



CITY OF NEWARK

2023-2031 HOUSING ELEMENT

HCD COMPLIANT DRAFT

December 1, 2023



NEWARK 2023-2031 HOUSING ELEMENT TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	8
<hr/>	
SECTION 1 Introduction	9
<hr/>	
A. Purpose and Organization of the Housing Element	9
B. Changes in State Housing Law	10
C. Relation to Other General Plan Elements	12
D. Community Engagement	14
SECTION 2 Housing Needs	21
<hr/>	
A. Population Growth and Trends	23
B. Housing Tenure	28
C. Housing Needs for Special Needs Populations	41
SECTION 3 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	53
<hr/>	
A. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	53
B. History of the Land and People	54
C. Summary of Fair Housing Need	56
D. Fair Housing Assessment	58
E. Racially and/or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty + Affluence	74
F. Disparities in Access to Opportunity	76
G. Disproportionate Housing Needs for Low-income Households and Protected Classes	91
H. AFFH Analysis of Sites	123
I. Contributing Factors and Meaningful Actions	141
SECTION 4 Housing Constraints	148
<hr/>	
A. Governmental Constraints	148
B. Non-Governmental Constraints	187
C. Environmental Constraints	189
SECTION 5 Housing Resources	192
<hr/>	
A. Available Sites For Housing	192
B. City Financial Resources	195
C. Other City and Partner Agency Resources	195

SECTION 6 Housing Plan	197
A. Evaluation of Accomplishments Under Adopted Housing Element	197
B. Housing Plan: Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs	205

Appendices

A. Housing Needs	A-1
B. Public Engagement and Input Summary	B-1
C. Housing Sites Inventory	C-1
D. Public Comment Response	D-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: New State Housing Laws Relevant to Housing Element Update	Table 3-10: Housing Units at Risk of Conversion, 2022
Table 1-2: Draft Public Comment	Table 3-11: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness, 2016 to 2020
Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends	Table 3-12: Migrant Farmworker Student Population, 2016 to 2020
Table 2-2: Population by Race 2000 to 2019	Table 3-13: Distribution of Housing Capacity by Census Tract with AFFH Indicators
Table 2-3: Number and Type of Housing Units in Alameda County 2022	Table 3-14: Site Distribution by Median Income, 2015- 2019
Table 2-4: Newark Cash Rent, 2021	Table 3-15: Sites Along Transit Lines and High or Moderate Opportunity Areas, 2022
Table 2-5: Newark Rents, 2023	Table 3-16: Summary of Contributing Factors and Actions Regarding Housing Issues in Newark
Table 2-6 Overcrowding by Regional Population, 2013-2017	Table 4-1: General Plan Land Use Designations
Table 2-7: Substandard Housing Units, 2015-2019	Table 4-2: Residential Development Standards, Newark 2022
Table 2-8: Subsidized Affordable Housing Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate 2020	Table 4-3: Housing Types Permitted by Zone, Newark 2022
Table 2-9: Disability by Type, 2015-2019	Table 4-4: Potential Sites for Emergency Shelters in Newark, 2022
Table 3-1: Newark Fair Housing Complaints, 2016-2021	Table 4-5: Level of Review Authority, Selected Decision Types
Table 3-2: Fair Housing Complaints Forwarded to Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Alameda County, January 2017- June 2020	Table 4-6: Average Permit Processing Time, Newark, 2022
Table 3-3: Population by Racial Group, Newark and the Region, 2000 to 2020	Table 4-7: Permit Fees, Newark, Fiscal Year 2022-2023
Table 3-4: Race and Ethnicity of Newark Residents, 2000 to 2020	Table 4-8: Residential Development Impact Fees, Newark, Fiscal Year 2022-2023
Table 3-5: Dissimilarity Index Between Racial Groups, 2000 to 2020	Table 4-9: Off-Street Parking Requirements, Newark 2021
Table 3-6: Isolation Index for Newark and the Bay Area, 2000 to 2020	Table 6-1: Review of Policies and Programs of 5th Housing Element Cycle
Table 3-7: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps, 2021	Table 6-2: Assessors Parcels Numbers Subject to AB 1397, 2022
Table 3-8: Selected District Level Data - 0161234--Newark Unified for the year 2021-2022	
Table 3-9: Residents With A Disability, Newark and Region, 2015- 2019	

Table 6-3: List of Quantified Objectives for the 2023 to 2031 Planning Period

Table C-1: City of Newark Detailed Sites Inventory

Table C-2: City of Newark Sites Inventory APNs and Acreage

Table C-3: Planned and Proposed Sites with Project Status

Table C-4: Lower Income RHNA vis-a-vis Non Vacant Sites, 2023

Table C-5: Grocery Outlet Center Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-6: Thornton Ave. Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-7: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #1

Table C-8: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #2

Table C-9: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #3

Table C-10: E-Z 8 Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-11: Cherry Plaza Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-12: Sycamore St. Vacant Lot Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-13: Cedar Blvd. Public Storage Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table C-14: Filbert Ave. Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis

Table D-1: Housing Element Draft Public Comments Received and City Response

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2-1: Population by Age, 2000 to 2019
- Figure 2-2: Wage or Works by Place of Residence and Work, by Income, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-3: Housing Age, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-4: Newark Zillow Home Value Index, 2013 -2022
- Figure 2-5: Home Values of Owner Occupied Units, 2015-2019
- Figure 2-6: Rents for Renter Occupied Units in Newark, Alameda County, and the Bay Area, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-7: Housing Tenure by Race, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-8: Vacant Units By Type, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-9: Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-10: Low Income Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-11: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity, 2013- 2017
- Figure 2-12: Senior Households by Income and Tenure, 2013- 2017
- Figure 2-13: Cost Burdened Rates by Income Level, Seniors, 2013- 2017
- Figure 2-14: Households by Household Size, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-15: Household Type, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-16: Household Type by Tenure, 2015- 2019
- Figure 2-17: Households by Household Income Level, 2013- 2017
- Figure 3-1: Predominate Racial Groups in Newark, 2010
- Figure 3-2: Racial Demographics of Newark, 2018
- Figure 3-3: Household Income levels for Newark, Alameda County and the Bay Area, 2013- 2017
- Figure 3-4: Income by Race and Ethnicity, 2013- 2017
- Figure 3-5: Median Household Income, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-6: Low to Moderate Income Households and Percent Non-White Population, 2015- 2019, 2018
- Figure 3-7: Area of High Segregation and Poverty, 2021
- Figure 3-8: Distribution of TCAC Opportunity Areas in the San Francisco Bay Area, 2022
- Figure 3-9: Composite of Opportunity Areas in Newark, 2022
- Figure 3-10: Percentage of Residents in Low, Moderate and High Resourced Areas by Race, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-11: Jobs Proximity Index Composite, 2014-2017
- Figure 3-12: Economic Opportunity Score, 2021
- Figure 3-13: Environmental Opportunity Score, 2021
- Figure 3-14: CalEnviroScreen and Non-White Population, 2021 and 2018
- Figure 3-15: Newark School Enrollment, 2017-2022
- Figure 3-16: Race and Ethnicity of Newark Unified School District, 2020-2021 School Year
- Figure 3-17: Educational Opportunity Index, 2021
- Figure 3-18: Alameda County Transit Bus Stops and Proposed Transit Stations, 2022
- Figure 3-19: Housing and Transportation Costs as a Percentage of Income
- Figure 3-20: Percentage of Households With Children Under 18 Years of Age, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-21: Family Structures in Newark, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-22: Percent of Married Couples with Children, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-23: Percent of Children in a Female Headed Household, 2015- 2019
- Figure 3-24: Poverty Levels of Female Headed Households in Newark, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-25: Comparison of Household Size for Owners and Renters in Alameda County and Newark, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-26: Increase of Senior Population. 2010 to 2019

Figure 3-27: Seniors Income Level, Owners and Renters, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-28: Disability Status By Age, 2016- 2020

Figure 3-29: Newark Senior Population with Disability, 65 years and Older, 2016- 2020

Figure 3-30: Disability Status by Race, 2016- 2020

Figure 3-31: Cost Burden Renter Households in Newark Over Time, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-32: Cost Burdened by Income, 2013- 2017

Figure 3-33: Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015-2019

Figure 3-34: Overpayment by Renters, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-35: Overpayment by Homeowners, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-36: Cost Burdened Residents by Race, 2013- 2017

Figure 3-37: Percent of Owner and Renter Households Living in Crowded Conditions, 2013- 2017

Figure 3-38: Overcrowding by Race and Ethnicity, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-39: Overcrowding and Severe Overcrowding in Newark and Non-White Population, 2015- 2019 and 2018

Figure 3-40: Subsidized Housing and Housing Choice Vouchers, 2021

Figure 3-41: Housing Tenure in Newark, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-42: Rates of Homeownership by Race, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-43: Mortgage Applications and Acceptance by Race, 2018-2019

Figure 3-44: Total Count of People Experiencing Homelessness For The Point In Time Count On February 22, 2022

Figure 3-45: Unsheltered Individuals in Newark and Alameda County, 2022

Figure 3-46: Sheltered Individuals by Race, 2022

Figure 3-47: Permanent and Seasonal Farmworkers at the County Level, 2022 to 2017

Figure 3-48: Map of Plan and Dumbarton Corridor, 2010

Figure 3-49: Areas in Newark Vulnerable to Displacement and Percentage of Communities of Color, 2018 and 2022

Figure 3-50: 100 Year and 500 Year Flooding Projections for the City of Newark

Figure 3-51: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle

Figure 3-52: Sites by Racial Predominance, 2010

Figure 3-53: Site Distribution by Median Income, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-54: Site Distribution By Percent of Low and Moderate Income Residents, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-55: Site Distribution by CalEnviroScreen Percentile Score, 2021

Figure 3-56: Percentage of Housing Units by Resource Opportunity Area, 2022

Figure 3-57: Site Distribution by Resource Level and Transportation Access, 2022

Figure 3-58: Distribution of Sites by Rates of Cost burdened, 2015- 2019

Figure 3-59: Distribution of Sites by Displacement Risk and Percent BIPOC population, 2017 and 2018

Figure 3-60: Housing Sites Vis-a-Vis Disability Status, 2015- 2019

Figure 4-1: Development Review Process

Figure 5-1: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle

Figure C-1: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

City of Newark Staff

Steven Turner, Community Development Director

Art Interiano, Assistant Community Development Director

Carmelisa Lopez, Senior Planner

Joseph Balatbat, Associate Planner

Consultant Team

Paul Peninger, BAE Urban Economics

Community Planning Collaborative

Clara Cheeves

Bowen Close

Josh Ellsworth

Corinne Tsai

Newark Community

The City would like to extend its thanks to the community members, advocates and organizations that contributed to this report. An incomplete list of those who contributed their time and knowledge toward this draft is below:

- All the community members that filled out a survey, and attend a community meeting
- Alameda County Department of Health Developmental Disabilities Council
- Clark W. Redeker Newark Senior Center
- El Tímpano
- Greenbelt Alliance
- Housing Consortium of the East Bay
- Promotores
- Second Chance Inc.
- Newark Public Library
- Newark Unified School District: Newark Parent leadership team
- Newark Planning Commission

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

The city of Newark is a growing, vibrant, multicultural city with a diverse commercial and business sector, and an inclusive community character. The City is committed to ensuring that all current and future residents continue to enjoy Newark's distinctive attributes through the implementation of policies and programs that ensure that all residents have access to housing that meets the full range of household and community needs. To this end, the City is currently engaged in the implementation of an ambitious affordable housing work plan adopted by the Newark City Council in May, 2021. This Work Plan lays the foundation for the update of the City's General Plan Housing Element, an opportunity for Newark to plan for housing to meet the needs of all segments of Newark's diverse community.

A. Purpose and Organization of the Housing Element

Housing Element Purpose

California law recognizes the vital role that local governments play in the availability, adequacy, and affordability of housing. Every jurisdiction in California is required to adopt a long-range General Plan to guide its physical development, and the Housing Element is one of the seven required elements of the General Plan. Housing Element law mandates that local governments adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The law recognizes that in order for the private market to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain housing production. Housing Element statutes also require the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to review local housing elements for compliance with State law and to report their findings to the local government.

California's Housing Element law requires that each city and county develop local housing programs to meet its "fair share" of existing and future housing needs for all income groups. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is responsible for developing and assigning these regional needs, or "RHNA", to Bay Area jurisdictions. Pursuant to the RHNA planning period, the Newark Housing Element is an eight-year plan extending from 2023 to 2031, also referred to as the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

Newark’s Housing Element identifies strategies and programs that focus on:

1. Preserving and improving existing housing
2. Removing governmental and other constraints to housing development
3. Promoting and expanding fair and equitable housing opportunities
4. Assisting in the creation of new affordable housing in the City
5. Providing sites for new housing to be built
6. Addressing existing and emergent housing challenges related to climate change

Element Organization

The 2023-2031 Newark Housing Element is comprised of the following major components:

- An introduction to review the requirements of the Housing Element, recent State laws and the community engagement process
- A community profile evaluating Newark’s demographic, household and housing characteristics and related housing needs
- An analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints on housing production and maintenance
- A detailed analysis of sites to accommodate the City’s RHNA for the planning period
- An evaluation of available resources to facilitate the production and maintenance of housing, including housing sites, financial and administrative resources available for housing, and opportunities for energy conservation
- A Housing Plan for addressing the City’s identified housing needs, constraints and resources; including housing goals, policies and programs

A series of appendices provide additional documentation.

- **Appendix A** is a presentation of the Housing Needs analysis.
- **Appendix B** provides a summary of public input received from the variety of community engagement opportunities undertaken throughout the Housing Element update process.
- **Appendix C** presents the parcel-specific Housing Element sites inventory.

B. Changes in State Housing Law

In response to California’s worsening affordable housing crisis, in each of the last several years the State legislature has enacted a series of bills aimed at increasing production, promoting affordability and creating greater accountability for localities in addressing their housing needs. The following items in Table 1-1 represent substantive changes to State housing law since Newark’s last Housing Element was adopted and certified in 2014.

Table 1-1: New State Housing Laws Relevant to Housing Element Update

Housing Bills	Bill Overview
<p>Housing Element Sites Analysis and Reporting AB 879 (2017); AB 1397 (2017); SB 6 (2019)</p>	<p>Requires cities to zone more appropriately for their share of regional housing needs and in certain circumstances require by-right development on identified sites. Site analysis must also include additional justification for being chosen, particularly for sites identified to address lower income needs.</p>
<p>No Net Loss Zoning SB 166 (2017)</p>	<p>Requires cities to identify additional low-income housing sites in their Housing Element when market-rate housing is developed on a site currently identified for low-income housing.</p>
<p>Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing AB 686 (2017)</p>	<p>Housing Elements must contain an Assessment of Fair Housing, consistent with the federal Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule. The AFFH sections must include a summary of fair housing issues in the jurisdiction; a summary of fair housing data including contributing factors to fair housing issues; analysis of Housing Element sites in relation to AFFH; and an AFFH program that includes meaningful action.</p>
<p>Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units AB 494 (2017), SB 229 (2017), AB 68 (2019), AB 881 (2019), AB 587 (2019), SB 13 (2019), AB 670 (2019), AB 671 (2019), AB 3182 (2020)</p>	<p>The State enacted legislation in both 2017 and 2019 to further assist and support the development of ADUs, including "by right" approval for one-bedroom units less than 850 square feet and two-bedroom units less than 1,000 square feet. and Junior ADUs less than 500 square feet.</p>
<p>Density Bonus AB 1763 (2019), AB 2345 (2020)</p>	<p>Permits 100% affordable projects to be built denser and taller through three modifications to current Density Bonus Law. AB 2345 creates additional incentives and also requires the annual progress report to include if density bonuses have been granted.</p>
<p>Housing Crisis Act of 2019 SB 330 (2019)</p>	<p>Seeks to boost homebuilding by expediting approvals for housing development, including application processing times. SB 339 also prevents jurisdictions from decreasing a site's housing capacity through tools such as downzoning if that would preclude a jurisdiction from meeting its RHNA targets. Also, any project that includes demolition of housing units must replace or exceed that number of units. Any demolished units occupied by low-income households must be replaced with new units that are affordable to that same income level.</p>

Housing Bills	Bill Overview
<p>Surplus Land for Affordable Housing SB 1486 (2019), AB 1255 (2019)</p>	<p>Expands definition of surplus land and puts additional restrictions on the disposal of surplus land. Jurisdictions must include information about surplus lands in the Housing Element and Annual Progress Reports. A central inventory of surplus lands also must be submitted to HCD.</p>
<p>Emergency and Transitional Housing Act AB 139 (2019)</p>	<p>Amends assessment method to show site capacity, including using the most up-to-date point-in-time count. Additionally, the bill modifies parking requirement for emergency shelters. The Housing Element must include all of this information as well as analysis of the jurisdiction's special needs populations.</p>
<p>Supportive Housing Streamlined Approval AB 2162 (2018)</p>	<p>Requires supportive housing to be a use by right and eliminates parking if close to transit.</p>
<p>Safety Element Changes SB 1035 (2018), SB 99 (2019), SB 747 (2019)</p>	<p>Updates requirements for the General Plan Safety Element including expanded information on environmental hazards facing jurisdictions and analysis of emergency evacuation routes. These updates must occur at the same time as the Housing Element updates.</p>

C. Relation to Other General Plan Elements

The City of Newark's General Plan is comprised of the following eleven Chapters: 1) Introduction; 2) Planning Framework; 3) Land Use; 4) Transportation; 5) Housing; 6) Economic Development; 7) Conservation and Sustainability; 8) Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; 9) Environmental Hazards (to be renamed Safety Element); 10) Health and Wellness; and 12) Community Services and Facilities. Except for the Housing Element which was updated to be consistent with other elements, the other Newark General Plan Elements were adopted by the Newark City Council on December 12, 2013. State law requires that the General Plan be internally consistent. The Housing Element is consistent with Goals and Policies of the other elements of the General Plan.

The City will ensure consistency between the Housing Element and the other General Plan elements so that policies introduced in one element are consistent with other elements. Whenever any element of the General Plan is amended in the future, the Housing Element will be reviewed and modified, if necessary, to ensure continued consistency between elements.

General Plan and Housing Element Consistency

The City of Newark's General Plan, adopted in 2013, is the city's long term vision for the growth and development. There are a number of elements that are interconnected with the goals and policies of the Housing Element: The Land Use Element, Transportation Element, Economic Development Element, and the Health and Wellness Element.

The Land Use Element seeks to encourage redevelopment and promote infill in strategic areas to create new pedestrian oriented, high-density, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, especially around the proposed Dumbarton Rail station and Old Town neighborhood. The Land Use Element seeks to ensure that the design of new development is responsive to existing residential neighborhoods and community character. The Land Use Element's policies and actions encourage new housing opportunities for all residents, through increasing ADU production and inclusionary zoning, to co-locate services, parks and recreation to increase access to residential opportunities.

The Transportation Element reinforces elements of the Land Use Element through the emphasis on high density, mixed use housing development in proximity to public transportation. The element also looks at the addressing parking requirements for housing to ensure the number of parking spaces is reflective to the use, resident type and location.

The Economic Development Element is focused on the revitalization of the NewPark Mall area, reducing commuter times through jobs housing balance, and ensuring that new development has a positive economic impact for the city.

The Health and Wellness Element looks at connecting land use planning with the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and general community health through increasing access to healthy foods. This year a new chapter will be added to the Health and Wellness Element, this chapter will work to:

- Reduce **pollution exposure** and improve **air quality**
- Promote access to **public facilities**
- Promote access to **healthy foods**
- Promote **safe and sanitary homes**
- Promote **physical activity**
- Promote **civic engagement**

Upon adoption, this Housing Element will be incorporated into the 2013 General Plan, updating the existing Housing Element. This Housing Element was prepared to maintain internal consistency with other elements of the General Plan. In addition, State law requires that other General Plan elements be reviewed and/or modified upon adoption of the Housing Element. Senate Bill (SB) 1035 requires the safety element to be revised upon update of the Housing Element to include new information on fire hazards, flood hazards, and climate adaptation and

resilience strategies. The City will be updating the Environmental Hazards Element (to be renamed the Safety Element) in conjunction with the 2023-2031 Housing Element update. The City will maintain consistency between the Housing Element and the other General Plan elements so that policies introduced in one element are consistent with other elements.

D. Community Engagement

The City of Newark maintains an ongoing commitment to providing meaningful community engagement in partnership with community based organizations and in collaboration with other city departments in order to reach all segments of the population. Through a multi-pronged and multi-lingual approach, City staff worked to provide opportunities for community engagement over the course of the Housing Element update process.

Findings from the Community Engagement process were used to inform Newark's Fair Housing Assessment and the goals, policies, and programs of the Housing Element update. See Section 3 (Affirmatively Furthering fair Housing) and 6 (Goals, Policies, & Programs) for more information.

Public Comment from HCD review process

During the HCD Review process, the City received comment letters from East Bay for Everyone, Save the Bay, Greenbelt Alliance and the Planning Commission and the public. Comments and responses received during the comment period focused on making adjustments to parking to better facilitate affordable housing development, programs to increase missing middle housing, aligning housing with active transportation investments and concern about housing development in the floodplain areas of the city. Comment letters and responses can be found in Appendix D.

Outreach Methods Utilized:

Social Media

The City and consultants utilized social media promotion for pop up events, promoting the website and a housing survey through Facebook. Content was posted on Facebook pages for the City of Newark, Newark Unified School District, Promotores, and Newark Recreation and Community Services.

Posters and Flyers

In addition to social media, the city used more traditional forms of communication, including the distribution of posters and flyers. Posters were distributed and posted in a variety of public places throughout the city, including parks, community centers, and other public buildings, local

businesses and with faith-based communities. Posters and flyers were translated into Spanish, Simplified Chinese, Vietnamese and Tagalog in order to reach a broad spectrum of the community.

Places the city posted:

- Newark Public Library
- Mel Nunes Skate Park
- NewBark Dog Park
- Restaurants in partnership with community groups
- Senior Center
- Silliman Community Activity Center
- Newark Community Center and childcare center

Flyers were shared at popular and frequented sites in the community and distributed at in-person community events. The flyers had a QR code that connected residents directly to the website and housing survey.

Website

The city also created a unique, dedicated stand-alone website that is translatable in three languages, and also touches on issues of environmental justice. The website is the hub for the community to access information on the housing element update and opportunities for engagement including in-person events, email updates, and our survey.

In Person Engagement: Meeting The Community Where They Are

The city conducted in person community engagement in a variety of locations and events around the city. They engaged with residents at Family Day in the Park on April 9, 2022, spent time connecting with folks at the Newark Public Library on a busy Saturday, visited the senior center for Bingo, and Tri City food pantry mobile pop up. These provided an opportunity for city staff to answer questions, and encourage residents to take part in the housing survey.

One On One Interviews and Listening Sessions

The city conducted one-on-one interviews with staff from the Housing Consortium of the East Bay (HCEB), an organization that creates inclusive communities for individuals with developmental disabilities or other special needs, and a member of the Newark Parent leadership team with Newark Unified School district. We gained insight and guidance into the needs of families and those with developmental disabilities.

Meeting with a member of the Newark Parent leadership team, the city heard there needs to be more affordable housing, as families are being displaced, or forced to live in hotels on a short-term basis. The member shared that households are kept out of the rental market due to unattainable

income requirements, and they cited the need for rent control in order to make housing more attainable. There is a need to have more homeownership opportunities that are attainable to a larger demographic. The lack of stable housing and internet access places these children at a disadvantage both educationally, mentally and physically. Increasing access to enrichment and after school activities at the Silliman Center was seen as a beneficial element for the city to develop in conjunction with affordable housing.

Survey


From March 15th through April 30th 2022, 342 people participated in the City of Newark's online community conversation about housing issues and opportunities in Newark. 300 of those responses were in English, 38 in Spanish and 4 in Chinese.

Participants were invited to answer a series of 22 questions covering housing experience and preference, environmental justice and demographic information. The survey was hosted on the SurveyMonkey platform accessible via the city's webpage.

The survey was distributed and advertised in multilingual materials through various platforms to reach as broad of a cross section of the community as possible. It was promoted through the social media pages of the City of Newark, Newark Recreation and Community Services, Newark Police Department, and Newark Unified School District. It was also listed in print newsletters that were sent to all Newark residents, the Clark W. Redeker Newark Senior Center email list, and the Alameda County Health Department Developmental Disabilities council list. To reach those lacking internet access, we conducted in-person outreach at the city's Family Day in the Park event and the Newark Library where residents and workers could take our survey on paper or an iPad.

We also utilized our partnerships with local organizations to share our survey with special needs populations. We worked in partnership with the group Promotores to reach the Latino community. We also reached out to nonprofit organizations that support people experiencing and escaping from domestic violence, and transitioning from homelessness, to share the survey with them. With the intention of connecting with families, we reached out to the Newark Unified School District parent leadership committees, and was able to gain valuable insight into the needs of families in the city.

Essential insight from the survey is that quality of life, in addition to increasing housing affordability and homeownership opportunities for Newark residents is of great importance and concern. For the full survey questions and responses, see Appendix B.



Example survey page



Example flyer

WHAT WE HEARD **Residents are very concerned about housing affordability**

53% of respondents to the English language survey are very concerned about housing affordability. 87% of respondents in the Spanish language survey are very concerned about housing affordability.

The three biggest issues to address for housing affordability:

1. More homeownership opportunities, especially affordable homeownership for first time homebuyers
2. More affordable rental opportunities
3. Low cost home improvements for seniors and low income households

The most urgent affordable housing needs are: housing on both ends of the spectrum. Housing for large families as well as for smaller households.

1. Housing for families: Large and intergenerational. Housing for single parents was brought up in comments repeatedly throughout the survey
2. Housing for smaller households
3. Housing for low income and underserved households
4. Housing for seniors

WHAT WE HEARD **Housing prices have risen, making housing unaffordable to many**

- 40% of respondents are in housing that is not affordable to them
- 17% of respondents are in housing that they can afford but does not meet their needs
- 43% in housing they can afford and like

WHAT WE HEARD **Not everyone feels that they live in a neighborhood of opportunity**

What would make your neighborhood feel like it has more opportunity?

1. City infrastructure that supports physical activity, including sidewalks, bike lanes, parks, and rec centers
2. Affordable, safe, and healthy housing choices
3. Educational opportunities that are academically and culturally supportive

WHAT WE HEARD **People are interested in a variety of housing types**

Residents were most interested in low scale housing types. Backyard cottages were the most favorable housing type. Cottage clusters and Townhomes were similarly favored housing types, while small to mid-size multifamily housing and multi-family buildings downtown were the least favored.

Who We Heard From

There were 342 overall participants, 300 of which responded in English, 38 in Spanish and 4 in Chinese.

There were five demographic questions, including the survey respondent's connection to Newark, living situation, age and race. This information helped us understand if participants were representative of the city's general population and helped us refine subsequent outreach and engagement to improve representation.

In summary, most participants identified as White (31%), followed by Hispanic/Latino (24%) and Asian/Asian American (18%). While nearly half were between the ages of 30 and 49, the remaining were split between people aged 20 to 29 (3%), 50 to 69 (21%), and over 70 (5%). The majority of respondents live in Newark (71%) and in a single family home (57%), and nearly half are homeowners (49%).

Community Meeting

The City held an online community meeting with 50 attendees on June 22 2022, to share with the community the findings from the survey and obtain general feedback on proposed goals and

policies that we had developed in response to research and survey results. We advertised the meeting through email communication to local organizations, posters in laundromats and grocery stores such as 99 Ranch that are located in low-income neighborhoods with a majority of BIPOC community members, as well as on social media sites for the Newark Public Library, the parents of NUSD, community organizations such as the Promotores, and the City of Newark. The meeting provided simultaneous translation in both Mandarin Chinese and Spanish, with small break out groups to help residents feel comfortable discussing their thoughts.

WHAT WE HEARD **Newark needs to plan for climate change**

- Making Newark the green city by the bay: Incorporating and increasing access to public parks, preserving existing ecologically sensitive land, and increasing tree planting to combat increased heat
- Building for energy efficiency: requiring solar panels on homes, insulation, and water conservation
- Increasing access to transportation options: increasing bus access, and building bike lanes to support active transportation with bikes and scooters.
- Building a walkable city: planning housing close to existing amenities such as schools, parks and grocery stores for walkability

WHAT WE HEARD **Residents want to stay in their communities, and right now it's challenging, with many facing displacement**

- Supportive resources: Residents, documented and undocumented, need more support and increased access to housing resources and tenant protections

"We all deserve housing"

- Innovative programs: Seniors on a fixed income need more support to remain in their homes and communities

"Developing a shared housing program with others that need a room to rent, connect seniors with single people who need affordable housing. Helps seniors on limited incomes"

- Protect tenants: The city needs programs to combat gentrification such as protections from rapid increases in rent

"Rents increase but our incomes do not. The median income is really very high for Newark, so you have a lot of people who need housing at the low and very low incomes."

- Build + preserve homes: More affordable housing is needed for a variety of income levels and housing types. Families, and those transitioning out of homelessness are especially in need.

“It is very hard to move people who have been homeless into permanent housing, we need more options for those that are on SSI and extremely low incomes” – Director of Second Chance

Public Communication for the Draft Housing Element

Newark released the Draft Housing Element for Public Review for 30 days on February 24th, 2023 to March 27th, 2023. The greater Newark community was made aware of the public review and comment period through a variety of channels, including social media, email, the website and a community meeting.

Social media outreach was conducted multiple times a week, with bilingual posts in English and Spanish connecting residents with information about the housing element update such as the release of the draft for comment and the community meeting.

City staff sent out an email announcement that the housing element is available for public comment to 16 community based organizations that are representative of the ethnic and linguistic diversity of Newark. Other organizations included the Alameda County coalition for disability, Def plus, and the domestic violence shelter. Working with the Newark Unified School District, Newark sent out a bilingual community meeting invite over Peachjar, sending the message to parents and caregivers district wide. City staff engaged with the Spanish speaking community, meeting with the local Promotoras group and providing a translated summary of the housing element in Spanish on the website.

Newark hosted a virtual community meeting, the evening of March 22nd, 2023. The meeting provided Spanish and American Sign Language translation to ensure the attendees would be able to participate fully. City staff got the word out through email, social media posts on city and public library sites, and bilingual posters in key locations such as community center, library and laundry mat to reach those without access to the internet.

The website continues to be a source of information for updates on community meetings and Housing Element timelines. A recording providing the public with an overview of the housing element update, how to access and review the draft, the draft goals and a highlight of some of the proposed programs was posted to walk community members through the process.

Detailed Public Comments are provided as Appendix D below.

SECTION 2 HOUSING NEEDS

The Housing Needs Assessment analysis of housing and population characteristics, housing needs for vulnerable population groups, as well as the cities growth and employment, to provide the foundation for the development of the goals, policies and programs to meet the future and current needs of the residents.

This section pulls from various sources, primary data sources were compiled by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in 2021. ABAG utilized the US Census, American Community Survey (ACS), the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), California Department of Finance (DOF), California Employment Development Department (EDD). If possible, data was updated to most recent available data and local sources were utilized.

SUMMARY

- **Population** – Generally, the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region. The population of Newark increased by 15.3% from 2000 to 2020, which is above the growth rate of the Bay Area
- **Age** – In 2019, Newark’s youth population under the age of 18 was 10,015 and senior population 65 and older was 6,038. These age groups represent 21.2% and 12.8%, respectively, of Newark’s population.
- **Race/Ethnicity** – In 2020, 23.7% of Newark’s population was White while 3.9% was African American, 33.9% was Asian, and 34.8% was Latinx. People of color in Newark comprise a proportion above the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.¹
- **Employment** – Newark residents most commonly work in the *Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation* industry. From January 2010 to January 2021, the unemployment rate in Newark decreased by 3.7 percentage points. Since 2010, the number of jobs located in the jurisdiction has increased by 4,650 (29.9%). Additionally, the jobs-household ratio in Newark has increased from 1.33 in 2002 to 1.49 jobs per household in 2018.

¹ The Census Bureau’s American Community Survey accounts for ethnic origin separate from racial identity. The numbers reported here use an accounting of both such that the racial categories are shown exclusive of Latinx status, to allow for an accounting of the Latinx population regardless of racial identity. The term Hispanic has historically been used to describe people from numerous Central American, South American, and Caribbean countries. In recent years, the term Latino or Latinx has become preferred. This report generally uses Latinx, but occasionally when discussing US Census data, we use Hispanic or Non-Hispanic, to clearly link to the data source.

- **Number of Homes** – The number of new homes built in the Bay Area has not kept pace with the demand, resulting in longer commutes, increasing prices, and exacerbating issues of displacement and homelessness. The number of homes in Newark increased, 11.2% from 2010 to 2020, which is *above* the growth rate for Alameda County and *above* the growth rate of the region’s housing stock during this time period.
- **Home Prices** – A diversity of homes at all income levels creates opportunities for all Newark residents to live and thrive in the community.
 - **Ownership** – The largest proportion of homes had a value in the range of \$750k-\$1M in 2019. Home prices increased by 133.9% from 2010 to 2020.
 - **Rental Prices** – The typical contract rent for an apartment in Newark was \$2,110 in 2019. Rental prices increased by 61.1% from 2009 to 2019. To rent a typical apartment without cost burden, a household would need to make \$84,720 per year.²
 - **Housing Type** – It is important to have a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a community today and in the future. In 2020, 69.6% of homes in Newark were single family detached, 9.5% were single family attached, 4.4% were small multifamily (2-4 units), and 16.5% were medium or large multifamily (5+ units). Between 2010 and 2020, the number of single- family units increased more than multi-family units. Generally, in Newark, the share of the housing stock that is detached single family homes is above that of other jurisdictions in the region.
- **Cost Burden** – The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30% of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In Newark, 19.2% of households spend 30%-50% of their income on housing, while 12.4% of households are severely cost burdened and use the majority of their income for housing.
- **Neighborhood** – 9.7% of residents in Newark live in neighborhoods identified as “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” areas by State-commissioned research, while 11.0% of residents live in areas identified by this research as “Low Resource” or “High Segregation and Poverty” areas. These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors.³

² Note that contract rents may differ significantly from, and often being lower than, current listing prices.

³ For more information on the “opportunity area” categories developed by HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, see this website: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp>. The degree to which different jurisdictions and neighborhoods have access to opportunity will likely need to be analyzed as part of new Housing

- Special Housing Needs** – Some population groups may have special housing needs that require specific program responses, and these groups may experience barriers to accessing stable housing due to their specific housing circumstances. In Newark, 7.6% of residents have a disability of any kind and may require accessible housing. Additionally, 18.7% of Newark households are larger households with five or more people, who likely need larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. 11.8% of households are female-headed families, which are often at greater risk of housing insecurity.

A. Population Growth and Trends

In recent decades, Newark’s population has seen rapid growth, with an increase of 15.3 percent from 2000 to 2020; this rate is above that of the region as a whole, at 14.8 percent. In 2020, the population of Newark was estimated to be 48,966 (see Table 2-1). From 1990 to 2000, the population increased by 12.2 percent, while it increased by just 0.2 percent during the first decade of the 2000s. In the most recent decade, the population increased by 15 percent. The population of Newark makes up three percent of the population in Alameda County.

Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends

Geography	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Newark	37,861	39,681	42,471	43,522	42,573	44,371	48,966
Alameda County	1,276,702	1,344,157	1,443,939	1,498,963	1,510,271	1,613,528	1,670,834
Bay Area	6,020,147	6,381,961	6,784,348	7,073,912	7,150,739	7,595,694	7,790,537

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series


Age

In recent years the population of youth has declined slightly with continued growth in those 55 and over. In 2019, Newark’s youth population under the age of 18 was 10,015 and the senior population 65 and older was 6,038. These age groups represent 21.2 percent and 12.8 percent of Newark’s population. Figure 2-1 shows slight increases in population in the 25-34 age group, and the 55 to 64+ age group. The increase in senior population can possibly be attributed to the establishment of a new affordable senior housing development. Community members have shown a preference for more walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods that are close to work, schools, parks, and amenities. The majority of seniors prefer to stay in their homes and communities, known as *aging-in-place*. Yet many live on fixed incomes and may have mobility issues as they age, which

Element requirements related to affirmatively furthering fair housing. ABAG/MTC will be providing jurisdictions with technical assistance on this topic this summer, following the release of additional guidance from HCD.

require supportive services. Similar financial and mobility obstacles exist for many of Newark’s households with special needs. Younger generations are less likely to own homes and have less savings than previous generations; they are more likely to live alone and delay marriage. Yet, many are growing their families, reflected by a higher percentage of families with children in Newark versus the County and Bay Area, and therefore may be in greater need of support when purchasing their first home. Coupled with increasing housing prices, it is more difficult for younger generations to rent or purchase a home than it is for current residents. For these reasons, Newark residents consider the three biggest issues to address housing affordability as: (1) more homeownership opportunities, especially for first time homebuyers; (2) more affordable rental opportunities; and (3) low cost home improvements for seniors and low income households. We therefore must address how to support our seniors as they get older so they can stay in their homes and communities, and make sure young people and households with special needs, new families, and our workers can find housing that is affordable and accessible.

Figure 2-1: Population by Age, 2000 to 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B01001

Race & Ethnicity

Since 2000, the percentage of residents in Newark identifying as White has decreased – and at the same time, the percentage of residents of all *other* races and ethnicities has *increased* – by 18.6 percentage points, with the 2019 population standing at 11,168 (see Table 2-2). In absolute terms, the *Asian / API, Non-Hispanic* population increased the most while the *White, Non-Hispanic* population decreased the most. In 2020, 23.7 percent of Newark’s population was White while four percent was African American, 33.9 percent was Asian, and 34.8 percent was Latinx. People of color in Newark comprise a proportion above the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.⁴ When planning for housing, we need to consider a variety of housing needs—like larger homes for multi- generational families or those with more children—and how to create opportunities for everyone to access quality, affordable housing near schools, transit, jobs, and services.

Past exclusionary practices have prevented people of color from purchasing homes, living in certain neighborhoods, and building wealth over time. As a result, they are more likely to experience poverty, housing insecurity, displacement, and homelessness. And while many of our communities are very diverse, we are still contending with segregation and a lack of equitable opportunities. To help prevent displacement due to gentrification and to create a future where it is possible for everyone to find the housing they need, it will be important to plan for a variety of housing types and affordability options in all neighborhoods.

Table 2-2: Population by Race 2000 to 2019

Year	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian / API	Black or African American	White	Other Race or Multiple Races	Hispanic or Latinx
2000	148	9,329	1,639	17,103	128	12,145
2010	95	12,005	1,908	11,726	1,845	14,994
2019	130	16,002	1,818	11,168	1,661	16,392

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001

⁴ The Census Bureau’s American Community Survey accounts for ethnic origin separate from racial identity. The numbers reported here use an accounting of both such that the racial categories are shown exclusive of Latino status, to allow for an accounting of the Latinx population regardless of racial identity. The term Hispanic has historically been used to describe people from numerous Central American, South American, and Caribbean countries. In recent years, the term Latino or Latinx has become preferred. This report generally uses Latino, but occasionally when discussing US Census data, we use Hispanic or Non-Hispanic, to clearly link to the data source.

Employment Characteristics


By 2050 the number of jobs in South Alameda County will increase to 221,000, 19% of the projected growth for the County⁵ In Newark there are 17,935 employed residents, and 17,168 jobs⁶ - the ratio of jobs to resident workers is 0.96; Newark is a *net exporter of workers*. Despite the overall job growth expected in the county, 92 percent of Newark residents work outside of the City, with a greater number today employed in the peninsula and Silicon Valley.

Figure 2-2 shows the balance when comparing jobs to workers, broken down by different wage groups, offering additional insight into local dynamics. A community may offer employment for relatively low- income workers but have relatively few housing options for those workers - or conversely, it may house residents who are low wage workers but offer few employment opportunities for them. Such relationships can potentially contribute to an unbalanced demand for housing in particular price categories. A relative *surplus* of jobs relative to residents in a given wage category suggests the need to import those workers, while conversely, surpluses of workers in a wage group relative to jobs means the community will export those workers to other jurisdictions. Newark has more low-wage *jobs* than low-wage *residents* (where low-wage refers to jobs paying less than \$25,000). At the other end of the wage spectrum, the city has more high-wage *residents* than high-wage *jobs* (where high-wage refers to jobs paying more than \$75,000). In addition to the inflow of workers, our population is growing naturally, meaning more people are living longer while our children are growing up and moving out into homes of their own. All of this impacts housing demand.

⁵ Plan Bay Area 2050 [Projected Growth Pattern](#).

⁶ Employed *residents* in a jurisdiction is counted by place of residence (they may work elsewhere) while *jobs* in a jurisdiction are counted by place of work (they may live elsewhere). The jobs may differ from those reported above as the source for the time series is from administrative data, while the cross-sectional data is from a survey.

Figure 2-2: Wage or Works by Place of Residence and Work, by Income, 2015- 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B08119, B08519

B. Housing Tenure

The 2020 Decennial Census estimates a total of 15,371 housing units in Newark, with 14,946 as occupied housing units. Of these occupied housing units, 10,185 or 68 percent were owner occupied and 4,761 or 32 percent were renter occupied, compared to approximately 47 percent of Alameda County households that rent and 44 percent of Bay Area households.


Housing Stock Characteristics

This section examines housing stock in Newark from age, condition, type to understand current and emerging needs and analyzing vacancy and cost to understand the affordability.

Housing Age and Type

Housing in Newark was primarily built before 1980, with 53 percent built from 1960 to 1979 (see Figure 2-3). In 2020, 70 percent of homes in Newark were single family detached, 9.5 percent were single family attached, four percent were small multifamily (2-4 units), and 16.5 percent were medium or large multifamily (5+ units). Between 2010 and 2020, the number of single-family units increased more than multi-family units. Generally, in Newark, the share of the housing stock that is detached single family homes is above that of other jurisdictions in the region. With 10,385 single family homes in 2020 and 659 two to four unit homes, there is opportunity for Newark to support the increase of missing middle housing types. Programs such as SB9 can further support these efforts, as well as program H2.8 Zoning for Missing Middle Housing.

Figure 2-3: Housing Age



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019: Table B25034

Table 2-3: Number and Type of Housing Units in Alameda County 2022

POPULATION			HOUSING UNITS												
City	Household	Total Housing Units	Single Family Detached		Single Attached		Two to Four		Five Plus		Mobile Homes		Occupied	Vacancy Rate	Persons per Household
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Alameda	75,677	33,524	13,993	41.7%	3,482	10.4%	6,003	17.9%	9,920	29.6%	126	0.4%	31,473	6.1%	2.40
Albany	18,450	7,946	4,864	61.2%	277	3.5%	954	12.0%	1,823	22.9%	28	0.4%	7,545	5.0%	2.45
Berkeley	105,151	52,921	21,534	40.7%	2,128	4.0%	10,307	19.5%	18,730	35.4%	221	0.4%	48,377	8.6%	2.17
Dublin	68,482	24,977	13,331	53.4%	3,524	14.1%	812	3.3%	7,254	29.0%	56	0.2%	24,040	3.8%	2.85
Emeryville	12,396	7,656	424	5.5%	406	5.3%	766	10.0%	6,023	78.7%	36	0.5%	7,025	8.2%	1.76
Fremont	227,195	79,749	44,781	56.2%	10,210	12.8%	2,718	3.4%	21,314	47.6%	725	0.9%	76,507	4.1%	2.97
Hayward	156,757	52,870	27,328	51.7%	5,599	10.6%	3,063	5.8%	14,476	53.0%	2,403	4.5%	50,794	3.9%	3.09
Livermore	85,444	33,087	22,536	68.1%	3,218	9.7%	1,652	5.0%	5,140	22.8%	541	1.6%	31,968	3.4%	2.67
Newark	47,029	15,811	11,040	69.8%	1,457	9.2%	688	4.4%	2,626	23.8%	0	0.0%	15,329	3.0%	3.07
Oakland	414,325	183,729	75,322	41.0%	7,115	3.9%	33,457	18.2%	67,272	89.3%	562	0.3%	171,880	6.4%	2.41
Piedmont	10,973	3,964	3,679	92.8%	68	1.7%	138	3.5%	78	2.1%	0	0.0%	3,846	3.0%	2.85
Pleasanton	76,830	29,750	18,004	60.5%	2,858	9.6%	1,687	5.7%	6,806	37.8%	395	1.3%	28,581	3.9%	2.69
San Leandro	87,506	32,952	19,659	59.7%	2,008	6.1%	1,952	5.9%	8,436	42.9%	898	2.7%	31,851	3.3%	2.75
Union City	67,434	21,947	13,762	62.7%	2,856	13.0%	821	3.7%	3,489	25.4%	1,019	4.6%	21,467	2.2%	3.14

Source: California Department of Finance, City/County Population Estimates, E5, 2022


Housing Cost and Vacancy

Housing Costs and Vacancy have a pronounced effect on residents' ability to find housing that is affordable, that fits their needs, and be able to purchase a home, allowing them to build equity and stability in the community. Newark has experienced increasing housing costs over the past decade. The Zillow Home Value Index shows home prices \$ 542,000 in 2013, to more than double that in 2022, with an average home value of \$1,169,000. Coupled with low vacancy rates of three percent, Newark residents face numerous housing challenges. In relation to other cities in Alameda County, Newark provides fewer housing options, but has a similar percentage of housing types as Union City, and fewer five plus units than Fremont. Only Newark and Piedmont do not have any mobile homes.


In relation to Alameda County and the Bay Area, Newark has a lower percentage of vacancies, with a 3 percent total vacancy rate(Table 2-3) 14 % of rental units are vacant, in comparison to Alameda County at 24 % and the Bay Area at 26% (Figure 2-8). The largest vacancies are for units that are for sale at 23% and for seasonal use at 30%. Taking into account the increase in housing prices over the last 10 years, with a significant spike in 2018, brings ownership costs to over \$900,00, the large vacancy rates for homes sales correlates. Throughout community engagement, community members echoed the data to share that housing costs are too high and unattainable for current residents. In response, programs such as H2.2 an Accessory Dwelling Unit program to incentivise and support the increased development of ADU production, Program H2.6 to Work in Partnership with Newark Unified School District to find creative ways to utilize school properties, Program H2.7 the Affordable housing fund to support non profit developers in developing affordable housing, H4.4 the Small Sites program supports the purchase of small scale multi family housing by affordable housing organizations and H5.1 First Time Homebuyer Assistance. As seen in Figure 2-7, BIPOC communities have lower rates of home ownership, and programs such as H5.1 will focus on supporting those populations.

Figure 2-4: Newark Zillow Home Value Index, 2013 -2022

The ZHVI is a smoothed, seasonally adjusted measure of the typical home value and market changes across a given region and housing type. The ZHVI reflects the typical value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The ZHVI includes all owner-occupied housing units, including both single-family homes and condominiums.



Source: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI) 2013-2022

Figure 2-5: Home Values of Owner Occupied Units, 2015-2019

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B25075


Rental Cost and Affordability

With the recent increase in rents in the Bay Area, affordable housing has become much harder for lower- and moderate-income households to find. This rent burden is an important issue for many households. In Newark 44 percent of rents are from \$2,000 to \$3,000 dollars per month from the 2021 American Community Survey. Conversely, only 17 percent of residents pay between \$500 and \$1,500 dollars per month. An indicator of the few choices available for deed restricted affordable housing in the City, which is consistent with what we have heard from community members. This is a slight change from 2019, with a reduction of those paying \$1,00 to \$2,500 (see Table 2-4), and a sharp increase in those paying \$3,000 dollars or more, from 7 percent in 2019 to 20 percent in 2021. The percentage of those paying \$500 to \$1,000 dollars per month doubled from 3 percent to 6 percent, potentially tied to new affordable senior housing developments.

Newark, in relation to Alameda County and the Bay Area, has an average of 24 percent of residents paying from \$2,000 to \$3,000 dollars in rent, a higher percentage than both Alameda and the Bay Area with an average of 14 percent (Figure 2-6). In Newark 3 percent of residents were paying \$500 to \$1,000 dollars per month in cash rent, significantly fewer in comparison to Alameda County at 12 percent and the Bay Area at 10 percent. This wide discrepancy could be attributed to the lack of deed restricted affordable housing, an abundance of single family homes,

and general housing pressure from high wage earners of Silicon Valley. Table 2-5 shows most recent rents show a general increase in rents from the previous years, with housing for two and three bedrooms seeing the largest increases. With some of the largest family sizes in Alameda County, this places extreme pressure on larger families looking for housing. Housing for large families is one of the key populations the city is focusing on for new housing through their Affordable Housing Action Plan. Programs such as H 2.1 and H2.2 will open up new housing opportunities for residents. H2.7 provides funding for affordable housing developments in Newark.

Figure 2-6: Rents for Renter Occupied Units in Newark, Alameda County, and the Bay Area, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25056

Table 2-4: Newark Cash Rent, 2021

Rent	Percent	Population
Less than \$500 per month	5%	220
\$500 to \$1,000 per month	6%	270
\$1,000 to \$1,500	6%	280
\$1,550 to \$2,000	18%	799
\$2,000 to \$2,500	22%	979
\$2,500 to \$3,000	22%	958
\$3,000 or more	20%	860
Total with cash rent	100%	4,366


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2017- 2021), Table B25056

Table 2-5: Newark Rents, 2023

Unit	Average Rent	Year over year change
Studio	\$1,600	+\$200
One Bedroom	\$2,300	+\$55
Two Bedroom	\$2,900	+\$299
Three Bedroom	\$3,750	+\$314
Four Bedroom +	\$4,950	+\$133

Source :Zillow.com, accessed June 21st, 2023


Figure 2-7: Housing Tenure by Race, 2015- 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B25003 (A-1)

Vacancy Rate

Figure 2-8: Vacant Units By Type, 2015- 2019




Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B25004

Overpayment and Overcrowding

Overall, many residents are paying too much for housing, while many others have been priced out entirely. If a household spends more than 30 percent of its monthly income on housing, it is considered cost-burdened. If it spends more than 50 percent, it is considered severely cost-burdened. In Newark, 12 percent of households spend 50 percent or more of their income on housing, while 19 percent spend between 30 to 50 percent. However, these rates vary greatly across income and race. Of those who are extremely low income—making 30 percent or less of the area median income (AMI)— 365 renter households, or 51 percent, spend more than half of their income on housing, as do extremely low-income owners at a slightly lower number of 255 households⁷. Figure 2-9 shows that renters are more likely to be cost burdened, with twice the number of renters (30%) spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing compared to 16 percent of homeowners, and 14 percent of renters are severely cost burdened. This leaves them with little to meet other basic needs, such as food and healthcare. Since low-income residents and communities of color are the most cost burdened, they are at the highest risk for eviction, displacement, and homelessness. Through the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Newark will be able to support the development of affordable housing throughout the city, with a focus on special populations such as seniors and large families.

Overcrowding is defined by the US Census as households with 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens). Units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. Newark residents are experiencing both overcrowding and severe overcrowding. Table 2-6 shows Newark with 9 percent of the population living in overcrowded conditions, and three percent in severely overcrowded households.


Figure 2-9: Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015- 2019



US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 year data, 2015-2019, Table B25070, B25091

⁷ Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2015-2019 release

Figure 2-10: Low Income Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015- 2019




U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2015-2019 release. Note: For this figure, the definition of cost burdened is spending more than 30% of income on housing.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2015-2019 release

Table 2-6 Overcrowding by Regional Population, 2013-2017

Geography	1.00 occupants per room or less	1.01 to 1.50 occupants per room	1.50 occupants per room or more
Newark	88%	9%	3%
Alameda County	92%	5%	3%
Bay Area	93%	4%	3%

Source: Housing and Urban Development, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, ACS Tabulation. 2013-2017

Figure 2-11: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity, 2013- 2017

Source: Housing and Urban Development, *Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy*, ACS Tabulation. 2013-2017

Substandard Housing Units

High housing costs can often result in households, particularly renters, living in substandard conditions to afford housing. Through public comment and mapping of code enforcement reports, there is a high concentration of substandard housing conditions in the Mirabeau and Old Town/ Central neighborhoods from 2018 to the present, some of the oldest housing stock in the city. US Census data shows that a small number of homeowners and renter households experience substandard housing with .3 percent having substandard kitchens. That would translate to 42 homeowners and 37 rental units. Homeowners reported 0.1 percent of homes without adequate plumbing, or 12 homes. There were no rental units reported. Due to the fact that over 50 percent of Newark's housing stock was constructed before 1980, there is potential for other buildings in need of rehabilitation in the near future, and Newark will continue to offer and expand upon home maintenance programs for low and moderate income residents, with a focus on informing residents in the Mirabeau Park and Old Town/ Central Newark neighborhoods. The city has identified 40 units that could use rehabilitation and repair. The existing rehabilitation program has supported about 10 homes per year and with the addition of programs such as H1.1 Housing Rehabilitation and Repair, supporting homeowners with repairs, and H1.2 Citywide inspection program, which will inspect rental properties to ensure safe and healthy living conditions for all will help in addressing these needs and support even more households.

Table 2-7: Substandard Housing Units, 2015-2019

Building Amenity	Owner	Renter
	Percentage	
Kitchen	0.3%	0.3%
Plumbing	0.1%	0.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B25053, B25043, B25049

Subsidized Housing Units at Risk

Currently Newark has a total of 274 low income subsidized housing units (Table 2-8), owned by non profit housing developers. Due to the ownership structure of the housing units, the California Housing Partnership finds these units are at low risk of conversion to market rate housing in the next ten years. Newark Station Seniors, Newark Gardens I and Newark Gardens II are senior housing developments in Newark that comprise the total number of subsidized housing units.

Table 2-8: Subsidized Affordable Housing Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate 2020

Geography	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Total Assisted Units in Database
Newark	274	0	0	0	274
Alameda County	23,040	167	189	106	23,502
Bay Area	110,177	3,375	1,854	1,053	116,459


Source: Universe: 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.

C. Housing Needs for Special Needs Populations

Seniors

Seniors in Newark are a growing population, as long time residents continue to age and the city adds more affordable senior rental housing. As of the 2020 US Census, there are 6,005 Seniors in Newark. Seniors in Newark overwhelmingly are home owners at every income level, with low income seniors having the highest percentage of renters at 37 percent.⁸ Low income seniors experience higher rates of cost burdened then moderate and above moderate income counterparts. Figure 2-12 shows that 37 percent of very low income seniors are cost burdened with 22 percent extremely cost burdened.


Figure 2-12: Senior Households by Income and Tenure, 2013- 2017



Source: Housing and Urban Development, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2013-2017

⁸ Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS Tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Figure 2-13: Cost Burdened Rates by Income Level, Seniors, 2013- 2017



Source: Housing and Urban Development, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2013-2017

Available affordable housing for seniors in Newark includes: Newark Gardens, Newark Gardens 2, Newark Station, and Timber Senior Housing is under construction with an anticipated completion later this year. As the senior population continues to grow, there will be increased need for housing that is accessible, affordable to those on fixed incomes and allows residents to age in place. In addition to increased types of housing options, seniors need support with the maintenance of their existing homes and their age and spaces that are accessible. Programs to address the growing senior population are program H1.1 Financial assistance with home repair, the adoption of H2.4 Universal Design Ordinance, and program H4.5 will develop a Shared Housing Partnership.

Disability

People with disabilities often face additional housing challenges. Encompassing a broad group of individuals living with a variety of physical, cognitive and sensory impairments, many people with disabilities live on fixed incomes and often need accessible designed housing to live more independent lives. In Newark, eight percent of the population has a disability of any kind, with the majority being ambulatory (Table 2-9). Due to housing challenges of affordability, accessibility and

discrimination, 87 percent⁹ of people with disabilities live with family members in Newark. Partnering with local organizations that serve people with disabilities will support Newark in developing more housing options to meet the diverse needs of this population. Through community engagement we have connected with organizations providing resources and support to those with disabilities: Deaf Plus, Housing Consortium of the East Bay, and Alameda County Public Health Disability Council. **Program H4.7** will identify housing opportunities for those with Developmental disabilities, and **program H2.4** for a Universal Design Ordinance.

Table 2-9: Disability by Type, 2015-2019

Persons with Disability	Percentage
Total percentage of people with Disabilities	8%
With an ambulatory difficulty	4%
With an independent living difficulty	3%
With a hearing difficulty	3%
With a cognitive difficulty	2%
With a self-care difficulty	2%
With a vision difficulty	1%

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B18102, B18103, B18104, Table B18105, Table B18105, B18107

People Experiencing Homelessness

People experiencing homelessness have steadily increased in Alameda County since 2017, with 9,747 sheltered and unsheltered people at the most recent point in time count on February 22, 2022. The city of Newark has a documented reduction of people experiencing homelessness, from 89 in 2019, to 58 sheltered and unsheltered people in 2022. The point in time count found a total of 32 unsheltered individuals, with 34 percent, or 11 people, living in a tent, with 8 living outside and 7 in a RV. Fewer people were found living in their car, at 6 people or 19 percent. It is no surprise that the largest number of people outside of shelters are living in tents, as the locations with the highest concentrations of people experiencing homelessness are in the undeveloped areas along highway 84, in the Eucalyptus grove, and along the 880. These sites are all concentrated in the Mirabeau and Mayhews Landing areas, in the northern portion of the city due

⁹ Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California Zip Code and Residence Type (2020).

to the proximity of open space for tents along the freeway.

Although Newark has a significantly lower number of people experiencing homelessness than neighboring jurisdictions, housing and homeless support is the most prevalent service request for Newark callers to the countywide 2-1-1 referral service, representing about 42% of all service requests. Newark residents are seeking referrals for low cost rental listings, rent payment and deposit assistance, supportive and transitional housing, emergency shelter, among other services (Eden I&R Referral Service, January 2020 through March 2022).

Currently Second Chance provides transitional housing for those experiencing homelessness in Newark. The facility has 32 beds, with the shelter at 81 % capacity on the point in time count. In conversation with John Balentine, Executive Director of Second Chance, he shared that as an organization, they budget funds for transportation, providing bus passes and having a van to transport residents if public transportation is not sufficient.

The city has engaged in a number of actions to address homelessness in Newark. There is a partnership with the Fremont Family Resource Center to provide support to Newark households at risk of becoming homeless, and the city was awarded a HomeKey grant to convert the Towne Place Suites extended stay hotel into 124 supportive, affordable residential units known as Cedar Community Apartments. The Housing Navigation Center in Fremont has prioritized space for those experiencing homelessness from the greater Tri City area. The 2021 Housing Navigation Center Annual report showed 8 percent or 6 Newark residents were supported. The City also partners with the city of Fremont to provide access for personal hygiene, with a mobile unit coming to Newark once a week for showers and laundry.

Utilizing American Rescue Plan Act funding, the city is working to establish a local family resource center in the Old Town/ Bayside neighborhood. This resource center would provide an initial point of access to any residents in need of social services. Some services could be accessed directly at the center through third party social service providers or referrals could be made to other agencies, and a space for the Promotores, a local organization for the Latino Community. Most recently the city has created a Homelessness Committee with members from various City departments to develop a cohesive plan to address homelessness and have launched a Human Resources webpage, connecting the community with resources for people experiencing homelessness such as housing, transportation, and food pantries around the city.

The city has developed a number of programs in response to the needs of people experiencing homelessness identified : Program H2.5 will continue to build upon the work the city has undertaken to develop a local response to homelessness. Program H2.10, makes changes to increase uptake of Single Room Occupancy or (SROs), an affordable housing type, Program H4.10, identifies zoning changes for special needs housing, and Program H4.8 connects residents with foreclosure assistance. The following is a list of agencies operating support services, emergency shelters, and transitional and supportive housing in Newark and the surrounding area:


- **Viola Blythe Community Services Center, Newark.** Viola Blythe provides services for Children, men, women and families in immediate need can use the services and programs of the Viola Blythe Community Service Center. No fees are charged for any services provided. Some services include food distribution, baby food and formula, clothing, children’s shoe fund, and referrals to other agencies.
- **Clean Start Mobile Hygiene Unit.** For someone experiencing homelessness, keeping yourself and your clothes clean can be incredibly challenging, and can greatly impact your ability to get and keep a job, or simply participate in society. To meet this need, the City of Fremont, City of Newark, and several community partners developed the [Clean Start Mobile Hygiene](#) Program to provide much-needed shower and laundry services to our homeless neighbors. This mobile hygiene van travels between Fremont, Newark and Union City each week.
- **Centro de Servicios, Union City.** Centro de Servicios has assisted more than 800 families and individuals every month since its inception in 1974. This nonprofit corporation is a major service provider for the homeless population in Alameda County’s Tri-City area. The center provides basic necessities, such as food, clothing, and blankets as well as referrals, counseling, job listings, and workshops to its clients. Recently celebrating 40 years of operations, Centro de Servicios serves over 1,300 families per month, out of multiple locations. Staff estimates that they assist at least 20-50 homeless or at-risk clients from Union City per week. Most (80 percent) of these clients are Latino. Many live in substandard housing, in their cars, or at local parks and campgrounds. Staff makes referrals to nearby shelters, especially Sunrise Village in Fremont and Second Chance in Newark.
- **Second Chance Addiction Recovery.** Second Chance is a counseling and recovery agency that operates five outpatient centers in addition to a short-term emergency shelter. They have locations in Newark, Hayward, Phoenix, and the Tri-City area. The emergency shelter has 30 beds for single men, women, and for families. Addiction recovery services are provided on-site and there is not typically a waiting list to receive treatment and recovery services.
- **Abode Services (formerly known as Tri-City Homeless Coalition), Fremont.** Abode Services operates nearly 60 primary programs across six counties and has experienced dramatic growth in response to the increasing need for affordable housing and services for homeless people. Abode Services works to provide housing and services to homeless people in the community as they work to help people remain stably housed and live as independently as possible. In 2021 they served 14,700 adults and children across their programs. In Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, Abode offers three main types of services: emergency shelter and street outreach services, supportive housing for formerly homeless families and individuals, and supportive services, such as mental health services and employment support. They provide extensive services to Tri-City residents, including permanent supportive housing, emergency shelter and services at Sunrise Village Emergency Shelter in Fremont, and social and health services through the HOPE Project Mobile Health Clinic. Their programs serve a wide variety of people, including families with

children, at risk youth exiting foster care, veterans and their families, and people who are chronically homeless. In 2021, 5,542 participants throughout Alameda County received support.

- **Safe Alternatives to Violent Environments (SAVE).** SAVE is a non-profit community-based organization founded in 1976 to address domestic violence. They provide supportive services, advocacy and education, and a 25-bed safe house for families fleeing abuse. From 2020 to 2021, 1,265 participants received critical services from SAVE. SAVE also provided shelter to 98 women and children and provided rent subsidies and ongoing case management to 60 families in the Housing First Program.

Large Households

Large Families are considered to have 5 or more people, bringing about the need for larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. Figure 2-13 shows Newark has a larger percentage of families with 3 or more people than Alameda County and the Bay Area, with 38 percent of households with 3 or more, and 19 percent of households with five or more people. While Newark has a large inventory of single family homes, the cost of rent and ownership place many of these homes beyond reach for families. Families also face costs such as child care, increased transportation and medical care that further reduce their housing budget allowance. The pace of construction of multifamily and affordable units has not kept pace with that of market rate single family homes in Newark. **Program H5.2** Affordable Housing Development Programs work to increase the number of affordable housing constructed in the city. Newark's Affordable Housing Action Plan has identified large families as a community of focus for new housing needs.


Figure 2-14: Households by Household Size, 2015- 2019

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B11016

Female Headed Household


Government Code Section 65583(a)(7) identifies families with female heads of households as a group that may have special housing needs and requires the City to analyze the housing needs of these households. Female-headed households are households led by a single female with one or more children under the age of 18 at home. In Newark, 11 percent of households are female-headed families, which are often at greater risk of housing insecurity. A greater number of single parent headed households are renters, with 67 percent of married households owning homes, compared to 16 percent of female headed households (Figure 2-15). Female headed households have a significantly higher vulnerability to poverty, 22.8 percent of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line, while 5.7 percent of female-headed households without children live in poverty (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012). As Female headed households face challenges of familial housing discrimination, limited income due to wage discrimination against women makes this population have higher rates of poverty and vulnerability to being housing cost burdened.

