

HOUSING ELEMENT (2021-2029)

ADOPTED

June 14, 2022

Revised August 15, 2022

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-55

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA APPROVING UPDATES TO THE GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT FOR THE 2021 TO 2029 PLANNING PERIOD AND ADOPTION OF THE INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE

WHEREAS, each planning agency shall prepare and legislative body of each city shall adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan for the physical development of the city (Government Code Section 65300); and

WHEREAS, the General Plan shall consist of a statement of policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards and plan proposals. The plan shall include the following elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety (Government Code Section 65302); and

WHEREAS, the State law requires jurisdictions to periodically update their Housing Elements to be in compliance with changes in Housing Element Law, reflect population trends, and demonstrate that the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) allocated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) can be satisfied; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a draft Housing Element for the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued a letter to the City dated December 14, 2021, with results of their compliance review of the draft Housing Element and provided further revisions to comply with Housing Element Law; and

WHEREAS, the City has incorporated those revisions into the Housing Element update to ensure that the Housing Element substantially complies with Housing Element Law; and

WHEREAS, the City published a joint "Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to Adopt an Initial Study and Negative Declaration" on October 30, 2021 announcing the start of a 30-day public review and comment period on the Initial Study and Negative Declaration from November 1, 2021 through November 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, following the Initial Study and Negative Declaration public review period, a Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration was prepared to address comments received by the City from HCD on the 6th Cycle HEU; and

WHEREAS, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5(c), the updates to the Initial Study and Negative Declaration do not require recirculation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council duly authorizes the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from HCD to support state certification of the 2021-2029 Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2022, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider adoption of the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element Update and the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council adoption of the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element and of the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on June 14, 2022, the City Council considered and approved updates to the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021 to 2029 planning period and the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

Furthermore, the City Council determines that:

- The 2021-2029 Housing Element facilitates land use planning and policies to accommodate City's RHNA, and comply with State Housing Element Law, which mandates that local governments plan for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community and individuals with special needs.
- The RHNA is essentially non-discretionary for the local jurisdiction. The RHNA is an eight-year planning goal, not a housing production requirement.
- The Housing Element does not grant any development entitlements or authorize construction development.
- No physical development, construction or other ground disturbance is proposed at this time. Therefore, no direct physical impacts to the environment would occur from HEU adoption.

///


///

///


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the updates to the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element are hereby APPROVED,

INTRODUCED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 14th day of June, 2022.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
PATRICK Q. SULLIVAN, City Attorney


Tatia Y. Strader, Assistant City Attorney


Mayor Patrick J. Furey

ATTEST:

Rebecca Poirier, MMC, City Clerk


TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2022-55

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss
CITY OF TORRANCE)

I, Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk of the City of Torrance, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, approved, and adopted by the City Council of the City of Torrance at an adjourned regular meeting of said Council held on the 14th day of June, 2022 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS Ashcraft, Chen, Griffiths, Kalani, Walsler, and Mayor Furey.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS Mattucci.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS None.

Date: 6/21/2022



Rebecca Poirier, MMC
City Clerk of the City of Torrance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Statutory Framework	1
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Organization	2
1.4 Relationship to Other General Plan Elements	3
1.5 Data Sources	3
1.6 Public Participation	4
1.6.1 Community Workshops	7
1.6.2 Focus Group Sessions	8
1.6.3 Housing Element Webpage	9
1.6.4 1 st Draft Housing Element Review	10
1.6.5 Summary of Public Comments and City Responses	10
1.6.6 2 nd Public Review draft	13
1.6.7 Adoption Hearings	13
1.7 Acronyms used	14
1.8 Terms Used	14
2. Community Profile	15
2.1 Population Characteristics	15
2.1.1 Population Growth	16
2.1.2 Age Characteristics	17
2.1.3 Racial and Ethnic Composition	18
2.1.4 Economic characteristics	18
2.2 Household Characteristics	19
2.2.1 Household Type and Size	20
2.2.2 Household Income	20
2.2.3 Households By Income Group	22
2.3 Housing problems	22
2.3.1 Overcrowding	22
2.3.2 Cost Burden	23
2.4 Special Needs Groups	24
2.4.1 Seniors	25
2.4.2 Persons With Disabilities	26
2.4.3 Large Households	28
2.4.4 Single-Parent Households	29
2.4.5 Farmworkers	29
2.4.6 Housing Needs Of Extremely-Low Income (ELI) Households	30
2.4.7 Extremely Low-Income Households	33
2.4.8 Homeless	34

