

MINUTES OF THE ADJOURNED JOINT MEETING OF
THE MONTCLAIR CITY COUNCIL AND
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD HELD ON
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2003, AT 5:45 P.M. IN
THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 5111 BENITO
STREET, MONTCLAIR, CALIFORNIA

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor/Chairman Eaton called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Mayor/Chairman Eaton; Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chairman Dutrey; Council Member/Director Ruh; City Manager/Executive Director McDougal; Director of Administrative Services Starr; Director of Redevelopment/Public Works Staats; Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark; City/Agency Engineer Hudson; City Clerk/Agency Secretary Crawford

Absent: Council Member/Director Paulitz (arrived at 5:48 p.m.); Council Member/Director Raft (arrived at 5:52 p.m.)

III. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

IV. COUNCIL/AGENCY WORKSHOP

A. Housing Improvement Task Force Action Plan Update

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark stated that the update presented this evening would focus on the first half of the **Housing Improvement Task Force *Action Plan 2003*** document and would be given by various staff members.

Council Member/Director Paulitz arrived at 5:48 p.m.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark gave a preliminary review of the revised San Antonio Gateway Development project that will be the last presentation made this evening. He clarified two handouts given to the Council this evening, one of which contains income criteria for affordable housing and the other being a worksheet equating household unit sizes with corresponding rental amounts.

Council Member/Director Raft arrived at 5:52 p.m.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark reviewed *Task Force Program* Sections "Housing Requirements"

and "Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)."

Council Member Ruh inquired as follows:

1. Why is the City not in compliance with the Housing Element requirements of the **California Department of Housing and Community Development**?

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark clarified that the **Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)** is requiring a high number of new housing units, a total of 895 to be built during the next three years, compared to the City's conservative General Plan expectation of only 440 new units, which is what is projected to be attainable pursuant to the City's General Plan land-use policies.

2. Why is the City not more proactive in achieving the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goal?

City Manager/Executive Director McDougal advised it is unfair to criticize a staff person for the inaction of the Council. He indicated that staff has been entirely forthcoming during periodic updates of the General Plan Housing Element over the past 10 to 20 years that it has not been in compliance.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark concurred that staff has been very straightforward in disclosing that the periodic updates to the General Plan Housing Element would not gain compliance to the RHNA. He reiterated that the RHNA numbers are unreasonably high, though the three housing development projects being proposed, including the **Margarita School** project, would contribute significantly towards the Housing Element requirements. He clarified that the City's largest RHNA shortfall is in the moderate- to above moderate-income units as follows: a shortage of a total of 141 units in the very low- to low-income categories as compared to a shortage of 353 units in the moderate- to above moderate-income categories. Noting that the housing advocates focus on low- and very low income housing units, he emphasized that the large number of low- to very low-income homebuyers that the City has assisted do not always count towards the Housing Element requirements.

Council Member Paulitz noted that while serving on the Montclair Planning Commission in 1970, **SCAG** set forth a requirement that Montclair should have a population of 40,000 by 1990 without first conducting an analysis of available land in the City. He stated he is not overly concerned about meeting these arbitrary numbers, noting it is likely that other cities have not done so, either.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark advised that cities with vast amounts of vacant land could certainly meet their housing element requirements.

Council Member Raft inquired as to the consequence of not meeting the RHNA requirement.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark indicated there are no legal sanctions or penalties for not complying with the RHNA requirement.

Council Member Ruh emphasized that "the Inland Empire cities led the charge against" legislation that would have forced the coastal cities to build their share of affordable housing. He stated that Inland Empire cities do not want to build low-to moderate-income income housing.

Director of Community Development/Agency Planner Clark stated that the Housing Element requirements are something to strive for, though they are fraught with controversy, as there may be penalties for noncompliance in the future. That said, he pointed out the inequities in the RHNA low-moderate unit requirements of Montclair as compared to other neighboring cities depicted in Table 2, "Housing Price and RHNA Construction Needs Comparison in Pomona Valley." He credited **SCAG** for soliciting local input for the next five-year RHNA requirement, which has no doubt resulted from the controversy.

Director of Redevelopment/Public Works Staats reviewed *Task Force Program* Section "Redevelopment Inclusionary Housing Requirements."

Redevelopment and Housing Manager Caldwell reviewed *Task Force Program* Section "Assisted Housing Inventory."

Mr. R. Richard Fleener, Vice President, Community Development, **L. D. King, Inc.**, reviewed *Task Force Program* Section "San Antonio Gateway Development."

Mayor/Chairman Eaton indicated that careful consideration must be made in deciding what would be the best development for Montclair.