Figure 2-15: Household Type, 2015- 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B11001

Figure 2-16: Household Type by Tenure, 2015- 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 Year Data, 2015-2019, Table B25011


Existing housing need for extremely low-income households

Residents with extremely low incomes, less than 30% of the Area Median Income, face extreme housing challenges due to fixed or low incomes, credit, disability, family structure and access to affordable housing. In Newark, 58% of households make more than 100% of the Area Median Income (AMI), compared to 10% making less than 30% of AMI, which is considered extremely low-income (see Figure 2-17). In Newark, renters are disproportionately experiencing cost burden, with 30 percent of renters cost burdened and 14 percent spending more than 50 percent of their income on housing (Figure 2-9) . Regionally, more than half of all households make more than 100% AMI, while 15% make less than 30% AMI. In Alameda County, 30% AMI is the equivalent to the annual income of \$34,850 for a family of four. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers and healthcare professionals – can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in many industries.

To estimate the projected housing need for extremely low-income households, 50 percent of Newark’s 464 very low-income RHNA units are assumed to serve extremely low-income households. Based on this methodology, the City has a projected need of 232 units for extremely

low-income households over the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period. More than half of this allocation will be provided through the Cedar Creek Apartments, which is already in the development pipeline and has received \$6M in funding support from the City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee Fund. Additional proposed programs to support the housing needs for this population include Program H5.2 Affordable Housing Development Programs work to increase the number of affordable housing constructed in the city.

Figure 2-17: Households by Household Income Level, 2013-2017



Source: Housing and Urban Development, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2013-2017

Farmworkers

The number of farmworkers living in Newark has declined over the years, with the student population at 57 students for the 2019-2020 school year. The previous years saw 79 students for 2017-2018 and 72 for the 2018 to 2019 school year. Table 3-12 shows the trends for both Alameda county and the greater Bay Area see a similar decline in the migrant farmworker student population. Generally, the number of farmworkers living in Alameda county has been declining since 2012, with fewer than 400 residents working in the industry in a permanent position. It is important to recognize that farmworkers could be under-counted by the census due to their

migrant nature. Farming and farmworkers are a significant element of the state's economy, but play less of a role in the Bay Area. Due to lower wages, language barriers, and inconsistent work, farmworkers can have difficulty securing housing, and for these reasons could experience overcrowding and substandard housing conditions. To support these populations, program H2.6 Work in Partnership with Newark Unified School District to ensure that housing resources are reaching families that need them and and Program H5.2 Affordable Housing Development Programs work to increase the number of affordable housing constructed in the city.

SECTION 3 AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

A. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Historic and current land use policies and planning play a key role in the ability of individuals and families to live in neighborhoods with opportunity, including academically and culturally supportive schools, a wide variety of living wage jobs, and convenient access to transit and services. In response to continued housing discrimination, which prohibits discrimination regarding the sale, rental, and financing of housing based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, and disability status — people within protected classes continue to encounter limits in housing choice and mobility. In 2018, the California State Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 686 to expand upon the fair housing requirements and protections outlined in the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA); and, protect the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) as published in the 2015 U.S. Department of Housing and Community Development’s (HUD) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule. California’s Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) defines AFFH as taking meaningful actions to explicitly address, combat, and reverse disparities resulting from past patterns of segregation to foster more inclusive communities. As part of this, housing elements are required to include the following components:

- **Inclusive and Equitable Outreach:** Housing elements must make an effort to equitably include all community stakeholders in the housing element participation process.
- **Assessment of Fair Housing:** All housing elements must include an assessment of fair housing. This assessment should include an analysis of the following four fair housing issues: integration and segregation patterns and trends, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs, including displacement risk.
- **Analysis of Sites Inventory:** Local jurisdictions must evaluate and address how particular sites available for housing development will meet the needs of households at all income levels. The housing element must analyze and conclude whether the identified sites improve or exacerbate conditions for fair housing.
- **Identification of Contributing Factors:** Based on findings from the previous steps, housing elements must identify, evaluate, and prioritize the contributing factors related to fair housing issues.

- **Goals and Meaningful Actions to AFFH:** Local jurisdictions must adopt fair housing goals and actions that are significant, meaningful, and sufficient to overcome identified patterns of segregation and affirmatively further fair housing. The housing element should include metrics and milestones for evaluating progress and fair housing results.

B. History of the Land and People

The land that is now Newark is the aboriginal homeland to the [Muwekma Ohlone Tribe](#), Ohlone, [Confederated Villages of Lisjan](#) and [Tamien Nation](#). Throughout the period of European colonization, aboriginal tribes were removed from their lands and in some circumstances moved into mission settlements, such as the [Mission San José](#), and subjected to religious conversion practices and forced labor. In the Early 20th century Newark was still primarily marshland and waterways leading into the San Francisco Bay. Land speculation brought investors to the area and Newark became home to a dairy farm and tourism from around the county for picnicking and entertainment. Over time a railroad connection was established south to Santa Cruz and North to Alameda and industry followed. Incorporated as a city in 1955, Newark has been the home to steel foundries, manufacturing, and a large and successful solar evaporation of salt production that rivaled the entire Bay Area. Newark's development and land use was divided, with manufacturing isolated to the western portion of the city. The residential portion consisted of single family homes built during the post war building boom that were accessible to white families only through government backed low interest loans provided by the Federal Housing Administration. As manufacturing moved out of Newark in the 1970's and 1980's, Newark has transitioned to an economy of technology and education. The transition has also transformed the city from primarily White to one with a majority of residents from Asia and Latin America.



Ann Marie Sayers, Ruth Orta, Corrina Gould and Caleen Sisk at Living On Ohlone Land, Photo by Christopher McLeod

Although Newark has no redlining maps or racially restrictive covenants on file, de facto discrimination has shaped access to housing historically and into the present day. From discrimination in governmental lending for single family homes, to the real estate industry and personal prejudice, Newark's growth as a city coincided with unregulated racial discrimination in housing during the 1950s and 1960's. Through oral history accounts of Jean Ficklen, founder of Afro-American Cultural & Historical Society and first African American teacher in Newark, we learn of the discrimination her family faced in finding housing in the Bay Area as an African American family in the 1960's. Ms. Ficklen and her family were looking for housing closer to her husband's employment at the Lockheed Missile and Space Center in Sunnyvale, California, a 54 mile commute one way to Richmond where they lived. They found a home in Hayward that they liked, and after meeting with the realtor, were set to move to a house there. The day before they were scheduled to move, the house was no longer available to them. They were offered a house to rent in Newark but were asked not to tell who rented it to them. Soon after they moved to the neighborhood, for sale signs went up, typical of the times of neighborhood blockbusting fueled by fear and discrimination (J.Ficklen, Personal communication, January 21, 2021).

C. Summary of Fair Housing Need

Fair housing

- A lack of affordable housing for residents for sale and rent is one of the largest fair housing issues Newark faces. Due to decades-long reduction in federal funding for affordable housing production, and a lack of affordable housing production at the city level, there is a shortage of housing at prices that meet the needs of current and future residents.
- Disability and race are the highest reported instances of discrimination in Newark over the past five years. In 2020-2021 Echo Housing saw 10 cases of reported discrimination based on disability and 4 cases in National origin. The city heard from residents, specifically the Latinx community that there are significant challenges to accessing housing. A report from El Tiempano found that women and undocumented residents faced the most challenges, specific issues faced by residents were:
 - Difficulty of providing documentation when many undocumented immigrants are paid under the table or are not named on rental leases
 - Challenges accessing information digitally
 - Complicated/confusing applications without assistance readily available

Segregation and Integration

- There is a significant level of segregation between Latinx and White residents with an index of .229 or **22.9%**. **Meaning that 22 percent of Latinx or white residents would need to move to address this.** Due to the fact that the Latinx community is 30 percent of the population in Newark, this indicates a significant level of segregation between Latinx and White residents in Newark, slightly higher than segregation at the regional level.
- Asian residents are the most isolated at 0.451, meaning the average **Asian resident lives in a neighborhood that is 45.1% Asian.** Asian residents also have the highest percentage (36.7%) of residents making more than 100 percent of area median income.
- Other ethnicities in Newark have a higher likelihood of interacting with people outside their race. **White residents have seen the greatest reduction in isolation, from 43 percent in 2000 to 27 percent in 2020.**

Access to Opportunities

- Overall, Newark consists of two census tracts that are considered high resource areas (NewPark Place and Birch Grove) while the remaining six tracts (Lake- Rosemont, Mirabeau Park, Mayhews Landing, Gateway/Bayshore, Old Town and Central Newark) are considered moderate resource areas.

- The City's high resource areas have both dominant and secondary populations that are either White or Asian. In NewPark Place, nearly 51% of the population is Asian and 23% is White. In Birch Grove, 35% is White while nearly 29% is Asian.
- Five out of six of the City's moderate resource areas have dominant populations that are Hispanic/Latinx, ranging from almost 34% in Mayhews Landing to nearly 53% in Old Town/Central Newark. In the remaining moderate resource area, Lake-Rosemont, 40% of the population is White, making it the dominant population while nearly 29% is Hispanic/Latinx.
- There are large disparities in environmental outcomes in Newark, with low outcomes in central Newark and a portion of the Old Town area that is also home to a majority of lower income and Hispanic/Latinx residents.

Disparate Housing Needs

Overcrowding

BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and People of Color) populations are the most cost burdened and experience disproportionate rates of overcrowding. Central Newark in the Old Town area has 9 percent of households experiencing overcrowded housing, with 5 percent of households experiencing extreme overcrowding in the Northwest corner of the city. As shown in Figure 3-2, these two areas are predominantly occupied by communities of color, with 80 to 100 percent of residents in the Old Town area. Mixed race residents face the highest rates at 33 percent, followed by Hispanic/Latinx (30%) and Indigenous residents at 22 percent.

Cost Burdened

Newark's low and moderate income populations and renters experience the highest levels of cost burden. BIPOC communities, Black (41%), Indigenous (46%), Multi Racial (46%), and Latinx (47%) residents are the highest cost burdened, and most vulnerable to displacement, overcrowding and homelessness. Asian and White residents are the least cost burdened at 27 percent and 21 percent respectively. Renters are more likely to be cost burdened, with twice the number of renters (30%) spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing compared to 16 percent of homeowners.

Families

Households with children face additional challenges accessing housing that meets their needs for both size and cost. Housing survey results conducted from March 15th through April 30th 2022, found that when asked what are the most urgent housing needs at this time, 50 percent responded that housing for families was the greatest need. There was a special interest in housing for single

parents, as female-headed households make up 17 percent of all households and **22.8 percent of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line.**

People Experiencing Homelessness

Through community engagement we have been alerted to the high number of residents experiencing homelessness that are finding shelter in local motels that are not reflected in point in time counts. Homelessness in Newark affects all racial and ethnic groups, although not equally. There is a significant population of families experiencing homelessness, with about 5% of all students in Newark, which further indicates the lack of affordable housing. Notably, about **96 percent of homeless students in Newark are students of color**, with over 167 of these students being Hispanic or Latino. While NUSD has only a small number of Pacific Islander students (98 students), about 28 percent of them are homeless.

D. Fair Housing Assessment

Regional Barriers to Fair Housing

The following is a summary of key barriers to housing in Alameda county, compiled by Alameda County, in the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in January of 2020.

- Across the County, segregation has increased between White residents and BIPOC communities within the last decade, with White residents comprising the majority of homeowners but only approximately a third of the County's population.
- BIPOC households continue to have disproportionate levels of housing discrimination as renters and in the housing market. Overall, the rate of mortgage approvals has gone up in the last seven years, but the disparities in the rate of approval across race and ethnicity has stayed relatively the same. Black applicants continue to have the lowest approval rate at 59.1 percent and Hispanic applicants the second lowest at 61.5 percent compared to White applicants at 70 percent.
- BIPOC communities are displaced residents are being displaced from areas with a traditionally large population and have less access to proficient schools, jobs, and environmental health.

- The average home sales prices have increased from approximately \$300,000 to nearly \$900,000 in less than 20 years (unadjusted for inflation).
- Wages have not kept up with rent increases, currently the wage needed to rent an average housing unit in the County is \$44.79 an hour or \$93,000 a year. Median rents have risen an average of \$1,000 (unadjusted for inflation) since 2010, representing an increase of 55 percent in a 9-year period.
- Homelessness has increased by 42 percent since 2017.
- BIPOC households, especially black and Hispanic/ Latinx households, have the highest rate of disproportionate housing needs, which includes having incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, more than 1 person per room, and households with a cost burden greater than 30 percent.
- Based on community feedback, Housing Choice Voucher holders and those with disabilities often find it difficult to find an appropriate housing unit. Some find it difficult to find an appropriately sized unit that will take their voucher and others experience that the vouchers will not cover the rent of an appropriately sized unit.
- Disability, race, and familial status are the most common bases of housing discrimination complaints forwarded to the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

Fair Housing Outreach Capacity and Enforcement

Fair housing complaints can be used as an indicator to identify characteristics of households experiencing discrimination in housing. Pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [Government Code Section 12921 (a)], the opportunity to seek, obtain, and hold housing cannot be determined by an individual's "race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Section 51 of the Civil Code." Fair housing issues that may arise in any jurisdiction include but are not limited to:

- Housing design that makes a dwelling unit inaccessible to an individual with a disability;
- Discrimination against an individual based on race, national origin, familial status, disability, religion, sex, or other characteristic when renting or selling a housing unit; and
- Disproportionate housing needs including cost burden, overcrowding, substandard housing, and risk of displacement.

The following are organizations at the state and county level that provide resources and support for fair housing and eviction defense.

East Bay Community Law Center (EBCLC): EBCLC’s Housing Program focuses on defending eviction lawsuits brought against low-income tenants, as well as enforcement of local rent and eviction control ordinances. The program emphasizes defense of long-term tenancies to preserve the value of rent-controlled units. EBCLC also prioritizes subsidized tenancies such as those in Section 8 and conventional public housing programs, as well as on behalf of tenants with disabilities.

Housing and Economic Rights Advocates (HERA): HERA is a California statewide, not-for-profit legal service and advocacy organization dedicated to helping Californians – particularly those most vulnerable – build a safe, sound financial future, free of discrimination and economic abuses, in all aspects of household financial concerns. They provide free legal services, consumer workshops, training for professionals and community organizing support, create innovative solutions and engage in policy work locally, statewide and nationally.

Housing Equality Law Project (HELP): HELP seeks to expand legal protections in fair housing through advocacy, leadership training, education and outreach, and enforcement of anti-discrimination laws.

Newark works with ECHO Housing for fair housing enforcement. ECHO provides fair housing counseling and education, tenant/landlord counseling and mediation, and other housing-related programs. To address the needs of Limited English Proficient speakers, ECHO provides services and classes in Spanish, has online information available in multiple languages, and has access to interpretation and translation services. ECHO programs include:

- Fair housing counseling, investigation, education, and enforcement
- Tenant/landlord counseling and mediation
- Rental Assistance Program
- Home Seeking Services
- Shared Housing Counseling & Placement
- Homebuyer Education Workshops

ECHO Housing has compiled fair housing complaints in Newark that align with those at the county level, with the majority regarding race and disability. In Newark, disability has the highest share of complaints filed from 2016 to 2021 at 27, with race at 16 complaints. City staff conducted one on one interviews with affordable housing providers. Through communication with Darin Lounds on April 29th, 2022, Executive Director of the Housing Consortium of the East Bay, he shared that many people with disabilities are well educated in the process, which can make it appear there are a larger number of instances of discrimination in comparison with other types of discrimination.

El Timpano is a non profit, community based organization in Alameda County that provides access

to information for Spanish and Mayan speaking communities through a text based SMS platform. They conducted an in depth investigation on the barriers that residents are experiencing accessing housing resources during COVID-19. They found that women and undocumented residents faced the most challenges, with specific issues faced by residents were:

- Difficulty of providing documentation when many undocumented immigrants are paid under the table or are not named on rental leases,
- Challenges accessing information digitally
- Complicated/confusing applications without assistance readily available

Through communication through text and phone interviews, the organization found that changes that would be most impactful in supporting increased access would be less documentation-heavy requirements, help with the application process over the phone or in person, more promotion and support in Spanish, and a shorter application process.

Table 3-1: Newark Fair Housing Complaints, 2016-2021

Fiscal Year	Race	National Origin	Disability	Familial Status	Marital Status	Religion	Sex	Source of Income	Age	Other	TOTAL
2016-2017	10	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
2017-2018	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2018-2019	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
2019-2020	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
2020-2021	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	14

Source: ECHO Housing

Table 3-2: Fair Housing Complaints Forwarded to Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Alameda County, January 2017- June 2020

Complaint type					2017-2021 Total	
	2017	2018	2019	2020	Cases	% of Total
Color	1	1	1	0	3	1.5%
Disability	32	26	28	15	101	49.8%
Familial Status	10	5	3	2	20	9.9%

Complaint type					2017-2021 Total	
	2017	2018	2019	2020	Cases	% of Total
National Origin	4	4	0	1	9	4.4%
Hispanic Origin	2	2	0	0	4	2.0%
Race	7	9	5	2	23	11.3%
Asian	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
Black	5	4	5	2	16	7.9%
Black and White	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
Native American	1	1	0	0	2	1.0%
White	1	2	0	0	3	1.5%
Religion	1	2	2	0	5	2.5%
Retaliation	7	9	8	1	25	12.3%
Sex	7	5	5	0	17	8.4%
Total Cases	69	61	52	21	203	100%

HUD Note: Percents do not add up to 100 due to cases containing multiple bases of discrimination.

Local Knowledge on Capacity and Enforcement

Four key issues in the capacity and enforcement of fair housing have been identified in the Alameda County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing document, and by the Executive Director of ECHO Housing:

- Inadequate funding and organizational capacity** are the primary limitations for improving and expanding upon existing fair housing enforcement. Recivdng funding from a couple jurisdictions in the County is insufficient.
- Limited sources of funding and HUD capping allocation amounts** of Community Development Block Grants for fair housing activities limits the participating jurisdictions from being able to utilize more of these funds for fair housing work.

3. **Reduction in the number of fair housing organizations and activities in the region** has taken place, with at least two fair housing agencies in the East Bay have closed their doors.
4. **A lack of affordable housing supply** due to significant decreases in funding from the federal government since 2008. Guidance from HCD suggests a connection between fair housing complaints and that the lack of affordable housing that is needed is affordable to persons on public assistance, accessible housing for persons with disabilities, and senior citizens, single parent households and large families. Although local tax funding has been approved in select jurisdictions, a large funding shortcoming remains.

The Alameda County Collaborative, an ad-hoc group of housing program professionals working for local Alameda County jurisdictions, held a panel with representatives from community-based organizations (CBOs) on April 25, 2022. The participating CBOs' clientele included members of protected classes, including immigrants and non-English speakers; households with special needs, including persons with disabilities and seniors; and persons who are experiencing fair housing issues. This document synthesizes key points the CBOs presented.

Community-Based Organizations identified key barriers and obstacles that they and their clients face related to fair housing, including:

- Insufficient access to information due to language/technology barriers (particularly for immigrant communities and seniors); fear/distrust of the system; and difficulty understanding rights/resources
- Complex, inflexible application requirements for housing resources that may vary between jurisdictions, exclude certain people (e.g., undocumented, formerly incarcerated), or be difficult to meet
- Communication between CBOs and property owners is difficult to navigate, requires individual relationships with each location
- Overall cost of housing (most CBOs' clients fall under the 30% AMI) and need for tenant protections

The CBOs recommend these strategies to strengthen outreach efforts:

- Meet people where they are—engage with existing outreach channels
- Partner with school districts to distribute information, as well as any civic organizations such as libraries, religious institutions, medical services
- “Train the trainer” approach to educate existing service providers on housing rights and referrals for their clients

- Provide materials appropriate for audience (e.g., physical flyers for seniors; video/audio content for Mam speakers)

Solutions that panelists recommended for housing projects to better serve their clients:

- Identify onsite supportive services that are appropriate for residents early in process
- Early and sustained relationships between service providers and properties, especially relative to preparing eligible residents for the document/application needs for housing
- Renters' protection and long-term rental subsidies, particularly for households under 30% AMI
- Greater flexibility in application process (make it easier for CBOs and their clients to navigate, remove barriers for undocumented people)

Through housing survey responses and small group conversations in community meetings, The city has constantly heard from Newark residents and community organizations that there is both not enough affordable housing at levels accessible for those earning lower wages, as well as access to housing resources and application requirements for housing that make accessing housing out of reach.

Segregation and Integration Patterns

Segregation Patterns in the Bay Area

Across the San Francisco Bay Area, White residents and above moderate-income residents are significantly more segregated from other racial and income groups. The highest levels of racial segregation occur between the Black and white populations. The analysis completed for this report indicates that the amount of racial segregation both within Bay Area cities and across jurisdictions in the region has decreased since the year 2000. This finding is consistent with recent research from the Othering and Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley, which concluded that “although 7 of the 9 Bay Area counties were more segregated in 2020 than they were in either 1980 or 1990, racial residential segregation in the region appears to have peaked around the year 2000 and has generally declined since.” However, compared to cities in other parts of California, Bay Area jurisdictions have more neighborhood level segregation between residents from different racial groups. Additionally, there is also more racial segregation between Bay Area cities compared to other regions in the state.

Segregation is the separation of different demographic groups into different geographic locations or communities, meaning that groups are unevenly distributed across geographies. The city looked at two spatial forms of segregation: neighborhood level segregation within a local jurisdiction and city level segregation between jurisdictions in the Bay Area.

Neighborhood level segregation: Segregation of race and income groups can occur from neighborhood to neighborhood within a city.

City level segregation: Race and income divides also occur between jurisdictions in a region.

Newark and Regional Segregation

To understand how Newark is connected to the total segregation of the Bay Area, one can look at the difference in the racial composition of a jurisdiction compared to the racial composition of the region as a whole. The racial demographics in Newark for the years 2000, 2010, and 2020 can be found in Table 3-3 below. The table also provides the racial composition of the nine-county Bay Area. As of 2020, Newark has a lower share of white residents than the Bay Area as a whole, a higher share of Latinx residents, a lower share of Black residents, and a significantly higher share of Asian/Pacific Islander residents.


Latinx residents are primarily in close proximity to major highways and arterial roads such as Thornton Avenue, with White and Asian populations predominantly living to the North and South of Newark. The highest non white populations at 80 to 100 percent are concentrated along Thornton Ave in Old Town.

Table 3-3: Population by Racial Group, Newark and the Region, 2000 to 2020

Race	Newark			Bay Area
	2000	2010	2020	2020
Asian/Pacific Islander	21.1%	28.2%	42.6%	28.2%
Black/African American	3.9%	4.5%	3.1%	5.6%
Latinx	28.6%	35.2%	30.2%	24.4%
Other or Multiple Races	6.2%	4.6%	5.3%	5.9%
White	40.3%	27.5%	18.8%	35.8%

Source: Universe: Population. Source: IPUMS National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, 2020 Census of Population and Housing, Table P002. Data from 2010 is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, Table P4. Data for 2000 is standardized to 2010 census tract geographies and is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004.

Figure 3-1: Predominant Racial Groups in Newark



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Race and Ethnicity


Asian and Hispanic/Latinx populations have grown significantly over the past 20 years to become the majority populations, with decreasing Black and White populations. The Asian population in Newark is multi-ethnic, with the largest being Chinese (10.1%), followed by Filipino (9.6%) and Asian Indian (8.9%).

Table 3-4: Race and Ethnicity of Newark Residents, 2000 to 2020

Year	American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic	Asian / API, Non-Hispanic	Black or African American, Non-Hispanic	White, Non-Hispanic	Other Race or Multiple Races, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic or Latinx
2000	148	9,329	1,639	17,103	128	12,145
2010	95	12,005	1,908	11,726	1,845	14,994
2020	107	17,315	1,534	10,629	1,822	15,975

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Figure 3-2: Racial Demographics of Newark, 2018



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Dissimilarity Index

Dissimilarity Index Guidance for Cities with Small Racial Group Populations

The analysis conducted for this report suggests that dissimilarity index values are unreliable for a population group if that group represents approximately less than 5% of the jurisdiction’s total population.

If a jurisdiction has a very small population of a racial group, this indicates that segregation between the jurisdiction and the region (inter-city segregation) is likely to be an important feature of the jurisdiction’s segregation patterns.

Table 3-5 below provides the dissimilarity index values indicating the level of segregation in Newark between white residents and residents who are Black, Latinx, or Asian/Pacific Islander. The table also provides the dissimilarity index between white residents and all residents of color in the jurisdiction, and all dissimilarity index values are shown across three time periods (2000, 2010, and 2020).

In Newark, the highest segregation is between Black and White residents (see Table 3-5). Newark’s Black/white dissimilarity index of 0.244 means that 24.4 percent of Black or White residents would need to move to a different neighborhood to create perfect integration between Black residents and white residents. However, this dissimilarity index value is not a reliable data point due to small population size. See callout box above for more information. Latinx residents have rates of segregation between White residents with an index of .229 or 22.9 percent. Due to the fact that the Latinx community is 30 percent of the population in Newark, this indicates a significant level of segregation between Latinx and White residents in Newark, slightly higher than segregation at the regional level.

Table 3-5: Dissimilarity Index Between Racial Groups, 2000 to 2020

Race	Newark			Bay Area
	2000	2010	2020	2020
Asian/Pacific Islander vs. White	0.183	0.170	0.192	0.185
Black/African American vs. White	0.180*	0.204*	0.244*	0.244
Latinx vs. White	0.286	0.230	0.229	0.207
People of Color vs. White	0.204	0.173	0.169	0.168

Universe: Population. Source: IPUMS National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, 2020 Census of Population and Housing, Table P002. Data from 2010 is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, Table P4. Data for 2000 is standardized to

2010 census tract geographies and is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004. Note: If a number is marked with an asterisk (*), it indicates that the index is based on a racial group making up less than 5 percent of the jurisdiction population, leading to unreliable numbers.

Isolation Index

Within the City of Newark the most isolated racial group is Asian residents. Newark’s isolation index of 0.451 for Asian residents means that the average Asian resident lives in a neighborhood that is 45.1% Asian. Other racial groups are less isolated, meaning they may be more likely to encounter other racial groups in their neighborhoods. The isolation index values for all racial groups in Newark for the years 2000, 2010, and 2020 can be found in Table 3-6 below. Among all racial groups in this jurisdiction, the white population’s isolation index has changed the most over time, becoming less isolated from other racial groups between the years 2000 and 2020.

Table 3-6: Isolation Index for Newark and the Bay Area, 2000 to 2020

Race	Newark			Bay Area Average
	2000	2010	2020	2020
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.236	0.307	0.451	0.245
Black/African American	.041	0.048	0.032	0.053
Latinx	0.331	0.386	0.334	0.251
White	0.431	0.297	0.207	0.491


Universe: Population. Source: IPUMS National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census State Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, 2020 Census of Population and Housing, Table P002. Data from 2010 is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, Table P4. Data for 2000 is standardized to 2010 census tract geographies and is from U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004.

Income status

There are fewer very low and extremely low income households in Newark than Alameda County and the Bay Area, and with slightly higher percentages of moderate and above moderate income households than Alameda County and the Bay Area. Low income households at 50-80 percent area median income are relatively equal across geography at 12.6 percent for Newark, Alameda County (11.6 percent) and the Bay Area (13 percent). In Newark, low income households are concentrated in the central portion of the city, with the highest concentrations found along Thorton avenue in the Old Town area. Figure 3-4 shows income by race in Newark. The areas with 50 percent or greater of low to moderate income populations also have the highest concentrations of BIPOC residents. Higher income residents are found outside of Central Newark, as seen in Figure 3-5. While the majority of Newark is single family housing, Central Newark is where older housing stock is found along a major arterial road, with lower rents as a result. The majority of very

low and low income residents are Black, Hispanic/ Latino and Asian/ Pacific Islander. Figure 3-4 shows these populations are approximately 67 percent of the population for very low incomes and 68 percent for low income. For moderate and above moderate income populations, the demographics shift sharply to a greater percentage of White residents (44 percent) for moderate income and above moderate income White residents (36 percent) and Asian and Pacific Islander residents (37 percent) make up the larger percentage of residents in these income categories. Asian and Pacific Islanders have comprised a large percentage of both the lowest and highest income categories. Although the Censuses data combines the groups, we know from other research that Pacific Islander students in Newark Unified School District have high levels of homelessness.


Figure 3-3: Household Income levels for Newark, Alameda County and the Bay Area, 2013- 2017




Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy. ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Figure 3-4: Income by Race and Ethnicity, 2013- 2017


0%-30% of AMI




31%-50% of AMI



81%-100% of AMI




Greater than 100% of AMI




Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy. ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Figure 3-5: Median Household Income, 2015- 2019



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Figure 3-6: Low to Moderate Income Households and Percent Non-White Population, 2018



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Family Status

Newark has the largest household size in Alameda County. According to the County of Alameda’s Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (2020), there is a higher percentage of families with children in Alameda County as a whole compared to other family types, but the overall proportion of families with children has decreased by 6 percent from 1990 to 2017. According to the 2021 ACS 5 year data, there are 9,693 children under the age of 18 in Newark, with the majority, 7,546 in married couple households. Figure 3-22 Shows 80 percent and higher of married couples with children are found in the north east, north west and south east corners of the city. These areas include Lake-Rosemont, a moderate opportunity neighborhood of single family homes, NewPark Place and Sanctuary Village, a newer single family housing development and an area identified as high opportunity. The neighborhood to the South East surrounding Lincoln Elementary school is an older single family neighborhood with smaller single story homes. Central Newark has 60 to 80 percent of married couple households with children. This area also

has more civic and commercial uses. Only one area in North central Newark has a concentration of single mother households from 20 to 40 percent. The majority of the city is 20 percent or below. This is an area with older single family housing stock and a recently closed elementary school.

Disability


As seen in Figure 3-60, there is no concentration of residents with a disability in Newark. The majority of residents with a physical disability are seniors, and are primarily related to ambulatory movement. Through community engagement, especially with the senior community, there is a strong interest in shared housing and accessory dwelling units in order to remain in their communities. City is proposing programs such as H2.2 Accessory Dwelling Unit incentive program, H4.5, connecting residentings to existing shared housing programs and H4.7, Increasing housing opportunities for those with developmental disabilities.

E. Racially and/or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty + Affluence

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) are neighborhoods in which there are both racial concentrations and high poverty rates. HUD's definition of a R/ECAP is:

- A census tract that has a non-white population of 50 percent or more (majority-minority) or, for non-urban areas, 20 percent, AND a poverty rate of 40 percent or more; OR
- A census tract that has a non-white population of 50 percent or more (majority-minority) AND the poverty rate is three times the average tract poverty rate for the county, whichever is lower. Households within R/ECAP tracts frequently represent the most disadvantaged households within a community and often face a multitude of housing challenges. R/ECAPs are meant to identify where residents may have historically faced discrimination and continue to be challenged by limited economic opportunity. While there are several R/ECAPs in Alameda County, the majority are concentrated in the City of Oakland with a few in Berkeley, one in Hayward, and one in the unincorporated county (see Figure 3-7). No R/ECAPs were identified in Newark.

Figure 3-7: Area of High Segregation and Poverty, 2021



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Racially and/or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) are neighborhoods in which there are both high concentrations of non-Hispanic white households and high household income rates. HCD has not yet established one standard methodology for determining RCAAs in California, but for the purpose of this analysis an RCAA is defined as a census tract with: 1) an average total

White population that is 1.25 times higher than the average total White population in the Bay Area region and 2) a median household income of \$141,996 or higher (1.5 times higher than the Bay Area AMI in 2019). Based on this methodology, there are RCAAs throughout the eastern county spanning from Dublin, Livermore, and the unincorporated eastern county up through Castro Valley and Contra Costa County area. There are also RCAAs in the City of Alameda and Oakland. There are no RCAAs within Newark based on this methodology.

Although Newark does not have areas that have been identified as Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence through this methodology, there are areas of concentrated affluence in Newark, where residents are making more than \$141,000, but do not have the levels of white population to identify as an area of Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Area of Influence.

F. Disparities in Access to Opportunity

Historically, and into the present day, affordable housing in the United States has been disproportionately developed in BIPOC neighborhoods that have been disinvested with high poverty rates, thereby reinforcing the concentration of poverty and racial segregation in low opportunity and low resource areas. Several agencies, including HUD and HCD, in coordination with the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC), have developed methodologies to assess and measure geographic access to opportunity in areas throughout California. For this assessment, the opportunity indices prepared by HUD and HCD/TCAC are used to analyze access to opportunity in the City of Newark. Access to opportunity is measured by access to healthy neighborhoods, education, employment, and transportation. At the county level, Alameda county is close to equal in the percentage of the county that is high resourced (36%) and the percentage that is low resource (39%). Figure 3-8 shows the distribution of opportunity at the regional level. A large portion of the county is classified as low to moderate opportunity. Higher opportunity areas are found in Berkeley, Alameda, San Leandro, and Fremont. Figure 3-9 shows the composite opportunity areas in Newark. The majority of the city is identified as moderate and high resource, with no low resource areas or areas of high segregation and poverty. Through a community housing survey conducted by the city, residents were asked if they feel their neighborhood has opportunities for you and your family, 18 percent said no and 28 percent said somewhat. When asked what would make it feel that there was more opportunity the top three responses were:

1. City infrastructure that supports physical activity, including sidewalks, bike lanes, parks, and rec centers
2. Affordable, safe, and healthy housing choices
3. Educational opportunities that are academically and culturally supportive

"I think increasing access really has to do with increasing the supply first and putting affordable housing in

high resource areas and near public transit as well as retail.”

Figure 3-10 shows the distribution of opportunity areas by race. Asian residents comprise the majority of the residents in the high resource areas at 63.8 percent, followed by White residents (16%), and Hispanic/ Latinx (11.5%). Low resourced or high segregation and poverty areas are primarily populated by Hispanic/ Latinx (39.7%) and Asian (38.3%) residents. Moderate resource areas are representative of the population with 36.9 percent of Hispanic/ Latinx residents, Asian residents (29.7%) and African American (3.5%).


HUD Opportunity Index HUD’s opportunity indices compare data indicators by race and ethnicity, for households below the poverty line, between jurisdictions, and for the region overall. The indices include the following:

Table 3-7: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps, 2021

Domain	Indicators
Environmental	CalEnviroScreen 4.0 from pollution burdens and socio economic factors are indicators
Economic	Poverty, Adult education, Employment, Job proximity, Median home value
Education	Math proficiency, Reading proficiency, High School graduation rates, Student poverty rates
Poverty and Racial Segregation	Poverty: tracts with at least 30 percent of population under federal poverty line Racial Segregation: Overrepresentation of people of color relative to the county (i.e., Tracts with a racial location quotient higher than 1.25 for Black, Hispanic, Asian, or all people of color in comparison to the county)


Source: CA Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2021.

Figure 3-8: Distribution of TCAC Opportunity Areas in the San Francisco Bay Area, 2022



Source: CA Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2022


Figure 3-9: Composite of Opportunity Areas in Newark, 2022




Source: CA Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2022

Figure 3-10: Percentage of Residents in Low, Moderate and High Resourced Areas by Race, 2015- 2019


Low Resource or High Segregation and Poverty Area



moderate resources



Highest Resourced Area



Source: CA Tax Credit Allocation Committee / California Housing and Community Development (HCD), Opportunity Maps (2020); U.S. Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table B03002


Economic Opportunity and Jobs proximity Index

The TCAC/HCD Economic Opportunity map measures economic opportunity through poverty, levels of adult education, employment, proximity to employment, and median home values. The majority of Newark has an economic score of less than .25 and .25 to .50, indicating less than positive economic opportunity. The southern corner of the city has higher economic opportunity with a score of .50 - .75. The area has a predominant Asian population and a median income greater than 125,000.

Newark has a close proximity to jobs in the eastern portion of the city, close to Silicon Valley. Areas in the northern portion of the city are furthest from jobs, although in the future the south west portion of the city will potentially have access to regional transportation through the creation of


the Dumbarton rail line. Economic opportunity was not cited though community engagement as a concern. Newark has a relatively low unemployment rate of 3.5 percent, but does have a larger percentage of residents leaving the city for work, than remaining in the city.

Figure 3-11: Jobs Proximity Index Composite, 2014–2017



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool

Figure 3-12: Economic Opportunity Score, 2021



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Environmental Opportunity

Exposure to a variety of environmental pollutants causes detrimental effects on human health, especially for children. The environmental opportunity score looks at 12 indicators to determine the level of environmental health of a community. The score is created through the consideration of both the pollution burden of exposure, and the population characteristics of an area. Newark has a mixed classification of environmental impacts, with portions of the city identified as having more positive environmental outcomes and others with less.


As a whole, Newark has fine particulate matter rates of 7.2 micrometers, which are higher than the World Health Organization guideline of 5 micrometers, but lower than the US EPA standard of 12 micrometers. These levels can be attributed to industrial outputs, diesel exhaust from major arterials, and two freeways that border Newark. From December 1, 2019 - November 30, 2020,

Aclima collated data showing particulate samples of 8.7 micrometers along Thornton Avenue. The CalEnviroScreen score ranks census tracts from 1 to 100, with 100 being the highest percentile of communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution and with population characteristics that make them more sensitive to pollution. Figure 3-13 shows the patchwork distribution of outcomes, with the lowest environmental outcomes in central Newark and a portion of the Old Town area that is also home to a majority of BIPOC and low income residents. The census tract is 47 percent Hispanic / Latinx, Asian (26.6%) and African American (4.1%) residents. This area has an overall pollution burden percentile of 61 and 76th percentile for asthma, while areas with higher environmental outcomes are in the Northwestern corner of the city. Long-term exposure may increase the risk of respiratory disease, heart disease, decreased lung function, premature birth, and reduced life expectancy. For Newark, with a high percentage of families with children in the city, addressing environmental issues is vital to addressing environmental justice.

According to an analysis conducted by ESA towards the preparation of an Environmental Justice Element in Newark, the following are major indicators of environmental contamination:


1. Ozone Concentrations,
2. PM 2.5 Concentrations
3. Diesel PM Emissions
4. Drinking-Water Contaminants
5. Pesticide Use
6. Toxic Releases from Facilities
7. Traffic Density
8. Cleanup Sites
9. Groundwater Threats
10. Hazardous Waste Generators and Facilities
11. Impaired Water Bodies
12. Solid Waste Sites and Facilities

Figure 3-13: Environmental Opportunity Score, 2021



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Figure 3-14: CalEnviroScreen and Non-White Population, 2021 and 2018




Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Education

Equitable access to culturally relevant and engaging educational opportunities is foundational in increasing opportunities for all residents. Newark Unified school district has 11 schools in total, with 2 of its eight elementary schools either closed within the past year or scheduled to close in following the 2022 school year. The school board is making the choice to close schools in response to a 6 million dollar budget shortfall, due to declining enrollment.


Figure 3-15: Newark School Enrollment, 2017-2022



Source: Data collected by the California Department of Education (CDE) through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)

The racial and ethnic makeup of the district is highly diverse, with Hispanic/Latinx students comprising the majority of the population at 51.9 percent, followed by Asian at 16.8 percent, White at 10 percent and Filipino at 8.9 percent . Figure 3-16 goes into detail of the full district breakdown.

Figure 3-16: Race and Ethnicity of Newark Unified School District, 2020-2021 School Year



Source: Data collected by the California Department of Education (CDE) through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

Students in the Newark Unified school district have a comparable percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch as Alameda County, at 40.5 percent and 40.7 percent respectively. Both are below the state average at 57.8 percent. Within the district there is a wide range of students that qualify for free and reduced lunch. The California Department of Education district level data for the 2021 to 2022 school year finds Shilling Elementary with the highest percentage of students that qualify for free or reduced lunch at 60 percent, followed by Musick Elementary at 57 percent, one of the schools that is slated to be closed for the 2022-2023 school year, with students distributed among other schools. Schools with the lowest levels of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch are John F Kenedy Elementary school at 23 percent, and Birch Grove Intermediate and Primary schools at 28 and 30 percent respectively.


Table 3-8: Selected District Level Data - 0161234—Newark Unified for the year 2021-2022

School	Free or Reduced Price Meals
Non-public non-sectarian schools	3 (42.9%)
August Schilling Elementary	227 (59.9%)
Birch Grove Intermediate	118 (28.0%)
Birch Grove Primary	108 (30.0%)
Bridgepoint High (Continuation)	29 (46.8%)
Coyote Hills Elementary	260 (50.0%)
Crossroads High (Alternative)	70 (43.2%)
E.L. Musick Elementary	101 (57.4%)
John F. Kennedy Elementary	92 (23.0%)
Lincoln Elementary	174 (46.8%)
Newark Junior High	280 (41.2%)
Newark Memorial High	632 (38.7%)
District Total:	2,094 (40.5%)
County Total:	87,363 (40.7%)
State Totals:	3,404,572 (57.8%)

Source: California Department of Education, 2022

The city asked residents through the housing survey what would need to change to feel that their neighborhood is high in opportunity, and residents identified education as one of the top three things. Educational opportunity is measured by Math and Reading Proficiency, High School Graduation Rate, Student Poverty, High Segregation and Poverty. Overall according to the HCD AFFH Data viewer, the majority of Newark has lower than average education opportunities. The one area of Newark that has more positive educational outcomes is near Birch Grove Primary school. The elementary schools have similar performance levels on state indicators, which indicates the role of student poverty in the classification. We recognize that although measures of achievement such as test scores and levels of poverty are indicators, it is difficult to fully measure what a school means for a community. When Graham Elementary was threatened with closure, the primarily Latinx school community rallied together to share what the school community means to them to the school board in hopes of evading closure. Ultimately the school was combined with Snow elementary to form a new school, Coyote Hills Elementary.

Figure 3-17: Educational Opportunity Index, 2021



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.


Transportation Access and Cost

To better understand housing affordability, it is important to look at transportation costs associated with a location. Figure 3-19 shows the combined housing and transportation costs in Newark. Due to Newark being low density and auto oriented, with a lack of high frequency public transportation options, the majority of households spend more than 45% of their income on housing and transportation. Only 4 percent of households have combined costs less than 30% of income. Newark has no neighborhoods identified as location efficient, with housing that is close to jobs and services, with a number of transportation options. Due to this fact, 49 percent of residents spend 45 to 54 percent of their income on housing, with 23 percent spending 54 to 66 percent.


Currently, Newark is served by Alameda County Transit (AC Transit) bus service. Public transportation is accessible on major arterials such as Newark Blvd, Ceder, and Thorton. Unlike neighboring Union City and Fremont, there is no BART station in Newark, although a number of bus routes do connect with the Fremont BART station. Public transit options are more accessible in the northern portion of the city, with the addition of three school bus lines from AC Transit during the school year to Newark Memorial High School. Residents in our community meeting expressed the desire for more options beyond the personal automobile such as increased bus service and infrastructure for biking to reduce traffic congestion and be responsive to climate change. Newark's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master plan outlines a number of improvements, such as protected bike lanes, pedestrian overpass for train tracks and an increase in the number of bike lanes.

"Housing close to walkable parks and transit. Also need more transit options." – Community comment

Figure 3-18: Alameda County Transit Bus Stops and Proposed Transit Stations, 2022



Source: AC Transit, adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022

Figure 3-19: Housing and Transportation Costs as a Percentage of Income

Source: *The Center for Neighborhood Technology's Housing and Transportation (H+T®) Affordability Index,*


G. Disproportionate Housing Needs for Low-income Households and Protected Classes

Familial Status

The Fair Housing Act (FHA) bans discrimination based on certain protected classes, including "familial status," which refers to the presence of at least one child under 18 years old. Under the FHA, familial status discrimination occurs when a landlord, property manager, real estate agent, or property owner treats someone differently because they have a family with one or more individuals who are under 18 years of age. A "family" also includes people who are pregnant and people who are in the process of securing legal custody of a person under 18 years of age, including a family that is in the process of adopting a child, or foster parents. All families with children are protected by the FHA against familial status discrimination, including single-parent households and same-sex couples with children. Rules that unreasonably restrict children or limit the ability of children to use their housing or the common facilities at the property may violate the FHA. Moreover, enforcing certain rules only against families with children may also violate the FHA. The following are the types of conduct that may violate the FHA:


- Refusing to rent, sell, or negotiate with a family because the family has one or more children under 18 years of age.
- Advertising a preference for households without children or otherwise discouraging such families.
- Telling an individual or family no unit is available even though a unit is in fact available.
- Forcing families into housing units that are larger than necessary.
- Designating certain floors or buildings for families with children, or encouraging families with children to reside in particular areas.
- Charging additional rent, security deposit, or fees because a household has children under 18 years of age.

Figure 3-20: Percentage of Households With Children Under 18 Years of Age, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table B11005

Newark has many family households with an average family size of 3.61 people (ACS 2016-2020). The city has 37 percent of households with a child under 18 years of age. This rate is higher than both Alameda County (32%) and the Bay Area (30.5%). Although discrimination based upon family status has not been reported in Newark, it has been reported at the county level. Households with children face additional challenges accessing housing that meets their needs for both size and cost. Survey results found that when asked what are the most urgent housing needs at this time, 50 percent responded that housing for families was the greatest need.

Figure 3-21: Family Structures in Newark, 2015- 2019

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table S1101

"I would love to see more housing programs accessible for families currently in Newark"

- Community Member


Households headed by one person are often at greater risk of housing insecurity, particularly female headed households, who may be supporting children or a family with only one income. In Newark, the largest proportion of households are Married-Couple Family Households at 75% of total, while Female Headed Households make up 17 percent of all family households and male headed comprise 8 percent. Throughout engagement with the community, the city has heard from residents that housing for families, and single parents in particular is a high need.

"I'm an inside wireman electrician for 26 years. I cannot afford to buy a home in this town as a single father of 2. \$2million per home is ridiculously high. I am a critical worker, not just essential, and cannot afford to stay with these house prices."

Female-headed households with children may face particular housing challenges, with pervasive gender inequality resulting in lower wages for women. Moreover, the added need for childcare can make finding a home that is affordable even more challenging.


Figure 3-24 shows In Newark, 22.8% of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line, while 5.7% of female-headed households without children live in poverty (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012).

Figure 3-22: Percent of Married Couples with Children, 2015- 2019




Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Figure 3-23: Percent of Children in a Female Headed Household, 2015- 2019



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.


Figure 3-24: Poverty Levels of Female Headed Households in Newark, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table B17012

Household Size

Figure 3-25: Comparison of Household Size for Owners and Renters in Alameda County and Newark, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table CP04, Comparative

Housing Characteristics


Seniors

The senior population in Newark has increased significantly since 2010, with a 47 percent increase, compared with a 39 percent increase from Alameda county. This could partially be attributed to the construction of Newark Station, a 75 unit building completed in 2019. Figure 3-27, shows seniors in Newark are overwhelmingly home owners at all income levels, with seniors at the lowest income level having the highest percentage of renters at 37 percent. Housing needs change as we move through life, and due to seniors living on fixed incomes in smaller households, Newark needs housing types and programs to support seniors to age in place and remain in their community.

“Developing a shared housing program with others that need a room to rent, connect seniors with single people who need affordable housing. Helps seniors on limited incomes”


– Community meeting comment

Figure 3-26: Increase of Senior Population, 2010 to 2019



Source: American Community Survey 2015- 2019, 5-Year Estimate

Figure 3-27: Seniors Income Level, Owners and Renters, 2015 -2019



Source: American Community Survey 2015- 2019, 5-Year Estimate

Disability Status

The U.S. Census Bureau defines disability as one of the following: hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, and independent living difficulty. In Newark 3,561 residents over the age of 5 had a disability in 2018. This group equates to approximately 8 percent of the non-institutionalized population over age five in the City, which is slightly lower than the county (10 percent) and lower than the Bay Area (11 percent). Figure 3-28 shows the population of persons with a disability by age in the City. At the local level, seniors in Newark have the highest rates of disability of all age groups at 52 percent. Ambulatory difficulty and independent living were the highest for seniors at 23 and 22 percent, followed by hearing difficulty (13%). African Americans have significantly higher rates of disability compared to other racial and ethnic groups in the city at 22 percent, followed by White residents at 13 percent. Those living with a disability often have specialized housing needs due to living on a fixed or limited incomes, physical or intellectual disabilities or increased health care costs. This points toward a need for housing that incorporates universal design, is integrated within the community, in close proximity to public transportation, and supports seniors to age in place.

In conversation with Darin Lounds, executive director of the Housing Development Consortium of the East Bay, he shared a number of ways that the city of Newark can support inclusive housing options for people with developmental disabilities:


- Work with tax credit developers in larger multi families, to have a percentage devoted to people with disabilities. It is key for jurisdictions to work with developers when they are proposing new developments.
- Transit lines are most important. Only 10% of the demographic own a vehicle. Parking needs are more of a commercial need to provide services, less of a residential need.
- Discrimination: when property owners hear the income is SSI or disability, or someone with visible disability, they form assumptions about their ability to maintain a home. The regional center helps people to live in the community, they have a circle of support.
- Maximum integration is key, not just a big building with one demographic

Table 3-9: Residents With A Disability, Newark and Region, 2015- 2019

Geography	No disability	With a disability	Percentage
Newark	43,583	3,561	8%
Alameda County	1,496,381	151,368	10%
Bay Area	6,919,762	735,533	11%


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year estimate 2015-2019. Table B18101

Figure 3-28: Disability Status By Age, 2016- 2020




Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Table S1810

Figure 3-29: Newark Senior Population with Disability, 65 years and Older, 2016- 2020



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Disability Characteristics, Table S1810

Figure 3-30: Disability Status by Race, 2016- 2020



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Disability Characteristics, Table S1810


Cost Burden and Overpayment

From 2010-2019, Newark has experienced large increases in both rental and homeownership costs. Two-bedroom rents increased by 45 percent, while two-bedroom home prices have increased by 122 percent (Costar, 2010 and 2019 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates, Redfin). The growth in housing costs has outpaced the growth in income leading to large numbers of households cost burdened and experiencing homelessness.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30% of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In Newark, 44 percent of households spend 30%-50% of their income on housing, while 14 percent of households are severely cost burdened and use the majority of their income for housing. Over time, households have become increasingly cost burdened, with a 20 percent increase from 2010 to 2019. Figure 3-31 shows how households in Newark are cost burdened by income. While residents are cost burdened and severely cost burdened at all income levels, residents making below 50 percent area median income experience the highest levels. Fifty-seven percent of residents earning up to 30 percent of the area median income are severely cost burdened, with 22 percent spending 30 to 50 percent of their income on housing. Homeowners Median income households are still finding themselves costburden with 60 percent of households making 50 to 80 percent of median income are cost burdened.


Figure 3-33 shows that renters are more likely to be cost burdened, with twice the number of renters (30%) spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing compared to 16 percent of homeowners, and 14 percent of renters are severely cost burdened. This places renters at a greater risk of living in overcrowded housing, displacement and homelessness.

Figure 3-31: Cost Burden Renter Households in Newark Over Time, 2015- 2019




Source: American Community Survey 2015-2019, 5-Year Estimate

Figure 3-32: Cost Burdened by Income, 2013- 2017




Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy. ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

Figure 3-33: Cost Burdened Households, Renters and Homeowners, 2015- 2019




US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 year data, 2015-2019, Table B25070, B25091

Figure 3-34: Overpayment by Renters, 2015- 2019



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Figure 3-35: Overpayment by Homeowners, 2015- 2019




Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Cost Burdened Households by Race

Residents who are cost burdened in Newark are disproportionately experienced by some ethnic groups more than others. Figure 3-36 exhibits the changing demographics of being cost burdened in Newark. Black (41%), Indigenous (46%), Multi Racial (46%), and Latinx (47%) residents are the highest cost burdened, and most vulnerable to displacement, overcrowding and homelessness. Asian and White residents are the least cost burdened at 27 percent and 21 percent respectively.

Figure 3-36: Cost Burdened Residents by Race, 2013-2017



Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release Note: Hispanic category is not exclusive of other categories.

Overcrowding

An overcrowded household is defined as having more than one person per room, with severe overcrowding with more than 1.5 people sharing a room. Often immigrant communities, low income families and renter-occupied households are more likely to experience household overcrowding. Referred to as "doubling up"—living with family members or friends for economic reasons—is the most commonly reported living situation for families and individuals before experiencing homelessness.¹⁰ Renters in Newark are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions than homeowners. Figure 3-37 shows renters experience overcrowding at 3 times the rate as homeowners at 18 percent, and severe overcrowding at 9 percent.

Central Newark in the Old Town area has 9 percent of households experiencing overcrowded housing, with 5 percent of households experiencing extreme overcrowding in the Northwest corner of the city. As shown in Figure 3-39, these two areas are predominantly occupied by communities of color, with 80 to 100 percent of residents in the Old Town area. Mixed race residents face the highest rates at 33 percent, followed by Hispanic/ Latinx (30%) and Indigenous residents at 22 percent. The Old Town Neighborhood specific plan has zoning changes that


¹⁰ Healthy Communities Data and Indicators Project, California Department of Public Health, Percent of Household Overcrowding, 2017

remove constraints to the production of affordable housing. The upcoming development in the Old Town neighborhood by Satellite Affordable Housing, will provide 56 units of affordable housing, a quarter are 3 bedrooms specifically for large families.

“Families that are doubled up, tripled up can really use some programs that help them find more suitable accommodations in the community they want to stay in”


– Community meeting breakout session comment

Figure 3-37: Percent of Owner and Renter Households Living in Crowded Conditions, 2013- 2017




U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), ACS Tabulation 2013-2017

Figure 3-38: Overcrowding by Race and Ethnicity, 2015- 2019



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5 year data, 2015-2019, Table B25014

Figure 3-39: Overcrowding and Severe Overcrowding in Newark and Non-White Population, 2015- 2019 and 2018



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.


Housing Choice Vouchers and Subsidized Housing Developments

Newark has seen minimal development of subsidized housing, with three subsidized senior housing developments in the city, and a fourth subsidized senior housing development under construction with 79 units. The use of housing choice vouchers is low in Newark, with the majority of the city seeing a 5 to 15 percent use, and the remainder with 5 percent or less. Table 3-10 details the current subsidized housing in Newark. The city has 274 low income units at a low risk of conversion, with no units at the moderate, high and very high income brackets. The majority of subsidized housing in Newark is found in moderate resource areas, with one development in a low resource designated area

Table 3-10: Housing Units at Risk of Conversion, 2022

Name	Address	Affordable Units	Total Units	Active Program(s)	Risk Level	2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map Designation
Newark Station Seniors	37433 Willow Street, Newark	74	75	LIHTC	Low	Low resource
Rosemont aka Newark Gardens I	35300 Cedar Blvd, Newark	150	150	HUD	Low	Moderate resource
Newark Gardens II	35322 Cedar Blvd, Newark	50	50	HUD	Low	Moderate resource

Source: California Housing Partnership, 2022


Figure 3-40: Subsidized Housing and Housing Choice Vouchers, 2021

Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Rates of Homeownership


Homeownership in the United States has functioned as the key to generational wealth. Due to historic discrimination from the federal government, the real estate industry, BIPOC communities have lower homeownership rates in comparison to White residents. Addressing disparities between races in rates of homeownership is one way to address historic discrimination and access to wealth, furthering fair housing work. Newark has higher rates of homeownership at 69 percent, than Alameda County (54%) and the Bay Area (56%). Figure 3-42 shows homeowners in Newark are predominantly identified as White and Asian, with the lowest rates of homeownership being found with Indigenous, Black and Hispanic or Latinx residents. This corresponds with rates of acceptance for mortgages. Figure 3-43 shows that White and Asian residents have the highest rate of loan approval with Indigenous and Hispanic/ Latinx residents having the highest rates of application denied.

Figure 3-41: Housing Tenure in Newark, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5 year data, 2015-2019, Table B25003


Figure 3-42: Rates of Homeownership by Race, 2015- 2019



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5 year data, 2015-2019, Table B25003

Mortgage Loan Access/Rates of Denial Loan Access/Rates of Denial

Figure 3-43: Mortgage Applications and Acceptance by Race, 2018-2019



Source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Councils (FFIEC) Home Mortgage Disclosure Act Loan/ Application register Files

Substandard Housing

Concern over increased risk of displacement due to code enforcement violations has prompted a look at how substandard housing is addressed in communities. The majority of the community’s housing stock is older than 40 years old, which can increase the need for repairs. Oftentimes it is low income renters and homeowners that will be living in substandard housing conditions. While rates of substandard housing, including housing without kitchen or bathroom facilities, is less than one percent, these units could be underreported. As described in section 2 of the housing needs assessment, the neighborhoods of Mirabeau and Old Town / Central Newark through code enforcement data show significant need of rehabilitation. Currently Newark is responsive to code enforcement reports of housing in need of repair, and is planning to develop a new system for addressing code violations that reduce the risk of housing being removed from the market.

Program H1.2 outlines how the city will develop a rental inspection program that will provide a structured process for property owners to address code violations. There will be a process of reinspection, and the creation of an online reporting process for tenants. **Program H1.1 Programs for housing repair and rehabilitation** works to expand upon the existing program, to incorporate targeted outreach to identified neighborhoods of need.

People Experiencing Homelessness

The City has provided continuous support for regional efforts to end homelessness, such as the Alameda County EveryOne Home Program, which prioritizes supportive housing. Newark adopted a resolution declaring a shelter crisis, and authorized the City's participation in the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP).

People experiencing homelessness have steadily increased at the county level since 2017, with 9,747 sheltered and unsheltered people at the most recent point in time count on February 22, 2022. The city of Newark has a documented reduction from 89 people experiencing homelessness in 2019, to 58 people in 2022. Data from a 2021 Newark Police Department report provides an overview of unsheltered persons in Newark including known encampments:


- Eucalyptus Grove (Highway 84, north of Jarvis Avenue)
- Highway 84 Eastbound off-ramp to Newark Boulevard
- Residence Inn hotel area (near the off-ramp)
- Sycamore Street at the Union Pacific railroad tracks
- Thornton Avenue at Interstate 880
- Home Depot and surrounding businesses parking lot

Housing and homeless support is the most prevalent service request for Newark callers to the countywide 2-1-1 referral service, representing about 42% of all service requests. Newark residents are seeking referrals for low cost rental listings, rent payment and deposit assistance, supportive and transitional housing, emergency shelter, among other services (Eden I&R Referral Service, January 2020 through March 2022). Currently Second Chance provides transitional housing for those experiencing homelessness in Newark. The facility has 32 beds, with the shelter at 81 % capacity on the point in time count. The city has engaged in a number of actions to address homelessness in Newark. There is a partnership with the Fremont Family Resource Center to provide support to Newark households at risk of becoming homeless, and has been awarded a HomeKey grant to convert the Towne Place Suites extended stay hotel into 124 supportive, affordable residential units known as Cedar Community Apartments. Most recently the city has created a Homelessness Committee with members from various City departments to develop a cohesive plan to address homelessness.

Through community engagement, the city has been alerted to the high number of residents experiencing homelessness that are finding shelter in local motels. The challenge with this is that these populations are uncounted, so while the city does not have a full sense of how many individuals and families are there, through communication with parent liaisons with the Newark Unified School district and from a community member experiencing homelessness that those residing in the hotels hold jobs outside of the home, but due to a variety of issues such as the cost of housing, requirements such as three times the income, and credit scores, these community members are kept from accessing stable housing.

Although the documented number of people experiencing homelessness in Newark is low, there are high rates of racial disparity compared to the population of Newark and Alameda County as a whole. As exhibited in Figure 3-46, although the African American population in Newark is 3 percent, they make up 27 percent of the population experiencing homelessness. The Latinx population of Newark is almost equal to that of those experiencing homelessness at 31 percent. White residents have the highest rate of residents experiencing homelessness at 58%, with their portion of the population in Newark at 29 percent.

Figure 3-44: Total Count of People Experiencing Homelessness For The Point In Time Count On February 22, 2022



Source: 2022 Point in Time Count. Everyone Count, February 22, 2022.

Figure 3-45: Unsheltered Individuals in Newark and Alameda County, 2022

Unsheltered Homelessness Data Summary



32 Individuals

Were observed as being unsheltered in Newark



7,135 Individuals

Were observed as being unsheltered in Alameda County.

<1% of *unsheltered* Individuals in Alameda County Live in Newark


Unsheltered Population by Location



	Tent	Car/Van	RV	Street/Outside	Abandoned Building
Newark 2022	11 (36%)	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	7 (22%)	0 (0%)
Alameda County 2022	2216 (31%)	2318 (32%)	1600 (22%)	958 (13%)	43 (1%)

Source: 2022 Point in Time Count. Everyone Count, February 22nd 2022.

Figure 3-46: Sheltered Individuals by Race, 2022



Source: 2022 Point in Time Count. Everyone Count, February 22nd 2022.

Access to affordable, stable housing is foundational for children and their families to be healthy - mentally and physically and support student success in school. Over the past few years the pandemic has amplified the disparities in housing, and with learning transferring online, many students did not have the resources to make that transition. Although schools have returned to in-person teaching, the number of families that are still struggling to access resources and affordable housing are high.

In Newark, the student population experiencing homelessness totaled 300 during the 2019-20 school year and increased by 9 percent since the 2016-17 school year. By comparison, Alameda County has seen a 18.7 percent decrease in the population of students experiencing homelessness since the 2016-17 school year, and the Bay Area population of students experiencing homelessness decreased by eight percent. During the 2019-2020 school year, there were still some 13,718 students experiencing homelessness throughout the region, adding undue burdens on learning and thriving, with the potential for longer term negative effects.

The number of students in Newark experiencing homelessness in 2019 represents **10.5 percent of the Alameda County total and two percent of the Bay Area total.**

In the most recent school year (2021-22), NUSD had 251 students that were homeless (about 5% of all students), which further indicates the lack of affordable housing. Notably, about 96 percent of homeless students in Newark are students of color, with over 167 of these students being Hispanic or Latino. While NUSD has only a small number of Pacific Islander students (98 students),

about 10.8 percent of them are homeless (Source: California Department of Education (ED-Data)).

Table 3-11: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness, 2016 to 2020

Academic Year	Newark	Alameda County	Bay Area
2016-17	275	3,531	14,990
2017-18	236	3,309	15,142
2018-19	192	3,182	15,427
2019-20	300	2,870	13,718

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools. Notes: The California Department of Education considers students to be homeless if they are unsheltered, living in temporary shelters for people experiencing homelessness, living in hotels/motels, or temporarily doubled up and sharing the housing of other persons due to the loss of housing or economic hardship. The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography. Source: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020). This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table HOMEELS-05.

Farmworkers


The number of farmworkers living in Newark has declined over the years, with the student population at 57 students for the 2019-2020 school year. The previous years saw 79 students for 2017-2018 and 72 for the 2018 to 2019 school year. Table 3-12 shows the trends for both Alameda county and the greater Bay Area see a similar decline in the migrant farmworker student population. Generally, the number of farmworkers living in Alameda county has been declining since 2012, with fewer than 400 residents working in the industry in a permanent position. It is important to recognize that farmworkers could be under-counted by the census due to their migrant nature. Farming and farmworkers are a significant element of the state's economy, but play less of a role in the Bay Area. Due to lower wages, language barriers, and inconsistent work, farmworkers can have difficulty securing housing, and for these reasons could experience overcrowding and substandard housing conditions.

Table 3-12: Migrant Farmworker Student Population, 2016 to 2020

Geography	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-2020
Newark	75	79	72	57
Alameda County	874	1,037	785	790
Bay Area	4,630	4,607	4,075	3,976

Source: California Department of education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data system, Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

Figure 3-47: Permanent and Seasonal Farmworkers at the County Level, 2002 to 2017



Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Census of Farmworkers (2002,2007,2012,2017), Table 7: Hired Farm Labor.
 Note: Farm workers are considered seasonal if they work on a farm less than 150 days a year, while farm workers who work on a farm more than 150 days are considered to be permanent workers for that farm.

Gentrification and Displacement

“It is really sad to see what is happening to our little old town of Newark. I moved here back in 1995 to raise my family. It was a small town and where I wanted to raise my family. My children are NUSD and now currently in college. The Tech Giants have moved into our backyards causing GENTRIFICATION raising rents that our families can't afford. Forcing them to leave and for some to become homeless sleeping in their cars with school-aged children. Also the high number of Homeless on our streets with mental health issues on the corners of all freeways intersections. How is it that we all live in one-million-dollar houses and see all this around us? This breaks my heart we need to see more affordable housing, rent control, good schools with proper equal education for all of our students in our community. All the tech giants use these Big Charter buses to send their employees to Facebook, Google, and Yahoo. Newark should start charging them a fee so that we can have funds available to provide free tutoring for school-aged students struggling in math.”

– Newark Resident

Defining Sensitive Communities: (Urban Displacement Project, 2020)

Communities sensitive to displacement were measured through a number of indicators. Neighborhoods with a high proportion of residents vulnerable to displacement in the case of rising housing costs, and market-based displacement pressures present in and/or near the community. Communities were designated sensitive if they currently have populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased redevelopment and drastic shifts in housing cost. Vulnerability includes metrics for the share of very low income residents, share of renters, share of people of color, and share of very low income households (50% AMI or below) that are severely rent burdened (spending 50% of income on rent). Market-based displacement pressures include percent change in rent between 2012-2017 above county median rent increases.

