



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 19, 2021

TO: Housing Advisory Committee

FROM: Pierce Macdonald-Powell, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT – Consideration of Guiding Principles
for Recommendation to City Council

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 4

REPORT SUMMARY:

Consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for the adoption of Guiding Principles for the research and housing policies prepared under the auspices of the SB2 program.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS:

Draft guiding principles, prepared by LWC and City staff are intended to inform and guide the development of the new SB2 grant housing programs, public engagement, and work products. The draft guiding principles build on the 2015 Housing Element policy, stakeholder interviews in November 2020, and public engagement completed to date. These guiding principles direct the City to consider affordable housing opportunities in all parts of Piedmont, consider architectural design that blends new development with existing development, streamline the development process, and other broad principles. Once adopted by the City Council, the City will evaluate the work prepared under the auspices of the SB2 program against these guiding principles.

In November 2020, LWC representatives met with 35 Piedmont residents, including City officials, community members, realtors, and staff. A summary of the stakeholder feedback is provided as Attachment A to this report. The City presented the draft SB 2 Guiding Principles to the Piedmont community as part of the March 2021 Fair Housing Survey and presented them to the Housing Advisory Committee at its first meeting on April 20, 2021. The draft SB 2 Guiding Principles are as follows:

1. **Support equitable distribution of affordable units across the City.** A diversity of housing choices, including new affordable multi-family housing, new mixed-income multi-family housing, new residential mixed-use development, converted units, ADUs, and JADUs, should be considered throughout the City's neighborhoods, corridors, and zoning districts.
2. **Promote and enhance community design and neighborhoods.** Infill development should be compatible with the neighborhood context. Development and design standards should ensure that new construction "fits in" in terms of building scale, placement, and design; and is sensitive to impacts on the neighborhood, including impacts related to sunlight access, privacy, and roadway access. Each building must exhibit high-quality design and play a role in creating a better whole.

3. Remove barriers to development and access to housing through clear and objective standards. Development standards and procedures should guide development that is equitable and feasible and that lead applicants through procedures that are transparent and predictable.

4. Facilitate the development of new housing units through strategic partnerships between the City and the broader community. Partnerships to facilitate development include reaching community consensus for desired development types; achieving community support for new incentives, standards, and tools to meet housing goals; and beginning a community discussion about strategies for City-facilitated development of housing units for a range of income levels.

On May 19, 2021, the Housing Advisory Committee is asked to vote to recommend City Council adoption of the SB 2 Guiding Principles. The City Council is tentatively scheduled to consider the SB 2 Guiding Principles at a public meeting on June 21, 2021. If adopted, the Guiding Principles will guide work on the SB 2 grant housing programs, and staff will compare work produced for the SB 2 grant to these principles.

If the Housing Advisory Committee Members wish to move approval of the draft SB 2 Guiding Principles, a Committee Member may make the following motion:

“I move that the Housing Advisory Committee recommend City Council adoption of the SB 2 Guiding Principles as prepared by City staff and LWC.”

CONFORMANCE WITH GENERAL PLAN:

Development of the new SB 2 grant housing programs is consistent with General Plan Housing Element goals, policies, and actions, including the following goals:

Goal 1: New housing construction – provide a range of new housing options in Piedmont to meet the needs of all household types in the community.

Goal 3: Affordable Housing Opportunities – Create additional housing opportunities for moderate, low, and very low income Piedmont residents.

Programs to support ADUs are consistent with the General Plan Housing Element Goal #3’s policies and actions specifically created to support ADUs, which were previously titled “second units,” as follows:

3.A: Second Unit Ordinance assessment – Complete a 5-year assessment of the Piedmont Second Unit Ordinance, with a focus on the incentives that are being used to promote rent-restricted units and the steps that can be taken to increase second unit production and occupancy rates.

3.B: Affordable second unit public information campaign – Initiate a public information and education campaign about second units, including definitions, regulations for their use,

opportunities for their construction, and the various incentives offered by the City to create rent-restricted units.

A list of the General Plan Housing Element goals, policies, and actions that will be supported by the new SB 2 grant housing programs is included with this staff report as Attachment B.

CEQA:

This agenda item is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because this report is not a project as defined in section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines, and also exempt pursuant to section 156061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of an impact on the environment.