Council Member Paulitz commented as follows:

1. He spoke in favor of meeting the Redevelopment Agency inclusionary housing requirements, noting the Agency Board became committed to establishing the Low- to Moderate-Income Housing Set-Aside Fund when the Redevelopment Agency was created.
2. He expressed his opinion that the **SCAG** new housing unit requirement is a target but, realistically, a seldom attainable goal for local government.
3. He stated he is for no net increase in apartment units, with the exception of replacing the apartments proposed to be removed on Amherst Avenue.

4. He advised that new housing developments cannot be forced; and unless the City starts building houses, prospective homebuyers go where the market is.
5. He noted the Redevelopment Agency has shown its good intentions related to meeting the Housing Element requirements by purchasing, restoring, and managing neglected property and supporting housing programs like **NPHS**.
6. With regard to the San Antonio Gateway Development project, he spoke in favor of Plan No. II, with an amendment that senior multifamily housing units be built in Section A and new apartments be built on the west side of Amherst Avenue, south of Pradera Avenue.

Mayor Pro Tem Dutrey noted the area proposed for the San Antonio Gateway Development project is in need of major revitalization, including the incompatible land uses, unusable landlocked parcels, and the blight issue along Amherst Avenue. He spoke in support of turning the area around to encompass a new urbanism type of land-use design and to provide good quality housing for prospective homebuyers. He summarized the five typical problems found in today's dysfunctional multifamily areas listed on page 21 of *Action Plan 2003* as follows:

1. Small fourplex, or similar buildings, located on individual parcels, with separate absentee ownership for each building, resulting in property owners having little knowledge of what occurs at their properties as well as very little time to devote to property management.
2. Lack of on-site amenities for tenants, such as recreational opportunities and community facilities, in part resulting from the age of older buildings.
3. Inappropriate site design not conforming to current multifamily architectural designs.
4. Lack of design consideration for public safety and defensible space, including open alleyways that invite the criminal element and create difficulty in public safety measures.
5. Lack of quality tenant-screening and on-site management, which the City's Housing Improvement Task Force Foundation Area projects have improved upon.

Mayor Pro Tem Dutrey noted that improvement of these particular issues would attract a better class of tenant. He spoke in support of the Council's conceptual approval of staff's recommendations. He suggested the Council tour different sites where this type of project has been successful. He asked his Council colleagues to be open-minded to the proposed San Antonio Gateway Development project, noting it has the possibility to become an award-

winning quality project.

Council Member Ruh commented as follows:

1. He noted that pursuant to the builders, developers, and realtors he encounters in his profession, the market is demanding a much more affordable product, though cities are "forcing people to build products that people don't want, simply because of the actions they've taken requiring certain densities, certain setbacks, certain building sizes, certain dwelling unit sizes." He emphasized that the need is for a much more affordable product as evidenced by the number of financing programs to assist prospective homebuyers.
2. He indicated that the plans presented this evening are commendable, though he pointed out that Montclair has been termed "apartment row" because the City has a concentration of low-income units in one area. He suggested that the San Antonio Gateway Development project proposals would continue that design element and must be carefully considered. He reported that pursuant to a new planning concept recommended by the **American Planning Association**, low-income housing should be scattered throughout a community so there is not an area identified as the "low-income neighborhood."
3. He emphasized that the community needs to provide housing for every type of person, and that the City needs to fulfill its low- to moderate-income housing requirements.
4. He noted that less than 40 percent of the families in San Bernardino County can afford to buy a home; in Montclair, it is less than 35 percent. He added that last month, the median sales price of a home in Montclair was \$196,000, which requires an income of \$70,000 per year, perfect credit, and a debt load of no more than \$470 a month. He spoke of the importance of and commitment to housing the low- to moderate-income workforce in Montclair.

Mayor/Chairman Eaton thanked staff and **Mr. Fleener** for their presentations.

Council Member Paulitz commented as follows:

1. He commented further on the problems surrounding small fourplex-type buildings and the inappropriate site design of multifamily units, resulting in high density of small units, cited by Mayor Pro Tem Dutrey.
2. Noting that commercial development was being emphasized in the community when he was first elected to the Council, he advised he was instrumental in focusing the Council's attention back to housing, which has continued to this day.

3. He noted he supported increasing unit sizes, constructing garages instead of carports, and providing adequate parking when the R-3 development standards were last modified.
4. He spoke in favor of touring different development sites as suggested by Mayor Pro Tem Dutrey and reiterated his support of the mixture of housing units specified in Plan No. II.

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 6:41 p.m., Mayor/Chairman Eaton adjourned the City Council and Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors.

Submitted for City Council/Redevelopment Agency Board approval,

Yvonne L. Smith
Transcribing Secretary