The City of Newark has grown its job base by 37% since 2010, significantly outpacing the County's job growth, which was also strong. While the City has a higher share of job growth in high-paying industries compared to the County, over 40% of the City's job growth still came from lower wage industries paying less than \$75,000 a year. Currently, residents are unable to find housing at a cost and requirements accessible to them, which has led to residents finding shelter in motels. Concern around gentrification is a consistent narrative from residents, many of whom find themselves unable to find housing in a city they have grown up in, and have community connections.

*"Programas de vivienda que combaten la gentrificación." (Housing programs that combat gentrification)
- Community Meeting Comment*

Figure 3-49 shows areas in Newark that are vulnerable to gentrification and displacement, according to the 2017 study from the Urban Displacement Project, University of California, Berkeley. The area corresponds to a majority of BIPOC populations with an average of 82 percent non white, specifically Hispanic/ Latinx communities, cost burdened and overcrowded households.

The city of Newark has a number of redevelopment projects underway in the Old Town Area, Bayside, and ParkPlace. These projects are working to add more housing to the city through the redevelopment of industrial land into a walkable neighborhood close to commuter rail, repurpose an aging shopping mall, and revitalize a historic district.

Old Town

Old Town is the historic commercial district of Newark that has experienced disinvestment over the years. The neighborhood has a history of a variety of housing types and businesses, with a number of food manufacturing and local restaurants. The Old Town Specific plan looks to revitalize the neighborhood, making it more pedestrian friendly and implement zoning changes to bring higher density housing and mixed use buildings into the neighborhood.

The area has lower rents than the surrounding areas of the city, and is home to a predominantly


Hispanic/ Latinx population of residents and associated small businesses (fig 3-49). The neighborhood has the highest level of low income residents, with 53 percent of renters cost burdened.

With improvements to the Dumbarton transportation corridor, connecting Newark and the surrounding area to Silicon Valley, this will open up the area for increased development pressure that could result in displacement of existing residents and small businesses.

Bayside Newark


Bayside Newark is a 200-acre planned neighborhood on land previously used for industrial production and manufacturing. The city is implementing a specific plan for a walkable neighborhood with a variety of housing types, recreational open space, and everyday services adjacent to the future Dumbarton rail line. Although there was no residential or small business in the planning area, it is still important to note the impact that the commuter rail line and the inclusion of hundreds of new market rate housing units will have on the demographics of the city.

Figure 3-48: Map of Plan and Dumbarton Corridor, 2010



Source: Dahlin Group, 2010

Figure 3-49: Areas in Newark Vulnerable to Displacement and Percentage of Communities of Color, 2018 and 2022



Source: HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Displacement From Environmental Hazards

Environmental hazards can cause both physical and social vulnerabilities specifically in low income, disabled, and BIPOC communities. Many communities and households face social vulnerabilities that are intensified during the short- and long-term recovery period after a disaster. Access to information, housing, and social services are disrupted during and after a disaster, straining local housing markets and service providers. Due to the lack of affordable housing due to a mismatch between housing costs and income, communities are vulnerable to local shocks such as a natural disaster. For households that were struggling to find and/or maintain affordable housing before a major event, resulting in displacement of residents and an increase in homelessness. These events also compromise the ability for residents with disabilities to find accessible temporary shelter.


Newark is susceptible to multiple major types of environmental hazards that are visible through the Association of Bay Area Governments Hazard Viewer: Flooding due to sea level rise, tsunamis, and earthquakes. Figure 3-50 of the FEMA flood map shows extreme flooding at the 100 year flood line, engulfing much of the southern portion of the city. At the 500 year flood level, the flooding will move well into established housing, schools and commercial establishments. Flooding most significantly affects areas that are identified as high in opportunity currently, but also encroaches on areas in the city that have been identified as vulnerable to displacement through the Urban Displacement Project.

With Newark being in close proximity to the Hayward fault line, there is the possibility of severe shaking in the event of an earthquake. Residents in our community survey cited multi-year drought as their greatest environmental concern at 52 percent, followed by flooding and sea level rise (44%) and earthquakes (35%). In our community meeting, concern about development in sensitive areas was highlighted, especially ensuring that vulnerable residents are aware of the environmental hazards in their neighborhood.

“Restrict or limit construction of new development in zones or overlay areas that have been identified or designated as hazardous areas to avoid or minimize impacts to coastal resources and property from sea level rise impacts.”

– Community meeting comment

Figure 3-50: 100 Year and 500 Year Flooding Projections for the City of Newark



Source: Association of Bay Area Governments Hazard Viewer


H. AFFH Analysis of Sites

State law, Government Code Section 65583(c)(10), requires the sites analysis to be analyzed with respect to AFFH to ensure that affordable housing is dispersed equitably throughout the City rather than concentrated in areas of high segregation and poverty or low resource areas that have historically been underserved. By comparing the sites inventory to the fair housing indicators in this assessment, this section analyzes whether the sites included in the 2023-2031 Housing Element sites inventory improve or exacerbate patterns of segregation, fair housing conditions, and access to opportunity throughout the City.

Newark was allocated a total of 1,874 new housing units to plan for during the Sixth Cycle Housing Element planning period. This RHNA allocation includes 464 very low-, 268 low-, 318 moderate-, and 824 above moderate-income units. Using data and research from the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Tool 1.0, Table 3-13 presents the housing unit capacity and existing conditions as they relate to indicators of fair housing analyzed in this assessment for each census tract in the city. For more information about the indicators, refer to the local assessment discussed previously in this chapter. The census tracts and sites inventory are mapped and shown in Figure 3-51. Newark has several physical constraints that present challenges in developing the sites inventory and planning for future growth. These constraints include sensitive wetland habitat and flood plains along the western city boundary and limited vacant land. Because of these constraints, sites included in the 2023-2031 Housing Element inventory are largely located in specific plan areas that are redeveloping existing shopping malls and former industrial lands, with several additional sites located in the Old Town/ Central area.

Newark is a racially and ethnically diverse city, with higher levels of segregation than neighboring jurisdictions such as Union City. As shown in the Table 3-13 BIPOC residents are the majority of the population in all census tracts. Residents identifying as Hispanic/ Latinx compose the largest segments of the population in census tract 4443.02 (Bayside/ Old Town), and census tract 4444 (Old Town/ Central Newark). The sites inventory provides some opportunity to balance the distribution of the various racial/ethnic groups in the city as well as access to opportunity, as sites at all income levels are found in areas with high opportunity and lower predominance of Hispanic/ Latino populations. The sites in NewPark Place, Birchwood, Bayside /Old Town, and Old Town/Central Newark open up opportunities to diversify the area through income and race/ethnicity. Although there are no sites included in the inventory in the northern neighborhoods of the city (Lake-Rosemont, Mirabeau, and Mayhews Landing), proposed programs will work to address the concentration in specific neighborhoods and open up single family neighborhoods to new missing middle housing types identified through community engagement as filling a crucial need for large and small households throughout the city.

Figure 3-51: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle



Source: Community Planning Collaborative, 2023.

Table 3-13: Distribution of Housing Capacity by Census Tract with AFFH Indicators

					RHNA Capacity			AFFH Indicators									
								Integration and Segregation						Access to Opportunity	Displacement Risk		
Census Tract	Neighborhood	Total Households	Owner Households	Renter Households	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Median Household Income	AMI less than 50%	AMI 50 - 80%	AMI 80 - 100%	AMI greater than 100%	Hispanic / Latino	Non-White Population	Disability Rate	Resource Designation	Overcrowding Rate
4441	Lake-Rosemont	2,573	2,162	411	0	0	0	\$116,812	20%	8%	10%	62%	28%	74%	10%	Moderate Resource	0%
4442	Mirabeau Park	1,887	1,484	403	0	0	9	\$126,028	14%	12%	9%	64%	35%	81%	7%	Moderate Resource	2%
4443.01	Mayhews Landing	1,189	862	327	0	0	0	\$121,156	11%	6%	12%	72%	38%	76%	8%	Moderate Resource	2%
4443.02	Bayside/ Old Town	1,500	762	738	70	21	649	\$105,188	24%	12%	13%	51%	66%	89%	6%	Moderate Resource	6%
4444	Old Town / Central Newark	1,519	848	671	201	44	120	\$93,094	19%	13%	19%	49%	59%	86%	8%	Moderate Resource	0%
4445	Old Town / Central Newark	2,025	879	1,146	118	42	36	\$109,441	16%	14%	9%	60%	21%	88%	7%	Moderate Resource	5%
4446.01	Birch Grove	1,779	1,543	236	155	1	296	\$139,119	9%	11%	4%	76%	18%	84%	7%	High Resource	0%
4446.02	NewPark Place	1,575	1,129	446	178	18	536	\$128,229	14%	5%	8%	74%	11%	90%	5%	High Resource	0%

Source: Community Planning Collaborative, City of Newark. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.


Potential Effects of Segregation and Integration

Race and Ethnicity

In Newark, neighborhoods are predominantly Hispanic/ Latinx. Lake-Rosemont and Birch Grove Neighborhoods are the only neighborhoods in the city where White residents have a slim or sizable gap. The NewPark Place and Sanctuary West areas throughout the city have a predominantly Asian population (composed of a mix of different ethnicities). Generally, the sites inventory will provide some opportunity to balance the distribution of the various racial/ethnic groups in the city. As described above, Hispanic/ Latinx residents are the most segregated group and Asian residents are the most isolated compared to other groups. The sites inventory will not exacerbate segregation by race and ethnicity in Newark due to the high numbers of housing sites in areas that are predominantly Hispanic/ Latinx and Asian, providing new opportunities for housing mobility in the city.

Using the residential sites identified in the site inventory, we look to understand how new housing will impact segregation and integration of race, ethnicity and income level. Figure 3-52 shows the majority of identified sites are concentrated in the areas with a predominantly Latinx/Hispanic population. These areas correspond with the Old Town specific plan, that increases zoning to encourage investment in affordable housing and the transit oriented nature of Bayside Newark. In the Birchwood area, with the highest median incomes in the city, two housing projects, one the Timber Affordable senior housing project and the second, the E-Z 8 Motel site will provide 184 low and moderate income homes, and opportunities for those of other races with lower incomes in an area that has a slim white majority. The redevelopment of NewPark Mall, within the NewPark Place area, will provide 174 low and moderate income units in a high resource neighborhood with a predominantly Asian population. While the increase in above moderate income housing in areas that are predominantly low and moderate income will increase the diversity of incomes and increased investment in the area, it can also lead to higher rents for the surrounding households, and displacement. In response to the concentration of housing opportunity sites located in the central and southern portions of the city, Newark will be implementing a number of programs to expand housing development and housing choice for multiple incomes throughout the city. Programs include: Program H2.1 SB9 and SB10 ordinance as well as H2.8 Zoning for Missing Middle Housing, H2.2 to reduce constraints and expand accessibility for ADU production, in order to achieve a greater geographic diversity of housing type and location. Program H2.6 looks at public school sites in Newark as locations for affordable housing to district employees, and has the potential to both provide affordable family sized housing and increase access to opportunities throughout the city.

Figure 3-52: Sites by Racial Predominance, 2010



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.


Income

Newark has a population with a high median income, with 50% of residents making more than 100 percent of the median income. Despite this, there is still a large population of residents who are low income, with 10 percent of residents making less than 30 percent of the median income and 13 percent with moderate incomes. Through a variety of programs, the City is working to increase the development of housing for all income types, including housing for those with extremely low incomes, seniors, large families and those with moderate incomes. The Housing Element includes programs to establish development standards that facilitate missing middle housing that is affordable to middle-income households in single-family neighborhoods (Program H2.8) and promoting the development of ADUs throughout the city (Program H2.2).

Fifty percent of sites (2,075 units) are located within the NewParkPlace and the areas, which have a median income of \$139,000. The NewParkPlace developments have 28 percent of the total low income units, the largest number of low income units in the city, along with the largest percentage

of above moderate units at 58 percent. Although the lower income sites are distributed amongst The Old Town/ Central, Bayside, Birch Grove and NewParkPlace areas, these census tracts have a range of median incomes between \$93,094 to \$1390,111, and accounts for 91 percent of the lower-income capacity, 84 percent of the moderate-income capacity, and a majority (2,291 units) of the above-moderate income capacity. The sites in the Bayside /Old Town area are zoned for a variety of housing options to be built, with the greatest capacity of low and moderate income sites which will in turn help to diversify income levels in the area. Table 3-14 show that 23 percent of the lower-income sites are in census tracts with incomes below \$93,000. This is driven by the capacity on sites in the Old Town/ Central area along Thornton Boulevard and works to ensure that housing is affordable to existing residents in order to support them to stay in place as investments come to the area. The sites inventory for all other income levels (i.e., lower-income sites, moderate income sites, mixed income sites, and pipeline projects) will not have a significant impact on patterns of segregation and integration by the remaining fair housing indicators including familial status and disability status due the even distribution of those populations in the City.

Figure 3-53: Site Distribution by Median Income, 2015- 2019




Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Table 3-14: Site Distribution by Median Income, 2015- 2019

Census Tract	Neighborhood	Lower income		Moderate income		Above Moderate		Total Units		Median Household Income	AMI less than 50%	AMI 50 - 80%	AMI 80 - 100%	AMI greater than 100%
		units	%	units	%	units	%	units	%					
4441	Lake-Rosemont	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	\$ 116,812	20%	8%	10%	62%
4442	Mirabeau Park	0	0%	0	0%	9	0.5%	9	0.4%	\$ 126,028	14%	12%	9%	64%
4443.01	Mayhews Landing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	\$ 121,156	11%	6%	12%	72%
4443.02	Gateway / Bayshore/ old Town	70	10%	21	17%	649	39%	740	30%	\$ 105,188	24%	12%	13%	51%
4444	Old Town / Central Newark	201	28%	44	35%	120	7%	365	15%	\$ 93,094	19%	13%	19%	49%
4445	Old Town / Central Newark	118	16%	42	33%	36	2%	196	8%	\$ 109,441	16%	14%	9%	60%
4446.01	Birch Grove	155	21%	1	1%	296	18%	452	18%	\$ 139,119	9%	11%	4%	76%
4446.02	NewPark Place	178	25%	18	14%	536	33%	732	29%	\$ 128,229	14%	5%	8%	74%

Source: Community Planning Collaborative, 2023.

Figure 3-54: Site Distribution By Percent of Low and Moderate Income Residents, 2015- 2019



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Potential Effects on Access to Opportunity

According to 2022 TCAC data, Newark is a mix of moderate and high resource areas. The Birchwood, NewParkPlace areas comprise Newark’s high resource areas, while the rest of the city is considered moderate resource areas, as highlighted in Figure 3-56. Newark does not have any low resource areas, areas of high segregation, or highest resource areas.

A percentage breakdown of proposed and sites zoned for housing by resource area in Figure 3-56 shows that 46 percent of low income units are located in high resource areas. A significant percentage of planned and proposed moderate income housing, 85 percent, are located in moderate resource areas as are 54 percent for low income units. For the most part, both low and above moderate housing are relatively evenly distributed across moderate and high resource areas. While a high percentage of moderate units are planned and proposed for moderate resource areas, this figure does not take into account the additional units expected from missing


middle and ADU programs which will be prioritized for high resource areas.

In the higher resource areas there is a mix of housing both in the pipeline for development and sites identified for new housing. Pipeline projects include site 9, Cedar Community Apartments, a HomeKey project that provides 124 units of housing for those with extremely low incomes. The focus will be on providing housing for those that are homeless and those at risk of homelessness, with 11 units reserved for veterans that have experienced homelessness. The redevelopment of NewPark Mall consists of two mixed income projects providing housing for very low, low and moderate income households, and one pipeline project serving those with above moderate incomes. Pipeline and housing opportunity sites in the Birchwood and NewPark Place areas will provide 352 units of low and moderate income housing in high opportunity areas. By providing housing opportunities for very low, low and moderate income households in high resourced areas the city is addressing the need to expand housing choices available to those looking for affordable housing close to shopping, parks, transportation and quality schools and support vulnerable populations.

Newark is making targeted investments in the Old Town/ Bayside area, with active transportation infrastructure improvements connected to the Old Town Specific Plan and the Bicycle master plan, and supporting small businesses and community members through facade improvement grants for small businesses in the Old Town area and the construction of a family resource center. See the chapter on transportation and the Public Realm for more details on city lead investments. These investments will provide needed improvements in an area that is lower income than surrounding areas.

Environmental Outcomes

Figure 3-55: Site Distribution by CalEnviroScreen Percentile Score, 2021



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2023. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool and CalEnviroScreen Data

CalEnviroScreen is a mapping tool that helps identify California communities that are most affected by many sources of pollution, and where people are often especially vulnerable to pollution’s effects. The tool uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic information to produce scores at the census tract level and is indexed allowed for cross community comparison. Tracts with high scores experience a much higher pollution burden than areas with low scores.

As displayed in Figure 3-55 above, sites identified by Newark as being suitable for accommodating lower-income RHNA housing during the planning period are located in areas with low to very-low levels of environmental risk. Both planned and proposed projects and sites zoned for housing are in areas with a relatively low incidence of environmental contamination per CalEnviroScreen.

Environmental Quality

Bayside Newark

This project area includes 233 acres of land that historically has contained various industrial, manufacturing, chemical processing and salt production facilities since the early twentieth century. Due to the history of industrial use on the site, the city has remediated portions of the site. One form of contamination was a groundwater plume that exists in shallow groundwater beneath portions of the Plan area. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is directing mitigation of this groundwater plume in collaboration with the Alameda County Water District (ACWD). Some properties within the Specific Plan area also contain soil impacted hazardous substances. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is directing the remediation of impacted soils at these properties.

The specific plan includes neighborhood focused retail, new infrastructure to support new residential and commercial development, new parks and the Bayside Trail, as well as new residential units in a variety of sizes and types.

Old Town Specific Plan Area

Central Newark and sites within the Old Town Specific Plan are at high risk of exposure to particulates from diesel fuel. In an effort to increase health equity in the area, and create a safer environment for walking and biking, the city will conduct a truck route study in 2023, looking to remove semi trucks from using Thornton avenue in the old town district.

Transportation and the Public Realm

Through public participation, pedestrian improvements and access to public transportation have been consistent themes that are associated with opportunity for a variety of populations, as well as being conscientious of climate change and the environment.

Figure 3-57 shows the distribution of housing sites and bus routes in Newark. We have heard from the disability community that having affordable housing in close proximity to transit is important for their community. There is also an understanding that transportation can be a significant expense, to providing housing in close proximity to transportation, new developments can lessen the cost burden and support more sustainable development.

In 2017 Newark City Council approved the Pedestrian and Bicycle master plan, in order to prioritize and implement infrastructure improvements and educational/enforcement programs that will improve the biking and walking environment in Newark. The following is an overview of pedestrian and bicycle improvements to be undertaken during the Housing Element cycle:

- Cherry street will be improved by a class 4 separated bike lane from Central Ave to Stevenson blvd.
- The Central ave overpass, with an estimated completion in 2025, will eliminate railroad grade crossing for pedestrians, creating a separated crossing at Sycamore and Filbert, make it easier for pedestrians to cross safely, and the addition of new bike lanes
- In Old Town, with an estimated completion date of 2025 there will be bike and pedestrian improvements: a road diet, widened sidewalks, bike lanes where there are none, high visibility crosswalks.
- The Bay Trail will be extended through the Bayside Newark development
- The city has received grant funding to add sidewalks and for the development of a cycle track on Thornton ave, between Gateway blvd and Hickory street, to improve access to the wildlife refuge. This will add bike lanes to the west side to make it safer to access the wildlife refuge. Estimated project completion will be in 2029.
- Grant funding to install the rapid fire beacons where the residents have expressed concerns over safe crossing, especially for students. One is planned for Old Town at Mulberry street, and near the Bayshore district on Enterprise drive.


Through area specific plans, Newark is investing in their public realm through pedestrian improvements for active transportation and pedestrian safety through more human scale streets. The Old Town Specific plan will be directing infrastructure investments in the form of streetscape improvements, such as wider sidewalks, bike lanes, high visibility crosswalks and traffic calming. Through the Old Town Area, Thornton Avenue will be reduced to slow traffic and increase space for walking and biking. Public art and new gathering spaces will support placemaking efforts to celebrate Newark past and present.

Table 3-15: Sites along transit lines and High or Moderate Opportunity Areas, 2022

Housing Site	Specific Plan Area and / or Opportunity area	Pedestrian Improvements
14	High Resource (NewPark Place)	
5, 6, 7, 13, 17, 22	High Resource (Birchwood)	
8, 9, 16, 19, 21, 28	Moderate Resource (Old Town)	Changes will be made to Thornton Ave to facilitate safer walking and biking in the area. There will be traffic calming measures, bike lanes and wider sidewalks.
10, 15, 20, 21, 24, 25	Moderate Resource (Old Town / Central Newark)	


Source: Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2022, ACTrans 2022, City of Newark

Figure 3-56: Percentage of Housing Units by Resource Opportunity Area, 2022



Source: Tax Credit Allocation Committee, 2022, Community Planning Collaborative Sites Analysis

Figure 3-57: Site Distribution by Resource Level and Transportation Access, 2022



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool


Potential Effects On Disproportionate Housing Needs

As previously mentioned, Newark has a large portion of residents that have housing needs that make them vulnerable to displacement due to being cost burdened, large families, female headed households or a senior. As highlighted in Figure 3-59 the areas vulnerable to displacement also correspond with portions of the city with BIPOC populations above 80%, specifically Hispanic / Latinx residents. The areas that are vulnerable to displacement in the Old Town, Bayside area also have higher rates of cost burden. With a focus on increasing affordable housing opportunities in the Old Town/ Central area, 57 percent of sites are for lower income households, as well as sites identified as mixed income developments will provide housing options that will support community members ability to remain in their neighborhoods.

The city is planning to develop and implement a number of policies and programs to support residents to stay in place such as a local preference policy, program H4.2 a community/tenant

opportunity to purchase act, and program H4.1 Develop Anti Displacement programs for the Old Town area.

Figure 3-58 Distribution of Sites by Rates of Cost burdened, 2015- 2019




Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

Cost Burdened Households

- 30% of housing sites are affordable for very low, low and moderate income households and are distributed throughout the city.
- Recognizing the role that access to transportation plays, 25 percent of housing units are along existing bus lines and are affordable to very low, low, and moderate income households.

Figure 3-59: Distribution of Sites by Displacement Risk and Percent BIPOC population, 2017 and 2018




Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

People with Disabilities

Residents with disabilities in Newark are a lower percentage than the county at 8 percent, and are equally distributed throughout the city. Through conversation with the executive director of the Housing Consortium of the East Bay, he identified important aspects of housing development for those with physician and developmental disabilities. Having housing in close proximity to public transit to connect with jobs and services is key, as only 10 percent of the demographic owns a car. In Newark, major transit lines run along Thornton Ave, Central Ave and Sycamore street. Housing sites are well positioned to be within a half mile walking distance of transit as shown in Figure 3-57. With The majority of sites centrally located near parks, libraries and transit, new housing in Newark will be accessible to those with limited mobility. Fifty two percent of housing sites along existing transit routes are to be affordable to those with very low, low and moderate incomes, yielding an expected total of 754 units.

Figure 3-60: Housing Sites Vis-a-Vis Disability Status, 2015- 2019



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2022. HCD AFFH Data Resources and Mapping Tool.

I. Contributing Factors and Meaningful Actions

The City of Newark has a significant Asian and Hispanic/Latinx population, a large number of families, and few affordable rental and home ownership opportunities available for residents. A history of housing discrimination and disinvestment have brought uneven opportunity and quality of life for BIPOC residents. Housing pressures from workers in Silicon Valley are increasing housing costs for long term residents. The city is constrained by ecologically sensitive marshlands of the San Francisco Bay, and is vulnerable to flooding and sea level rise, which plays a key role in planning for growth in a sustainable manner.

There is an urgent need for affordable housing, especially for families and seniors. There is a high percentage of students experiencing homelessness, single parent households in poverty, and multigenerational families - all with disparate housing needs. Old town and Central Newark have low environmental outcomes, due to pollution from industrial and truck traffic that disproportionately affects children and seniors.

Newark's BIPOC community are disproportionately cost burdened renters, who face increasing rents with few protections. Many residents shared the challenge of finding affordable rental housing, and the desire for stability and the opportunity to build wealth through homeownership.

The city is committed to furthering fair housing in Newark and has identified the contributing factors, and policies and programs to implement in order to increase access to opportunity and affordable housing options in the city, especially for those communities most vulnerable to gentrification and displacement.

Mobility Strategies Removing barriers to housing in areas of opportunity and strategically enhancing access.

PROGRAM H2.8: Zoning for Missing Middle Housing Types.

PROGRAM H5.1: First-Time Homebuyer Assistance

PROGRAM H7.1: Develop training programs in collaboration with Alameda County Housing Authority for property owners to understand the housing choice voucher program

PROGRAM H4.6: Support tenant stability through minimum lease terms and relocation assistance

PROGRAM H4.8: Connect Residents with Foreclosure Assistance

PROGRAM H7.4: Affirmatively Market Affordable Housing

New Housing Choices in Areas of Opportunity Promoting housing supply, choices and affordability in areas of high opportunity and outside of areas of concentrated poverty

PROGRAM H2.1: Encourage New Housing options in areas of the city close to services such as parks, schools and grocery stores.

PROGRAM H2.2: Accessory Dwelling Unit program

PROGRAM H2.6: Work in Partnership with Newark Unified School District to develop new housing

PROGRAM H2.7: Affordable housing development fund.

PROGRAM H2.8: Zoning for Missing Middle Housing types

PROGRAM H2.10: Single Room Occupancy Housing

PROGRAM H4.5: With community partners, connect residents to existing shared housing programs

PROGRAM H5.2: Affordable Housing Development Programs

PROGRAM H5.6: Affordable Housing Overlay Zone

PROGRAM H5.3: Public Lands for dedicated affordable housing.

PROGRAM H2.3: A Community Plan for the 4 Corners Area

Place Based Strategies (Amenities, Economic Development) Conserving and improving assets in areas of lower opportunity and concentrated poverty such as targeted investment in neighborhood revitalization, preserving or rehabilitating existing affordable housing, improving infrastructure, schools, employment, parks, transportation and other community amenities.

PROGRAM H1.1: Housing Rehabilitation and Repair Programs.

PROGRAM H2.9: Area Specific Plans

PROGRAM H4.1: Develop anti displacement programs for the Old-Town Newark Specific Plan area

PROGRAM H6.3: Cool Roofs for cool homes

Anti Displacement Strategies + Tenant Protection (Fair Housing Outreach and Enforcement) strategies that protects residents in areas of lower or moderate opportunity and concentrated poverty and preserves housing choices and affordability

- PROGRAM H1.2:** Develop a citywide rental inspection program to maintain high quality housing throughout the city
- PROGRAM H4.2:** Develop a Tenant/Community Opportunity to Purchase Policy
- PROGRAM H4.3:** Develop a Just Cause Eviction Ordinance
- PROGRAM H4.4:** Small Sites Program
- PROGRAM H4.9:** No Net Loss of Units
- PROGRAM H5.1:** First-Time Home Buyer Assistance
- PROGRAM H7.2:** Partner with community organizations to ensure that community members have access to tenant rights information and Fair Housing in multiple languages
- PROGRAM H7.3:** Work with Newark Unified school district to distribute housing resources to families enrolled in the district

Table 3-16: Summary of Contributing Factors and Actions Regarding Housing Issues in Newark

Fair Housing Identified Issue	Contributing Factor	Prioritization and Geographic target	Meaningful actions
<p>Population of children and families experiencing homelessness.</p>	<p>Lack of available rental housing that is affordable to those making at or below the median income. There is no affordable housing available for rent and for those transitioning out of homelessness.</p>	<p>HIGH. City wide with a focus in supporting the students in schools in the Old Town/ Central area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a strong working relationship and partnership with the Newark Unified School district to increase access to resources to families in the District. PROGRAM H7.3 • Build more housing for low and extremely low income residents and those transitioning from and experiencing homelessness. PROGRAM H2.7 • Prioritize publicly owned land for affordable housing development. PROGRAM H5.3 • Implement an affordable housing overlay zone to incentivize the construction of affordable housing for very low, low, and moderate income households in targeted areas. PROGRAM H5.6 • Develop a local response to support people experiencing homelessness, with specific attention to the racial disparities and large population of youth and families. PROGRAM H2.5; PROGRAM H7.3 • Support Tenants through minimum lease terms and relocation assistance. PROGRAM H4.6 • Work with partners to develop scattered sites for shared housing utilizing funding sources such as Project Home Key. PROGRAM H4.11
<p>Ineffective outreach and access to information for renters and property owners, those with limited English, lack of existing knowledge of resources, or limited time</p>	<p>Resources for renters are not easily accessible currently. Those with limited English language, lack of access to a personal computer and or internet connection need additional support and resources tailored to their needs. Landlords need training to better understand laws and regulations</p>	<p>HIGH Citywide with a focus on supporting the significant Hispanic/ Latinx and Asian populations in the Old Town / Central area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner with a local non profit to co produce tenants rights materials and support systems for communities that have not been equitably served by existing resources and processes. PROGRAM H7.2 • Update the city website to make housing resources easier to access for populations that have limited English. PROGRAM H7.2; PROGRAM H7.3; PROGRAM H7.4

Fair Housing Identified Issue	Contributing Factor	Prioritization and Geographic target	Meaningful actions
<p>Significant negative environmental outcomes for existing low income BIPOC communities & increased risk of climate related displacement</p>	<p>Due to high levels of air pollution from freeway pollution and truck traffic on Thornton Avenue, and high levels of cost burden residents, the majority of Newark has less positive environmental outcomes.</p>	<p>MEDIUM Focus on the Bayside/Old Town</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Flood Risk Disclosure for New Development. As a significant portion of Newark falls within the 100 and 500 year flood plain, ensuring that development is built in response to climate change. PROGRAM H6.4
<p>Displacement pressure for BIPOC communities. Large cost burden BIPOC community and a low inventory of affordable rental homes for all segments of the population</p>	<p>Due to close proximity to Silicon Valley, the housing market has become more attractive to those working in the tech industries in the area. As rents continue to increase, residents with incomes at or below the median income are not able to find rentals they can afford.</p>	<p>HIGH Focus on areas identified as vulnerable to displacement such as the Old Town/Central, Bayside areas and renters around the city</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increasing renter support by developing and implementing a Just Cause Eviction Ordinance, to ensure that renters clearly know their rights. PROGRAM H4.3 ● Developing a Local Preference policy to support housing that prioritizes those residents currently living in Newark. POLICY H4.1 ● Developing a community / tenant opportunity to purchase ordinance. PROGRAM H4.2 ● Develop an anti displacement plan for the Old Town/ Central Newark areas. PROGRAM H4.1 ● Support tenant stability through minimum lease terms and relocation assistance. PROGRAM: H4.6 ● Develop a city wide rental inspection program. PROGRAM H1.2
<p>Lack of affordable rental homes for all segments of the population, with protected classes being the most affected. A large number of single parent families in Newark in poverty</p>	<p>Newark’s housing stock is primarily composed of market rate single family homes for ownership or rent. The most recent subsidized housing constructed was the first built in the city in over 20 years, and currently all subsidized housing is for seniors.</p>	<p>HIGH Citywide focus on new housing on Newark Unified school district sites, and a focus on missing middle housing types in the Birch Grove, Lakes, Mirabeau, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop an Affordable Housing NOFA to encourage affordable housing developers to locate projects in the city for high need populations. POLICY H5.5 ● Develop a program for the development of low and moderate income Accessory Dwelling Units in the city, with the intention of increasing housing options for public service workers and residents that are in need of affordable housing such as single parents. PROGRAM H5.5 ● Update the inclusionary zoning policy to include home

Fair Housing Identified Issue	Contributing Factor	Prioritization and Geographic target	Meaningful actions
		<p>Mayhews Landing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>ownership opportunities, encourage more on site affordable units and ensure affordability requirements will address those at residents at low incomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate local funds for affordable housing production and programming through an affordable housing fee program. PROGRAM H5.2 • In collaboration with a non profit organization, implement a shared housing program in Newark. PROGRAM H4.5 • Work in partnership with the Newark Unified School District to plan for affordable housing production and build upon the existing partnership between the City of Newark and Newark Unified School District to bring forward implementable plans for affordable housing school owned properties. PROGRAM H2.6 • Develop new housing options in established neighborhoods of the city close to services such as parks, schools and grocery stores. PROGRAM H2.1
<p>Low homeownership levels for Black, Indigenous and Hispanic/ Latinx residents</p>	<p>History of housing discrimination in Newark as well as mortgage lending discrimination has led to a lack of access to home ownership opportunities for Black, Indigenous and Hispanic/ Latinx residents.</p>	<p>MODERATE Focus on supporting BIPOC residents, as part of the Newark Affordable Housing Action Plan work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a below market rate homeownership program in partnership with a non profit organization to expand home ownership for first time homebuyers and BIPOC community members. PROGRAM H5.1 • Connect residents to foreclosure assistance, With a focus on Hispanic/Latinx, Indigenous and Black residents. PROGRAM H4.8
<p>Disproportionate access to opportunity across the city. Areas with low access to opportunity are primarily in areas with high proportion of Hispanic/ Latinx, Asian and</p>	<p>Older areas of the city such as Old Town have seen a lack of investment over the years in the historic commercial and residential district and private investment has gone into newer</p>	<p>HIGH Programs and policies focused in the Old Town/ Central Newark area. Family sized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop new affordable homes in opportunity areas throughout the city, close to parks, schools and public transportation. PROGRAM H2.1 • Invest in improving the infrastructure and affordable housing opportunities in Old Town and Bayside neighborhoods in

Fair Housing Identified Issue	Contributing Factor	Prioritization and Geographic target	Meaningful actions
<p>Indigenous residents</p> <p>High segregation of Hispanic / Latinx population</p>	<p>developments. Due to the disinvestment, the area has supported lower rents than the surrounding neighborhoods, supporting a primarily BIPOC neighborhood of residents.</p>	<p>housing and pedestrian improvements are planned/ in process</p>	<p>Newark through the Old Town specific plan, to create areas of high opportunity where residents currently reside. PROGRAM H2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Open up single family zoning in larger portions of the city for low scale “missing middle housing” types such as courtyard housing that were identified in the housing survey. PROGRAM H2.8 ● Update inclusionary zoning policy to ensure new affordable homes are built on site, with no in lieu fee option ● Accessory Dwelling Unit program to support the development of new housing distributed throughout the city and with 25 percent in high opportunity neighborhoods. PROGRAM H2.3 ● Develop an Anti Displacement program for the Old Town/Central areas, PROGRAM H4.1 ● Develop a program for the preservation of unsubsidized affordable housing in the city, especially in areas of high displacement risk. PROGRAM H4.4

SECTION 4 HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

State housing law requires the City to review both governmental and non-governmental constraints to the maintenance and production of housing for all income levels. Examples of such constraints include development standards, local processing and permit procedures, development fees, construction costs, and compliance with various State laws to facilitate housing for lower-income and special needs households. State law requires the local governments to take action through their Housing Element to “address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities,” (Government Code Section 65583(c) (3)). A thorough understanding of the potential constraints to development can help to create appropriate policy responses

A. Governmental Constraints

Government regulations can potentially constrain the supply of housing available in a community if those regulations limit opportunities to develop housing, impose requirements that unnecessarily increase the cost to develop housing, or overcomplicate the development process for developers. State law requires that housing elements contain an analysis of the governmental constraints on housing maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels including special needs households and persons with disabilities (Government Code, Section 65583(a) (4)). Potential constraints to housing include land use controls, development processing procedures and fees, impact fees, on- and off-site improvement requirements, and building and housing codes and enforcement. This section discusses these standards and assesses whether any serve as a constraint to affordable housing development in Newark.

Land Use

The City of Newark controls the location, type, density, and scale of new development through the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, and various specific plans.

General Plan

Every jurisdiction in California is required to prepare a comprehensive, long-term General Plan to guide decision making. Newark’s General Plan, adopted in 2013, sets forth the City’s vision, goals, and policies to shape development of the city. The updated plan created new opportunities for residential and mixed-use development throughout the city and has subsequently been supplemented by Specific Plans (described below) that further set forth plans and policies to

accommodate a range of housing types in key priority growth areas to create inclusive housing opportunities for Newark residents. These new residential development opportunities are reflected in the increased capacity of the Housing Element sites inventory. The Land Use Element of the General Plan has five land use designations that allow for residential use as follows:

Table 4-1: General Plan Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Housing Capacity	General Uses
Low Density Residential	Less than 8.7 units per net acre	This designation is intended for single-family residential development on lots larger than 5,000 square feet. It corresponds to most of Newark’s residential neighborhoods. Multiple zoning districts apply within Low Density Residential areas to distinguish areas with different minimum lot sizes. Other compatible uses, such as schools, childcare centers, parks, and religious facilities may also be located in areas with this designation, subject to appropriate permitting requirements.
Low-Medium Density Residential	8.7 to 15 units per net acre	This designation is intended for small lot single-family homes, zero lot line and patio homes, mobile home parks, and other areas characterized by a mix of older single-family homes and small multi-unit buildings. These areas have the basic characteristics of single-family neighborhoods, such as front and rear yards, driveways, and garages, but have smaller lots and a wider variety of housing types. Densities in areas with this designation range from 8.7 to 15 units per net acre, but the higher end of this range (e.g. from 11 to 15 units per acre) will only be allowed on properties which have their primary access on an arterial or collector street and which are found to be compatible with the character and intensity of residential development in the immediate area. Other compatible uses, such as schools, childcare centers, parks, and religious facilities may be located in all areas with this designation, subject to appropriate permitting requirements.
Medium Density Residential	14 to 30 units per net acre	This designation is intended for garden apartments and condominiums, townhomes, row houses, 4 to 8 plexes, and older areas that contain a mix of multi-family and single-family homes within this density range. These areas tend to be multi-family in character but retain some of the characteristics of suburban neighborhoods such as landscaped yards, off-street parking, common open space, and low building heights. Densities in areas with this designation range from 14 to 30 units per net acre, but the higher end of this range (e.g. from 22 to 30 units per acre) will only be allowed on properties which have their primary access on an arterial or collector street and which are found to be compatible with the character and intensity of residential development in the immediate area. Additionally, to ensure that land with this designation is used as efficiently as possible, a minimum density standard of 14 units per net acre applies. Other compatible uses, such as schools, childcare centers, parks, and religious facilities may also be located in areas with this designation, subject to appropriate permitting requirements.

Land Use Designation	Housing Capacity	General Uses
High Density Residential	25 to 60 units per net acre	This designation is intended for apartment and condominium complexes that are generally three stories or more. On larger parcels with this designation, common open space and other shared amenities are typically provided. Structured (or basement level/ podium) parking is also common. Densities range from 25 to 60 units per acre, corresponding to site area allowances of 725 to 1,450 square feet of lot area per each dwelling unit. To ensure that land with this designation is used as efficiently as possible, a minimum density standard of 25 units per net acre applies. Other compatible uses, such as schools, childcare centers, parks, and religious facilities may also be located in areas with this designation, subject to appropriate permitting requirements.
Commercial Mixed-Use	30 to 60 units per net acre. FAR of 0.5 to 2.0	This designation supports a combination of office, residential, and retail use, with an emphasis on specialty commercial uses such as antique stores, boutiques, galleries, cafes, and restaurants. Development standards should foster a walkable, pedestrian-oriented character that emphasizes a fine-grained building scale and streetscape. Structures that are entirely residential or entirely commercial are both permitted, but the optimal development form on larger sites would include housing located above ground level retail shops or services. This designation is used in Old Town Newark, where it recognizes the historic scale, lot pattern, and context of this district. Floor area ratios (FARs) are generally in the range of 0.5 to 2.0. The actual intensity of development on any given site is dictated by a number of factors, including height limits, parking and landscaping requirements, and site size and dimensions. Multiple zoning districts apply in this designation, with one zone focused on ground floor retail uses and the other allowing more diverse ground floor uses, such as offices and housing.
Regional Commercial	Greater than 30 units per acre. FAR of 0.2 to 4.0	This designation supports the largest and most complete shopping facilities in the city. The emphasis is on a broad array of goods and services, including department stores, retail shops, restaurants, entertainment facilities, and similar uses which draw patrons from throughout Newark and the surrounding region. This designation is applied to NewPark Mall and some of the commercial areas on the Mall's perimeter. Uses such as hotels and corporate office buildings are acceptable in areas with this designation. Housing at densities greater than 30 units per acre may be included in Regional Commercial areas if such housing is a component of a large-scale planned development which is primarily oriented around regional retail commercial uses. FARs are generally in the range of 0.2 to 4.0. The actual intensity of development on any given site is dictated by a number of factors, including height limits, parking and landscaping requirements, and site size and dimensions.

Source: City of Newark General Plan, 2013

Zoning

The City's zoning and development regulations establish permitted and conditionally permitted uses within each zone and standards which dictate how much development can occur on a given parcel of land such as minimum and maximum densities, height, setbacks, and lot coverage. The City Zoning Ordinance is adopted as Title 17 of the Municipal Code. Title 17, as well as all the other titles that comprise the Newark Municipal Code, are easily accessible on the city's website at www.newark.org.

The current zoning ordinance includes four residential zoning districts (RS Residential Single Family, RL Residential Low Density, RM Residential Medium Density, RH Residential High Density, and two mixed-use/commercial districts that allow for residential development (CMU Commercial Mixed Use, RC Regional Commercial). These "base" zoning districts are supported by combining districts or "overlay" districts, including the Form Based Code Overlay District, Planned Development and Old Town Newark Overlay District (Table 4-2).

As shown in Table 4-1, the current zoning districts which permit multifamily housing provide a base density range of 30-60 DU/A with the exception of the RC zone, which permits higher densities. In practice, projects in Newark such as the Newpark Place Phase 1A have significantly exceeded these base densities.

Development Standards

Residential development standards established in the Zoning Ordinance are designed to provide orderly development of the City and to protect and promote the health, safety, and welfare of local residents and to implement the policies of the General Plan. An analysis of the residential standards, shown in Table 4-2, shows that Newark's development standards (prior to the adoption of the zoning amendment required by Program H3.6) are typical for Bay Area communities and are not a constraint to the development of housing. These standards are intended to balance the need for predictable, orderly development with the need to allow the maximum possible residential density. Through program H2.12, the City will address potential barriers to residential development at all density levels through regular review and if necessary, amend the relevant development standards.

Minimum Lot Area

In the RS district, the vast majority of residential development during the planning period is anticipated to occur through ADUs and SB 9 Urban Lot Splits and Urban Housing Developments. These development types are not required to observe minimum lot size requirements for the underlying zoning district. The minimum lot sizes for the RS district

range from 6,000 to 10,000 square feet depending on the zoning designation which correlates to the development patterns of the surrounding subdivisions. The minimum lot sizes for the RM and RH districts, 6,000 square feet, do not affect the development potential of multi-family developments which allow multiple units to be constructed on a single parcel. The minimum lot size for CMU is 20,000 square feet which could be considered a constraint since many of the CMU parcels abutting Thornton Avenue are less than half an acre which would require lot consolidation in order to facilitate redevelopment. The City will investigate this possible constraint as part of Program H2.12

Setbacks

In the RS district, the vast majority of residential development during the planning period is anticipated to occur through ADUs and SB 9 Urban Lot Splits and Urban Housing Developments. These development types are not required to observe setback requirements for the underlying zoning district. As a program of the Housing Element, a local SB 9 ordinance will be prepared to provide specific development standards for SB 9 projects. A standard residential subdivision in an RS district would not be constrained from achieving maximum density by setback requirements.

As shown in the Table 4-2, front setbacks decrease from 20 feet in RL to 15 feet in RM and RH districts, Street side setbacks decrease from 10 feet in RL to 8 feet, and rear setbacks decrease from 15 feet to 10 feet. CMU and RC districts can be developed to the lot line, but have setbacks imposed if they are adjacent to RS districts or a lot which is developed with a single family residence. The City's setbacks are typical for a community of its size and development patterns and are not considered barriers to achieving maximum density.

Height

Height limitations are intended to allow projects to achieve the maximum allowable density, while also being responsive to community character. In the RS district, the height limit is 30 feet which allows for the construction of typical two-story homes. In the RM and RH districts, heights greater than 35 feet and up to 75 and 100 feet respectively are permitted with a Minor Use Permit, which may be granted at the discretion of the Community Development Director without a public hearing. In practice, these height limits are reasonable to allow the maximum density and range of product types that are typical in these zones. However, the requirement for an MUP may still be a constraint to development, so Program H2.12 includes the objective of removing this barrier. In the RL, RM, and RH districts, the height limits are 35, 75, and 100 feet respectively, which allow for the construction of three-story townhomes up to multi-story apartments or condominiums in the upper range.

Planned and proposed projects included in the Element generally do not reach the maximum allowable heights for their respective zoning districts but still achieve considerable residential densities. The proposed SAHA development, zoned RH, shows that heights are not a barrier in

achieving maximum densities since the project has a height of 60 feet and achieves a density of 105 dwelling units per acre. Waymark Homes, a proposed three-story attached townhome development which is zoned RM, reaches a height of 37 feet and a density of 22 dwelling units per acre, which is the maximum for the district.

The districts that provide the highest densities for residential development also provide for the highest maximum heights, including the RC district which is 250 feet and the CMU district which is 60 feet or 75 feet within the Old Town Newark Specific Plan area. According to an analysis of the CMU zone, currently only one parcel is outside of the Old Town Specific Plan area and is subject to the 60-foot height limit. While few parcels are zoned CMU in Newark, the 60-foot height limit could potentially be a barrier to reaching maximum allowable densities, especially if the City decides to use this zoning in future locations. The City will review this concern (Program H2.12) and provide flexibility as needed to make maximum densities achievable.

In order to be responsive to community character, the City has scaled height restrictions if the parcel is adjacent to a less intensive zone district. However, this restriction only applies to the area of the parcel which is within 20 feet of the less intensive district, including setbacks, therefore it is not considered a barrier to achieving maximum density. As with other development standards described in this section, height limits and any associated city processes will be continually evaluated during the course of the planning period per Program H2.12.

Lot Coverage

Maximum lot coverage standards vary from 50 percent in RS and RL districts to 55% in RM and RH districts. Lot coverage increases in the RM district to 65% for development within the Old Town Specific Plan area. The CMU and RC districts have no maximum standards. These standards are typical in many Bay Area communities and in Newark have not been perceived as a barrier to development and achieving maximum densities.

Parking

Because off-street parking often requires large amounts of land and structured parking is expensive to build, parking requirements are one of the development standards that can most negatively impact the feasibility of new housing development. Compared to many neighboring jurisdictions, Newark currently has somewhat higher parking requirements for most housing types than neighboring jurisdictions. For multifamily housing, Newark has higher requirements for studio and one-bedroom units than Fremont, as well as higher requirements for covered parking. Although Newark and Fremont have the same guest parking requirement of 0.5 spaces per unit, Fremont does not have the same requirements for covered parking, and removes minimum parking requirements entirely in areas near transit. Additionally Newark requires one space per unit to be located in a garage, a requirement that can significantly increase the cost of development.

Senior housing. Although it has been found that seniors do not have the same rates of driving, Newark has higher parking requirements than neighboring Union City and Fremont, at one space per unit.

ADUs. Union City does not list a parking requirement for ADU's, but Newark has a higher parking requirement than Fremont, which has no parking requirements at all for ADU and JADU units.

Because Newark has higher parking requirements for multi-family, senior housing and accessory dwelling units this Housing Element update provides an opportunity for significant changes in parking requirements such as removing parking minimums and aligning requirements to be more in line with neighboring jurisdictions. Although the City complies with State density bonus parking standards upon request, the City's parking requirements can be a potential constraint on the production of housing in some cases. In order to address this constraint, the City will implement Program H3.5 and will commit to developing new, lower parking standards to facilitate residential development, particularly on sites identified for the development of lower-income housing. This will also include a reduction of required guest parking from 0.5 to 0.25 spaces per unit.

Open Space Requirements

Newark has open space square footage requirements per unit in the RL, RM, RH and CMU and RC districts which are 400, 300, 200, 50, and 50 square feet respectively. The required open space is the product of the number of units multiplied by required square footage. Required open space consists of two types: common and private. This is no minimum private open space requirement. Common open space must be a minimum of 50% of the required open space, but may be more, up to 100% of the requirement. Within the Old Town Specific Plan area, the RM district only requires 100 square feet of open space per unit. The open space requirements in the RL and RM districts may be considered high and have the potential to limit densities. Through Program H2.12, the City will review and revise the open space requirements as necessary including adjustments to the minimum area and dimensional requirements, as well as to provide more flexibility for open space types, location, and usability.

Minimum Commercial Component in Mixed Use Zones

Parcels within the CMU zone that have frontages on Newark Blvd. and Thornton Ave. between the Union Pacific Railroad and Olive Street are required to have nonresidential uses that occupy no less than 15% of the gross lot area on their ground floors. Ground non-residential use is also a requirement for all development in the RC district. The intent of this standard is to promote walkable and vibrant mixed-use neighborhoods with a strong sense of place, however the standard is a potential barrier since recent development in Newark has been predominantly residential. Outside of these major commercial corridors, 100% residential projects are permitted.

Table 4-2: Residential Development Standards, Newark 2022

Zoning District	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Max Units Per Acre	Minimum Lot Width (ft.)	Minimum/Maximum Setbacks (ft)	Maximum Main Building Coverage (%)	Maximum Height (ft.)	Required Open Space Per Unit (sq. ft.)
RS	RS-6,000: 6,000; RS-7,000: 7,000; RS-8,000: 8,000; RS-10,000: 10,000	8.7	RS-6,000: 60; RS-7,000: 65; RS-8,000: 70; RS-10,000: 80	Front: 20 Interior Side: 5 Street Side: 10 Rear: 20	50	30	n/a
RL	6,000; 3,000 for Single unit dwelling, detached	11, up to 15 with CUP depending on street classification	60	Front: 20 Interior Side: 5 Street Side: 10 Rear: 15	50	35	400
RM	6,000	22; up to 30 with CUP depending on street classification, 50 within the Old Town Specific Plan area	60	Front: 15 Interior Side: 5 Street Side: 8 Rear: 10	55, 65 within the Old Town Specific Plan area	75 (over 35 requires a MUP), 48 within the Old Town Specific Plan area, 35 within 20 ft. of an RS or RL District	300; 100 within the Old Town Specific Plan area
RH	6,000	60	60	Front: 15 Interior Side: 5 Street Side: 8 Rear: 10	55	100 (over 35 requires a MUP); 35 within 20 ft. of an RS or RL district	200

Zoning District	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Max Units Per Acre	Minimum Lot Width (ft.)	Minimum/Maximum Setbacks (ft)	Maximum Main Building Coverage (%)	Maximum Height (ft.)	Required Open Space Per Unit (sq. ft.)
CMU	20,000	60, 100 within the Old Town Newark Specific Plan area	100	<p>Front: 0, max. of 10 Interior Side: 0, 20 abutting a RS district or any lot developed with a single family residence Street Side: 0, max of 10. Rear: 0, 10 abutting a RS district or any lot developed with a single family residence</p>	n/a	60; 75 within the Old Town Specific Plan area; 48 within 20 ft of an RM District boundary, 35 within 20 ft. of an RS or RL District boundary	50
RC	20,000	120	100	<p>Front: 0 Interior Side: 0 Street Side: 0 Rear: 0</p>	n/a	250	50

Source: City of Newark Zoning Ordinance, 2022

An analysis of the residential standards, shown in Table 4-2, indicates that these requirements overall are not a constraint to the development of housing.

Specific Plans

The City has four (4) adopted specific plans which have significantly increased the City's capacity to accommodate new housing development through the coming Housing Element update period and beyond. These plans are expected to guide new housing development during the timeframe of the 2023-2031 Housing Element and are described in more detail below.

[Bayside Newark Specific Plan, Adopted July 2021](#)

The Bayside Newark Specific Plan, formerly known as The Dunbarton Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), provides the framework for a proposed new neighborhood that will provide a broad range of new housing, retail and business opportunities in Western Newark, centered around the proposed Dunbarton Commuter Rail station.

This project area includes 233 acres of land that has contained various industrial, manufacturing, chemical processing and salt production facilities since the early twentieth century. The plan steers the development of a contemporary version of a pedestrian oriented neighborhood where housing, recreation, neighborhood retail center and employment opportunities are integrated and connected via pedestrian and bicycle networks. The community would include shops, parks and open space amenities, including a bayside trail. Approximately 8% of the area is designated as low density residential, 33% for medium density residential, 29% for medium/high residential, and 2% for high density residential.

In the proposed design, higher densities of residential development-such as condos-would be located within a quarter-mile radius of the transit station, medium densities-such as townhomes-are located slightly further, and single family dwellings are located farthest from the station. Retail stores and shops are concentrated near the transit station at the intersection of Willow Street and Enterprise Blvd. Higher density housing would be adjacent to the retail area and the transit station. Neighborhood parks would be located within the residential areas and a larger community park would be included. Blocks are generally short and pedestrian-oriented. The street circulation network of streets will have one travel lane in each direction and will utilize traffic calming measures such as bike lanes in both directions, on street parking, and single lane roundabouts with the goal of prioritizing active transportation. The plan has a unit cap of 2,500.

[Old Town Specific Plan, Adopted September 2021](#)

The Old Town Specific Plan addresses a 76-acre area which encompasses Thornton Avenue spanning seven blocks from Elm Street to Cherry Street, and residential parcels north and south of the commercial corridor. The plan seeks to develop this corridor into a mixed-use area that accommodates a range of housing types, retail and service businesses, expanded public spaces, and mobility improvement. The Old Town Specific Plan does not allow single unit dwellings,

requires densities between 30 and 100 dwelling units per acre, and height maximums of up to 75 feet (48 feet within 20 feet of a RM district and 35 feet within 20 feet of an RS or RL district). The plan also requires ground floor retail commercial uses on projects that front Newark Boulevard and Thornton Avenue between The Union Pacific Railroad Tracks and Olive Street.

Through zoning amendments, streetscape improvements, and public and private investments, the plan envisions Old Town Newark as a revitalized mixed-use neighborhood with a strong sense of place, thriving retail and commercial businesses, a range of housing choices for existing and future residents, a streetscape that prioritizes bicyclists and pedestrians, and public spaces. The plan's grand visions are matched by clear realistic steps for implementation of long-standing goals for revitalization and provide steps to maintain the existing housing stock and avoid displacement of existing residents and businesses.

[NewPark Place Specific Plan](#)

The NewPark Place Specific Plan (Plan), adopted in 2018 and implemented as revised in 2021, provides a comprehensive planning and development implementation strategy for a 125-acre area in the southeastern portion of the city adjacent to I-880 which includes the existing NewPark Mall retail center (mall), the parking facilities that surround it, and commercial uses on the perimeter of the center.

The Plan's vision is to transform the Greater NewPark Mall area into a vibrant urban place through thoughtful land use design, which includes mixed-income residential areas, retail and dining opportunities, community venues, a movie theater, inviting pedestrian-oriented streets and public spaces, and enhanced sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and transit facilities. Creating a premier Bay Area and local destination will re-power the regional retail uses within the mall itself as a vital economic engine for the city. Higher-density multifamily housing across types and affordability levels will comprise the predominant land use type in this reconfigured and revitalized area.

The Plan includes guidance in the form of plans, policies, development standards, and design guidelines and serves as an extension of the general plan making it both a policy and regulatory document. To achieve the development vision for the Greater NewPark Mall area, the Plan contains a framework that is flexible in land use types, development standards, and design guidelines. In collaboration with the city, the developer project sponsor will work within this framework to deliver project designs and programs with desired uses, development form, mobility improvements, and public amenities that create a unique "sense of place".

The plan is anticipated to build out over an approximate 20-year timeframe, with a total capacity of 1,519 multifamily residential units. The Mixed Use I area (where Phases A through D are located and highlighted in this Element) is expected to redevelop first based on the expressed interest of the property owner/developer. Diverse affordable housing will be an important component of the overall unit mix in the plan area, with at minimum 6 percent of units being affordable to very-low income households, 3 percent to low-income households and 3 percent to moderate-income households per City Council Resolution 10,184.

The plan calls for building heights between 30 and 200 feet, with a preferred minimum of 60 feet. The residential densities must be within a minimum of 60 dwelling units to the acre and a maximum of 160 dwelling units per acre, which can be accommodated within the overall plan development area under the Specific Plan's development standards. Building heights are currently constrained by the lack of adequate emergency response infrastructure Newark and the surrounding communities to safely respond to emergencies on high rise buildings. Because of this, the current plan shows densities on the lower edge of the spectrum.

Southwest Newark Residential and Recreational Project (Area 3 and 4 Specific Plan)

This is the largest area proposed for future development in Newark, comprising 856 acres in the area bordered by Mowry Avenue on the west, Stevenson Boulevard on the east, Cherry Street on the north, and Mowry Slough on the south. The Union Pacific Railroad bisects the area. Most of the land is vacant, although the area near the end of Mowry Avenue includes an auto-dismantling yard. The remainder of this area has been disked and graded for agricultural use since the early 1900s.

A Specific Plan was adopted in 2010 and 2015 (Newark Specific Plan - Area 3 and 4 of the General Plan). The Plan calls for the development of housing, a major recreational facility such as an 18-hole golf course, and the dedication of conservation open space on some of the low-lying areas south of the railroad tracks. Areas 3 and 4 contain sub areas where development would be focused.

Area 3, Sub Area B has been developed with 386 single-family residential units; construction was substantially complete by early 2021. This sub area, on land facing Cherry Street just east of Ohlone College, has been developed with a three acre community park, as well as a possible future elementary school on a six acre parcel.

A residential project within Area 3, Sub Area C and Area 4, Sub Area B was approved by City Council in November 2019. This project would include 469 detached single-family homes, open space, new utility infrastructure, and roadways, including a new connecting roadway at the existing terminus of Stevenson Boulevard to the project area. A substantial number of homes are expected to be constructed within the period of the Housing Element.

The City is currently considering a development application for 203 detached single-family homes within Area 4, Sub Area D on a parcel which contain an automobile dismantling yard with retail sales. Entitlements have not been granted as of the publication of the Housing Element.

Once the proposed project within Area 4, Sub Area D has been considered and a final decision has been made, the city may take action to retire the plan in a manner consistent with applicable laws and conforming to previously adopted agreements and approved entitlements.

Zoning for a Diversity of Housing Types

Housing Element Law (Government Code Section 65583(c) (1) and 65583.2(c)) requires that local governments analyze the availability of sites that will “facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of types of housing for all income levels, including multifamily rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, supportive housing, single-room occupancy units (SROs), emergency shelters, and transitional housing.” This section discusses relevant regulations that govern the development of the types of housing listed above as required by Government Code Section 65583(a) (3). Table 4-3 summarizes the permitted housing types by zone.

Table 4-3: Housing Types Permitted by Zone, Newark 2022

Land Use	RS	RL	RM	RH	CMU	RC
Accessory Dwelling Units	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Single-Unit, Detached	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	-	-
Single-Unit, Attached	-	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted ¹¹	-
Two-Unit Dwelling	-	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted		-
Multi-Unit Development	-	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted ¹²	Conditional Use Permit Required ¹⁹
Manufactured/Mobile Home	-	-	-	-	-	-
Employee Housing (6 or fewer persons)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Care Facilities (6 or fewer persons)	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	-
Residential Care Facilities (7 or more persons)	-	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	-	-
Family Day Care (Group Residential)	-	-	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	-
Family Day Care (Large)	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	Minor Use Permit Required	-	-
Family Day Care (Small)	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	-

¹¹ Single-Unit Dwelling, Attached uses are not permitted in the Old Town Newark Specific Plan area. Residential uses are not allowed on the ground floor along Newark Boulevard frontage and Thornton Avenue frontage, between the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Olive Street.

¹² Not allowed on the ground floor. Residential units shall be intended to support retail commercial uses of the project.

Land Use	RS	RL	RM	RH	CMU	RC
Single-Room Occupancy Units	-	-	-	Conditional Use Permit Required	Conditional Use Permit Required	-
Emergency Shelters	-	-	Minor Permit Required	Permitted	-	-
Supportive Housing	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted		-
Transitional Housing	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted		-

Source: City of Newark Zoning Ordinance, 2022

Multifamily Housing

As shown in Table 4-3, multifamily housing is permitted throughout the City of Newark in all RL, RM, RH and CMU zones. Multifamily housing is also permitted in RC zones with a conditional use permit.

Manufactured Housing and Mobile Homes

State law limits the extent to which cities and counties can regulate the installation of manufactured homes, including mobile homes. Government Code Section 65852.3 requires that cities allow installation of certified manufactured homes on foundation systems on lots zoned for conventional single-family residences. This section and Government Code Section 65852.4 generally require that manufactured homes be subject to the same land use regulations as conventional homes. Government Code Section 65852.7 deems mobile home parks to be a permitted use in all areas planned and zoned for residential use. The City of Newark permits manufactured and factory-built housing in designated residential zoning districts. Because of the high cost of land, manufactured housing is not commonly placed on private property, except perhaps as caretaker residences within industrial districts. There are currently no mobile home parks or manufactured housing in Newark. Pursuant to State law, any site that can be developed for site-built residential development is also available for the development of factory-built (manufactured) housing or for mobile homes. There are no specific restrictions upon the development of manufactured housing or mobile home parks within the Newark Municipal Code or General Plan.

Housing for Farmworkers

The provisions of Section 17020 (et seq.) of the California Health and Safety Code relating to employee housing and labor camps supersede any ordinance or regulations enacted by local governments. Such housing is allowed in all jurisdictions in California pursuant to the regulations set forth in Section 17020. Section 17021.5(b) states, for example:

“Any employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure with a residential land use designation for the purposes of this section. For the purpose of all local ordinances, employee housing shall not be included within the definition of a boarding house, rooming house, hotel, dormitory, or other similar term that implies that the employee housing is a business run for profit or differs in any other way from a family dwelling. No conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves six or fewer employees that is not required of a family dwelling of the same type in the same zone.”

Section 17021.6, concerning farmworker housing, states that:

“No conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of this employee housing [consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units] that is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.”

Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, and Supportive Housing

Emergency Shelters

The California Health and Safety Code (Section 50801[e]) defines an emergency shelter as “housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that 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.”

Pursuant to State housing law (California Government Code Sections 65582, 65583, and 65589.5), jurisdictions must identify at least one zone where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use permit or other discretionary permit. The identified zone must have sufficient capacity to accommodate the shelter need, and at a minimum provide capacity for at least one year-round shelter. Permit processing, development standards, and management standards for emergency shelters must be objective and facilitate the development of, or conversion to, emergency shelters. Emergency shelters “may only be subject to those development and management standards that apply to residential or commercial development within the same zone” along with a list of exceptions that may be made.

Assembly Bill 139, passed in 2019, revised State housing element law by requiring that emergency shelters only be required to provide sufficient parking to accommodate all staff working in the emergency shelter, provided that the standards do not require more parking for emergency shelters than other residential or commercial uses within the same zone.

Emergency shelters are permitted by right in the Residential High Density, Public Facility, Transit Station, and Park zones and with a Minor Use Permit in the Residential Medium Density zone.

In Newark emergency shelters are subject to the following development standards:

- Location. Emergency shelters shall be located at least three hundred feet from another emergency shelter.
- Number of Residents. No more than fifty clients may be present on the premises at any one time.
- Length of Occupancy. Occupancy by an individual or family may not exceed sixty days. Extensions up to a total stay of one hundred eighty days may be provided if no alternative housing is available, upon determination by the director.
- Common Area. The shelter shall provide at least ten square feet per bed of public or communal gathering space, exclusive of hallways.
- Parking Reduction. The director may reduce the number of on-site parking spaces required by [Section 17.23.040](#), Required Parking Spaces, where a shelter is located on a bus route, or other evidence is provided to indicate that less parking will be needed. The shelter shall, however, provide at least one space for each staff member who will be on duty when residents are present, and at least one space for residents.
- Lighting and Illumination. The shelter shall provide outdoor lighting sufficient to provide illumination and clear visibility to all outdoor areas, with minimal shadows or light leaving

the property. The lighting shall be stationary, directed away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way, and of intensity compatible with the neighborhood.

