affordable, decent, and stable housing, avoid homelessness, and make ends meet. When implemented properly, vouchers can give low-income families real choices about where to live, including the chance to live in lower-poverty, higher-opportunity neighborhoods, and help public housing agencies meet their legal obligation to address housing discrimination and segregation.

HACoLA distributes housing choice vouchers in Santa Clarita, where households receiving Housing Choice Vouchers are dispersed among neighborhoods with mid- to high- opportunity index scores (Figure 20). While Housing Choice Vouchers are distributed evenly across multiple opportunity index locations, stakeholder interviews revealed that an overall lack of landlord participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program could represent a constraint to accessing affordable housing in the City. Program HP-2.10 contains actions to conduct educational outreach regarding source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs.

Figure 20: Housing Choice Vouchers and Opportunity Index Location



Source: Center on Budget and Priorities, 2021

Public Outreach

Education is one of the most important tools in ensuring that fair housing opportunities are provided, by giving residents the knowledge to understand their rights and responsibilities, to recognize discrimination, to locate resources if they need to file a complaint or need general assistance, and much more. Outreach efforts in the City are largely coordinated by the City’s contracted fair housing services provider, the Housing Rights Center (HRC).

HRC conducts media activities, such as advertisements, press releases, and interviews or comments on housing issues. HRC maintains publishing relationships with local and regional newspapers, magazines and other outlets including the *Santa Clarita Valley Signal*, *El Clasificado* (Spanish), and the local *Pet Me! Magazine* (highlighting service and support animals). HRC also circulates multiple press releases per year highlighting its fair housing programming, enforcement activities, and other major fair housing news in order to increase general awareness of its services, fair housing rights, and recourse for victims of discrimination.

HRC creates and distributes multilingual educational literature designed to be accessible at a 3rd grade reading level. This includes both general and specific fair housing topics, such as sexual harassment, reasonable accommodations, source of income discrimination, as well as other housing and landlord-tenant laws subject to frequent resident concern, such as rent increases, evictions, and harassment. HRC distributes this literature to community organizations, lenders, and City agencies, as well as directly to residents via email, social media, in person, and through targeted mailings.

HRC regularly collaborates with government and nonprofit partners serving the City of Santa Clarita and the region to generate new training and referral opportunities, as well as to stay abreast of the concerns facing Santa Clarita tenants and landlords. HRC attends regular meetings of service provider groups such as the Santa Fernando & Santa Clarita Valley Homeless Coalition (LA County SPA 2 meetings) and the City of Santa Clarita Community Resource Collaborative's quarterly meetings. HRC provides literature, trainings, and other services to organizations including New Market Careers, Help the Children, Santa Clarita YMCA, Santa Clarita Eagle Collegiate Academy, Volunteers of America, Boys and Girls Club, Santa Clarita Food Pantry, Santa Clarita Domestic Violence Center, and the Triumph Foundation; the Los Angeles Unified School District and Sulphur Springs Union School District; the Senior and Community Center and the Activities Center; the Valencia Public Library, Jo Anne Darcy Canyon Country Library, Old Town Newhall Library, and Stevenson Ranch Library.

Many of the services HRC offers to Santa Clarita and the surrounding region go beyond the specific deliverables named in its contract with the City. For example, HRC conducts in-depth Fair Housing Certification Training seminars for housing industry professionals operating properties across the region. Currently, HRC conducts weekly workshops in English and Spanish covering COVID-19 tenant protections for Los Angeles County (applying to Santa Clarita), which are streamed to hundreds of viewers on Facebook Live.

HRC maintains a website that provides fair housing information, COVID-19 resources, and easy access to its free services, including registration for virtual workshops and trainings. HRC also maintains an email subscriber list and sends regular email updates on housing legislation, upcoming events, and resources. The email list allows both general and targeted communications to tenants, landlords, Spanish-speaking audiences, and local City residents. HRC uses this email list in part to advertise Santa Clarita contract workshops. HRC also has a robust social media presence that is used to advertise events as well as to share posts from partners, including the City. HRC also created Project Place, a monthly listing of rental vacancies including the Santa Clarita area. Project Place is distributed to approximately 900 recipients monthly and available to Santa Clarita residents on HRC's website. The City also created a dedicated Fair Housing Services webpage available on the City's website in 2019.

Recent Workshops

FY 21-22 (July 2021 – June 2022)

- 9/21/21 Housing Rights Workshop on Zoom
2 attendees
- 9/7/21 Housing Rights Workshop on Zoom
8 attendees, 15 received literature
Literature emailed (total 105):

Tenant Protection Act Flyer (English/Spanish); Landlords & Fair Housing Brochure (English/Spanish); Disability RAR Flyer (English/Spanish); AB 832 Declaration Form (English); AB 832 LA County Flyer (English/Spanish/Chinese); HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish); Presentation Slides (English)

FY 20-21 (July 2020 – June 2021)

- 2/23/21 Housing Rights Workshop for Tenants on Zoom
2 attendees, 13 received literature
Literature emailed (total 102):

HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish); HRC Weekly Events Flyer (English/Spanish); Disability Brochure (English/Spanish); Disability RAR Flyer (English/Spanish); Familial Status Brochure (English/Spanish); Fair Housing Brochure (English/Spanish); Tenant Protection Act Flyer (English/Spanish); AB 3088 Step-by-Step Guide (English/Spanish)

- 2/22/21 Housing Workshop for Landlords on Zoom
10 attendees, 35 received literature
Literature emailed (total 210):

HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish); HRC Weekly Events Flyer (English/Spanish); Disability Brochure (English/Spanish); Disability RAR Flyer (English/Spanish); Familial Status Brochure (English/Spanish); Landlord & Fair Housing Brochure (English/Spanish); Tenant Protection Act Flyer (English/Spanish)

FY 19-20 (July 2019 – June 2020)

- 3/2/20 Housing Rights Workshop at Jo Anne Darcy Canyon Country Library
3 attendees
Literature distributed (total 175):

Tenant Protection Act Flyer (English/Spanish); HRC Service Flyer (English/Spanish); Who is Protected Flyer (English/Spanish); Disability Flyer (English/Spanish); Familial Status Flyer(English/Spanish); LGBTQ Flyer(English/Spanish); 2020 Summit Save the Date Flyer (English)

- 12/9/19 Housing Rights Workshop at Canyon Country Library

15 attendees

Literature distributed (total 250):

HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish); Disability Flyer (English/Spanish); Familial Status Flyer (English/Spanish); Tenant Protection Act Flier (English/Spanish); Who is Protected Flyer (English/Spanish)

FY 18-19 (July 2018 – June 2019)

- 5/22/19 Housing Rights Workshop at Santa Clarita Valencia Library

4 attendees

Literature distributed (total 125):

HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish) (English/Spanish); Landlord/Tenant Questions Flyer (English/Spanish); Disability Flyer (English/Spanish); Familial Status Flyer (English/Spanish); Legal Aid Flyer (English/Spanish)

Booths

- 3/12/20 - Santa Clarita Hiring Spree & Community Resource Fair

Literature distributed (total 125):

HRC Services Flyer (English/Spanish); Tenant Protection Act Flyer (English/Spanish); Section 8 Flyer (English/Spanish); Eviction Process Flyer (English/Spanish); Who is Protected Flyer (English/Spanish)

Media

- 1/29/21 – comment for *Santa Clarita Valley Signal* on COVID-19 eviction protections (SB 91)
- 2/24/21 – advertisement in *El Clasificado (S)* targeted to the Santa Clarita Valley area (including Canyon Country, Newhall, Santa Clarita)
- 8/2020 – advertisement in *Pet Me! Magazine* July-August issue on service and support animal reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities under the Fair Housing Act

- 1/2020 – advertisement in *Pet Me! Magazine* January-February issue on service and support animal reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities under the Fair Housing Act
- 7/2019 – advertisement in *Pet Me! Magazine* July-August issue on service and support animal reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities under the Fair Housing Act
- 5/2019 - advertisement in *Pet Me! Magazine* for the May-June issue on service and support animal reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities under the Fair Housing Act Access to Fair Housing information on the City’s website;
- Fair Housing contact information in the City’s Affordable Housing and Services brochure;
- Fair Housing posters displayed in public offices.

In preparation for the Housing Element Update, the City made a diligent effort to conduct public outreach that would engage residents from all economic segments of the community which is outlined in detail in Appendix B. Notable findings from the public outreach process that are relevant to the Assessment of Fair Housing are summarized as follows:

Community members and stakeholders were engaged throughout the process to better understand housing needs from the perspective of the community. This outreach included questions related to fair housing. Stakeholders and community members consistently identified the need for more affordable housing in the City with developers citing lack of funding and the high cost of land as a top constraint to affordable housing development. Stakeholders from non-profits identified higher rental prices as a significant obstacle for their clients which has led to residents leaving the City or living in overcrowded units to increase affordability. These stakeholders also indicated a need for workforce housing, stating that a significant portion of the workforce cannot afford to live within the City, resulting in them commuting to and from the City which contributes to traffic and carbon emissions. Advocates for seniors also identified high rental prices as quality-of-life barriers and supported ADU development and transit-oriented development to meet the need of this special needs population. Other issues that were identified include lack of Housing Choice Voucher participation, a need for multifamily housing close to amenities, and the need to address the stigma of affordable housing to overcome community opposition.

Local Data, Knowledge, and Other Relevant Factors

Local data and knowledge provide local context for data provided by HCD and HUD. Where appropriate and when available, the Assessment of Fair Housing includes additional data sources outside of those provided by HCD or HUD to further the discussion of fair housing in the City. Local knowledge obtained through conversations with City staff and stakeholder interviews has been utilized to develop a more complete analysis and to guide actions, metrics, and milestones.

Enforcement and Outreach: Contributing Factors

The primary fair housing issue related to enforcement and outreach is a low rate of community participation. The main factors that contribute to this issue are lack of awareness of fair housing issues, participation opportunities, and language access. In addition to the work done by the HRC and the City’s support of the Committee on Housing and Bridge to Home, the City will take the following actions:

- Engage and outreach to residents from lower resource areas to serve on boards, committees, task forces, and other local government decision-making bodies. (Program HP-2.10)
- Work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs. (Program HP-2.10)
- Seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to government assisted housing. (Program HP-2.10)

4.5.3 Segregation and Integration Patterns and Trends

To inform priorities, policies, and actions, the Housing Element must include an analysis of integration and segregation, including patterns and trends, related to people with protected characteristics. Integration generally means a condition in which there is not a high concentration of persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or having a disability or a particular type of disability when compared to a broader geographic area. Segregation generally means a condition in which there is a high concentration of persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or having a disability or a type of disability in a particular geographic area when compared to a broader geographic area.

Race and Ethnicity

The ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns as it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, household income, and mobility.

Table 34 shows the racial and ethnic composition of Santa Clarita’s population. Similar to the greater County of Los Angeles and State of California, no race or ethnic group represents the majority in Santa Clarita. The White Non-Hispanic population is the current plurality; however, the rate of change over the last decade indicates an increasingly diverse population, with the White Non-Hispanic population declining significantly while all other racial and ethnic groups, excluding Native American and Pacific Islander populations, have increased in the last decade.

Compared to Los Angeles County and the State of California, Santa Clarita has higher populations of White Non-Hispanics and people who identify as two or more races. While the City has lower populations of Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American, and Asians overall, the growth rates of these populations outpace both the County and State (Table 35).

Table 34: Trends in Racial and Ethnic Composition of Santa Clarita (2010-2020)

| Racial or Ethnic Group | 2010 | 2020 | Change |
|---|--------|--------|---------|
| Hispanic/Latino | 29.46% | 34.40% | +4.94% |
| White (Non-Hispanic) alone | 56.06% | 44.52% | -11.54% |
| Black or African American alone | 2.92% | 3.96% | +1.04% |
| Native American alone | 0.25% | 0.20% | -0.05% |
| Asian alone | 8.33% | 11.72% | +3.39%% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander alone | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.00% |
| Some other race alone | 0.26% | 0.57% | +0.31% |
| Two or More Races | 2.59% | 4.48% | +1.89% |

Source: U.S. Decennial Census 2010, 2020

Table 35: Trends in Racial and Ethnic Composition of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, and the State of California 2010-2020

| | Santa Clarita | | Los Angeles County | | California | |
|---|---------------|--------|--------------------|--------|------------|--------|
| | 2010 | 2020 | 2010 | 2020 | 2010 | 2020 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 29.46% | 34.40% | 47.74% | 47.98% | 37.62% | 39.40% |
| White (Non-Hispanic) alone | 56.06% | 44.52% | 27.79% | 25.60% | 40.15% | 34.69% |
| Black or African American alone | 2.92% | 3.96% | 8.30% | 7.60% | 5.18% | 5.36% |
| Native American alone | 0.25% | 0.20% | 0.19% | 0.18% | 0.44% | 0.39% |
| Asian alone | 8.33% | 11.72% | 13.50% | 14.72% | 12.82% | 15.12% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander alone | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.23% | 0.20% | 0.35% | 0.35% |
| Some other race alone | 0.26% | 0.57% | 0.26% | 0.59% | 0.23% | 0.57% |
| Two or More Races | 2.59% | 4.48% | 1.99% | 3.13% | 2.60% | 4.12% |

Source: U.S. Decennial Census 2010, 2020

Areas of Racial and Ethnic Concentration

To assist in this analysis of integration and segregation, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened the California Fair Housing Task force to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD)”. The taskforce has created Opportunity Maps to identify resource levels across the state “to accompany new policies aimed at increasing access to high opportunity areas for families with children in housing financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits”.

The Opportunity Maps measure the level of opportunity of a region, broken down by census tract, by considering levels of poverty or wealth, and degree of segregation. The model identifies indicators which are research based and represent neighborhood conditions and develops measures which can transform data to represent opportunity. These indicators are assigned to a set of domains (Table 36), such as Education, Economics and Health, which capture the extent of an individual’s life outcomes, quality of life, and capabilities. (Source: *Othering and Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley*)

The opportunity maps include a measure or “filter” to identify areas with poverty and racial segregation. To identify these areas, census tracts were first filtered by poverty and then by a measure of racial segregation. The criteria for these filters were:

- Poverty: Tracts with at least 30 percent of population under federal poverty line
- Racial Segregation: Tracts with location quotient higher than 1.25 for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, or all people of color in comparison to the County


Table 36: Opportunity Map Domains and Indicators

| Domain | Indicator |
|---------------|--|
| Economic | Poverty, Adult Education, Employment, Job Proximity, Median Home Value |
| Environmental | CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Pollution Indicators and Values |
| Education | Math Proficiency, Reading Proficiency, High School Graduation Rates, Student Poverty Rates |

Source: TCAC, 2020

According to the California Fair Housing Task Force’s 2021 opportunity maps, areas with high segregation and poverty are located in subregional cities of the San Fernando Valley including Burbank, Glendale, and San Fernando and in the greater Los Angeles county cities of El Monte, Lancaster, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palmdale, Pasadena, and Pomona. These maps show that there are no census tracts or areas of high racial segregation and poverty in Santa Clarita (Figure 21).

Figure 21: TCAC Areas of High Segregation and Poverty




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

While the 2021 HCD/TCAC map combines both poverty and patterns of minority concentrations where census tracts that have both a poverty rate of over thirty percent *and* that are designated as being racially segregated, HUD considers census tracts to be an area of minority concentration when either:

- The percentage of persons of a particular racial or ethnic minority within an area is at least twenty percentage points higher than the percentage of that minority group in the housing market area as a whole; or
- The total percentage of minority persons within an area is at least twenty points higher than the total percentage of minorities in the housing market area as a whole.


As shown in Figure 22, most of the City has well integrated racial demographics but most of the City shows some degree of Non-Hispanic White population predominance (Figure 23:). However, there are several census tracts with predominant Hispanic/Latino populations (Figure 24). Three of those census tracts with predominant Hispanic/Latino populations meet the HUD definition of areas of minority concentration census tracts having a higher density of Hispanic/ Latino residents than the whole of Santa Clarita or the Greater County of Los Angeles (Figure 22).

Figure 22: Racial Dot Density Map of Santa Clarita




Source: ESRI, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019

Figure 23: White Non-Hispanic Population Predominance by Census Tract in Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley Region, and Los Angeles County



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Figure 24: Hispanic Population Predominance by Census Tract in Santa Clarita, San Fernando Valley Region, and Los Angeles County



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Race is a known contributor to unfair housing practices. The existence of concentrations of minorities living in one location may be an indicator that some minority groups in Santa Clarita do not have as many housing choices as nonminority residents. As seen in Table 37, the tracts identified as HUD minority tracts have significantly higher Hispanic/Latino populations when compared to the City or County.

Figure 25: HUD Minority Census Tracts and Hispanic/Latino Population Predominance




Table 37: Comparative Percentages of Hispanic or Latino Population

| | 2010 | 2019 |
|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Los Angeles County | 48.5% | 47.9% |

| | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| City of Santa Clarita | 33.5% | 34.4% |
| Tract 9200.37 ¹ | 58.0% | 68.7% |
| Tract 9203.36 ¹ | 77.0% | 76.6% |
| Tract 9203.37 ¹ | 69.0% | 68.0% |
| ¹ Census Tracts in Santa Clarita that meet HUD definition of Minority Concentration Source: U.S. Decennial Census, 2010, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019 | | |

Dissimilarity Index

The “Dissimilarity Index” provides a quantitative measure of segregation in an area, based on the demographic composition of smaller geographic units within that area. One way of understanding the index is that it indicates how evenly two demographic groups are distributed throughout an area: if the composition of both groups in each geographic unit (e.g., Census tract) is the same as in the area as a whole (e.g., county), then the dissimilarity index score for that entire area will be 0. By contrast, and again using Census tracts as an example, if one population is clustered entirely within one Census tract, the dissimilarity index score for that entire area will be 100. The higher the dissimilarity index value, the higher the level of segregation in an area. Table 38 below demonstrates how HUD views various levels of the index.