CITY COUNCIL ACTION REQUIRED:

City Council approval is required for any of the SB 2 grant programs to take effect or to be implemented by City staff. City Council consideration of Guiding Principles for the SB 2 grant housing programs is not required but will ensure that City staff and consultants are following the will of the City Council as the new SB 2 grant housing programs are researched and prepared.

ATTACHMENTS:

A	Pages 4 to 12	Stakeholder Interview Summary Report and Guiding Principles
B	Pages 13 to 14	General Plan Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Actions

MEMO

To: Pierce Macdonald-Powell, Senior Planner, City of Piedmont

From: Monica Szydlak and Lisa Wise, Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc.

Date: May 12, 2020 (revised from December 8, 2020)

Subject: SB2 Planning Grant Mixed-Use and Multi-Family Objective Design Standards and Prototype Plans and Incentives for Accessory Dwelling Units: **Stakeholder Interviews Summary and Guiding Principles**

The SB2 Planning Grant project, led by the City of Piedmont, involves a robust community outreach program with four community events and an online survey. As the first of these four community events, the City directed Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC) to conduct interviews with key stakeholders. The interviews were intended to provide an insider's perspective of existing standards; identify community priorities for design of multi-family and residential mixed-use projects; and solicit thoughts on strategies for incentivizing the development of new multi-family, residential mixed-use, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in Piedmont. The interviews were also intended to help generate Guiding Principles, which will be shared with the community and will guide future efforts for the project. (The Guiding Principles are listed at the end of this memo.)

The City identified and contacted 35 individuals as potential interviewees and 34 participated in the interviews. Included were residents, architects, realtors, property owners, City staff, Planning Commissioners, City Councilmembers, and members of special interest groups. LWC conducted a total of 21 one-on-one or small group interviews (up to four interviewees per small group). All 21 interviews were conducted on November 12 and 13, 2020, via Zoom teleconference or telephone.

Interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes each out of respect for respondents' time and to limit informant fatigue, and generally lasted 30 to 40 minutes. The interviews followed a list of eight questions developed by LWC and reviewed and approved by the City (see below and Appendix). All interviews were initiated with a greeting and a brief: 1) introduction to the project, 2) description of intent of the interviews, 3) assurance on confidentiality, and 3) expected time commitment (about 30 minutes). Lastly, interviewees were reminded that there will be more opportunities to provide input during later phases of the project.

Below is a summary of the stakeholder interviews followed by the Guiding Principles that emerged from the interview responses.

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS SUMMARY

Generally, respondents were friendly, generous with information, and appreciative of the opportunity to be involved. All interviewees agreed to answer additional questions or comments and continue to work with the team on the project, indicating that the respondents valued the process and that the responses were candid and accurate. The following are summaries of responses to each question.

Question 1: What is your relationship with the City of Piedmont (Council, Commission, property owner, resident, business owner/operator, advocate, non-profit organization, neighborhood organization, concerned/interested citizen)?

Most respondents identified themselves primarily as residents. Respondents also identified themselves as property owners, realtors, architects, or representatives of special interest groups or committee. About half of interviewees (a total of 16) identified themselves as a current or former Planning Commissioner or City Councilmember.

Question 2: In your opinion, which residential buildings or blocks in the Grand Avenue area or the Highland Avenue area best represent the Piedmont aesthetic? (Name 3)

Positive responses included the following:

- Multi-family on Linda Avenue near Oakland Avenue overpass (16 mentions). Interviewees cited effective use of materials, low-impact scale and massing, and favorable architectural style, landscaping, corner design elements, and parking configuration. Three respondents, however, mentioned that the Linda Avenue townhouses are not a good example because it was expensive to build; the units are market rate/not affordable; and the project is overparked.
- Wildwood Gardens (5 mentions). This development was cited as blending in with the neighborhood context and exhibiting building and parking design that “disguises” its density.
- Il Piemonte (4 mentions). Interviewees saw this as a good example of vertical mixed-use with quality design that doesn’t feel dense and doesn’t look cheap. It was also described as tasteful with good light fixtures, rooftop open space, and landscaping.
- 154 Moraga Avenue (3 mentions). The historic Irving Gill garden cottages were described as blending seamlessly into the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Two- to four-unit developments on Moraga Avenue (3 mentions). Existing multi-family housing along Moraga Avenue was described as fitting in with the neighborhood context and appearing as single-family homes.
- Lakeshore Drive fourplexes; Multi-unit housing on Linda Avenue between Lake and Kingston avenues; Broadway Grand condos at 438 W Grand in Oakland; 4409 Piedmont Avenue, the Spanish Mission style of Highland Avenue; San Francisco-style 3-flat buildings (1 mention each).