- **Outdoor Activities.** All functions associated with the shelter, except for children's play areas, outdoor recreation areas, and parking shall take place within the building proposed to house the shelter. There shall be no space for clients to congregate in front of the building, and there shall be no outdoor public telephones.
- **Designated Smoking Area.** The shelter shall provide a designated smoking area, preferably outside, that is not visible from public rights-of-way.
- **Noise.** The use shall be conducted in conformance with the noise standards set forth for multifamily housing in the noise element of the general plan.
- **Supervision.** On-site management shall be provided any time that clients are present at the shelter.
- **Management and Security Plan.** The operator of the shelter shall submit a management and security plan for approval by the director. The plan shall address issues identified by the director, including emergencies, transportation, client supervision, security, client services, staffing, and good neighbor issues.

Newark's standards for emergency shelter facilities comply with the allowances made for standards set forth under Government Code Section 65583(a)(4)(A). The shelter size of 50 beds provides sufficient space for the identified need and flexibility for parking requirements show that the current zoning is not a constraint for development.

Zoning for Emergency Shelters

As described in Chapter 2, Needs Assessment, the 2022 point-in-time count identified 32 unsheltered homeless individuals in Newark, a reduction from the 2019 estimate of 89 people. As described above, emergency shelters are permitted by right in the Residential High Density, Public Facility, Transit Station, and Park zones. In Newark, there are many parcels owned by the City that are zoned as Public Facility and Park and one site that is zoned as Residential High Density. Collectively, the sites in these zones could be developed with shelter beds needed to accommodate the 2022 demand and reported in the 2022 Point In Time count. Below are some of the sites that could be developed with an emergency shelter.

Table 4-4: Potential Sites for Emergency Shelters in Newark, 2022

APN	Description	Total Acreage	Estimated developable Acreage
92A-1045-13-11	Civic Center Park	5 acres	3.1 acres
92A-1036-11-1	Civic Center, Old Library Site	5.1 acres	0.75 acres
92-150-12-3; 92-150-15-1	Ash Street Park, Senior Center and adjacent site	1.4 acres	1.1 acres
92-148-14-1	Ash Street Park, Former Head Start Site	0.69 acres	0.5 acres
Total		12.19 acres	5.45 acres

Source: City of Newark, 2023

In 2023, Newark initiated a facilities master plan effort to assess all city-owned buildings, including the buildings listed in Table 4-4. The facilities master plan will provide an assessment of each building and the costs to either maintain, improve, or replace each building. Existing and new uses will be considered as part of this effort. The master plan is expected to be completed in 2024.

All of the sites identified in Table 4-4 are centrally located, close to bus routes, community centers and other services that support those experiencing homelessness with access to food and community organizations providing supportive resources.

None of these sites have existing structures intended to be used as shelters. Any shelters to be constructed on these sites will be appropriate for human habitability, consistent with the Minimum Habitability Standards for Shelter and Housing Policy published by HCD's Emergency Solutions Grant Program.

Transitional and Supportive Housing

Transitional housing is designed to assist homeless individuals and families in moving beyond emergency shelter and into permanent housing by helping people develop independent living skills through the provision of supportive services. Permanent supportive housing is housing that is linked to services that assist residents in maintaining housing, improving health, and maximizing ability to live and work in the community.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65583 and Section 65651, transitional and supportive housing types are required to be treated as residential uses and subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. Furthermore, per recent changes in State law (AB 2162), the City must also allow 100 percent affordable projects by right where multi-family and mixed-use development is permitted if the project includes 25 percent, or 12 units of, supportive housing.

The Zoning Ordinance allows supportive and transitional housing in all residential districts and in

all zones that allow multifamily and mixed-use development including nonresidential zones, per Government Code Sections 65583 and 65650. No additional parking is required beyond what is required for the residential housing type. While parking requirements can be a constraint, program **H3.5 Parking Standards Update** will address parking to encourage housing development.

Employee Housing

Consistent with Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, employee housing is permitted by right in every residential zone, including single family zones.

Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Assembly Bill 101, passed in 2019, requires that a low barrier navigation center be a use permitted by right in mixed-use zones and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements. AB 101 defines “low barrier navigation center” as a housing first, low-barrier, service-enriched shelter focused on moving people into permanent housing that provides temporary living facilities while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing.

For a navigation center to be considered “low barrier”, its operation should incorporate best practices to reduce barriers to entry, which may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Permitting the presence of partners if it is not a population-specific site, such as for survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault, women, or youth
- Pets
- Ability to store possessions
- Providing privacy, such as private rooms or partitions around beds in a dormitory setting or in larger rooms with multiple beds

Accessory Dwelling Units

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is an additional self-contained living unit, either attached to or detached from the primary residential unit on a single lot, also referred to as a secondary dwelling unit. The unit is required to include cooking, sleeping, full sanitation facilities, and separate, exterior entrance. ADUs are an important source of affordable housing since they can be constructed relatively cheaply and have no associated land costs. They can also provide supplemental income to the homeowner, allowing them to remain in their homes or moderate-income families to afford houses.

Recognizing that ADUs are part of the solution for addressing the statewide affordable housing shortage, California lawmakers have passed several bills in recent years to facilitate the development of ADUs. To encourage establishment of ADUs, State law requires cities and counties to either adopt an ordinance based on standards set out in the law authorizing ADUs in residentially-zoned areas, or where no ordinance has been adopted, to allow ADUs on lots zoned for single family or multifamily use that contain an existing single-family unit subject to ministerial approval (“by right”) if they meet standards set out by law.

In Newark, ADUs are permitted within all single family, multifamily, and mixed-use residential districts. JADUs are a specific type of ADU that is no more than 500 square feet and built entirely within an existing single-unit or duplex dwelling residence. ADUs and JADUs are subject to the following criteria:

- On lots with an existing or proposed single-family dwelling, one ADU and up to one JADU is allowed per parcel. An ADU can be either attached or detached to the primary residence but JADUs must be constructed entirely within the walls of an existing primary residence.
- ADUs may be allowed within existing portions of a multifamily or mixed-use development that are not used as livable space. At least one attached ADU or up to two detached ADUs may be provided per lot.
- ADUs must be between 150 and 1,000 square feet in floor area. Each unit shall, at minimum, include a full bathroom including shower and/or bathtub, a sleeping area, permanent cooking facilities, and a separate, exterior entrance.
- The total lot coverage for all buildings shall not exceed the allowable lot coverage for the zoning district except that such a ratio shall not prohibit an 800 square foot ADU meeting the maximum height and minimum setback requirements.
- ADUs and JADUs may not be sold separately from the primary residence but may be rented separately. ADUs and JADUs may not be used for short-term rentals (less than 30 days).
- For properties with JADUs, the primary residence must be owner-occupied, but the owner may reside in either the JADU or the primary residence. This owner-occupancy requirement does not apply to primary residences owned by a public agency, land trust, or non-profit housing organization.
- Studio ADUs shall not be required to provide parking. Any number of bedrooms require one parking space with limited exceptions such as within a half mile of public transit. When an existing garage, carport or covered parking structure is demolished in conjunction with the construction of an ADU or converted into an ADU, the parking spaces shall not be required to be replaced.
- The ADU must meet specified objective design standards related to building facades and materials, windows and glazing, roof form and detailing, and entryway features. ADUs are prohibited from having exterior stairways or balconies.

The City will comply with state law until the updated existing Accessory Dwelling unit ordinance is in compliance with state law. Newark will make further amendments to the ordinance, as necessary, to remain consistent with State law and reflect local needs. The parking requirement for an ADU with one bedroom or more, can be a constraint on development. **Program H2.2** works to develop tools to support uptake of accessory dwelling units production in Newark and make changes in parking requirements, in collaboration with Alameda County.

Single-Room Occupancy Units

Extremely low-income households typically comprise persons with very low incomes and special

housing needs, including, but not limited to, seniors, people with disabilities, and at risk of homelessness. AB 2634 (Lieber 2006) requires the quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of extremely low-income households. Housing Elements must also identify zoning to encourage and facilitate supportive housing and single-room occupancy units.

Single-room occupancy (SRO) units can provide affordable private housing for lower-income individuals, seniors, low-income working people, and persons with disabilities. An SRO unit is usually small, between 200 to 350 square feet. These units can also serve as an entry point into the housing market for formerly homeless people. The current Zoning Code provisions for SROs limit the potential for SROs in Newark through the requirement of a conditional use permit. The required parking of 0.5 spaces per unit is not seen as a constraint and is comparable to neighboring jurisdictions. The Housing Element includes a program to define SROs as a separate use, expand the zones where SROs are permitted by right, and ensure development standards, including parking, facilitate the development of SROs. Through community engagement, we heard there is a housing need for housing for small households. **Program H2.10** expands the zones where single room occupancy is permitted by right, and prioritizes development along transit routes to support access to employment and other services.

Senate Bill 9 Subdivisions

Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) became effective January 1, 2022. The bill mandates local jurisdictions to ministerially approved two unit developments and urban lot splits within a single-family residential zone, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed development meets certain requirements. For SB 9 developments, the City may apply objective zoning, subdivision, and design standards. Include reference to policy for bringing the city in compliance with SB (included in Plan below).

Constraints on Development for People with Disabilities

Residential Care Facilities and Other Zoning Provisions for Persons with Disabilities

Small Community Care Facilities

Health and Safety Code Sections 1267.8, 1566.3, and 1568.08 require local governments to treat licensed group homes and residential care facilities with six or fewer residents no differently than other by-right single-family housing uses. “Six or fewer persons” does not include the operator, the operator’s family, or persons employed as staff. Local agencies must allow these licensed residential care facilities in any area zoned for residential use and may not require licensed residential care facilities for six or fewer persons to obtain conditional use permits or variances that are not required of other family dwellings. In Newark, these facilities are permitted in all residential zoning districts and the CMU zone.

Large Community Care Facilities

Due to the unique characteristics of large community care facilities (serving more than six

persons), most jurisdictions require a use permit to ensure neighborhood compatibility in the siting of these facilities. In Newark, large community care facilities are permitted with a minor use permit in all residential zoning districts.

Currently, unless specifically allowed pursuant to a Use Permit approval, residential care facilities serving seven or more persons shall be located on a lot with frontage on an arterial and at least 300 feet from any other residential care facility, day care center, or large family day care home serving seven or more persons. The Housing Element includes program H4.10, an implementation program to permit community care facilities for more than six persons as a permitted use in all zones where other residential uses are permitted subject to the same requirements of other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

Reasonable Accommodation

State and Federal laws prohibit housing discrimination against persons with disabilities in land use practices and decisions, such as applying special requirements that limit the ability of disabled individuals to live in the residence of their choice. Both the Federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act direct local governments to make reasonable accommodations (i.e., modifications or exceptions) in their zoning laws and other land use regulations when such accommodations may be necessary to afford persons with disabilities an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. For example, it may be reasonable to accommodate requests from persons with disabilities to waive a setback requirement or other standard of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that homes are accessible for the mobility impaired. Whether a particular modification is reasonable depends on the circumstances.

The City adopted an ordinance in 2016 establishing the process for allowing flexibility within the zoning code for reasonable accommodation of access for the disabled.

The ordinance includes:

- Clear rules, policies, and procedures to promote equal access to housing and comply with fair housing and disability laws including but not limited to identifying who may request a reasonable accommodation (i.e., persons with disabilities, family members, landlords, etc.) timeframes for decision-making, and provisions for flexibility in the various land-use, zoning, or building regulations that may otherwise constrain housing for persons with disabilities. Chapter 17.37 of the City's Zoning Ordinance outlines the process for requesting a waiver to any zoning regulation to allow improvements to an existing building in order to provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities.
- Regularly monitoring the implementation of the jurisdiction's ordinances, codes, policies, and procedures to ensure they comply with the "reasonable accommodation" for disabled provisions and fair housing laws.
- Reduced parking requirements for projects serving seniors and persons with disabilities (The Zoning Ordinance was revised in 2018 reducing parking requirements to 0.5 spaces per unit, inclusive of guest parking).

The applicable findings for reasonable accommodation requests are provided in NMC 17.37 (Waivers):

- A. The waiver is necessary due to the physical characteristics of the property and the proposed use or structure or other circumstances, including, but not limited to, topography, noise exposure, irregular property boundaries, or other unusual circumstance.
- B. There are no alternatives to the requested waiver that could provide an equivalent level of benefit to the applicant with less potential detriment to surrounding owners and occupants or to the general public.
- C. The granting of the requested waiver would not be detrimental to the health or safety of the public or the occupants of the property or result in a change in land use or density that would be inconsistent with the requirements of this title.
- D. If the waiver requested is to provide reasonable accommodation pursuant to state or federal law, in addition to any other findings that this chapter requires, the decision-maker must also make the following findings:
 - a. That the housing or other property which is the subject of the request for reasonable accommodation will be used by an individual or organization entitled to protection;
 - b. If the request for accommodation is to provide fair access to housing, that the request for accommodation is necessary to make specific housing available to an individual protected under state or federal law;
 - c. That the conditions imposed, if any, are necessary to further a compelling public interest and represent the least restrictive means of furthering that interest; and
 - d. That denial of the requested minor exception or waiver would impose a substantial burden on religious exercise or would conflict with any state or federal statute requiring reasonable accommodation to provide access to housing.

Overall, the findings are not atypical for California jurisdictions that impose findings for reasonable accommodation projects and are generally consistent with State law.

Definition of Family

There are a number of State and Federal rules that govern the definition of family, including the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, the California Fair Housing and Employment Act, the California Supreme Court case *City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson* (1980), and the California Constitution privacy clauses. The laws for families have a few primary purposes: to protect people with disabilities, to protect non-traditional families, and to protect privacy. According to HCD and Mental Housing Advocacy Services there are three major points to consider when writing a definition of family:

- Jurisdictions may not distinguish between related and unrelated individuals.
- The definition may not impose a numerical limit on the number of persons in a family.
- Land use restrictions for licensed group homes for six or fewer individuals must be the same as those for single families.

The Newark Municipal Code defines “Family” as follows:


“One or more persons living together in a single dwelling unit, with common access to, and common use of, all living and eating areas and all areas and facilities for the preparation and storage of food; who share living expenses, including rent or mortgage payments, food costs and utilities, and who maintain a single mortgage, lease, or rental agreement for all members of the household.”

This definition is consistent with the best practices for a definition of “Family” and does not add any new government constraints.

Site Development Review

Government policies and ordinances regulating development affect the availability and cost of new housing. Land use controls have the greatest direct impact, but development approval procedures, permit fees, building code requirements, and the permit processing time can affect housing costs as well. This section addresses the relationship of development fees, processes, and standards to the production of housing.

Figure 4-1: Development Review Process



The development review process illustrated above is generally consistent across the city’s zone districts and planning application types. The municipal code provides the “Level of Review Authority” for various application types:

Table 4-5: Level of Review Authority, Selected Decision Types

Type of Decision	Advisory Body	Decision Maker	Appeal Body
Minor Use Permit	N/A	Community Development Director	Planning Commission
Conditional Use Permit	Community Development Director	Planning Commission	City Council
Variance	Community Development Director	Planning Commission	City Council
Amendments	Planning Commission	City Council	Superior Court
Planned Development Districts	Planning Commission	City Council	Superior Court
Design Review	N/A	Community Development Director or Planning Commission	Planning Commission or City Council

Discretionary Findings and Criteria

As provided in the municipal code, planning applications for city review and decisions that are not “ministerial” (such as building permits) include findings for approval that must be made in the affirmative in order for the Decision Maker to approve a project. The following are the applicable findings and criteria for discretionary applications in Newark:

Minor Use Permit for a Temporary Use (NMC 17.26.260):

- A. The proposed use will not unreasonably affect adjacent properties, their owners and occupants, or the surrounding neighborhood, and will not in any other way constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the area of such use or to the general welfare of the city; and
- B. The proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with pedestrian or vehicular traffic or circulation in the area surrounding the proposed use, and will not create a demand for additional parking that cannot be safely and efficiently accommodated by existing parking areas.

Conditional Use Permit (NMC 17.35.060):

- A. The proposed use is allowed within the applicable zoning district and complies with all other applicable provisions of this title and all other titles of the Municipal Code;
- B. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plan;
- C. The proposed use will not be adverse to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community, nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements;
- D. Tax revenue generated by the development will exceed the city's cost of the service

- demand as a result of the development or a compelling community benefit will be provided.
- E. The proposed use complies with any design or development standards applicable to the zoning district or the use in question unless waived or modified pursuant to the provisions of this title;
 - F. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with the existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity; and
 - G. The site is physically suitable for the type, density, and intensity of use being proposed, including access, utilities, and the absence of physical constraints.

Variance (NMC 17.36.040):

- A. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to property in the vicinity and identical zoning district, and that the granting of a variance will not constitute a granting of a special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on the property in the vicinity and identical zone district;
- B. The granting of the application is necessary to prevent a physical hardship which is not of the applicant's own actions or the actions of a predecessor in interest;
- C. The granting of the application will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity, and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, general welfare or convenience; and
- D. The granting of the variance will be consistent with the general purposes and objectives of this title, any applicable specific plans, and of the general plan.

Amendments (Zoning Map and Text, NMC 17.39.080):

- A. The amendment is consistent with the general plan;
- B. Any change in district boundaries is necessary to achieve the balance of land uses desired by the city, consistent with the general plan, and to increase the inventory of land within a given zoning district; and
- C. The amendment will promote the growth of the city in an orderly manner and to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare.

Planned Development Districts (NMC 17.12.060):

- A. The proposed development is consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plan, including the density and intensity limitations that apply;
- B. Adequate transportation facilities and public services exist or will be provided in accord with the conditions of development plan approval, to serve the proposed development; and the approval of the proposed development will not result in a reduction of traffic levels of service or public services so as to be a detriment to public health, safety, or welfare;
- C. The proposed development will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding land uses and will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area;

- D. The development generally complies with applicable adopted design guidelines; and
- E. The proposed development is demonstratively superior to the development that could occur under the standards applicable to the underlying base district, and will achieve superior community design, environmental preservation and/or substantial public benefit.

Design Review (NMC 17.34.060):

- A. The overall design of the project including its scale, massing, site plan, exterior design, and landscaping will enhance the appearance and features of the project site and surrounding natural and built environment.
- B. The project design is appropriate to the function of the project and will provide an attractive and comfortable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.
- C. Project details, materials, signage and landscaping, are internally consistent, fully integrated with one another, and used in a manner that is visually consistent with the proposed architectural design.
- D. The design of streetscapes, including street trees, lighting, and pedestrian furniture, is consistent with the intended character of the area.
- E. Parking areas are designed and developed to buffer surrounding land uses; compliment pedestrian-oriented development; enhance the environmental quality of the site, including minimizing stormwater run-off and the heat-island effect; and achieve a safe, efficient, and harmonious development.
- F. Lighting and lighting fixtures are designed to complement buildings, be of appropriate scale, provide adequate light over walkways and parking areas to create a sense of pedestrian safety, and avoid creating glare.
- G. Landscaping is designed to be compatible with and enhance the architectural character and features of the buildings on site, and help relate the building to the surrounding landscape.

Overall, the findings provided above are not atypical for California jurisdictions that impose findings and criteria for discretionary projects and are generally consistent with State law.

Conditional Use Permit Finding D, *“Tax revenue generated by the development will exceed the city's cost of the service demand as a result of the development or a compelling community benefit will be provided.”* is somewhat unique in that the city seeks to offset city costs associated with new commercial uses with increased tax revenue. This finding is typically applicable to projects and new uses that are not subject to Development Impact Fees. This does not generally apply to new residential projects, in that Housing Impact Fees or construction of new affordable units offset the costs associated with this development.

As described below, the city is undertaking an effort to create objective design standards that provide certainty and clarity in terms of design review, and that would be consistent with State laws and requirements that limit a jurisdictions ability to enforce design standards that may be interpreted as discretionary.

Objective Design Standards

The City currently relies on a combination of objective and subjective design standards and guidelines to review and regulate the design of most housing projects. However, the State of California continues to enact new laws that require streamlined housing approval by establishing a by-right, ministerial approval process for multifamily residential development. Key to ministerial approval is the replacement of subjective design guidelines with objective standards.

The intent of Objective Design Standards is to provide applicants and developers with a clear understanding of the City's expectations for mixed-use and multi-family residential project design. Objective design standards are written as requirements, rather than guidelines; therefore, all mixed-use and multi-family residential projects applying under Housing Accountability Act (HAA) protections shall comply with each standard. Importantly, objective design standards regulate site and structure design only. Projects must also comply with all applicable building permit requirements, zoning code requirements, and development standards such as height, setbacks, lot coverage, etc.

To accommodate the requirements of State law, the City is developing a thorough set of objective design standards to govern the development of multi-family housing, including certain mixed-use projects. The City anticipates adoption of the new Objective Design Standards in 2025 per Program H3.2.

The objective design review standards supplement the objective development standards (e.g. height limit, lot coverage, setback, etc.) defined in each zoning district. In combination, the two sets of standards (design and development) provide for a streamlined and efficient project review process by ensuring that applicants know and understand the city's requirements and ensuring that the project review and approval process is objective, efficient, and consistent.

Permit Processing Times

The minimum amount of time for processing permits is established by requirements for environmental review, public notice, and by the meetings of the Planning Commission and City Council. While there is little room for processing permits any faster than the City already does, the current practice of automatic review of some Planning Commission permit decisions by the City Council does add several weeks to the total permit processing time. Ultimately, the maximum amount of time for processing residential development permits is set by State law (California Government Code 65920 et. seq.). Some of the average times have increased due to infill complexity and extra notification of State requirements.

Table 4-6 summarizes the average time required to process development permits. The processing time needed to obtain development permits and required approvals varies depending on the scope of the project. Smaller projects typically require less time than larger projects. The City strives to keep its permit procedures streamlined and processing times minimal.

The amount of time between the completion of the review and the issuance of a Building Permit is

determined by the speed at which the applicant is able to make any necessary corrections to the Construction Drawings and resubmit for approval and Building Permit.

Table 4-6: Average Permit Processing Time, Newark, 2022

Permit Process	Decision Type	Level of Review	Permit Types	Timeframe
Accessory Dwelling Unit Process	Ministerial (by-right)	Staff	Building permits for projects that comply with applicable building, zoning, and development regulations	1 to 3 months
	Discretionary	Staff	Single Family Design Review permits for projects involving a second story addition for an ADU that is taller than 16 feet	2 to 5 months
Ministerial By-Right	Ministerial (by-right)	Staff	Building permits for projects that comply with applicable building, zoning, and development regulations; parcel maps; and lot line adjustments	2 to 5 months
Discretionary By-Right	Discretionary	Staff	Includes design review permits, minor use permits, and sign permits	3 to 5 months
Discretionary (Hearing officer if Applicable)	Discretionary	Hearing officer	Includes variances, certain site development permits, and certain conditional use permits. Site development permits are required when development is proposed on Environmentally Sensitive Lands and for large multifamily developments on consolidated lots. Conditional use permits are required when development is proposed that is subject to supplemental conditions identified in the Municipal Code	4 to 9 months
Discretionary (Planning Commission)	Discretionary	Planning Commission	Includes certain minor use permits, conditional use permits, variances, and certain design review permits	6 to 9 months
Discretionary (City Council)	Discretionary	Planning Commission Recommendation and City Council approval	Includes tentative maps, condominium conversion maps, easement vacations, public right-of-way vacations, rezoning, land use plan and specific plan amendments, and planned development permits. Planned development permits are not required for residential development but are an option for large residential developments to allow greater flexibility than standard zoning.	9 to 18 months

Source: City of Newark, 2022

Senate Bill 35

Senate Bill (SB) 35, passed in 2017, requires jurisdictions that have not approved enough housing units to meet their RHNA to provide a streamlined, ministerial entitlement process for housing developments that incorporate affordable housing. In order for applicants to take advantage of SB 35, per Government Code Section 65913.4 (10)(b)(1)(a)(et seq.) they need to submit a Notice of Intent and jurisdictions need to give Native American tribes an opportunity for consultation.

The City processes SB 35 applications consistent with Senate Bill 35. The City will also establish a written policy or procedure and other guidance as appropriate to specify the Senate Bill (SB) 35 streamlining approval process and standards for eligible projects, as set forth under California Government Code Section 65913.4. The City has included Program H3.1 to prepare and publish administrative procedures for the processing of housing developments eligible for streamlined review pursuant to SB 35.

Senate Bill 330

Senate Bill 330 (SB 330), Housing Crisis Act of 2019, prohibits cities and counties from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would impose or enforce design standards that are not objective design standards on or after January 1, 2020 [Government Code Section 663300 (b)(C)]. The bill also established specific requirements and limitations on development application procedures.

The City of Newark permitting process is consistent with Senate Bill 330, the Housing Crisis Act of 2019. Consistent with SB 330, housing developments for which a preliminary application is submitted that complies with applicable General Plan and zoning standards are subject only to the development standards and fees that were applicable at the time of submittal. This applies to all projects unless the project square footage or unit count changes by more than 20 percent after the preliminary application is submitted.

Submittal of a SB 330 preliminary application allows a developer to provide a specific subset of information on the proposed housing development before providing the full amount of information required by the local government for a housing development application. Submittal of the preliminary application secures the applicable development standards and fees adopted at that time. The project is considered vested, and all fees and standards are frozen, unless the project changes substantially. The City has an SB 330 preliminary application form.

Permit Fees and Exactions

Housing construction imposes short- and long-term costs on communities. Short-term costs include the cost of providing planning services and inspections. New residential developments can also result in significant long-term costs relating to the maintenance and improvement of infrastructure, facilities, parks, and streets. To offset these community costs, jurisdictions collect various fees from developers.

This model is comparable to surrounding jurisdictions, such as Fremont, Union City, Hayward. Fees depend on the complexity of the project. Example of fees. Table 4-7 shows planning fees commonly required for development based on level of review. Newark's planning fees are comparable to surrounding jurisdictions and do not present a constraint to the construction of housing.

Table 4-7: Permit Fees, Newark, Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Planning Fee Schedule	
Application Type	Fee/ Cost
Preliminary Review	
Preliminary Review	\$800 per review, first and second reviews; \$900 for subsequent reviews
Preliminary Review for new single-family unit or second story addition to single-family unit, and administrative use permits	No fee.
Site Development Review	
Administrative Site Development Review a. Small Residential Projects (e.g. single detached accessory structure or balcony)	\$100
Large Residential Projects (e.g. second-story additions, multiple accessory structures)	\$1,500
Commercial/Industrial Projects	\$1,500
Use Permit	
Minor Use Permit	\$100
Conditional Use Permit, Residential	\$2,600
Subdivision	
Tentative Parcel Map	\$2,000 + \$60 per lot
Tentative Tract Map (including condominiums)	\$3,500 + \$75 per lot
Variance	
Variance, Residential	\$1,400
Amendments	
Zoning Text Amendment	\$4,300
Zoning Map Amendment	\$4,300
General Plan Amendment	\$,300
Specific Plan Amendment	\$4,300
Extensions	

Planning Fee Schedule	
Application Type	Fee/ Cost
Discretionary Permits/Variances	\$800
Environmental Review	
CEQA Exemption	\$400
Negative Declaration, (ND)	\$1,800
Negative Declaration, Mitigated (MND)	\$1,800
Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	Deposit
Other	
Planned Unit Development	\$3,200

Source: City of Newark, 2023

Development Impact Fees

The City also collects impact fees to cover the costs of providing the necessary services and infrastructure related to new development projects. Since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, local governments in California have come to rely increasingly on impact and connection fees to finance infrastructure. Newark charges several fees on residential development at the building permit stage, as shown in Table 4-7. The estimated City development impact fees for a single family four-bedroom, two-bathroom house of 2,600 square feet are approximately \$77,629. There are significant cost savings for multifamily residential development, as development impact fees are estimated at \$36,724 per unit of a hypothetical 10-unit multi-family development (averaging 850 square feet per unit), and \$35,052 per unit of a 100-unit multi-family development (averaging 750 square feet per unit).

Table 4-8: Residential Development Impact Fees, Newark, Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Fee	Cost	Estimated Fees		
		Single Family Unit	Small Multi-Family (per unit)	Large Multi-Family (per unit)
Citywide Development Fees (Community Development Department)				
Parks		\$28,185	\$20,293	\$20,293
Public Safety		\$3,891	\$2,335	\$2,335
Community Service/Facilities		\$2,606	\$1,303	\$1,303
Transportation		\$5,607	\$3,476	\$3,476

Fee	Cost	Estimated Fees		
		Single Family Unit	Small Multi-Family (per unit)	Large Multi-Family (per unit)
Housing		\$37,070	\$9,047	\$7,375
Art in Public Spaces		\$270	\$270	\$270

Source: City of Newark, 2022

Total Estimated Fees

Newark recently prepared estimates of total fees of example projects to assess total estimated fees (Planning, Building, and Impact fees). The example projects include development of one single-family residence, a small multi-family project of 10-units on one building and a 100-unit project on two acres of land. The result of the estimates are:

- Single Family: \$124,246
- Multi-family large: \$4,344,915 for a 100-unit project on two acres, or \$43,449 per unit
- Multi-family small: \$604,453 for a 10-unit project in one building, or \$60,445.35 per unit

The estimate indicates that it is significantly less expensive in terms of city fees for multifamily development as compared to single-family development.

When the City implements Program H2.1, H2.8, H2.10 and H4.10, the City will ensure that fees for Missing Middle and SRO housing types will be set at levels in line with current permit and impact fees for multifamily.

City fees associated with development and described above are easily accessible on the city’s website: www.newark.org.

Available Infrastructure

With all sites identified for planned housing development already served by utilities, and requirements in place for infrastructure improvements for all new development, infrastructure does not pose a constraint on development of those sites within the eight-year planning period.

On- and Off-Site Improvements

The City requires certain public improvements for residential subdivisions. In 1977 the City adopted these standards to ensure that minimum levels of design and construction quality are maintained and adequate levels of street and facility improvements are provided.

Title 16.16 of the Municipal Code describes the public improvements that must be agreed to prior to acceptance and approval of the final subdivision map, as follows:

- Grading and surfacing of all streets, public ways and bicycle paths within the subdivision

that lie between the boundary of the subdivision and the centerline of proposed or existing streets, public ways, and bicycle paths fronting, backing or siding to the subdivision;

- Providing such domestic water supply and fire hydrants as may be necessary for fire protection and protection of the public health;
- Providing such storm drain and flood control works as necessary for the public convenience and safety;
- Providing a sanitary sewer system and connection to an existing sewage disposal system;
- Constructing curb, gutter, sidewalk, tie-in paving, and replacement of inadequate existing pavement on streets where the subdivision adjoins existing streets;
- Constructing other structures necessary to the use of streets, highways, bicycle paths, public ways and the drainage thereof;
- Providing for street name signs and their installation;
- Providing for the cost of street trees and their planting and one-year maintenance on streets, bicycle paths and public ways;
- Providing underground utilities as follows:
 - All existing overhead utility distribution facilities (including but not limited to electric, communication, and cable television lines) within the subdivision that lie between the boundary of the subdivision and the centerline of proposed or existing streets fronting, backing or siding the subdivision shall be undergrounded,
 - All on-site and off-site utility distribution facilities (including but not limited to electric, communication, and cable television lines) to be installed shall be placed underground, except as follows: Equipment appurtenant to underground facilities such as surface-mounted transformers, pedestal-mounted terminal boxes and meter cabinets, and concealed ducts; Metal poles supporting street lights.
 - The city council may grant variances for the provision of underground utilities in certain circumstances.
- Providing street light facilities on all streets, paths, and other pedestrian or vehicular ways proposed for development. The subdivider shall make all necessary arrangements with the utility company and pay all costs for providing underground service;
- Construction of the improvement across any storm drain channel, Hetch-Hetchy right-of-way or other public facility adjacent to the subdivision.

The City's on- and off-site development standards have been in place since 1977, and do not represent a constraint to the development of housing. In addition to public improvement standards, the Municipal Code has specific standards for residential streets and parking as described below.

Residential Streets

The City of Newark Subdivision Ordinance Chapter 12.04 requires standard improvements for streets. These requirements were originally adopted in 1963. Depending on the type of project, it enforces standard improvements including street paving, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. All required improvements must be constructed and installed in accordance with City specifications and design. As a primarily built-out community, most new development in the city does not require

building out new streets. These requirements are similar to other jurisdictions and do not represent a constraint to the development of housing.

The City has not received feedback to date that offsite requirements in Newark, whether imposed by the City or other agencies/utilities, are extraordinary or onerous. As an example, the off-site improvements for Site 7 (Timber Senior Housing) include approximately \$2 million for paving, concrete work, signage, landscaping, irrigation, furnishings, and planters. Off-site dry and wet utility costs are approximately \$1 million. These costs represent approximately 4% of the total project cost of almost \$70 million (not including land acquisition).

Water and Wastewater

Housing Element housing opportunity sites listed in this Housing Element (see Appendix C) are already served by utilities, with existing infrastructure in place. The Alameda County Water District (ACWD) and the Union Sanitary District (USD) are the sole providers of potable and reclaimed water, and wastewater conveyance and treatment, in Newark. ACWD and USD has current and planned capacity to accommodate the RHNA for water and wastewater. ACWD and USD have provided water assessments for a number of the sites and has determined that adequate water supplies exist to accommodate Newark's current and projected water needs, including the RHNA. Solid waste, recycling, and organics collection are managed through a franchise agreement with Republic Services.

To minimize infiltration of ground water into the sewer system and provide modern, efficient utilities and services, new development proposals in Newark typically replace or upgrade the on-site sewer, storm drain, and water lines following the guidance and requirements of ACWD and USD. Each project is evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine the extent of replacements and upgrades. Therefore it is difficult to assess a water and wastewater replacement/upgrade cost factor across the city. However, as mentioned earlier, housing element sites are located in areas already served by water and wastewater utilities, so the installation of new service lines is typically not a cost factor.

Priority for Water and Sewer

Per Chapter 727, Statutes of 2004 (SB 1087), upon completion of an amended or adopted Housing Element, a local government is responsible for immediately distributing a copy of the element to area water and sewer providers. In addition, water and sewer providers must grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households. Chapter 727 was enacted to improve the effectiveness of the law in facilitating housing development for lower-income families and workers.

To comply with SB 1087, upon adoption, the City of Newark will immediately forward its adopted Housing Element to ACWD and USD its water and wastewater providers to grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include units affordable to lower-income households.

Available Dry Utilities

Dry utilities, including electricity and telephone service, are available to all areas within the City.

Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) serves Newark for electrical service. Newark customers may also consider East Bay Community Energy (EBCE) for electrical service. In 2018, the County of Alameda and 11 of its cities launched EBCE as a not-for-profit public agency that governs this Community Choice Energy service. The Joint Power Agency expanded in 2021. The cities currently served are: Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Tracy, and Union City. EBCE offers a competitive, reliable energy service provider alternative to the Newark community. Similar to the discussion above, new development proposals in Newark are generally required to typically replace or upgrade the electrical service following the guidance and requirements of PG&E. Each project is evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine the extent of replacements and upgrades. Therefore it is difficult to assess dry utilities cost factor across the city. However, as mentioned earlier, housing element sites are located in areas already served by dry utilities, so the installation of new service lines is typically not a cost factor.

Opportunities for Energy Conservation

The City of Newark has adopted a wide range of policies and programs to facilitate energy efficiency in residential development. Taken as a whole, the City's policies and programs form a comprehensive approach to energy efficiency in residential development.

Parking

Because off-street parking often requires large amounts of land, parking requirements are one of the development standards that can most negatively impact housing development. The cost of land associated with parking, in addition to the costs of construction, paving, and maintenance, drive up the overall cost of development, requiring more funds to assist in the development of affordable housing. Parking standards in some jurisdictions have been arbitrarily established and do not necessarily represent the needs of the people living in the developments. This is especially true for senior and affordable housing developments where occupants are less likely to require more than one parking space.

The city of Newark overall has higher parking requirements than neighboring jurisdictions, Union City and Fremont. For multifamily housing, Newark has higher requirements for studio and one bedroom units than Fremont, as well as higher requirements for covered parking. Although Newark and Fremont have the same guest requirements of 0.5 spaces per unit, Fremont does not have the same requirements for covered parking. One space per unit must be in a garage in Newark in comparison to Fremont, a requirement that can significantly increase the cost of development. Union City has the lowest guest parking requirement of 0.25 spaces for multi family housing.

Although it has been found that seniors do not have the same rates of driving, Newark has the highest parking requirements of all three cities for senior housing, at one space per unit.

Union City does not list a parking requirement for ADU's, but Newark has a higher parking requirement than Fremont, which has no parking requirements at all for ADU and JADU units.

Because Newark has higher parking requirements for multi-family, senior housing and accessory dwelling units, there is opportunity for significant changes in parking requirements such as removing parking minimums and aligning requirements to be more in line with neighboring jurisdictions, responsive to construction costs and the lack of substantial off street parking for seniors. Although the City complies with State density bonus parking standards upon request, the City's parking requirements can be a hindrance on the production of housing. In response, the city will conduct a parking study **Program H3.5**, to develop new parking standards to align with neighboring jurisdictions.

Table 4-9: Off-Street Parking Requirements, Newark, 2021

Residential Use	Required Units	Covered Parking Requirement
Single-Unit Dwelling, Attached or Detached	2 per unit	Must be within a garage
Two-Unit Dwelling	1.5 per studio or one-bedroom unit. 2 per unit with two or more bedrooms. 1 Guest space per unit	One space per unit must be within a garage
Multi-Unit Building	1.5 per studio or one-bedroom unit. 2 per unit with two or more bedrooms. Guest parking: .5 space per unit. Projects located outside a radius of 100 feet of RS and RL districts, or separated by an arterial street from single family homes, or with driveway aprons, or located within a Specific Plan shall require 1 space plus .25 per unit Old Town Specific Plan Area: Minimum of 1.25 per unit; maximum of 2 per unit. No additional guest parking required.	Ten or fewer dwelling units: One space per unit must be within a garage More than ten dwelling units: One space per unit must be covered Guest parking shall be clearly marked as reserved for guests and available with unrestricted access
Accessory Dwelling Unit	No off street parking required for studio units, 1 off street parking space required per unit regardless of number of bedrooms. Off street parking requirement is waived if within a half mile of a transit stop, and other instances. To see the entire list see municipal code section 17.26.040.C.8 .	
Supportive Housing	None beyond what is required for the Residential Housing Type	
Transitional Housing	None beyond what is required for the Residential Housing Type	

Residential Use	Required Units	Covered Parking Requirement
Senior Housing	1 per unit, plus .25 per unit for guest parking	
Residential Care Facility (7 or more persons)	1 for every 3 beds	
Residential Care Facilities (Less than 7 persons)	None beyond what is required for the Residential Housing Type	
Family Day Care (Small)	None beyond what is required for the Residential Housing Type	
Family Day Care (Large)	1 for each nonresident employee plus an area for loading and unloading children plus parking required for the residential use	
Group Residential	1 for each employee plus 1 for each guest room or every two beds, whichever is greater Old Town Specific Plan Area: 0.25 per bedroom	
Single Room Occupancy Units	0.5 per unit	
Emergency Shelter	1 per family room, 0.35 per individual bed, plus 1 for each employee	

Source: City of Newark, 2022

State density bonus law (Government Code Section 65915) imposes statewide parking standards that a jurisdiction must grant upon request from a developer of an affordable housing project that qualifies for a density bonus. The parking standards are summarized in Table 4-9. When local parking requirements are higher, the statewide parking standards supersede the local requirements. The developer may request these parking standards even if they do not request the density bonus. These numbers are the total number of parking spaces including guest parking and accessible parking.

Open Space Requirements

The City has a policy in the General Plan that sets parkland standards. For multifamily housing, the open space requirement ranges from 100 square feet per unit for RM in the Old Town District, to 200 square feet per unit in RH, 300 square feet per unit in RM, and 400 square feet per unit in RL. Open space requirements in the mixed-use and commercial districts where housing is allowed (CMU and RC) are at 50 square feet per unit. Overall, these standards are the same or lower than the requirements of Newark’s closest neighbors. These standards are typical of many jurisdictions in the Bay Area and would not significantly reduce the affordability of multifamily housing units. Further, the City has not received developer feedback that its open space requirements are excessive or a barrier to feasibility.

Density Bonus Regulations

State law (California Government Code, section 65915-65918) requires cities and counties to approve density bonuses for housing developments that contain specified percentages of affordable housing units or units restricted to occupancy by seniors. A density bonus is the allocation of development rights that allows a parcel to accommodate additional square footage or additional residential units beyond the maximum for which the parcel is zoned. Projects that qualify for a density bonus are also eligible for reduced parking standards and additional concessions, or incentives. Upon the developer's request the City must also allow the parking standards shown above in Table 4-6. The legislature has made frequent changes to State density bonus law over the years, including AB 1763, which significantly increased density bonus provisions for 100 percent affordable projects.

Building Codes and Enforcement

Building codes and their enforcement influence the style, quality, size, and costs of residential development. Such codes can increase the cost of housing and impact the feasibility of rehabilitating older properties that must be upgraded to current code standards. In this manner building codes and their enforcement can act as a constraint on the supply of housing and its affordability.

Building and housing codes establish minimum standards and specifications for structural soundness, safety, and occupancy. State housing law requires cities and counties to adopt minimum housing standards based on model industry codes. In addition to meeting the requirements of State housing law, local governments enforce other State requirements for fire safety, noise insulation, soils reports, earthquake protection, energy conservation, and access for people with physical disabilities. The enforcement of building and housing codes for all homes is per the minimum standards and requirements set forth in the codes listed in the City's building code. Standards for rehabilitation are no more rigorous than those contained in the California Health and Safety Codes and Uniform Building Codes.

On October 13, 2022, the City Council approved Ordinance No. 539, repealing and replacing certain chapters of Title 15 (Buildings and Construction) to adopt by reference, with modifications to address local conditions, the 2022 editions of the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) and related codes. Ordinance No. 539 includes local amendments to the California Administrative Code, California Building Code, California Plumbing Code, California Electrical Code, California Residential Code, California Mechanical Code, and California Fire Code. The adopted Title 15 including local amendments is provided on the city's website, www.newark.org. The local amendments adopted with Ordinance No. 539 do not increase requirements above standards. Generally, the local amendments provide clarifications and consistency with other sections of the Newark Municipal Code. The city does not have a REACH code. In addition, local amendments were made to provide consistency with fire protection, alarms, and detection system requirements of the Alameda County Fire Department, the agency that provides contract fire

protection services in Newark.

Building codes and their enforcement can increase the cost of housing and impact the feasibility of rehabilitating older properties that must be upgraded to existing code standards. In this way building codes and their enforcement can act as a constraint on the amount of housing and its affordability. However, the codes enforced by Newark are similar to other cities in the region and are necessary to promote the minimum standards of safety and accessibility to housing. Therefore, the codes are not considered to be an undue constraint on housing investment or development.

In some cases, energy conservation requirements may increase construction costs and, therefore, the initial sales prices and cost of rent. However, these increased costs are often offset by the long-term reductions in the utility's component of housing operation costs. Accessibility modifications may also increase initial sales prices and rents but will help address the housing needs of the elderly and people with disabilities.

Code Enforcement

The Building Division is responsible for enforcing both state and City regulations governing maintenance of all buildings and property. The Community Development Department is responsible for code enforcement activities through the Community Preservation Division. The purpose of code enforcement of housing in need of rehabilitation is to ensure the safety of the City's residents; without basic living standards being met, life and safety are threatened. The city does have a code enforcement division to address health and safety concerns in the community. Currently, the City operates on a complaint-based system to respond to code enforcement needs. The Community Preservation Division will respond to complaints and investigate violations to ensure compliance with the City's Municipal Code. In 2021, the city expanded the number of full-time employees by hiring a code enforcement manager to oversee existing efforts and create proactive code enforcement services, which would include the rental inspection and landlord registration program identified in Program H1.2.

State of California, Article 34

Article 34 of the State Constitution requires local jurisdictions to obtain voter approval for specified "low rent" housing projects that involve certain types of public agency participation. Generally, a project is subject to Article 34 if more than 49 percent of its units will be rented to low-income persons. If a project is subject to Article 34, it will require an approval from the local electorate. This can constrain the production of affordable housing, since the process to seek ballot approval for affordable housing projects can be costly and time consuming, with no guarantee of success.

Local jurisdictions typically place a measure or referendum on the local ballot that seeks authority to develop a certain number of low-income units during a given period of time. If the electorate approves general parameters for certain types of affordable housing development, the local

jurisdiction will be able to move more quickly in response to housing opportunities that fall within those parameters.

B. Non-Governmental Constraints

The availability and cost of housing is strongly influenced by market forces over which local governments have little or no control. Nonetheless, State law requires that housing elements contain a general assessment of these constraints, which can serve as the basis for actions to offset their effects. This section describes primary non-governmental constraints to the development of new housing in Newark.

Availability of Financing

The availability of financing is a critical factor that can influence the cost and supply of housing. There are generally two types of financing used in the housing market: (1) capital used for initial site preparation and construction; and (2) capital used to finance the purchase of units by homeowners and investors. Financing is largely impacted by interest rates. Small fluctuations in interest rates can dramatically influence the ability to qualify for a loan. Mortgage interest rates have a large influence over the affordability of housing. Higher interest rates increase a homebuyer's monthly payment and decrease the range of housing that a household can afford. Lower interest rates result in a lower cost and lower monthly payments for the homebuyer.

Because interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates. Jurisdictions can, however, offer interest rate write-downs to extend home purchase opportunities to lower-income households. In addition, government-insured loan programs may be available to reduce mortgage down-payment requirements.

The cost of borrowing money to finance the construction of housing or to purchase a house affects the amount of affordably priced housing in Newark. Lower initial rates are available with graduated payment mortgages, adjustable rate mortgages, and buy-down mortgages. Variable interest rate mortgages on affordable homes may increase to the point where the interest rate exceeds the cost of living adjustments, which is a constraint on affordability. Although rates are currently low, they can change significantly and substantially impact the affordability of housing stock. Fluctuating interest rates can eliminate many potential homebuyers from the housing market or render a housing project infeasible that could have been successfully developed or marketed at lower interest rates. Housing prices in Newark are unaffordable for lower-, moderate-, and even some above moderate- income households, even with the lower interest rates. The primary constraint on homeownership in Newark is not the availability of financing, but the cost of housing, of which is unaffordable to many households.

Financing for both construction and long-term mortgages is generally available in Alameda County subject to normal underwriting standards, though rates have increased markedly throughout 2022. 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. Conventional home loans typically require 5 to 20 percent of the sales price as a down payment, which is the largest

constraint to first-time homebuyers. This indicates a need for flexible loan programs and a method to bridge the gap between the down payment and a potential homeowner's available funds. The availability of financing for developers under current economic conditions may also pose a constraint on development outside of the City's control.

According to the Alameda Board of Realtors, there is no evidence of "redlining" of any Alameda neighborhood by the financial community. The City provides Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for counseling for individual clients regarding fair housing rights and responsibilities and to disseminate education and information materials. Households receive intensive counseling, and legal and/or agency referral for cases involving discrimination against families, racial or religious minorities, and individuals with disabilities.

Land Costs

As with most built out Bay Area communities, the high cost of land is a constraint to the production of affordable housing in Newark. There are very few vacant parcels zoned for residential development left in the city and it is rare for vacant residential land to be listed for sale.

Based on a review of land for sale in Fremont, Union City, and Hayward, land prices for land zoned to accommodate multifamily projects range from \$5M to \$15M per acre depending on locational amenities, density, and other factors. In addition to market sales prices, there can be other costs associated with the acquisition of land including the cost of holding the property throughout the development process. Developers in Newark also face added expenses associated with the demolition and removal of existing structures or remediation of contaminated soil.

Construction Costs

In addition to the high cost of land, construction costs can also act as a constraint to the production of new housing, particularly in the Bay Area. The cost of construction depends primarily on the cost of materials and labor, which are influenced by market demand. The cost of construction will also depend on the type of unit being built and on the quality of product being produced. The cost of labor is based on a number of factors, including housing demand, the number of contractors in the area, and the unionization of workers. The construction cost of housing affects the affordability of new housing and may be considered a constraint to affordable housing in Alameda County and throughout the Bay Area.

Both material and labor costs have increased substantially in recent years. Supply chain issues during the Covid-19 pandemic are partly responsible for recent material cost increases, and a shortage in the construction labor market is adding significantly to the cost of producing housing.

According to a 2020 report by the Turner Center, hard construction costs for multifamily projects in California rose by 25 percent over the course of a decade, from an average of \$177 per square foot in 2008-2009 to \$222 per square foot in 2018. Cost increases were even greater in the Bay Area, increasing by 119 percent and reaching more than \$380 per square foot in 2018.

Construction costs vary widely according to the type of development. According to the Turner Center report, Type I projects, which are typically over 5-7 stories and constructed with steel and concrete, cost an average of \$65 more per square foot than other types of construction, like Type V (i.e., wood frame floors over a concrete platform). Type I projects are more likely to be found in infill locations where zoning allows higher density construction.

Affordable housing projects also cost more on average than market-rate and mixed-affordability projects. The 2020 Turner Center report found that affordable projects cost \$48 more per square foot on average compared to market-rate and mixed affordability projects. Some of the added costs for affordable housing are because many affordable housing developers are required to pay “prevailing wages.”

A reduction in construction costs can be brought about in several ways. A reduction in amenities and quality of building materials in new homes (still above the minimum acceptability for health, safety, and adequate performance) may result in lower sales prices. State housing law provides that local building departments can authorize the use of materials and construction methods if the proposed design is found to be satisfactory and the materials or methods are at least equivalent to that prescribed by the applicable building codes.

In addition, prefabricated, factory-built housing may provide lower-priced products by reducing labor and material costs. As the number of units built at one time increases, savings in construction costs over the entire development are generally realized as a result of an economy of scale, particularly when combined with density bonus provisions.

C. Environmental Constraints

Environmental issues affect the amount, location, and timing of new residential development in Newark. Sites in Newark are susceptible to a variety of environmental constraints including sea level rise and flooding, seismic hazards, sensitive ecological areas, and hazardous materials.

Geologic Hazards

Geologic Hazards are associated with earthquakes that can bring about risks such as ground shaking, landslides and tsunamis. Newark sits two miles west of the Hayward fault, and due to this proximity, ground shaking levels would be higher in the southern and western portions of the city. Ground shaking is measured on a scale ranging from I to X (the Modified Mercalli Scale) with shaking levels ranging from imperceptible to very violent. Most of the developed portions of Newark would experience “very strong” ground shaking (level VIII) in a 6.7 Hayward Fault earthquake, but some parts of the city would experience “violent” ground shaking (level IX).

The city has a sandy loam soil type that is prone to liquefaction. The city of Newark could experience seismic shaking levels with the potential to cause liquefaction in areas where groundwater is generally shallower than 30 feet. Based on data provided by the California

Geological Survey, the entire city is considered a liquefaction hazard zone.

Flooding and Sea Level Rise Due to Climate Change

Flooding can have devastating effects on property and residents and impact water quality in Newark housing element housing opportunity sites in Newark may be affected by flooding and sea-level rise. Newark falls within both 100 and 500 year flood zones as well as being affected by sea level rise. The 100 year flood zone covers areas 3 and 4 as well as a number of sites in the Bayside Newark specific plan area. The 500 year flood plain is found further into established residential areas of the city.

The area with the most vulnerability to sea level rise will be in the southern portion of the city, adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. Sea level rise not only affects housing, but other infrastructure such as roads, water and sewer infrastructure.

The City's Municipal Code sets standards to minimize flood hazard risks, including anchoring and flood-proofing and a requirement that the lowest floor, including basements, is at or above the 100-year flood elevation. Development within the 100-year flood zone is limited, with requirements for building at least 1 foot above the flood elevation. The City requires non-residential development to be elevated at least 8 feet above mean high tide and 11.25 feet for residential development

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, were established at the state level to ensure compliance with federal regulations to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances. These regulations must be implemented, as appropriate, and are monitored by the state (e.g., Cal OSHA in the workplace or the DTSC for hazardous waste) and/or local jurisdictions.

As with many infill urban locations, many of the housing element housing opportunity sites in Newark are on former industrial or commercial properties. These properties typically have environmental issues related to the prior use. The city of Newark has a high number of existing sites with hazardous materials, a legacy of their industrial land use.

Despite their historical use, all of the housing element sites are either already remediated of their hazardous materials and ready for residential use or are in the process of being remediated of hazardous materials to allow for residential use pursuant to approved plans by the appropriate regulatory agency.

Sensitive Ecological Areas

The southwest portion of Newark contains a number of riparian areas, transitional areas between the water and land that support periodic flooding and habitat. They are typically vegetated with lush growths of grasses, shrubs, and trees that are tolerant of periodic flooding and have sediments that are rich in nutrients and organic matter. Riparian areas are found in Site 2, Sanctuary West, also referred to as specific planning area 3 and 4.

SECTION 5 HOUSING RESOURCES

Key resources in Newark to address housing needs include housing sites (see Appendix C below), financial resources, administrative resources and non-profit resources. In addition to a robust inventory of sites available for housing development during the Housing Element planning period, the City is also implementing an ambitious affordable housing work plan¹³ which includes the provision of regular financial assistance to nonprofit sponsors of affordable housing through a regular “Notice of Funding Availability” (NOFA) process. Leveraging the City’s affordable housing impact fee fund, the City will continue to deploy substantial financial resources to support affordable housing production during the planning period. In addition, the City will implement policies to streamline affordable housing approvals and continue to partner with developers of affordable housing as detailed in the following section, Housing Plan.

A. Available Sites For Housing

The most important resource for meeting Newark’s future housing needs is a sufficient supply of land zoned for housing and with supportive infrastructure and pro-housing policies and programs. As shown in Appendix C, the City has developed a robust inventory of sites to accommodate its 6th cycle RHNA of 1,874. Combining planned and proposed projects that are already in the development pipeline with vacant and non-vacant sites that are zoned for housing and already permit housing to be developed without additional changes to the Zoning code, the sites in Appendix C have the potential to accommodate 2,854 units, representing over 150 percent of the City’s RHNA. This includes sites to accommodate all of the City’s lower-income housing needs for the 6th cycle in addition to a significant buffer.

Sites included in the City’s 6th cycle inventory are described in detail in Appendix C and displayed below in Figure 5-1.

The sites selected for this Housing Element have also been selected to achieve the following major policy objectives:

Access to Opportunity: The sites work to expand access to opportunity by siting 46 percent of affordable units in areas identified as high opportunity by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee.

Connecting Housing and Transit: Priority Development areas plan to connect new housing with regional and local transportation options in existing and new walkable communities; 29 percent of new housing sites are located within two Priority Development Areas in Newark which are the Dunbarton TOD (now known as Bayside Newark) and the Old Town Mixed Use Area.

Neighborhood Revitalization: Through the implementation of the NewPark Place Specific Plan, the former Newpark Mall will transform into a mixed-use neighborhood, with 1,519 new housing

¹³ [Newark Affordable Housing Work Plan](#)

units, including new homes for low and moderate incomes. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements will also be developed through a multiphased redevelopment. Similar revitalization efforts are reflected in the sites identified in Newark's other key specific plan areas in the Old Town area and Bayside Newark.

Figure 5-1: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle



Source: City of Newark; Planning Collaborative, 2023.

B. City Financial Resources

Along with housing, financial resources are critical for meeting Newark’s future housing needs. These include funding and financing programs to provide gap funding for affordable multifamily housing programs, loan and grant programs for first time homebuyers, and home rehabilitation grant and loan programs. The major sources of funding for affordable housing at the Federal and State levels are constrained and highly competitive, and in this context local funding sources for affordable housing are increasingly critical.

Key resources at Newark’s disposal include HUD HOME and CDBG funds, allocated to ongoing housing programs through a process overseen by the City’s Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC). As noted elsewhere in this Housing Element, the most important source of funding support for new affordable housing production in Newark is the City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee fund, which has collected upwards of \$35M in recent years. \$19M of this fund has been allocated by the City to support **three** affordable housing developments which are included in the City’s development pipeline: 1) \$2.8M for the entitled but not yet built Timber Street Senior Apartments sponsored by Eden Housing; \$4.5M for the Cedar Community Apartments; and 2) \$12M awarded to Satellite Affordable Housing Associates to support the development of a new 56-unit development on three underutilized sites that will be assembled. The City retains a balance in June of 2023 of 23,450,000 million in the Affordable Housing Impact Fee fund. The City anticipates issuing regular funding NOFAs to continue to partner with nonprofit sponsors of affordable housing.

The ability of the City to effectively deploy these local financial resources is also critical to the community’s ability to leverage other sources of funding from Federal, State, regional and private sources. An important recent example of this is the award last year of \$38.2M in State of California Project Homekey funding for the Cedar Community Apartments; this was one of the largest allocations of funding received by any jurisdiction in California for the recent funding round.

C. Other City and Partner Agency Resources

Housing Programs in Newark are administered by the City’s Community Development Department. The Department works actively to partner with residents, housing providers and other public agencies to facilitate housing production, preservation and rehabilitation in Newark. Additional key resources provided by partner agencies include:

- **Alameda County 2-1-1.** 2-1-1 is a free, non-emergency, confidential service that provides easy access to housing information and critical health and human services.
- **Alameda County Housing Authority.** The Housing Authority administers programs throughout the County including portable

- Section 8 vouchers for eligible Newark Households. The authority also provides information on housing resources, housing assistance, rental assistance, affordable land and housing, and public housing.
- **Alameda County Housing Portal.** This portal, which is under development, will provide a central location for affordable housing rentals and information, county-wide. Support for multiple languages is available. www.housing.acgov.org
- **COVID-19 Renter Assistance.** AC-Housing Secure is a program that offers assistance with unpaid back rent. Renters and landlords are encouraged to apply. There is a high demand for assistance, but additional program funds have been requested. Applicants will not be asked about their citizenship. Proof of citizenship is not required. Support for multiple languages is available. www.ac-housingsecure.org
- **ECHO Housing.** ECHO Housing provides fair housing services and tenant/landlord counseling and mediation to Newark residents. Renters who believe they have been discriminated against or who need assistance for a dispute with their landlord can contact ECHO at (510) 581-9380. www.echofairhousing.org
- **Fremont Family Resource Center.** The Fremont FRC is a welcoming place where families and individuals are nurtured, encouraged, and provided quality services to build on their own strengths to help themselves and others. Fremont FRC serves the entire Newark community, as well as Union City and Fremont.
- **AC Boost Down Payment Program.** AC Boost provides financial assistance to middle-income working households to purchase a home in Alameda County. The program offers shared appreciation loans to first-time homebuyers who live in, work in, or have been displaced from Alameda County. AC Boost is funded by Alameda County Measure A1 and administered by nonprofit organization Hello Housing. www.acboost.org
- **Alameda County Healthy Homes.** Alameda County has programs and funding opportunities to promote healthy and safe homes. Grants are available for minor home repairs, including the removal of lead hazards. These programs are available to qualified Newark households. www.achhd.org
- **Renew Alameda County.** Renew Alameda County helps homeowners make renovations necessary to stay, grow, and thrive in their homes. Renew AC is administered by Alameda County with funding provided by the Measure A1 Housing Bond. The program is operated by Habitat for Humanity East Bay/Silicon Valley. www.renewac.org
- **Urban County Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program.** The Alameda County Urban County Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program ("EMAP") is intended to provide financial relief for lower income homeowners living in the Alameda County communities (including Newark) who have experienced a loss of income resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. www.heraca.org/emap

SECTION 6 HOUSING PLAN

A. Evaluation of Accomplishments Under Adopted Housing Element

The City of Newark has developed and implemented various programs and policies to address its housing needs during the previous housing element's planning period (2015 to 2023). The following table provides a detailed program-by-program review of progress and performance. This information will help ensure that the updated element for 2023 to 2031 builds on success, responds to lessons learned, and positions us to better achieve our community's housing needs and priorities.

During the 5th Cycle, the City put in place new policies to help fund and create new affordable housing into the future such as creating a comprehensive affordable housing work plan that will invest 80% of its Housing Impact Fee funds; financing affordable housing production that supports those at risk of or experiencing homelessness; and applying for state, county, regional, and federal funds to construct affordable housing for low income and special needs households. The City also laid the groundwork for future housing and envisioned transit-oriented development (TOD) by producing an Old Town Development Strategy and rezoning its Dumbarton TOD site. It adopted a Specific Plan for Old Town with recommendations and actions to add up to 400 residential units to the planned area and one for Dumbarton TOD that has resulted in the approval or construction of approximately 828 units.

Additionally, the City of Newark has led the way in establishing new policies and programs to affirmatively further fair housing and support communities with special housing needs in obtaining access to housing. The City built a 75-unit affordable complex with universal design features (Newark Station Senior Apartments) and has approved plans for a 79-unit 100% senior housing development with deep levels of affordability (Timber Street Senior Housing). It has modified its building code to require universal design to be applied to both private and public housing and approved 180 units with universal design. Newark has also adopted an Ordinance establishing a process that allows flexibility within the zoning code for reasonable accommodation of access for the disabled and is prepared to adopt a fair housing ordinance for the sixth housing element cycle.

Table 6-1: Review of Policies and Programs of 5th Housing Element Cycle

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
<p>1. Work with Lower Income Housing Developers and Prioritize Funding</p>	<p>The City worked with nonprofit and for-profit housing developers and organizations to support efforts to create new housing for seniors, people with disabilities, formerly homeless people, households with moderate incomes or below, especially including extremely low income households, and other special needs populations. The City developed a comprehensive affordable housing work plan to engage developers and prioritized funding for housing for people with special needs and very low income people. As provided in the work plan, Newark will invest up to 40% of its Housing Impact Fee fund balance (or approximately \$12 million) for funding a NOFA to incentivize affordable housing development. In addition, Newark will invest an additional 40% of the Housing Impact Fee fund balance for site acquisition meant to facilitate affordable housing development. Consistent with the City Council-approved Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Affordable Housing Work Plan, in June 2022, the City of Newark invited developers of affordable rental housing to submit applications for funding assistance under a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). A total of approximately \$12 million was made available from the City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee Fund. The City received one response from Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA) requesting \$12,000,000 of funding from the City’s housing impact fee fund to construct a 57-unit multifamily apartment building at 6347-6375 Thornton Avenue that would meet the need for family-sized units. On January 19, 2023, the Community Development Advisory Committee on January 19, 2023 reviewed the proposal against the NOFA selection criteria and recommended approval. On March 23, 2023, the City Council reviewed and approved the proposed funding decision as well as authorized the City Manager to execute the Affordable Housing Loan Agreement and all related loan documents to effectuate the approval of the funding award. SAHA will complete the acquisition of the subject properties in April. After conducting community outreach, SAHA expects to submit their formal entitlement application in Summer 2023. In 2021, the City approved plans for “Timber Street Senior Housing”, a 79-unit 100% senior housing development, to be built by Eden Housing. The location of the project was rezoned from Limited Industrial District to Medium Residential Density to revitalize the area from a light industrial and warehouse space to a walkable residential neighborhood. A minimum of 20% of the units would have rents restricted at 60% AMI and the remaining units would have rents restricted at no more than 80% AMI. The final AMI unit allocations have not been formally established, but Eden Housing anticipates that most units would have affordability levels deeper than 80% AMI.</p>	<p>Ongoing. The City will retain this program and expand it by creating additional programs to supplement it. It will conduct focused outreach to Housing providers annually throughout the 6th Cycle.</p>

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
	<p>The City granted two incentives/concessions (parking and setbacks) and three waivers (lot coverage, landscaped area, open space) to help facilitate the project and residential density. The entitlements for the project were approved on 10/28/2021 and are expected to be constructed in 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff worked with Adobe Services on a Homekey project to convert an existing hotel to supportive housing, which consists of a total of 125 units (1 unit for the on-site manager and 124 units for rent permanent affordable housing). The breakdown of the 124 units for rent permanent affordable housing is 60 units for chronically homeless households and 64 units for households at risk of homelessness; all of which would be for extremely low-income households. On 9/22/2022, the City Council approved a Resolution (Resolution No. 11408) Project Homekey Standard Agreement which includes \$38.2 million Homekey grant funds and \$6 million City funds. A building permit for the tenant improvement for the project has been issued on 12/22/2022. 	
<p>2. Support Regional Homeless Initiatives</p>	<p>The City has provided continuous support for regional efforts to end homelessness, such as the Alameda County EveryOne Home Program, which prioritizes supportive housing. The City adopted a resolution declaring a shelter crisis in the City of Newark and authorized the City's participation in the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP). It further authorized the City Manager (or his designee) to execute all applications and agreements related to HEAP and other State and County funding sources for homeless populations (Resolution No. 10867 on December 13, 2018). The City of Newark partnered with the City of Fremont's Continuum of Care program to allocate its \$229,000 of HEAP funding. The funding was mainly used to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded Warm Center hours; Expanded "Homeless Navigation" services; Development of a site for the safe parking of recreational vehicles and vans; offering time limited housing subsidies <p>The City also took definite action to set aside affordable housing funds for projects through the HomeKey grant program, an effort to provide affordable housing in existing hotels and buildings to low-income households and those experiencing or at-risk of homelessness. In early 2022, the City Council authorized City staff to apply to the State's HomeKey grant program for a grant of up to \$39 million and allocated \$1.5 million of American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) funds, as well as \$6</p>	<p>Ongoing. The City will retain this program into the next Cycle.</p>

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
	<p>million from the City’s Housing Impact Fee fund to acquire Towne Place Suites Hotel with Abode Services and Allied Housing. The Town Places Suites project would convert an extended-stay hotel into 124 permanent, supportive affordable residential units known as Cedar Community Apartments.</p> <p>Additionally, the City has taken on a variety of other initiatives to address issues of homelessness. The Police Department conducts a more in-depth count of its homeless population on a regular basis. The City partners with Caltrans and Alameda County Human Services Agency to address homeless encampments on public property, and with the Fremont Family Resource Center to provide support to Newark households at risk of becoming homeless. It has also created a Homelessness Committee with members from various City departments to coordinate actions and responses to homelessness in the community.</p> <p>In May 2022, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, along with City Councils throughout Alameda County, endorsed the Home Together 2026 Strategic Community Plan. The Plan is a five-year strategic initiative that centers racial equity, and identifies the strategies, activities, and resources needed to dramatically reduce homelessness in Alameda County. The City will continue to participate in the Home Together 2026 plan to address issues at the local and regional levels.</p> <p>City adopted a resolution declaring a shelter crisis in the City of Newark and authorized the City of Newark’s participation in the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP); and further authorized the City Manager or his designee to execute all applications and agreements related to HEAP and other State and County funding sources for homeless populations. Resolution No. 10867 on December 13, 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The City Council approved a Resolution (Resolution No. 11408) Project Homekey Standard Agreement which includes \$38.2 million Homekey grant funds and \$6 million City funds on 9/22/2022 for the conversion of an existing hotel to supportive housing Homekey project. ● On 5/12/2022, City Council adopted a Resolution (Resolution No. 11,341) for Home Together, a county-wide initiative (Home Together 2026) to address homelessness. 	

