

SUMMARY MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE GENERAL PLAN COMMITTEE OF THE TOWN OF LOS GATOS **MARCH 25, 2009** HELD AT THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER, 208 EAST MAIN STREET, LOS GATOS, CALIFORNIA.

---

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Jane Ogle.

**ATTENDANCE**

Members present: John Bourgeois, Joe Pirzynski, Barbara Cardillo, Marcia Jensen, Chuck Sloan, Barbara Spector,

Members absent: Margaret Smith

Staff present: Wendie Rooney, Director of Community Development; *Suzanne Davis*, Associate Planner; *Joel Paulson*, Associate Planner.

Public attendees: None

**VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS: NONE**

**ITEM 1 Affordable Housing Strategies**

Associate Planner Joel Paulson introduced the Draft Affordable Housing Strategies Report dated February 2009, noting that the Town has been working with Seifel Consulting to develop affordable housing strategies.

The Committee discussed and made the following comments regarding the document:

- Table 8 on Page 11 (Proposed Criteria for Use of Housing Set-Aside Funds and BMP Funds ) – is confusing. The Committee questioned how it would be used and stated that the “criteria” and “measurements” would not be applicable to all projects. The Committee commented that there is a brief explanation of Table 8 on Page 9, but that the explanation of its use is separated from the Table by the “Existing Housing Programs” Section. The Committee suggested revising Table 8 and providing a better description and methodology for how it should be used. Rather than calling Table 8 proposed “criteria”, it might be called something else (or take the word criteria out).
- Table 11 on Page 19 (Proposed Allocation of Funds) is very helpful, but does not relate well to Table 8. The Programs in Table 11 may fit under the “Criteria” Section in Table 8, but needs some clarification if these are to be used together to analyze the effectiveness of the program.
- Add a summary chart that provides the basis for measuring the success of the various programs identified in Table 11. The chart should be included in the final chapter of the report or include an appendix .


- Questioned if the various “Special Needs Population” categories in Table 5 on Page 6 (Special Housing Needs Groups) are mutually exclusive or double counted, and if so, which category or group has higher priority?
- Asked clarification of whether income levels are factored into Table 5. Stated that it does not appear that they are included.
- Page 4 Section A.3.b (Housing Costs and Affordability Gap) states that in order to consider a unit affordable, the household is expected to pay a maximum of 35% of income on housing. The Committee asked if this percentage is adjusted due to the housing costs in Santa Clara County and also suggested that the document clarify the use of the range from 30% - 35% .
- Asked if the median price and other valuations used in Table 3, Page 4 (Comparison of Household Income and Housing Costs in 2008) in particular are changing as the value of homes decreases.
- Referring to Table 3, the Committee commented that never before has there been such a universal decline in the housing market and that this is a new environment for the foreseeable future. They questioned if the median price numbers reflect this new dynamic in the housing market and requested to have the numbers. Staff stated that while the median housing price numbers are important, the affordable housing qualifications levels are based on household income, which may actually decline with the recent loss of jobs/shrinking income levels in the County.
- Section V.B.4 (Provide Zero Interest Loans for Secondary Dwelling Units): Questioned whether this program would conflict with the Town’s policies on second units.
- Section V.A.4 (Below Market Price (BMP) and Density Bonus Programs): The Committee advocated deed restrictions to maintain the unit as an affordable unit for a specified time frame, preferably in perpetuity.
- Subsection V.B.1 (Issue Notice of Funding Availability for Multifamily Housing): Committee members noted a concern with requiring 100% affordable housing projects versus mixed income housing. While they recognize that there may be cases where 100% affordability may be the best plan, they prefer that projects have a mixture of market rate and affordable units so that the affordable units are not clustered.
- Section V.B.1: Support the NOFA concept.
- Section V.B.3 (Purchase Affordability Covenants...) Support this concept.
- Section II. B (Housing Element and Redevelopment Plan Goals): Add a goal that reflects the following: The Community strives to provide housing projects that include a variety of affordability levels (integrated housing).
- Ensure that the Town’s philosophy on non-clustering of affordable units is referenced in the document.
- Section V.B.2 (Create a Property Acquisition, Fund): Clarify what happens when the Town purchases a property.
- Section V.B.3 (Purchase Affordability Covenants in Existing Apartments): Clarify who would monitor this and how it is paid for.
- Figure 1, Page 20: provides no new information – it is all in Table 11. It should be revised or removed.

- Appendix A, Page A-1: Has staff verified the feasibility of these projects?
- Appendix A, Page A-1: Add site on Park Avenue to Appendix A.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM. The next meeting of the General Plan Committee is scheduled for April 8, 2009.

Prepared by:

  
Suzanne Davis  
Suzanne Davis, Associate Planner