Table 38: Dissimilarity Index Definitions

| Measure | Values | Description |
|---|--------|----------------------|
| Dissimilarity Index [range 0-100] | <30 | Low Segregation |
| | 30-60 | Moderate Segregation |
| | >60 | High Segregation |
| Source: University of Delaware, Center for Community Research & Service, 2021 | | |

The 2010 Dissimilarity Index for Santa Clarita reveals that the White population is highly segregated from other racial groups, scoring a value of 56.1%. While the Hispanic population has a low segregation value of 29.5%, it is close to being categorized as moderately segregated. Asian, Black, and Other Races are equally distributed throughout different census tracts in Santa Clarita.

Compared to the broader Los Angeles region, Santa Clarita’s White population is far less dispersed and approximately twice as segregated (Table 39).

Table 39: Ethnic and Racial Composition Dissimilarity Index for Santa Clarita and LA County

| Ethnic/Racial Composition | Santa Clarita Dissimilarity Index | Los Angeles County Dissimilarity Index |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|

| | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| Non-Hispanic White | 56.1% | 27.8% |
| Non-Hispanic Black | 3.6% | 8.9% |
| Hispanic | 29.5% | 47.7% |
| Asian | 10.0% | 14.9% |
| Other Races | 0.9% | 0.7% |
| <i>Source: Brown University, Diversity and Disparities, 2010</i> | | |

Familial Status

Familial status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, whether the child is biologically related to the head of household, and the marital status of the head of households. It is important to analyze familial status to identify areas where a city might need to focus resources (i.e., single-parent households, female-headed, large families, and/or elderly persons living alone).

Single-parent households may also be discriminated against in the rental housing market. At times, landlords may be concerned about the ability of such households to make regular rent payments and therefore, may require more stringent credit checks, or higher security deposits for single-parent applicants. Data from the 2015-2019 American Community Survey indicates that approximately 5,265 single-parent (both male- and female-headed) households resided within Santa Clarita, representing 7.6 percent of the City’s total households compared to Los Angeles County where single-parent households represent 8.9 percent of the total.

The most recent American Community Survey results show that 10.5 percent of households in Santa Clarita are female-headed with no spouse, and 53.3 percent of those have children under 18 years old compared to the County where 14.7 percent of households are female headed with no spouse, and 54.8 percent of them having children under 18 (Table 40).

Table 40: Trends in Familial Status in Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, and the State of California


| | Santa Clarita | | | Los Angeles County | | | California | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| | 2010 | 2019 | Rate of Change | 2010 | 2019 | Rate of Change | 2010 | 2019 | Rate of Change |
| Total Households | 57,328 | 69,046 | +20.4% | 3,217,889 | 3,316,795 | +3.1% | 12,392,852 | 13,044,266 | +5.3% |
| Family Households | 42,455 (74.1%) ¹ | 52,297 (75.7%) ¹ | +23.2% | 2,170,227 (67.44%) ¹ | 2,210,939 (66.65%) ¹ | +1.9% | 8,495,322 (68.55%) ¹ | 8,958,436 (68.67%) ¹ | +5.5% |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Average Family Size | 3.43 | 3.50 | +2.0% | 3.64 | 3.66 | +0.6% | 3.48 | 3.53 | +1.4% |
| Married-Couple Family Households | 32,763 (57.2%) ¹ | 41,122 (59.6%) ¹ | +25.5% | 1,465,486 (45.54%) ¹ | 1,495,658 (45.09%) ¹ | +2.1% | 6,166,334 (49.75%) ¹ | 6,491,236 (49.76%) ¹ | +5.3% |
| Percent With Children | 54.8% | 51.5% | -3.3% | 54.2% | 47.4% | -6.8% | 51.6% | 47.0% | -4.6% |
| Female-Headed Households, no spouse present | 6,510 (6.1%) ¹ | 7,266 (10.5%) ¹ | +11.6% | 491,428 (15.27%) ¹ | 488,776 (14.73%) ¹ | -0.5% | 1,615,112 (13.03%) ¹ | 1,690,625 (12.96%) ¹ | +4.7% |
| Percent With Children | 67.1% | 53.3% | -13.8% | 63.8% | 54.8% | -9.0% | 65.8% | 53.3% | -12.5% |
| Non-Family Households | 14,873 (25.9%) ¹ | 16,749 (24.3%) ¹ | +12.6% | 1,047,662 (32.55%) ¹ | 1,105,856 (33.34%) ¹ | +5.6% | 3,897,530 (31.44%) ¹ | 4,085,830 (31.32%) ¹ | +4.8% |
| Householder living alone over age 65 | 7.6% | 8.5% | +0.9% | 7.6% | 8.8% | +1.2% | 8.1% | 9.5% | +1.4% |
| ¹ Percent of households relative to total households Source: Source: U.S. Decennial Census, 2010, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019 | | | | | | | | | |

Due to their relatively lower per-capita income and higher living expenses, such as daycare, single-parent households face greater challenges to finding affordable, decent, and safe housing. Of particular concern are single-parent households with lower incomes.

Five tracts in Santa Clarita have concentrations of children living in female-headed households where there is no spouse or partner present (Figure 26). Data from the 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates indicate that approximately 23.3 percent of the City’s female-headed households with children had incomes below the poverty level, a 3 percent increase from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate. Additionally, two of these census tracts are considered HUD minority concentration areas. While the concentrations do not exceed the overall rates of children living in female-headed households in the state or county, Program HP-2.10 addresses the need for place-based strategies to provide information about housing rights and services available to vulnerable populations.

Figure 26: HUD Minority Census Tracts and Female Headed Households by Census Tract in Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Higher densities of individuals living with a spouse are found near the borders of Santa Clarita, significantly in the northern census tracts where 60-80 percent of

individuals live with a spouse (Figure 27). Individuals living with a spouse often have more economic opportunities as they may have higher combined household incomes.

Figure 27: Households Living with a Spouse by Census Tract in Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

At 1.7 percent, the City has a lower share of 7+ person households than the SCAG region overall based on the 2014-2018 ACS 5-year estimates. The City also has a lower share of single-person households than the SCAG region overall as seen in Appendix A.

Of Santa Clarita’s 24.3 percent of non-family households, 8.5 percent are households age 65 or older that live alone. The City has three census tracts consisting of higher percentages of single-person households (Figure 28). One of these tracts has higher concentrations of persons with disabilities.

Figure 28: Households Living Alone by Census Tract in Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Persons with Disabilities

Fair housing choice for persons with disabilities can be limited based on the nature of their disability. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) defines a disability as a “physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities.” Special housing needs for persons with disabilities fall into two broad categories: physical design to address mobility impairments, and in-home social, educational, and medical support to address developmental and mental impairments. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, approximately ten percent of the population in both the City, County, and State have one or more disabilities (Table 41).

Persons with physical and mental disabilities may face additional barriers while seeking housing, including discrimination. Landlords/owners sometimes fear that a unit may sustain wheelchair damage or may refuse to exempt disabled tenants with service/guide animals from a no-pet policy. Additionally, some units may not be accessible to physically disabled tenants without significant modifications. Persons with mental disabilities may face barriers such as stigma, where landlords may refuse


to rent to tenants with a history of mental impairment and community opposition can prevent the establishment of group homes for persons with mental disabilities. In order to ensure the safety of disabled persons, the City maintains a special needs registry. In accordance with Federal Law, the City requires that Housing providers make reasonable accommodations to allow for modifications that may be necessary to allow persons with disabilities to live comfortably in their housing and that certain multifamily housing must be accessible to persons with disabilities.

Table 41: Trends in Disability Characteristics

| | Santa Clarita | | Los Angeles County | | California | |
|--|---------------|------|--------------------|------|------------|-------|
| | 2015 | 2019 | 2015 | 2019 | 2015 | 2019 |
| Total with a Disability | 9.8% | 9.6% | 9.7% | 9.9% | 10.4% | 10.6% |
| Hearing Difficulty | 2.8% | 3.0% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.9% | 2.9% |
| Vision Difficulty | 1.6% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| Cognitive Difficulty | 3.9% | 3.8% | 4.0% | 4.1% | 4.3% | 4.3% |
| Ambulatory Difficulty | 5.3% | 5.2% | 5.8% | 5.7% | 5.9% | 5.8% |
| Independent Living | 4.9% | 4.7% | 5.4% | 5.4% | 5.5% | 5.5% |
| Self-Care Difficulty | 2.3% | 2.2% | 2.8% | 2.9% | 2.6% | 2.6% |
| Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates 2011-2015, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019 | | | | | | |

As seen in Figure 29, Santa Clarita has similar rates and distributions of persons living with disabilities when compared to the San Fernando Valley Region and larger Los Angeles County. According to ACS 2015 – 2019 estimates, between 10 to 20 percent of the population residing in census tracts located south of Santa Clarita (Sylmar, Granada Hills, San Fernando and Pacoima) had one or more disabilities. Similarly, urbanized communities north of Santa Clarita, near the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, exhibited identical disability rates per census tract. It is not uncommon to find concentrations of disabled populations, as care facilities are often located in proximity to hospitals or other medical facilities.

Figure 29: Households Living with a Disability by Census Tract in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley, and Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

In Santa Clarita, two census tracts have higher percentages of people living with disabilities. Local knowledge informs that the northern tract, 9200.11, is sparsely populated and is largely located outside of City limits (Figure 30).

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, Census Tract 9203.30, located in Valencia, consists of 22.1 percent of disabled individuals. In this tract, over 73 percent of those with disabilities are over age 75. As seen in Table 42, most individuals with disabilities in this tract reported independent living and ambulatory difficulties. Notably, the Black and African American population, which represents just 1.7 percent of the total population of this tract, is disproportionately affected by disability in this area.


The data for census tract 9203.30 is likely skewed by the concentration of licensed residential care facilities for the elderly near the Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital which is also located in the tract (Figure 31).

Figure 30: Households Living with a Disability by Census Tract in Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Figure 31: Location of Licensed Care Facilities in Santa Clarita



Source: Santa Clarita Analysis of Impediments, 2021

Table 42: Disability Characteristics for Census Tract 9203.30

| Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin | Percent of Disabled Population |
|--|--------------------------------|
| White alone | 23.8% |
| Black or African American alone | 78.6% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | -- |
| Asian alone | 15.5% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | -- |
| Some other race alone | 0.0% |
| Two or more races | 7.4% |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino | 26.2% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 12.5% |
| Disability Type | |
| With an independent living difficulty | 16.2% |
| With an ambulatory difficulty | 13.5% |
| With a cognitive difficulty | 12.6% |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| With a self-care difficulty | 9.1% |
| With a hearing difficulty | 7.1% |
| With a vision difficulty | 2.8% |
| Source: 2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates | |


Income

Household income is the principal factor in determining a household’s ability to balance housing costs with other basic life necessities. Households with lower incomes are limited in their ability to balance housing costs with other needs, and often face additional barriers when seeking adequate housing.

While economic factors that affect a household’s housing choice are not a fair housing issue per se, the relationships among household income, household type, race/ethnicity, and other factors often create misconceptions and biases that raise fair housing concerns.

Identifying geographies and individuals with a low- to moderate- income (LMI) is important to overcome patterns of segregation. Figure 32 and Figure 33 show LMI areas in Santa Clarita and the County by Census block group. HUD defines LMI areas as a Census tract or block group where over 51 percent of the population is LMI (based on HUD income definition of up to 80 percent of the area median income).


Figure 32: Percent of Low- to Moderate-Income Block Groups in Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer 2021, HUD 2020

In Santa Clarita, six block groups in the Newhall and Canyon Country areas were identified as having 75-100 percent of their population considered LMI. Areas with the lowest percentages of LMI households are in the eastern and northern parts of Santa Clarita.


Figure 33: Percent of Low- to Moderate- Income Block Groups in LA County



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer 2021, HUD 2020

Median incomes in Los Angeles County are unevenly dispersed, as shown in Figure 34. Low to moderate incomes in Los Angeles County are concentrated in the Central and South regions, as well as in the San Fernando Valley and the San Gabriel Valley. In these areas, 75-100 percent of populations earn a low to moderate income. Further west of LA and along the coast, in the Santa Monica Mountains and the Westside, less than 25 percent of the population is low-income. While Santa Clarita’s median household income is higher than Los Angeles County’s and above the HCD 2020 State Median Income, there are still regions with a concentration of low-income households.


Figure 34: Median Income Block Groups in LA County Area



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Median incomes over \$125,000 in Santa Clarita can be found dispersed throughout the northern, central, and eastern tracts. Households earning less than \$87,100 are primarily located in central Santa Clarita, while households earning between \$87,100 and \$125,000 are located more towards the outer edges of the city. Twelve census block groups have households that earn less than \$55,000, and one block group in western Santa Clarita near Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital has a median income that earns less than \$30,000 (Figure 35). Potential contributing factors that may affect the concentration of lower median incomes in Santa Clarita include the location and type of affordable housing available and access to economic opportunities within the city. Neighborhoods with lower median incomes concentrated in the southern part of the city had a disproportionate share of renter-occupied housing and mobile home parks, compared to areas with higher median incomes and census block groups with lower median incomes were more likely to have a greater share of subsidized rental units, permanent supportive housing and emergency shelters for persons experiencing homelessness. Additionally, while there are no low resource areas within Santa Clarita city limits, areas with lower median incomes had the lowest opportunity scores in Santa Clarita.

Figure 35: Median Income Block Groups in Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Poverty

8.2 percent of Santa Clarita’s households are experiencing poverty, compared to 14.9 percent of households in Los Angeles County. Poverty thresholds, as defined by the ACS, vary by household type. In 2019, a single individual under 65 was considered in poverty with an income below \$13,330/year, while the threshold for a family consisting of 2 adults and 2 children was \$26,246/year (Source: Appendix A).

Figure 36: Percent of Households in Poverty in the Last 12 Months in Santa Clarita by Census Tract



Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019

While most of Santa Clarita’s tracts have less than 10 percent of households below the poverty level, areas with higher concentrations of poverty are worth noting. Four census tracts in the Newhall and Canyon Country districts have populations where 20-30 percent of individuals are living below the poverty level (Figure 36).

Integration and Segregation: Contributing Factor

Various metrics show higher rates of segregation in the Newhall and Canyon Country areas, with higher concentrations of lower and moderate-income households, female-headed households with children, and Hispanic residents. The primary contributing factor to these issues is the location and type of affordable housing. To address this, the City will take the following actions:

- The City will prepare a feasibility study for an inclusionary housing ordinance (Program HP-1.7), which would provide affordable units within market-rate developments.

- The City will encourage collaboration between local governments and community land trusts as a mechanism to develop affordable housing in higher-opportunity areas and increase opportunities for community ownership of housing. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will develop an outreach strategy that proactively connects tenants and those seeking rental housing with the information and resources they need. The City will seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to government assisted housing. (Program HP-2.10)

4.5.4 Disparities in Access to Opportunities

While it is common to find ethnic enclaves of persons based on cultural values, it is important to analyze any areas of socioeconomic or racial concentration to ensure equitable access to opportunities and identify issues that could negatively impact residents such as access to resources like education, healthy environments, employment, and transportation.

HUD has developed a series of indices for the purpose of fair housing assessment to help inform communities about disparities in access to opportunity. HUD-provided index scores are shown in Table 43 which assess residents' access to key opportunity assets in Santa Clarita based on the scores of the following opportunity indices:

- **Low Poverty Index:** The low poverty index captures poverty in a given neighborhood. The poverty rate is determined at the census tract level. ***The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.***
- **School Proficiency Index:** The school proficiency index uses school-level data on the performance of 4th grade students on state exams to describe which neighborhoods have high-performing elementary schools nearby and which are near lower performing elementary schools. ***The higher the score, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.***
- **Labor Market Engagement Index:** The labor market engagement index provides a summary description of the relative intensity of labor market engagement and human capital in a neighborhood. This is based upon the level of employment, labor force participation, and educational attainment in a census tract. ***The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood.***
- **Transit Trips Index:** This index is based on estimates of transit trips taken by a family that meets the following description: a 3-person single-parent family with income at 50% of the median income for renters for the region (i.e. the Core-Based Statistical Area (CBSA)). ***The higher the transit trips***

index, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.

- **Low Transportation Cost Index:** This index is based on estimates of transportation costs for a family that meets the following description: a 3-person single-parent family with income at 50 percent of the median income for renters for the region/CESA. ***The higher the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.***
- **Jobs Proximity Index:** The jobs proximity index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a region/CESA, with larger employment centers weighted more heavily. ***The higher the index value, the better the access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.***
- **Environmental Health Index:** The environmental health index summarizes potential exposure to harmful toxins at a neighborhood level. The higher the index value, the less exposure to toxins harmful to human health. ***Therefore, the higher the value, the better the environmental quality of a neighborhood, where a neighborhood is a census block-group.***

Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Hispanic residents were more likely to be impacted by poverty, limited access to proficient schools, lower labor participation rate, and more likely to utilize public transportation in the Santa Clarita.

Table 43: HUD Opportunity Index Values by Racial and Ethnic Group

| | Low Poverty Index | School Proficiency Index | Labor Market Index | Transit Index | Low Transportation Cost Index | Jobs Proximity Index | Environmental Health Index |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Total Population | | | | | | | |
| White, Non-Hispanic | 71.90 | 69.56 | 61.46 | 69.92 | 66.33 | 41.46 | 54.70 |
| Black, Non-Hispanic | 63.67 | 67.04 | 58.66 | 72.43 | 69.91 | 39.62 | 53.61 |
| Hispanic | 56.27 | 63.09 | 51.08 | 73.71 | 70.99 | 44.03 | 52.74 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic | 69.81 | 71.23 | 63.96 | 71.04 | 68.20 | 43.16 | 53.70 |
| Native American, Non-Hispanic | 65.09 | 66.28 | 56.94 | 70.06 | 67.37 | 45.96 | 54.26 |


| Population Below Federal Poverty Line | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| White, Non-Hispanic | 64.13 | 68.76 | 57.14 | 71.64 | 68.96 | 43.17 | 54.66 |
| Black, Non-Hispanic | 62.92 | 63.30 | 56.31 | 66.37 | 65.40 | 47.25 | 56.50 |
| Hispanic | 35.59 | 62.76 | 40.62 | 77.85 | 77.98 | 45.40 | 49.83 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic | 65.60 | 74.88 | 67.43 | 77.60 | 75.53 | 49.48 | 51.04 |
| Native American, Non-Hispanic | 73.00 | 61.58 | 47.91 | 61.55 | 60.83 | 47.22 | 61.42 |

Source: Santa Clarita Analysis of Impediments, 2019

Based on the indicators determined by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Area Index (as explained in Section 4.5.3, Table 36) the City has been given resource designations ranging from moderate- to highest- areas of opportunity based upon consideration of factors affecting quality of life and health outcomes including educational enrollment and attainment, employment rates, overcrowding in housing, overpayment for housing costs, transportation costs, and environmental health.