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
<p>3. Continue Repair and Rehabilitation Program</p>	<p>Each year, a portion of Newark’s CDBG funds is dedicated to the Housing Repair and Rehabilitation Program according to a formula approved by the Alameda County Urban County jurisdictions. The City entered into an agreement with the County of Alameda for participation in the CDBG Program for FY20-21 and the Community Development Advisory Committee made recommendation to the City Council for the use of Jurisdiction Improvement funds for ADA compliance needs at Music Park and Civic Center park on February 18, 2020.</p> <p>Overall, the minor repair program has been very successful in the past. However, the home repairs in 2020 and 2021 were slightly lower than expected due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Conversations with county staff revealed that many homeowners were hesitant to allow contractors into their homes during the last two years out of fear of COVID-19 transmission. Nonetheless, the City of Newark has funded 49 projects in the current 5th Cycle.</p> <p>In discussion with the Alameda County HCD staff, there is no plan to change or substitute the program with any other during FY22-23. The City will continue to participate in the program and will increase community awareness of the program through various city communications tools. Through its continued participation, the City is expected to meet and likely exceed its goal of funding 65 projects by the end of the cycle.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Assuming continued CDBG funding, the City will continue to participate in the program.</p>
<p>4. Civic Center Replacement</p>	<p>Staff and consultants prepared a Newark Civic Center feasibility study (completed in June 2016) that assessed the facility needs for a new civic center. The study, informed by two City Council work sessions and a community meeting, included a brief description of locations throughout Newark that were considered for the new civic center. Ultimately, the feasibility analysis focused on the current civic center site as the location for the new civic center. There was no discussion of HE Program 4 as it related to the civic center site, and no discussion of affordable housing as a possible use of the site. The new civic center, which includes city hall, a police building, and library was completed in 2021. Additional analysis would be required to assess the feasibility for affordable housing on remaining city-owned portions of the site. The site retains the Residential High-Density zoning designation and Public-Institutional general plan land use.</p>	<p>Not completed. Affordable housing was ultimately not considered as a land use during the civic center replacement feasibility study. Replacement of the civic center was the only project that was considered.</p>
<p>5. Old Town Development Strategy</p>	<p>The City completed an Old Town Development Strategy in 2017 to facilitate the development of higher density housing in subareas N, M, and O of the Old Town area, with the goal of yielding 228 higher density housing units by 2022. In 2019, two community meetings were held (March 13 and</p>	<p>Completed. The City will work to further the recommendations of the Old Town Newark Specific</p>

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
	<p>June 26) followed by a Joint Work Session on December 12th to develop the Old Town Newark Specific Plan. The City was granted a Planning Grant Program award of \$160,000 for the preparation of this plan.</p> <p>In 2021, the City adopted the Specific Plan, which includes a feasibility analysis of sites within the area as well as various policies and strategies that are targeted at reducing barriers to housing in the area. For example, Policy LU-1 focuses on zoning amendments that strategically increase density in certain areas. Policy LU-16 revises zoning regulations to revise parking design standards and reduce the parking demands per unit, thus making units more affordable. Policy INF-1 & INF-2 recommend infrastructure improvements which increase water and sewer capacity which are needed to increase residential density in the area. Additional recommendations included as part of the plan are to reduce or eliminate development impact fees and require inclusionary affordable housing. Overall, the Plan recommendations and actions will add up to 400 residential units to the planned area, far exceeding the goal of 228 units.</p>	<p>Plan within the next few years to advance development.</p>
<p>6. Fair Housing Programs</p>	<p>The City signed an Inter-Governmental Collaboration Agreement for the Completion of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice for Community Development Block Grant Program on March 14, 2019 (Resolution No. 10,904). The Analysis of Impediments (AI) was completed in January 2020. To achieve the AI Metric and Milestone for Activity 1.c to “advocate for local federal/state laws that would improve fair housing protections for those experiencing barriers to accessing housing”, the City of Newark’s CDD will develop and adopt a fair housing ordinance by FY 2023 for consideration by the City Council. This ordinance will clarify and publicize the prohibition against discrimination in housing and will assist the implementation of Federal Fair Housing regulations. As part of the ordinance, the City will either refer or respond to fair housing complaints.</p>	<p>Ongoing programs and initiatives as documented in Section 3: AFFH.</p>
<p>7. Housing Accessible to the Disabled</p>	<p>The City has made it a priority to provide housing that is accessible to disabled people, who comprise 7.6% of the population in Newark, through universal design requirements. Pursuant to the Health and Safety code, HCD has specified that the Building Standards Commission provide documentation of these requirements in the California Building Code. Chapter 11A of the building code outlines the City’s accessibility requirements for private housing, including a mandate for adaptable design in all ground floor units that was established in 2013, while Chapter 11B outlines</p>	<p>Ongoing. The City will continue to use Chapter 11A and 11B as an effective method to increase housing accessibility.</p>

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
	<p>the requirements for public housing. During this 5th Cycle of Housing Elements, the City has approved 180 units with universal design.</p> <p>In 2018, the Newark Station Senior Apartments was built with universal design features. This complex, which can house 75 families, was the first affordable apartment community to be built in the City of Newark in at least 25 years.</p>	
<p>8. Seek Funds for Affordable Housing</p>	<p>The City applied for state, county, regional, and federal funds to construct housing for low income and special needs households as well as funding to provide infrastructure that supports housing development. For instance, the City applied for the Alameda County Measure A-1 Bond Competitive grant for \$6.5 million. An investment of those funds will go to the Timber Street Senior Housing mentioned in Program 1.</p> <p>In addition, the City has raised money through impact fees from market-rate housing development per the Affordable Housing fee program adopted by Council in 2014. This ordinance is codified in Chapter 17.18 of the Municipal Code. The fee is based on square footage of the project: \$21.52 per square foot of floor area is charged for the first 1,000 square feet and \$8.62 per square foot is charged for floor area above 1,000 square feet, excluding garages, carports or common areas. To date, approximately, \$24 million in impact fees have been deposited in the Affordable Impact Fee Fund to support projects or programs that preserve and/or increase the supply of affordable housing in Newark.</p>	<p>Ongoing. The City will evaluate funding each year and apply for funding as appropriate.</p>
<p>9. Adopt Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance</p>	<p>The City adopted an Ordinance in 2016 establishing the process for allowing flexibility within the zoning code for reasonable accommodation of access for the disabled.</p> <p>The ordinance includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear rules, policies, and procedures to promote equal access to housing and comply with fair housing and disability laws including but not limited to identifying who may request a reasonable accommodation (i.e., persons with disabilities, family members, landlords, etc.), timeframes for decision-making, and provisions for flexibility in the various land-use, zoning, or building regulations that may otherwise constrain housing for persons with disabilities. Chapter 17.37 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance outlines the process for 	<p>Ongoing.</p>

Program	5 th Cycle Activity Summary	Status for 6 th Cycle
	<p>requesting a waiver to any zoning regulation to allow improvements to an existing building in order to provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regularly monitoring the implementation of the jurisdiction’s ordinances, codes, policies, and procedures to ensure they comply with the “reasonable accommodation” for disabled provisions and fair housing laws. ● Reduced parking requirements for projects serving seniors and persons with disabilities (The Zoning Ordinance was revised in 2018 reducing parking requirements to 0.5 spaces per unit, inclusive of guest parking). 	
<p>10. Rezone Dumbarton TOD</p>	<p>Development in the Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development (Site Q) is governed by a Specific Plan which has numerous requirements and amenities. The Specific Plan supports and controls development within the 200-acre area, promoting a comprehensive development plan to encourage the creation of a livable community designed for compatible neighborhoods with connectivity to parks, open space, the future Transit Station, and commercial services. These important project elements are assured concurrent with the rezoning application.</p> <p>Most of the Specific Plan has been built-out or is under construction. Construction activities include the previously approved residential uses, streets, sidewalks, landscaping, utilities, and open spaces. The Specific Plan limited residential development to 2,500 units for the entire Specific Plan area. To date, approximately 1,836 units have been approved or constructed.</p> <p>In February 2021, staff provided City Council with an overview of the rezoning activities within the Dumbarton TOD, now known as Bayside TOD. The Bayside TOD developer has summarized development of approved projects, the development that was anticipated in the Specific Plan, and the development table including the current project under review, FMC Willow.</p>	<p>Completed. The Bayside TOD area will be built out in phases, with plans for the last site to be entitled before the end of 2023.</p>

B. Housing Plan: Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

This Chapter pulls from what the city has learned from extensive community engagement and data, to develop seven goals to further affordable housing production and housing mobility, increase opportunity and protect residents from displacement. The programs have an implementation timeline of immediate (0-3 years) mid term, (3 to 5 years), long term (5-8 years) and ongoing programs. The city will track program progress through the identification of responsible department and performance metrics through the 6th cycle.

IMMEDIATE: 2023-2025

MID TERM: 2026-2028

LONG TERM: 2029-2031

ONGOING: This is an existing policy or program that will be continue to be implemented

GOALS

GOAL H1: Preserve and Improve Existing Housing

POLICY H1: Leverage local funds to supplement county, state and federal funding to support the maintenance, rehabilitation and preservation of existing rental and ownership housing.

GOAL H2: Facilitate the Development of More Homes for More People

Supporting the development of housing that is affordable and accessible to all segments of the community.

POLICY H2.1: Create opportunities for new housing for moderate income households through zoning adjustments to promote missing middle housing types such as courtyard housing, duplex and small multi family homes.

POLICY H2.2: Second Units. Recognize second units (also known as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and in-law apartments) as an important part of Newark's housing supply and continue to allow such units, subject to parking, ownership, and size

standards that are consistent with State law. [ongoing]

- POLICY H2.3:** Promote and facilitate new affordable housing partnerships with various organizations with different housing needs that include but are not limited to the following:
- Community serving nonprofits
 - Newark Unified School District
 - Community college districts
- POLICY H2.4:** Work with community partners and property owners to revisit a community visioning plan for the Four Corners neighborhood/community commercial area.
- POLICY H2.5:** Support programs aimed at housing vulnerable and special needs populations. Monitor the need for housing for seniors across all income groups and for various levels of care, and support programs and incentives that encourage the development of a variety of age-friendly housing options.
- POLICY H2.6:** Develop and adopt a Universal Design Ordinance to ensure new construction is accessible to residents in all phases of life and regardless of their physical abilities.
- POLICY H2.7:** Update the existing Reasonable Accommodation requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and adopt [Ongoing]
- POLICY H2.8:** Support regional homeless initiatives and develop robust and equitable local responses to people experiencing homelessness.[Ongoing]
- POLICY H2.9:** Increase housing for large households as stated in the Affordable Housing Work Plan (which may be amended from time-to-time). Large households are defined as those with five or more people. The city will review existing site development regulations and design guidelines to ensure that the city is not unintentionally restricting housing designs that meet the needs of extended, multigenerational, and/or large families such as 2 + bedroom units, to reduce overcrowding and assist in maintaining the affordability of existing housing stock.
- POLICY H2.10:** Evaluate annual housing production targets to ensure the city is meeting the RHNA goals.

GOAL H3: Reduce and Remove Constraints to Affordable Housing Development

Removing barriers to developing affordable housing is key in meeting the goal of providing housing that is accessible to all residents, regardless of income and responsive to the unique ecological and natural environment of the city.

- POLICY H3.1:** Allow By-Right Approval of Projects with 20 Percent Affordable Units on “Reused” Sites. Pursuant to AB 1397, amend the Zoning Ordinance to require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower-income households, on sites being used to meet the 6th Cycle RHNA that represent “reuse sites” previously identified in the 4th and 5th Cycles Housing Element, and on sites that are subject to a text amendment to accommodate the lower-income RHNA.
- POLICY H3.2:** Increase certainty of entitlement procedures and accessibility to resource information for developers. Prepare a comprehensive set of guidelines and associated process diagram for all of the city’s processes and fees related to residential development generally and affordable housing specifically.
- POLICY H3.3:** Ensure there is a sufficient supply of multifamily and single-family zoned land to meet the housing needs identified in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

GOAL H4: Help People Stay in Their Homes and Communities

- POLICY H4.1:** Develop programs that support homeowners and tenants remain in their homes and communities with a focus on low and moderate income residents and BIPOC households.
- POLICY H4.2:** Preservation of unsubsidized affordable units. Many low income residents depend on unsubsidized housing at below market rates, which is vulnerable to investment and speculation. Work with nonprofit organizations that may acquire at-risk projects to extend affordability of existing unsubsidized affordable housing for lower-income households. These policies aim to prevent displacement of low-income BIPOC communities, long-term renters, and other marginalized residents by preserving currently affordable housing and creating pathways for permanent affordability.
- POLICY H4.3:** Sites Acquisition for affordable housing. The city will proactively work to identify opportunities for partnering with other local public sector agencies and private landowners to acquire sites for affordable housing, as well as to seek creative ways of partnering with developers to include affordable units in market-rate projects.

GOAL H5: Increase Access to Affordable Housing

- POLICY H5.1:** Continue to generate funding for affordable housing and seek additional funding opportunities as they arise.
- POLICY H5.2:** Bring home ownership within reach for Newark residents. Develop a BMR

homeownership program, and down payment assistance programs, with a focus on first time home buyers.

- POLICY H5.3:** Prioritize the use of City-owned property for affordable housing prior to other uses (if the sites are feasible and appropriate for housing), and prioritize housing for extremely low income households.
- POLICY H5.4:** Amend the existing Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to require on-site production of units rather than allowing the payment of an in-lieu or impact fee to support increased access to affordable housing opportunities across the city and in high opportunity areas.
- POLICY H5.5:** Develop an affordable notice of funding availability (NOFA) that will be released regularly to incentivize new developments consistent with the City's goals of increasing affordable housing opportunities for residents that are families, low income seniors, and residents with disabilities.

GOAL H6: Enhance Quality of Life, Equity, and Environmental Justice

- POLICY H6.1:** Identify the various existing and potential funding sources for infrastructure / public facility needs, including local, State, and Federal money.
- POLICY H6.2:** Urban Centers. Implement existing specific plans for NewPark Place and Old Town, creating locations in Newark which are more urban and pedestrian-oriented in character than they are today. These areas will be transformed over time into mixed-use centers with retail, office, civic, and higher density housing uses. [Ongoing policy]
- POLICY H6.3:** Land use and transportation policy that encourages active transportation and transit oriented development. Make land use and transportation decisions that reduce emissions, including promotion of walking and bicycling, improvements to public transportation, and a jobs-housing balance that reduces vehicle commute miles.
- POLICY H6.4:** In partnership with local non profits and city departments, work to promote energy efficiency and wise water use in new and existing residential buildings in order to reduce energy costs, provide quality and resilient housing, improve building comfort, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- POLICY H6.5:** Allow and encourage green building practices and energy efficient construction, such as Cross Laminated Timber buildings, solar installations, and electrification of buildings.
- POLICY H6.6:** Urban Heat Island Effect. Develop standards and requirements for municipal

projects that can incorporate natural cooling techniques to reduce the urban heat island effect.

POLICY H6.7: Residential Development in the FloodPlain. Limit development within low-lying areas at high risk from flooding. Require any new residential development, including streets and other surface improvements, to be constructed above the 100-year flood elevation.

GOAL H7: Further Fair Housing Throughout the City

POLICY H7.1: Improve awareness, access, and use of education, training, complaint investigation, mediation services of the fair housing service provider, particularly in areas sensitive to displacement, low-income, racial/ethnic concentration, disability or other fair housing considerations.

POLICY H7.2: Promote affirmative marketing in affordable housing programs to enable mobility among low-income residents and BIPOC residents in areas of poverty and segregated neighborhoods.

POLICY H7.3: Address barriers to renting and increase tenant support. Low income households and people experiencing homelessness face obstacles that prevent them from accessing housing that is affordable to them.

PROGRAMS

PROGRAM H1.1: Housing Rehabilitation and Repair Programs

Continue partnership with Alameda County's housing rehabilitation and minor home repair programs, Renew Alameda County, and contracting with Rebuilding Together Oakland East Bay. Encourage participation in these programs by Newark property owners for the maintenance of local rental homes and homeowners. The City shall continue to apply for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds on an annual basis. The City shall give high priority for the expenditure of a portion of CDBG funds for housing rehabilitation, and directly contract with the County to administer the housing rehabilitation services. The City shall also use HOME funds, as available and appropriate, to support housing rehabilitation for lower-income households.

Quantified Objective:

The City plans to support 13 households per year with home rehabilitation. The city will facilitate place-based revitalization by focusing on lower-income households with rehabilitation programs and promoting availability of programs in areas with a high concentration of housing in need of rehabilitation and repair, such as the Old Town and Mirabeau Park areas.

Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	ONGOING: Continuation of existing program
Funding Source(s):	HOME and CDBG funds as available

PROGRAM H1.2: Develop citywide rental inspection program to maintain high quality housing throughout the city.

Rental Inspection Program / Landlord Registration. The Rental Inspection Program enhances the quality of rental properties and thereby the quality of life for tenants throughout the City and ensures that all rental properties are maintained in accordance with City standards. City inspectors inspect rental properties for code violations and will issue corrective reports with recommendations for improvements to property owners/landlords and tenants. The property owner will be expected to have the property reinspected to ensure the repairs have been made. Examples of reportable issues include: roof leaks, unsafe fire conditions, mold, unsafe stairs and lead based hazards per AB 838.

Quantified Objective:	Update Newark’s Community preservation and nuisance abatement ordinance to create a proactive citywide rental inspection program, and develop an online reporting system for tenants to report substandard housing conditions. Support 12 rental units in improved condition per year.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program developed by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Affordable housing fund, Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.1: Develop new housing options in areas of the city close to services such as parks, schools and grocery stores, with existing infrastructure.

Missing middle housing will provide for an increase in housing choice in established single family neighborhoods, enabling more moderate income homes within walking distance to schools and parks. SB 9 requires ministerial approval of housing developments containing no more than two residential units on lots zoned for single family residences. Adopted simultaneously with SB 9, SB 10 provides for SB 10 allows local agencies to adopt ordinances to permit up to 10 dwelling units on any parcel, at a height specified in the ordinance, if the parcel is within a transit-rich area or urban infill site. Implementing SB 9 and SB 10 ordinances, along with pursuing Program H2.8:

Zoning for Missing Middle Housing Types, will provide additional opportunities for new housing in a variety of neighborhood types throughout the city.

<p>Quantified Objective:</p>	<p>Draft and implement SB 9 and SB 10 ordinances to provide additional opportunities for missing middle housing. Review the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance and implement updates as needed to provide clarity and facilitate housing development under SB 9. These include adopting updated definitions, use regulations, development standards, and ministerial processes. Production and affordability will be monitored every two years and alternative actions will be implemented if necessary to meet the RHNA. In coordination with research being conducted at the State level, pursue opportunities to incentivize and provide funding assistance for homeowners to provide affordable units under SB 9 to further housing opportunities and more affordable homeownership options in high opportunity areas.</p> <p>Develop and implement the City’s SB 9 Ordinance to expand the housing supply in single-family zones by allowing for lot splits, cottage housing developments, triplexes and duplexes. 120 moderate income SB 9 units developed during the housing element cycle, with a focus on expanding housing opportunity in neighborhoods in the northern portion of the city.</p> <p>Through programs such as H3.2, Objective Design Standards and H3.5, Parking standards update and study, the city will be able to ensure that development standards, including parking and open space requirements, are not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Adopt an SB 10 Ordinance to allow up to 10 units to be developed on smaller residential parcels throughout the City, with a goal to produce 80 units of missing middle housing, targeting 75% of these units in neighborhoods in the northern portions of the city, including Lake-Rosemont, Mirabeau, and Mayhews Landing Neighborhoods.</p> <p>The quantified objective for Missing Middle for Programs H2.1 and H2.8 is a total of 200 units.</p>
<p>Responsible Agency:</p>	<p>Community Development Department</p>
<p>Timeline:</p>	<p>IMMEDIATE: Ordinance developed by June 30, 2025</p>
<p>Funding Source(s):</p>	<p>Community Development Maintenance Fund</p>

Missing Middle Housing

House-scale buildings with multiple units in walkable neighborhoods. These building types, such as duplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and backyard cottages (accessory dwelling units), provide

diverse housing options and support locally-serving retail and public transportation options.

PROGRAM H2.2: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Program.

Develop tools to support uptake of accessory dwelling units production in Newark, in collaboration with Alameda County. Newark will comply with state law until the updated existing Accessory Dwelling unit ordinance is in compliance with state law.

Accessory Dwelling Unit Incentive Program. Develop a program to incentivize construction of ADUs that are deed-restricted for very low, low, and moderate income households.

<p>Quantified Objective:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase viability and uptake of accessory dwelling units through a multi pronged approach. Develop an ADU calculator to be available for Newark residents, pre approved plans, and increase community outreach, in partnership with Alameda County. ● Work to develop a series of incentives and a low interest loan program (if feasible in collaboration with Alameda County) to bring more ADU production for affordable rental housing to the city, specifically in areas that are identified as high in opportunity by the Tax Credit Allocation Committee. ● Per SB 897, Increase height limits for detached accessory dwelling units on a lot with an existing multifamily or multistory building to 18 feet and 25 feet if the unit is attached to a primary dwelling. ● Per AB 345, Accessory Dwelling units built or developed by non profit entities to be sold separately from the primary residence to a qualified buyer. ● Remove parking requirements. ● Revise ordinance to comply with state law.
<p>Responsible Agency:</p>	<p>Community Development Department, Alameda County</p>
<p>Timeline:</p>	<p>IMMEDIATE: ADU Community outreach to begin in 2024, pre approved plans to be finalized by 2025. The Alameda County ADU Resource website will function as a resource for community members interested in constructing an ADU. The site currently includes an ADU calculator and in the future will include a how to handbook and instructional videos. The City will revise its ADU ordinance to comply with state law in 2024.</p> <p>MID-TERM: Accessory Dwelling Unit Incentive Program developed by June 30, 2026, with the goal of 144 very low, low and moderate income units with 25% in high opportunity areas, and 160 total units constructed</p>

	during the housing element period.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund, Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H2.3: Facilitate market-rate and affordable housing and promote neighborhood revitalization in the Four Corners area through increased mixed use development and walkability.

Quantified Objective:	<p>Creation of a community guided plan for the Four Corners area (in between Lake-Rosemont and Mirabeau Neighborhoods), to bring housing and local retail to the area. The plan will consist of community engagement, with the objective of developing community-led decision making around housing, commercial space and public infrastructure improvements. As a key element of the community guided Four Corners area plan, the city will incorporate the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) development policies and requirements as a portion of the Four Corners area is within a transit priority area. The Four Corners area is zoned for community commercial, which does not allow for residential development by right, but housing may be considered as a component of planned developments within these areas in the event a shopping center is reused. The regulations provided in AB2011 are available to property owners, to facilitate the redevelopment of older underutilized strip malls in the Four Corners area.</p> <p>For example, per state law AB2011, 4.5 acres of underutilized land can be developed with mixed income housing at 80 dwelling units per acre due to being within 0.5 miles of the proposed Ardenwood rail stop as part of the South Bay Connect rail realignment project.</p> <p>The community-guided plan will include zoning and site development standards that will incentivize the development of multi-unit housing, with a target of 360 units on existing commercial properties in the Four Corners area. As part of the plan, the City will establish or modify development standards to facilitate maximum densities.</p>
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Community outreach in 2024, MID TERM: neighborhood plan developed by June 30, 2025, rezoning completed by December 31, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.4: Universal Design Ordinance.

This program supports residential development that incorporates Universal Design features to meet the needs of as many users as possible. The intent is to reduce the potential for occupants to be displaced from their homes due to a disability, to allow those persons to visit neighboring dwelling units, and to increase the number of accessible dwelling units in the local housing supply that meet long term housing needs by creating a process that facilitates this type of accessible design.

Quantified Objective:	Develop a Universal Design ordinance for new construction of single family, accessory dwelling units, duplex and building 20 units or larger.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, Building Division
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.5: Develop a local response to support people experiencing homelessness.

Develop a local response to support people experiencing homelessness, with specific attention to the racial disparities and large population of youth and families.

Quantified Objective:	<p>The City of Newark adopted a resolution endorsing the Alameda County Home Together 2026 Implementation Plan to address homelessness.</p> <p>Newark is preparing a local homelessness plan intended to be consistent with the Home Together 2026 Plan, which will further the objectives of the County plan. The City will maintain a city webpage to (www.newark.org/residents/homelessness) provide a connection to resources for those at risk of, or experiencing homelessness. The City has responded to homelessness needs by proactively partnering with an affordable housing developer and services provider to create and support 124 units of housing for homeless households and people at risk of becoming homeless.</p> <p>To develop this plan, the City shall work with the appropriate homeless agencies, community stakeholders, and faith-based organizations to identify new strategies, funding, and opportunities to provide new emergency shelter and transitional housing options and address the needs of 40 unsheltered persons (in addition to the completed 124-unit HomeKey project) annually in need of emergency shelter or temporary housing.</p>
-----------------------	--

Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department/City Manager’s office
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Homelessness plan developed by the end of 2024
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H2.6: Work in Partnership with the Newark Unified School District

Work in partnership with the Newark Unified School District to plan for affordable housing production and build upon the existing partnership between the City of Newark and Newark Unified School District Liaison Committee. Collaborate to bring forward cohesive and implementable plans for District owned properties, and expand the accessibility of housing resources for families, educators and staff in the district. This program will also expand housing opportunities throughout the city, into high opportunity, predominantly single family neighborhoods.

Quantified Objective:	<p>Develop a strategy in collaboration with the Newark Unified school district and the community on a long term development plan and funding for the redevelopment of school district owned sites.</p> <p>AB 2295 supports housing development on property owned by a local educational agency for teachers and staff on both active and vacant district owned properties. AB2295 establishes minimum standards for development, including a minimum of 10 units, deed restricted for affordability for 55 years and be offered to district teachers and staff. The units are required to be for low and moderate income households, with thirty percent of units required to be for very low incomes. The development standards are 35 feet, with a minimum density of 30 dwelling units per acre.</p>
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City Manager’s office, Newark City Council, Newark Unified School District
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by end of year, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.7: Affordable Housing Development Fund

The city will provide financing for affordable housing construction of at least 343 lower-income units. They are sites 13,11,9 on the sites inventory. The housing will serve very low to moderate income households, with an emphasis on young families, key workers (teachers, first responders, etc.), individuals and families at risk of homelessness, people with disabilities and other special

housing needs, and low-income senior citizens.

- SAHA Development: 6347-6375 Thornton Avenue**
 New construction with a total of 56 very low income units, with one on site management unit. 16 units are 3 bedroom units that are suitable for larger families, a housing priority for the city of Newark. The site is located along Thornton Ave, in a moderate resource area as defined by TCAC.
- 37660 Timber Street: Timber Senior Housing**
 New construction of 78 very low and low income housing units for seniors. The site is located in an area identified as a moderate resource area. The development is close to transit and services – less than a quarter of a mile to a bus station with easy access to downtown Newark and the Fremont and Union City BART stations. Near the site is a retail plaza with restaurants, dentists and optometry offices. The NewPark Mall is a five minute bus ride away and Newark Civic Center is less than a mile from Timber Street. The project is being funded by measure A funds, and a significant contribution from the city of Newark from the affordable housing fund. Construction is slated to begin in 2022.
- Cedar Community Apartments at Towne Place Suites, Project Home Key development**
 As a Project Home Key development, the Cedar community apartments are the reuse of an existing extended stay hotel. The development will result in 124 supportive units affordable to extremely low-income households, with 12 units set aside for veterans and one manager's unit. Cedar Community Apartments is located in an area identified as high resource by TCAC in close proximity to schools, shopping and the Silliman Activity and Family Aquatic Center.

Quantified Objective:	Support the development of at least 343 lower-income units.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City Council
Timeline:	Ongoing
Funding Source(s):	Affordable Housing Impact Fee Fund, Alameda County Measure A1, Home Key Grant Funds, Launch Initiative

PROGRAM H2.8: Zoning for Missing Middle Housing Types.

Along with the implementation of SB 9 and SB 10 through Program H2.1, the City shall review and amend the Zoning Code and applicable design guidelines to encourage and promote a mix of dwelling types and sizes, specifically missing middle-density housing types (e.g. courtyard housing, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes) to create housing for middle- and moderate-income households and increase the availability of affordable housing in a range of sizes to reduce displacement risk for residents living in overcrowded units or overpaying for housing.

Quantified Objective:

To remove constraints and better encourage small multi-family developments in the RS, RL, and RM zoning districts, particularly in the northeast area of the city, including Lake-Rosemont, Mirabeau, and Mayhews Landing neighborhoods, zoning text amendments will be implemented.

Within 12 months of Housing Element Adoption, staff shall recommend a specific proposal to the city council for consideration and adoption to increase baseline density to at least 15 dwelling units to the acre in key high opportunity areas in RL zones. Recommendations would include amendments to zoning, appropriate development standards to facilitate maximum densities including but not limited to: eliminating minimum lot size requirements, reducing setbacks, and eliminating minimum unit size requirements. In addition, the city will adopt a development standard waiver system for cases when development standards may preclude development to the maximum allowable density. The City shall evaluate the effectiveness of meeting missing middle housing targets of these strategies in 2027, including but not limited to further increasing development intensity in RL zones within the following year to achieve more inclusive neighborhoods throughout the City.

Zoning text amendments to may include, but are not limited to:

- Minimum Lot Size: 5,000 square feet for all building types.
- Minimum Lot Width: 50 feet for all building types.
- Parking Requirements: Parking requirements include a minimum of 1 space per unit for a multifamily dwelling outside the specific plan areas and mixed-use zones, Remove requirements for covered parking spaces, allow parking to be located within required setbacks, and remove guest parking requirements.
- Open Space Requirements: Review 400 square foot/unit requirement in RL zoning districts.
- Study feasible densities, identify sites, corridors, and neighborhoods for intensification. Develop a strategy to increase allowable densities to at least 15 du/ac, housing choices and affordability in RL and high opportunity areas with a target of 200 moderate-income units in the planning period (as noted in Program H2.1)

Zoning text amendments will be implemented to support the overall strategy to encourage small, multi-family developments.

The City shall evaluate the effectiveness of meeting missing middle housing targets of these strategies by 2027, including but not limited to further increasing development intensity in single family zones within the following year, to achieve more inclusive neighborhoods throughout the City.

Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City Council
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Community engagement and zoning changes by December 31, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.9: Area Specific Plans

NewPark Place Specific Plan The multi phase redevelopment of a shopping mall, will bring new mixed-use residential development to the area. The City worked closely with Brookfield on entitlements for Phase A, with plans for new mixed income housing and a Costco. Subsequent phases will include additional residential development, small scale retail and pedestrian infrastructure such as bike lanes and human scaled streets.

Though Phase A entitlements have now expired, the City will continue to partner with the developer to implement the Newpark Place Specific Plan to meet the affordable housing goals of the City of Newark.

The original entitled project included a total of 319 units, 29 of which would be affordable (4 very low, 9 low, and 16 moderate). The project included 3,700 square feet of ground floor retail, 12,900 square feet of amenities (such as a bike shop, club room, co-work space, and fitness center), a pool courtyard, and enclosed parking. Along Alpenrose Drive, the structures was planned to be six stories, with five residential levels over ground floor retail and amenities.

Old Town Specific Plan The Old Town Newark Specific Plan, adopted September 23rd 2021, sets forth a community informed plan to support public and private investments in the historic neighborhood. The planning area is envisioned as a mixed-use area that accommodates a range of housing types, retail and service business, expanded public spaces, and mobility improvements. To anticipate this development, this Specific Plan:

- Refines zoning regulations to align with market conditions and balance community desires for form and massing
- Develops programs to support investment in the community and continued affordability for people who live and work in the community today
- Identifies streetscape improvements for Thornton Avenue
- Provides scenarios and prototypes for how future development could build out in the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) and Residential Medium (RM) Zoning designations

Zoning Amendments: Modifies zoning standards in the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) and Residential Medium (RM) districts to align development standards, use requirements, and design standards with current market conditions and building types.

Streetscape Improvements: Identifies a streetscape plan for Thornton Avenue as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization and investment of new housing. The streetscape plan will complement improvements in the private realm and create a safe destination for residents and visitors, whether on bike, foot, or in a vehicle.

Bayside Newark A Transit Oriented Development community to be built next to the proposed Dumbarton Commuter Rail station. Due to the proximity of high capacity transit, this area is also a

priority development area for Newark.

On 9/22/22, The City of Newark approved land use modifications proposed by Lennar Home Builder, FMC Corporation, and Integral Communities within the FMC Willow and Grand Park portion of the Bayside Newark Specific Plan area. The proposed modifications would redevelop the 22.1-acre site into a 370-unit multi-family community including 279 townhouse units, a 1.6-acre mixed-use area with 3,600 sq. ft. of retail, club room, fitness center, and 90 affordable units (plus 1 manager unit) within a 6-story building, a 5-acre community park (Grand Park), and a 1,485 sq. ft. community building, along with approx. 1.8 acres set aside for the future Dumbarton transit station.

The South Site of the project, known as “FMC Willow South”, (Grand Park, PA 3, and PA 4) would include a 1,485 square foot community building, 123 multifamily units, and 92 townhomes for a total of 215 units. The 123 units would be UA Split (multifamily), and 92 would be UA Towns (townhomes). The UA Stacks would have 5 floorplans ranging from 1,696 square feet to 2,015 square feet. The UA Splits would have a standard option with 4 floorplans ranging from 1,307 square feet to 2,108 square feet and a 4-story option with 4 floorplans ranging from 1,307 square feet to 2,422 square feet. The homes would be 3-5 stories high.

Quantified Objective:	1,594 total units for the three specific plan areas. 147 very low, 101 low, 82 moderate and 1,263 above moderate units.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE, MID- and LONG-TERM: Development underway and though 2031
Funding Source(s):	Development within Area Specific Plans are privately financed. Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.10: Single Room Occupancy Housing

In order to expand the housing options in Newark, the city will support a wider variety of housing types that would be accessible for low-income working people, retirees, people receiving disability payments and newcomers to the area. Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units provide small units for a single person, with shared amenities such as kitchens or bathrooms. Along with commitments in Program H4.10: Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Special Needs Housing, the City shall update the zoning code to facilitate the development of more SROs and small units.

Quantified Objective:	In order to support an increase in this housing type in the city, SROs will be permitted use in Residential Medium Density, Commercial Mixed Use and Residential High Density, with a priority for SRO development to occur along transit corridors. Review and update existing development standards (Chapter 17.26.230), including parking requirements, to ensure
-----------------------	--

	they are not a barrier to the development of SROs. City fees for SRO projects will remain in line with fees for multifamily projects.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: updates to land use regulations in zoning code by early 2024. SRO development standards and fee requirements to be reviewed and updated as necessary by December 2024.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.11: Catalyze the development of small sites through a lot consolidation incentive program

The city commits to continuing improvement, evaluation, and adjustment of programs during the housing element cycle to ensure quantified objectives are being met.

Quantified Objective:	Implement a lot consolidation incentive program to catalyze development on small sites. The program would include deferring fees specifically for consolidation, expediting permit processing, providing flexible development standards such as setback requirements, reduced parking or increased heights, committing resources for development of affordable housing on small sites, and/or increasing allowable density or lot coverage. In addition, the city will adopt a development standard waiver system for cases when city requirements may preclude development on small sites.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Review and implement in mid 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H2.12: Ensure maximum residential densities are achievable

The city commits to annually review, and amend as necessary, the Municipal Code to ensure that maximum allowable densities are achievable on sites zoned for housing.

Quantified Objective:	Review, and amend as necessary, city requirements and development standards in all zones that allow residential development to ensure that maximum densities are achievable. This includes those standards and requirements related to maximum units per building, maximum building
-----------------------	---

	<p>coverage, required open space per unit, minimum lot area, setbacks, height limits, parking (also see Program H3.5) and limits on allowable densities. Specifically, remove the MUP requirement for buildings over 35 feet in the RM and RH zones and review whether the 60-foot height limit in the CMU zone (outside of the Old Town Specific Plan area) is a constraint on development and make needed changes, or allowing for flexibility to achieve maximum allowable densities.</p> <p>The analysis will consider impacts on cost, supply, housing choice, affordability, timing, approval certainty and ability to achieve maximum densities and include programs to address identified constraints.</p>
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: City will initially review city requirements and development standards in 2024 and on an annual basis thereafter, and amend the appropriate requirements and standards as necessary to the Municipal Code.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.1: Streamline Ministerial Approval Permit Procedures

The City will review and update its approval processes to ensure it accommodates streamlined applications, pursuant to Senate Bill 35.

Quantified Objective:	<p>Prepare and publish administrative procedures by 2024 for the processing of housing developments eligible for streamlined review pursuant to SB 35.</p> <p>Assign a staff member to support the streamlined development review process. This staff person will be a point of contact for affordable housing developers that will work to create a clear and streamlined process.</p>
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Prepare and publish new procedures by 2024, assign staff as necessary to achieve the objective by June 30, 2026
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.2: Develop objective design standards for single family and multi family developments and infill housing.

Identify parking standards, setbacks and height standards to facilitate development that is responsive to fluctuating costs and results in high quality design.

Quantified Objective:	Develop new objective design standards that result in designs that reflect the needs of the community while supporting new developments that are responsive to local ecological conditions and climate change while reducing development costs where applicable.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Ordinance and zoning changes implemented by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.3: Assess and update impact fees

Assess and update impact fees as required to ensure that it is in line with neighboring jurisdictions and not a hindrance to development.

Quantified Objective:	<p>The city will undergo a comprehensive impact fee study to assess and update the impact fee structure to reflect the needs of the community and ensure fee structure is in line with neighboring jurisdictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently the policy in the Old Town Specific Plan area is to temporarily reduce fees to encourage development. • The city will provide a fee waiver for senior and housing for people with disabilities
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department/Finance Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Study would be part of the Affordable Housing work plan.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.4: Adjust zoning to allow mixed use in current Commercial zones

In order to align zoning with planned development areas and associated policies of developing pedestrian friendly, walkable neighborhoods, the city proposes to utilize State laws SB6 and AB 2011 to encourage residential and mixed use developments in current commercial zones. A project proposed under SB 6 may be either a 100-percent residential project or a mixed-use project where at least 50 percent of the square footage is dedicated to residential uses. SB 6 projects are not exempt from CEQA but need not provide any affordable housing. SB 6 projects are required to pay prevailing wages and utilize a "skilled and trained workforce." Although there

is a possibility that including commercial space in a mixed use development could be viewed as a constraint, the community and City Council are interested in mixed use, walkable environments that support a variety of uses.

Quantified Objective:	Amend the City's Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial zones and land use code to create objective standards for mixed-uses and facilitate the redevelopment of commercial sites to mixed-use.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.5: Parking standards update and study

Parking can be a significant portion of the cost of developing new housing. Research and develop new parking standards for residential developments that align with neighboring jurisdictions and are reflective of the community needs and development costs. Although the Dumbarton rail project is proposed for Newark, there is no firm timeline for its development. Due to limited frequent public transportation in the city, many residents are car dependent in order to access employment and other basic needs which reflects the extent of parking reductions.

Quantified Objective:	<p>Update the Zoning Ordinance to encourage infill development, including housing for persons with disabilities, senior housing, accessory dwelling units. Engage with the development community to discuss changes to parking minimums. Identify and implement parking requirement reductions in NMC 17.23.50, eliminating parking minimums for ADUs, and/or unbundled parking from the dwelling unit for large housing projects. Revised parking changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Senior Parking: Reduce from 1 space per unit to .5 spaces per unit ● Remove parking requirements for ADUs ● Two Unit Dwelling : Remove the guest parking requirement ● Multi Unit Dwelling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce covered parking requirement to 0.5 spaces per unit ○ Reduce guest parking to 0.25 spaces per unit ○ Reduce overall parking requirement for studios and one bedrooms to 1 space per unit. ○ Reduce 2-plus bedroom requirement to 1.5 spaces per unit with 0.25 spaces for guest parking. <p>Provide more opportunities for alternatives to individual automobile such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CAR SHARING
-----------------------	--

	<p>One stall reduction for each stall dedicated and designated for use by a locally-operating car sharing program, such as Zipcar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ON-STREET PARKING CREDIT One-half stall reduction for each new public, on-street parking stall provided as part of a project (through the installation of angled or perpendicular spaces with bulb-outs and curbs or other methods). ● BICYCLE PARKING CREDIT One stall reduction for every five, non-required bicycle parking spaces provided on the site (beyond the standard requirements). <p>Analyze and revise as necessary existing standards for SROs, small multifamily (Missing Middle), and shared parking.</p>
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Parking requirement updates in zoning code by mid 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H3.6: By-Right Approval of Projects with 20 Percent Affordable Units on “Reused” Sites.

Pursuant to AB 1397, amend the Zoning Ordinance to require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower-income households, on sites being used to meet the 6th Cycle RHNA that represent “reuse sites” previously identified in the 4th and 5th Cycles Housing Element. The nine sites listed in Table 6-2 will be adjusted by text amendment to accommodate the lower income RHNA as needed.

Table 6-2: Assessors Parcels Numbers Subject to AB 139, 2022

Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number
8	92-30-16-2; 92-30-15-2; 92-30-17-2; 92-30-14-3; 92-30-18-4
9	92-31-15; 92-31-16-2
15	92A-900-1-2
16	92-29-13; 92-29-19-2; 92-29-18-2; 92-29-17-2; 92-29-16-2; 92-51-2-3; 92-29-20-2; 92-51-5-3
17	92A-2125-17 92A-2125-11-2' 92A-2125-13
18	92A-2585-32
19	92-50-13

Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number
21	92-255-11
22	92A-2375-32
23	92-131-3; 92-131-2-4; 92-131-1-9

Quantified Objective:	602 total units, 304 very low and low income units, 67 moderate income units and 231 above moderate income units.
Responsible Agency:	Newark City Council, Community Development Department, Planning Commission
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Text amendment within one year of Housing Element Adoption
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H4.1: Develop Anti-Displacement Programs for the Old-Town Newark Specific Plan Area.

Quantified Objective:	Apply local preference ordinance to new residential development in the Old Town area. Convene an Old Town community working group composed of residents, youth and business owners in the neighborhood. This group will work with staff to develop neighborhood priorities for an anti displacement program for the Old Town Newark Specific Plan area that supports community residents and small businesses to stay in place.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Local preference policy, 2024. MID-TERM: Anti displacement implementation program developed by June 30, 2026
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H4.2: Develop a Tenant/Community Opportunity to Purchase Policy

Develop programs to support renters stay in their homes and create opportunities for home ownership through a Tenant Opportunity to Purchase or Community Opportunity to Purchase (COPA and TOPA). A TOPA/COPA policy can also facilitate homeownership for tenants by creating limited equity housing cooperatives or other ownership models, enabling increased

wealth-building opportunities for BIPOC communities who have historically been denied access to homeownership.

Work with community members, community-based, mission-driven entities, housing providers, real estate professionals, and other relevant stakeholders to review best practices and lessons learned to develop a report with recommendations for the implementation of a small sites program and COPA / TOPA policy in the City of Newark.

Quantified Objective:	The recommendations will include a framework for an ordinance, administrative and supportive policies, program process and design, community engagement plan, and identification of costs and funding sources for implementation.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: COPA and TOPA ordinance and program developed by June 30, 2026
Funding Source(s):	HOME funds

PROGRAM H4.3: Develop a Just Cause Eviction Ordinance

Just Cause ordinances prohibit landlords from ending a tenancy or evicting a tenant without a specific reason.

Quantified Objective:	Develop and implement a just cause eviction ordinance for the city to cover tenants under state law when AB 1482 expires in 2029. Support 15 low income residents per year to stay in their homes.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City Council
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H4.4: Small Sites Program

Develop a small sites funding program that enables nonprofit housing providers to acquire market-rate multifamily properties that are less than 25 units and convert these buildings to affordable housing.

Quantified Objective:	Develop an RFP for small sites program. Recipients of funding from the Small Sites Program sign a 55-year regulatory agreement that governs the income limits for tenants and rents that can be charged. The program will
-----------------------	---

	focus on the Old Town/ Central area, identified as vulnerable to displacement, and with higher concentrations of low income residents.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2027
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H4.5: Connect Residents to Existing Shared Housing Programs

With community partners, connect residents to existing shared housing programs to support those in need of affordable housing and seniors in need of additional income to remain in their homes.

Quantified Objective:	Work to connect 20 residents per year to existing shared housing resource programs through non profit partners for Newark such as the Home Match program.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program implemented by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H4.6: Support Tenant Stability Through Minimum Lease Terms and Relocation Assistance.

Quantified Objective:	Develop an ordinance outlining minimum lease terms and relocation assistance for renters
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program developed by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H4.7: Identify Housing Opportunities For Those With Developmental Disabilities

Work with community partners such as the Housing Consortium of the East Bay, to identify scattered smaller parcels that would be suitable for affordable housing, and the inclusion of units in larger housing developments for those with developmental disabilities.

Quantified Objective:	20 units to increase housing opportunities for those with developmental disabilities in Newark.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Coordination with housing developers and community partners by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H4.8: Connect Residents with Foreclosure assistance.

Quantified Objective:	Connect residents with existing foreclosure prevention resources for Alameda County to stem the displacement of 20 low and moderate income residents. With a focus on Hispanic/ Latinx, Indigenous and Black residents.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program support by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H4.9: No Net Loss of Units

To facilitate place-based revitalization for households at risk of displacement due to new development, the City will require replacement housing units subject to the requirements of Government Code, Section 65915, subdivision (c)(3), when any new development (residential, mixed use, or nonresidential) occurs on a site that has been occupied by or restricted for the use of lower income households at any time during the previous five years. This requirement applies to non-vacant sites and vacant sites with previous residential uses that have been vacated or demolished.

Quantified Objective:	Replace any of the units if (a) they are planned to be demolished for purposes of building new housing, and (b) they are determined to be occupied by low income residents.
-----------------------	---

Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department,
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: The replacement requirement will be implemented immediately and applied as applications on identified sites are received and processed.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H4.10: Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Special Needs Housing

The City of Newark, through its Zoning Ordinance, provides opportunities for special needs housing, including uses such as Group Residential, Residential Care Facilities, Single Room Occupancies, Supportive Housing, and Transitional Housing, and Emergency Shelters. However, the locations where these uses are allowed are limited. Along with commitments in Program H2.10, the City shall prepare and adopt the following amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to allow housing for special needs groups consistent with State law:

- Allow “low barrier navigation center” developments by right in mixed-use zones and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses, consistent with Government Code Section 65662.
- Allow for the by-right approval of 100 percent affordable developments that include a percentage of supportive housing units, either 25 percent or 12 units, whichever is greater, to be allowed without a conditional use permit or other discretionary review in all zoning districts where multifamily and mixed-use development is permitted, consistent with Government Code Section 65651(a).
- Ensure the identified zone has available sites with capacity to accommodate at least 32 shelter beds, using the methodology outlined in Government Code section 65583 subdivision (a)(4), and that the identified zones have sites located near amenities and services that serve people experiencing homelessness, which may include health care, transportation, retail, employment, and social services.
- Allow large Residential Care Facilities for 7 or more people as a permitted use in the Residential Low Density, Residential Medium Density, and Residential High Density zones. The facilities are subject to the same requirements as other residential uses of the same type in these zones.
- Expand the zones where single-room occupancy units (SROs) are a permitted use to RM, RH, and CMU districts.
- Allow employee and farmworker housing consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 17021.5(b) Section 17021.6.
- Revise the definition of “emergency shelter” to include other interim interventions, including but not limited to, navigation centers, bridge housing, and respite or recuperative care, per Government Code 65583. The City will also confirm zones utilized for emergency shelters allow residential uses, confirm they have sufficient capacity and proximity to

services based on statutory formulas and review to ensure that the appropriate development standards are in place to encourage the development of emergency shelters.

- Revise the City’s definition of “Family” in the municipal code to remove provisions requiring shared living expenses or maintaining a single lease or rental agreement.
- Review and revise the City’s reasonable accommodation procedure to eliminate constraints for persons with disabilities, particularly the finding (a) that requires the request to be necessary “... due to the physical characteristics of the property and the proposed use or structure or other circumstances, including, but not limited to, topography, noise exposure, irregular property boundaries, or other unusual circumstance.”

Quantified Objective:	Ensure compliance with State law
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Zoning amendments completed by October 26, 2024, including zoning related to emergency shelters within one year of adoption.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H4.11: Scattered Site Housing for Persons Experiencing Homelessness

As funds become available, the City shall partner with other Alameda County cities and organizations like Bay Area Community Services (BACS) and Abode Housing to apply for funds to support the acquisition and conversion of single-family homes and hotels/motels to supportive shared housing for people experiencing homelessness. If the project is awarded funds and a partner organization acquires a property in Newark, the City will record a 55-year regulatory agreement against the subject property restricting the rents for extremely low-income households and establishing property maintenance and management standards. Staff will work with partners and the other participating cities to refine the program goals and secure matching funding from Alameda County HOME Consortium.

Quantified Objective:	Conversion of a Homekey-funded hotel containing 124 units for households experiencing homelessness and households at risk of homelessness was completed in 2023. Through a scattered-sites program, purchase 1-2 single-family properties in partnership with nonprofits utilizing available funds to provide extremely low-income housing units for persons experiencing homelessness, with a goal of identifying the majority of sites in high resource census tracts.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	Homekey-funded hotel conversion will be complete in 2023. Scattered-site program compete in 2025-2026, subject to the availability of federal, state and local funding e.
Funding Source(s):	Federal, state, and local funding sources, including Lanterman Act funds or Project Homekey.

PROGRAM H5.1: First-Time Homebuyer Assistance

Bring home ownership within reach for Newark residents. Develop a BMR homeownership program, and down payment assistance programs, with a focus on first time home buyers and BIPOC residents with low home ownership rates. The City will participate in the Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) and Down Payment Assistance (DPA) programs to provide down payment assistance to expand homeownership opportunities in Newark. Down payment assistance funds provided by the County may be used to leverage monies from other grants to provide additional assistance with the intent to make homeownership more attainable for families.

Quantified Objective:	The city will target an average of four households for down payment
-----------------------	---

	assistance each year, with a focus on recruitment of moderate income BIPOC households.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program developed by June 30, 2024 as part of the Affordable Housing work plan
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund, potentially CDBG funds.

PROGRAM H5.2: Affordable Housing Development Programs

Resolution 10184 to ensure an adequate amount of affordable housing through three programs.

- 1. Percentage of Affordable Units to mitigate the effects of new development.** The city utilizes a percentage of units for very low, low and moderate income units to be included in the development of new housing.
- 2. Density Bonus Law.** The city will offer developers the opportunity to utilize the state density Density Bonus (Section 17.19) for an increase in housing units affordable to very low, low and moderate income households or seniors. Concessions are also available under the density bonus law such as reduced parking standards and setbacks, and allowing tandem or uncovered parking.
- 3. Affordable Housing fee program.** This ordinance is codified in Chapter 17.18 of the Municipal Code. The fee is based on square footage of the project: The fee is calculated per square foot for floor area above 1,000 square feet, excluding garages, carports or common areas.

Quantified Objective:	778 housing units over the period of the Housing Element. 326 very low, 326 low income units, 126 moderate units
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City Council
Timeline:	Ongoing from existing program
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H5.3: Public Lands for dedicated affordable housing.

The city, in compliance with the Surplus Land Act will develop and implement programs and policies to further Increase the utilization of public land for affordable housing with particular emphasis in high resource and gentrifying areas to support housing mobility and anti displacement efforts.

Quantified Objective:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rezone PF (Public Facility) zoned land to allow affordable housing as a permitted use, by-right. 2. Rezone publicly owned land, from Single Family to Mid rise Residential for the development of 20 new housing units targeted for disabled, single parent and low and moderate income households. 3. Develop a public land framework / policy that enables a coordinated interagency approach to public land reuse. 4. Maintain long-term ownership of public sites to ensure permanent affordability and long-term financial benefits. 5. Work with the school district to reuse excess and underutilized school sites and meet the needs of the local education workforce for the creation of 50 new units of housing for low and moderate income households. 6. Consider interim uses of public sites that can provide amenities to the community (e.g., housing for those experiencing homelessness, art installations and non profit art spaces) 7. The City shall also continue to monitor the status of available land owned by other public agencies and actively work with developers that may wish to develop such properties for affordable housing.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Public land framework developed by June 30, 2025, rezonings to occur by December 31, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H5.4: Affordable Housing Overlay Zone

Develop an affordable housing overlay zone to incentivize the construction of affordable housing for very low, low, and moderate income households in targeted areas.

Quantified Objective:	Work to develop a series of incentives such as reduced parking requirements, and fast tracked permitting to bring increased production of affordable rental housing to the Four Corners area and other high opportunity areas of the city.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2026
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H6.1: In Response to Multi-Year Drought Conditions, Support a Community Reduction of Local Water Usage

Quantified Objective:	Develop a city wide water wise garden challenge, partner with local non profit organizations and city departments to support the transformation yards and medians with drought tolerant plants. Update municipal code to incorporate language on drought resistant landscaping.
Responsible Agency:	Public Works Department, Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2026
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H6.2: Encourage Water Utilities to Participate in BayREN's Water Upgrades \$ave Program

In order to make water efficiency improvements available to residents at little-to-no up-front cost. Provide information to residents on incentives for energy efficiency and electrification from organizations such as PG&E, BayREN, and others.

Quantified Objective:	Provide information in citywide mailings twice a year and post on City of Newark website and social media outlets.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, Public Works Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H6.3: Cool Roofs for Cool Homes

In response to increased urban heat events, work to ensure that homes are incorporating designs to support cooler interiors.

Quantified Objective:	Amend the City's building ordinance to exceed Title 24 standards by requiring cool roofs for all new or replacement roofs.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, Public Works Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program developed by June 30, 2025

Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund
--------------------	--

PROGRAM H6.4: Flood Risk Disclosure for New Development

As a significant portion of Newark falls within the 100 and 500 year flood plain, ensuring that development is built in response to climate change.

Quantified Objective:	Require developments in the flooding and other high-risk inundation areas to disclose flood risks and identify appropriate flood mitigation actions for incorporation into project design.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, Public Works Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H7.1: Training for Voucher Program and Landlord Responsibilities

Develop training programs in collaboration with Alameda County Housing Authority for property owners to understand the housing choice voucher program and landlord responsibilities.

Quantified Objective:	Hold two workshops annually for rental property owners/managers
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H7.2: Increase City Access, and Partner With Community Organizations To Ensure That Community Members Have Access To Tenant Rights Information and Fair Housing In Multiple Languages.

Expand education and outreach on fair housing laws and source of income discrimination to landlords, property owners with accessory dwelling units, and property owners seeking building permits for rental properties.

Quantified Objective:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cocreation of tenants rights information in collaboration with local community organizations made accessible in culturally relevant ways and in a variety of formats such as videos, flyers, social media and public workshops. • The city is working to install and implement the community development information module on the city’s website. The city expects to have this operational by the end of 2023 or early 2024. The City has launched a service called “TextMyGov” which is a streamlined way to interact with community members on various topics and services. Users can send questions or concerns via text on mobile devices. Responses are provided via a return text with links to additional information and city services. Users can also register to receive push notifications via text on various city topics such as general city affairs (in English and Spanish), City Council meetings, and community events.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	IMMEDIATE: Program implemented by June 30, 2024
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H7.3: Work with Newark Unified School District to Distribute Housing Resources

Work with Newark Unified School District to distribute housing resources to families enrolled in the district per state law AB27 that directs schools, including charter schools to identify homeless children and youth, requires annual staff training, and mandatory website postings of resources.

Quantified Objective:	Information on housing resources and general family support resources for district families distributed through multiple sources to increase accessibility and that families are connected with housing resources for those experiencing homelessness. Translated into relevant languages for families in Newark. An example would be information published on the website.
Responsible Agency:	City of Newark Homeless Committee, Newark Unified School District
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H7.4: Affirmatively Market Affordable Housing

Affirmatively market affordable housing rental and for sale units, through the online affordable housing listing portals such as the Alameda Housing Portal, Doorway and elsewhere, to underrepresented groups such as people with disabilities, extremely low income households and BIPOC households.

Quantified Objective:	Information on housing resources and general family support resources for district families distributed through multiple sources to increase accessibility and that families are connected with housing resources for those experiencing homelessness. Translated into relevant languages for families in Newark. An example would be information published on the website.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department, City of Newark Homeless Committee, Newark Unified School District
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Program developed by June 30, 2025
Funding Source(s):	Housing Impact Fee Fund

PROGRAM H7.5: Monitor housing programs through a mid-cycle review

The city commits to continuing improvement, evaluation, and adjustment of programs during the housing element cycle to ensure quantified objectives are being met.

Quantified Objective:	Review quantified objectives for housing construction, rehabilitation, and conservation
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	MID-TERM: Programs reviewed by end of 2026
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

PROGRAM H7.6: Monitor annual progress towards meeting the City’s RHNA goals

The city commits to continuing improvement, evaluation, and adjustment of programs during the

housing element cycle to ensure progress is being made toward the City’s RHNA goals.

Quantified Objective:	Monitor housing sites, residential development and future development potential, and programs annually. Survey property owners of sites in the sites inventory to stay current on the project viability and development climate. Report findings through the Annual Progress Report. Make adjustments to programs as needed.
Responsible Agency:	Community Development Department
Timeline:	ANNUALLY: The city will evaluate planned, approved and pending projects for progress toward completion every other year and if necessary, take alternative actions (e.g., additional sites or rezoning) within one year.
Funding Source(s):	Community Development Maintenance Fund

Quantified Objectives

One of the requirements of State law (California Government Code Section 65583[b]) is that the Housing Element contain quantified objectives for the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing. State law recognizes that the total housing needs identified by a community may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need. Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the total housing needs. The quantified objectives shown in Table 6-3 represent targets. They are estimates based on experience, anticipated funding levels, and housing market conditions. The quantified objectives are not designed to be minimum requirements. The quantified objectives are based largely upon implementation programs that have measurable outcomes. However, the Housing Element contains several policies and implementation programs that reduce barriers and create opportunities for affordable housing. These policies and programs are essential to meeting the City's housing needs but are more qualitative and difficult to quantify.

Table 6-3: List of Quantified Objectives for the 2023 to 2031 Planning Period

Action	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
RHNA	464	268	318	824	1,874
<i>New Construction</i>					
Pipeline Projects	274	66	26	891	1,257
Program H2.1 and H2.8 Missing Middle			200		200
Program H2.2 Accessory Dwelling Units	48	48	48	16	160
<i>Rehabilitation</i>					
Program H1.1 Housing Rehabilitation and Repair ¹⁴	34	34	34		102
Program H1.2 Rental Inspection and Repair	32	32	32		96
<i>Conservation, Preservation, + Assistance</i>					
Program H4.3 Tenant Protections	50	40	30		120
Program H4.8 and H5.1 First Time Home Buyer and Foreclosure		10	14		24
Program H4.7 Disability	10	10			20
Program H4.5 Shared Housing	80	80			160

Source: City of Newark, 2023

¹⁴ Community Development Block Grant Status Report. April 5, 2023. An average of 9 units per year in a 10 year period.

APPENDIX A HOUSING NEEDS

HOUSING NEEDS DATA REPORT: NEWARK

ABAG/MTC Staff and Baird + Driskell Community Planning

2021-04-02



ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Technical Assistance
for Local Planning
HOUSING

0.1 Table of content

0.1	Table of content	2
0.2	List of figures	3
0.3	List of tables	3
1	Introduction	5
2	Summary of Key Facts	6
3	Looking to the Future: Regional Housing Needs	9
3.1	Regional Housing Needs Determination.....	9
3.2	Regional Housing Needs Allocation	9
4	Population, Employment and Household Characteristics	11
4.1	Population	11
4.2	Age	12
4.3	Race and Ethnicity	14
4.4	Employment Trends	15
4.4.1	Balance of Jobs and Workers.....	15
4.4.2	Sector Composition	19
4.4.3	Unemployment	20
4.5	Extremely Low-Income Households.....	21
4.6	Tenure.....	25
4.7	Displacement	29
5	Housing Stock Characteristics	31
5.1	Housing Types, Year Built, Vacancy, and Permits.....	31
5.2	Assisted Housing Developments At-Risk of Conversion.....	34
5.3	Substandard Housing.....	35
5.4	Home and Rent Values.....	36
5.5	Overpayment and Overcrowding	39
6	Special Housing Needs.....	48
6.1	Large Households	48
6.2	Female-Headed Households.....	49
6.3	Seniors.....	51
6.4	People with Disabilities	52
6.5	Homelessness.....	54
6.6	Farmworkers	59
6.7	Non-English Speakers	60



0.2 List of figures

Figure 1: Population Growth Trends	12
Figure 2: Population by Age, 2000-2019	13
Figure 3: Senior and Youth Population by Race	14
Figure 4: Population by Race, 2000-2019	15
Figure 5: Jobs in a Jurisdiction	16
Figure 6: Workers by Earnings, by Jurisdiction as Place of Work and Place of Residence.....	17
Figure 7: Jobs-Worker Ratios, By Wage Group	18
Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio	19
Figure 9: Resident Employment by Industry	20
Figure 10: Unemployment Rate	21
Figure 11: Households by Household Income Level	23
Figure 12: Household Income Level by Tenure	24
Figure 13: Poverty Status by Race	25
Figure 14: Housing Tenure	26
Figure 15: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder	27
Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Age	28
Figure 17: Housing Tenure by Housing Type	29
Figure 18: Households by Displacement Risk and Tenure.....	30
Figure 19: Housing Type Trends	31
Figure 20: Housing Units by Year Structure Built	32
Figure 21: Vacant Units by Type	33
Figure 22: Substandard Housing Issues.....	36
Figure 23: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units.....	37
Figure 24: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)	37
Figure 25: Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units.....	38
Figure 26: Median Contract Rent	39
Figure 27: Cost Burden by Tenure	40
Figure 28: Cost Burden by Income Level	41
Figure 29: Cost Burden by Race.....	42
Figure 30: Cost Burden by Household Size	43
Figure 31: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level	44
Figure 32: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity	45
Figure 33: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity	46
Figure 34: Overcrowding by Race.....	47
Figure 35: Household Size by Tenure	48
Figure 36: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms	49
Figure 37: Household Type	50
Figure 38: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status.....	51
Figure 39: Senior Households by Income and Tenure.....	52
Figure 40: Disability by Type	53
Figure 41: Homelessness by Household Type and Shelter Status, Alameda County	55
Figure 42: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, Alameda County	56
Figure 43: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, Alameda County.....	57
Figure 44: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, Alameda County.....	58
Figure 45: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, Alameda County.....	60
Figure 46: Population with Limited English Proficiency.....	61

0.3 List of tables

Table 1: Illustrative Regional Housing Needs Allocation from Draft Methodology 10

Table 2: Population Growth Trends 11

Table 3: Housing Permitting 33

Table 4: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion 34

Table 5: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age 54

Table 6: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence 54

Table 7: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness 59

Table 8: Migrant Worker Student Population 59

1 INTRODUCTION

The Bay Area continues to see growth in both population and jobs, which means more housing of various types and sizes is needed to ensure that residents across all income levels, ages, and abilities have a place to call home. While the number of people drawn to the region over the past 30 years has steadily increased, housing production has stalled, contributing to the housing shortage that communities are experiencing today. In many cities, this has resulted in residents being priced out, increased traffic congestion caused by longer commutes, and fewer people across incomes being able to purchase homes or meet surging rents.