Other responses included:

- “Dingbats” on Moraga Avenue are a bad example.
- The commercial development at the intersection of Linda and Grand avenues is not the right aesthetic.
- The expression of a design aesthetic typical of Piedmont should be neither a priority nor an expectation for multifamily and residential mixed-use development.

Question 3: In your opinion, do the current zoning standards and design guidelines for multifamily and mixed-use development encourage development that expresses the most valuable characteristics of the City’s neighborhoods?

Almost half of interviewees/interview groups (a total of 11) felt that current zoning standards and design guidelines for multifamily and mixed-use development are lacking in some way. Interviewees cited zoning envelopes that don’t incentivize mixed-use and multifamily development and called for taller heights, greater allowable density, and smaller units. Some participants felt that existing standards for soundproofing, privacy

(windows placement), and access to sunlight are inadequate, and some felt that the Code and guidelines are not specific enough and do not adequately maintain architectural integrity. One participant noted that quality projects typically need many variances.

Feedback about parking requirements was mixed. Some felt that parking restrictions that pose challenges to car-dependent multi-family and mixed-use development, while some felt that parking standards for such development should be further reduced or eliminated.

Many participants also felt that existing Zoning causes procedural barriers for multi-family, mixed use, and especially affordable housing by being unclear, difficult to understand, and creating too much “red tape.” Some expressed distrust in the discretionary review process and felt that its subjective nature inhibits development. In addition, one participant felt that the City would simply not allow ADUs and Junior ADUs (JADUs) that would otherwise be feasible.

About one-third of interviewees/interview groups (a total of 6) felt that the zoning standards and design guidelines generally work well to maintain good design in Piedmont. Specifically, these participants felt that the Design Guidelines have led to quality landscaping, character/style, and adequately address compatibility.

Four interviewees/interview groups were unsure or did not respond.

Question 4: Please rate the following elements in establishing or maintaining the character in Piedmont, 5 being the highest/most and 1 the least/lowest. Consider both primary and accessory structures. (Scale and size of structure; setbacks; façade design; architectural styles; quality of building materials; landscaping and streetscape; location and configuration of parking)

Some participants were comfortable with assigning a numeric rating to each design element while some respondents preferred to discuss the design elements qualitatively. Overall, respondents frequently mentioned the need for design elements to be consistent with, or “fit in with,” the surrounding neighborhood context. The following provides, in order, the average ranking of each design element based on the respondents that offered quantitative rankings, as well as a summary of related feedback.

- **Scale and size of structure: 4.7.** Must be consistent with (have a “similar feel to,” be “in harmony with”) neighboring homes. Upper-story step backs are important and standards should be conscious of shade cast. Height/scale must be sensitive to adjacent single-family residences.
- **Location and configuration of parking: 4.4.** Required parking must be covered and off-street. Underground, tandem, and stackable mechanical is OK. Should not be visible/should not impact design from the street. Parking standards in the ADU ordinance should permit addition of curb cuts for ADUs regardless of whether primary dwelling is conforming. Alley access where possible should be encouraged. Garage width as a percentage of building width or lot width should be limited. Entrances to parking must be carefully designed/located to preserve streetscapes and ensure pedestrian safety.
- **Façade design: 4.4.** Should match the style of the community. Must be “human scale.” Façade design should be more formal in the center of town/Downtown area (e.g., Colonial); less formal/more flexible in the Grand Avenue area. More articulation.
- **Landscaping and streetscape: 4.4.** Must blend in. Need to be conscious of water usage, need a MWEL. Planter boxes are good. Should complement the streetscape in the right-of-way. Piedmont is not a town of fences, gates, and/or walls. Landscaping can be effective in ensuring privacy.