The TCAC Opportunity Area Index map is provided as Figure 37. High opportunity areas are in the northern and western regions of Santa Clarita. Most tracts in the city are considered moderate to high resource areas and there are no areas indicated as low resource areas. Areas previously identified as lower-income and Hispanic/Latino population concentration are identified as moderate resource areas, which is the lowest score in the City.

Figure 37: TCAC Opportunity Area Index Map of Santa Clarita Census Tracts




Source: TCAC, 2021

Education

Public education in the Santa Clarita Valley is administered by the following school districts:

- Castaic Union School District
- Newhall School District
- Saugus Union School District
- Sulphur Springs School District
- William S. Hart Union High School District

Figure 38: TCAC Education Opportunity Index Values in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley Region, and Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Title 1 schools help low-achieving children meet state standards in core academic subjects. These schools coordinate and integrate resources and services from federal, state, and local sources. To be considered for Title 1 school funds, at least 40 percent of the students must be considered low-income. There are seven Title 1 schools in

Santa Clarita. Figure 39 shows the location of schools in the City with Title 1 schools indicated in red. The map shows low- to moderate- income (LMI) areas in grey. LMI areas are well served by Title 1 schools. All LMI neighborhoods within the attendance boundaries of Newhall School District and Sulphur Springs District are served by their Title 1 Schools.

Figure 39: Schools and Title 1 Status in Low- and Moderate-Income Areas of Santa Clarita



Source: HUD, 2020

Schools perform universally well in Santa Clarita and in the 2018-2019 reporting year, Santa Clarita school districts outperformed both the Los Angeles Unified District and the State in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (Table 44).

Table 44: California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress

| District | Level 1: Standard Not Met | Level 2: Standard Nearly Met | Level 3: Standard Met | Level 4: Standard Exceeded |
|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Castaic Union | 23.49% | 30.33% | 26.47% | 19.70% |
| Newhall | 13.04% | 18.30% | 24.01% | 44.65% |
| Saugus Union | 17.79% | 26.15% | 28.33% | 27.73% |

| | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Sulphur Springs Union | 22.39% | 27.82% | 24.73% | 25.07% |
| William S. Hart Union | 22.74% | 24.32% | 24.45% | 28.49% |
| Los Angeles Unified | 40.7% | 25.83% | 18.39% | 15.08% |
| California Statewide Average | 34.86% | 25.41% | 20.04% | 19.69% |
| Source: California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, 2021 | | | | |

Most adults in Santa Clarita have completed a high school education and residents in the City have better educational attainment outcomes in terms of secondary degrees than greater Los Angeles County and the state (Table 45).

Table 45: Educational Attainment for Adults 25 and Over

| Area | High School Graduate or Higher | Bachelor’s Degree or Higher | Graduate or Professional Degree |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Santa Clarita | 90.5% | 36.8% | 11.8% |
| LA County | 79.1% | 21.2% | 11.3% |
| California | 83.3% | 33.9% | 12.8% |
| Source: ACS 5-Year Estimates (2014-2019) | | | |

Environment

The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) developed the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) to identify communities disproportionately burdened by pollution. CalEnviroScreen uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic information to produce scores for comparing and mapping every census tract in the state. An area with a high score is one that experiences a much higher pollution burden, sensitive populations, or adverse socioeconomic factors than areas with low scores. The following indicators are used in the CalEnviroScreen Assessment:

- Exposure: Air Quality, Lead Risk in Housing, Diesel Particulate Matter, Drinking Water Contaminants, Pesticide Use, Toxic Releases from Facilities, Traffic Density
- Environmental Effects: Cleanup Sites, Groundwater Threats, Hazardous Waste Generators and Facilities, Impaired Water Bodies, Solid Waste Sites and Facilities
- Sensitive Populations: Asthma, Cardiovascular Disease, Low Birth Weight Infants
- Socioeconomic Factors: Educational Attainment, Housing Burden, Linguistic Isolation, Poverty, Unemployment


According to the data put forth by CalEPA, there are no census tracts that qualify as disadvantaged communities. However, two census tracts in the Newhall district are at risk of being considered disadvantaged communities and stand out on several AFFH issues; similar issues are also present in the Canyon Country area (Figure 40). Of the individual indicators analyzed in these tracts, exposure to poor air quality/ozone, lead in housing, and drinking water contaminants as well as socioeconomic factors such as poverty, linguistic isolation, housing burden, and educational attainment contributed to scores that designate these areas as at-risk of becoming disadvantaged. Some indicators, like exposure to ozone, are largely outside of local control and affect many residents in the valleys of Southern California.

Likewise, water quality is controlled by the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water) who recently released the 2021 Water Quality Report. This report indicated that every three years, each water system is required to sample for lead and copper at specific customer taps as part of the Lead and Copper Rule. In 2019, SCV Water also tested all public K-12 schools in the service area. No traces of lead were detected in any source waters in the Santa Clarita Valley by any of the local water systems.

The report also included findings regarding chemical contaminants in drinking water including perchlorate and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). Contaminants were identified in several wells which led to SCV Water taking measures to ensure the safety of the water. Since February 2020, additional wells were voluntarily removed from service as ongoing monitoring revealed PFOA concentrations. In December 2020, SCV Water brought the first ion exchange treatment for PFAS online, bringing three wells back into service. Currently, SCV Water is in various stages of design and construction for PFAS treatment plants to return more of these wells back into service.

To address the environmental hazards from lead in housing that disproportionately affect the older housing stock in Newhall, the City will implement Program HP-3.2, HP-3.3, HP-4.10, and HP-2.10 which include place-based strategies to address the aging housing stock in these areas.

Figure 40: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Index Scores in Santa Clarita



Source: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 2021

Table 46: Indicators for At-Risk of Becoming Disadvantaged Tracts in Santa Clarita


| | Census Tract 9203.36 | Census Tract 9203.37 |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Exposure Indicators | | |
| Air Quality- Ozone | X 94 | X 95 |
| Air Quality- PM 2.5 | X 46 | X 48 |
| Diesel Particulate Matter | X 50 | X 47 |
| Lead in Housing | X 80 | X 54 |
| Pesticide Use | X 0 | X 0 |
| Toxic Releases from Facilities | X 27 | X 24 |
| Traffic Density | X 65 | X 84 |
| Drinking Water Contaminants | X 86 | X 89 |
| Environmental Effect Indicators | | |
| Cleanup Sites | X 71 | X 0 |

| | | |
|--|------|------|
| Groundwater Threats | X 13 | X 17 |
| Hazardous Waste Generators and Facilities | X 41 | X 26 |
| Impaired Water Bodies | X 0 | X 0 |
| Solid Waste Sites and Facilities | X 40 | X 64 |
| Sensitive Populations Characteristics | | |
| Asthma | X 35 | X 56 |
| Low Birth Weight | X 46 | X 59 |
| Cardiovascular Disease | X 32 | X 57 |
| Socioeconomic Factors | | |
| Education Attainment | X 89 | X 81 |
| Linguistic Isolation | X 90 | X 75 |
| Poverty | X 90 | X 78 |
| Unemployment | X 61 | X 65 |
| Housing Burden | X 89 | X 94 |
| Aggregate Scores | | |
| Pollution Burden | X 71 | X 59 |
| Sensitive Population Burden | X 66 | X 77 |
| Overall CalEnviroScreen 4.0 | X 73 | X 74 |
| X 75-100: High Burden X 25-75: Moderate X 0-25: Low Burden | | |

Source: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 2021

Compared to the Los Angeles County region, Santa Clarita has better environmental outcomes overall. Most of the San Fernando Valley and areas of Downtown Los Angeles contain disadvantaged communities, while Santa Clarita does not (Figure 41).

Figure 41: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Index Scores in the LA County Area



Source: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 2021


Transportation

Public transit is relevant to the issue of fair housing, as access to public transit is of paramount importance to households affected by low incomes and rising housing prices. Public transit should link lower-income persons, who are often transit dependent, to major employers where job opportunities exist. Access to employment via public transportation can reduce welfare usage rates and increase housing mobility, which enables residents to locate housing outside of traditionally lower- and moderate-income neighborhoods. The lack of a relationship between public transit, employment opportunities, and affordable housing may impede fair housing choice because persons who depend on public transit will have limited choices regarding places to live. In addition, elderly and disabled persons also often rely on public transit to visit doctors, go shopping, or attend activities at community facilities. Public transit that provides a link between job opportunities, public services, and affordable housing helps to ensure that transit-dependent residents have adequate opportunity to access housing, services, and jobs.

The City of Santa Clarita Transit provides public transportation services to the City of Santa Clarita and nearby surrounding unincorporated areas (Figure 42). The City of Santa Clarita Transit also provides commuter services to various communities in Los Angeles County including connections with Metro. Additionally, the agency accommodates connections with Metrolink and the Antelope Valley Transit Authority at various transfer points within the city limits. The City of Santa Clarita Transit supports the needs of the disabled community by ensuring that all bus lines are accessible through wheelchair lifts, with at least two on each bus. In addition, the agency offers free fares on local routes and reduced fares on its commuter express lines to seniors 60 and over or disabled passengers with identification. The various services include:

- **Commuter Express Service:** The Transit Commuter Bus offers service to and from major places outside of the Santa Clarita Valley, including various locations in Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley.
- **Station Link Service:** Station Link service provides services from the Santa Clarita Metrolink station to major local places of employment within the Santa Clarita Valley.
- **Dial-A-Ride:** For persons with special needs due to age or disabilities, the agency offers paratransit services for qualified elderly or special needs customers, as well as the general public. City residents who are at least 60 years of age or have a certified disability are eligible to use Dial-A-Ride anytime during regular service hours.
- **Paratransit Services:** Access Services Incorporated offers paratransit services for individuals whose disabilities prevent them from using regular buses or rail service.

Figure 42: Bus Lines and Stops (shown as colored lines and dots) in Santa Clarita



Source: City of Santa Clarita Transit, 2021

Ride-dependent populations are defined as individuals who, for one reason or another, do not have the ability to transport themselves and therefore rely on other means (i.e., public transportation) for basic mobility needs. Industry standards defines ride-dependent individuals as low-income, seniors, youth, persons with disabilities, and those with no or limited access to a personal vehicle.

The most recent Transit Development Plan for the City included an analysis to identify areas with large populations or ride-dependent groups to help identify gaps between existing service and demand. The analysis identified an increase in ride dependent populations which translates to a strong and continuing demand for effective transit options. frequency) and demand. While providing local fixed routes is useful in serving most populations (such as youth and low-income individuals), more individualized mobility options (such as dial-a-ride service) can be more effective for others (including some persons with disabilities or seniors). Santa Clarita Transit


currently operates 21 supplemental routes to local junior high schools and high schools as a means of providing affordable home-to-school transportation for the community's youth, as well as a local dial-a-ride service for eligible seniors and persons with disabilities.

Routes 1/2, 4/14, and 5/6 serve the Santa Clarita Senior Center, while the dial-a-ride service is available to those qualifying individuals over the age of 60 who are unable to use the fixed-route system. Additional senior-oriented destination/trip generators (such as senior housing) and the routes serving them include:

- Belcaro (Route 7);
- Bouquet Canyon Seniors (Routes 3, 4/14);
- Canterbury Village Seniors (Routes 4/14, 5/6);
- Canyon Country Senior Apartments (Route 12);
- Castaic Lake Senior Village (Routes 1);
- Fountain Glen Apartments (Route 7);
- Friendly Valley (Routes 12);
- Orchard Arms (Routes 5/6);
- Pacifica Senior Living (Routes 5/6);
- Santa Clarita Convalescent Home (Route 12);
- Summerhill Villa (Routes 5/6);
- Sunrise at Sterling Canyon (Routes 5/6);
- Valencia Villas (4/14); and
- Whispering Oaks (Routes 4/14)

The Transit Development Plan illustrated the relationship between transit demand and supply by quantifying aggregate demand (ride-dependent population as well as total residents) within individual census tracts in the Santa Clarita Valley. Figure 43 provides a visual representation of the aggregate demand by identifying the ride-dependent distribution combined with block population information. This demand data was then contrasted with transit supply, quantified by representing each route alignment within the Santa Clarita Transit fixed-route service area. The analysis found high concentrations of ride-dependent persons residing in the south and southeast areas/portions of the Valley. These areas are currently served by Routes 12 and 5/6, along with several commuter routes (757, 795, 796, 797, and 799) and various school trippers. The Plan identified the need to maintain and expand transit service in areas with high concentrations of ride-dependent persons. The report included robust community outreach and an Operations Plan chapter that provided recommendations to meet the needs of the community and implementation measures to be taken by the City of Santa Clarita Transit Service.


Figure 43: Ride-Dependent Population by Block Group in Santa Clarita



Source: The City of Santa Clarita Transit Development Plan, 2019

The City’s affordable housing units are universally well-served by public transit (Figure 44). As shown, most affordable housing projects in the City are situated along transit routes, with all but two being located within one-quarter mile of a bus stop, which are only slightly outside of the given radius and are still considered to be well-served by transit.

Figure 44: Affordable Housing Near Public Transit



Source: Santa Clarita Analysis of Impediments, 2019

Economic Development and Access to Jobs

The TCAC Opportunity Map accounts for regional differences in access to opportunities and identifies economic outcomes for each census tract. A score of less than 0.25 is considered a less positive economic outcome, while scoring greater than 0.75 indicates higher access to opportunities.

The index is based on measurements of the following indicators:


- Poverty
- Adult Education
- Employment
- Job Proximity

The City has mixed ratings in terms of economic outcomes (Figure 45). Areas with the lowest economic index scores are located in Newhall and Canyon Country, where other trends in segregation have been identified including higher rates of poverty, HUD minority concentration, and higher rates of children living in female headed households with no spouse present. Neighborhoods in the central part of the city (near the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Whites canyon Road) and the

southern part of the city (near intersection of Newall Ave and Lyons Ave) had a concentration of census tracts with less positive economic outcomes that overlapped with areas exhibiting a higher rate of persons with disabilities and a greater share of non-white residents compared to areas with more positive economic outcomes in the city. Likewise, outcomes are universal throughout the Los Angeles County region with economic outcomes often reflecting other patterns of segregation (Figure 46). The following programs contain implementing actions to address these disparities:


- The City will continue to promote the State’s rental and mortgage relief programs on the City website. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will proactively promote the services of the Housing Rights Center in communities who are vulnerable to displacement, and maintain year-round informational postings at community centers and other municipal buildings near vulnerable communities (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will implement programs designed to increase the supply of affordable units in a range of sizes. (Programs HP-1.4: Affordable Housing Density Bonus, HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, HP- 2.1: Changes for Consistency with State Law, HP-3.7: Workforce Housing Program)

Figure 45: Economic Index Map of Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer 2021, TCAC 2021

Figure 46: Economic Index Map of LA County Area




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer 2021, TCAC 2021

According to ESRI Community Analyst, 71 percent of the working population in Santa Clarita is employed in white collar industries. As of 2021, the top three sectors of the labor force in the City are in management, office administration, and sales. These are also the top three sectors of the labor force in Los Angeles County.

Employment Inflow/Outflow analyses highlight the movement of workers commuting into and out of selected geographies such as cities or counties (Figure 47). Movement captured by inflow/outflow diagrams shows both the employment level of a community and whether it is a net importer or exporter of workers.

Figure 47: Inflow and Outflow Analysis of Santa Clarita



**Note: Arrows do not indicate directionality of worker flow*


Source: OntheMap.ces.census.gov, 2021

Data from On the Map identifies Santa Clarita as a net exporter of workers. A majority of those who live in Santa Clarita are employed outside of the C (52.8%), while 15.3 percent of residents work within the area. Non-residents who are employed within the City comprise of 31.8 percent of Santa Clarita’s workforce. In sum, twice as many people employed in Santa Clarita are from outside of the City. Further analysis of worker flow is needed to identify if there is a housing need for non-resident employees. The City continues to work on creating job opportunities locally through programs like the Jobs Creation overlay zone (JCOZ) for residents, thus reducing work trips outside of the City.

Santa Clarita has a wide range of ratings on the HUD Jobs Proximity Index, which quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a statistical area (Figure 48). The Jobs Proximity Index is used in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program determination process; however, a recent study published by HUD found no evidence that HCV households in the labor force are more likely than those not in the labor force to locate closer to

jobs. In addition, the authors found no link between job proximity and greater earned incomes. However, HCV households are a diverse group, and proximity to jobs is worth acknowledging for households in the workforce without access to reliable transportation.

Figure 48: HUD Jobs Proximity Index Map of Santa Clarita and Surrounding Areas




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Areas with the closest proximity to jobs in Santa Clarita are located in the northwestern census tracts, while areas to the south have lower proximity to jobs. Many census tracts in the City have low job proximity ratings despite major employers being well-served by public transit (Figure 53). From the northern and eastern regions of the City, there is little access to employment opportunities for residents within the neighborhoods, as observed by the lowest values in red. Areas in the eastern and southern part of Santa Clarita with lower job proximity scores have a larger share of non-white residents and also were more likely to have lower median incomes and higher rates of poverty compared to areas of high job proximity in the northwest of the city.