The 2023-2031 Housing Element Update provides a roadmap for how to meet our growth and housing challenges. Required by the state, the Housing Element identifies what the existing housing conditions and community needs are, reiterates goals, and creates a plan for more housing. The Housing Element is an integral part of the General Plan, which guides the policies of Newark.



2 SUMMARY OF KEY FACTS

- **Population** - Generally, the population of the Bay Area continues to grow because of natural growth and because the strong economy draws new residents to the region. The population of Newark increased by 15.3% from 2000 to 2020, which is above the growth rate of the Bay Area.
- **Age** - In 2019, Newark’s youth population under the age of 18 was 10,015 and senior population 65 and older was 6,038. These age groups represent 21.2% and 12.8%, respectively, of Newark’s population.
- **Race/Ethnicity** - In 2020, 23.7% of Newark’s population was White while 3.9% was African American, 33.9% was Asian, and 34.8% was Latinx. People of color in Newark comprise a proportion above the overall proportion in the Bay Area as a whole.¹
- **Employment** - Newark residents most commonly work in the *Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation* industry. From January 2010 to January 2021, the unemployment rate in Newark decreased by 3.7 percentage points. Since 2010, the number of jobs located in the jurisdiction increased by 4,650 (29.9%). Additionally, the jobs-household ratio in Newark has increased from 1.33 in 2002 to 1.49 jobs per household in 2018.
- **Number of Homes** - The number of new homes built in the Bay Area has not kept pace with the demand, resulting in longer commutes, increasing prices, and exacerbating issues of displacement and homelessness. The number of homes in Newark increased, 11.2% from 2010 to 2020, which is *above* the growth rate for Alameda County and *above* the growth rate of the region’s housing stock during this time period.
- **Home Prices** - A diversity of homes at all income levels creates opportunities for all Newark residents to live and thrive in the community.
 - **Ownership** The largest proportion of homes had a value in the range of \$750k-\$1M in 2019. Home prices increased by 133.9% from 2010 to 2020.
 - **Rental Prices** - The typical contract rent for an apartment in Newark was \$2,110 in 2019. Rental prices increased by 61.1% from 2009 to 2019. To rent a typical apartment without cost burden, a household would need to make \$84,720 per year.²
- **Housing Type** - It is important to have a variety of housing types to meet the needs of a community today and in the future. In 2020, 69.6% of homes in Newark were single family detached, 9.5% were single family attached, 4.4% were small multifamily (2-4 units), and 16.5% were medium or large multifamily (5+ units). Between 2010 and 2020, the number of single-family units increased more than multi-family units. Generally, in Newark, the share of the

¹ The Census Bureau’s American Community Survey accounts for ethnic origin separate from racial identity. The numbers reported here use an accounting of both such that the racial categories are shown exclusive of Latinx status, to allow for an accounting of the Latinx population regardless of racial identity. The term Hispanic has historically been used to describe people from numerous Central American, South American, and Caribbean countries. In recent years, the term Latino or Latinx has become preferred. This report generally uses Latinx, but occasionally when discussing US Census data, we use Hispanic or Non-Hispanic, to clearly link to the data source.

² Note that contract rents may differ significantly from, and often being lower than, current listing prices.



housing stock that is detached single family homes is above that of other jurisdictions in the region.

- **Cost Burden** - The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers housing to be affordable for a household if the household spends less than 30% of its income on housing costs. A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” In Newark, 19.2% of households spend 30%-50% of their income on housing, while 12.4% of households are severely cost burden and use the majority of their income for housing.
- **Displacement/Gentrification** - According to research from The University of California, Berkeley, 0.0% of households in Newark live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement, and 0.0% live in areas at risk of or undergoing gentrification. 31.8% of households in Newark live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely excluded due to prohibitive housing costs. There are various ways to address displacement including ensuring new housing at all income levels is built.
- **Neighborhood** - 9.7% of residents in Newark live in neighborhoods identified as “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” areas by State-commissioned research, while 11.0% of residents live in areas identified by this research as “Low Resource” or “High Segregation and Poverty” areas. These neighborhood designations are based on a range of indicators covering areas such as education, poverty, proximity to jobs and economic opportunities, low pollution levels, and other factors.³
- **Special Housing Needs** - Some population groups may have special housing needs that require specific program responses, and these groups may experience barriers to accessing stable housing due to their specific housing circumstances. In Newark, 7.6% of residents have a disability of any kind and may require accessible housing. Additionally, 18.7% of Newark households are larger households with five or more people, who likely need larger housing units with three bedrooms or more. 11.8% of households are female-headed families, which are often at greater risk of housing insecurity.

Note on Data

Many of the tables in this report are sourced from data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey or U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, both of which are samples and as such, are subject to sampling variability. This means that data is an estimate, and that other estimates could be possible if another set of respondents had been reached. We use the five-year release to get a

³ For more information on the “opportunity area” categories developed by HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, see this website: <https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp>. The degree to which different jurisdictions and neighborhoods have access to opportunity will likely need to be analyzed as part of new Housing Element requirements related to affirmatively furthering fair housing. ABAG/MTC will be providing jurisdictions with technical assistance on this topic this summer, following the release of additional guidance from HCD.



larger data pool to minimize this “margin of error” but particularly for the smaller cities, the data will be based on fewer responses, and the information should be interpreted accordingly.

Additionally, there may be instances where there is no data available for a jurisdiction for particular data point, or where a value is 0 and the automatically generated text cannot perform a calculation. In these cases, the automatically generated text is “NODATA.” Staff should reword these sentences before using them in the context of the Housing Element or other documents.

Note on Figures

Any figure that does not specify geography in the figure name represents data for Newark.

3 LOOKING TO THE FUTURE: REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS

3.1 Regional Housing Needs Determination

The Plan Bay Area 2050⁴ Final Blueprint forecasts that the nine-county Bay Area will add 1.4 million new households between 2015 and 2050. For the eight-year time frame covered by this Housing Element Update, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has identified the region's housing need as 441,176 units. The total number of housing units assigned by HCD is separated into four income categories that cover housing types for all income levels, from very low-income households to market rate housing.⁵ This calculation, known as the Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND), is based on population projections produced by the California Department of Finance as well as adjustments that incorporate the region's existing housing need. The adjustments result from recent legislation requiring HCD to apply additional adjustment factors to the baseline growth projection from California Department of Finance, in order for the regions to get closer to healthy housing markets. To this end, adjustments focus on the region's vacancy rate, level of overcrowding and the share of cost burdened households, and seek to bring the region more in line with comparable ones.⁶ These new laws governing the methodology for how HCD calculates the RHND resulted in a significantly higher number of housing units for which the Bay Area must plan compared to previous RHNA cycles.

3.2 Regional Housing Needs Allocation

A starting point for the Housing Element Update process for every California jurisdiction is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA - the share of the RHND assigned to each jurisdiction by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). State Housing Element Law requires ABAG to develop a methodology that calculates the number of housing units assigned to each city and county and distributes each jurisdiction's housing unit allocation among four affordability levels. For this RHNA cycle, the RHND increased by 135%, from 187,990 to 441,776. For more information on the RHNA process this cycle, see ABAG's website: <https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/rhna-regional-housing-needs-allocation>

Almost all jurisdictions in the Bay Area are likely to receive a larger RHNA this cycle compared to the last cycle, primarily due to changes in state law that led to a considerably higher RHND compared to previous cycles.

In January 2021, ABAG adopted a Draft RHNA Methodology, which is currently being reviewed by HCD. For Newark, the proposed RHNA to be planned for this cycle is 1,874 units, a stated increase from the last cycle. **Please note that the previously stated figures are merely illustrative, as ABAG has yet to issue Final RHNA allocations. The Final RHNA allocations that local jurisdictions will use for their**

⁴ Plan Bay Area 2050 is a long-range plan charting the course for the future of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It covers four key issues: the economy, the environment, housing and transportation

⁵ HCD divides the RHND into the following four income categories:

Very Low-income: 0-50% of Area Median Income

Low-income: 50-80% of Area Median Income

Moderate-income: 80-120% of Area Median Income

Above Moderate-income: 120% or more of Area Median Income

⁶ For more information on HCD's RHND calculation for the Bay Area, see this letter sent to ABAG from HCD on June 9, 2020: [https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/abagrhna-final060920\(r\).pdf](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/abagrhna-final060920(r).pdf)



Housing Elements will be released at the end of 2021. The potential allocation that Newark would receive from the Draft RHNA Methodology is broken down by income category as follows:

Table 1: Illustrative Regional Housing Needs Allocation from Draft Methodology

Income Group	Newark Units	Alameda County Units	Bay Area Units	Newark Percent	Alameda County Percent	Bay Area Percent
Very Low Income (<50% of AMI)	464	23606	114442	24.8%	26.5%	25.9%
Low Income (50%-80% of AMI)	268	13591	65892	14.3%	15.3%	14.9%
Moderate Income (80%-120% of AMI)	318	14438	72712	17.0%	16.2%	16.5%
Above Moderate Income (>120% of AMI)	824	37362	188130	44.0%	42.0%	42.6%
Total	1874	88997	441176	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments Methodology and tentative numbers were approved by ABAG's Executive board on January 21, 2021 (Resolution No. 02-2021). The numbers were submitted for review to California Housing and Community Development in February 2021, after which an appeals process will take place during the Summer and Fall of 2021. THESE NUMBERS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PRELIMINARY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE PER HCD REVIEW

4 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

4.1 Population

The Bay Area is the fifth-largest metropolitan area in the nation and has seen a steady increase in population since 1990, except for a dip during the Great Recession. Many cities in the region have experienced significant growth in jobs and population. While these trends have led to a corresponding increase in demand for housing across the region, the regional production of housing has largely not kept pace with job and population growth. Since 2000, Newark’s population has increased by 15.3%; this rate is above that of the region as a whole, at 14.8%. In Newark, roughly 9.5% of its population moved during the past year, a number 3.9 percentage points smaller than the regional rate of 13.4%.

Table 2: Population Growth Trends

Geography	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Newark	37861	39681	42471	43522	42573	44371	48966
Alameda County	1276702	1344157	1443939	1498963	1510271	1613528	1670834
Bay Area	6020147	6381961	6784348	7073912	7150739	7595694	7790537

Universe: Total population

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series

For more years of data, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-01.

In 2020, the population of Newark was estimated to be 48,966 (see Table 2). From 1990 to 2000, the population increased by 12.2%, while it increased by 0.2% during the first decade of the 2000s. In the most recent decade, the population increased by 15.0%. The population of Newark makes up 2.9% of Alameda County.⁷

⁷ To compare the rate of growth across various geographic scales, Figure 1 shows population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the year 1990. This means that the data points represent the population growth (i.e. percent change) in each of these geographies relative to their populations in 1990.




Figure 1: Population Growth Trends

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series Note: The data shown on the graph represents population for the jurisdiction, county, and region indexed to the population in the first year shown. The data points represent the relative population growth in each of these geographies relative to their populations in that year. For some jurisdictions, a break may appear at the end of each decade (1999, 2009) as estimates are compared to census counts. DOF uses the decennial census to benchmark subsequent population estimates. For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-01.

4.2 Age

The distribution of age groups in a city shapes what types of housing the community may need in the near future. An increase in the older population may mean there is a developing need for more senior housing options, while higher numbers of children and young families can point to the need for more family housing options and related services. There has also been a move by many to age-in-place or downsize to stay within their communities, which can mean more multifamily and accessible units are also needed.

In Newark, the median age in 2000 was 32.2; by 2019, this figure had increased, landing at around 37 years. More specifically, the population of those under 14 has decreased since 2010, while the 65-and-over population has increased (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: Population by Age, 2000-2019

Universe: Total population

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 SF1, Table P12; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-04.

Looking at the senior and youth population by race can add an additional layer of understanding, as families and seniors of color are even more likely to experience challenges finding affordable housing. People of color⁸ make up 51.4% of seniors and 73.8% of youth under 18 (see Figure 3).

⁸ Here, we count all non-white racial groups




Figure 3: Senior and Youth Population by Race

Universe: Total population

Notes: In the sources for this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity, and an overlapping category of Hispanic / non-Hispanic groups has not been shown to avoid double counting in the stacked bar chart.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-G)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-02.

4.3 Race and Ethnicity

Understanding the racial makeup of a city and region is important for designing and implementing effective housing policies and programs. These patterns are shaped by both market factors and government actions, such as exclusionary zoning, discriminatory lending practices and displacement that has occurred over time and continues to impact communities of color today⁹. Since 2000, the percentage of residents in Newark identifying as White has decreased - and by the same token the percentage of residents of all *other* races and ethnicities has *increased* - by 18.6 percentage points, with the 2019 population standing at 11,168 (see Figure 4). In absolute terms, the *Asian / API, Non-Hispanic* population increased the most while the *White, Non-Hispanic* population decreased the most.

⁹ See, for example, Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law : a forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY & London, UK: Liveright Publishing.




Figure 4: Population by Race, 2000-2019

Universe: Total population

Notes: Data for 2019 represents 2015-2019 ACS estimates. The Census Bureau defines Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity separate from racial categories. For the purposes of this graph, the “Hispanic or Latinx” racial/ethnic group represents those who identify as having Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity and may also be members of any racial group. All other racial categories on this graph represent those who identify with that racial category and do not identify with Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, Table P004; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B03002

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-02.

4.4 Employment Trends

4.4.1 Balance of Jobs and Workers

A city houses employed residents who either work in the community where they live or work elsewhere in the region. Conversely, a city may have job sites that employ residents from the same city, but more often employ workers commuting from outside of it. Smaller cities typically will have more employed residents than jobs there and export workers, while larger cities tend to have a surplus of jobs and import workers. To some extent the regional transportation system is set up for this flow of workers to the region’s core job centers. At the same time, as the housing affordability crisis has illustrated, local imbalances may be severe, where local jobs and worker populations are out of sync at a sub-regional scale.

One measure of this is the relationship between *workers* and *jobs*. A city with a surplus of workers “exports” workers to other parts of the region, while a city with a surplus of jobs must conversely “import” them. Between 2002 and 2018, the number of jobs in Newark increased by 15.3% (see Figure 5).




Figure 5: Jobs in a Jurisdiction

Universe: Jobs from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment

Notes: The data is tabulated by place of work, regardless of where a worker lives. The source data is provided at the census block level. These are crosswalked to jurisdictions and summarized.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files, 2002-2018 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-11.

There are 17,935 employed residents, and 17,168 jobs¹⁰ in Newark - the ratio of jobs to resident workers is 0.96; Newark is a *net exporter of workers*.

Figure 6 shows the balance when comparing jobs to workers, broken down by different wage groups, offering additional insight into local dynamics. A community may offer employment for relatively low-income workers but have relatively few housing options for those workers - or conversely, it may house residents who are low wage workers but offer few employment opportunities for them. Such relationships may cast extra light on potentially pent-up demand for housing in particular price categories. A relative *surplus* of jobs relative to residents in a given wage category suggests the need to import those workers, while conversely, surpluses of workers in a wage group relative to jobs means the community will export those workers to other jurisdictions. Such flows are not inherently bad, though over time, sub-regional imbalances may appear. Newark has more low-wage *jobs* than low-wage *residents* (where low-wage refers to jobs paying less than \$25,000). At the other end of the wage

¹⁰ Employed *residents* in a jurisdiction is counted by place of residence (they may work elsewhere) while *jobs* in a jurisdiction are counted by place of work (they may live elsewhere). The jobs may differ from those reported in Figure 5 as the source for the time series is from administrative data, while the cross-sectional data is from a survey.

spectrum, the city has more high-wage *residents* than high-wage *jobs* (where high-wage refers to jobs paying more than \$75,000) (see Figure 6).¹¹




Figure 6: Workers by Earnings, by Jurisdiction as Place of Work and Place of Residence

Universe: Workers 16 years and over with earnings

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2015-2019, B08119, B08519

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-10.

Figure 7 shows the balance of a jurisdiction’s resident workers to the jobs located there for different wage groups as a ratio instead - a value of 1 means that a city has the same number of jobs in a wage group as it has resident workers - in principle, a balance. Values above 1 indicate a jurisdiction will need to import workers for jobs in a given wage group. At the regional scale, this ratio is 1.04 jobs for each worker, implying a modest import of workers from outside the region (see Figure 7).

¹¹ The source table is top-coded at \$75,000, precluding more fine grained analysis at the higher end of the wage spectrum.




Figure 7: Jobs-Worker Ratios, By Wage Group

Universe: Jobs in a jurisdiction from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment

Notes: The ratio compares job counts by wage group from two tabulations of LEHD data: Counts by place of work relative to counts by place of residence. See text for details.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs); Residence Area Characteristics (RAC) files (Employed Residents), 2010-2018

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-14.

Such balances between jobs and workers may directly influence the housing demand in a community. New jobs may draw new residents, and when there is high demand for housing relative to supply, many workers may be unable to afford to live where they work, particularly where job growth has been in relatively lower wage jobs. This dynamic not only means many workers will need to prepare for long commutes and time spent on the road, but in the aggregate it contributes to traffic congestion and time lost for all road users.

If there are more jobs than employed residents, it means a city is relatively jobs-rich, typically also with a high jobs to household ratio. Thus bringing housing into the measure, the *jobs-household ratio* in Newark has increased from 1.33 in 2002, to 1.49 jobs per household in 2018 (see Figure 8).




Figure 8: Jobs-Household Ratio

Universe: Jobs in a jurisdiction from unemployment insurance-covered employment (private, state and local government) plus United States Office of Personnel Management-sourced Federal employment; households in a jurisdiction

Notes: The data is tabulated by place of work, regardless of where a worker lives. The source data is provided at the census block level. These are crosswalked to jurisdictions and summarized. The ratio compares place of work wage and salary jobs with households, or occupied housing units. A similar measure is the ratio of jobs to housing units. However, this jobs-household ratio serves to compare the number of jobs in a jurisdiction to the number of housing units that are actually occupied. The difference between a jurisdiction’s jobs-housing ratio and jobs-household ratio will be most pronounced in jurisdictions with high vacancy rates, a high rate of units used for seasonal use, or a high rate of units used as short-term rentals.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Workplace Area Characteristics (WAC) files (Jobs), 2002-2018; California Department of Finance, E-5 (Households)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-13.

4.4.2 Sector Composition

In terms of sectoral composition, the largest industry in which Newark residents work is *Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation*, and the largest sector in which Alameda residents work is *Health & Educational Services* (see Figure 9). For the Bay Area as a whole, the *Health & Educational Services* industry employs the most workers.




Figure 9: Resident Employment by Industry

Universe: Civilian employed population age 16 years and over

Notes: The data displayed shows the industries in which jurisdiction residents work, regardless of the location where those residents are employed (whether within the jurisdiction or not). Categories are derived from the following source tables: Agriculture & Natural Resources: C24030_003E, C24030_030E; Construction: C24030_006E, C24030_033E; Manufacturing, Wholesale & Transportation: C24030_007E, C24030_034E, C24030_008E, C24030_035E, C24030_010E, C24030_037E; Retail: C24030_009E, C24030_036E; Information: C24030_013E, C24030_040E; Financial & Professional Services: C24030_014E, C24030_041E, C24030_017E, C24030_044E; Health & Educational Services: C24030_021E, C24030_024E, C24030_048E, C24030_051E; Other: C24030_027E, C24030_054E, C24030_028E, C24030_055E

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table C24030

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-06.

4.4.3 Unemployment

In Newark, there was a 3.7 percentage point decrease in the unemployment rate between January 2010 and January 2021. Jurisdictions through the region experienced a sharp rise in unemployment in 2020 due to impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, though with a general improvement and recovery in the later months of 2020.




Figure 10: Unemployment Rate

Universe: Civilian noninstitutional population ages 16 and older

Notes: Unemployment rates for the jurisdiction level is derived from larger-geography estimates. This method assumes that the rates of change in employment and unemployment are exactly the same in each sub-county area as at the county level. If this assumption is not true for a specific sub-county area, then the estimates for that area may not be representative of the current economic conditions. Since this assumption is untested, caution should be employed when using these data. Only not seasonally-adjusted labor force (unemployment rates) data are developed for cities and CDPs.

Source: California Employment Development Department, Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS), Sub-county areas monthly updates, 2010-2021.

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-15.

4.5 Extremely Low-Income Households

Despite the economic and job growth experienced throughout the region since 1990, the income gap has continued to widen. California is one of the most economically unequal states in the nation, and the Bay Area has the highest income inequality between high- and low-income households in the state¹².

In Newark, 57.5% of households make more than 100% of the Area Median Income (AMI)¹³, compared to 10.3% making less than 30% of AMI, which is considered extremely low-income (see Figure 11).

¹² Bohn, S. et al. 2020. Income Inequality and Economic Opportunity in California. *Public Policy Institute of California*.

¹³ Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. Households making between 80 and 120 percent of the AMI are moderate-income, those making 50 to 80 percent are low-income, those making 30 to 50

Regionally, more than half of all households make more than 100% AMI, while 15% make less than 30% AMI. In Alameda County, 30% AMI is the equivalent to the annual income of \$34,850 for a family of four. Many households with multiple wage earners - including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers and healthcare professionals - can fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in many industries.

Note on Estimating the Projected Number of Extremely Low-Income Households

Local jurisdictions are required to provide an estimate for their projected extremely low-income households in their Housing Elements. HCD's official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making 0-50% AMI) to calculate their projected extremely low-income households. For more information, visit HCD's Building Blocks page on Extremely Low-Income Housing Needs.

This document does not contain the required data point of projected extremely low-income households, as Bay Area jurisdictions have not yet received their final RHNA numbers. Once Newark receives its 6th Cycle RHNA, staff can estimate the projected extremely low-income households using one of the following three methodologies:

Option A: Assume that 59.8% of Newark's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

According to HCD's Regional Housing Need Determination for the Bay Area, 15.5% of the region's housing need is for 0-30% AMI households while 25.9% is for 0-50% AMI households. Therefore, extremely low-income housing need represents 59.8% of the region's very low-income housing need, as 15.5 divided by 25.9 is 59.8%. This option aligns with HCD's guidance to use U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, as HCD uses U.S. Census data to calculate the Regional Housing Need Determination.

Option B: Assume that 55.2% of Newark's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

According to the data shown below (Figure 11), 2,508 of Newark's households are 0-50% AMI while 1,384 are extremely low-income. Therefore, extremely low-income households represent 55.2% of households who are 0-50% AMI, as 1,384 divided by 2,508 is 55.2%. This option aligns with HCD's guidance to use U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, as the information in Figure 11 represents a tabulation of Census Bureau Data.

Option C: Assume that 50% of Newark's very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households.

HCD's guidance notes that instead of using U.S. Census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income RHNA that qualifies for extremely low-income households, local jurisdictions can presume that 50% of their RHNA for very low-income households qualifies for extremely low-income households.

percent are very low-income, and those making less than 30 percent are extremely low-income. This is then adjusted for household size.




Figure 11: Households by Household Income Level

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. The data that is reported for the Bay Area is not based on a regional AMI but instead refers to the regional total of households in an income group relative to the AMI for the county where that household is located. Local jurisdictions are required to provide an estimate for their projected extremely low-income households (0-30% AMI) in their Housing Elements. HCD's official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making 0-50% AMI) to calculate their projected extremely low-income households. As Bay Area jurisdictions have not yet received their final RHNA numbers, this document does not contain the required data point of projected extremely low-income households. The report portion of the housing data needs packet contains more specific guidance for how local staff can calculate an estimate for projected extremely low-income households once jurisdictions receive their 6th cycle RHNA numbers.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table ELI-01.

Throughout the region, there are disparities between the incomes of homeowners and renters. Typically, the number of low-income renters greatly outpaces the amount of housing available that is affordable for these households.

In Newark, the largest proportion of renters falls in the *Greater than 100% of AMI* income group, while the largest proportion of homeowners are found in the *Greater than 100% of AMI* group (see Figure 12).




Figure 12: Household Income Level by Tenure

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-21.

Currently, people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to white residents.¹⁴ These economic disparities also leave communities of color at higher risk for housing insecurity, displacement or homelessness. In Newark, Black or African American (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents experience the highest rates of poverty, followed by American Indian or Alaska Native (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents (see Figure 13).

¹⁴ Moore, E., Montojo, N. and Mauri, N., 2019. Roots, Race & Place: A History of Racially Exclusionary Housing the San Francisco Bay Area. *Hass Institute*.




Figure 13: Poverty Status by Race

Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined

Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the population for whom poverty status is determined for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled "Hispanic and Non-Hispanic" are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the population for whom poverty status is determined.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17001(A-I)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table ELI-03.

4.6 Tenure

The number of residents who own their homes compared to those who rent their homes can help identify the level of housing insecurity - ability for individuals to stay in their homes - in a city and region. Generally, renters may be displaced more quickly if prices increase. In Newark there are a total of 14,047 housing units, and fewer residents rent than own their homes: 31.2% versus 68.8% (see Figure 14). By comparison, 46.5% of households in Alameda County are renters, while 44% of Bay Area households rent their homes.




Figure 14: Housing Tenure

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-16.

Homeownership rates often vary considerably across race/ethnicity in the Bay Area and throughout the country. These disparities not only reflect differences in income and wealth but also stem from federal, state, and local policies that limited access to homeownership for communities of color while facilitating homebuying for white residents. While many of these policies, such as redlining, have been formally disbanded, the impacts of race-based policy are still evident across Bay Area communities.¹⁵ In Newark, 54.1% of Black households owned their homes, while homeownership rates were 74.5% for Asian households, 54.1% for Latinx households, and 77.1% for White households. Notably, recent changes to state law require local jurisdictions to examine these dynamics and other fair housing issues when updating their Housing Elements.

¹⁵ See, for example, Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law : a forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY & London, UK: Liveright Publishing.




Figure 15: Housing Tenure by Race of Householder

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the total number of occupied housing units for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled “Hispanic and Non-Hispanic” are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the total number of occupied housing units.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003(A-I)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-20.

The age of residents who rent or own their home can also signal the housing challenges a community is experiencing. Younger households tend to rent and may struggle to buy a first home in the Bay Area due to high housing costs. At the same time, senior homeowners seeking to downsize may have limited options in an expensive housing market.

In Newark, 43.6% of householders between the ages of 25 and 44 are renters, while 13.5% of householders over 65 are (see Figure 16).




Figure 16: Housing Tenure by Age

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25007

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-18.

In many cities, homeownership rates for households in single-family homes are substantially higher than the rates for households in multi-family housing. In Newark, 82.3% of households in detached single-family homes are homeowners, while 22.7% of households in multi-family housing are homeowners (see Figure 17).




Figure 17: Housing Tenure by Housing Type

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25032

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-22.

4.7 Displacement

Because of increasing housing prices, displacement is a major concern in the Bay Area. Displacement has the most severe impacts on low- and moderate-income residents. When individuals or families are forced to leave their homes and communities, they also lose their support network.

The University of California, Berkeley has mapped all neighborhoods in the Bay area, identifying their risk for gentrification. They find that in Newark, 0.0% of households live in neighborhoods that are susceptible to or experiencing displacement and 0.0% live in neighborhoods at risk of or undergoing gentrification.

Equally important, some neighborhoods in the Bay Area do not have housing appropriate for a broad section of the workforce. UC Berkeley estimates that 31.8% of households in Newark live in neighborhoods where low-income households are likely to be excluded due to prohibitive housing costs.¹⁶

¹⁶ More information about this gentrification and displacement data is available at the Urban Displacement Project's webpage: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/>. Specifically, one can learn more about the different gentrification/displacement typologies shown in Figure 18 at this link: https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/typology_sheet_2018_0.png. Additionally, one can view maps that show which typologies correspond to which parts of a jurisdiction here: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/san-francisco/sf-bay-area-gentrification-and-displacement>






Figure 18: Households by Displacement Risk and Tenure

Universe: Households

Notes: Displacement data is available at the census tract level. Staff aggregated tracts up to jurisdiction level using census 2010 population weights, assigning a tract to jurisdiction in proportion to block level population weights. Total household count may differ slightly from counts in other tables sourced from jurisdiction level sources. Categories are combined as follows for simplicity: At risk of or Experiencing Exclusion: At Risk of Becoming Exclusive; Becoming Exclusive; Stable/Advanced Exclusive At risk of or Experiencing Gentrification: At Risk of Gentrification; Early/Ongoing Gentrification; Advanced Gentrification Stable Moderate/Mixed Income: Stable Moderate/Mixed Income Susceptible to or Experiencing Displacement: Low-Income/Susceptible to Displacement; Ongoing Displacement Other: High Student Population; Unavailable or Unreliable Data Source: Urban Displacement Project for classification, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25003 for tenure.

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-25.

5 HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

5.1 Housing Types, Year Built, Vacancy, and Permits

In recent years, most housing produced in the region and across the state consisted of single-family homes and larger multi-unit buildings. However, some households are increasingly interested in “missing middle housing” - including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, cottage clusters and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). These housing types may open up more options across incomes and tenure, from young households seeking homeownership options to seniors looking to downsize and age-in-place.

The housing stock of Newark in 2020 was made up of 69.6% single family detached homes, 9.5% single family attached homes, 4.4% multifamily homes with 2 to 4 units, 16.5% multifamily homes with 5 or more units, and 0.0% mobile homes (see Figure 19). In Newark, the housing type that experienced the most growth between 2010 and 2020 was *Single-Family Home: Detached*.




Figure 19: Housing Type Trends

Universe: Housing units

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5 series

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-01.

Production has not kept up with housing demand for several decades in the Bay Area, as the total number of units built and available has not yet come close to meeting the population and job growth experienced throughout the region. In Newark, the largest proportion of the housing stock was built 1960 to 1979, with 7,737 units constructed during this period (see Figure 20). Since 2010, 4.9% of the current housing stock was built, which is 713 units.




Figure 20: Housing Units by Year Structure Built

Universe: Housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25034

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-04.

Vacant units make up 3.5% of the overall housing stock in Newark. The rental vacancy stands at 2.6%, while the ownership vacancy rate is 1.7%. Of the vacant units, the most common type of vacancy is *For Seasonal, Recreational, Or Occasional Use* (see Figure 21).¹⁷

Throughout the Bay Area, vacancies make up 2.6% of the total housing units, with homes listed for rent; units used for *recreational or occasional use*, and units not otherwise classified (*other vacant*) making up the majority of vacancies. The Census Bureau classifies a unit as vacant if no one is occupying it when census interviewers are conducting the American Community Survey or Decennial Census. Vacant units classified as “for recreational or occasional use” are those that are held for short-term periods of use throughout the year. Accordingly, vacation rentals and short-term rentals like AirBnB are likely to fall in this category. The Census Bureau classifies units as “other vacant” if they are vacant due to foreclosure, personal/family reasons, legal proceedings, repairs/renovations, abandonment, preparation for being rented or sold, or vacant for an extended absence for reasons such as a work assignment, military duty, or incarceration.¹⁸ In a region with a thriving economy and housing market like the Bay Area, units being renovated/repared and prepared for rental or sale are likely to represent a large portion of the “other vacant” category. Additionally, the need for seismic retrofitting

¹⁷ The vacancy rates by tenure is for a smaller universe than the total vacancy rate first reported, which in principle includes the full stock (3.5%). The vacancy by tenure counts are rates relative to the rental stock (occupied and vacant) and ownership stock (occupied and vacant) - but exclude a significant number of vacancy categories, including the numerically significant *other vacant*.

¹⁸ For more information, see pages 3 through 6 of this list of definitions prepared by the Census Bureau: <https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/definitions.pdf>.

in older housing stock could also influence the proportion of “other vacant” units in some jurisdictions.¹⁹




Figure 21: Vacant Units by Type

Universe: Vacant housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25004

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-03.

Between 2015 and 2019, 829 housing units were issued permits in Newark. 95.7% of permits issued in Newark were for above moderate-income housing, 4.3% were for moderate-income housing, and 0.0% were for low- or very low-income housing (see Table 3).

Table 3: Housing Permitting

Income Group	value
Above Moderate Income Permits	793
Moderate Income Permits	36
Low Income Permits	0
Very Low Income Permits	0

Universe: Housing permits issued between 2015 and 2019

Notes: HCD uses the following definitions for the four income categories: Very Low Income: units affordable to households making less than 50% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Low Income: units affordable to households making between 50% and 80% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Moderate Income: units affordable to households making between 80% and 120% of the Area Median Income for the

¹⁹ See Dow, P. (2018). Unpacking the Growth in San Francisco’s Vacant Housing Stock: Client Report for the San Francisco Planning Department. University of California, Berkeley.

county in which the jurisdiction is located. Above Moderate Income: units affordable to households making above 120% of the Area Median Income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located.
 Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), 5th Cycle Annual Progress Report Permit Summary (2020)
 This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table HSG-11.

5.2 Assisted Housing Developments At-Risk of Conversion

While there is an immense need to produce new affordable housing units, ensuring that the existing affordable housing stock remains affordable is equally important. Additionally, it is typically faster and less expensive to preserve currently affordable units that are at risk of converting to market-rate than it is to build new affordable housing.

The data in the table below comes from the California Housing Partnership’s Preservation Database, the state’s most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing. However, this database does not include all deed-restricted affordable units in the state, so there may be at-risk assisted units in a jurisdiction that are not captured in this data table. There are 274 assisted units in Newark in the Preservation Database. Of these units, 0.0% are at *High Risk* or *Very High Risk* of conversion.²⁰

Note on At-Risk Assisted Housing Developments

HCD requires that Housing Elements list the assisted housing developments at risk of converting to market-rate uses. For more information on the specific properties that are at Moderate Risk, High Risk, or Very High Risk of conversion, local jurisdiction staff should contact Danielle Mazzella, Preservation & Data Manager at the California Housing Partnership, at dmazzella@chpc.net.

Table 4: Assisted Units at Risk of Conversion

Income	Newark	Alameda County	Bay Area
Low	274	23040	110177
Moderate	0	167	3375
High	0	189	1854
Very High	0	106	1053
Total Assisted Units in Database	274	23502	116459

Universe: 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.

²⁰ California Housing Partnership uses the following categories for assisted housing developments in its database: Very-High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate within the next year that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.

High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 1-5 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.

Moderate Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.

Low Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in 10+ years and/or are owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer.

Notes: While California Housing Partnership's Preservation Database is the state's most comprehensive source of information on subsidized affordable housing at risk of losing its affordable status and converting to market-rate housing, this database does not include all deed-restricted affordable units in the state. Consequently, there may be at-risk assisted units in a jurisdiction that are not captured in this data table. Per HCD guidance, local jurisdictions must also list the specific affordable housing developments at-risk of converting to market rate uses. This document provides aggregate numbers of at-risk units for each jurisdiction, but local planning staff should contact Danielle Mazzella with the California Housing Partnership at dmazzella@chpc.net to obtain a list of affordable properties that fall under this designation. California Housing Partnership uses the following categories for assisted housing developments in its database: Very-High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate within the next year that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. High Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 1-5 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. Moderate Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in the next 5-10 years that do not have a known overlapping subsidy that would extend affordability and are not owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. Low Risk: affordable homes that are at-risk of converting to market rate in 10+ years and/or are owned by a large/stable non-profit, mission-driven developer. Source: California Housing Partnership, Preservation Database (2020)
This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table RISK-01.

5.3 Substandard Housing

Housing costs in the region are among the highest in the country, which could result in households, particularly renters, needing to live in substandard conditions in order to afford housing. Generally, there is limited data on the extent of substandard housing issues in a community. However, the Census Bureau data included in the graph below gives a sense of some of the substandard conditions that may be present in Newark. For example, 0.3% of renters in Newark reported lacking a kitchen and 0.0% of renters lack plumbing, compared to 0.3% of owners who lack a kitchen and 0.1% of owners who lack plumbing.

Note on Substandard Housing

HCD requires Housing Elements to estimate the number of units in need of rehabilitation and replacement. As a data source for housing units in need of rehabilitation and replacement is not available for all jurisdictions in the region, ABAG was not able to provide this required data point in this document. To produce an estimate of housing needs in need of rehabilitation and replacement, staff can supplement the data below on substandard housing issues with additional local information from code enforcement, recent windshield surveys of properties, building department data, knowledgeable builders/developers in the community, or nonprofit housing developers or organizations. For more information, visit HCD's Building Blocks page on Housing Stock Characteristics.






Figure 22: Substandard Housing Issues

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Per HCD guidance, this data should be supplemented by local estimates of units needing to be rehabilitated or replaced based on recent windshield surveys, local building department data, knowledgeable builders/developers in the community, or nonprofit housing developers or organizations.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25053, Table B25043, Table B25049 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-06.

5.4 Home and Rent Values

Home prices reflect a complex mix of supply and demand factors, including an area’s demographic profile, labor market, prevailing wages and job outlook, coupled with land and construction costs. In the Bay Area, the costs of housing have long been among the highest in the nation. The typical home value in Newark was estimated at \$978,600 by December of 2020, per data from Zillow. The largest proportion of homes were valued between \$750k-\$1M (see Figure 23). By comparison, the typical home value is \$951,380 in Alameda County and \$1,077,230 the Bay Area, with the largest share of units valued \$500k-\$750k.

The region’s home values have increased steadily since 2000, besides a decrease during the Great Recession. The rise in home prices has been especially steep since 2012, with the median home value in the Bay Area nearly doubling during this time. Since 2001, the typical home value has increased 165.8% in Newark from \$368,220 to \$978,600. This change is above the change in Alameda County, and above the change for the region (see Figure 24).




Figure 23: Home Values of Owner-Occupied Units

Universe: Owner-occupied units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25075

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-07.




Figure 24: Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)

Universe: Owner-occupied housing units

Notes: Zillow describes the ZHVI as a smoothed, seasonally adjusted measure of the typical home value and market changes across a given region and housing type. The ZHVI reflects the typical value for homes in the 35th to 65th percentile range. The

ZHVI includes all owner-occupied housing units, including both single-family homes and condominiums. More information on the ZHVI is available from Zillow. The regional estimate is a household-weighted average of county-level ZHVI files, where household counts are yearly estimates from DOF's E-5 series. For unincorporated areas, the value is a population weighted average of unincorporated communities in the county matched to census-designated population counts.

Source: Zillow, Zillow Home Value Index (ZHVI)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-08.

Similar to home values, rents have also increased dramatically across the Bay Area in recent years. Many renters have been priced out, evicted or displaced, particularly communities of color. Residents finding themselves in one of these situations may have had to choose between commuting long distances to their jobs and schools or moving out of the region, and sometimes, out of the state.

In Newark, the largest proportion of rental units rented in the *Rent \$2000-\$2500* category, totaling 26.8%, followed by 25.6% of units renting in the *Rent \$1500-\$2000* category (see Figure 25). Looking beyond the city, the largest share of units is in the *rent for \$1500-\$2000* category.




Figure 25: Contract Rents for Renter-Occupied Units

Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25056

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-09.

Since 2009, the median rent has increased by 61.1% in Newark, from \$1,510 to \$2,110 per month (see Figure 26). In Alameda County, the median rent has increased 36.0%, from \$1,240 to \$1,690. The median rent in the region has increased significantly during this time from \$1,200 to \$1,850, a 54% increase.²¹

²¹ While the data on home values shown in Figure 24 comes from Zillow, Zillow does not have data on rent prices available for most Bay Area jurisdictions. To have a more comprehensive dataset on rental data for the region, the rent data in this document comes from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, which may not fully




Figure 26: Median Contract Rent

Universe: Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent

Notes: For unincorporated areas, median is calculated using distribution in B25056.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data releases, starting with 2005-2009 through 2015-2019, B25058, B25056 (for unincorporated areas). County and regional counts are weighted averages of jurisdiction median using B25003 rental unit counts from the relevant year.

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-10.

5.5 Overpayment and Overcrowding

A household is considered “cost-burdened” if it spends more than 30% of its monthly income on housing costs, while those who spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs are considered “severely cost-burdened.” Low-income residents are the most impacted by high housing costs and experience the highest rates of cost burden. Spending such large portions of their income on housing puts low-income households at higher risk of displacement, eviction, or homelessness.

reflect current rents. Local jurisdiction staff may want to supplement the data on rents with local realtor data or other sources for rent data that are more current than Census Bureau data.




Figure 27: Cost Burden by Tenure

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25070, B25091

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-06.

Renters are often more cost-burdened than owners. While the housing market has resulted in home prices increasing dramatically, homeowners often have mortgages with fixed rates, whereas renters are more likely to be impacted by market increases. When looking at the cost burden across tenure in Newark, 29.7% of renters spend 30% to 50% of their income on housing compared to 16.2% of those that own (see Figure 27). Additionally, 14.1% of renters spend 50% or more of their income on housing, while 7.6% of owners are severely cost-burdened.

In Newark, 12.4% of households spend 50% or more of their income on housing, while 19.2% spend 30% to 50%. However, these rates vary greatly across income categories (see Figure 28). For example, 56.6% of Newark households making less than 30% of AMI spend the majority of their income on housing. For Newark residents making more than 100% of AMI, just 0.8% are severely cost-burdened, and 89.0% of those making more than 100% of AMI spend less than 30% of their income on housing.




Figure 28: Cost Burden by Income Level

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-05.

Currently, people of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to white residents. As a result, they often pay a greater percentage of their income on housing, and in turn, are at a greater risk of housing insecurity.

American Indian or Alaska Native, Non-Hispanic residents are the most cost burdened with 46.2% spending 30% to 50% of their income on housing, and *Hispanic or Latinx* residents are the most severely cost burdened with 22.1% spending more than 50% of their income on housing (see Figure 29).




Figure 29: Cost Burden by Race

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. For the purposes of this graph, the “Hispanic or Latinx” racial/ethnic group represents those who identify as having Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity and may also be members of any racial group. All other racial categories on this graph represent those who identify with that racial category and do not identify with Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-08.

Large family households often have special housing needs due to a lack of adequately sized affordable housing available. The higher costs required for homes with multiple bedrooms can result in larger families experiencing a disproportionate cost burden than the rest of the population and can increase the risk of housing insecurity.

In Newark, 22.3% of large family households experience a cost burden of 30%-50%, while 13.4% of households spend more than half of their income on housing. Some 18.5% of all other households have a cost burden of 30%-50%, with 12.1% of households spending more than 50% of their income on housing (see Figure 30).




Figure 30: Cost Burden by Household Size

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-09.

When cost-burdened seniors are no longer able to make house payments or pay rents, displacement from their homes can occur, putting further stress on the local rental market or forcing residents out of the community they call home. Understanding how seniors might be cost-burdened is of particular importance due to their special housing needs, particularly for low-income seniors. 21.8% of seniors making less than 30% of AMI are spending the majority of their income on housing. For seniors making more than 100% of AMI, 89.3% are not cost-burdened and spend less than 30% of their income on housing (see Figure 31).




Figure 31: Cost-Burdened Senior Households by Income Level

Universe: Senior households

Notes: For the purposes of this graph, senior households are those with a householder who is aged 62 or older. Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is “select monthly owner costs”, which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. HUD defines cost-burdened households as those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of monthly income, while severely cost-burdened households are those whose monthly housing costs exceed 50% of monthly income. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located. Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-03.

Overcrowding occurs when the number of people living in a household is greater than the home was designed to hold. There are several different standards for defining overcrowding, but this report uses the Census Bureau definition, which is more than one occupant per room (not including bathrooms or kitchens). Additionally, the Census Bureau considers units with more than 1.5 occupants per room to be severely overcrowded.

Overcrowding is often related to the cost of housing and can occur when demand in a city or region is high. In many cities, overcrowding is seen more amongst those that are renting, with multiple households sharing a unit to make it possible to stay in their communities. In Newark, 9.3% of households that rent are severely overcrowded (more than 1.5 occupants per room), compared to 0.6% of households that own (see Figure 32). In Newark, 17.7% of renters experience moderate overcrowding (1 to 1.5 occupants per room), compared to 4.9% for those own.



Figure 32: Overcrowding by Tenure and Severity

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-01.

Overcrowding often disproportionately impacts low-income households. 3.6% of very low-income households (below 50% AMI) experience severe overcrowding, while 1.4% of households above 100% experience this level of overcrowding (see Figure 33).




Figure 33: Overcrowding by Income Level and Severity

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-04.

Communities of color are more likely to experience overcrowding similar to how they are more likely to experience poverty, financial instability, and housing insecurity. People of color tend to experience overcrowding at higher rates than White residents. In Newark, the racial group with the largest overcrowding rate is *Other Race or Multiple Races (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic)* (see Figure 34)




Figure 34: Overcrowding by Race

Universe: Occupied housing units

Notes: The Census Bureau defines an overcrowded unit as one occupied by 1.01 persons or more per room (excluding bathrooms and kitchens), and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. For this table, the Census Bureau does not disaggregate racial groups by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity. However, data for the white racial group is also reported for white householders who are not Hispanic/Latinx. Since residents who identify as white and Hispanic/Latinx may have very different experiences within the housing market and the economy from those who identify as white and non-Hispanic/Latinx, data for multiple white sub-groups are reported here. The racial/ethnic groups reported in this table are not all mutually exclusive. Therefore, the data should not be summed as the sum exceeds the total number of occupied housing units for this jurisdiction. However, all groups labelled “Hispanic and Non-Hispanic” are mutually exclusive, and the sum of the data for these groups is equivalent to the total number of occupied housing units.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25014
 For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table OVER-03.

6 SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

6.1 Large Households

Large households often have different housing needs than smaller households. If a city's rental housing stock does not include larger apartments, large households who rent could end up living in overcrowded conditions. In Newark, for large households with 5 or more persons, most units (57.4%) are owner occupied (see Figure 35). In 2017, 17.4% of large households were very low-income, earning less than 50% of the area median income (AMI).




Figure 35: Household Size by Tenure

Universe: Occupied housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25009

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table LGFEM-01.

The unit sizes available in a community affect the household sizes that can access that community. Large families are generally served by housing units with 3 or more bedrooms, of which there are 10,345 units in Newark. Among these large units with 3 or more bedrooms, 17.4% are owner-occupied and 82.6% are renter occupied (see Figure 36).




Figure 36: Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms

Universe: Housing units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B25042

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HSG-05.

6.2 Female-Headed Households

Households headed by one person are often at greater risk of housing insecurity, particularly female-headed households, who may be supporting children or a family with only one income. In Newark, the largest proportion of households is *Married-couple Family Households* at 63.0% of total, while *Female-Headed Households* make up 11.8% of all households.






Figure 37: Household Type

Universe: Households

Notes: For data from the Census Bureau, a “family household” is a household where two or more people are related by birth, marriage, or adoption. “Non-family households” are households of one person living alone, as well as households where none of the people are related to each other.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B11001

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table POPEMP-23.

Female-headed households with children may face particular housing challenges, with pervasive gender inequality resulting in lower wages for women. Moreover, the added need for childcare can make finding a home that is affordable more challenging.

In Newark, 22.8% of female-headed households with children fall below the Federal Poverty Line, while 5.7% of female-headed households *without* children live in poverty (see Figure 38).




Figure 38: Female-Headed Households by Poverty Status

Universe: Female Households

Notes: The Census Bureau uses a federally defined poverty threshold that remains constant throughout the country and does not correspond to Area Median Income.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B17012

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table LGFEM-05.

6.3 Seniors

Senior households often experience a combination of factors that can make accessing or keeping affordable housing a challenge. They often live on fixed incomes and are more likely to have disabilities, chronic health conditions and/or reduced mobility.

Seniors who rent may be at even greater risk for housing challenges than those who own, due to income differences between these groups. The largest proportion of senior households who rent make *0%-30% of AMI*, while the largest proportion of senior households who are homeowners falls in the income group *Greater than 100% of AMI* (see Figure 39).




Figure 39: Senior Households by Income and Tenure

Universe: Senior households

Notes: For the purposes of this graph, senior households are those with a householder who is aged 62 or older. Income groups are based on HUD calculations for Area Median Income (AMI). HUD calculates the AMI for different metropolitan areas, and the nine county Bay Area includes the following metropolitan areas: Napa Metro Area (Napa County), Oakland-Fremont Metro Area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), San Francisco Metro Area (Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties), San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metro Area (Santa Clara County), Santa Rosa Metro Area (Sonoma County), and Vallejo-Fairfield Metro Area (Solano County). The AMI levels in this chart are based on the HUD metro area where this jurisdiction is located.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) ACS tabulation, 2013-2017 release

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table SEN-01.

6.4 People with Disabilities

People with disabilities face additional housing challenges. Encompassing a broad group of individuals living with a variety of physical, cognitive and sensory impairments, many people with disabilities live on fixed incomes and are in need of specialized care, yet often rely on family members for assistance due to the high cost of care.

When it comes to housing, people with disabilities are not only in need of affordable housing but accessibly designed housing, which offers greater mobility and opportunity for independence. Unfortunately, the need typically outweighs what is available, particularly in a housing market with such high demand. People with disabilities are at a high risk for housing insecurity, homelessness and institutionalization, particularly when they lose aging caregivers. Figure 40 shows the rates at which different disabilities are present among residents of Newark. Overall, 7.6% of people in Newark have a disability of any kind.²²

²² These disabilities are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one disability. These counts should not be summed.




Figure 40: Disability by Type

Universe: Civilian noninstitutionalized population 18 years and over

Notes: These disabilities are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one disability. These counts should not be summed. The Census Bureau provides the following definitions for these disability types: Hearing difficulty: deaf or has serious difficulty hearing. Vision difficulty: blind or has serious difficulty seeing even with glasses. Cognitive difficulty: has serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions. Ambulatory difficulty: has serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs. Self-care difficulty: has difficulty dressing or bathing. Independent living difficulty: has difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor’s office or shopping.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B18102, Table B18103, Table B18104, Table B18105, Table B18106, Table B18107.

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table DISAB-01.

State law also requires Housing Elements to examine the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities. Developmental disabilities are defined as severe, chronic, and attributed to a mental or physical impairment that begins before a person turns 18 years old. This can include Down’s Syndrome, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and mild to severe mental retardation. Some people with developmental disabilities are unable to work, rely on Supplemental Security Income, and live with family members. In addition to their specific housing needs, they are at increased risk of housing insecurity after an aging parent or family member is no longer able to care for them.²³

In Newark, of the population with a developmental disability, children under the age of 18 make up 56.3%, while adults account for 43.7%.

²³ For more information or data on developmental disabilities in your jurisdiction, contact the Golden Gate Regional Center for Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties; the North Bay Regional Center for Napa, Solano and Sonoma Counties; the Regional Center for the East Bay for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties; or the San Andreas Regional Center for Santa Clara County.

Table 5: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Age

Age Group	value
Age Under 18	156
Age 18+	121

Universe: Population with developmental disabilities

Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions. The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

*Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Age Group (2020)
This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table DISAB-04.*

The most common living arrangement for individuals with disabilities in Newark is the home of parent /family /guardian.

Table 6: Population with Developmental Disabilities by Residence

Residence Type	value
Home of Parent /Family /Guardian	244
Community Care Facility	20
Independent /Supported Living	12
Foster /Family Home	5
Other	0
Intermediate Care Facility	0

Universe: Population with developmental disabilities

Notes: The California Department of Developmental Services is responsible for overseeing the coordination and delivery of services to more than 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities including cerebral palsy, intellectual disability, Down syndrome, autism, epilepsy, and related conditions. The California Department of Developmental Services provides ZIP code level counts. To get jurisdiction-level estimates, ZIP code counts were crosswalked to jurisdictions using census block population counts from Census 2010 SF1 to determine the share of a ZIP code to assign to a given jurisdiction.

*Source: California Department of Developmental Services, Consumer Count by California ZIP Code and Residence Type (2020)
This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table DISAB-05.*

6.5 Homelessness

Homelessness remains an urgent challenge in many communities across the state, reflecting a range of social, economic, and psychological factors. Rising housing costs result in increased risks of community members experiencing homelessness. Far too many residents who have found themselves housing insecure have ended up unhoused or homeless in recent years, either temporarily or longer term. Addressing the specific housing needs for the unhoused population remains a priority throughout the region, particularly since homelessness is disproportionately experienced by people of color, people with disabilities, those struggling with addiction and those dealing with traumatic life circumstances. In Alameda County, the most common type of household experiencing homelessness is those without children in their care. Among households experiencing homelessness that do not have children, 84.0% are unsheltered. Of homeless households with children, most are sheltered in emergency shelter (see Figure 41).




Figure 41: Homelessness by Household Type and Shelter Status, Alameda County

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD's requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMELS-01.

People of color are more likely to experience poverty and financial instability as a result of federal and local housing policies that have historically excluded them from the same opportunities extended to white residents. Consequently, people of color are often disproportionately impacted by homelessness, particularly Black residents of the Bay Area. In Alameda County, Black or African American (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic) residents represent the largest proportion of residents experiencing homelessness and account for 47.3% of the homeless population, while making up 10.6% of the overall population (see Figure 42).




Figure 42: Racial Group Share of General and Homeless Populations, Alameda County

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD’s requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness. HUD does not disaggregate racial demographic data by Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness. Instead, HUD reports data on Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for people experiencing homelessness in a separate table. Accordingly, the racial group data listed here includes both Hispanic/Latinx and non-Hispanic/Latinx individuals.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I) For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMELS-02.

In Alameda, Latinx residents represent 17.3% of the population experiencing homelessness, while Latinx residents comprise 22.5% of the general population (see Figure 43).




Figure 43: Latinx Share of General and Homeless Populations, Alameda County

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD’s requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness. The data from HUD on Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity for individuals experiencing homelessness does not specify racial group identity. Accordingly, individuals in either ethnic group identity category (Hispanic/Latinx or non-Hispanic/Latinx) could be of any racial background.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019); U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B01001(A-I) For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMELS-03.

Many of those experiencing homelessness are dealing with severe issues - including mental illness, substance abuse and domestic violence - that are potentially life threatening and require additional assistance. In Alameda County, homeless individuals are commonly challenged by severe mental illness, with 2,590 reporting this condition (see Figure 12). Of those, some 78.3% are unsheltered, further adding to the challenge of handling the issue.

Note on Homelessness Data

Notably all the data on homelessness provided above is for the entire county. This data comes from the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Point in Time count, which is the most comprehensive publicly available data source on people experiencing homelessness. HUD only provides this data at the county-level and not for specific jurisdictions. However, Housing Element law requires local jurisdictions to estimate or count of the daily average number of people lacking shelter. Therefore, staff will need to supplement the data in this document with additional local data on the number of people experiencing homelessness. If staff do not have estimates of people experiencing homelessness in their jurisdiction readily available, HCD recommends contacting local service providers such as continuum-of-care providers, local homeless shelter and service providers, food

programs, operators of transitional housing programs, local drug and alcohol program service providers, and county mental health and social service departments.²⁴




Figure 44: Characteristics for the Population Experiencing Homelessness, Alameda County

Universe: Population experiencing homelessness

Notes: This data is based on Point-in-Time (PIT) information provided to HUD by CoCs in the application for CoC Homeless Assistance Programs. The PIT Count provides a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night during the last ten days in January. Each Bay Area county is its own CoC, and so the data for this table is provided at the county-level. Per HCD’s requirements, jurisdictions will need to supplement this county-level data with local estimates of people experiencing homelessness. These challenges/characteristics are counted separately and are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may report more than one challenge/characteristic. These counts should not be summed.

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports (2019)

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table HOMELS-04.

In Newark, the student population experiencing homelessness totaled 300 during the 2019-20 school year and increased by 9.1% since the 2016-17 school year. By comparison, Alameda County has seen a 18.7% decrease in the population of students experiencing homelessness since the 2016-17 school year, and the Bay Area population of students experiencing homelessness decreased by 8.5%. During the 2019-2020 school year, there were still some 13,718 students experiencing homelessness throughout the region, adding undue burdens on learning and thriving, with the potential for longer term negative effects.

The number of students in Newark experiencing homelessness in 2019 represents 10.5% of the Alameda County total and 2.2% of the Bay Area total.

²⁴ For more information, see HCD’s Building Blocks webpage for People Experiencing Homelessness: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/housing-needs/people-experiencing-homelessness.shtml>

Table 7: Students in Local Public Schools Experiencing Homelessness

AcademicYear	Newark	Alameda County	Bay Area
2016-17	275	3531	14990
2017-18	236	3309	15142
2018-19	192	3182	15427
2019-20	300	2870	13718

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools

Notes: The California Department of Education considers students to be homeless if they are unsheltered, living in temporary shelters for people experiencing homelessness, living in hotels/motels, or temporarily doubled up and sharing the housing of other persons due to the loss of housing or economic hardship. The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography.

Source: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table HOMEELS-05.

6.6 Farmworkers

Across the state, housing for farmworkers has been recognized as an important and unique concern. Farmworkers generally receive wages that are considerably lower than other jobs and may have temporary housing needs. Finding decent and affordable housing can be challenging, particularly in the current housing market.

In Newark, the migrant worker student population totaled 72 during the 2019-20 school year and has decreased by 24.0% since the 2016-17 school year. The trend for the region for the past few years has been a decline of 2.4% in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-17 school year. The change at the county level is a 9.6% decrease in the number of migrant worker students since the 2016-17 school year.

Table 8: Migrant Worker Student Population

AcademicYear	Newark	Alameda County	Bay Area
2016-17	75	874	4630
2017-18	79	1037	4607
2018-19	72	785	4075
2019-20	57	790	3976

Universe: Total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), public schools

Notes: The data used for this table was obtained at the school site level, matched to a file containing school locations, geocoded and assigned to jurisdiction, and finally summarized by geography.

Source: California Department of Education, California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), Cumulative Enrollment Data (Academic Years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020)

This table is included in the Data Packet Workbook as Table FARM-01.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Farmworkers, the number of permanent farm workers in Alameda County has decreased since 2002, totaling 305 in 2017, while the number of seasonal farm workers has decreased, totaling 288 in 2017 (see Figure 45).




Figure 45: Farm Operations and Farm Labor by County, Alameda County

Universe: Hired farm workers (including direct hires and agricultural service workers who are often hired through labor contractors)

Notes: Farm workers are considered seasonal if they work on a farm less than 150 days in a year, while farm workers who work on a farm more than 150 days are considered to be permanent workers for that farm.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Census of Farmworkers (2002, 2007, 2012, 2017), Table 7: Hired Farm Labor For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table FARM-02.

6.7 Non-English Speakers

California has long been an immigration gateway to the United States, which means that many languages are spoken throughout the Bay Area. Since learning a new language is universally challenging, it is not uncommon for residents who have immigrated to the United States to have limited English proficiency. This limit can lead to additional disparities if there is a disruption in housing, such as an eviction, because residents might not be aware of their rights or they might be wary to engage due to immigration status concerns. In Newark, 6.7% of residents 5 years and older identify as speaking English not well or not at all, which is below the proportion for Alameda County. Throughout the region the proportion of residents 5 years and older with limited English proficiency is 8%.




Figure 46: Population with Limited English Proficiency

Universe: Population 5 years and over

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2015-2019), Table B16005

For the data table behind this figure, please refer to the Data Packet Workbook, Table AFFH-03.

APPENDIX B PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND INPUT SUMMARY

From March 15th through April 30th, 342 people participated in the City of Newark's online community conversation about housing issues and opportunities in Newark. 300 of those responses were in English, 38 in Spanish and 4 in Chinese.

Participants were invited to answer a series of 22 questions covering housing experience and preference, environmental justice and demographic information. The survey was hosted on the SurveyMonkey platform accessible via the city's webpage.

The survey was distributed and advertised in multilingual materials through various platforms to reach as broad of a cross section of the community as possible. It was promoted through social media, print newsletters, email lists to special populations (e.g., seniors, individuals with developmental disabilities), in-person events, and outreach to partner organizations. Our partner organizations were able to extend our reach to the Latinx community, people experiencing and escaping from domestic violence, individuals transitioning from homelessness, and families in the Newark Unified School District.

Essential insights from the survey are that quality of life, in addition to increasing housing affordability and homeownership opportunities for Newark residents, is of great importance and concern.

Approach to Analyses

The following is a summary of responses to each survey question broken down by answer choice. Response Count signifies the number of selections made for a particular answer choice while Respondent Percent signifies the number of respondents who chose the answer choice out of the total number of survey respondents (i.e., 342 people), including the 38 Spanish responses and 4 Chinese responses.

Note: For multi-select questions, the respondent percentages may reflect more than one selection by a single individual rather than all unique responses. Additionally, please keep in mind that for these questions the response count will not sum to the number of respondents who answered the question.

Q1. How concerned are you about the availability of affordable housing in Newark?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
Very concerned	182	53%
Somewhat concerned	76	22%
Not that concerned	44	13%
Not at all concerned	35	10%
No opinion/ not sure	4	1%
Number of Respondents	341	100%

Q2. As we look to improve housing opportunities in Newark, which of the following do you think are the three biggest issues we need to address?

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
We need more homeownership opportunities especially for first time homeowners	226	66%
We need more affordable rental opportunities	140	41%
We need to encourage more housing types (apartments, accessory dwelling Units, duplexes/triplexes)	93	27%
We need more opportunities for those that are unhoused or in danger of being unhoused	96	28%
We need stronger protections for renters (minimum lease terms, relocation benefits)	44	13%
We need low cost home improvement programs for seniors and those on limited incomes	135	39%
Other (please specify)	60	18%
Number of Respondents	319	93%

Q3. Thinking about the cost of housing from one year ago ...

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
It is much less expensive to find a home	8	2%
Somewhat less expensive	6	2%
About the same	22	6%
Somewhat more expensive	73	21%
Much more expensive	188	55%
Does not apply/don't know	10	3%
Number of Respondents	307	90%

Q4. Based on the definition of “affordable” housing as being housing that takes 30% or less of your income to pay for it, how would you describe your current housing situation?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
I'm in a home I like at a price I can afford	136	40%
I'm in a home I like but it's taking more than 30% of my income to be here	97	28%
I'm in a home I can afford, but it's not a place I like or meets my needs	54	16%
I'm in a home I can't afford, and don't like	28	8%
Number of Respondents	315	92%

Q5. If you're not happy with your current housing situation, what would make it better? (Check all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
I need a home with more space	106	31%
I would like to live in a different neighborhood	44	13%
I rent, but would like to own my own home	86	25%
I need a place that is more accessible due to disabilities	14	4%
I need a home with fewer housemates or roommates	24	7%
I like my home, but need to pay less	67	20%
I'm happy with my current housing situation	113	33%
Number of Respondents	299	87%

Q6. Of the following five options, which three do you think are the most urgent affordable housing needs in Newark at this time?

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Housing for families - larger units with more bedrooms for all families, especially multigenerational or large families	171	50%
Housing for smaller households - smaller units or housing types for young adults and couples starting out, single households, students and seniors looking to downsize	148	43%
Housing for seniors - specific developments for seniors, including housing with supportive services	112	33%
Housing for people with special needs - greater accessibility and supportive services for those with disabilities	47	14%
Housing for those experiencing homelessness - transitional housing and permanent supportive housing	82	24%
Housing for low-income and underserved households - subsidized housing	119	35%
Other (please specify)	30	9%
Number of Respondents	298	87%

Q7. Thinking about the future of your neighborhood, what gives you optimism?

The survey received more than 200 responses to this question which were categorized and summarized in part in the community engagement summary included in this Housing Element.