- **Quality of building materials: 4.0.** No vinyl windows, no hardy board, no aluminum cladding, no siding, no all-glass structures. There should be a reference to the natural environment (wood, brick, stone). Must not be/look cheap. Should be “green,” long-life, and termite-, moisture-, and fireproof.
- **Setbacks: 4.0.** Important to protect access to sunlight. Setbacks can be zero along Grand Ave. Setbacks should be consistent with neighboring properties and protect the feeling of openness in the city.
- **Architectural styles: 3.7.** Must be well-done, coherent, pleasing, and “blend in.” Should have some recognizable style, whether Contemporary, Craftsman, Tudor, or other. No freight containers. Brutalist architecture is not appropriate. Detailed architectural standards will be important.

Question 5: In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges property owners in Piedmont face in constructing ADUs?

Interviewees were generally enthusiastic about ADUs and JADUs as “affordable-by-design” housing. Many participants mentioned and voiced support for recent measures on the part to the State to facilitate construction of ADUs and expressed optimism that these can become a source of new affordable units in Piedmont. Challenges identified by interviewees included:

- **Procedural challenges.** Some interviewees felt that getting through discretionary review is the biggest real or perceived challenge, with detached ADUs running into style and compatibility issues. Many participants also referenced the lack of clarity/understanding of the whole process. Participants suggested the City provide a guide for working through the ADU process that lets people know that the restrictions have been loosened, outlines the process step-by-step, and provides a resource list.
- **Regulatory challenges.** Many interviewees simply stated that there need to be clearer standards in place. In terms of specific regulations, challenges included:
 - *Parking.* Participants noted that ADUs cause parking problems in neighborhoods, particularly on narrow streets. Interviewees suggested that the ADU ordinance should provide more direction on parking and that parking in the driveway or tandem parking should be allowed.
 - *Design.* Some participants felt that requirements for the design of the ADU to match that of the primary dwelling is too onerous.
 - *Lot Minimums.* Interviewees noted that the Zone minimum lot size makes many lots nonconforming, which can cause challenges to development.
 - *Height limits.* Interviewees cited small lot sizes as a reason to increasing height limits, and voiced support for ADUs above garages.
 - *Impervious surfaces.* Interviewees expressed concern that the limit on impervious surfaces restricts development of ADUs.

Other participants stated that ADU standards should not be more liberal than what the State allows; that people should be required to rent out ADUs; and that people should not be allowed to use ADUs to avoid parking requirements for additional bedrooms in the primary dwelling.

- **Physical constraints.** Interviewees noted that standards should be sensitive to development on sloped rear yards where ADUs are naturally more visible from the street; and that narrow side yards pose challenges to access.

- **Cost/Financing.** Many interviewees cited cost as the major challenge to constructing ADUs.
- **Opposition from neighbors.** Neighbors' concerns about traffic, noise, solar access, and view protection were identified as challenges. Some interviewees felt that the City is not sufficiently addressing neighbors' concerns; and that there is a need for a neighbor notification requirement and an opportunity for neighbors to provide input.

Other comments related to ADUs included doubt that ADUs can be the primary driver to increase housing diversity and production; concerns about the usefulness of templates/prototypes; and concern that people simply don't want to be landlords.

Question 6: What should the City do to increase housing production and make Piedmont a welcoming and inclusive place to live to a more diverse range of household income levels (e.g., land acquisition, rehabilitation/conversion, housing funds, fees, credits, streamlined approvals, parking requirements, ownership programs, etc.)?

Interviewees' ideas, strategies, and concerns are described below:

- **Revisit development standards and regulations.** Consider changes to density, height, setbacks, lot size and/or parking to make construction more feasible. Specifically, reduced minimum lot sizes were recommended to encourage lot splits.
- **Rezoning.** Re-zone some areas from single-family residential or estate residential to a zone that supports multi-family and residential mixed-use development.¹
- **Conversions.** Allow houses to be divided into multiplex structures, either as condos or rentals. Amend definitions to ensure these are allowed.
- **Acquisition.** The City should consider acquiring existing single-family homes to rehabilitation and conversion into multi-unit structures. The City should also consider acquiring land on Grand Avenue or elsewhere and partnering with non-profit housing developers to build affordable units.
- **Deed restrictions.** Use deed restrictions to ensure long-term affordability.
- **Funds.** The City should consider strategies to fund affordable housing including establishing a City fund for housing ownership support and subsidies and using Measure A-1 funds.
- **Messaging.** The City should work on messaging to the community. The City should correct misconceptions about affordable housing leading to lower property values or increased crime; frame the discussion in terms of needs for teachers, City staff, and first responders; and demonstrate the benefits of conversions of large homes into multi-unit structures. There also needs to be a change in perception that the planning process is difficult.