As indicated by Figure 47, most residents are employed outside of the City. A number of development projects on the eastern portion of the City have been approved and/or are under construction that will create new, local job opportunities. These development projects include the Center at Needham Ranch, Vista Canyon, Sand Canyon Plaza, and the Plaza at Golden Valley. Intergovernmental cooperation will be necessary to ensure equity in transportation access to these new job opportunities, as the areas with lowest job proximity scores overlap with lower income areas bearing higher concentrations of Hispanic or Latino residents.

Figure 49: Public Transit and Major Employers



Source: Santa Clarita Analysis of Impediments, 2019

Disparities in Access to Opportunities: Contributing Factors

The main disparities in access to opportunities in Santa Clarita are related to economic conditions and environmental health hazards which are more prevalent in Newhall and Canyon Country, areas with higher populations of protected classes. The main factor that contributes to these issues are the location and type of affordable housing. To address this, the City will take the following actions:

- The City will prepare a feasibility study for an inclusionary housing ordinance (Program HP-1.7), which would provide affordable units within market-rate developments.
- The City will encourage collaboration between local governments and community land trusts as a mechanism to develop affordable housing in higher-opportunity areas and increase opportunities for community ownership of housing. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will work with LACDA to develop a landlord education and outreach program that will include information on source of income discrimination and Housing Choice Voucher programs. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will develop an outreach strategy that proactively connects tenants and those seeking rental housing with the information and resources they need. The City will seek to establish an affirmative marketing campaign aimed at promoting equal access to government assisted housing. (Program HP-2.10)

4.5.5 Disproportionate Housing Needs

The HUD AFFH Guidebook defines ‘disproportionate housing needs’ as “a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing need when compared to the proportion of a member of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing the category of housing need in the applicable geographic area.” The analysis is completed by assessing cost burden, severe cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing.

The City’s 2019 Analysis of Impediments found that 52 percent of Santa Clarita households experience ‘housing problems’ at higher rates than the County overall. Findings also revealed that non-white, minority households in the City experience housing problems at higher rates than non-white, minority households in the County.

Data indicates that renters, elderly, and large (7+ persons) households may be subject to disproportionate housing problems, including affordability and adequate physical needs. Renters in both the City and the County experience housing problems at a greater rate than owners.

Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden

Housing cost burden is most commonly measured as the percentage of gross income spent on housing, with 30 percent a commonly accepted threshold for ‘cost burden’ and 50 percent the threshold for ‘severe cost burden.’ Renter- and owner-occupied households in Santa Clarita experience housing cost burdens at similar, if not slightly lower, rates than households across Los Angeles County. However, a lower-income household spending the same percent of income on housing as a higher-income household will likely experience a greater ‘cost burden.’

As seen in Table 47, renters experience ‘cost burden’ and ‘severe cost burden’ at higher rates than owners in both the City and the County. Additionally, ACS data shows that the majority of renters earn less than the median annual income, while the majority of owners earn more than the median annual income. Some of the implications of high-cost burden can include housing-induced poverty, where overspending on housing leaves households little financial resources for other expenditures, and reduced savings which can impact asset accumulation.


As seen in other sections of the Assessment of Fair Housing, census tracts in Newhall and Canyon Country are disproportionately affected by cost burden for renters and homeowners (Figure 50, Figure 51). Cost burden in these areas is more likely to seriously impact households’ financial wellbeing, as these areas also experience higher rates of poverty, lower household incomes, and have higher percentages of children living in female-headed households without a spouse or partner. Actions taken under Program HP-1.7, HP-2.10, and HP-3.7 seek to address these issues by supporting affordable housing development and bringing services to these areas to support equitable economic outcomes.

Local knowledge has indicated that the reason for severe cost burden for renters in the northeast area of the City is likely due to the presence of the College of the Canyons campus, which does not have student housing. Students are often underemployed and rely on financial aid, student loans, or family support which often are not reflected in their individual incomes. This could skew the representation of the data in this area.

Table 47: Cost Burden & Severe Cost Burden by Tenure in the City and County


| | Cost burden > 30% | Cost Burden >50% |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Santa Clarita | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 30.54% | 12.16% |
| Renter-Occupied | 54.77% | 25.74% |
| Los Angeles County | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 34.98% | 16.26% |
| Renter-Occupied | 54.16% | 29.34% |
| <i>Source: HUD CHAS Data; ACS 2013-2017</i> | | |

Figure 50: Percent of Renters Overpaying for Housing in Santa Clarita by Census Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Figure 51: Percent of Owners Overpaying for Housing in Santa Clarita by Census Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021


Overcrowding

Overcrowding is defined as housing units with more than one person per room, including dining and living rooms, but excluding bathrooms and kitchen. Overcrowding has been correlated with increased risks of contracting communicable diseases, higher rates of respiratory illness, and greater vulnerability to being homeless. Residential crowding reflects demographic and socioeconomic conditions. Older-adult immigrant and recent immigrant communities, families with low incomes and renter-occupied households are more likely to experience household crowding. A form of residential overcrowding known as "doubling up" is co-residing with family members or friends for economic reasons. Doubling up is the most commonly reported living situation for families and individuals before the onset of homelessness. (California Health and Human Services).

According to the 2019 5-year ACS estimates, a lower percentage of households in Santa Clarita (3.8%) are living in overcrowded conditions than the County (6.6%).

Census tracts in the Newhall and Canyon Country areas have the highest rates of overcrowding in the City (Figure 52). This issue overlaps with other socioeconomic disparities including higher rates of poverty, children living in female headed households with no spouse or partner present, HUD minority concentration, and lower economic and environmental index scores. Programs HP-1.7, HP-2.10, and HP-1.6 seek to overcome disparate trends in these areas.


Figure 52: Percent of Overcrowded Households in Santa Clarita by Census Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Regionally, census tracts with overcrowded households are concentrated in urban areas, particularly in the City of Los Angeles, San Fernando, and El Monte (Figure 53). Areas in the northern and western Los Angeles tracts have lower rates of overcrowding. However, in the Los Angeles’ Gateway Cities region and Central LA region, high rates of overcrowding are the majority. Santa Clarita has less cases of overcrowding than the surrounding areas overall.


Figure 53: Overcrowding in Santa Clarita and the Surrounding Areas



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Severe overcrowding is defined as more than 1.51 persons per room. One census tract in the Newhall area has a high concentration of severely overcrowded households, 30.4 percent, compared to the rest of the City which broadly reports less than 5.0 percent of households being severely overcrowded (Figure 54). Census tracts in the Newhall and Canyon Country areas have the highest rates of severe overcrowding in the City. This issue overlaps with other socioeconomic disparities including higher rates of poverty, children living in female-headed households with no spouse or partner present, HUD minority concentration, and lower economic and environmental index scores. Programs HP-1.6, HP-1.7, and HP-2.10 have been included to overcome disparate trends in these areas.

Figure 54: Severe Overcrowding in Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Substandard Housing

The American Community Survey includes questions that are used to indicate ‘substandard housing’ as defined by the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 24, § 5.425). In Santa Clarita, 2.6 percent of occupied housing lacks either telephone service, plumbing facilities, or complete kitchen facilities; 3.7 percent of occupied homes in Los Angeles County experience the same issues. The rate of substandard housing within surrounding jurisdictions differed slightly compared to Santa Clarita. About 4 percent of occupied housing units in the City of Los Angeles, 2.7 percent in Lancaster and 2.4 percent in Palmdale were considered substandard, according to the U.S Census Bureau. Local data from City staff responsible for Community Preservation indicates that an estimated 4 percent of units will require rehabilitation in the next 10 years. The areas staff identified include Newhall, Canyon Country, and Saugus which are older and have a history of code enforcement. The most recent CHAS data indicates that lower income households experience substandard housing at higher rates than moderate and above moderate-income households (Table 48).

Program HP-2.10 and HP-3.2 implements actions to conduct outreach in lower income areas of the City and to implement the Handyworker Program which provides grants to qualified applicants up to \$5,000 to help pay for necessary repairs to their homes.

Table 48: Substandard Housing and Household Income

| Income by Housing Problems (Owners and Renters) | Household has at least 1 of 4 Housing Problems | Household has none of 4 Housing Problems OR cost burden not available, no other problems | Total |
|---|--|--|--------|
| Household Income <= 30% HAMFI | 4,675 | 825 | 5,500 |
| Household Income >30% to <=50% HAMFI | 5,200 | 1,020 | 6,225 |
| Household Income >50% to <=80% HAMFI | 6,600 | 2,545 | 9,145 |
| Household Income >80% to <=100% HAMFI | 4,090 | 2,905 | 6,995 |
| Household Income >100% HAMFI | 7,270 | 32,445 | 39,720 |
| Total | 27,840 | 39,745 | 67,585 |


Source: CHAS, 2021

Homelessness

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) conducts annual point-in-time surveys of homeless populations. According to the LAHSA, there were 63,706 homeless individuals in Los Angeles County in 2020, 46,090 of which were reported as unsheltered. Of the total homeless population in Los Angeles County, Hispanic/Latino (36%) comprised the largest share of homeless persons in the region, followed by Black/African American (34%), White (25%), Multi-Racial/Other (2%), and Asian (1%). The same survey identified 168 people reported as experiencing homelessness in Santa Clarita in 2020, a 35 percent decline from 2019 (Figure 55). 103 homeless residents surveyed were reported as unsheltered, with almost 75 percent of those individuals reporting that they live in a vehicle (car, van, or recreational vehicle). Of the 65 sheltered individuals, 87.7 percent reported being sheltered in emergency shelters and 12.3 percent reported being in transitional housing.

Services for homeless individuals in Santa Clarita are provided by homeless services provider Bridge to Home. Bridge to Home operates year-round 24/7 services for up to 60 people at any given time and has an approved proposal to expand its services. The Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness also works toward completing action items from the Community Plan to Address Homelessness. The City supports for the Task Force on Homelessness to implement the Community Plan to Address Homelessness, including supporting the Shared Housing Program, which will offer innovative housing solutions that add to the stock of attainable, sustainable housing, by establishing shared living arrangements between home seekers and those with space in existing housing

Figure 55: Los Angeles County Point-In-Time Homeless Count Results in Santa Clarita



Source: LAHSA, 2021


Displacement

UCLA’s Urban Displacement Project defines residential displacement as “the process by which a household is forced to move from its residence - or is prevented from

moving into a neighborhood that was previously accessible to them because of conditions beyond their control.” As part of this project, the UCLA team has an interactive map that displays changes in neighborhood characteristics that may indicate displacement. Two key factors in visualizing displacement are the loss of low-income households and increases in rent. According to the Urban Displacement Project, five census tracts in the City are at risk of displacement (Figure 56). The proactive community preservation program is in place to prevent displacement in the City. Place-based strategies in the most vulnerable areas will seek to reduce the likelihood of displacement including actions taken under Programs HP-2.10 and HP-1.6.

The Newhall area is currently undergoing revitalization led by the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan which utilizes both physical and policy initiatives to increase transit-oriented development, increase mixed uses, and create a variety of housing types. To overcome any risk of investment-driven displacement, the plan will implement City policies, state mandates, and housing incentives that facilitate the development of necessary low- and moderate-income dwellings. The Plan identifies the risk of displacement due to proposed redevelopment. The Plan, in conjunction with the General Plan, outlines specific actions to overcome that risk. Actions taken under Programs HP-2.7 and HP 2.10 reduce the risk of investment- driven displacement.

Figure 56: Census Tracts Vulnerable to Displacement in Santa Clarita




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Additionally, the vulnerable tracts identified in Figure 56 are at risk of disaster-driven displacement from either flood risk, fire risk, or both (Figure 57, Figure 58). The most destructive flooding event in recent history in the City occurred in 2005 when flooding caused significant damage to a mobile home park and other residential sites near Newhall Creek. Additionally, unhoused residents are particularly vulnerable to disaster-driven displacement.


FEMA programs can help residents in the immediate aftermath of a disaster but certain communities such as disabled, elderly, or residents without a local support network may face additional challenges if they find themselves displaced by disaster. Policies in the City’s Safety Element seek to overcome these risks including the prioritization of climate mitigation actions and retrofits in neighborhoods that currently experience social or environmental injustice or bear a disproportionate burden of potential public health impacts, cooperation with other agencies to ensure adequate shelter for homeless persons to limit their exposure to accidental injury and illness, and the implementation of the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure safe travel paths and accommodations for persons with disabilities.

Figure 57: Fire Severity Zones in Santa Clarita



Source: The State of California and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2021

Figure 58: Subsidized Housing, Mobile Home Parks and Flood Risk in Santa Clarita



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021


Policies in the City’s Safety Element seek to overcome these risks including the prioritization of climate mitigation actions and retrofits in neighborhoods that currently experience social or environmental injustice or bear a disproportionate burden of potential public health impacts.

Housing Affordability

According to data from Zillow.com, a real estate and rental market website that uses a specific methodology to calculate typical home values, Santa Clarita’s typical home values are slightly lower than surrounding Los Angeles County with values increasing at a similar exponential rate between 2012 and 2021 (Figure 59).

As is being experienced across much of the state, home values in the City have increased dramatically during the post-pandemic recovery, increasing nearly 18 percent in the last year alone. Additional data from the Southland Regional Association of Realtors indicates the home sales prices in the Santa Clarita Valley region have risen 28 percent in the last year. The Southland Regional Association of Realtors’ Income-to-Loan guide indicates that a loan applicant would need an income of \$156,788 to obtain a loan for a single-family home in the Santa Clarita Valley region. The most recent 5-year ACS estimates the median income in the City of Santa Clarita to be \$99,666.

Figure 59: Home Value in the City and the County Over Time



Source: Zillow, 2021

Data from Zillow also revealed an increase in rental rates in the City of 6 percent over the last five years. The average rental rate for studio, one- and two- bedroom apartments in the City is \$1,300, \$1,750, and \$2,450, respectively.

As seen in Table 49, many block groups with HUD defined minority concentration, cannot afford the average rent for a one-bedroom rental in the City without falling into a housing cost-burden where total housing costs exceed 30 percent of gross monthly income (HUD).

Table 49: Minority Concentration Areas and Affordability of Average Rent

| Census Tract/ Area | Block Group | Median Income | Ability to afford Average Rent without Cost-Burden | | |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------|
| | | | Studio/\$1300 | 1-BR/ \$1700 | 2-BR/\$2450 |
| 9200.36 Canyon Country | 1 | \$59,667 | Yes | No | No |
| | 2 | \$61,667 | Yes | No | No |
| | 3 | \$109,886 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| | 4 | \$81,667 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 9200.37 Canyon Country | 1 | \$69,986 | Yes | Yes | No |
| | 2 | \$49,487 | No | No | No |
| | 3 | \$58,250 | Yes | No | No |
| 9203.36 Newhall | 3 | \$44,040 | No | No | No |
| | 4 | \$51,875 | No | No | No |
| 9203.37 Newhall | 1 | \$48,750 | No | No | No |
| | 2 | \$70,250 | Yes | Yes | No |
| | 3 | \$77,240 | Yes | Yes | No |
| | 4 | \$44,306 | No | No | No |

Source: ACS 2015-2019; Zillow Average Rental Cost in Santa Clarita

Disproportionate Housing Needs: Contributing Factors

Fair housing issues related to disproportionate housing needs in Santa Clarita include displacement, overcrowding, and overpayment, primarily in Newhall and Canyon Country areas. The highest priority factors that contribute to these issues are the location and availability of affordable housing in a range of sizes and the displacement of residents due to economic pressures. In addition to the programs described in 4.5.3 to increase the availability and integration of affordable housing and the City’s continued work with the Santa Clarita Community Task Force on Homelessness, the Committee on Housing, and implementing the Community Plan to Address Homelessness the City will take the following actions:

- The City will review the Old Town Newhall Specific Plan, which governs land-use decisions where there are identified populations that are vulnerable to displacement, to ensure it includes anti-displacement measures (e.g.

relocation assistance for projects which displace lower income residents and first right of return to existing residents). (Program HP-1.6)

- The City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 65915(c)(3) for sites on the City's Sites Inventory (Program HP-2.7)
- The City will continue to promote the State's rental and mortgage relief programs on the City website. (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will proactively promote the services of the Housing Rights Center in communities who are vulnerable to displacement, and maintain year-round informational postings at community centers and other municipal buildings near vulnerable communities (Program HP-2.10)
- The City will implement programs designed to increase the supply of affordable units in a range of sizes. (Programs HP-1.4: Affordable Housing Density Bonus, HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, HP- 2.1: Zoning for a Variety of Housing Types, HP-3.7: Workforce Housing Program)


4.5.6 Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (RECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50 percent) that have either a poverty rate that exceeds 40 percent or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. In Los Angeles County, RECAP clusters have become smaller over time, with RECAPs scattered in sections of Palmdale, Long Beach, and San Fernando. Larger RECAP clusters can be seen in the central portion of the City of Los Angeles.

Racially Concentrated Areas of Poverty


According to the 2009-2013 HUD estimates there are no RECAPs in Santa Clarita. The areas where the most people experience poverty have largely stayed the same or expanded, while the more affluent areas have not seen an increase in the percentage of people experiencing poverty. Over the last decade, the same areas in Newhall and Canyon Country are the most impacted by poverty, have higher concentrations of minority populations, experience more disparities in access to opportunities, and have disproportionate housing needs including overcrowding, risk of displacement, and higher incidents of substandard housing.

Figure 60: Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley SCAG Subregion, and Santa Clarita, ACS 5- Year Estimates 2010-2014



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Figure 61: Percent of Population Below Poverty Level in Los Angeles County, San Fernando Valley SCAG Subregion, and Santa Clarita, ACS 5-Year Estimates 2015-2019




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence

While racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty and segregation (RECAPs) have long been the focus of fair housing policies, racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) must also be analyzed to ensure housing is integrated, a key to fair housing choice. According to a policy paper published by HUD, RCAA is defined as affluent, white communities. According to HUD's policy paper, whites are the most racially segregated group in the United States and “in the same way neighborhood disadvantage is associated with concentrated poverty and high concentrations of people of color, conversely, distinct advantages are associated with residence in affluent, white communities.”

