

Araiza, Fatima

From: Nathaniel Greensides [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 8:59 PM
To: eComment
Cc: Hernandez, Johnathan
Subject: May 7 City Council Meeting - Public Comment Agenda Item 13

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear City Council,

Regarding the quarterly report, please see my comments below. The item was also on the CDC meeting agenda for April 30th.

TL;dr: I am happy to see that in-lieu fees collected are going towards programs which positively impact Santa Ana residents. It is great to see projects coming to fruition which provide wraparound services and resources to those who need it. I think it is still not enough if we are to completely resolve or ameliorate the matter of housing un-affordability. Our successes as a City should set the bar for surrounding cities; we can maintain our top spot as an example by going above and beyond what the state or federal government requires. We can make the world a better place and we can make our City even better if we work towards a vision where all who lack safe and affordable shelter can have one with as little barriers for such in the process. Sincerely,

Nate Greensides
Ward 5 Resident

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Nathaniel Greensides [REDACTED]
Date: Tue, Apr 30, 2024 at 1:20 PM
Subject: April 30 2024 CDC Public Comment - Item number 3
To: Zurita, Bianca <BZurita@santa-ana.org>

Dear Commission members and City Staff,

Thank you for the comprehensive and informative Quarterly Report for Housing Division Projects and Activities for the period of January 1, 2024 to March 31, 2024. One request I would like to make about Exhibit one of the item is on page 5 regarding the table of the density bonuses: would it be possible to add in a column of total units constructed (both affordable and market rate) so that the public can see how many new residential units in total are being constructed during the period?

A point of input as an advocate of the RSO and JCEO: besides listing inquiries, it would be helpful for the general public to know the outcome of the inquiries fielded. For example, this could include the number of enforcement actions the Department has acted on whether it be forwarding inquiries to Code Enforcement or number of inquiries resulting in the inquirer being informed to seek independent legal counsel, the number of new residential units registered, number of tenant vs non-tenant inquiries.

A point of input regarding the HOO information at the bottom of page 8: it would be helpful to see any numbers of upcoming affordable units to be constructed per the HOO in the same table alongside the numbers for the affordable units which now exist because of the ordinance.

A comment about the in-lieu fees listed by FY on page 9: the City Council temporarily lowered the in lieu fees in August of 2020 (FY2021 at that point and then the lower fees were in effect by the early October; and it should be reminded that in-lieu fees paid means that developers were choosing to NOT construct affordable units and pay fees in-lieu of constructing affordable units) and as a result we can see that there was an increase of in-lieu funds collected in FY21/22 with a tapering amount each FY thereafter as the HOO fees changed again in 2021. Some might consider this to be a good thing - to see an increase of funds received when the in-lieu fees were temporarily decreased. However, to me, this means that an excess of market rate units at non-affordable rates came onto the market and affordability for residents in Santa Ana became even more worse. Yes, I understand completely that the in-lieu fees are to be utilized for affordable housing programs and creation on the part of the city. But when considering that the projects which paid the in-lieu fees during this period generated or will be generating yields and returns that are far above and beyond the \$6,933,320 in FY21/22 for the "investors" (the vast majority of which I would safely conjecture are not Santa Ana residents) of the projects which opted for in-lieu fees over constructing affordable units, it becomes clear that temporarily reducing the fee ultimately worsens the availability of affordable housing for Santa Ana residents. I was able to request the info of projects that paid fees in that year and when you look into each project, the proformas will show as much:

FY21/22:

Tom's Trucks / KB Home Coastal	1,096,955
Redhill & Warner	4,384,335
MainPlace Residential	1,213,575
Haphan Residential Development	158,300
West Fifth Villas	80,155
	<hr/>
	6,933,320

^and market rate rents and purchase prices for any of the above units definitely have increased making affordability worse for Santa Ana residents.

I am happy to see that in-lieu fees collected are going towards programs which positively impact Santa Ana residents. It is great to see projects coming to fruition which provide wraparound services and resources to those who need it. I think it is still not enough if we are to completely resolve or ameliorate the matter of housing un-affordability. Our successes as a City should set the bar for surrounding cities; we can maintain our top spot as an example by going above and beyond what the state or federal government requires. We can make the world a better place; we can make our City even better; if we work towards a vision where all who lack safe and affordable shelter can have one with as little barriers for such in the process.

Sincerely,
Nate Greensides
Ward 5 resident