¹ Section 9.02 of the Charter of the City of Piedmont: The Council may classify and reclassify the zones established, but no existing zones shall be reduced or enlarged with respect to size or area, and no zones shall be reclassified without submitting the question to a vote at a general or special election. No zone shall be reduced or enlarged and no zones reclassified unless a majority of the voters voting upon the same shall vote in favor thereof; provided that any property which is zoned for uses other than or in addition to a single family dwelling may be voluntarily rezoned by the owners thereof filing a written document executed by all of the owners thereof under penalty of perjury stating that the only use on such property shall be a single-family dwelling, and such rezoning shall not require a vote of the electors as set forth above.

- **Opportunity areas.** Suggested opportunity areas for affordable housing included the Linda Avenue tennis courts; the Shell station; the Ace Hardware site; the Mulberry's/Citibank site; the B of A; the gas station on Highland Way and Highland Ave; the Kehilla synagogue lot; underutilized open spaces; Blair Park; and deep lots along Moraga (for ADUs specifically).

One participant objected to the question, stating that the City should engage in litigation rather than strive to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Question 7: Are there other issues we have not covered that you feel are important for us to consider?

Less than half (a total of 10 respondents) provided a response to this question. Responses that were not directly relevant to other questions included:

- Consider creating more one-way/fewer two-way streets to ease parking problems.
- Most houses don't have garages/on-site parking, and those that do use garages for storage.
- Parking that is tied to the number of bedrooms can cause problems.
- It would be nice to have one-story homes for accessibility.
- Parking enforcement is needed.
- Are there concerns with overbuilding in the era of COVID?

Question 8: If we have additional questions, may we contact you?

Every person that participated in the interviews agreed to answer more questions or provide more information to the project team. Many saying, "call me any time," or "call or email me for anything you need."

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

8 fUZi; i]X]b['Df]bV]d`Yg`Zf`Wtbg]XYfU]cb`cZH Y<5 7`UfYdfcj]XYX`cb`h`YZ`ck]b[`dU] Y"



- 1 Support equitable distribution of affordable units across the City.** A diversity of housing choices, including new affordable multi-family housing, new mixed-income multi-family housing, new residential mixed-use development, converted units, ADUs, and JADUs, should be considered throughout the City's neighborhoods, corridors, and zoning districts.
- 2 Promote and enhance community design and neighborhoods.** Infill development should be compatible with the neighborhood context. Development and design standards should ensure that new construction "fits in" in terms of building scale, placement, and design; and is sensitive to impacts on the neighborhood, including impacts related to sunlight access, privacy, and roadway access. Each building must exhibit high-quality design and play a role in creating a better whole.
- 3 Remove barriers to development and access to housing through clear and objective standards.** Development standards and procedures should guide development that is equitable and feasible and that lead applicants through procedures that are transparent and predictable.
- 4 Facilitate the development of new housing units through strategic partnerships between the City and the broader community.** Partnerships to facilitate development include reaching community consensus for desired development types; achieving community support for new incentives, standards, and tools to meet housing goals; and beginning a community discussion about strategies for City-facilitated development of housing units for a range of income levels.

APPENDIX

City of Piedmont Objective Design Standards and ADU Plans and Incentives Stakeholder Interview Questions

Name:

Day:

Time:

OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT: Revise code to be legally compliant, objective, and easy to use. Assure code supports feasible and high-quality residential development (multi-family, residential mixed-use, and ADUs). Develop recommendations for the upcoming Housing Element; Implement community vision.

OBJECTIVE OF THE INTERVIEWS: Hear your perspective, as a code-user/person knowledgeable about the City. Help the consultant team understand the highest priority issues from the perspective of the community. Inform the community of the project timeline and opportunities for participation.

CONFIDENTIALITY: All results will be reported in aggregate form where no comment can be attributed to an individual. Your participation is completely voluntary. You can stop the interview at any time.

QUESTIONS: We'll ask 8 questions. Please note, there are no right or wrong answers. You will not be judged on your responses. Please answer each question as sincerely as you can. The interview should take about 25 minutes. We appreciate your input.

1. What is your relationship with the City of Piedmont (Council, Commission, property owner, resident, business owner/operator, advocate, non-profit organization, neighborhood organization, concerned/interested citizen)?