RCAAs have not been studied extensively nor has a standard definition been published by HCD or HUD. This fair housing assessment uses the percent white population and median household income as proxies to identify potential areas of affluence. As Figure 62 shows, census tracts in the city with a large white population (over 50 percent) tend to be in areas where household median incomes are above the state median income however, that is not always the case.

Figure 62: Percentage of White Population and Median Incomes (HCD) by Census Block Group



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021


Another way to visualize this data is by looking at how median incomes have changed over the last decade in relationship to the percentage of the non-white population. Figure 63 and Figure 64 show the median incomes for census block groups in Santa Clarita from the ACS 5- year estimates from 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 respectively. The graduated circles represent the percentage of the total non-white populations from 2010 and 2018 respectively. Smaller circles indicate higher percentages of White alone, non-Hispanic populations and larger circles indicate higher percentages of non-White populations.

While median incomes have increased in almost all areas of the city, the areas with the lowest median incomes have the highest percentages of non-White populations, while the areas with the highest median incomes tend to have lower percentages of non-white populations. While incomes have risen across most census block groups in the City, these maps indicate increasing segregation of non-white populations in the areas of Newhall and in some portions of Canyon Country, which have been repeatedly identified as experiencing higher rates of poverty, more disparities in access to opportunities, and have disproportionate housing needs including overcrowding, risk of displacement, and higher incidents of substandard housing.

Similar to Santa Clarita, increasing median income trends and ethnic/racial composition have changed across the region. Median income levels across urbanized neighborhoods in northern Los Angeles County including Sylmar, Pacoima, Granada Hills, the cities of San Fernando, Palmdale and Lancaster had increased when comparing 2010 and 2015 ACS 5- year estimates. In addition, ethnic/racial demographics across communities in the throughout northern Los Angeles County has also changed, as the total percentage of non-White population significantly increased during this time. To contrast, high income areas of concentrated affluence within Santa Clarita and the surrounding region experienced increasing median incomes, however the percent of total non-white population increase at a slower rate compared to areas with lower median incomes.


However, there does appear to be improvement outside of those areas as the City becomes increasingly diverse over time. New revitalization strategies implemented through the Oldtown Newhall Specific Plan aim to transform the area to better meet the needs of the community while reducing the risk of displacement. The Specific Plan is guided by design principles for transit-oriented development and will create a more diverse set of housing choices. Additionally, the Plan will create new economic opportunities that will continue to bring economic opportunities to the area. Likewise, recent investment in Canyon Country has brought new development to the community including the opening of the Canyon Country Community Center which offers multi-generational services, programs, and activities to the community.

Figure 63: Median Income and Percent of Non-White Population by Block Group in 2010



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

Figure 64: Median Income and Percent of Non-White Population by Block Group in 2019



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021

R/ECAP and RCAA: Contributing Factors

While there are no RECAPs in Santa Clarita, areas of the City have higher concentrations of poverty and of racial and ethnic minorities. The main factor that contributes to this issue is the location and type of affordable housing, and programs to address this issue are described in 4.5.3, Integration and Segregation.

APPENDIX A: SCAG LOCAL HOUSING DATA





TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSEHOLDS
- II. SPECIALIZED HOUSEHOLD NEEDS: LARGE FAMILIES, SENIORS, AND FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS
- III. PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS
- IV. PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, INCLUDING DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES
- V. HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS
- VI. OVERPAYMENT AND OVERCROWDING
- VII. ASSISTED UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION
- VIII. FINAL REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION


Pre-Certified Local Housing Data for Santa Clarita

Developed by SCAG and pre-certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for use in 6th cycle housing elements.

This report contains a wide range of jurisdiction-level data elements intended to provide an understanding housing need experienced in Santa Clarita as a part of its 6th cycle housing element update. Data sources are noted below each table or figure.

I. POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSEHOLDS

Population Trend, 2000-2020




CA DOF E-5 Population and Housing Unit Estimates

Santa Clarita has a 2020 total population of 221,932 including 1,500 living in group quarters according to the California Department of Finance. The chart above describes the population trend in Santa Clarita from 2000 to 2020. Over this period Santa Clarita had an annual growth rate of 1.9% compared to 0.7% for the region.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Current Population by Age and Sex



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates

The population of Santa Clarita is 49.6% male and 50.4% female. The share of the population of Santa Clarita which is under 18 years of age is 25.9%, which is higher than the regional share of 23.4%. Santa Clarita's seniors (65 and above) make up 11.3% of the population, which is lower than the regional share of 13%.

Employment by Industry




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates using groupings of 2-digit NAICS codes.

Santa Clarita has 104,338 workers living within its borders who work across 13 major industrial sectors. The chart above provides detailed employment information. The most prevalent industry is Education & Social Services with 23,164 employees (22.2% of total) and the second most prevalent industry is Professional Svcs. with 12,024 employees (11.5% of total).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Employment by Occupation



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates using groupings of SOC codes.

In addition to understanding the industries in which the residents of Santa Clarita work, it is also possible to analyze the types of jobs they hold. The most prevalent occupational category in Santa Clarita is Management, in which 45,614 (43.7% of total) employees work. The second-most prevalent type of work is in Sales, which employs 23,693 (22.7% of total) in Santa Clarita.

Farmworkers

Farmworkers by Occupation:

| Santa Clarita | Percent of total Santa Clarita workers: | SCAG Total | |
|---------------|---|------------|--|
| 102 | 0.10% | 57,741 | Total jobs: Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations |
| 102 | 0.14% | 31,521 | Full-time, year-round jobs: Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations |

Employment in the Agricultural Industry:


| Santa Clarita | Percent of total Santa Clarita workers: | SCAG Total | |
|---------------|---|------------|--|
| 178 | 0.17% | 73,778 | Total in agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting |
| 190 | 0.26% | 44,979 | Full-time, year-round in agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting |

American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates using groupings of NAICS and SOC codes.

Statewide, farmworker housing is of unique concern and of unique importance. While only a small share of SCAG region jurisdictions have farmworkers living in them, they are essential to the region's economy and food supply.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Housing Tenure



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Housing security can depend heavily on housing tenure, i.e. whether homes are owned or rented. Santa Clarita's housing stock consists of 67,583 total units, 45,807 of which are owner-occupied and 21,776 of which are renter-occupied. The share of renters in Santa Clarita is lower than in the SCAG region overall.

Housing Tenure By Age




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

In many places, housing tenure varies substantially based on the age of the householder. In Santa Clarita, the age group where renters outnumber owners the most is 15-24 (by 79.8%). The age group where owners outnumber renters the most is 65-74 (by 62.8%).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Housing Tenure by Year Moved to Current Residence




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Across the SCAG region, the most common move-in period was 2010-2014 (31.9%) followed by 2000-2009 (26.1%). In Santa Clarita, the period during which most people started living in their current residence was 2010-2014 (30%) followed by 2000-2009 (29.7%).

II. SPECIALIZED HOUSEHOLD NEEDS: LARGE FAMILIES, SENIORS, AND FEMALE-HEADED

Households by Household Size




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

This chart illustrates the range of household sizes in Santa Clarita for owners, renters, and overall. The most commonly occurring household size is of two people (29.1%) and the second-most commonly occurring household is of three people (19.3%). Santa Clarita has a lower share of single-person households than the SCAG region overall (18.9% vs. 23.4%) and a lower share of 7+ person households than the SCAG region overall (1.7% vs. 3.1%).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Female Headed Households (FHH)



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Statute requires analysis of specialized housing needs, including female-headed households in an effort to ensure adequate childcare or job training services. Of Santa Clarita's 67,583 total households, 11.3% are female-headed (compared to 14.3% in the SCAG region), 5.5% are female-headed and with children (compared to 6.6% in the SCAG region), and 0.8% are female-headed and with children under 6 (compared to 1.0% in the SCAG region).

Households by Poverty Status



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

4.1 percent of Santa Clarita's households are experiencing poverty, compared to 7.9 percent of households in the SCAG region. Poverty thresholds, as defined by the ACS, vary by household type. More information can be found at M256. In 2018, a single individual under 65 was considered in poverty with a money income below \$13,064/year while the threshold for a family consisting of 2 adults and 2 children was \$25,465/year.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Elderly Households by Income and Tenure

| | | Owner | Renter | Total | Percent of Total Elderly Households: |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Income category, relative to surrounding area: | < 30% HAMFI | 1,085 | 1,070 | 2,155 | 15.3% |
| | 30-50% HAMFI | 1,480 | 750 | 2,230 | 15.8% |
| | 50-80% HAMFI | 1,875 | 445 | 2,320 | 16.4% |
| | 80-100% HAMFI | 1,220 | 260 | 1,480 | 10.5% |
| | > 100% HAMFI | 5,305 | 615 | 5,920 | 42.0% |
| TOTAL | | 10,965 | 3,140 | 14,105 | |

HUD CHAS, 2012-2016. HAMFI refers to Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income.

Statute requires analysis of specialized housing needs, including housing needs for seniors. Federal housing data define a household type as 'elderly family' if it consists of two persons with either or both age 62 or over. Of Santa Clarita's 14,105 such households, 15.3% earn less than 30% of the surrounding area income, (compared to 24.2% in the SCAG region), 31.1% earn less than 50% of the surrounding area income (compared to 30.9% in the SCAG region).

III. PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS




2019 city and county homelessness point-in-time counts processed by SCAG. Jurisdiction-level counts were not available in Imperial County and sheltered population (and thus total) counts were not available in Riverside County. As a result, SCAG region totals from this compilation of data sources likely undercount true totals.

#N/A

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

IV. PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, INCLUDING DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES


Disability by Type



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Disability data also provides valuable context for assessing current and future need for accessible housing units. Note that since some disability types are not recorded for children below a certain age, calculating disability as a percentage of total population may not be accurate.

Disability by Type - Seniors (65 and over)



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

In Santa Clarita, the most commonly occurring disability amongst seniors 65 and older was an ambulatory disability, experienced by 24.2% of Santa Clarita's seniors (and 22.9% of seniors in the SCAG region).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Disability by Employment Status

| | With a Disability | Percent of Total | No Disability | Percent of Total |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Employed | 4,517 | 43% | 94,168 | 78% |
| Unemployed | 560 | 5% | 5,346 | 4% |
| Not in Labor Force | 5,515 | 52% | 21,220 | 18% |
| TOTAL | 10,592 | | 120,734 | |

American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Understanding the employment status of people with disabilities may also be an important component in evaluating specialized housing needs. In Santa Clarita, 42.6% of the population with a disability is employed, compared to 78% of the non-disabled population.

Developmental Disabilities

| | | Santa Clarita |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| By Residence: | Home of Parent/Family/Guardian | 1021 |
| | Independent/Supported Living | 41 |
| | Community Care Facility | 38 |
| | Intermediate Care Facility | 0 |
| | Foster/Family Home | 15 |
| | Other | 10 |
| By Age: | 0 - 17 Years | 1125 |
| | 18+ Years | 729 |
| TOTAL | | 2979 |


CA DDS consumer count by CA ZIP, age group and residence type for the end of June 2019. Data available in 161/197 SCAG jurisdictions.

The California Department of Developmental Services also provides data on developmental disabilities by age and type of residence. These data are collected at the ZIP-code level and were joined to the jurisdiction-level by SCAG. Totals may not match as counts below 11 individuals are unavailable and some entries were not matched to a ZIP code necessitating approximation.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

V. HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS


Housing Type



CA DOF E-5 Population and Housing Unit Estimates

The chart above provides detailed information on the housing stock in Santa Clarita, which has a total of 77,008 housing units. The most prevalent housing type in Santa Clarita is single-family detached with 46,951 units. The share of all single-family units in Santa Clarita is 72.8%, which is higher than the 61.7% share in the SCAG region. Out of the total housing units in Santa Clarita, there are 74,149 occupied-units, which equates to a 3.7% total vacancy rate. The average household size (as expressed by the population to housing unit ratio) is 2.973.

Housing Type Trend




CA DOF E-5 Population and Housing Unit Estimates

Over the past two decades (2000-2020), there has been more construction of single-family residential units than multi-family residential units in Santa Clarita. When comparing 2000 to 2020, SFR units increased by 17,930, MFR units increased by 6,286, and mobile units increased by 336.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Vacant Units by Type



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

The ACS provides additional detail on vacant housing units by category.

Housing Units by Year Structure Built




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Examining the age of the current housing stock is one way to understand how historical development patterns have contributed to a city's form. The time period where the highest share of Santa Clarita's housing units were built is 1980-1989, while in the SCAG region more units were built during 1970-1979 than any other period.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Substandard Housing



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

The ACS includes surveys about three factors of what may be considered substandard housing. In Santa Clarita, 805 units lack telephone service, 96 units lack plumbing facilities, and 592 units lack complete kitchen facilities.

Median Home Sales Price for Existing Homes




SCAG Local Profiles, Core Logic/Data Quick. SCAG median home sales price calculated as household-weighted average of county medians.

Between 2000 and 2018, median home sales prices in Santa Clarita increased 134% while prices in the SCAG region increased 151%. 2018 median home sales prices in Santa Clarita were \$538,000 and the highest experienced since 2000 was \$548,100 in 2006. Prices in Santa Clarita have ranged from a low of 87.8% of the SCAG region median in 2007 and a high of 126.2% in 2009.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Housing Units Permitted



Core Logic/Data Quick. Additional detail available in SCAG 2019 Local Profiles. SCAG median home sales price calculated as household-weighted average of county medians.

VI. OVERPAYMENT AND OVERCROWDING

Crowding by Extent and Tenure



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

In Santa Clarita, 1,077 owner-occupied and 3,199 renter-occupied households had more than 1.0 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for overcrowding. 175 owner-occupied households and 1,179 renter-occupied households had more than 1.5 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for severe overcrowding.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Cost Burden by Income

| Households by Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost: | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Income | < 30% | 30-50% | > 50% |
| < 30% HAMFI | 564 | 575 | 4,405 |
| 30-50% HAMFI | 1,395 | 1,680 | 3,165 |
| 50-80% HAMFI | 3,130 | 3,845 | 1,730 |
| 80-100% HAMFI | 3,480 | 2,470 | 409 |
| > 100% HAMFI | 27,770 | 4,155 | 384 |
| Total Households | 36,339 | 12,725 | 10,093 |

HUD CHAS, 2012-2016. HAMFI refers to Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income.

Housing cost burden is most commonly measured as the percentage of gross income spent on housing, with 30% a usual threshold for 'cost burden' and 50% the threshold for 'severe cost burden.' However, a lower-income household spending the same percent of income on housing as a higher-income household will likely experience more true 'cost burden.' These data indicate the number of households in Santa Clarita by their income relative to the surrounding area and their share of income spent on housing.


Spending on Rent



Across Santa Clarita's 21,776 renter households, 12,574 (57.7%) spend thirty percent or more of gross income on housing cost, compared to 55.3% in the SCAG region. Additionally, 5,876 renter households in Santa Clarita (27%) spend fifty percent or more of gross income on housing cost, compared to 28.9% in the SCAG region.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Spending on Rent by Income



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

While the previous table breaks down cost burden by area-relative income, the ACS also allows for the analysis of Santa Clarita's 21,077 renter households (for which income data are available) by spending on rent by income bracket (dollar amounts). As one might expect, the general trend is that low-income households spend a higher share of income on housing (e.g. over 50%) while high-income households are more likely to spend under 20% of income on housing.

Household Income by (Cash) Rent




American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Santa Clarita renter households' cash rent paid can be broken down by household incomes. As one might expect, the general trend is that lower-income households spend less on rent while higher-income households spend more on rent, though this may not be universally true. Rent categories range from <\$500/month (2.1% of Santa Clarita renters) to >\$2000/month (36.5% of Santa Clarita renters). The most common rent category in Santa Clarita is \$1500-2000/month with 37.3% of renters.

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Monthly Owner Costs for Mortgage Holders



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

While renter households receive much of the focus when it comes to housing cost analysis, owner households make up 67.8% of Santa Clarita and 52.5% of the SCAG region. The most commonly occurring mortgage payment in Santa Clarita is \$2000-\$3000/month and the most commonly occurring mortgage payment in the SCAG region is \$2000-\$3000/mo.


Costs for Mortgage Holders by Income



Mortgage-holding households in Santa Clarita can be broken down by income and the percentage of income spent on mortgage costs. As one might expect, the general trend is that lower-income households spend a higher share of income on housing costs, while high-income households may spend a lower share of income on housing. The income category most prevalent amongst Santa Clarita mortgage-holding households is \$75,000 or more (27,763 households) and the most prevalent share of income spent on mortgage costs is over 30% (13,222 households).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Household Income by Home Value (for owned units)



Another approach to evaluating the relationship between housing and income is to compare incomes and home values in Santa Clarita. The most commonly-occurring income category amongst owner households in Santa Clarita is \$100,000 or more (26,374 households) and the most commonly-occurring home value category is Above \$500,000 (22,642 households).

Extremely Low Income Housing Needs

| | Total Households | Households below 30% HAMFI | Share below 30% HAMFI |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| White, non-Hispanic | 36,730 | 3,125 | 8.5% |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1,780 | 205 | 11.5% |
| Asian and other, non-Hispanic | 6,865 | 714 | 10.4% |
| Hispanic | 14,195 | 1,915 | 13.5% |
| TOTAL | 59,570 | 5,959 | 10.0% |
| Renter-occupied | 19,020 | 3,325 | 17.5% |
| Owner-occupied | 40,580 | 2,640 | 6.5% |
| TOTAL | 59,600 | 5,965 | 10.0% |

HUD CHAS, 2012-2016. HAMFI refers to Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income.