2.5 Housing Stock Characteristics	39
2.5.1 Housing Growth	39
2.5.2 Housing Type	40
2.5.3 Housing Availability And Tenure	40
2.5.4 Housing Age And Condition	41
2.5.5 Housing Cost And Affordability	47
2.6 Affordable Housing In Torrance	50
2.6.1 Public Housing	50
2.6.2 Inventory of At-Risk Housing Units	51
2.6.3 Preservation of At-Risk HOUSING Units	53
3. Housing Constraints	56
3.1 Introduction	56
3.2 Governmental Constraints	56
3.2.1 Land Use Controls	56
3.2.2 Building Codes and Enforcement	80
3.2.3 On- and Off-Site Improvements	81
3.2.4 Fees and Exactions	82
3.2.5 Processing and Permit Procedures	84
3.2.6 Streamlining programs	87
3.2.7 Transparency in the Development Process	89
3.2.8 Coastal Zone Development	89
3.2.9 Housing for Persons with Disabilities	92
3.2.10 Reasonable Accommodation	92
3.2.11 Dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies in California	93
3.2.12 Other regulatory challenges that present barriers to development include the following:	94
3.2.13 Reductions to Constraints	94
3.3 Non-governmental Constraints	94
3.3.1 Construction Costs	94
3.3.2 Land Costs	95
3.3.3 Home Financing	95
3.4 Environmental Constraints	96
3.4.1 Endangered Species and Sensitive Habitat	97
3.4.2 Seismic Activity	97
3.4.3 Flooding	98
3.4.4 Energy Efficiency	99
3.4.5 Mineral Extraction	100
3.5 Infrastructure Constraints	100
4. Housing Opportunities and Resources	102
4.1 Future Housing Needs	102
4.1.1 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	102
4.1.2 Residential Sites Inventory	107
4.1.3 Infrastructure Availability	142
4.1.4 Adequacy of Sites Inventory to meet RHNA	142
4.2 Financial Resources	143

4.2.1	Housing Choice Voucher (SECTION 8) rental assistance program	144
4.2.2	Low & Moderate Housing set-aside funds	144
4.2.3	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds	144
4.2.4	Home Improvement Program	145
4.2.5	Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) Grants	145
4.2.6	SB2 Grants	145
4.2.7	South Bay Regional Housing Trust	145
4.3	Administrative Resources	146
4.3.1	City of Torrance Community Development Department	146
4.3.2	City of Torrance Community Services Department	148
4.3.3	City of Torrance Commissions	148
4.3.4	Non-Profit Housing Developers	149
4.4	Opportunities for resource Conservation	149
4.4.1	City Programs	149
4.4.2	Utility Provider Programs	150
4.4.3	Regional Programs	151
5.	Housing Plan	152
5.1	Housing Goals And Policies	152
5.1.1	Housing Opportunities	152
5.1.2	Housing to Meet the Needs of All Income Levels	153
5.1.3	Removal of Governmental Constraints	154
5.1.4	Conserve, Preserve, and Improve the Housing Stock	154
5.1.5	Promote Equal Housing Opportunity	155
5.2	Housing Programs	156
5.3	Summary of Quantified Objectives	186

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: OUTREACH EFFORTS
- APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- APPENDIX C: SITES INVENTORY
- APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING
- APPENDIX E: SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS
- APPENDIX F: CORRESPONDENCE FROM PROVIDERS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING
- APPENDIX G: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