2. In your opinion, which residential buildings or blocks in the Grand Avenue area or the Highland Avenue area best represent the Piedmont aesthetic? (Name 3)

3. In your opinion, do the current zoning standards and design guidelines for multi-family and mixed-use development encourage development that expresses the most valuable characteristics of the City's neighborhoods? (Yes, No, Unsure, Explain)

Attachment B

General Plan Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Actions

The SB 2 Planning Grants Program application prepared by staff is consistent with the following General Plan Housing Element goals, policies, and actions:

Goal 1: New housing construction – provide a range of new housing options in Piedmont to meet the needs of all household types in the community.

Policy 1.2: Housing diversity – Continue to maintain planning, zoning, and building regulations that accommodate the development of housing for all income levels.

Policy 1.4: Context-appropriate programs – Participate in those state and federal housing assistance programs that are most appropriate to Piedmont’s character and that recognize the unique nature of affordable housing opportunities in the City.

Policy 1.5 – Second units – Continue to allow second units (in-law apartments) “by right” in all residential zones within the City, subject to dimensional and size requirements, parking standards, and an owner-occupancy requirements for either the primary or secondary unit. Local standards for second units may address neighborhood compatibility, public safety, and other issues but should not be so onerous as to preclude the development of additional units.

Policy 1.6: Second units in new or expanded homes – Strongly encourage the inclusion of second units when new homes are built and when existing homes are expanded.

Policy 1.7: Housing in commercial districts – Ensure that local zoning regulations accommodate multi-family residential uses on commercial properties in the City, including the addition of apartment to existing commercial buildings.

Policy 1.10: Intergovernmental coordination – Coordinate local housing efforts with the California Department of Housing and Community Development, the County of Alameda, and adjacent cities. Where City-sponsored housing programs are infeasible due to limited local resources, explore the feasibility of participating in programs initiated by other jurisdictions.

Action 1.C: Market-rate second unit production – Maintain zoning regulations that support the development of market-rate second units in Piedmont neighborhoods.

Action 1.E.: Allowing multi-family housing and mixed-use in in the Commercial Zone – Amend the Piedmont Zoning Ordinance to add multiple family housing and mixed-use development to the list of conditionally permitted uses in the Commercial Zone (Zone D).

Action 1.G: Facilitating multi-family development – Develop incentives which would facilitate multi-family development on land zone for multi-family or commercial uses in Piedmont, including modifications to lot coverage requirements for multi-family uses in Zones C and D, and modifications to permitted and conditionally permitted use requirements for Zones C and D. The City will also consider potential ways to streamline environmental review in the event future multi-family uses are proposed in these areas.

Action 2.E: Streamlining design review – Conduct a Planning Commission study session to identify steps that might be taken to expedite and improve the design review process. Following this session, develop amendments to the Design Review process consistent with Action 28.C of the General Plan (Design and Preservation Element).

Action 2.F: Update Design Review Guidelines – Update the 1988 City of Piedmont Residential Design Guidelines consistent with Action 28.E of the Piedmont General Plan.

Goal 7: Equal access to housing – Ensure that all persons have equal access to housing opportunities in Piedmont.

Policy 7.1: Housing choice – Promote the development of housing for all persons regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or other arbitrary factors.

Policy 7.3: Fair housing enforcement – Implement and enforce relevant State and federal fair housing laws.

Action 5.A: Shared housing program – Consider participating in ECHO Housing’s shared housing program as a way to improve housing opportunities for lower income seniors and extremely low income households.

Action 5.C: Assistance to non-profit developers – Provide assistance to non-profit entities interested in developing housing for low and moderate income Piedmont residents, including elderly and others with special needs.

Action 5.H: Faith Community participation – Work with local faith community to serve residents in need within Piedmont and the greater East Bay, and to identify potential partners for meeting local extremely low income housing needs.

Action 5.I: Second units for extremely-low income households – Maintain an inventory of second units that are available at rents that are affordable to extremely low income households. Explore ways to expand this inventory and encourage the development of additional extremely low income second units through the City’s affordable second unit program and other means.

Action 5.J: Housing for extremely low income families – Develop incentives to meet the needs of Piedmont’s extremely low income households potentially including modified development standards for new multi-family buildings that include units for extremely low income families.