Housing the extremely-low income population (below 30% of area median income) can be especially challenging. HUD's CHAS dataset provides a wealth of information on such households in Santa Clarita. The above table provides a breakdown of extremely low income households by race and ethnicity. The race/ethnicity with the highest share of extremely-low income households in Santa Clarita is Hispanic (13.5% compared to 10% of total population). In the SCAG region, the highest share of extremely-low income households is Black, non-Hispanic (27.1% compared to 17.7% of total households).

LOCAL HOUSING DATA, 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

VII. ASSISTED UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION

Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

| Risk Level | Definition: | Low-income units in jurisdiction | Percent of county's low-income units |
|--------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Very High | At-risk of converting to market rate within the next year | 0 | 0% |
| High | At-risk of converting to market rate in the next 1-5 years | 89 | 14% |
| Moderate | At-risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years | 0 | 0% |
| Low | At-risk of converting to market rate in the next 10 or more years and/or are owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. | 559 | 86% |
| TOTAL | | 648 | 100% |

California Housing Partnership, July 2020. Includes HUD, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), USDA, and CalHFA projects. Subsidized or assisted developments that do not have one of the aforementioned financing sources may not be included.

The California Housing Partnership (CHP) provides data on assisted housing units and assesses the level of risk to converting to market rate. These data identify homes without a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability beyond the indicated timeframe and unless otherwise noted are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. Detailed 2019 data can be found in SCAG's RHNA data appendix at <http://scag.ca.gov/programs/Documents/RHNA/SCAG-Final-RHNA-Data-Appendix-030520.pdf>. Complete, updated data can be requested from CHP through Danielle Mazzella, Preservation & Data Manager (dmazzella@chpc.net)

VIII. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION

Final 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Santa Clarita:

| | Units |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Very-Low Income (<50% of AMI) | 3,397 |
| Low Income (50-80% of AMI) | 1,734 |
| Moderate Income (80-120% of AMI) | 1,672 |
| Above Moderate Income (>120% of AMI) | 3,228 |
| TOTAL | 10,031 |

SCAG, 2021. Based on SCAG's 6th cycle Final RHNA Allocation, adopted March 2021. Please note that for the housing element update, local jurisdictions will have to consider extremely low income (ELI) households as well. ELI housing needs may be calculated either by using Census data or simply assuming that 50 percent of the very low income households qualify as extremely low income households.

MAJOR DATA SOURCES USED

| | DESCRIPTION | FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE SEE |
|------------------------|---|--|
| ACS | American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates | www.data.census.gov |
| DOF | CA DOF E-5 Population and Housing Unit Estimates | www.dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/ |
| CHAS | HUD CHAS, 2012-2016 | www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html |
| CA DDS | California Department of Developmental Services | www.dds.ca.gov/transparency/ |
| SCAG LOCAL PROFILES | Including Construction Industry Research Board (CIRB) and Core Logic/DataQuick | www.scag.ca.gov/DataAndTools/Pages/LocalProfiles.aspx |



MAIN OFFICE
900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

REGIONAL OFFICES

IMPERIAL COUNTY
1503 North Imperial Ave., Ste. 104
El Centro, CA 92243
Tel: (213) 236-1967

ORANGE COUNTY
OCTA Building
600 South Main St., Ste. 741
Orange, CA 92868
Tel: (213) 236-1997

RIVERSIDE COUNTY
3403 10th St., Ste. 805
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 784-1513

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
1170 West 3rd St., Ste. 140
San Bernardino, CA 92410
Tel: (213) 236-1925

VENTURA COUNTY
4001 Mission Oaks Blvd., Ste. L
Camarillo, CA 93012
Tel: (213) 236-1960



APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The City of Santa Clarita values community input and offers numerous opportunities for residents and community stakeholders to provide input on housing and community development issues. Government Code Section 65583(c)(7) requires that “The local government shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort.”

Public Outreach

Santa Clarita’s Housing Element Update has included the following public outreach efforts:

March 2021: The City established a dedicated website for the Housing Element Update with information on the update process, RHNA, upcoming events, frequently asked questions, and how to get involved. The website also includes a link to the survey in English and Spanish, as well as a dedicated email address, and phone number for more information.

January – September 2021: Consultants facilitated stakeholder meetings for the Housing Element Update with local and regional non-profit and for-profit housing providers, service providers, and community groups.

April – September 2021: An online community opinion survey was conducted in English and Spanish to collect input from Santa Clarita residents, housing and service providers, and other interested parties. This survey was advertised through June 2021 and received responses through September 2021. Most of the survey responses were received from April through May 2021. The survey asked questions regarding current living situations and opinions on various housing issues and approaches. Outreach efforts during this time included focused outreach to grocery stores and Mexican restaurants in the Old Town Newhall and Canyon County areas.

April 29, 2021: The City conducted a virtual community workshop to introduce major elements of the Housing Element Update process and outline the City’s current Regional Housing Need Assessment requirements. The public was invited to provide initial comments regarding the Housing Element Update process and general housing needs in the City. Public comments received at this meeting are summarized in Table 51.

June 1 – June 30, 2021: The City posted a Housing Element Update informational flyer, in English and Spanish, at all City Libraries. The flyer included information about the Housing Element Update and advertised the dedicated website for the Housing Element Update and the online survey. The City also advertised the Housing Element Update on all City buses during the month of June 2021. Digital fliers, in English and Spanish, were displayed on the onboard widescreen monitors and included the

address to the dedicated Housing Element Update website, as well as a QR Code link to the Housing Element Update website.

June 15, 2021: The City held a public study session meeting with the City of Santa Clarita Planning Commission to introduce the Housing Element process and seek initial input from the Planning Commission. The staff presentation covered important housing topics including affordable housing, Housing Element requirements, RHNA, new housing laws, demographics, project objectives, and survey results. Public comments received at this meeting are summarized in Table 51.

Community Opinion Survey Results

An important component of the public outreach effort included an online community engagement survey (via SurveyMonkey). A link to the survey is available on the City's Housing Element Update webpage in both English and Spanish. The purpose of the survey was to collect input from Santa Clarita residents, housing and services providers, and other interested parties. The survey asked questions regarding current living situations and opinions on various housing issues and approaches. This survey was circulated from April 2021 through September 2021, and a total of 83 responses were received. A copy of the survey and the survey results are included in Appendix C: Community Engagement Materials.

Stakeholder Outreach

Upon initiating the Housing Element update, consultants met with several housing advocacy groups and providers and invited them to share their insight on regional conditions, constraints, outreach, and housing needs. These groups include the following:

- Affordable Housing LA
- Southern California Non-Profit Housing
- CA YIMBY (Yes in My Back Yard)

Later, while developing the Housing Strategy, consultants reached out via email messaging to an additional list of local stakeholders, inviting them to share their opinions and insight on housing needs, constraints, and strategies for the City of Santa Clarita. The list of stakeholders included contacts on the list of stakeholders who participated in the 5th Cycle Housing Element, a contact list of non-profit organizations maintained by the City, and other key community stakeholders as defined by The Department of Housing and Community Development Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidance. The consultants intended to engage diverse segments of the community including homeless service agencies, advocacy groups, housing and community development providers, churches, community service organizations that serve lower-income or ethnic minority populations, and senior living centers.

Four messages were sent out inviting community organizations and businesses to stakeholder interviews.

- Message A: Distributed to List 1; 99 non-profit community organizations identified by the City and additional community stakeholders identified by the consultant.
- Message B: Distributed to List 2; nine organizations that typically apply for and/or are funded CDBG grants.
- Message C: Distributed to List 3; specific stakeholders identified by the consultant
- Message D: Distributed to List 4; contacts that had been identified by other stakeholders.

These contact lists and outreach messages can be found in their entirety within Appendix C: Community Engagement Materials.

Additionally, the City of Santa Clarita received a letter on October 26, 2020 from representatives of Abundant Housing LA that details best practices for the site inventory analysis and policy recommendations for consideration in the Housing Element update. These comments are also addressed in Table 50.

Stakeholder Interviews

Table 50 below outlines stakeholder comments that were received and interviews that were held during the public outreach period.

Table 50: Summary and Response to Stakeholder Input

| Organization Contact Date Of Communication | Summary of Comments | Responses |
|---|--|---|
| Abundant Housing LA Leonora Camner- Executive Director Anthony Dedousis- Director Of Policy and Research October 26, 2020 | Memo on Requirements and Best Practices for Housing Element Updates: The Site Inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic Capacity methods • Safe Harbor ADU methodology • AFFH Requirements • No Net Loss Checklist of Core Policy Recommendations | The Sites Inventory uses conservative development estimates based on recent development trends in the City. Programs were included to address No Net Loss, including Program HP-1.13: Administrative List of Additional Sites, which has been discussed and recommended by HCD staff. No housing sites were identified in low resource areas, most sites were in moderate resource areas. Programs are included to invest in lower resource areas. ADU assumptions were based on HCD safe harbor numbers. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Southern California Non-Profit Housing Alan Greentree January 22, 2021</p> | <p>High cost of housing and land is the biggest constraint Do not have many members actively building in Santa Clarita; other markets get more attention Churches can help to get the word out to hard-to-reach populations</p> | <p>Churches were included in outreach. Program HP-1.10: Publish Information about Housing Sites Program HP-2.5: Collaboration with Non-Profit Affordable Housing Developers</p> |
| <p>Abundant Housing LA Leonora Camner-Executive Director Anthony Dedousis-Director Of Policy and Research February 25, 2021</p> | <p>Missing-middle housing is a low-cost solution; see examples of by-right 4-plexing in Sacramento Suggestions: Land Trusts and Community Ownership Tax Increment Financing Use revenue from greenfield land declared a park to fund Affordable Housing development Real Estate Transfer Tax; see example in Culver City</p> | <p>4.3.7 Planning and Zoning Incentives includes information on “Missing-Middle” Zoning Incentives Program HP-1.9: Minimum Residential Densities may assist in enabling missing-middle housing Policy H3.5: Monitor the status of at-risk units and work with partners to preserve at-risk units. Policy H3.7 addresses the Workforce Housing partnership opportunities</p> |
| <p>Milestone Housing Marcus Griffin February 19, 2021</p> | <p>High land values are barriers to development Suggestions: Lot consolidation program Public/Private Partnerships Potential for mixed-income developments</p> | <p>Program HP-1.6: Graduated Density Zoning and Site Consolidation—Old Town Newhall facilitates small site development Program HP-3.5: Preservation of At-Risk Housing utilizes public/private partnerships Program HP-1.7: Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study Program pursues a mixed-income housing program</p> |
| <p>CA YIMBY Jes McBride May 5, 2021</p> | <p>Need to limit ADU assumptions to HCD’s “safe harbor” allowances. CA YIMBY will be checking inventory carefully.</p> | <p>ADU assumptions limited to safe harbor numbers.</p> |
| <p>Finally Family Homes Christina Dronen August 27, 2021</p> | <p>Many precariously housed and vulnerable foster youth, transitional youth, and students Some City residents dislike housing solutions proposed for transitional housing</p> | <p>Programs addressing these comments include: Program HP-4.3: Homeless Case Management Program HP-2.1: Changes for Consistency with State LawActions</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Transitional housing should include services and amenities, like laundry and job programs Youth owned-and-occupied tiny houses on wheels would be a good solution to house transitional age foster youth</p> | <p>Program HP-4.5: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice/Fair Housing Analysis</p> |
| <p>Family Promise Roche Vermaak August 30, 2021</p> | <p>Has heard it would be easier to build affordable and transitional housing in unincorporated County than City HOAs and community attitudes make it hard to run transitional housing in City Building/buying and running transitional and supportive housing is cheaper than paying for hotel vouchers Rent control is needed in City Very few areas where Section 8 Vouchers are accepted in the City</p> | <p>Programs addressing these comments include: Program HP-4.3: Homeless Case Management Program HP-4.5: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice/Fair Housing Analysis Program HP-3.6: Mobilehome Rent Adjustment Policies Objective H4-1: Reduce or remove governmental constraints and restrictions on housing and housing occupancy while preserving public health and safety. Objective H2-2: Eliminate unneeded regulatory constraints to the production of housing, especially affordable housing.</p> |
| <p>Bridge To Home Peggy Edwards September 2, 2021</p> | <p>High need for workforce/ low-income/ affordable housing High need for community education about affordable housing and subsidy programs Unique opportunities for success as a city doing greenfield development Funding needed to run housing programs</p> | <p>Objective H2-3: Increase opportunities for the production of affordable housing. Policy H3.4: Monitor the status of at-risk units and work with partners to preserve at-risk units Policy H3.7 Workforce Housing partnership opportunities Unique opportunities for success described throughout Section 1</p> |
| <p>Southland Regional Association of Realtors Nancy Starczyk Bob Khalsa September 2, 2021</p> | <p>Cost of land is the top constraint in the area, it is not unique to Santa Clarita Lower development costs than LA City due to faster approvals Top request in City is single story homes for aging residents Younger people and senior residents are more interested in amenities and location</p> | <p>Incorporated feedback in Section 4, discussion of governmental and nongovernmental needs, and needs for senior residents</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | (entertainment, transportation, hospital access) Multifamily development needs to be near amenities, especially groceries Shared list of 19 ideas for building more housing | |
| Santa Clarita Affordable Housing Committee Renee Roque September 2, 2021 | Affordable Housing Committee has ideas but needs funding and action Section 8 Vouchers not accepted in City Stigma of affordable housing needs to be addressed Affordable Housing developers have told the committee the City is not doing enough (land, tax credits, etc.) to bring them in | Objective H2-3: Increase opportunities for the production of affordable housing. |
| SCV Boys and Girls Club Matthew Nelson September 3, 2021 | Biggest housing issue: people living in City pushed out due to cost Multiple families living in the same home due to rent Workforce cannot afford to live here; they commute in and contribute to the traffic People make too much to qualify for childcare tuition but still do not make enough for rent | Contributed to discussion on special housing needs |
| SCV Senior Center Robin Clough September 3, 2021 | Seniors are “aging into poverty” - rent increases faster than Social Security increases Senior housing needs to be near amenities (transportation, grocery stores), and should not have stairs Senior housing solution ideas include building ADUs and renting out houses, small studio apartments, congregated home care facilities Affordable Housing Committee has good ideas but no action or funding | Contributed to discussion on senior housing needs |
| SCV Chamber of Commerce John Musella | Supply remains strong, but affordability waning and more low-wage workers commuting to SCV | Contributed to discussion |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| September 7, 2021 | Recent transit-oriented development ending a 15-year “apartment drought” Podium construction is happening less than the region overall due to lower area rents diminishing developers’ confidence in ability to recoup costs | |
|-------------------|---|--|

Community Comments

In addition to the survey described above, community members had regular opportunities to express their input on the Housing Element, including a City Planning Commission meeting, and a Housing Element workshop. In addition, comments could be submitted using the email and phone contact information provided on the dedicated Housing Element webpage and giving feedback on publicly released drafts. Public input was then taken into consideration and incorporated into the Housing Element where appropriate.

The City received public comments from multiple members of the local construction industry expressing support for a policy requiring developments in the area to utilize a local “skilled and trained workforce” for construction.

Public Feedback on Draft Housing Element

(Reserved)

Table 51: Summary and Incorporation of Community Comments

| Summary of Comment | How Comment was Addressed |
|---|---|
| April 29, 2021: Virtual Community Workshop | |
| Would rezoning to allow higher density projects be required? | Staff indicated the City did not intend to rezone; adequate capacity to meet regional needs is available under current zoning. |
| What are additional public outreach efforts that will be conducted in the future? | Public outreach is ongoing; consultants provided examples of non-profit and service agencies to be interviewed. Graphic of all community input opportunities was shown. |
| How does the City plan to address the need to allow an increase in lower income units? | Several programs will be proposed, including consideration of a focused density bonus program and an inclusionary housing requirement. |
| June 15, 2021: Public Study Session | |
| Support for a policy requiring developments in the area to utilize a local “skilled and trained workforce” for construction | Comment letters have been provided to the City Council for consideration. |
| How will progress towards accomplishing Housing Element | Feedback mechanism built into Annual Progress Report. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Programs be measured so people can see, understand, and follow? | |
|---|--|

APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MATERIALS

Stakeholder Outreach Messaging

August 25, 2021: Stakeholders in List 1 Received the Following Message:

Message A:

Hello,

As you may know, Santa Clarita is currently undergoing its Housing Element update. I am [_____] and I am working with 4LEAF, Inc. to assist the City of Santa Clarita in this process. In order to develop housing policies that best reflect the experience and opinions of residents and stakeholders in the City, we are holding stakeholder interviews to gather input and we would greatly appreciate your involvement. If you are available to do so, please use this [link](#) to sign up for one of the following times to meet with us via Zoom and discuss how we can best plan for housing in the City of Santa Clarita:

- Friday August 27 at 1 pm
- Monday August 30 at 9:30 am
- Wednesday September 1 at 9:30 am

If you are not available at those times, please feel free to reply with your comments in written form or to set up an alternative meeting time. Additionally, if you know of other organizations that would like to make their voices heard, please let us know as well!

Thank you, and we look forward to working together to make Santa Clarita the best it can be. Your time and feedback are appreciated

This email is sent by 4LEAF staff. 4LEAF, Inc. is the consulting team that has been chosen to assist the City in the update of its Housing Element, as well as the City's Public Safety and Health Element. 4LEAF is a full-service firm that has been providing services to numerous public agencies across California for more than 20 years. You may find more information about 4LEAF here: <https://www.4leafinc.com/>

August 25, 2021: Stakeholders in List 2 Received the Following Message:

Message B:

Hello!

As you may know, Santa Clarita is currently undergoing its Housing Element update. My name is [_____] and I am working with 4LEAF, Inc. to assist the City of Santa Clarita in this process. As you've been identified by the City as an organization who typically applies for CDBG funding, we wanted to reach out to you to receive your valuable input regarding housing and development in the City of Santa Clarita. In

order to develop a housing strategy that best reflects the experience and opinions of stakeholders in the City, you are invited to a virtual stakeholder interview to share your thoughts so we can gather your important feedback. Additionally, if you know of other organizations that would like to make their voices heard, please let us know as well! Please use this [link](#) to sign up. If you are unable to attend this meeting, please let me know and we can arrange another time to meet.