Q8. Do you see your neighborhood as a place of opportunity for yourself and/or your family?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
Yes	121	35%
No	60	18%
Somewhat	96	28%
Number of Respondents	277	81%

Q9. If you didn't answer yes to the previous question, what are three of the most pressing issues that would need to change to feel like there is more opportunity? (Please select up to three)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Pollution from vehicles on neighborhood streets and freeways	55	16%
Healthy food and grocery stores close to home or work	71	21%
City infrastructure and facilities that support physical activity, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, parks, and recreation centers	112	33%
Air or chemical pollution from industrial businesses and activities.	52	15%
Easy to access health care facilities	35	10%
Affordable, safe, and healthy housing conditions	106	31%
Educational opportunities that are academically and culturally supportive	86	25%
Number of Respondents	219	64%

Q10. The city could do a variety of things to create more housing affordability. of the following six options, which three do you think are the most promising or worth doing? (Please choose 3)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Create incentives for building affordable housing	120	35%
Reduce the cost of building all housing, but especially affordable housing through lower fees and faster approvals	113	33%
Allow for a larger variety of housing through the city	93	27%
Use city-owned land for affordable housing	94	27%
Use city funds to get more state, federal and private funding for affordable housing (through the city's Affordable Housing Trust Fund)	117	34%
Enact policies such as inclusionary zoning that allow for a portion of affordable units in each development	96	28%
Number of Respondents	260	76%

Q11. What kind of housing would you like to see more of? (Check all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Backyard cottages	125	37%
Duplexes, triplexes and fourplex	86	25%
Cottage clusters	106	31%
Townhomes	104	30%
Small to mid-size multifamily	77	23%
Multifamily buildings downtown	75	22%
Number of Respondents	252	74%

Q12. Where in Newark would you like to see more housing? (Please select all that apply)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Old Town (Thornton Ave between Cherry Street and Ash Street)	141	41%
Bayside Newark (formerly known as The Dumbarton Transit-Oriented Development, near Willow Street and Enterprise Drive)	99	29%
NewPark Place area (Newpark Mall Road and Cedar Blvd)	156	46%
Other (please specify)	46	13%
Number of Respondents	248	73%

Q13. Which hazards, both natural and human, do you think are most important for Newark to address? (Please choose three)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
None of the above	8	2%
Wildfires	53	15%
More frequent and intense heat waves	87	25%
Earthquakes	119	35%
Multi-year drought	179	52%
Sea-level rise and related flooding	150	44%
Hazardous materials spills	70	20%
Other (please specify)	32	9%
Number of Respondents	264	77%

Q14. How concerned are you about the impact of sea level rise, bringing the possibility of increased flooding to the lower-lying communities of Newark?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
Very concerned about the impact flooding will have on lower-lying communities	100	29%
Somewhat concerned about the impact flooding will have on these communities	92	27%
Not really concerned about it	50	15%
No opinion, don't have enough information	26	8%
Number of Respondents	268	78%

Q15. Are there pollution and environmental issues you are concerned about in your neighborhood or larger community? (If so, please check all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Issues related to car and truck traffic: Noise, air pollution	126	37%
Issues connected to industry in the area: air pollution, dangerous fumes, dumping of chemicals	121	35%
Poor quality drinking water	81	24%
Trash in public spaces, vacant lots, graffiti	168	49%
Other (please specify)	29	8%
Number of Respondents	250	73%

Q16. What is your connection to Newark? (Please select all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
Live here	242	71%
Work here	51	15%
Go to school here	40	12%
Have a business here	15	4%
Have family or grew up here (but do not live here)	23	7%
Interested in Newark housing issues (but do not live here)	10	3%
Number of Respondents	255	75%

Q17. Currently I live...

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
In a home or condo I own	168	49%
In a home or apartment I rent	72	21%
In an unstable/unhoused situation	3	1%
Prefer not to say	11	3%
Number of Respondents	254	74%

Q18. How would you describe your home?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
A single family home	196	57%
A multi-family home such as a duplex or apartment building	53	15%
A mobile or manufactured home	1	0.3%
Other (please specify)	7	2%
Number of Respondents	250	73%

Q19. What is your age?

Answer Choices	Response Count	Respondent % (out of 342)
Under 19	1	0.3%
20-29	9	3%
30-49	153	45%
50-69	72	21%
70+	18	5%
Number of Respondents	253	74%

Q20. What is your race and/or ethnicity? (Check all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8	2%
Asian or Asian American	63	18%
Black or African American	3	1%
Hispanic or Latino	82	24%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	8	2%
White or Caucasian	107	31%
Other (please specify)	10	3%
Number of Respondents	241	70%

Q21. We would love for you to be involved in this process. If you have not attended public meetings in the past, please share what is keeping you from attending. (Please check all that apply.)

Answer Choices	Response Count (multi-select)	Respondent % (out of 342)
I have difficulty understanding what is being said in English	18	5%
I don't have the time to attend – too busy with work and/or family	102	30%
I need child care to attend	25	7%
I don't feel that my opinions are heard and taken into consideration	88	26%
The time and /or day of the week meetings are held makes it difficult for me to attend	47	14%
Other (please specify)	52	15%
Number of Respondents	200	58%

Q22. and let us know if there's anything else you want to tell us:

The city received more than 200 comments which were categorized and used to inform policies and programs reflected in this document.

APPENDIX C HOUSING SITES INVENTORY

Introduction

A Housing Element must include an inventory of available land that is appropriately zoned and suitable for housing development to accommodate a jurisdiction's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as required by State law. This inventory for the City of Newark focuses on residential sites that are currently in the development pipeline, or vacant and non-vacant sites that can be made available for housing development affordable at varying income levels. This Appendix summarizes the evaluation of potential housing sites, and the adequacy of sites to meet development capacities to accommodate the City's regional housing needs for the 2023-2031 planning period.

California law (Government Code Sections 65583 (a)(3)) requires that the Housing Element contain an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and non-vacant (i.e., underutilized) sites having potential for development. State law also requires an analysis of the relationship to zoning and services to these sites as well as identifying sites throughout the community, in a manner that is consistent with its duty to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH).

The analysis presented in this Appendix demonstrates that there is an adequate supply of suitable land to accommodate the City's housing allocation of 1,874 units, plus a surplus of 980 units to act as a "buffer" if sites develop to non-residential or at different affordability levels than assumed in the sites inventory. This section is organized by the following topics:

- Summary of Newark's projected housing needs by AMI level
- Capacity to Accommodate RHNA
- Sites selection process, including a description of the methodology and evaluation of site criteria, realistic unit capacity, and sites to accommodate varied income levels
- Evaluation of sites in meeting AFFH requirements
- Individual site profiles

Projected Housing Needs

A key component of any Housing Element Update is identifying adequate sites to address the jurisdiction's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines state-wide projected housing needs and allocates new housing unit target numbers to regional councils of government (COGs). State law (California Government Code Section 65584) provides for COGs to then prepare and adopt plans

that assign a “fair share” of the region’s housing needs to each city and county. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the COG that determines fair-share portions of state allocations for Newark. .

The City’s RHNA requirements for the 2023-2031 Housing Element projection period are summarized in Table C- 1 below. For the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period, the City of Newark is required to plan to accommodate the development of at least 1,874 housing units. This includes 464 units for very low-income households, 268 units for low-income households, 318 units for moderate-income households, and 824 units for above moderate-income households.

Housing Needs for Extremely Low-Income Households

Although the RHNA does not include allocations for extremely low-income households, Housing Element Law requires that jurisdictions estimate the need for housing units affordable to extremely low-income households and plan to accommodate this need. Extremely low-income households are those with incomes less than 30% of area median income. In Alameda County, 30% of the AMI is the equivalent to an annual income of \$42,850 for a family of four. Households with extremely low incomes have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance, such as supplemental security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance, are considered extremely low-income households. Many households with multiple wage earners – including food service workers, full-time students, teachers, farmworkers, and healthcare professionals – can also fall into lower AMI categories due to relatively stagnant wages in these industries.

HCD’s official Housing Element guidance notes that jurisdictions can use their RHNA for very low-income households (those making zero to 50 percent AMI) to calculate their projected need for extremely low-income households. HCD provides three methodologies for estimating this need: 1) allocate the percentage of very low-income need to extremely low-income households based on the ABAG region’s proportion; 2) allocate the percentage of very low-income need to extremely low -income households based on the current proportion for Newark; 3) assume that 50 percent of Newark’s very low-income RHNA is for extremely low-income households. To estimate the projected housing need for extremely low-income households, 50 percent of Newark’s 464 very low-income RHNA units are assumed to serve extremely low-income households. Based on this methodology, the City has a projected need of 232 units for extremely low-income households over the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period. More than half of this allocation will be provided through the Cedar Creek Apartments, which is already in the development pipeline and has received \$6M in funding support from the City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee Fund.


Capacity to Accommodate RHNA

The total realistic development capacity of all sites in the land inventory is detailed in Table C-1 below which lists all consolidated sites in the sites inventory and total residential capacity against the City's 6th cycle RHNA. The total realistic capacity shown is 2,854 units, which exceeds the net target of 1,874 units the City is required to plan to accommodate for its RHNA, and also supplements that allocation by providing a significant buffer representing more than 100 percent of the required RHNA for all income levels; this includes a 13 percent buffer for very low-income units and 10 percent for low-income units. HCD recommends that jurisdictions provide a 15 to 30 percent buffer beyond the minimum RHNA target to comply with the "no net loss" provisions of State Housing Element Law that require the jurisdiction to maintain sufficient capacity to accommodate its RHNA for the duration of the planning period at every income level. In addition to considering the aggregate number of units that the sites can accommodate, it is necessary to consider the potential for sites to accommodate housing that is affordable to all income levels, in accordance with the RHNA allocations, as discussed in the "Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels" .

Each of the two primary project types, Pipeline Projects and Sites Zoned for Housing, are presented in Table C-1 below and described in further detail in the Sites Selection section. As shown in Table C-1, the number of units from Pipeline Projects represents 67 percent of the city's RHNA, including 59 percent of Newark's RHNA for very low-income (VLI) housing. Though these Pipeline units do not fulfill the RHNA allocation at every income level, this demonstrates there are sufficient sites for the City's RHNA and provides strong evidence there is residential developer interest and economic feasibility for housing development on the types of sites, including non-vacant sites, identified in this inventory. Table C-2 lists the APNs and acreage for all sites zoned for housing.

The following map shows the distribution of sites throughout the City of Newark with an inset for the boundary of the Old Town Specific Plan. Parcels indicated in yellow are active project sites (pipeline projects) while sites indicated in red are sites zoned for housing, or locations whose zoning and land use will support new housing. The map also shows three specific plan areas: Old Town Specific Plan, Bayside Newark, and NewPark Place Specific Plan. The site numbers match data in the following tables which show unit counts and the more detailed summary sheets found later in this document.

Figure C-1: Housing Sites for the RHNA 6th Cycle



Source: Adapted by Community Planning Collaborative, 2023

Table C-1: City of Newark Sites Inventory

Site	Name	Income Level				Total Units
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Planned and Proposed Projects (Also known as pipeline projects are sites 1 through 13)						
1	Bridgeway / Gateway (under construction)	0	0	0	134	134
2	FMC Willow - North (Parcel C) (entitled)	47	23	21	64	155
3	FMC Willow - South (entitled)	0	0	0	215	215
4	Harbor Pointe (under construction)	0	0	0	192	192
5	Cedar Homes- 38478 Cedar Boulevard (entitled)	0	0	0	118	118
6	Cedar Community Apts. (complete)	124	0	0	1	125
7	Timber St. Senior Living (entitled)	39	39	1	0	79
8	Lepakshi Homes - Building A, 6781 Thornton Ave. (active application)	0	0	0	60	60
9	Lepakshi Homes - Building B, 6781 Thornton Ave. (active application)	8	4	3	13	28
10	SAHA Development- 6347 -6375 Thornton Ave. (active application)	56	0	1	0	57
11	Mulberry Residential 36952 Mulberry Street (entitled)	0	0	0	8	8
12	Bain Ave. & Magnolia St. - 37280 Magnolia Street (under construction)	0	0	0	10	10
13	Waymark Homes - Cedar Blvd (entitled)	0	0	0	76	76
Subtotal Planned and Proposed		274	66	26	891	1,257
Sites Zoned for Housing (Vacant and Nonvacant sites are sites 14 through 28)						

Site	Name	Income Level				Total Units
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
14	NewPark Place (Phases A to D)	36	18	18	535	607
15	Grocery Outlet Shopping Center	27	26	0	0	53
16	Thornton Ave. Sites (within Old Town Specific Plan boundary)	41	41	40	40	162
17	Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites	0	0	0	61	61
18	E-Z 8 Motel	39	38	0	0	77
19	Cherry Plaza	15	15	0	0	30
20	Thornton Ave. Sites (outside of Old Town Specific Plan boundary)	18	18	18	17	71
21	Sycamore St. Vacant Lot	25	25	24	0	74
22	Cedar Blvd. Public Storage Sites	0	0	0	41	41
23	Filbert Villas - 37243 & 37257 Filbert St. (expired entitlement)	0	0	0	16	16
24	Filbert Ave. Sites	0	0	0	7	7
25	Mayhews Place - 36589 Newark Boulevard (expired entitlement)	0	0	0	9	9
26	Locust St. & Railroad - 37093 Locust St. (expired entitlement)	0	0	0	6	6
27	Fahmy Homes - 37503 & 37511 Cherry Street (expired entitlement)	0	0	0	6	6
28	Neighborhood Infill Lots	0	0	0	17	17
	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	48	48	48	16	160
	Middle Housing Units	0	0	200	0	200
Subtotal Sites Zoned for Housing		249	229	348	771	1,597
Total Capacity		523	295	374	1,662	2,854
Newark RHNA		464	268	318	824	1,874
	<i>Surplus %</i>	113%	110%	118%	202%	152%
	<i>Surplus Units</i>	59	27	56	838	980

Source: City of Newark; Community Planning Collaborative, 2023.

Table C-2: City of Newark Sites Inventory with APNs and Acreage

#	Name	APN	Acreage	GP Land Use	Zoning	Income Level				Total Units
						Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
Planned and Proposed Projects										
1	Bridgeway / Gateway	assorted	n/a	LDR, MDR	BTP	0	0	0	134	134
2	FMC Willow - North	92-100-5	7.21	TS, R	BTP	47	23	21	64	155
3	FMC Willow - South	537-852-1-8	12.67	HDR, O, TS	BTP	0	0	0	215	215
4	Harbor Pointe	537-852-1-3	1.71	HDR, O	BTP	0	0	0	192	192
		537-852-2-9	2.29							
		537-852-2-16	15.70							
5	Cedar Homes	92A-2375-2-6	7.16	MDR	RM	0	0	0	118	118
6	Cedar Community Apts.	901-195-38	1.36	CC	CC	124	0	0	1	125
		901-195-37	1.36							
7	Timber St. Senior Living	92A-2125-10-2	1.04	MDR	RM	39	39	1	0	79
8	Lepakshi Homes - Building A	92-30-17-2	0.17	CMU	CMU	0	0	0	60	60
		92-30-16-2	0.17							
		92-30-18-4	0.31							
		92-30-14-3	0.19							
		92-30-15-2	0.17							
9	Lepakshi Homes - Building B	92-31-16-2	0.17	CMU	CMU	8	4	3	13	28
		92-31-15	0.08							
10	SAHA Development- Thornton Ave.	92A-919-17-2	0.18	HDR	RH	56	0	1	0	57
		92A-919-16-2	0.18							
		92A-919-18	0.20							
11	Mulberry St. Residential	92-29-22	0.23	MDR	RM	0	0	0	8	8
		92-29-21	0.23							

#	Name	APN	Acreage	GP Land Use	Zoning	Income Level				Total Units
						Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
12	Bain Ave. & Magnolia St.	92-61-11	0.43	MDR	RM	0	0	0	10	10
		92-61-12-2	0.36							
		92-61-12-1	0.14							
13	Waymark Homes	92A-2585-12-1	0.83	MDR	RM	0	0	0	76	76
		92A-2585-30-4	0.35							
		92A-2585-31	2.62							
Subtotal Planned and Proposed						274	66	26	891	1,257
Sites Zoned for Housing										
14	NewPark Mall (Phases A to D)	901-111-19	9.71	Mixed-use I	RC	36	18	18	535	607
		901-111-24	7.89							
		901-111-30	0.82							
		901-111-21	4.34							
		901-111-24	1.21							
		901-111-22	6.24							
		901-111-31	3.30							
		901-111-26	5.64							
		901-111-26	1.54							
		901-111-20	7.42							
		901-111-26	0.64							
		901-111-29	1.03							
		901-111-25	14.71							
15	Grocery Outlet Shopping Center	92A-900-1-2	4.62	CMU	CMU	27	26	0	0	53
16	Thornton Ave. Sites (within Old Town Specific Plan boundary)	92-50-1-3	0.13	CMU	CMU	41	41	41	41	162
		92-29-20-2	0.34							

#	Name	APN	Acreage	GP Land Use	Zoning	Income Level				Total Units
						Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
		92-29-16-2	0.17							
		92-29-15-2	0.09							
		92-50-2-3	0.13							
		92-29-19-2	0.17							
		92-29-18-2	0.17							
		92-51-5-3	0.50							
		92-50-3-3	0.13							
		92-29-14-2	0.08							
		92-29-17-2	0.17							
		92-29-13	0.16							
		92-51-2-3	0.27							
17	Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites	92A-2125-17	1.00	MDR	RM	0	0	0	61	61
		92A-2125-11-2	1.67							
		92A-2125-13	2.00							
18	E-Z 8 Motel	92A-2585-32	2.24	HDR	RH	39	38	0	0	77
19	Cherry Plaza	92-50-13	0.96	CMU	CMU	15	15	0	0	30
20	Thornton Ave. Sites (outside of Old Town Specific Plan boundary)	92A-919-20-2	0.24	RHD	RH	18	18	18	17	71
		92A-919-11-2	0.21							
		92A-919-15-2	0.16							
		92A-919-13-2	0.19							
		92A-919-21-2	0.24							
		92A-919-12-2	0.16							
		92A-919-22-2	0.24							
		92A-919-14-2	0.21							
		92A-919-19-2	0.19							

#	Name	APN	Acreage	GP Land Use	Zoning	Income Level				Total Units
						Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
21	Sycamore St. Vacant Lot	92-255-11	1.81	RHD	RH	25	25	24	0	74
22	Cedar Blvd. Public Storage Sites	92A-2375-32	1.44	RMD	RM	0	0	0	41	41
		92A-2375-32	1.46							
23	Filbert St. Villas	92-131-3	0.17	RMD	RM	0	0	0	16	16
		92-54-4	0.18							
		92-54-5	0.21							
24	Filbert Ave. Sites	92-54-6	0.31	RMD	RM	0	0	0	7	7
		92A-623-43	0.52							
		92-125-10	0.43							
25	Mayhews Place	92A-623-43	0.52	LMDR	MDR	0	0	0	9	9
26	Locust & Railroad	92-125-10	0.43	LMDR	RS	0	0	0	6	6
27	Fahmy Homes	92-75-5-2	0.18	MDR	RM	0	0	0	6	6
		92-75-4-2	0.20							
28	Neighborhood Infill Lots	92-135-23	0.19	LDR	RS	0	0	0	17	17
		92-127-13	0.17							
		92-136-15	0.14							
		92-24-10	0.17							
		92-127-20	0.43							
		92-125-2-2	0.42							
	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	n/a	n/a			48	48	48	16	160
	Middle Housing Units	n/a	n/a			0	0	200	0	200
Subtotal Sites Zoned for Housing						249	229	348	771	1,597
Total Capacity						523	295	374	1,662	2,854

#	Name	APN	Acreage	GP Land Use	Zoning	Income Level				Total Units
						Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
Newark RHNA						464	268	318	824	1,874
	Surplus %					113%	110%	118%	202%	152%
	Surplus Units					59	27	56	838	980

Source: City of Newark; Community Planning Collaborative, 2023.

Site Selection Process

The following is a summary of the overall sites inventory process and the methodology and assumptions that support the sites selection process. Using guidance provided by HCD, an inventory of available sites was conducted by closely examining site characteristics and other HCD-established criteria. Primarily, sites were identified by using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping software from multiple datasets to identify parcels that fit the HCD-specified criteria as adequate housing sites. Sites were further refined over a series of working sessions and through input staff, the City Council and community and development sector stakeholders through the community engagement process. The information used to generate the sites inventory database was derived from these primary resources:

1. ABAG’s Housing Element Site Selection (HESS) Tool;
2. City of Newark current and long-term planning records and planning documents;
3. County of Alameda assessor’s data.

Housing sites identified as part of the site inventory analysis were evaluated using a variety of criteria to determine their ability to meet State requirements and meet the City’s RHNA, plus a buffer. The following sections describe the screening criteria and methodology applied for the site selection process. Once all sites had been selected and verified, the realistic density assumption was informed by and calculated from precedent projects in Newark, as well as from regional data provided by ABAG through the HESS tool realistic capacity module.

Methodology/Evaluation of Possible Sites

To meet the City’s RHNA requirement, three primary project types are identified in the sites inventory, as described below. The methodology and assumptions that support these project types are summarized in the “General Site Evaluation Considerations” and “Sites for Rezoning” sections.

Planned and Proposed/Pipeline Projects

Pipeline Projects include those that have been approved, permitted, or received a final certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA projection period (which started on June 30, 2022). Based on HCD guidance, these projects may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development. The following is a description of the subcategories under Pipeline Projects:

Approved/Under Construction: These projects include those that have been approved or are under construction and will receive a final certificate of occupancy after the beginning of the RHNA projection period, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA.

Proposed Projects: These are projects that are seeking entitlements. Project status includes formal applications or pre-applications under review, master plans with development agreements approved or under review (only those portions realistically expected to start construction by 2031), and sites owned by 100 percent affordable housing developers with the intent to submit applications in the next year. Permits or certificates of occupancy for these Proposed Projects are expected to be issued in the 6th cycle, making these projects eligible to be counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA as well.

Project Status and Barriers to Development

The City expects to accommodate a significant percentage of its RHNA through planned and proposed projects. Currently, there are 13 projects which are in various stages of the development process and are expected to provide 1,257 units, 340 of which are lower income. One project, Cedar Community Apartments, has been completed and has provided 124 units of very low income housing. Three of the projects are in the construction phase, six are entitled, and three are active applications. Newark continues to see strong demand in multifamily housing as indicated by these planned and proposed projects and development trends from the previous planning cycle.

The following table (C-3), provides an overview of the different projects, potential barriers, likelihood of development within the planning period, and expected completion date. While numerous factors affect a project's completion, many of which are outside of the purview of the City, all of the projects are likely to be completed within RHNA 6 planning period. Six of the thirteen projects have known barriers identified by the city, the most common being that building permits must be approved or a request for an entitlement extension must be submitted. The City is closely monitoring the progress of each of these projects and is in contact with applicants to provide guidance on how to keep project progress moving forward.

Table C-3: Planned and Proposed Sites with Project Status

Site	Name	Development Stage	Remaining Steps in Entitlement Process	Known Barriers to Development in Planning Period	Likelihood of Development in Planning Period	Expected Completion	Income Level				Total Units
							Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
1	Bridgeway / Gateway	under construction	none	none	Likely	2024	0	0	0	134	134
2	FMC Willow - North (Parcel C)	entitled	none	none	Likely	Building permits issued late 2024; construction complete in 2026	47	23	21	64	155
3	FMC Willow - South	entitled	none	none	Likely	Building permits issued late 2024; construction complete in 2026	0	0	0	215	215
4	Harbor Pointe	under construction	none	none	Likely	2024	0	0	0	192	192
5	Cedar Homes-38478 Cedar Boulevard	entitled	none	Clearance required for underground leakage from applicable agencies prior to grading permit issuance. Building permit approval or entitlement extension required by May 25, 2025.	Likely	Building permits issued mid-2024; construction complete late 2025.	0	0	0	118	118

Site	Name	Development Stage	Remaining Steps in Entitlement Process	Known Barriers to Development in Planning Period	Likelihood of Development in Planning Period	Expected Completion	Income Level				Total Units
							Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
6	Cedar Community Apts.	complete	none	none	Complete	2023	124	0	0	1	125
7	Timber St. Senior Living	entitled	none	<p>Construction closing process must be complete and construction started by February 19, 2024 as required by TCAC/CDLAC.</p> <p>Building permit approval or request for entitlement extension required by October 28, 2024.</p>	Likely	Building permits issued Q1 2024; construction complete by late 2025.	39	39	1	0	79
8	Lepakshi Homes - Building A, 6781 Thornton Ave.	active application	Completeness determination; CEQA review; Planning Commission and City Council review.	<p>Visibility triangle requirements for corner lots must be met.</p> <p>Main water line adjustment needs to be complete and new fire hydrants need to be added.</p>	Likely	Entitlements issued by mid 2024; building permits issued late 2024; construction complete by mid-2026.	0	0	0	60	60
9	Lepakshi Homes - Building B, 6781 Thornton Ave.	active application	Completeness determination; CEQA review; review; Planning Commission and City Council review	None	Likely	Entitlements issued by mid 2024; building permits issued late 2024;	8	4	3	13	28

Site	Name	Development Stage	Remaining Steps in Entitlement Process	Known Barriers to Development in Planning Period	Likelihood of Development in Planning Period	Expected Completion	Income Level				Total Units
							Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
						construction complete by mid-2026.					
10	SAHA Development- 6347-6375 Thornton Ave.	active application	Completeness determination, CEQA, public hearings	Entitlement application needed which is expected in November 2023.	Likely	Entitlements issued in 2024; construction complete in 2026	56	0	1	0	57
11	Mulberry Residential 36952 Mulberry Street	entitled	none	Construction drawings required which may be delayed due to high interest rates. Building permit approval or request for entitlement extension required by June 22, 2025.	Likely	Building permits issued late 2024; construction complete in early 2026	0	0	0	8	8
12	Bain Ave. & Magnolia St. - 37280 Magnolia Street	under construction	none	none	Likely	2023	0	0	0	10	10

Site	Name	Development Stage	Remaining Steps in Entitlement Process	Known Barriers to Development in Planning Period	Likelihood of Development in Planning Period	Expected Completion	Income Level				Total Units
							Very Low	Low	Mod.	Above Mod.	
13	Waymark Homes - Cedar Blvd	entitled	none	<p>Closing of sale on City property must be complete by January 12, 2024 per the Purchase & Sale Agreement.</p> <p>Building permit approval or request for entitlement extension required by September 14, 2025.</p>	Likely	Building permits issued 2024; construction complete late 2026	0	0	0	76	76
Subtotal Planned and Proposed							274	66	26	891	1,257

Sites Zoned for Housing

Sites zoned for housing comprise the second main type of site to accommodate the City's RHNA, including both vacant and non-vacant sites with available infrastructure and that meet a variety of criteria that make them candidates for residential development during the 6th cycle planning period. These sites are considered vacant or underutilized and are eligible for residential development as is currently allowed under the existing zoning in the General Plan or in one of the City's adopted specific plans.

Accessory Dwelling Units and SB 9 Units

Accessory Dwelling Units are considered opportunities for residential development and are based on projected development during the planning period as is currently allowed under the existing zoning or General Plan. The sites inventory provided in Table C-1 assumes that Newark will continue to approve on the order of 15 units per year¹⁵. In addition, it is anticipated that homeowners in Newark will begin to take advantage of the opportunities to add additional housing units through the addition of new units on existing residential lots or through urban lot splits as provided in SB 9.¹⁶

¹⁵ The affordability levels assumed by Newark in the sites inventory for ADU production is supported by research conducted for ABAG's RHTA program and is based on a robust statewide survey of ADUs by affordability level. <https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2022-03/ADUs-Projections-Memo-final.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/docs/planning-and-community-development/SB9FactSheet.pdf>

General Site Evaluation Considerations

This section provides a summary of the evaluation considerations made as part of the analysis and a description of each consideration. As most of the city is already built with limited vacant parcels remaining, sites in the inventory primarily include non-vacant parcels that already have access to infrastructure and meet a variety of HCD criteria that make them suitable candidates for housing redevelopment. While sites not included in the sites inventory can also be developed for housing to meet RHNA targets, those sites identified in the inventory are considered optimal and most likely to develop and contribute to housing production in the 6th cycle. The following considerations were evaluated and are described in more detail in the following sections:

- Infrastructure Availability;
- Environmental Constraints;
- Site Status and Capacity (i.e., vacant, underutilized, existing uses, and residential zoning);
- Site Size;
- Permitted Density; and
- Evaluating Sites from Prior Housing Element(s).

Infrastructure Availability

The availability of utility infrastructure to a site can be a constraint to housing development and was considered as an evaluation criterion when working to identify sites for the inventory. As a primarily developed community, the City of Newark is well-served by existing infrastructure systems, including both wet and dry utilities. As much of Newark already has available or nearby access to water and wastewater services, wet utilities are not a constraint to residential development though minor upgrades to these services (e.g., expanded sewer and water hookups to the trunk line) may be needed to develop select sites for residential uses. All sites have been screened to have available infrastructure.

Environmental Constraints

The analysis of environmental constraints included a review of all parcels identified in the inventory using different GIS-based data screens as well as ABAG's HESS tool to determine if sites possess one or more environmental constraint, including hazard risks such as parcel shapes, flood zones or wetlands, easements, contamination, steep slopes, and other possible constraints to development feasibility. Two sites, both in the construction phase, Bridgeway/Gateway and Harbor Pointe have floodplain exposure, which was mitigated during the entitlement process. None of the sites in the inventory, either planned or proposed or zoned for housing, have irregular shapes, or are impacted by either wetlands or critical habitat.

The sites zoned for housing in the sites inventory are located in urbanized areas of the City and do not have special hazard risks or significant environmental challenges. However, some of the sites zoned for housing have current or former industrial uses which may need contamination mitigation. Additional regulatory constraints or mitigation efforts have not been an issue for the projects that have been entitled or are in the entitlement process (for example, Waymark Homes and Timber St. Senior Living) in this

formerly industrial/warehouse area. For instance, the Environmental Impact Report for the Bayside Newark Specific Area Plan, an area that had considerable previous industrial contamination, outlines and addresses contamination and other environmental concerns which has led the way for significant housing construction. Where siting housing on parcels with environmental constraints may be unavoidable to accommodate the City's housing need, risks would be addressed through building codes and other mitigation measures.

Site Status and Capacity

Sites in Newark which are zoned to accommodate housing include vacant and nonvacant sites in the zoning districts summarized in Section 4A. Residentially zoned sites, either vacant or underutilized, were considered as potential buildable residential sites and were evaluated for site adequacy and capacity. Government Code Sections 65583(a)(3) and 65583.2 require that the inventory of suitable land look at criteria for vacant and underutilized sites as outlined below:

- Vacant sites that are zoned for multi-family development
- Vacant sites that are not zoned for multi-family development, but that allow such development
- Underutilized sites that are zoned for residential development and capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity
- Sites that are not zoned for residential development, but can be redeveloped for and/or rezoned for multi-family residential development
- Sites owned or leased by the City that can be redeveloped for multi-family residential development within the housing cycle
- Sites controlled by the State, a city/county, or another public agency where there is agreement/documentation that the site can be developed within the housing cycle
- Non-vacant sites require substantial evidence to demonstrate that existing development will not preclude housing production during the planning period

A methodology to determine “underutilized” sites was necessary given that the City has shrinking supply of vacant land. Sites were removed from consideration in the underutilized methodology if sites: did not initially allow residential uses, were historic resources, were sites that support community-serving uses (parks, utilities, transportation, schools, hospitals), had structures that were recently built or modified, and were generally built out to their allowed density.

Sites owned by the City and other public agencies were also evaluated for affordable housing development, but none were identified as suitable at this time.

Site Size

Per State law, sites smaller than half an acre or larger than 10 acres are not considered adequate to accommodate lower income housing needs unless it can be demonstrated that sites of equivalent size were successfully developed during prior planning periods, or other evidence is provided that sites at this size can be developed as lower income housing.

Large Sites – There are no individual sites in the inventory larger than 10 acres (with the exception of one parcel within the NewPark Place Specific Plan Area which is 14.7 acres).

Small Sites – The sites inventory includes parcels that are less than or slightly greater than one-half acre in size. A screening of these smaller parcels and common ownership was conducted. Where smaller parcels were immediately adjacent to other Opportunity Sites that had the same landowner, these parcels were consolidated to create larger sites, given the likelihood of these consolidated sites being developed together as a single project (the SAHA Thornton Avenue project falls in this category). Recent proposals and projects underway confirm trends toward lot consolidation in Newark. Sites 8-13 are all recent examples of projects where lot consolidation is happening, entitlements have been issued (Sites 11 and 13) or are under review (Sites 8-10), and in some cases, construction is progressing (Site 12). In addition, interviews with the owners of Site 23 and 27, which have expired entitlements, confirm continued interest in parcel assembly (Site 23 has already been assembled) and development and do not indicate that lot consolidation is a barrier to development. In combination with Program 2.11, which will provide incentives for lot consolidation, conditions for the potential development of small parcels in Newark are promising. A full list of these and other sites is included in the sites inventory form to be prepared for submission to HCD for review.

Permitted Density

State law (Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)) establishes a “default density standard” of 30 units per acre for lower income units in a metropolitan jurisdiction such as Newark. This is the minimum density that is deemed appropriate in State law to accommodate the City’s lower income RHNA. In accordance with the State’s default density standards, sites that could support a minimum of 30 units per acre were considered appropriate for very low and low income units, as well as for moderate income units. All underutilized Opportunity Sites in the inventory can accommodate at least the default density.

Evaluating Sites from Prior Housing Element(s)

To accommodate the 2023-2031 RHNA, sites from both the 4th and 5th cycle housing elements were evaluated to determine their viability for the 2023-2031 Housing Element planning period. As reflected in Program H3.6 and Table 6-2, the city has identified all parcels that need to be rezoned to accommodate RHNA during the planning period. Specifically, by January 31, 2024, Newark will implement zoning text amendments to provide adequate capacity for up to 602 units. This program will provide for a minimum density of 30 DU/A for sites to accommodate lower income RHNA units. The City will incorporate a replacement housing provision for any sites with existing residential use and will permit multifamily uses without discretionary action.

Pursuant to AB 1397, Newark will also amend the Zoning Ordinance to require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower-income households, on sites being used to meet the 6th Cycle RHNA that represent “reuse sites” previously identified in the 4th and 5th Cycles Housing Element. The ten sites listed in Table 6-2 will be adjusted by text amendment to accommodate the lower income RHNA as needed.

Sites for Rezoning

Government Code section 65583.2(h) sets requirements if sites are identified for rezoning to accommodate a lower income RHNA shortfall. The City's sites inventory does not have a lower income shortfall, and therefore is not subject to those requirements.

Realistic Capacity Evaluation - Approach and Methodology

As required by Housing Element law, local governments must analyze available sites based on a determination of their realistic residential development capacity. Consistent with this requirement, Newark collected and analyzed data on precedent projects to evaluate the realistic capacity of both vacant sites and non-vacant/underutilized sites in both residential and commercial/mixed-use zones. Specifically, the typical achieved densities of existing or approved residential development on sites in all zoning districts were analyzed to confirm their realistic capacity to achieve the identified number of housing units for each site by AMI level.

Land Use, Zoning and Development Standards and Realistic Capacity

The precedent projects used as reference housing developments for this analysis are subject to the same land use controls and site improvement standards as the sites in the inventory. Local precedent projects were supplemented by sub-regional data provided from the ABAG HESS tool regarding typical achieved densities on projects in the Newark/Tri-City Market Area.

Realistic Capacity in Multifamily-Residential (RM, RH zones)

For housing opportunity sites identified in the City's multi-family residential districts (RM, RH), the realistic capacity assumption applied to total site capacity is 80 percent. This assumption is conservatively set lower than representative projects currently in the City's development pipeline (see, for example, Site 7 in the below sites inventory, which is being built out at more than 100 percent of the maximum allowed density in the RM zone). This more conservative realistic capacity adjustment factor for sites in the RM and RH zones is also broadly consistent with 357 projects built in the Multi-Family Residential districts of the Tri-City area between 2018 and 2020.¹⁷

Realistic Capacity in Commercial Mixed-Use, Regional Commercial (CMU, RC zones) and Other Non-Residential Zones

Per State Housing Element law, the realistic development capacity calculation for nonresidential, non-vacant, or overlay zoned sites must be adjusted to reflect the realistic potential for residential development capacity on the sites in the inventory. Specifically, when the site has the potential to be developed with non-residential uses, requires redevelopment, or has an overlay zone allowing the underlying zoning to be utilized for residential units, these capacity limits must be reflected in the Housing Element.

For this analysis, Newark has taken into account both recently developed and planned and proposed residential development in Newark as well as data from comparable projects in the Tri-City area obtained from the HESS tool. As detailed in the realistic capacity analyses provided for Sites 14 through 28, factors used to make the adjustment included:

- Local and regional residential development trends in non-residential zoning districts.

¹⁷ ABAG HESS tool

- Local or regional track records, past production trends, and development yields for redeveloping sites or site intensification.
- The likelihood for residential development based on recent precedents, market demand and City efforts to incentivize the development of 100 percent residential development on formerly commercial sites (see, for example, Site 14 Newpark Place, which contemplates new residential development on several sites that were formerly commercial).

Market data provided by the HESS tool identified 128 project(s) built in the non-residential districts of the Alameda South County/Tri-Cities Area between 2018 and 2020. The average number of units built as a percentage of the maximum allowable units on these sites was 130 percent. However, due to ground floor retail requirements and the experience of comparable pipeline projects, a more conservative feasibility multiplier of 80 percent was used in the sites inventory analysis to reflect local conditions in Newark, and also to take into account the unlikely event that commercial-only development would occur on these sites, despite recent development trends.

Development Trends in Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones

As noted, precedent projects were evaluated to determine the likely density of 100 percent residential development in each of the zones that permit housing in Newark. In general, throughout Newark and the larger Tri-City market area, residential uses have been outcompeting retail and office uses, and the overwhelming trend has been towards the conversion of existing commercial centers. The NewPark Place Specific Plan reflects this trend in that there is a planned downsizing of the commercial retail portions of the existing center in favor of higher density residential product types.

During the fifth cycle RHNA planning period, only five (5) non-residential commercial projects were developed on commercial or mixed-use sites in Newark. Specifically, these 100 percent commercial uses consisted of the following projects: three hotels developed on commercial and mixed-use sites; a new restaurant replacing an existing restaurant in a commercial zone; and, a Costco retail warehouse replacing existing commercial uses in the NewPark Place Specific Plan Area resulting in a net decrease in commercial floor area.

This limited commercial development occurred in the context of over 30 residential development projects that were approved during the same time frame in residential and specific plan areas, representing thousands of new units. In addition, the City receives regular inquiries from developers interested in developing housing on existing commercial land, reflecting the strong trend towards the conversion of existing commercial land to residential and mixed-uses. Taking these development trend factors into account, the realistic capacity factor of 80% is extremely conservative in accounting for the limited possibility that future development on these sites may be 100% non-residential.

Overall Planning and Development Context for Residential Development in Formerly Non-Residential Areas

Newark has a history of reimagining underutilized sites for new housing development. As described in Section 4, Section A (Housing Constraints, Governmental Constraints) Newark has adopted specific plans in important transitional areas of the City that can accommodate a variety of uses, including residential

uses:

- Bayside Newark Specific Plan (formally known as the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan) an area of over 200 acres that contained various industrial, manufacturing, chemical processing, and salt production facilities. Extensive environmental and hazardous materials remediation has been completed to allow the construction of dense single-family and multiple-family residential buildings. As of 2023, over 2,000 units have been approved, built, and/or are in a phase of construction.
- Old Town Specific Plan, an area of 76 acres representing some of Newark's oldest neighborhoods. The specific plan's vision is the development of this corridor into a mixed-use area that accommodates a range of housing types, retail and service businesses, expanded public spaces, and mobility improvement. Through zoning amendments, streetscape improvements, and public and private investments, the plan envisions Old Town Newark as a revitalized mixed-use neighborhood with a strong sense of place. The specific plan envisions approximately 400 net-new residential units to be located within the specific Plan area.
- NewPark Place Specific Plan provides a comprehensive planning and development implementation strategy for a 125-acre area in the southeastern portion of the city adjacent to I-880, which includes the existing NewPark Mall retail center (mall), the parking facilities that surround it, and commercial uses on the perimeter of the center. This specific plan envisions over 1,500 residential units located in the existing shopping malls surface parking area. Residential uses are permitted uses within these surface parking areas; conditional use permits are not required.

In addition to adopting specific plans, the city has rezoned other areas of the city from commercial and industrial uses to residential uses. For example, through various zoning amendments and project entitlements, the light industrial neighborhood on the eastside of Cedar Boulevard between Central Avenue and Mowry Avenue is transforming into a dense urban neighborhood. Since 2014, over 700 residential units have been approved or constructed within this area.

Newark has consistently approved residential development on lands that have transitioned from industrial and other uses into high-quality residential neighborhoods, resulting in the production of thousands of units. This development is in addition to residential development on lands identified in the general plan and in zoning districts specifically for residential uses. Residential development is expected to continue, especially in areas where mixed-uses are allowed, based upon the implantation of housing element policies and State legislation that remove barriers to residential development on commercial and mixed-use sites.

Policies and Programs Incentivizing Residential Development in Commercial and Mixed Use Area

This above realistic capacity analysis is further supported by a range of policies and programs that the City has committed to implementing during the planning period. These policies include, but are not limited to, the following:

PROGRAM H2.3: Investigate Opportunities in the Four Corners Area to facilitate market-rate and affordable housing and promote neighborhood revitalization through increased mixed use development

and walkability.

POLICY H2.4: Work with community partners and property owners to revisit a community visioning plan for the Four Corners neighborhood/community commercial area.

PROGRAM H3.4: Adjust Zoning to Allow Mixed Use in Current Commercial Zones

PROGRAM H4.10: Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Special Needs Housing

In order to support an increase in this housing type in the city, SROs will be permitted use in Residential Medium Density, Commercial Mixed Use and Residential High Density zones, with a priority for SRO development to occur along transit corridors.

To align zoning with planned development areas and associated policies of developing pedestrian friendly, walkable neighborhoods, the city proposes to implement State laws SB6 and AB 2011 to encourage residential and mixed-use developments in current commercial zones.

Evaluation of Sites to Accommodate Varied Income Levels

One of the most important evaluation considerations of the sites selection process is to evaluate a site's ability to accommodate households with varying income levels. To satisfy the RHNA requirement, the amount of lower, moderate, and above moderate income units is specified for each site in the inventory. Furthermore, the unit capacity must be maintained throughout the 2023-2031 planning period. Therefore, a buffer of at least 15 percent to 30 percent is generally recommended by HCD, and Newark's sites inventory buffer is well beyond this recommendation. If sites listed in the inventory are redeveloped with other uses or different income levels than what is identified, the difference can be made up with the buffer sites to ensure there is "No Net Loss" of Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites.

Suitability of Non-Vacant Sites for Development

The lack of vacant land in Newark and the relatively high value of new residential development means that the City consistently sees the redevelopment of underutilized sites, a fact which is reflected most notably in the adoption and ongoing implementation of the Newpark Place Specific Plan. Developer and property interest in non-vacant commercial sites for future residential development has been strong in recent years, and the inventory included here is, by many measures, relatively conservative in terms of the number of non-vacant commercial sites included relative to market pressures.

Non-vacant opportunity sites in the inventory were screened based on the criteria previously described. The consultant team worked closely with city staff to identify suitable properties and analyze existing uses and the conditions of buildings or lots on non-vacant sites. Property owner outreach was also conducted for the relevant sites, as well as analysis on constraints and market conditions. In each case, the analysis indicated that the opportunity sites included in this Housing Element Have a strong likelihood of developing as residential projects during the planning period.

Lower Income RHNA vis-a-vis Non Vacant Sites

State law requires additional analysis of existing uses in the sites inventory if more than 50 percent of the City's low-income RHNA is accommodated on non-vacant sites. HCD has published guidance for how to determine this, which includes adjustments for proposed lower income projects and ADU capacity, in addition to vacant sites in the inventory. A substantial amount of the City's lower-income units (more than 50 percent of the lower income RHNA) are within Pipeline Projects. In addition, the inventory includes affordable ADU units. In summary, less than 34 percent of Newark's lower income RHNA is accommodated on non-vacant sites, which is below the 50 percent threshold. Therefore, no additional analysis is needed to support the site inventory's non-vacant sites.

Table C-4: Lower Income RHNA vis-a-vis Non Vacant Sites, 2023

Site Location	Lower Income Units	Percent of Lower Income RHNA
Planned and Proposed Sites	340	46.4%
Vacant Sites (Sycamore St.)	50	6.8%
ADUs	96	13.1%
Total Lower Income RHNA	732	100%
Lower Income RHNA vis-a-vis Non Vacant Sites	246	33.6%

Site Profiles

The following site profiles provide specific information about each of the opportunity sites listed in Table C-1 and displayed vis-a-vis AFFH factors in the maps provided above. The sites include both planned and proposed projects as well as sites zoned for housing that will be available to be developed during the planning period. Each profile includes a description of the site's general plan land use designation, zoning, site size and maximum allowable density. Notes regarding realistic capacity are included as well as available links to relevant planning documents and plans. Sites 1 through 13 are in the development pipeline process (either under construction, fully entitled or active applications) and sites 14 through 28 are locations identified for housing either from previous Housing Elements or new analysis. Sites identified as zoned for housing include detailed analyses of development standards, government constraints and environmental constraints. Tables summarizing development standards and unit yield are provided for sites 15 through 19, 21, 22, 24, and 25.

1 Bridgeway / Gateway (Bayside Newark) - under construction

Zoning: Residential High Density, Residential Medium Density

Size: 41 acres

Specific Plan Designation: Medium/High Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

APNs: Consolidated sites with APNs to be listed in the HCD electronic inventory form.

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

On March 10, 2016, Newark City Council adopted Ordinance No. 492 which was a zoning amendment on property shown in [Vesting Tentative Tract Map 8099](#) from MT-1 (High Technology Park District) to MDR-FBC (Medium Density Residential-Form Based Codes) and HDR-FBC (High Density Residential-Form Based Codes) as part of the [Bayside Newark](#) (formerly known as the Dunbarton TOD Specific Plan) to develop the land as Gateway Station West.

The project, proposed by Integral Communities, calls for the phased development of 589 market-rate residential units within approximately 41 acres of the 54.5-acre project site, at an approximately density of 14.36 DU/A. A total of 321 single family detached homes and 268 attached condos are planned, along with streets, 1,473 parking spaces, sidewalks, trails, landscaping, parks, water quality treatment basins and permanent open space. In addition, several off-site roadway, sidewalk and landscaping improvements may be constructed in conjunction with the project. The development site is located within the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan Project area.



2 FMC Willow - North (Bayside Newark) - entitled

Zoning: Business and Technology Park

Size: 7.2 acres

Specific Plan Designation: Transit Station, Commercial/Retail

Max Allowable Density: Form-based code

APN: 92-100-5

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

On 9/22/22, The City of Newark approved land use modifications proposed by Lennar Home Builder, FMC Corporation, and Integral Communities within the FMC Willow and Grand Park portion of the [Bayside Newark Specific Plan](#) area. The proposed modifications would redevelop the 22.1-acre site into a 370-unit multi-family community including 279 townhouse units, a 1.6-acre mixed-use area with 3,600 sq. ft. of retail, club room, fitness center, and 90 affordable units (plus 1 manager unit) within a 6-story building, a 5-acre community park (Grand Park), and a 1,485 sq. ft. community building, along with approx. 1.8 acres set aside for a future transit station.

The north site, known as FMC Willow - North” would contain the 91-unit affordable housing, mixed-use building, 64 multifamily units and the future transit station parcel for a total of 155 units. The 64 market-rate units would be UA Stack (multifamily). The UA Stacks would have five floor plans ranging from 1,696 square feet to 2,015 square feet, and they would be three-stories high.



[Link to approved Application \(Resolution No. 11,407\)](#)

[Link to FMC Willow Staff Report](#)

3 FMC Willow - South (Bayside Newark) - entitled

Zoning: Business and Technology Park

Size: 12.6 acres

Specific Plan Designation: High Density Residential, Commercial Office, Transit Station

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

APN: 537-852-1-8

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

On 9/22/22, The City of Newark approved land use modifications proposed by Lennar Home Builder, FMC Corporation, and Integral Communities within the FMC Willow and Grand Park portion of the [Bayside Newark Specific Plan](#) area. The proposed modifications would redevelop the 22.1-acre site into a 370-unit multi-family community including 279 townhouse units, a 1.6-acre mixed-use area with 3,600 sq. ft. of retail, club room, fitness center, and 90 affordable units (plus 1 manager unit) within a 6-story building, a 5-acre community park (Grand Park), and a 1,485 sq. ft. community building, along with approx. 1.8 acres set aside for a future transit station.



The South Site of the project, known as “FMC Willow South”, (Grand Park, PA 3, and PA 4) would include a 1,485 square foot community building, 123 multifamily units, and 92 townhomes for a total of 215 units. The 123 units would be UA Split (multifamily), and 92 would be UA Towns (townhomes). The UA Stacks would have 5 floorplans ranging from 1,696 square feet to 2,015 square feet. The UA Splits would have a standard option with 4 floorplans ranging from 1,307 square feet to 2,108 square feet and a 4-story option with 4 floorplans ranging from 1,307 square feet to 2,422 square feet. The homes would be 3-5 stories high.



[Link to project plans.](#)

4 Harbor Pointe, FMC Parcel C (Bayside Newark) - under construction

Zoning: Business and Technology Park

Size: 13.6 acres

Specific Plan Designation: High Density Residential, Commercial/Office

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

APN: 537-852-2-9, 537-852-1-3, 537-852-2-16

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

In line with the Bayside Newark Specific Plan (formerly known as the Dumbarton TOD), the City of Newark approved a title sheet and site plan submitted by Parcel C Project Owner, LLC. The date on the filing is from 12/17/2018.

The developable area of 13.6 acres was subdivided to accommodate 192 units over three planning areas. Planning Area 1 has a total 72 units at a density of 11.56 units to the acre, Planning Area 2 has a total of 75 units at 16.13 units per acre, and Planning Area 3 has a total of 45 units at 16.48 units per acre. The plan has multiple typologies which are both three and four bedroom single family units which will be sold at market rate. The project is being built in phases and multiple final maps may be filed.



[Link to project plans.](#)

5 Cedar Homes - 38478 Cedar Boulevard - entitled

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 7.76 acres


General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 dwelling units per acre.

APN: 92A-2375-2-6

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to application materials, Robson Homes, LLC proposes to construct 118 residential units composed of single family residences and two-unit attached townhomes on a 7.76-acre site located at 38288-38594 Cedar Blvd. The site would be subdivided to create 124 lots including six common and 118 residential lots. The project would include landscaping and open space areas, a new private street, and on-site and off-site improvements. Below is a rendering of an example unit.



[Link to project plans.](#)

6 Cedar Community Apartments - complete

Zoning: Community Commercial

Size: 2.7 acres

General Plan Designation: Community Commercial

Max Allowable Density 25-60 dwelling units per acre.

APN: 901-195-37, 901-195-38

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

The Cedar Community Apartments project was selected for a Homekey grant valued at \$38.2 million. This grant assisted with the acquisition and conversion of Town Place Suite into 125 apartment units that are affordable to extremely low-income households and households experiencing homelessness, including 11 units that are reserved for military veterans. The grant also assists with the provision of resident services including education and employment services. 1 unit is at market rate for management.

The owner of the Towne Place Suites (TPS) extended-stay hotel in Newark and Allied Housing/Abode Services entered into an option agreement for the sale of the property. The hotel suites were converted into 124 supportive, affordable residential units to be known as Cedar Community Apartments. 60 units are for households who have experienced homelessness, and the other 64 are set aside for people at risk of homelessness.



7 Timber St. Senior Living - entitled

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 1.0 acre

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 dwelling units per acre.

APN: 92A-2125-10-2

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

Timber Street Senior, developed by Eden Housing, will provide 79 units of new affordable housing for seniors in a convenient location in Newark, CA. The project will redevelop the 1-acre site and fulfill the city's vision of transforming the surrounding neighborhood from light industrial and warehouse space to a vibrant, walkable residential neighborhood.

The project has been granted \$21.7 million in funding for its construction with the City of Newark and Alameda County (Measure A1 Affordable Housing Fund) both as financial partners. The project's funding is a part of Governor Newsom's recent commitment of more than \$825 million to help expand the state's affordable housing stock and increase capacity for additional climate-smart infill housing.

The building will include a community room with a kitchen and attached courtyard with space for planter boxes and organized activities, a computer learning center, an exercise room, a bicycle storage room, and offices to house on-site services staff. All of the units are 1-bedrooms, so the community will support seniors living on their own as well as couples. A rendering of the project is shown below.



[Link to project plans.](#)

8 Lepaskshi Homes - 6781 Thornton Ave. Building A (Old Town Newark Area Plan) - active application

Zoning: Commercial Mixed Use

Size: 1.0 acres

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

Max Allowable Density 100 dwelling units per acre (Old Town Newark Area Plan)

APN: 92-30-16-2, 92-30-15-2, 92-30-14-3, 92-30-18-4, 92-30-17-2

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

The developer, Lepaskshi Homes, has proposed a residential project at the gateway to the City's Old Town neighborhood. The project consists of two sites with a single building on each site. "Building A" with 60 market rate units, 12 one-bedroom, 37 two-bedroom, 6 three-bedroom, and 5 live-work units. The proposed plan is approximately 60 units per acre for Building A. Building A's building height is 57 feet with a clocktower at 72 feet.

As of October 2023, the application is under review. The city anticipates that the application will be complete in early 2024 with public hearings scheduled shortly thereafter. Entitlements include a Planned Development and Design Review.

[Link to project plans.](#)



9 Lepakshi Homes - 6781 Thornton Ave. Building B (Old Town Newark Specific Plan) - active application

Zoning: Commercial Mixed-Use

Size: 0.25 acres

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

Max Allowable Density 100 dwelling units per acre (Old Town Newark Specific Plan)

APN: 92-31-15, 92-31-16-2

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

The developer, Lepakshi Homes, has proposed a residential project at the gateway to the City's Old Town neighborhood. The project consists of two sites with a single building on each site. "Building B" is across the street from Building A and would contain 15 affordable units and 13 market rate units. The proposed plan is at 94 units per acre, and the building height is 59 feet. Below is a rendering of the project, with Building B in the foreground. The smaller "Building B" parcels are part of the same application and approval process as Building A.



As of October 2023, the application is under review. The city anticipates that the application will be complete in early 2024 with public hearings scheduled shortly thereafter. Entitlements include Planned Development and Design Review.

[Link to project plans.](#)



10 SAHA - 6347 -6375 Thornton Ave. - active application

Zoning: Residential High Density

Size: 0.54 acres

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 60 dwelling units per acre.

APN: 92A-919-18, 92A-919-17-2, 92A-919-16-2

Realistic capacity based on developer proposal as submitted to city in NOFA process.

According to application materials, SAHA proposes a multi-family housing development of 57 deeply affordable homes targeted to individuals and families including 15 two-bedroom apartments and 16 three-bedroom apartments, on three underutilized parcels, 6347-6375 Thornton Avenue. The proposal calls for a single 60 foot. 5-story building on 0.54 acres at 105 DU/A (a waiver or concession is needed).

SAHA proposes to develop a five-story building using Type 5A wood-frame construction for the upper four floors over a Type 1A concrete ground floor and parking garage. The design includes numerous family-friendly common area amenities such as a computer lab, an acoustically-insulated music practice room, a bicycle repair station, building wide wireless internet service free to residents, an outdoor tot play area and wheelchair-accessible raised garden beds in a sunny spot where SAHA's Resident Services team will expand its successful gardening program.

To fund this transformation, SAHA requested and received \$12M of seed capital from the City of Newark which will cover approximately 25% of the total development cost. The developer will submit a formal design review, minor use permit, and a map application before the end of 2024. Entitlements are expected in late 2024.

[Link to project plans.](#)



11 Mulberry Residential - 36952 Mulberry Street - entitled

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.46 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.

APN: 92-29-22, 92-29-21

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to application materials, Rajesh Rao, proposes to demolish the existing single-story residence and detached garage, and construct eight for-sale market-rate condominiums with new landscaping, open space areas, a private driveway, and guest parking on the property located at 36952 Mulberry St. The property is zoned RM-OT (Residential Medium Density with the Old Town Overlay District). The proposed project would merge two existing lots to create a 0.46-acre lot with 4 three-bedroom units and 4 four-bedroom units at a density of 17.4 DU/A. Below is a proposed rendering of the project.



[Link to project plans.](#)

12 Bain Ave. & Magnolia St. - 37280 Magnolia Street - under construction

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.93 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.

APN: 92-61-11, 92-61-12-1, 92-61-12-2

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to application materials, Goldsilverisland Homes, LLC is proposing 10 market-rate single family homes at 37280 Magnolia Street. The applicant is also proposing a PD overlay district to allow for lower lot sizes of 3,500 square feet instead of 6,000 square feet. The density of the development is approximately 10.75 DU/A.

[Link to project plans.](#)



13 Waymark Homes - Cedar Blvd. - entitled

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 3.44 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.

APN: 92A-2585-30-4, 92A-2585-12-1, 92A-2585-31

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

The applicant, Waymark Development, proposes to demolish the existing buildings currently occupied by commercial/industrial uses and construct 76 three-story attached townhomes within 14 buildings on a 3.44-acre site located at 38600 Cedar Blvd. The project calls for 34 three-bedroom units and 46 four-bedroom units with a total density of 22 DU/A. The project would include landscaping and open space areas, a new private street, and on-site improvements. The property is zoned RM (Residential Medium Density District). The project requires a Design Review, Minor Use Permit for a building height up to 40 feet, and a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map. Below is a render of an example unit.



[Link to project plans.](#)

14 NewPark Place (Phases A to D)

Zoning: Regional Commercial

Specific Designation: Mixed-Use I

APN: 901-111-19, 901-111-30, 901-111-29, 901-111-24, 901-111-22, 901-111-20, 901-111-25, 901-111-21, 901-111-26, 901-111-31

Size: 52.03 acres

Max Allowable Density 160 units per acre.

Realistic capacity based on Specific Plan

As described above in Section 4 and in other sections of this Housing Element, the [NewPark Place Specific Plan](#) will guide the redevelopment of this entire area, comprising 52.03 acres with an expected residential build-out capacity of 1,519 across 5 major phases as follows (see Phase A in top aerial, Phases B-D in bottom aerial):

- **Phase A:** Type-III multifamily development. A total of 319 units on 3.98 acres at a density of 80 dwelling units per acre. The development includes six levels of parking.
- **Phase B1:** Type-III multifamily development. A total of 195 units on 3.47 acres at a density of 56 dwelling units per acre. The development includes a six level garage.
- **Phase B2:** Type-III multifamily development with a podium. A total of 310 units on 4.30 acres at a density of 72 dwelling units per acre. The development includes a 3-level structure parking facility.
- **Phase C:** Type-III multifamily development with a podium. A total of 300 units on 3.70 acres at a density of 81 dwelling units per acre. The development includes a 2 level garage and 1 sub-t.
- **Phase D2:** Type-III multifamily development. A total of 395 units on 5.67 acres at a density of 70 dwelling units per acre.

The development includes a five level garage.

The phases are regulated by the Mixed-Use Area I standards, which include a maximum building height of 200 feet, with buildings adjacent to the streets to be a minimum of 30 feet, but preferably 60 feet. Residential density may be up to 160 units per acre, but not less than 60 dwelling units per acre.

While the specific plan has a relatively high maximum density, it is largely unachievable for multiple reasons. First, the plan has a cap on the total number of units at 1,519. An adjustment of this number would require City Council action and a new EIR process. Second, taller developments than Type-III multifamily would require new emergency vehicle typologies, procedures, and training which the City of Newark currently does not have nor does the surrounding area. Therefore, it is not surprising that the actual densities of the proposed



developments are somewhat lower than the maximum would permit. Residential uses may be within residential only multiple story buildings and/or in buildings with a mix of uses. First floor residential is allowed in non-active frontage locations, which are outlined in the plan. Parking demand for development within areas designed Mixed-Use I must be accommodated by a combination of surface and structured parking per the Parking Sub Plan. The residential uses within each “block” must be self-parked within the boundary of the individual block. For a more detailed account of all applicable development standards, refer to the Specific Area Plan.

The NewPark Place plan has a 20 year planning arc, therefore it is expected that only 40% of the total units will be complete for the 8 year RHNA 65 Housing Element Period. As feasible, the City will continue to work with the property owner to encourage the inclusion of larger percentages of affordable units in future phases of development.

The build out capacity and affordable housing assumptions for NewPark Place provided in this sites inventory reflects City Council Resolution NO. 10,184 which went into effect on June 9, 2014 and is the guiding document which outlines that for apartment development, the affordability breakdown starting point should be 6% VLI, 3% LI, and 3% MOD in order to fully mitigate the impact of the residential development. The document gives City Council the authority to determine that an alternative distribution of affordable units will fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the need for affordable housing, based on community needs and the characteristics of the development. In the case of NewPark Phase A, Council advocated strongly for onsite affordable units instead of a mitigation fee.

As described in full in the Specific Plan, this area has adequate infrastructure to accommodate the planned residential development and there are no known environmental constraints. In addition, each separate phase of this development would comprise a land area of less than 10 acres.





[Link to the project plans for Phase A.](#)

15 Grocery Outlet Center

Zoning: Commercial Mixed Use

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

APN: 92A-900-1-2

Size: 4.62 acres (1.54 acres under the assumption that $\frac{1}{3}$ of the site will redevelop)

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

The Grocery Outlet Center site is an aging multi-tenant retail center with a large surface parking lot, which takes up approximately 40% of the site, located on the corner of Newark Boulevard and Mayhews Landing Road. The site was previously included in the 5th Cycle Housing Element. The shopping center is a collection of four different buildings, each with multiple tenants providing a range of retail and service options for the community, including a well established Grocery Store.

Realistic Capacity

Since the leases are current and tenants like Grocery Outlet are popular among residents, the approach here is that only a third of the site will feasibly redevelop throughout the eight-year planning period.

Newark code requires ground floor retail adjacent to Newark Boulevard, so a realistic capacity of 80% was applied to this site yielding a total of 57 units as detailed below. The density is at 45 dwelling units per acre giving it 100% affordable potential. The existing establishments, a liquor store, Southeast Asian restaurant, and flower shop would be able to continue to operate on the ground floor.



Analysis of Redevelopment Potential

- In Newark and the Tri-City Area, similar commercial centers have recently developed as mixed-use and/or 100 percent residential projects at similar densities. The redevelopment of the NewPark mall and surrounding area are an important comparable example of the residential redevelopment potential provided by this key site.
- The redevelopment potential of this site is also supported by the relatively low improvement to land value ratio of 0.49, which shows that the built improvements are valued lower than the underlying land. This indicates a strong propensity for the site to redevelop during the planning period.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.49) meaning that the appraised value of the land is greater than the appraised value of the built improvements, indicating a propensity for redevelopment to another land use
- Large and underutilized surface parking lot (greater than 2 acres)
- Aging structures and lack of recent improvements (auto-oriented single story commercial from 1964-1986)
- Single ownership of parcel
- Adjacent redevelopment occurring (Mayhews Place)

- Similar redevelopment occurring in Newark (NewPark Place)

Rezoning

Since the site was included in the 5th Cycle Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above, this site will be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-5: Grocery Outlet Center Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	1.54 acres
Zoning	Commercial Mixed Use
Allowable Density	30 - 60 dwelling units per acre
RHNA Affordability	Lower Income
Existing Use	Non-Vacant, aging strip mall
Infrastructure Availability	Yes, no constraints
Environmental Constraints	None Known

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.75	Net development area based: on front and side setbacks; open space requirements; reduced parking requirements per program H3.5; and, ground floor commercial use comprising 15% of lot area.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for the conversion of existing commercial sites to 100% residential or mixed use projects. Program H3.4 will be implemented to facilitate the development of this and other potential residential sites in commercial zones. Program H3.5 will also be implemented to reduce required covered parking standards for residential projects. will be implemented to streamline the Note: the ABAG Hess tool reports build out of 1.35 for residential projects in mixed use zones in the tri city market area, and thus this assumption is very conservative.
Typical Densities	0.95	Affordable housing developments in Newark build out to almost maximum density.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Water, sewer and power infrastructure in place and sufficient to support residential development.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints on this site.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	53	

16 Thornton Ave. Sites (within Old Town Neighborhood)

Zoning: Commercial Mixed Use

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

Size: varies by parcel, total of 2.5 acres

Max Allowable Density 100 units per acre per Old Town Specific Plan

APN: 92-51-2-3, 92-29-20-2, 92-29-19-2, 92-51-5-3, 92-29-18-2, 92-29-17-2, 92-29-13, 92-29-16-2, 92-29-15-2, 92-50-1-3, 92-29-14-2, 92-50-2-3, 92-50-3-3

The Thornton Avenue area comprises a number of underutilized parcels which are primed for residential development during the planning period. Improvement to land value ratios for the sites range from 0.22 to 0.79 indicating a propensity to redevelop, and the Old Specific Plan (Specific Plan) also includes policies encouraging residential and mixed-use development. The size and shape of these contiguous sites lend themselves to parcel assembly and lot consolidation.