TABLES

TABLE H-1: REGIONAL POPULATION GROWTH	16
TABLE H-2: POPULATION AND HOUSING GROWTH 1940-2040	17
TABLE H-3: AGE DISTRIBUTION	17
TABLE H-4: RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS	18
TABLE H-5: EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS 2010 - 2018	19
TABLE H-6: MEAN SALARY BY OCCUPATION – LA, LONG BEACH, GLENDALE REGION (2021)	19
TABLE H-7: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	20
TABLE H-8: TORRANCE HOUSEHOLD INCOME	21
TABLE H-9: MEDIAN INCOME HOUSEHOLD COMPARISON	21
TABLE H-10: HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME GROUPS	22
TABLE H-11: OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS	23
TABLE H-12: COST BURDEN	23
TABLE H-13: SPENDING ON RENT BY INCOME (NUMBER OF RENTER HOUSEHOLDS)	24
TABLE H-14: COSTS FOR MORTGAGE HOLDERS BY INCOME	24
TABLE H-15: SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS	25
TABLE H-16: SENIOR POPULATION	25
TABLE H-17: SENIOR HOUSEHOLD TRENDS	25
TABLE H-18: SENIOR HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME AND TENURE	26
TABLE H-19: DISABILITY STATUS	26
TABLE H-20: PERSONS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY BY AGE AND ZIP CODE	28
TABLE H-21: HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE	28
TABLE H-22: HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN	29
TABLE H-23: PERMANENT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS FOR LA COUNTY	30
TABLE H-24: EXTREMELY-LOW INCOME HOUSING NEEDS	30
TABLE H-25: RESOURCES FOR SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS	31
TABLE H-26. EXTREMELY LOW INCOME HOUSING NEEDS	34
TABLE H-27: INVENTORY OF HOMELESS SERVICES AND FACILITIES	38
TABLE H-28: HOUSING GROWTH	39
TABLE H-29: HOUSING UNIT TYPES	40
TABLE H-30: TENURE COMPARISON	40
TABLE H-31: HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE (2010-2019)	41
TABLE H-32: SUBSTANDARD HOUSING	42
TABLE H-33: RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE COMPLAINTS	43
TABLE H-34: HOME PRICES	47
TABLE H-35: HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME GROUP	49
TABLE H-36: ASSISTED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS	51
TABLE H-38: LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ZONING DISTRICTS PERMITTING RESIDENTIAL USES	61
TABLE H-39: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ¹	65
TABLE H-40: MINIMUM UNIT SIZE	66
TABLE H-41: PARKING REQUIREMENTS	67
TABLE H-42: PERMITTED USES IN LAND USE CODE	71
TABLE H-43: DENSITY BONUS OPPORTUNITIES	79
TABLE H-44: PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION FEES	83
TABLE H-45: COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT APPLICATION FEES TO SURROUNDING CITIES	83
TABLE H-46: 2021 TORRANCE IMPACT FEES	84
TABLE H-47: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TIME FRAMES	86

TABLE H-48: DISPOSITION OF CONVENTIONAL HOME PURCHASE LOAN APPLICATIONS FOR THE LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH-GLENDALE MSA.....96

TABLE H-49: MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD OF EARTHQUAKE EVENTS BY SIZE AND FAULT IN THE NEXT 30 YEARS.....98

TABLE H-50: RHNA 2021-2029103

TABLE H-51: CREDITS TOWARD RHNA104

TABLE H-52 ADU PERMITS ISSUED FROM 2018-2020.....105

TABLE H-53: ESTIMATED NUMBER OF ADUS DURING 6TH CYCLE PLANNING PERIOD106

TABLE H-54: REMAINING RHNA OBLIGATION.....106

TABLE H-55: RECYCLING TRENDS—SUMMARY OF SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS IN TORRANCE110

TABLE H-56: RECYCLING TRENDS—SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS IN NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS.....115

TABLE H-57: ASSUMED TARGET DENSITIES FOR CAPACITY ESTIMATES118

TABLE H-58: ADEQUACY OF SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE 2021-2029 RHNA143

TABLE H-59: ADEQUACY OF SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE 2021-2029 RHNA BY GENERAL DESCRIPTION143

TABLE H-60: AFFH MEANINGFUL ACTIONS MATRIX179

TABLE H-61 SUMMARY OF 2021-2029 QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES186

FIGURES

FIGURE H-1: TORRANCE HOMELESS COUNT 2020.....36

FIGURE H-2: AGE OF TORRANCE HOUSING UNITS.....42

FIGURE H-3: RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY COMPLAINTS.....45

FIGURE H-4: COMMERCIAL PROPERTY COMPLAINTS46

FIGURE H-5: GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICY MAP59

FIGURE H-6: ZONING MAP64

FIGURE H-7: COASTAL ZONE MAP.....91

FIGURE H-8: MAP OF SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE PROJECTS113

FIGURE H-9: HOUSING CORRIDORS STUDY AREAS133

FIGURE H-10: DOWNTOWN TORRANCE STUDY AREA.....137

1. INTRODUCTION

The Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

1.1 STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The Housing Element is an integral component of the City’s General Plan. It addresses existing and future housing needs of all types for persons of all economic groups in Torrance. The Housing Element is a tool for use by citizens and public officials in understanding and meeting the housing needs in the city.

Recognizing the importance of providing adequate housing in all communities, the state of California (state) mandated a Housing Element within every General Plan since 1969. It is one of the seven required elements. Article 10.6, Section 65580 – 65589.8, Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code sets forth the legal requirements of the Housing Element and encourages the provision of affordable and decent housing in communities to meet statewide goals. Specifically, Section 65580 states the element shall consist of “...an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing.” The contents of the element must be consistent with the other elements of the General Plan [Government Code § 65300.5].

Meeting the housing needs established by the state is an important goal for the City of Torrance (the City or City, as the local government). As the population of the state continues to grow and scarce resources decline, it becomes more difficult for local agencies to create adequate housing opportunities while maintaining a high standard of living for all citizens in the community. State law recognizes that housing needs may exceed available resources and, therefore, does not require that the City’s quantified objectives be identical to the identified housing needs. This recognition of limitations is critical, especially during this period of financial uncertainties as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic in both the public and private sectors.