Thank you, and we look forward to working together to make Santa Clarita the best it can be. Your time and feedback are appreciated.

This email is sent by 4LEAF staff. 4LEAF, Inc. is the consulting team that has been chosen to assist the City in the update of its Housing Element, as well as the City's Public Safety and Health Element. 4LEAF is a full-service firm that has been providing services to numerous public agencies across California for more than 20 years. You may find more information about 4LEAF here: <https://www.4leafinc.com/>

August 25, 2021: Stakeholders in List 3 Received the Following Message:

Message C:

Hello!

As you may know, Santa Clarita is currently undergoing its Housing Element update. I am [_____] and I am working with 4LEAF, Inc. to assist the City of Santa Clarita in this process. In order to develop a housing strategy that best reflects the experience and opinions of stakeholders in the City, we wanted to reach out to you and invite you to a stakeholder interview to hear your perspective and gather feedback from you and those you represent and maintain an open dialogue through the Housing Element update process. Please let me know if this is something you are interested in and let me know a few times you may be available to meet. Additionally, if you know of other organizations that would like to make their voices heard, please let us know as well!

Thank you, and we look forward to working together to make Santa Clarita the best it can be. Your time and feedback are appreciated.

This email is sent by 4LEAF staff. 4LEAF, Inc. is the consulting team that has been chosen to assist the City in the update of its Housing Element, as well as the City's Public Safety and Health Element. 4LEAF is a full-service firm that has been providing services to numerous public agencies across California for more than 20 years. You may find more information about 4LEAF here: <https://www.4leafinc.com/>

August 25, 2021: Stakeholders in List 4 Received the Following Message:

Message D:

Hello!

As you may know, Santa Clarita is currently undergoing its Housing Element update. My name is [____] and I am working with 4LEAF, Inc. to assist the City of Santa Clarita in this process. I got your contact information from [redacted] who let me know you expressed interested in being involved. We wanted to reach out to you to seek your valuable input regarding housing and development in the City of Santa Clarita.

In order to develop a housing strategy that best reflects the experience and opinions of stakeholders in the City, you are invited to a virtual stakeholder interview to share your thoughts so we can gather your important insight. You may use this [link](#) to sign up for a Wednesday meeting, or email me if you’d like to set up another time or method to talk.

Thank you, and we look forward to working together to make Santa Clarita the best it can be. Your time and feedback are appreciated.

This email is sent by 4LEAF staff. 4LEAF, Inc. is the consulting team that has been chosen to assist the City in the update of its Housing Element, as well as the City’s Public Safety and Health Element. 4LEAF is a full-service firm that has been providing services to numerous public agencies across California for more than 20 years. You may find more information about 4LEAF here: <https://www.4leafinc.com/>

Table 52: Outreach List 1

| Organization Name | Mailing Address | Zip Code |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|
| ACTION Support Group | 26893 Bouquet Canyon, C134 | 91350 |
| American Association of University Women | P.O. Box 800354 | 91380 |
| American Diabetes Association | 611 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900 | 90017 |
| American Cancer Society | 25020 W. Avenue Stanford, Suite 170 | 91355 |
| American Heart Association | 816 S. Figueroa Street | 90017 |
| Assistance League of Santa Clarita | P.O. Box 220145 | 91322 |
| Avenues Supported Living Services | 28415 Industry Drive #502 | 91355 |
| Betty Ferguson Foundation | 25510 W. Avenue Stanford, #104 | 91355 |
| Boy Scouts of America | 16525 Sherman Way, C-8 | 91406 |
| Brenda Mehling Cancer Fund | 23841 Foxwood Court | 91354 |
| California Youth Chess League | 25405 Via Nautica | 91355 |
| Canterbury Village | 23420 Avenida Rotella | 91355 |
| Canyon Theatre Guild | 24242 San Fernando Road | 91321 |
| Children’s Network International - Help the Children | 25030 Ave. Tibbitts, Suite L | 91355 |
| Circle of Hope | 23033 Lyons Avenue, Suite 3 | 91321 |
| College of the Canyons Foundation | 26455 Rockwell Canyon Road | 91355 |
| Friends of Castaic Lake | P.O. Box 6 | 91384 |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Friends of Hart Park & Museum | P.O. Box 220418 | 91322 |
| Friends of the Library c/o Valencia Library | 23743 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 |
| Friends of Mentryville | P.O. Box 801643 | 91380 |
| Girl Scouts of Greater Los Angeles | 1150 South Olive Street Suite 600 | 90015 |
| HandsOn Santa Clarita | 25201 Avenue Tibbitts, Suite 202 | 91355 |
| Help The Children | 25030 Avenue Tibbitts, Suite L | 91355 |
| Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital Foundation | 23845 McBean Parkway | 91355 |
| Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital | 23845 McBean Parkway | 91355 |
| Human Good | 23420 Avenida Rotella | 91355 |
| Jack and Jill of America, Inc. | 23890 Copper Hill Drive, PO Box 253 | 91354 |
| Junior Achievement | 6250 Forest Lawn Drive | 90068 |
| Kids With a Cause | 21564 Parvin Drive | 91350 |
| LifeQuest Foundation | 25460 Sheffield Lane | 91350 |
| Los Angeles Residential Community Foundation | 29890 Bouquet Canyon Road | 91390 |
| Mayra Bullon | 23542 Lyons Avenue, Suite 202 | 91321 |
| Michael Hoefflin Foundation | 26027 Huntington Lane, Unit F | 91355 |
| Old Town Newhall Association | P.O. Box 221614 | 91322 |
| Old West Masonic Lodge, #813 | 19310 Avenue of The Oaks B | 91321 |
| Partners for Potential | 6255 Van Nuys Blvd. | 91401 |
| Placerita Canyon Nature Center Associates | 19152 Placerita Canyon Road | 91321 |
| Pleasantview Industries | 27921 Urbandale Avenue | 91350 |
| Providence Holy Cross | 15031 Rinaldi Street | 91346 |
| Ragdoll Restoration Foundation | 28607 N. High Ridge Drive | 91390 |
| Samuel Dixon Family Health Centers, Inc. | 25115 Avenue Stanford, Suite A-104 | 91384 |
| Santa Clarita Ballet | 26798 Oak Avenue | 91351 |
| Santa Clarita Elks Lodge No 2379 | 17766 Sierra Highway | 91351 |
| Santa Clarita Special Olympics | 24779 Valley Street | 91321 |
| Santa Clarita Valley Bicycle Coalition-LA Co. Chapter | 23121 Poplar Glen Circle | 91354 |
| Saugus Union School District | 24930 Avenue Stanford | 91355 |
| SCOPE | P.O. Box 1182 | 91386 |
| SCV Athletic Association | 27618 Open Crest Drive | 91350 |
| SCV Concert Band | P.O. Box 55002 | 91385 |
| SCV Economic Development Corporation | 26455 Rockwell Cyn Road, Suite 263 | 91355 |
| SCV Family Promise | 25718 McBean Parkway | 91350 |
| SCV Council PTA | 27226 Trinidad Court | 91354 |
| SCV Food Pantry | 24133 Railroad Avenue | 91321 |
| SCV Historical Society | P.O. Box 221925 | 91322 |
| SCV Mayor's Committee | P.O. Box 803325 | 91380 |
| SCV Optimist Club | P.O. Box 1446 | 91351 |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------|
| SCV Pregnancy Center | 23838 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 270 | 91355 |
| SCV Safe Rides | P.O. Box 3001 | 91386 |
| SCV School & Business Alliance | 21380 Centre Pointe Parkway | 91350 |
| SCV Sheriff's Station | 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway | 91355 |
| SCV Youth Orchestra | 24555 Rockwell Canyon Road | 91355 |
| SCV Youth Project | P.O. Box 801982 | 91380 |
| Single Mothers Outreach | 24781 Valley Street | 91321 |
| Soroptimist International of SCV - SISCO | P.O. Box 802275 | 91380 |
| Step Up | 6911 San Fernando Mission Blvd., #147 | 91344 |
| The Gentle Barn Foundation | 15825 Sierra Highway | 91390 |
| Val Verde Community Benefits Fund Committee | 30133 San Martinez Road, Ste A | 91384 |
| Valencia Library/Literacy Center | 23743 W. Valencia Boulevard | 91355 |
| Valley Industrial Association | 28368 Constellation Road Suite 360 | 91355 |
| Strength United | 22620 Market St. | 91321 |
| Village Family Services | 6736 Laurel Canyon Blvd., Suite 200 | 91606 |
| Visually Impaired Assistance Center | 22900 Market Street | 91321 |
| WISH Education Foundation | 24343 Magic Mountain Parkway | 91355 |
| Vast Homes | 1050 Lakes Drive, Suite | 91790 |
| Salvation Army | 22935 Lyons Avenue | 91321 |
| Family Links North Valley MAT | 11565 Laurel Canyon Blvd. Unit 116 | 91340 |
| Finally Family Homes | PO Box 55186 | 91385 |
| Royal Oaks Mobile Park | 18145 Soledad Canyon Rd | 91388 |
| Canyon Villas Senior Apartments | 27850 Solamint Rd | 91387 |
| Castaic Lions Club | 24201 Magic Mountain Pkwy | 91355 |
| Calvary Chapel Golden Valley | 18319 Sierra Hwy | 91351 |
| Divine Fijians Home Care | 27707 Thalia Ln | 91351 |
| William S Hart Union High School District Office | 21380 Centre Pointe Pkwy | 91350 |
| City of Santa Clarita: WorkSource Center | 20730 Soledad St | 91352 |
| City of Santa Clarita: Newhall Community Center, | 22421 Market St | 91321 |
| Louis Design Studio + Raven General Contractors | 24270 Walnut St | 91321 |
| Design Masonry Inc | 20703 Santa Clara St | 91351 |
| American Family Funding | 28338 Constellation Rd #900 | 91355 |
| Alterra Home Loans | 23232 Lyons Ave | 91321 |
| Valencia Hills Homeowners' Association | 24060 Oak Vale Dr | 91355 |
| Newhall-Hidden Valley HOA | 24260 Creekside Dr | 91321 |
| Scenic Hills HOA | 26207 Rainbow Glen Dr | 91321 |
| Elevate Church | 24346 Main St | 91321 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Christ Church of SCV | 24436 Valley St | 91321 |
| Santa Clarita United Methodist Church | 26640 Bouquet Canyon Rd | 91350 |

Table 53: Outreach List 2

| Name of Organization | Mailing Address | Zip Code |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Boys and Girls Club of SCV | 24909 Newhall Avenue | 91321 |
| Bridge To Home | 23752 Newhall Avenue | 91321 |
| Carousel Ranch, Inc. | 34289 Rocking Horse Road | 91390 |
| Child & Family Center | 21545 Centre Pointe Parkway | 91350 |
| Family Promise | 24820 Orchard Village Road, Suite A-391 | 91355 |
| Fostering Youth Independence | P.O. Box 801604 | 91380 |
| SCV Committee on Aging | 27180 Golden Valley Road | 91351 |
| SCV Family YMCA | 26147 McBean Parkway | 91355 |
| Single Mothers Outreach | 24781 Valley Street | 91321 |

Table 54: Outreach List 3

| Name of Organization | Mailing Address | Zip Code |
|--|---|-----------------|
| Southland Regional Association of Realtors | 20655 Soledad Canyon Rd #33 | 91351 |
| Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce | 28494 Westinghouse Place Suite 114 | 91355 |
| Abundant Housing LA | 515 S Flower Street 18th floor Los Angeles, CA | 90071 |


Table 55: Outreach List 4

| Name of Organization | Name of Contact |
|--|------------------------|
| Bridge to Home | Peggy Edwards |
| Homelessness Task Force, Affordable Housing Subcommittee | Renee Roque |
| Santa Clarita Valley Senior Center | Robin Clough |
| Spicher Group Properties | Doug Spicher |

Survey Results

Q1 Which best describes your current housing situation?

Answered: 83 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|--|-----------|
| Own | 71.06% 59 |
| Rent | 20.48% 17 |
| Live with friends/family, do not own or pay rent | 8.43% 7 |
| Do not currently have a permanent home | 0.00% 0 |
| TOTAL | 83 |

Most respondents (approximately 70 percent) stated that they currently own a home in Santa Clarita. Approximately 20 percent of respondents rent, and 10 percent of respondents stated they live with friends and/or family.

Q2 Which best describes your current living situation?

Answered: 83 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Accessory dwelling unit (granny flat/guest house/in-law suite/second unit/converted garage) | 1.20% | 1 |
| Apartment | 7.23% | 6 |
| Condominium/townhome | 25.30% | 21 |
| Single-family home | 65.06% | 54 |
| Mobile home | 1.20% | 1 |
| Group home/assisted living | 0.00% | 0 |
| Do not currently have a permanent home | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 83 |

About 65 percent of respondents stated they live in a single-family home and approximately 25 percent of respondents live in a condominium/townhome. About seven percent of respondents live in an apartment and the remaining respondents live in a mobile home or ADU.

Q3 Which best describes your household composition?

Answered: 83 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Single, living alone | 7.23% | 6 |
| Single, living with roommates | 2.41% | 2 |
| Couple living together, no children | 18.07% | 15 |
| Living with children under 18 at home | 49.40% | 41 |
| Multiple generations living together (adult children, parents, grandparents, etc.) | 22.89% | 19 |
| TOTAL | | 83 |

About half the respondents (49 percent) stated they live with children. Approximately 23 percent of respondents stated they live with multiple generations of their family and 18 percent of respondents stated they live with their partner/significant other with no kids. The remaining respondents either are single and live alone or are single and live with roommates.

Q4 What is your age group?

Answered: 83 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|----------------|-----------|
| Under 18 | 0.00% 0 |
| 18 – 29 | 8.43% 7 |
| 30 – 49 | 67.47% 56 |
| 50 – 64 | 19.28% 16 |
| 65 or older | 4.82% 4 |
| TOTAL | 83 |

Most respondents (approximately 67 percent) stated they were between the ages of 30-49. About 19 percent of respondents were between the ages of 50-64. The remaining respondents were either between 18-29 years old or 65 and older.

Q5 Which best describes your annual gross household income?

Answered: 83 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Below \$25,000 | 1.20% | 1 |
| \$25,000 - \$50,000 | 7.23% | 6 |
| \$50,001 - \$100,000 | 24.10% | 20 |
| \$100,001 - \$200,000 | 45.78% | 38 |
| More than \$200,000 | 12.05% | 10 |
| Prefer not to say | 9.64% | 8 |
| TOTAL | | 83 |

Approximately 46 percent stated they have an annual gross household income between \$100,000-\$200,000. About 24 percent of respondents stated they have an annual gross household income between \$50,000-\$100,000. The remaining respondents ranged in household incomes with nine percent of the remaining respondents preferring not to specify.

Q6 From most effective to least effective, please rank what approaches you think would best improve housing options?

Answered: 81 Skipped: 2




| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOTAL | SCORE |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Build more housing and provide a range of housing types such as single-family homes, townhomes, condominiums, and apartments. | 34.67% 26 | 12.00% 9 | 10.67% 8 | 9.33% 7 | 33.33% 25 | 75 | 3.05 |
| Financial assistance programs such as rental assistance and down payment assistance programs for low-income households. | 10.26% 8 | 38.46% 30 | 20.51% 16 | 23.08% 18 | 7.69% 6 | 78 | 3.21 |
| Incentives for developers to build more below market rate housing. | 16.00% 12 | 20.00% 15 | 28.00% 21 | 28.00% 21 | 8.00% 6 | 75 | 3.08 |
| Require developers to include a certain percentage of units in a housing project that are affordable to low- and moderate-income households. | 14.29% 11 | 18.18% 14 | 27.27% 21 | 23.38% 18 | 16.88% 13 | 77 | 2.90 |
| Programs that help people experiencing homelessness find permanent housing. | 27.27% 21 | 10.39% 8 | 12.99% 10 | 15.58% 12 | 33.77% 26 | 77 | 2.82 |

Respondents specified that the most preferable housing options ranked from most favorable to least favorable are as follows: 1. Financial Assistance programs (i.e., rental assistance) 2. Incentives for developers 3. Build more housing (with a range of housing types) 4. Require developers to allocate a percentage of units to affordable housing 5. Programs for persons experiencing homelessness.

Q7 Do you think Santa Clarita should build more housing by:

Answered: 75 Skipped: 8




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|----|
| Allowing more housing in already developed areas by increasing how many housing units can be built on each piece of property. | 10.67% | 8 |
| Building housing on vacant land located inside the city that is already zoned for development (not parks or open space areas). | 44.00% | 33 |
| Allowing housing to be built in commercial areas near and/or above stores and restaurants. | 45.33% | 34 |
| TOTAL | | 75 |

About 45 percent of respondents stated that the City should allow housing to be built in commercial areas near and/or above stores and restaurants. 44 percent of respondents stated that more housing should be built on vacant land that is already zoned for residential development (not parks or open space areas). The remaining respondents stated that the City should be allowing more housing in already developed areas by increasing how many housing units can be built on each piece of property.

Q8 Do you think new housing (single-family homes, condominiums, apartments) should primarily be located:

Answered: 78 Skipped: 5




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|----|
| Throughout the city | 53.85% | 42 |
| Concentrated in core areas such as the Lyons Avenue or Soledad Canyon Road corridors | 5.13% | 4 |
| Concentrated in the Downtown areas such as Valencia Town Center and Old Town Newhall | 6.41% | 5 |
| In high quality transit areas such as areas near major bus routes and Metrolink stations | 34.62% | 27 |
| TOTAL | | 78 |

A majority of respondents (approximately 54 percent) stated that new housing should be located throughout the City. About 35 percent of respondents stated that housing should be concentrated in high quality transit areas such as areas near major bus routes and Metrolink stations. The remaining respondents stated that housing should be concentrated in core areas such as the Lyons Avenue or Soledad Canyon Road corridors or should be in the downtown areas such as Valencia Town Center and Old Town Newhall.