The major constraints facing these parcels are the need for assemblage (most parcels are less than half an acre) and ground floor retail requirements along Thornton Ave. Because of this, a realistic capacity multiplier of 80% was used to calculate unit totals.

While many of the buildings date from earlier than 1970, The Specific Plan found that there are no historic buildings or structures in the planning area. The plan notes that 25 buildings within the planning area have “historic merit”, the City’s Historic Preservation Program allows for modification and demolition of buildings with historic merit. Several existing City regulations would help ensure that development and redevelopment activities do not cause a substantial adverse change. Therefore, the protection of cultural resources is not a significant barrier to redevelopment of these sites.



Analysis of Redevelopment Potential

Many of the Thornton Avenue parcels were also previously identified as “potential opportunity sites” in the Specific Plan. According to the Specific Plan, these sites “include vacant and underutilized sites, which may be more likely locations for redevelopment.” The plan projected that throughout the planning area, 400 net new units could be developed by 2040 which would be in the form of multi-family buildings with five or more units.¹⁸

In order to achieve this goal, the city has implemented land use regulations outlined in the Specific Plan which promote high density development, such as increased densities (up to 100 dwelling units per acre) and height limits (up to 75 feet) and the ability for 100 percent residential projects. The market has already started to respond to these new regulations with the Lepakshi Homes projects (88

¹⁸ Newark Old Town Specific Plan, pg. 21

units, 15 either low income or moderate, on 1.25 acres) and nearby SAHA (57 affordable units on 0.54 acres) as examples which are currently in the development pipeline. In addition, the city will promote the consolidation of small parcels through Program H2.11 which in turn will encourage larger scale multi-family development. The City is also planning significant pedestrian-oriented infrastructure improvements in the Old Town neighborhood which will increase the viability for welcomed high-density, mixed-use, compact development.

As noted in the Specific Plan, the opportunity sites originally selected and identified here were originally selected due to their redevelopment potential. It is important to note that since multiple factors influence redevelopment and some opportunity sites were not explicitly identified in the Housing Element, it is likely that new development will occur on sites which were not specifically identified in the sites inventory.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.22 to 0.79) meaning that the appraised value of the land is greater than the appraised value of the built improvements
- Updated land use controls which allow significantly denser development (Old Town Area Plan)
- Aging buildings and obsolete development typologies (single story commercial with frontage parking dating from before 1970, most with little historic merit)
- Adjacent redevelopment occurring (Lepakshi Homes and SAHA)
- Candidate for lot consolidation incentives through Program H2.11

Rezoning

Since the sites were included in a previous Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above they will be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-6: Thornton Ave. Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	2.5 acres
Zoning	Commercial Mixed Use (within Old Town)
Allowable Density	100 du/a (within Old Town)
RHNA Affordability	Mixed
Existing Use	Commercial, Parking
Infrastructure Availability	Yes
Environmental Constraints	None

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.85	Net development area based on: front and side setbacks; open space requirements; parking requirements, and ground floor commercial uses. Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for the conversion of existing commercial sites to 100% residential or mixed use projects. Program H3.4 will be implemented to facilitate the development of this and other potential residential sites in commercial zones. Program H3.5 will also be implemented to reduce required covered parking standards for residential projects.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	will be implemented to streamline the Note: the ABAG Hass tool reports build out of 1.35 for residential projects in mixed use zones in the tri city market area, and thus this assumption is very conservative.
Typical Densities	0.95	Affordable housing developments in Newark build out to almost maximum density.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Water, sewer and power infrastructure in place and sufficient to support residential development.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints on this site.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	162	

17 Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

APN: 92A-2125-13, 92A-2125-11-2, 92A-2125-17

Size: 4.96 acres

Max Allowable Density 22-30 units per acre.

These formerly industrial sites are underutilized properties with I/L ratios ranging from 0.38 to 0.58, indicating a propensity to redevelop. They are in an area of rapid change where market dynamics have tended to support residential development in recent years.

Rezoning

Since the sites were included in a previous Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above they will be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.38 to 0.58) meaning that the appraised value of the land is greater than the appraised value of the built improvements
- Aging buildings (single story light industrial/warehouses dating from 1964 to 1982)
- Significant adjacent medium residential development occurred in the previous HE Cycle
- Similar redevelopment occurring in Newark (Waymark Homes)



Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-7: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #1

Site Description	
Size of site	1 acre
Zoning	Residential Medium 22; up to 30 with CUP depending on street classification
Allowable Density	Above Moderate
RHNA Affordability	Industrial
Existing Use	Yes
Infrastructure Availability	None
Environmental Constraints	

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential Medium Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.9	Based on build out densities for comparable projects in Residential Medium density zones.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no known constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	14	

Table C-8: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #2

Site Description	
Size of Site	1.67 acres
Zoning	Residential Medium 22; up to 30 with CUP depending on street classification
Allowable Density	Above Moderate
RHNA Affordability	Industrial
Existing Use	Yes
Infrastructure Availability	None
Environmental Constraints	

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential Medium Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.9	Based on build out densities for comparable projects in Residential Medium density zones.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no known constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	24	

Table C-9: Cedar Blvd. and Timber St. Industrial Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis #3

Site Description	
Size of Site	2 acres
Zoning	Residential Medium 22; up to 30 with CUP depending on street classification
Allowable Density	Above Moderate
RHNA Affordability	Industrial
Existing Use	Yes
Infrastructure Availability	None
Environmental Constraints	

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential Medium Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.9	Based on build out densities for comparable projects in Residential Medium density zones.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no known constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	23	

18 E-Z 8 Motel

Zoning: Residential High Density

Size: 2.24 acres


General Plan Designation: High Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

APN: 92A-2585-32

This is an underutilized hotel property with an I/L ratio of 0.97. In the surrounding market area, similar properties have been redeveloped with residential uses, and hotel conversions like the Cedar Community Apartments described above are increasingly common. The site is also adjacent to the entitled Waymark Homes project which proposes 80 townhomes.

Given the site's high density zoning designation which allows for densities between 25 and 60 dwelling units per acre and 100 foot height maximums, the City supports residential redevelopment here. After accounting for max lot coverage standards and setbacks, a realistic capacity modifier of 65% was applied to the site which would yield a total of 87 units. After the adjustment, the density of the site will be almost 39 dwelling units per acre, well above the default density of 30 dwelling units per acre for 100% affordable projects. The city strongly supports the development of a 100% affordable housing development at this site and could pursue a similar strategy as SAHA in Old Town, which was also in an RH zone. The city will continue to work with the property owner to advocate for residential use.



Rezoning

Since the site was included in a previous Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above it will be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.97) meaning that the value of the land is greater than the improvements
- Aging buildings and underutilized surface parking lot (two story motel dating from 1986)
- Significant adjacent medium/high density residential development occurred in the previous HE Cycle
- Similar redevelopment occurring in Newark (SAHA)

Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-10: E-Z 8 Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	2.24 acres
Zoning	Residential High Density
Allowable Density	25 - 60 dwelling units per acre
RHNA Affordability	Lower Income
Existing Use	Motel
Infrastructure Availability	Yes, no constraints
Environmental Constraints	None Known

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.75	Net area adjustment accounts for setbacks, open space requirements, and structured parking.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on comparable properties in the Tri-City Area and Newark and takes into account implementation of Program H3.4 and H3.5.
Typical Densities	0.95	Affordable housing in Newark builds out at near maximum densities.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Water, wastewater and dry utilities infrastructure available.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	77	

19 Cherry Plaza

Zoning: Commercial Mixed Use

Size: 0.96 acres

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

Max Allowable Density 100 units per acre (within Old Town Specific Plan Area)

APN: 92-50-13

This underutilized property has an I/L ratio of 0.55, indicating a propensity to redevelop. The site has an educational use, but recent images show vacancies with a “for lease” sign. The surrounding market area has experienced the residential redevelopment of other such sites in recent years. The site is located within the Old Town Specific Plan Area which allows the site to have densities between 30 and 100 dwelling units per acre. The height maximum is 48 feet. Unlike other CMU locations outlined in the Element, this site is not required to have ground floor retail because it is not fronting either Newark Ave. or Thornton Boulevard. A realistic capacity modifier of 80% was still applied, even though this could be considered conservative.



Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-11: Cherry Plaza Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	0.96 acres
Zoning	Commercial Mixed Use
Allowable Density	48, within 20 ft. of a RM district
RHNA Affordability	100% affordable
Existing Use	Office building
Infrastructure Availability	Yes
Environmental Constraints	None

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.85	Net development area based on: front and side setbacks; open space requirements; parking requirements, and ground floor commercial uses. Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for the conversion of existing commercial sites to 100% residential or mixed use projects. Program H3.4 will be implemented to facilitate the development of this and other potential residential sites in commercial zones. Program H3.5 will also be implemented to reduce required covered parking standards for residential projects.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	will be implemented to streamline the Note: the ABAG Hess tool reports build out of 1.35 for residential projects in mixed use zones in the tri city market area, and thus this assumption is very conservative.
Typical Densities	0.95	Affordable housing developments in Newark build out to almost maximum density.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Water, sewer and power infrastructure in place and sufficient to support residential development.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints on this site.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	30	

20 Thornton Ave. Sites (outside of Old Town)

Zoning: Residential High Density

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential

Size: 1.2 acres

Max Allowable Density 60 units per acre.

APN: 92A-919-22-2, 92A-919-21-2, 92A-919-20-2, 92A-919-19-2, 92A-919-15-2, 92A-919-14-2, 92A-919-13-2, 92A-919-12-2, 92A-919-11-2


As with the sites within the Old Town area, these underutilized sites also show strong potential for redevelopment with residential uses. I/L ratios range from 0.53 to 0.76. These units do not have a required mixed-use component. The size and shape of these contiguous sites lend themselves to parcel assembly and lot consolidation and includes two contiguous parcels that are under the same ownership.

Rezoning

Since the sites were included in a previous Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above they will be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.53 to 0.76) meaning that the value of the land is greater than the improvements
- Aging buildings and obsolete development style (single story homes, the majority converted to commercial purposes and were built before 1970)
- Significant adjacent medium residential development occurred in the previous HE Cycle and currently (SAHA)
- Two vacant lots under same ownership and candidate for lot consolidation incentives through Program H2.11



Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

21 Sycamore St. Vacant Lot

Zoning: Residential High Density

Size: 1.81 acres

General Plan Designation: High Density Residential

Max Allowable Density: 60 units per acre.

APN: 92-255-11

This site consists of an underutilized vacant residential lot in an area with robust services and supportive infrastructure. Zoned for high-density residential uses with a minimum density of 25 dwelling units to the acre and a maximum density of 60 dwelling units to the acre, this site is suitable for accommodating lower-income units. Existing development standards would allow the development of this site at maximum densities, consistent with comparable affordable housing developments currently in Newark’s development pipeline.



Rezoning

This site will also be subject to Program H3.6 since it is being carried over from a previous 5th Cycle Housing Element.

Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-12: Sycamore St. Vacant Lot Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	1.81 acres
Zoning	Residential High Density
Allowable Density	25 - 60 dwelling units per acre
RHNA Affordability	mixed income
Existing Use	vacant
Infrastructure Availability	yes
Environmental Constraints	none

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential High Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.95	Affordable housing builds out at near maximum densities.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no known constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	74	

22 Cedar Blvd. Public Storage Sites

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 2.9 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 22-30 units per acre.

APN: 92A-2375-32


This public storage site has an I/L ratio of 0.78, indicating a propensity to redevelop with another use, and residential uses are generally the highest and best use in the surrounding neighborhood market area.

Rezoning

Since the site was included in a previous Housing Element, per Program H3.6 described above it will also be subject to a zoning text amendment that will require by-right approval of any new housing development in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower-income households.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Low improvement to land value ratio (0.78) meaning that the value of the land is greater than the improvements
- Aging structure and single story use (building from 1985)
- Significant medium density residential development occurred adjacent in the previous HE Cycle
- Similar redevelopment occurring (Waymark Homes)



Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.

Table C-13: Cedar Blvd. Public Storage Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	2.9 acres
Zoning	Residential Medium
Allowable Density	22
RHNA Affordability	Above Moderate
Existing Use	Industrial
Infrastructure Availability	Yes
Environmental Constraints	No

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential Medium Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.9	Based on build out densities for comparable projects in Residential Medium density zones.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no know constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	41	

23 Filbert Villas - 37243 & 37257 Filbert St. - expired entitlement

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.96 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.


APN: 92-131-1-9, 92-131-2-4, 92-131-3

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to application materials dated 3/23/17, SRAJ Development Inc, proposed Filbert Villas, a 16 unit market rate residential condominium project. The project consists of 16 new three-story four-bedroom townhouses. The density of the project is approximately 16 DU/A and the units will be market-rate. While the entitlement on this project expired, the city expects to see a project with similar densities.

A recent interview with the property owner indicates continued interest in the project. Barriers include high interest rates, higher construction costs, and lower sale prices, but the property owner plans to take steps to move forward with the project.

[Link to project plans.](#)



24 Filbert Ave. Sites

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.7 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 22-30 units per acre.

APN: 92-54-5, 92-54-6, 92-54-4

These sites would support relatively lower-density residential development and the sites inventory does not assume that affordable housing would be feasible on these sites.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Two parcels have low improvement to land value ratio (0.09 and 0.03) meaning that the value of the land is greater than the improvements
- Aging structures and single story use (two building predate 1970)
- Similar redevelopment potential across the street (Filbert St. Villas)
- Candidate for lot consolidation incentives through H2.11

Realistic Capacity Analysis

The following summary table provides a step by step analysis of the realistic capacity factors applied to this site, as well the reasoning for applying these adjustment factors to arrive at a realistic yield of net units.



Table C-14: Filbert Ave. Sites Realistic Capacity Analysis

Site Description	
Size of Site	0.52 acres with assemblage
Zoning	Residential Medium
Allowable Density	22
RHNA Affordability	Above Moderate
Existing Use	Industrial
Infrastructure Availability	Yes
Environmental Constraints	None

Capacity Factors	Adjustment Factor	Reasoning
Land Use Controls and Site Improvements	0.9	Net development area based on front and side setbacks, open space and parking requirements.
Realistic Capacity of the Site	0.8	Based on recent trends in the tri-city market area and in the City of Newark for properties in Residential Medium Density zones.
Typical Densities	0.9	Based on build out densities for comparable projects in Residential Medium density zones.
Infrastructure availability	Yes	Dry and wet utility infrastructure available for this site; no know constraints.
Environmental constraints	No	No known environmental constraints.
Realistic Capacity With Adjustment Factors	7	

25 Mayhews Place - 36589 Newark Boulevard - expired entitlement

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.53 acres

General Plan Designation: Commercial Mixed Use

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.

APN: 92A-623-43

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to project plans, David Langon Construction, Inc. is proposing 6 attached two-story, market-rate, single-family units on a site area of approximately 0.53 acres. The density of the proposal is 12 DU/A. Below is a rendering of the exterior facade. While the entitlement on this project expired, the city expects to see a project with similar densities.



[Link to project plans.](#)

26 Locust St. & Railroad - 37093 Locust St. - expired entitlement

Zoning: Residential Low Density

Size: 0.43 acres

General Plan Designation: Low-Medium
Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 8.7 units per acre.

APN: 92-125-10

*Realistic capacity based on approved
entitlements or developer proposal*

According to application materials dated June 21, 2018, Cherry Properties is proposing 6 new market-rate apartments at 37093 Locust Street. The project title is The Railroad Apartments. While the entitlement on this project expired, the city expects to see a project with similar densities.

[Link to project plans.](#)



27 Fahmy Homes - 37503 & 37511 Cherry Street - expired entitlement

Zoning: Residential Medium Density

Size: 0.38 acres

General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Max Allowable Density 30 units per acre.

APN: 92-75-5-2, 92-75-4-2

Realistic capacity based on approved entitlements or developer proposal

According to application materials dated November 9th, 2020, Sawart S. Fahmy had proposed a four-lot residential project on two adjacent parcels. The proposed subdivision called for 4 single-family market-rate units. While the entitlement on this project expired, the city expects to see a project with similar densities.

In 2023, a new owner gained site control and has indicated strong interest in combining these sites to create a larger site for development. The owner submitted a preliminary application for a seven-unit rowhouse project. The city has completed its preliminary review and is now awaiting a formal application from the property owner.

[Link to project plans.](#)



28 Neighborhood Infill Sites

Zoning: Residential Low Density

General Plan Designation: Low-Medium Residential, Medium Density Residential

APN: 92-135-23, 92-127-13, 92-136-15, 92-24-10, 92-127-20, 92-125-2-2

Size: 1.52 acres


Max Allowable Density 11-15 units per acre.

These are mixed neighborhood infill sites supporting lower density residential development. Five of the six sites are vacant while the non vacant site has subdivision potential. These sites would support relatively lower-density residential development and the sites inventory does not assume that affordable housing would be feasible on these sites.

These sites are expected to redevelop individually, and the sites will be listed separately by parcel number on the electronic submission form.

Redevelopment Indicators

- Either vacant or underutilized (subdivision potential)
- Two vacant lots are adjacent candidate for lot consolidation incentives through Program H2.11
- Strong demand for market rate residential in established neighborhoods (Over 750 single family detached units completed between 2018 and 2022¹⁹)



¹⁹ Source: HCD Housing Element Implementation and APR Dashboard

APPENDIX D PUBLIC COMMENT

The public comment period for the first Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element began on February 24th, 2023. As required by AB 215, the first Draft Housing Element was available for a 30-day public review period, before incorporating public comments and sending the revised first draft to HCD. Based on community feedback and to ensure that the Newark community had enough time to review and comment, the City kept the first public review draft of the Housing Element available for public comment through the 90-day State HCD review period (February 24th - March 27th, 2023). The City posted an updated draft for public review from August 7th - August 17th, 2023).

Thank you to all those who submitted public comments and attended public meetings. Based on community feedback and direction from Councilmembers, staff have prepared a response to comments to illustrate how the revised draft reflects public input received during the 142-day comment period. A total of 11 comments, comment letters, and emails were received during the comment period. No comments were received on the updated draft during or after the 10-day public review period in August 2023. Staff received an additional 5 comments during subsequent Housing Element public review periods.

1. Carla Rodriguez
2. Taran Singh
3. Pamela Roush
4. Andrea Heckman
5. Matt Francois on behalf of Integral Communities
6. Carol Drake
7. Namit Saksena
8. Sarah Klaustermeier, Brookfield Properties
9. Victor Flores, East Bay Resilience Manager, Greenbelt Alliance, David Lewis, Executive Director Save The Bay , Maxwell Davis and the 2500 members of East Bay for Everyone
10. Neelam Noorani
11. Aundi Mevoli, BayKeepers
12. David Song
13. Rishika Rawat
14. Alyssa Lopez

15. Pat Callaway

16. Krisie Knutson

Table D-1: Housing Element Draft Public Comments Received and City Response

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
1.	Carina Rodriguez		<p>After reviewing the Draft document, my biggest concerns are:</p> <p>1) Newark's continuing to infringe on the marshes and wetlands around our city. This is a large environmental issue and I saw very little mention of this in the housing plans. However, the city continues to approve housing developments on these natural lands. This will especially be an issue as climate change continues to wreak havoc on us - I do not want the city to be put in a situation where we have to use tax dollars to help those who ignorantly purchased homes on these wetlands and marshes. Especially when the lands should have never been built on in the first place.</p> <p>2) I do not want the city of Newark to become a haven for low income housing. While we should open our city to new residents - low income housing invites low income individuals who will not be contributing a significant amount in taxes. Some are indeed hard workers and have been beaten down by the systemic failures of our city, county, state, and country, but some have no interest in doing anything to help themselves and will just suck up the free resources paid for by taxpayers. Yes, we do need low income housing to assist some in our community. However, we should not accept a large percentage of this low income housing and rather have it spread out throughout the county of Alameda and the Bay Area.</p> <p>3) Lastly, there are many apartments, townhouses,</p>	<p>1. The City of Newark is guided by the Area 3 and 4 Specific Plan, adopted by the City Council in 2009. This specific plan provides land uses, development regulations, engineering and site improvements, landscape guidelines, and natural resource conservation standards. In 2014, the City entered into a Development Agreement with Newark Partners LLC, which guides development within certain areas of Area 3 and 4 and establishes performance expectations and requirements for the developers and the City. Development within the specific plan area has been limited to Area 3 and the residential subdivision known as "Sanctuary Village". In 2019, the City Council approved a residential subdivision via a Planned Unit Development permit consisting of 469 homes along with a determination that the environmental effects of the project were sufficiently analyzed and were under the scope of the previously adopted 2015 Recirculated Environmental Impact Report. Subsequent to Council's 2019 actions, the environmental determination was challenged in court. As of 2023, no unresolved legal matters are associated with the project. In 2021, the project sponsor indicated to the city that the project would be reduced in size from 469 units to approximately 430 units. The project sponsor is working with the city</p>

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>and duplexes that are completely run down and look absolutely awful. These can be found on Newark Blvd across the street from Newark Community park and Cherry towards Thornton. This housing looks abysmal and it's sickening that landlords are allowed to rent these apartments at top dollar while they are clearly falling apart and have made no investment in keeping them up to a basic, human level. Before we begin to build more housing, we need to look at this housing and bring them up to a livable standard for those currently living in the city. Let's fix our home city first before we begin building more housing that may eventually look as awful as this housing on Newark Blvd. and Cherry.</p>	<p>regarding site development activities. As Sanctuary West is a fully entitled project with legal matters resolved, the City has identified the project as contributing to the RHNA goal for above-moderate housing for the 6th Cycle.</p> <p>2. Newark is subject to RHNA, the process that resulted in the assignment of 1,871 units of housing for the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Each Bay Area jurisdiction received their own RHNA allocation. Compared to other Bay Area cities, Newark's RHNA increase from the 5th Cycle (1,048 units) to the 6th Cycle was relatively small at approximately 75%. This is not a requirement to build 1,874 units, but Newark must demonstrate that the city has the correct land use policy, programs, and requirements to accommodate the units over the next eight years. Since 2015, Newark has built thousands of market-rate units, but relatively few affordable units. The City Council recognizes the need for housing that is affordable and available for all members of the community.</p> <p>3. The City recognizes that some residential buildings in our community have been neglected by their property owners. Although some investment to refurbish units has occurred, more can be done. The Draft Housing Element includes goals, policies, and programs that address this need, starting with the Goal and Policy H-1: Preserve + Improve Existing Housing- "Leverage local funds to supplement county, state and federal funding</p>

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
				to support the maintenance, rehabilitation and preservation of existing rental and ownership housing. “
2.	Taran Singh		Area 3 and Area 4 plan of building 469 homes an environmental disaster. The City of Newark cannot solve the housing problem by 500 odd homes on our wetlands. I urge the city to revert the development plan for Area 3 and Area 4 and let them be a safe abode for our flora and fauna. Overall, I think the City needs to get denser in areas close to the 880 corridors and provide connectivity to BART/Transit.	See Response 1, above.
3.	PAMELA ROUSH		Please do not build in Newark Area 4. That is a flood zone and it will only get worse. Please, please reconsider building in Area 4. Thank you.	See Response 1, above.
4.	Andrea Heckman		I'm very concerned about development in the Area 4 shoreline because of it's importance to the ecosystem and protecting our existing development from future flooding. It seems imprudent to build on an area which is expected to need massive alteration and protection from future sea level rise. Makes no sense to develop housing where future disaster is predictable.	See Response 1, above.
5.	Matt Francois		We are submitting these comments on behalf of our client, Integral Communities, the proponent of the Mowry Village project. We write to request certain technical corrections and clarifications to the draft Housing Element. For instance, the reference to 398 built single family units in Area 3, Sub Area B (on page 104) should instead refer to 386 units. Additionally, the reference to the Mowry Village project (on page 105) refers to the site as being within Area 3 when it is located within Area 4; please also correct the	Thank you for your comments and corrections. The references to Area 3/4 and the unit count have been corrected in the October 3 draft. The language about retiring the Specific Plan has been adapted to reflect that the City “may take action to retire the plan in a manner consistent with applicable laws and conforming to previously adopted agreements and approved entitlements.”

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			location of the Mowry Village project in the last paragraph of this section. Finally, also in the last paragraph of this section, please clarify the intent about retiring the Area 3 & 4 Specific Plan after action on the Mowry Village project as it is anticipated that the Specific Plan would continue to be relied on to make consistency determinations for the Mowry Village and other projects.	
6.	Carol Drake		<p>Newark Area 4 is not a good choice for development. Wetlands sequester carbon, store floodwater, and filter nutrients and sediment from water. Already included in the expansion boundaries of the Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Area 4 provides an unparalleled opportunity to restore wetlands and other wildlife habitat, while creating a buffer against sea level rise.</p> <p>Newark should focus on infill development instead. It could utilize existing neighborhoods and major development opportunities such as revitalizing NewPark Mall, which could provide 1,519 housing units, and smaller projects already planned in and around Old Town Newark. Building in these developed areas would help place housing near job centers, reducing vehicle miles traveled and road congestion.</p>	See Response 1, above.
7.	Nमित	March 21st 2023	I was very happy to see that you mentioned working with Newark Unified School District in the draft Housing Element, Policy H2.4. Other cities in the Bay Area have helped their school districts address the missing housing for teaching staff and I think Newark should also partner with NUSD to do something	Hello Nमित, Thank you for your comments. We have updated policy H2.4, with more information from state law to support the redevelopment of land owned by Newark Unified School District. We agree, and the data shows how large of a burden

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>similar. I loved the creative idea you had shared during our chat at the after party of Mayor Hannon's swearing in ceremony late last year. Comment 2: After housing, the next big expense for low income residents tends to be transportation. While our Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan was approved in Feb 2017, we haven't made massive strides in making the overall vision in that plan come true.</p> <p>Bike lanes will not only improve accessibility to local employers: restaurants, gas stations, retail stores, Home Depot, Amazon etc. but also upcoming city centers such as NewPark Place and might even spark Old Town into life. The other thing is, bike lanes will benefit residents of all income levels.</p> <p>I saw that the number 1 response to Q.9 of the Public Engagement and Input Survey with 33% respondents was public infrastructure including bicycle lanes. Therefore it would be great if the Housing Element had a specific call out to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure vs. the single specific mention on Pg. 128.</p> <p>I think exploring ways to align the relevant parts of the Housing Element more closely with the Bicycle Element will help us capture this once in a decade opportunity to shape the future of housing in Newark by the handle bars!</p>	<p>transportation can be financially for residents. We also heard the desire for more pedestrian friendly streets and bike lanes in the city for more transportation options. The Public Works department has plans to start implementing portions of the bicycle master plan, and we are happy to see that the majority of sites are along bus routes as well. The community development department looks forward to working with the public works department to coordinate these two critical efforts.</p>
8.	Sarah Klaustermeier	March 24th 2023	I reviewed the draft Housing Element and had one comment specific to Phase A. The breakdown of income levels in Table C-1 is different than what is	Thank you for your comments. The 6th Cycle unit yield and affordability distribution has

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>approved in our Affordable Housing Agreement.</p> <p>[see screenshots below]</p>	<p>been updated in the appropriate tables to reflect the City Council’s Resolution 10,184.</p>
9.	<p>Victor Flores, East Bay Resilience Manager, Greenbelt Alliance David Lewis, Executive Director Save The Bay Maxwell Davis and the 2500 members of East Bay for Everyone</p>	<p>March 27th 2023</p>	<p>The undersigned organizations and individuals are excited to participate in Newark’s Housing Element process. We write to offer feedback on Newark’s Draft Housing element for the sixth cycle. This update is an opportunity for Newark to make sure that high resource and racially segregated neighborhoods take on their fair share of the City’s housing needs, particularly for lower income residents who are disproportionately people of color. As your housing element notes, the majority of Newark residents are in housing that is either unaffordable or does not meet their needs. In particular, the Latine community experiences high levels of overcrowding and above average spending on housing. The City must ensure that all, regardless of race or income, can enjoy safe, stable, and accessible homes located either near jobs or transit (bus as well as BART) and on sites that are clean and suitable for development.</p> <p>We are glad to see many great policies and sites that promote infill and active transportation. We also appreciate Newark going above the buffer recommendations for realistic zoning capacity. Among the sites we’re excited about is the Newpark project which will build medium density units on parking lots. This project is a perfect example of infill with access to AC Transit lines to BART. We also want to commend the city for Policy H6.7:</p>	<p>Hello Victor, David, and Maxwell, We appreciate your thoughtful comments on the Housing Element draft. In response to community discussion through engagement we have worked to make significant edits to many programs to better support the uptake of housing that is affordable to all segments of the population, and in proximity to public transportation and active transportation infrastructure investments. In response to climate and sea level rise, the Newark Safety Element is in process and will further address many of those questions and comments. Program H3.5 Parking standards has been strengthened, removing and reducing parking requirements for multiple housing types. We welcome your continued advocacy in this area. Numerous programs to increase housing access, opportunity and affordability have been added or strengthened. Program H2.1, SB9, H2.2, for ADU production, and H2.3 is looking at how a community guided plan for the 4 corners area can generate more housing close to parks, schools and a potential rail station. Program H2.6 looks to utilize state law to develop affordable housing for staff and employees, and H2.8 for Missing Middle Housing has been updated, and a new program,</p>

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>Residential Development in the FloodPlain. We continue our opposition to the Sanctuary West project. We are glad that the city recognizes that such developments are not in the interest of Newark residents nor the prudent fiduciary responsibility of the council and staff. In an era where our communities are facing the consequences of climate change and sea level rise, each community should be actively assessing how it will ensure future developments and infrastructure will be resilient to flood risk without adversely impacting existing residents and the environment. Building in Area 4 baylands would both greatly increase flood risk across the city, and also squander the opportunity to utilize these lands as a valuable flood buffer to protect the community from flooding and sea level rise, while also providing improved natural wildlife habitat and increased outdoor access opportunities for residents.</p> <p>Additionally, since there is broad community opposition from both environmental and pro-housing organizations in the area, building here has a high chance of community pushback which could delay the project to outside the planning period.</p> <p>We strongly recommend updating your Climate Action Plan which is now 13 years old in order to implement mitigation measures for water level rise (both sea level rise and groundwater rise) and to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We also recommend adding a policy to restore wetlands in order to maximize carbon sequestration and protection from sea level rise.</p>	<p>H2.10 will increase the zoning districts where single resident occupancy housing is permitted in Newark.</p>

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>Program H3.5: Parking standards study can be strengthened to commit to reducing parking minimums. A study from UC Berkeley’s Turner Center found, “the presence of structured parking added nearly \$36,000 per unit.” The Draft Housing Element notes that Newark has higher parking minimums than neighboring jurisdictions. Parking, especially covered parking, significantly increases the cost of housing developments and uses space for cars rather than for people. In order to combat climate change we know that we must reduce our reliance on cars and fossil fuels. By prioritizing land for people rather than cars we can address the housing crisis and GHG reduction goals. Due to this higher level of parking and its cost, we strongly urge you to commit to reducing the amount of required parking to no more than 0.5 spaces per residential unit, and zero in transit-adjacent areas.</p> <p>Program H2.1: Encourage new middle-density housing with SB 9 and SB 10. While this is a laudable direction for the city to go to encourage housing abundance throughout the city, it could be strengthened with a few more objective outcomes for the program. (1) The SB 9 ordinance should not reduce the buildable envelope below what an underlying single-family zone allows. (2) Missing middle zoning should allow at least 4 units on at least 80% of single-family lots—not merely legal as density, but practical in terms of development standards. See the Portland Residential Infill Program for a possible direction where buildable envelope is increased the</p>	

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>more units are planned on the lot. (3) No areas should be exempted from missing middle except based on floodplain, fire risk, or other major public health / ecological risks. (4) Required parking should continue to be no more than 0.5 spaces /unit, or zero near any bus line, as the major space requirements of off-street parking reliably kills missing middle.</p> <p>As we've mentioned, we oppose site number 2: Sanctuary West because of its location on baylands that are expected to see a nearly two feet rise of water levels in less than 50 years. We continue to urge you to remove this from your site list. To support our vision for Newark, Greenbelt Alliance and other partnering organizations have crafted a go-to guide for accelerating equitable adaptation to the climate crisis; The Resilience Playbook. The Playbook brings together curated strategies, recommendations, and tools to support local decision makers and community leaders wherever they are in their journey.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to engage with Newark and the community on how this vital work can move forward in the new year.</p>	
10.	Neelam Noorani	March 26th 2023	<p>Steven Turner, Dear Mayor Hannon, Vice Mayor Collazo and Newark City Councilmembers, Thank you for putting together a robust Housing Element draft. This is a once in a decade moment for Newark to make pivotal progress on climate change and fair housing by developing a</p>	See Response 1, above.

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>comprehensive housing strategy that builds housing in existing neighborhoods, while ensuring the long-term climate resilience of the city by protecting protecting valuable open space along the shoreline as wildlife habitat while providing community resilience as a flood buffer from sea level rise.</p> <p>I am writing to you today to implore you to remove Newark Area 4 (“Sanctuary West”) from your housing site inventory. This is not a good place to build housing and should not be how Newark meets a significant portion of its housing requirement. Newark Area 4 is almost entirely within a flood zone, and the site is anticipated to be almost completely inundated with just 1 meter of sea level rise. Additionally, new studies show that development of Area 4 could cause flooding for other shoreline communities in the Bay Area. Developing this site will increase flood risk to current and future residents and cause catastrophic financial issues to the city in the future.</p> <p>As evidenced by recent rains, Newark is already experiencing flooding and if Area 4 is developed, flooding will only increase. Newark has the capacity within the existing urban areas to meet its RHNA goals without putting future and current residents at risk.</p> <p>Further, the wetlands and wetland restoration potential of Newark Area 4 should be embraced for the numerous important benefits they provide. Wetlands not only protect the city from</p>	

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>flooding and provide wildlife habitat, they also clean our Bay waters, and have been demonstrated to be one of the most powerful tools in nature for fighting climate change, by sequestering carbon even more efficiently than our forests. We desperately need to protect and restore all the San Francisco Bay wetlands we can, and Newark has an incredible opportunity to support this regional goal.</p> <p>We strongly urge Newark to become a climate-forward city by focusing on infill growth in existing neighborhoods - rather than putting housing in an undeveloped shoreline flood zone that should be permanently protected as a wildlife habitat and as a valuable buffer to protect the community from flooding and sea level rise.</p>	
11.	Aundi Mevoli, BayKeepers	March 27th 2023	<p>I write on behalf of San Francisco Baykeeper (“Baykeeper”) in opposition to the City of Newark’s inclusion of the Sanctuary West Project (also commonly known as “Area 4”) in its Draft Housing Element. Baykeeper submits these comments on behalf of approximately 5,000 members and supporters who live and recreate in and around the San Francisco Bay Area. Together, our mission is to defend San Francisco Bay from the biggest threats and hold polluters and government agencies accountable to create healthy communities and help wildlife thrive. Our team of scientists and lawyers investigate pollution via aerial and water</p>	See Response 1, above.

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>patrols, strengthen regulations through science and policy advocacy, and enforce environmental laws on behalf of the public.</p> <p>It is discouraging to see the city continuing to recommend and approve housing at Area 4. Instead of allowing this area to be used as a natural barrier to mitigate sea level rise (SLR) and groundwater inundation as climate impacts increase, moving forward with development will expose more than a thousand new residents to SLR and put hundreds of millions of dollars of property at risk. With only about ten percent of the original wetlands remaining around San Francisco Bay, keeping these natural bufferlands is essential to having a resilient community and allowing shorelines to adapt in the midst of climate change.</p> <p>In addition, importing fill and paving over Area 4 would destroy restorable diked Baylands and harm wildlife habitats for over a dozen special-status species. This includes the endangered Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, endemic to only San Francisco Bay’s marshes which are increasingly threatened with the prospect of development. Furthermore, fragmenting and degrading the existing wetlands in Area 4 will also threaten pup rookeries for harbor seals.</p> <p>The scientific community has recommended Area 4 as a high priority for protection and restoration of</p>	

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>wetlands and upland habitat in order to support San Francisco Bay wildlife species and help them adjust to rising sea levels. Congress has already authorized lands such as Area 4 to be added to the Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge. We urge you to follow the guidance of the region’s scientific community and prioritize protecting and restoring this land rather than development in Area 4 as planned in your current Draft Housing Element. During the January 2023 King Tides, drone footage revealed just how much surface water already occupies the site. These images give a glimpse of what this site will look like under one foot of SLR. Seeing as this site is projected to have two feet of SLR by 2050, it is obvious why this is not a good site to build housing or degrade more wetland habitat.</p> <p>Lastly, sustainable development comes at the intersection of economic, social and environmental capitols. Area 4 development only looks at the economic benefit to build. However, if natural capitol was also part of the equation, one would see how many benefits this land offers: greenhouse gas sequestration, nature based multi-benefit adaptation solutions to SLR, open space for community members to enjoy, and biodiversity to ensure a healthy Bay.</p> <p>Staff, we implore you to remove the Sanctuary West Project from suitable housing in the 6th cycle of</p>	

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>Newark’s Housing Element. Follow the advice of the experts and protect these wetlands to, in turn, protect your community against climate change impacts. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft Housing Element. Please reach out to Aundi Mevoli at aundi@baykeeper.org with any questions.</p>	
12.	David Song	October 13, 2023	<p>I received a letter from city of Newark, regarding a piece of land that I own. 37079 Ash street, APN: 92-127-31. The letter stated that my property has been identified as a site that could be developed with residential units, and well suited for development. I have previously tried to discuss the development of this site with the planning department multiple times, with no success.</p> <p>With this new initiative from the city, what kind of incentive does the city provide to owners to develop this site? Higher density? Lower permit fees? Faster approval? Less red tape?</p> <p>After reading through the Housing Element report, I still could not figure out how does that report relate to my property and its potential for development.</p> <p>It would be nice for the city planner to sit down with me and explain what kind of incentives the city provides to the development of my site.</p>	<p>The city appreciates the commenter's interest in developing the site identified in the comment. City staff will contact the commenter to initiate the discussion. The development of the parcel could benefit through the implementation of the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PROGRAM H2.8: Zoning for Missing Middle Housing Types. -PROGRAM H2.11: Catalyze the development of small sites through a lot consolidation incentive program -PROGRAM H2.12: Ensure maximum residential densities are achievable -PROGRAM H3.1: Streamline Ministerial Approval Permit Procedures -PROGRAM H3.2: Develop objective design standards for single family and multi family developments and infill housing.

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
			<p>I am more than happy to work with the city to develop this site and provide more housing opportunities to medium and low income families.</p> <p>Best</p> <p>David</p>	
13.	Rishika Rawat	October 25, 2023	I was wondering where I could find a pdf of the Newark Safety Element.	Staff followed up with a PDF of the Newark Safety Element
14.	Alyssa Lopez	October 25, 2023	<p>Hi, I was wondering if there is any action being taken to invest in some programs such as a first-time buyers programs for Newark Residents, or a low-income based programs. If so, I'd like to get more information or be interested in investing some input</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>The 2023-2031 Housing Element, Section 3 (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)), contains a detailed analysis of the factors contributing to housing equity, segregation, access to housing opportunities, and the need for housing throughout the Newark community. Table 3-16 provides a summary of contributing factors and actions regarding housing issues in Newark. For example, the AFFH study identified the lack of available rental housing for lower-income households as a contributing factor for households experiencing or are at-risk of homelessness. The Housing Element contains programs that, when implemented, would begin to address the identified factors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PROGRAM H4.1: Develop Anti-Displacement Programs for the Old-Town Newark Specific Plan Area. -PROGRAM H4.3: Develop a Just Cause

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
				<p>Eviction Ordinance -PROGRAM H4.8: Connect Residents with Foreclosure assistance. -PROGRAM H5.1: First-Time Homebuyer Assistance -PROGRAM H5.2: Affordable Housing Development Programs -PROGRAM H5.3: Public Lands for dedicated affordable housing. -PROGRAM H5.4: Affordable Housing Overlay Zone</p>
15.	Pat Callaway		<p>There has been opposition to Area 4 development and I am confused by your responses. Has Area 4 been scrapped or not?</p>	<p>The Sanctuary West Project was approved by the Newark City Council in November 2019. A Development Agreement that sets the terms, conditions, and requirements for the developer and the city was previously approved in 2015. The Development Agreement is still in place, and the developer intends to proceed with residential development at some point in the future. Sanctuary West is not identified as a site needed to achieve the city’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) goal of 1,874 units within the 2023-2031 period. However, per the Development Agreement, the developer may still proceed with the project. Newark contains many sites that are zoned for residential uses and could be developed as housing but have not been identified in the 2023-2031 Housing Element’s sites inventory. Should Sanctuary West or any other site zoned for residential use be developed with housing units, the city would count these units as progress toward meeting our RHNA goal.</p>

Letter Number	Name/ Organization	Date	Comment	City Response
16.	Krisie Knutson		Those house are ugly , can't you make some pretty houses	Noted.

COMMENT LETTERS

<p>Comment 1</p>	<p>Carina Rodriguez</p>	<p>After reviewing the Draft document, my biggest concerns are:</p> <p>1) Newark's continuing to infringe on the marshes and wetlands around our city. This is a large environmental issue and I saw very little mention of this in the housing plans. However, the city continues to approve housing developments on these natural lands. This will especially be an issue as climate change continues to wreak havoc on us - I do not want the city to be put in a situation where we have to use tax dollars to help those who ignorantly purchased homes on these wetlands and marshes. Especially when the lands should have never been built on in the first place.</p> <p>2) I do not want the city of Newark to become a haven for low income housing. While we should open our city to new residents - low income housing invites low income individuals who will not be contributing a significant amount in taxes. Some are indeed hard workers and have been beaten down by the systemic failures of our city, county, state, and country, but some have no interest in doing anything to help themselves and will just suck up the free resources paid for by taxpayers. Yes, we do need low income housing to assist some in our community. However, we should not accept a large percentage of this low income housing and rather have it spread out throughout the county of Alameda and the Bay Area.</p> <p>3) Lastly, there are many apartments, townhouses, and duplexes that are completely run down and look absolutely awful. These can be found on Newark Blvd across the street from Newark Community park and Cherry towards Thornton. This housing looks abysmal and it's sickening that landlords are allowed to rent these apartments at top dollar while they are clearly falling apart and have made no investment in keeping them up to a basic, human level. Before we begin to build more housing, we need to look at this housing and bring them up to a livable standard for those currently living in the city. Let's fix our home city first before we begin building more housing that may eventually look as awful as this housing on Newark Blvd. and Cherry.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Taran Singh</p>	<p>Area 3 and Area 4 plan of building 469 homes an environmental disaster. The City of Newark cannot solve the housing problem by 500 odd homes on our wetlands. I urge the city to revert the development plan for Area 3 and Area 4 and let them be a safe abode for our flora and fauna. Overall, I think the City needs to get denser in areas close to the 880 corridors and provide connectivity to BART/Transit.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>PAMELA ROUSH</p>	<p>Please do not build in Newark Area 4. That is a flood zone and it will only get worse. Please, please reconsider building in Area 4. Thank you.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Andrea Heckman</p>	<p>I'm very concerned about development in the Area 4 shoreline because of it's importance to the ecosystem and protecting our existing development from future flooding. It seems imprudent to build on an area which is expected to need massive alteration and protection from future sea level rise. Makes no sense to develop housing where future disaster is predictable.</p>

5	Matt Francois	We are submitting these comments on behalf of our client, Integral Communities, the proponent of the Mowry Village project. We write to request certain technical corrections and clarifications to the draft Housing Element. For instance, the reference to 398 built single family units in Area 3, Sub Area B (on page 104) should instead refer to 386 units. Additionally, the reference to the Mowry Village project (on page 105) refers to the site as being within Area 3 when it is located within Area 4; please also correct the location of the Mowry Village project in the last paragraph of this section. Finally, also in the last paragraph of this section, please clarify the intent about retiring the Area 3 & 4 Specific Plan after action on the Mowry Village project as it is anticipated that the Specific Plan would continue to be relied on to make consistency determinations for the Mowry Village and other projects.
6	Carol Drake	<p>Newark Area 4 is not a good choice for development. Wetlands sequester carbon, store floodwater, and filter nutrients and sediment from water.</p> <p>Already included in the expansion boundaries of the Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Area 4 provides an unparalleled opportunity to restore wetlands and other wildlife habitat, while creating a buffer against sea level rise.</p> <p>Newark should focus on infill development instead. It could utilize existing neighborhoods and major development opportunities such as revitalizing NewPark Mall, which could provide 1,519 housing units, and smaller projects already planned in and around Old Town Newark. Building in these developed areas would help place housing near job centers, reducing vehicle miles traveled and road congestion.</p>

Comment 7:

From: Nabe Newark <nabenewark@...>
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2023 5:23 PM
To: Steven Turner
Cc: Art Interiano; Carmelisa Lopez; Joseph Balatbat; David Benoun; Lenka Hovorka
Subject: Re: City of Newark Virtual Community Meeting - Draft Housing Element March 22 at 7:00 PM

Hi Mr. Turner, thank you for including me in the distribution.

I am unsure if I will be able to join the meeting tomorrow, therefore please find 2 comments from me after reading this fantastic work by the city staff:

I was very happy to see that you mentioned working with Newark Unified School District in the draft Housing Element, Policy H2.4
 I want to share some recent news articles which should help support this idea within Newark.

[Affordable teacher housing development in Los Gatos 'move-in ready' \(mercurynews.com\)](https://www.mercurynews.com/story/news/local/2023/03/20/affordable-teacher-housing-development-in-los-gatos-move-in-ready/7000000001)

[Report: Silicon Valley housing crisis linked to declining school enrollment \(sanjosespotlight.com\)](#)

[News – Support Teacher Housing](#)

[Affordable teacher housing to be built in Palo Alto – The Talon \(lahstalon.org\)](#)

Other cities in the Bay Area have helped their school districts address the missing housing for teaching staff and I think Newark should also partner with NUSD to do something similar. I loved the creative idea you had shared during our chat at the after party of Mayor Hannon's swearing in ceremony late last year.

After housing, the next big expense for low income residents tends to be transportation.

While our Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan was approved in Feb 2017, we haven't made massive strides in making the overall vision in that plan come true.

Bike lanes will not only improve accessibility to local employers: restaurants, gas stations, retail stores, Home Depot, Amazon etc. but also upcoming city centers such as NewPark Place and might even spark Old Town into life. The other thing is, bike lanes will benefit residents of all income levels.

I saw that the number 1 response to Q.9 of the Public Engagement and Input Survey with 33% respondents was public infrastructure including bicycle lanes.

Therefore it would be great if the Housing Element had a specific call out to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure vs. the single specific mention on Pg. 128.

I think exploring ways to align the relevant parts of the Housing Element more closely with the Bicycle Element will help us capture this once in a decade opportunity to shape the future of housing in Newark by the handle bars!

Regards,
Namit

P.S. From the Needs Analysis of the Bicycle Master Plan, Pg.29:

"Newark has a great deal of potential for growing its bicycle network and safely and comfortably attracting new bicycle trips with its temperate climate, flat terrain, growing on-street facilities, system of low volume streets ideal for casual cyclists, and access to trails and recreation areas.

However, bicycling today can be difficult in Newark despite the growing interest and number of bicyclists. Heavy traffic, high traffic stress bikeways, and a lack of continuous bicycle facilities on Newark's major arterials, particularly on north & south routes, remain significant challenges for attracting new riders."

On Thu, Mar 16, 2023 at 4:49 PM Steven Turner <Stevent@newark.org> wrote:

Dear City Council, Planning Commission, and Community Development Advisory Committee-

Community Development staff and our consultants are hosting a virtual community meeting about the 2023-2031 Draft Housing Element on Wednesday, March 22, 2023, from 7:00-8:30 PM. You are certainly welcome to attend and participate.

We ask participants to register for the meeting with this link: [Meeting registration](#). After registering, you will receive a confirmation email about joining the meeting.

Comment 8:

From: Klaustermeier, Sarah
 <Sarah.Klaustermeier@brookfieldpropertiesdevelopment.com> **Sent:** Friday, March 24, 2023 7:46 PM
To: Steven Turner
Cc: Klaustermeier, Sarah
Subject: RE: Newark's Draft Housing Element - NewPark Place Specific Plan Residential Units

Steven,

I reviewed the draft Housing Element and had one comment specific to Phase A. The breakdown of income levels in Table C-1 is different than what is approved in our Affordable Housing Agreement. Please see screenshots below:

Table C-1: City of Newark Detailed Sites Inventory

Site #	Name	Income Level				Total Units
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Planned and Proposed Projects						
1	Bridgeway / Gateway	0	0	0	589	589
2	Sanctuary West	0	0	0	469	469
3	NewPark Mall - Phase A	15	14	0	290	319

Affordable Housing Agreement:

2.1 Occupancy Requirements.

For the Term of the Agreement, no fewer than twenty-nine (29) of the dwelling u the Project shall be occupied (or if vacant, available for occupancy) by Moderate Low-Income and Very Low-Income Households. The size and mix of the Restrict Units shall be as follows:

	Studio	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	Total
Very-Low Income Household	1	2	1	4
Low-Income Household	2	5	2	9
Moderate-Income Household	4	8	4	16
Total	7	15	7	29

Sarah Klaustermeier
 Sr. Director, Development| Commercial
 Development


From: Steven Turner <Stevent@newark.org>
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2023 1:21 PM
To: Klaustermeier, Sarah <Sarah.Klaustermeier@...>
Subject: Newark’s Draft Housing Element - NewPark Place Specific Plan Residential Units

CAUTION: EXTERNAL MAIL! Do not click links, open attachments or reply, unless you recognize the sender’s email address and know the content is safe! If unsure use the Report Phishing Button located in the ribbon.

Hi Sarah- I want to let you know that the city has prepared our Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element for p ublic review. We have a dedicated website where the documents can be reviewed, including an executi ve summary and the complete draft document: www.newarkhousingupdate.org

The Draft Housing Element identifies sites through the city that has the appropriate land use and zoning that would allow residential development over the next eight years. This includes sites within our specifi c plan areas, including the sites that allow residential as permitted uses in the NewPark Place Specific PI an. The entitled Phase A site is identified as a pipeline project site and the other sites anticipated for ho using that surrounds the mall are also identified. Here is a map that illustrates these housing sites (the p

parcel lines likely don't reflect the approved vesting tentative map, but we can update this map). The number of units identified for this area totals 1,519 units, consistent with the specific plan.



Development of 1,519 units is not specifically required during the 2023-2031 period, but the appropriate land use and requirements are in place to accommodate that development if requested. Newark was able to identify enough sites at the right densities throughout the city to exceed our Regional Housing Needs Allocation. We have also projected the number of units that could be developed at various income levels for the sites. See Table C-1 for more information.

The initial public review period runs through March 27. We will then send it to the State of California Housing and Community Development Department for their review, comments, and edits in early April. We expect to revise the housing element in June/July to incorporate all the necessary edits before public hearings are scheduled with the Planning Commission and City Council later in the summer.

Paul Peninger and his team are the city's primary consultants who prepare the draft. Paul and I would be happy to discuss the housing element with you and answer questions.

Thanks, Sarah,

--Steven

Comment 9



March 27, 2023

RE: Housing Element Policy Recommendations for Climate Resilience & Fair

Housing Dear Mayor Hannon, City Council, and Planning Staff,

The undersigned organizations and individuals are excited to participate in Newark's Housing Element process. We write to offer feedback on Newark's Draft Housing element for the sixth cycle.

This update is an opportunity for Newark to make sure that high resource and racially segregated neighborhoods take on their fair share of the City's housing needs, particularly for lower income residents who are disproportionately people of color. As your housing element notes, the majority of Newark residents are in housing that is either unaffordable or does not meet their needs. In particular, the Latine community experiences high levels of overcrowding and above average spending on housing. The City must ensure that all, regardless of race or income, can enjoy safe, stable, and accessible homes located either near jobs or transit (bus as well as BART) and on sites that are clean and suitable for development.

We are glad to see many great policies and sites that promote infill and active transportation. We also appreciate Newark going above the buffer recommendations for realistic zoning capacity. Among the sites we're excited about is the Newpark project which will build medium density units on parking lots. This project is a perfect example of infill with access to AC Transit lines to BART.

We also want to commend the city for Policy H6.7: Residential Development in the FloodPlain. We continue our opposition to the Sanctuary West project. We are glad that the city recognizes that such developments are not in the interest of Newark residents nor the prudent fiduciary responsibility of the council and staff. In an era where our communities are facing the consequences of climate change and sea level rise, each community should be actively assessing how it will ensure future developments and infrastructure will be resilient to flood risk without adversely impacting existing residents and the environment. Building in Area 4 baylands

would both greatly increase flood risk across the city, and also squander the opportunity to utilize these lands as a valuable flood buffer to protect the community from flooding and sea level rise, while also providing improved natural wildlife habitat and increased outdoor access opportunities for residents. Additionally, since there is broad community opposition from both environmental and pro-housing organizations in the area, building here has a high chance of community pushback which could delay the project to outside the planning period.

We strongly recommend updating your Climate Action Plan which is now 13 years old in order to implement mitigation measures for water level rise (both sea level rise and groundwater rise) and to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We also recommend adding a policy to restore wetlands in order to maximize carbon sequestration and protection from sea level rise.

Program H3.5: Parking standards study can be strengthened to commit to reducing parking minimums. A study from UC Berkeley’s Turner Center found, “the presence of structured parking added nearly \$36,000 per unit.” The Draft Housing Element notes that Newark has higher parking minimums than neighboring jurisdictions. Parking, especially covered parking, significantly increases the cost of housing developments and uses space for cars rather than for people. In order to combat climate change we know that we must reduce our reliance on cars and fossil fuels. By prioritizing land for people rather than cars we can address the housing crisis and GHG reduction goals. Due to this higher level of parking and its cost, we strongly urge you to commit to reducing the amount of required parking to no more than 0.5 spaces per residential unit, and zero in transit-adjacent areas.

Program H2.1: Encourage new middle-density housing with SB 9 and SB 10. While this is a laudable direction for the city to go to encourage housing abundance throughout the city, it could be strengthened with a few more objective outcomes for the program. (1) The SB 9 ordinance should not reduce the buildable envelope below what an underlying single-family zone allows. (2) Missing middle zoning should allow at least 4 units on at least 80% of single-family lots—not merely legal as density, but practical in terms of development standards. See the Portland Residential Infill Program for a possible direction where buildable envelope is increased the more units are planned on the lot. (3) No areas should be exempted from missing middle except based on floodplain, fire risk, or other major public health / ecological risks. (4) Required parking should continue to be no more than 0.5 spaces /unit, or zero near any bus line, as the major space requirements of off-street parking reliably kills missing middle.

As we’ve mentioned, we oppose site number 2: Sanctuary West because of its location on baylands that are expected to see a nearly two feet rise of water levels in less than 50 years. We continue to urge you to remove this from your site list.

To support our vision for Newark, Greenbelt Alliance and other partnering organizations have crafted a go-to guide for accelerating equitable adaptation to the climate crisis; [The Resilience Playbook](#). The Playbook brings together curated strategies, recommendations, and tools to support local decision makers and community leaders wherever they are in their journey.

We look forward to continuing to engage with Newark and the community on how this vital work can move forward in the new year.

Sincerely,

Victor Flores, East Bay Resilience Manager,
Greenbelt Alliance

David Lewis, Executive Director
Save The Bay

Maxwell Davis and the 2500 members of East
Bay for Everyone

¹ <https://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/research-and-policy/ab-1401-residential-parking-requirements/>

Comment 10

The City of Newark received the following comment as a form letter from 72 individuals. A full list of the individuals follows the letter.

To: Steven Turner

Subject: Remove Sanctuary West from the Newark Housing Element

Steven Turner,

Dear Mayor Hannon, Vice Mayor Collazo and Newark City Councilmembers, Thank you for putting together a robust Housing Element draft. This is a once in a decade moment for Newark to make pivotal progress on climate change and fair housing by developing a comprehensive housing strategy that builds housing in existing neighborhoods, while ensuring the long-term climate resilience of the city by protecting protecting valuable open space along the shoreline as wildlife habitat while providing community resilience as a flood buffer from sea level rise.

I am writing to you today to implore you to remove Newark Area 4 (“Sanctuary West”) from your housing site inventory. This is not a good place to build housing and should not be how Newark meets a significant portion of its housing requirement. Newark Area 4 is almost entirely within a flood zone, and the site is anticipated to be almost completely inundated with just 1 meter of sea level rise. Additionally, new studies show that development of Area 4 could cause flooding for other shoreline communities in the Bay Area. Developing this site will increase flood risk to current and future residents and cause catastrophic financial issues to the city in the future.

As evidenced by recent rains, Newark is already experiencing flooding and if Area 4 is developed, flooding will only increase. Newark has the capacity within the existing urban areas to meet its RHNA goals without putting future and current residents at risk.

Further, the wetlands and wetland restoration potential of Newark Area 4 should be embraced for the numerous important benefits they provide. Wetlands not only protect the city from flooding and provide wildlife habitat, they also clean our Bay waters, and have been demonstrated to be one of the most powerful tools in nature for fighting climate change, by sequestering carbon even more efficiently than our forests. We desperately need to protect and restore all the San Francisco Bay wetlands we can, and Newark has an incredible opportunity to support this regional goal.

We strongly urge Newark to become a climate-forward city by focusing on infill growth in existing neighborhoods - rather than putting housing in an undeveloped shoreline flood zone that should be permanently protected as a wildlife habitat and as a valuable buffer to protect the community from flooding and sea level rise.

Thank you,
[Name]

List of Individuals who sent the comment form letter:

- Neelam Noorani
- Jonathan Coreas-Diaz
- Jean Mccauley
- Marissa Hernandez
- Ashi Kodi Kodi
- Susana Real
- Marilyn Painter
- Jesus Jimenez
- Agustina Maradona
- Dakota Sierras
- Alyssa Lopez
- K. Encarnacion
- Analeez Iniguez
- Lauren Arreguin
- Tia Triplett
- Kassandra Vega
- David Strand
- Monika Strand
- Timmy Thach
- Katelyn Costa
- Jasmine Sandhu
- John Oda
- Ben Keller
- Cyril Bouteille
- Andrea Resendiz
- Victoria Ornelas
- Nael Mohammad
- Oscar Pena
- Lauren Farias
- Kaitlyn Fregoso
- Belle Farias
- Kamilah Arteaga
- Eden Kidd
- Jaime Arredondo
- Anthony Medina
- Vaidehi Sharma
- Lyndie Chiou
- Wendy Chou
- Justin Burks
- Vanessa Nunez
- David Alexander
- Malalai Mayar
- Diane Petersen
- Maia Rodriguez
- Raul Maldonado
- Remi Tan
- Kermit Cuff
- Sarah Bell
- Cassandra Jauregui
- Christopher Sulots
- Jaycee Moriguchi
- Kurt Harvey
- Christina Johnson
- Timothy Lee
- Nazim Haffaf
- Arianna G.
- Michael Brazil
- Allysia Irwin
- Janice MacKenzie
- Amanda C.
- Shawn Bean
- Amanda Cordoba
- Teresa Pinto
- Marina Montes
- George Flint
- Katherine Roberts
- Thalia Lubin
- AJ Cho
- A.F. Shayne
- Joan Starr
- Maxwell Davis
- Shaina Chemparathypatagonia

Comment 11

March 27, 2023

Transmitted Via Electronic Mail via the City Clerk

Steven Turner, Community Development Director

37101 Newark Blvd.

Newark, CA 94560

Email: city.clerk@newark.org

RE: Public comments by San Francisco Baykeeper on Newark's Draft Housing Element.

Dear Mr. Turner,

I write on behalf of San Francisco Baykeeper ("Baykeeper") in opposition to the City of Newark's inclusion of the Sanctuary West Project (also commonly known as "Area 4") in its Draft Housing Element. Baykeeper submits these comments on behalf of approximately 5,000 members and supporters who live and recreate in and around the San Francisco Bay Area. Together, our mission is to defend San Francisco Bay from the biggest threats and hold polluters and government agencies accountable to create healthy communities and help wildlife thrive. Our team of scientists and lawyers investigate pollution via aerial and water patrols, strengthen regulations through science and policy advocacy, and enforce environmental laws on behalf of the public.

It is discouraging to see the city continuing to recommend and approve housing at Area 4. Instead of allowing this area to be used as a natural barrier to mitigate sea level rise (SLR) and groundwater inundation as climate impacts increase, moving forward with development will expose more than a thousand new residents to SLR and put hundreds of millions of dollars of property at risk. With only about ten percent of the original wetlands remaining around San Francisco Bay, keeping these natural bufferlands is essential to having a resilient community and allowing shorelines to adapt in the midst of climate change.

In addition, importing fill and paving over Area 4 would destroy restorable diked Baylands and harm wildlife habitats for over a dozen special-status species. This includes the endangered Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, endemic to only San Francisco Bay's marshes which are increasingly threatened with the prospect of development. Furthermore, fragmenting and degrading the existing wetlands in Area 4 will also threaten pup rookeries for harbor seals.

The scientific community has recommended Area 4 as a high priority for protection and restoration of wetlands and upland habitat in order to support San Francisco Bay wildlife species and help them adjust to rising sea levels. Congress has already authorized lands such as Area 4 to be added to the Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge. We urge you to follow the guidance of the region's scientific community and prioritize protecting and restoring this land rather than development in Area 4 as planned in your current Draft Housing Element.

During the January 2023 King Tides, drone footage revealed just how much surface water already occupies the site. These images give a glimpse of what this site will look like under one foot of SLR. Seeing as this site is projected to have two feet of SLR by 2050, it is obvious why this

is not a good site to build housing or degrade more wetland habitat.



Jan. 22, 2023, King Tides at Area 4 *Photo credit: Carin High*

Lastly, sustainable development comes at the intersection of economic, social and environmental capitals. Area 4 development only looks at the economic benefit to build. However, if natural capital was also part of the equation, one would see how many benefits this land offers: greenhouse gas sequestration, nature based multi-benefit adaptation solutions to SLR, open space for community members to enjoy, and biodiversity to ensure a healthy Bay.

Staff, we implore you to remove the Sanctuary West Project from suitable housing in the 6th cycle of Newark's Housing Element. Follow the advice of the experts and protect these wetlands to, in turn, protect your community against climate change impacts.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft Housing Element. Please reach out to Aundi Mevoli at aundi@... with any questions.

Sincerely,

Aundi Mevoli

Field Investigator and Policy Advocate San Francisco Baykeeper

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING HCD REVIEW PERIODS

<p>Comment 12</p>	<p>David Song</p>	<p>I received a letter from city of Newark, regarding a piece of land that I own. 37079 Ash street, APN: 92-127-31. The letter stated that my property has been identified as a site that could be developed with residential units, and well suited for development. I have previously tried to discuss the development of this site with the planning department multiple times, with no success.</p> <p>With this new initiative from the city, what kind of incentive does the city provide to owners to develop this site? Higher density? Lower permit fees? Faster approval? Less red tape?</p> <p>After reading through the Housing Element report, I still could not figure out how does that report relate to my property and its potential for development.</p> <p>It would be nice for the city planner to sit down with me and explain what kind of incentives the city provides to the development of my site.</p> <p>I am more than happy to work with the city to develop this site and provide more housing opportunities to medium and low income families.</p> <p>Best</p> <p>David</p>
<p>Comment 13</p>	<p>Rishika Rawat</p>	<p>I was wondering where I could find a pdf of the Newark Safety Element.</p>
<p>Comment 14</p>	<p>Alyssa Lopez</p>	<p>Hi, I was wondering if there is any action being taken to invest in some programs such as a first-time buyers programs for Newark Residents, or a low-income based programs. If so, I'd like to get more information or be interested in investing some input</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
<p>Comment 15</p>	<p>Pat Callaway</p>	<p>There has been opposition to Area 4 development and I am confused by your responses. Has Area 4 been scrapped or not?</p>
<p>Comment 16</p>	<p>Krisie Knutson</p>	<p>Those house are ugly , can't you make some pretty houses</p>