Q9 Which areas do you think should have more multi-family residential units, such as apartments and townhomes? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 79 Skipped: 4




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|--|-----------|
| Throughout the city | 31.65% 25 |
| Concentrated in core areas such as the Lyons Avenue or Soledad Canyon Road corridors | 16.46% 13 |
| In the Downtown areas such as Valencia Town Center and Old Town Newhall | 27.85% 22 |
| In high quality transit areas such as areas near major bus routes and Metrolink stations | 43.04% 34 |
| In commercial areas near and/or above stores and restaurants | 25.32% 20 |
| Those areas zoned for higher residential density | 36.71% 29 |
| Total Respondents: 79 | |

About 43 percent of respondents stated that multifamily housing should be concentrated in high quality transit areas such as areas near major bus routes and Metrolink stations. Approximately 37 percent of respondents stated that multifamily housing should be concentrated areas zoned for higher residential density and approximately 28 percent of respondents stated multifamily housing should be concentrated in the downtown areas such as Valencia Town Center and Old Town Newhall. The remaining respondents stated that multifamily housing should be concentrated throughout the City, in commercial areas, or concentrated in core areas.

Q10 From most effective to least effective, please rank what programs you think the City should prioritize for increasing housing (single-family, multi-family, and accessory dwelling units) built in Santa Clarita.

Answered: 73 Skipped: 10




| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | TOTAL | SCORE |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Simplifying and streamlining the permit application process. | 30.43% 21 | 17.39% 12 | 21.74% 15 | 8.70% 6 | 4.35% 3 | 4.35% 3 | 7.25% 5 | 5.80% 4 | 69 | 5.90 |
| Reducing the fees associated with the permit application process, including for streets and parks. | 15.94% 11 | 18.84% 13 | 14.49% 10 | 13.04% 9 | 8.70% 6 | 8.70% 6 | 11.59% 8 | 8.70% 6 | 69 | 5.04 |
| Increasing the locations and number of housing units that can be built. | 12.86% 9 | 11.43% 8 | 18.57% 13 | 12.86% 9 | 14.29% 10 | 5.71% 4 | 7.14% 5 | 17.14% 12 | 70 | 4.64 |
| Reducing requirements for building housing, such as parking and amenities. | 1.47% 1 | 7.35% 5 | 14.71% 10 | 22.06% 15 | 10.29% 7 | 11.76% 8 | 17.65% 12 | 14.71% 10 | 68 | 3.88 |
| Allowing for increased residential building height in core areas | 8.57% 6 | 17.14% 12 | 12.86% 9 | 14.29% 10 | 21.43% 15 | 14.29% 10 | 10.00% 7 | 1.43% 1 | 70 | 4.87 |
| Repurposing older commercial centers with housing (potentially mixed use) | 23.94% 17 | 12.68% 9 | 9.86% 7 | 12.68% 9 | 11.27% 8 | 23.94% 17 | 5.63% 4 | 0.00% 0 | 71 | 5.31 |
| Promoting ADU development in existing residential neighborhoods | 4.35% 3 | 8.70% 6 | 4.35% 3 | 5.80% 4 | 14.49% 10 | 10.14% 7 | 27.54% 19 | 24.64% 17 | 69 | 3.19 |
| Adding more homes to established residential areas | 5.63% 4 | 8.45% 6 | 4.23% 3 | 8.45% 6 | 14.08% 10 | 18.31% 13 | 12.68% 9 | 28.17% 20 | 71 | 3.37 |

Respondents stated that the top four most favorable options would be: 1. simplifying and streamlining the permit application process; 2. repurposing older commercial centers with housing (potentially mixed use); 3. reducing fees associated with the permit application process; and 4. allowing for increased residential building height in core areas.

Q11 State law now requires cities to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) (i.e. granny flat/ in-law suite/second unit/converted garage) to be permitted by right on each developed residential property. ADUs can be small stand-alone small homes, or can be attached to the main home, or can be created from existing accessory buildings on the site. If you own a home, what might make you consider adding an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) (i.e. granny flat/ in-law suite/second unit/converted garage) to your house or property? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 77 Skipped: 6



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|---|-----------|
| Simple permitting process | 32.47% 25 |
| Inexpensive permitting fees | 28.57% 22 |
| Pre-approved building plans provided by the City | 23.38% 18 |
| Help with financing the ADU | 27.27% 21 |
| The additional income from renting the ADU | 24.68% 19 |
| The ADU increasing the home's property value | 27.27% 21 |
| My neighborhood is only for single-family homes. I would not consider adding one and I hope my neighbors do not add one either. | 44.16% 34 |
| I do not own a home/does not apply to me | 19.48% 15 |
| Total Respondents: 77 | |

Approximately 44 percent of respondents who own a single-family home stated that their neighborhood is only for single-family homes and that they would not consider adding an ADU and that they hope their neighbors do not add one either.

APPENDIX D: HOUSING SITES

The following table information related to all parcels listed on the City’s inventory of suitable sites. In addition to the information shown here, all sites are available and have infrastructure availability.

Table 56: Housing Opportunity Sites in Inventory

| Site Address/Intersection | 5 Digit ZIP Code | Assessor Parcel Number | Consolidated Sites | General Plan Designation (Current) | Zoning Designation (Current) | Minimum Density Allowed (units/acre) | Max Density Allowed (units/acre) | Parcel Size (Acres) | Existing Use/Vacancy | Identified in Last/Last Two Planning Cycle(s) | Lower Income Capacity | Moderate Income Capacity | Above Moderate Income Capacity | Total Capacity | TCAC Resource Level |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013135 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 35.07 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 225 | 564 | 0 | 789 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013911 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 1.01 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013919 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 22.20 | Vacant | Used in Last Two Consecutive Prior Housing Elements - Vacant | 225 | 277 | 0 | 502 | Moderate |
| Ave of the Oaks | 91321 | 2836014056 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 9.25 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 207 | 0 | 0 | 207 | Moderate |
| Vincenza Ln. | 91321 | 2836014902 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.99 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020004 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.62 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020005 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.72 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020006 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.61 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91388 | 2839020007 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.22 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Moderate |
| 17805 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020008 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.85 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | Moderate |
| 17745 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020011 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.83 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | Moderate |
| 17731 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020012 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.79 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021006 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 3.41 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021007 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 3.02 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 67 | 0 | 0 | 67 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021008 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 2.66 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021009 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 2.37 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 52 | 0 | 0 | 52 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021010 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 1.84 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021016 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 1.37 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021018 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 1.99 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 44 | 0 | 0 | 44 | Moderate |
| Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839021017 | A | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.17 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Moderate |
| Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001068 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.64 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | Moderate |
| Avignon Dr. | 91387 | 2861002106 | | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 1.92 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 71 | 0 | 0 | 71 | Highest |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2833017020 | B | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 2.24 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 84 | 0 | 0 | 84 | Moderate |
| Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2833017021 | B | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 2.79 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 104 | 0 | 0 | 104 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2833017022 | B | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 0.71 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2833017023 | B | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 0.37 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Moderate |
| State Rte 14 | 91321 | 2833018019 | B | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 0.88 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 | Moderate |
| 26501 McBean Pkwy. | 91355 | 2861062040 | | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 3.74 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 140 | 0 | 0 | 140 | Highest |
| Via Princessa and Sheldon | 91351 | 2836014067 | | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 18.50 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 225 | 0 | 0 | 225 | Moderate |
| Newhall Sierra | 91321 | 2827005021 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.92 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | Highest |
| Newhall Sierra | 91321 | 2833015005 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.65 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | Moderate |
| Newhall Molokai | 91321 | 2833015031 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 4.38 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 99 | 0 | 0 | 99 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2833018015 | | CR | CR | 18 | 30 | 1.79 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 67 | 0 | 0 | 67 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2833018020 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 6.00 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 225 | 0 | 0 | 225 | Moderate |
| Sierra Molokai | 91321 | 2833015035 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 9.00 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 202 | 0 | 0 | 202 | Moderate |
| Canyon Park & Jakes Wy. | 91387 | 2844023808 | K | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 10.05 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 225 | 0 | 0 | 225 | Moderate |
| Canyon Park & Jakes Wy. | 91387 | 2844022806 | K | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 2.25 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | Moderate |
| Canyon Park & Jakes Wy. | 91387 | 2844023006 | K | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 1.27 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | Moderate |
| Canyon Park & Jakes Wy. | 91387 | 2844042002 | K | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.84 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | Moderate |
| Canyon Park & Jakes Wy. | 91387 | 2844022014 | K | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.10 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Moderate |

Santa Clarita – Housing Element

December 2022

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|------------|---|------|-----|----|----|-------|---|--|----|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| Sierra Hwy. | 91351 | 2803025007 | | CC | CP | — | 18 | 0.71 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | Moderate |
| Copper Hill Dr. | 91354 | 2810109027 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 0.60 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Highest |
| Copper Hill Dr. | 91354 | 2810109043 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 3.73 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 50 | 0 | 50 | Highest |
| Copper Hill Dr. | 91354 | 2810109247 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 9.16 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 123 | 0 | 123 | Highest |
| Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830016020 | | CC | CP | — | 18 | 0.43 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | High |
| Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2833014044 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 1.04 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2836009011 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 0.60 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91321 | 2836009076 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 3.26 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 44 | 0 | 44 | Moderate |
| Via Princessa | 91321 | 2836009905 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 1.11 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013154 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 8.64 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 116 | 0 | 116 | High |
| Wiley Canyon Rd. | 91355 | 2859004023 | | UR4 | UR4 | — | 18 | 5.13 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 69 | 0 | 69 | Highest |
| Wiley Canyon Rd. | 91355 | 2859001039 | | UR4 | UR4 | — | 18 | 0.52 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | Highest |
| Wiley Canyon Rd. | 91355 | 2859001046 | | UR4 | UR4 | — | 18 | 7.00 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 95 | 0 | 95 | Highest |
| Flying Tiger Dr. | 91351 | 2844041003 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 2.55 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | High |
| Flying Tiger Dr. | 91351 | 2844041002 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 1.42 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | High |
| Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2833014043 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 7.62 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 103 | 0 | 103 | Moderate |
| 18409 Sierra Hwy. | 91351 | 2803025008 | | CC | CP | — | 18 | 0.85 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013920 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 7.67 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 104 | 0 | 104 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013921 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 3.33 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 45 | 0 | 45 | Moderate |
| Golden Valley Rd. | 91321 | 2836013912 | | CN | CN | — | 18 | 0.42 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91387 | 2839002031 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 2.58 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | Moderate |
| Sierra Hwy. | 91387 | 2839012014 | | CC | CC | — | 18 | 1.26 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | Moderate |
| 24250 Town Center Dr. | 91355 | 2861058072 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 4.82 | Two-Story Retail Parking Structure (FAR: 0.7) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 45 | 0 | 135 | 180 | Highest |
| 24180 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2861058073 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 10.00 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.1), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 93 | 0 | 281 | 374 | Highest |
| 26450 McBean Prky. | 91355 | 2861058074 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 1.02 | Two-Story Retail (FAR: 0.8), Surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 9 | 0 | 28 | 37 | Highest |
| 26450 McBean Prky. | 91355 | 2861058075 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 2.23 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.8) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 20 | 0 | 63 | 83 | Highest |
| 24137 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058076 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 1.18 | Surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 11 | 0 | 33 | 44 | Highest |
| Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058077 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 6.70 | Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 62 | 0 | 189 | 251 | Highest |
| 24243 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058079 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 1.79 | Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 16 | 0 | 50 | 66 | Highest |
| Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058080 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 2.72 | Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 25 | 0 | 76 | 101 | Highest |
| 24201 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058081 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 10.00 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.9) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 93 | 0 | 282 | 375 | Highest |
| 24137 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2861058082 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 2.45 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.9) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 22 | 0 | 68 | 90 | Highest |
| 24140 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2861058083 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 2.31 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.9), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 21 | 0 | 65 | 86 | Highest |
| 24251 Town Center Dr. | 91355 | 2861058084 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 2.05 | One-Story Office/Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 19 | 0 | 57 | 76 | Highest |
| 24251 Town Center Dr. | 91355 | 2861058085 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 0.33 | One-Story Office/Retail (FAR: 0.5), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 3 | 0 | 9 | 12 | Highest |
| 24250 Town Center Dr. | 91355 | 2861058071 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 0.84 | Road, One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.1) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 7 | 0 | 23 | 30 | Highest |
| 17753 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020010 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 11 | 30 | 0.50 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | Moderate |
| 18240 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001046 | C | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.39 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.1), Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Moderate |
| 18234 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001034 | C | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.19 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.9), Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Moderate |
| 18228 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001033 | C | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.33 | One-Story Auto Repair (FAR: 0.5), Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Moderate |
| 18234 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001032 | C | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.19 | Surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Moderate |
| 17865 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839020003 | I | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.71 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | Moderate |
| 27914 Adon Ave. | 91387 | 2839020002 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.37 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Moderate |
| 27908 Adon Ave. | 91387 | 2839020001 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.34 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Moderate |
| 17923 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839019027 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.16 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Moderate |
| 17929 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839019026 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.34 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Moderate |
| 27911 Adon Ave. | 91387 | 2839019018 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.20 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Moderate |
| 17911 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839019014 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.15 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Moderate |
| 17917 Scherzinger Ln. | 91387 | 2839019013 | D | UR5 | UR5 | 18 | 30 | 0.14 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Moderate |
| 23716 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001214 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 4.33 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 97 | 0 | 0 | 97 | High |
| 25075 Peachland Ave. | 91321 | 2830001208 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.52 | One-Story Office (FAR: 0.8), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | High |
| 23736 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001051 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 1.52 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | High |
| 25057 Peachland Ave. | 91321 | 2830001043 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.53 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | High |
| 23634 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001042 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.38 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | High |
| 23620 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001027 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.65 | One-Story Bank (FAR: 0.7), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | High |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------|---|------|------|----|----|-------|---|--|-----|-----|---|-----|----------|
| 23640 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001215 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 2.37 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 53 | 0 | 0 | 53 | High |
| 23222 Valencia Blvd. | 91355 | 2811002069 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 10.00 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 225 | 58 | 0 | 225 | Highest |
| 18230 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91387 | 2844001072 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.03 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | Moderate |
| 24458 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2825015015 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 3.92 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 | High |
| 18901 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032035 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.09 | One-Story retail (FAR: 0.8), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | Moderate |
| 18835 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032026 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.90 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.6), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | Moderate |
| 18917 1/2 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032001 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.59 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 | Moderate |
| 18821 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032034 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.83 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | Moderate |
| 26200 Hollywood Ct. | 91355 | 2811002067 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 5.68 | One-Story industrial yard (FAR: 0.8), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 127 | 0 | 0 | 127 | Highest |
| 26053 Bldg. "A" Bouquet Canyon Rd. | 91350 | 2811003004 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 2.17 | One-Story Animal hospital/industrial yard (FAR: 0.8), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | highest |
| 22500 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91350 | 2836011018 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 10.00 | One-Story Commercial (FAR: 0.1), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 225 | 567 | 0 | 225 | High |
| 23533 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004026 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.19 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | High |
| 23515 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004009 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.79 | Vacant | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | High |
| 23517 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004008 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.01 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | High |
| 23503 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004007 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.21 | One-Story Pre-school (FAR: 0.7), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | High |
| 23469 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827005039 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 9.05 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 203 | 0 | 0 | 203 | High |
| 23445 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827005001 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 2.44 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 54 | 0 | 0 | 54 | High |
| 23375 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827005046 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 2.23 | One-Story Commercial (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | High |
| 23375 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827005045 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 2.85 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 64 | 0 | 0 | 64 | High |
| 23347 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827005037 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 8.47 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 190 | 0 | 0 | 190 | High |
| 23681 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004027 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.06 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.6), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | High |
| 23655 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004017 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.64 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.6), surface Parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | High |
| 23645 1/2 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004014 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 1.46 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | High |
| 23645 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004013 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.50 | One-Story Residential (1) | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | High |
| 23661 Newhall Ave. | 91321 | 2827004016 | | MX-C | MX-C | 11 | 30 | 0.48 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | High |
| 23620 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001026 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.15 | One-Story Bank (FAR: 0.7), surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | High |
| 23644 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001036 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.42 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.1), surface Parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | High |
| 23646 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001037 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.11 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 1.0) | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | High |
| 23638 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001041 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.04 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.8), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | High |
| 23650 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001015 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.32 | One-Story Restaurant (FAR: 0.9), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | High |
| 23718 Lyons Ave. | 91321 | 2830001029 | G | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.23 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.7), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | High |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|------------|---|------|----|----|----|------|--|--|-----|---|---|-----|----------|
| 18955 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803010033 | | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.58 | One-Story restaurant (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Moderate |
| 18801 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032042 | H | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.22 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Moderate |
| 18741 Soledad Canyon Rd. | 91351 | 2803032043 | H | MX-C | CP | 11 | 30 | 0.43 | One-Story Restaurant (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Used in prior housing element - Non-Vacant | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Moderate |
| 24365 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025021 | I | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 0.45 | One-Story Restaurant (FAR: 0.6), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | Highest |
| 24301 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025019 | I | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 0.41 | One-Story Bank (FAR: 0.6), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | Highest |
| 24325 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025020 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 4.54 | One-Story Strip Mall (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 170 | 0 | 0 | 170 | Highest |
| 24201 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025017 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 1.05 | One-Story Restaurant (FAR: 0.3), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 | Highest |
| 24425 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025088 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 8.03 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.4), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 301 | 0 | 0 | 301 | Highest |
| 24451 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025023 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 1.27 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.6), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 | Highest |
| 24235 Magic Mountain Prky. | 91355 | 2811025018 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 6.93 | One-Story Retail (FAR: 0.5), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 259 | 0 | 0 | 259 | Highest |
| 26575 McBean Prky. | 91355 | 2861062049 | | CR | CR | 18 | 50 | 0.76 | One-Story Carwash (FAR: 0.7), surface parking | Not Used in Prior Housing Element | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | Highest |