Section 65583(b)(2) states, “It is recognized that the total housing needs...may exceed available resources and the community’s ability to satisfy this need within the content of the general plan requirements... Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the total housing needs. The quantified objectives shall establish the maximum number of housing units by income category, including extremely low income, that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved...”

This 2021-2029 City of Torrance Housing Element is prepared in compliance with state law and covers the period of October 15, 2021, through October 15, 2029.

1.2 PURPOSE

The state has declared that “the availability of housing is of vital statewide importance and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order.” In addition, the government and the private sector should make an effort to provide a diversity of housing opportunities and accommodate regional housing needs through a cooperative effort, while maintaining a responsibility toward economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals within the General Plan. Further, state Housing Element law requires “An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs.” The law requires:

- An analysis of population and employment trends;
- An analysis of household characteristics;
- An inventory of suitable land for residential development;
- An identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are permitted by right;
- An analysis of the governmental and non-governmental constraints on the improvement, maintenance and development of housing;
- An analysis of special housing needs;
- An analysis of opportunities for energy conservation;
- An analysis of publicly assisted housing developments that may convert to non-assisted housing developments; and
- An assessment of fair housing practices in order to develop policies and programs designed to affirmatively further fair housing.

The purpose of these requirements is to develop an understanding of the existing and projected housing needs within the community and to set forth policies and schedules, which promote preservation, improvement and development of diverse types and costs of housing throughout Torrance.

1.3 ORGANIZATION

This Housing Element is organized into five primary sections:

- **Introduction:** Provides an overview of the purpose, scope, and organization of the Housing Element.
- **Community Profile:** Provides a summary of the City’s demographic and housing characteristics, and associated housing needs.
- **Housing Constraints:** Provides an assessment of the various constraints to housing development and preservation.
- **Housing Opportunities and Resources:** Provides an inventory of resources available for meeting the City’s existing and projected housing needs.
- **Housing Plan:** Outlines the City’s commitments to providing and preserving housing opportunities in the community.

Additional data and background information are provided in appendices.

1.4 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS

The Torrance General Plan was adopted on April 6, 2010, and consists of the following elements: Land Use, Housing, Circulation and Infrastructure, Community Resources, Safety, and Noise, as well as an Implementation Program. All elements carry equal weight and are designed to be consistent with each other.

State law requires that “... the General Plan and elements and parts thereof comprise an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies...” The purpose of requiring internal consistency is to avoid policy conflict and provide a clear policy guide for the future maintenance, improvement, and development of housing within the City. The Housing Element is being updated at this time in conformance with the 2021-2029 update cycle (6th Cycle) for jurisdictions in the SCAG region. This Housing Element builds upon the other Elements and is consistent with the General Plan’s policies and proposals. The Housing Element draws upon the development capacity levels given in the Land Use Element to determine the appropriate location for affordable housing development. Several programs identified in Chapter 5 (Housing Plan) identify revisions to the Land Use Element to implement the Housing Element to maintain consistency. When any element of the General Plan is amended in the future, the City will review the Housing Element and, if necessary, amend it to ensure continued consistency among elements.

1.5 DATA SOURCES

Publicly Available Data. Data from a variety of resources, including federal, state, and regional data inform the crafting of the Housing Element. One of the most cited sources is the Pre-Certified Local Housing Data for Torrance, developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and pre-certified for use by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for use in 6th cycle housing elements. The source for much of the Pre-Certified Local Housing Data was the 2010 Census and the American Community Survey estimates from 2014-2018 and 2014-2019 (U.S. Census Bureau). California Department of Finance 2020 Population and Housing Estimates supplement the Census data. The source of the current number of mobile homes in the City was updated using information available on HCD’s website. Additional information has been drawn from the 2012-2016 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data. CHAS data are based on special tabulations for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) from sample Census data. Please note that due to the use of different data sources, slight variations in reporting can be expected.

Coordination with Subject Matter Experts. The City coordinated with the California Housing Partnership Corporation to update their inventory of subsidized or assisted affordable units in Torrance and associated risk levels. City staff coordinated with the operators of two affordable housing projects in the City to gain input necessary to complete the Housing Element.

Local Knowledge. The Housing Element also incorporates local data and knowledge where appropriate to capture emerging trends and issues, including utilizing knowledge from City staff, local and regional advocates, the local development community, service providers, and public comments. Throughout this Housing Element, local knowledge is incorporated to complement the federal, state and regional data. As an example, Chapter 3 contains an analysis of constraints to development and input from local developers is included to highlight how local regulations can constrain or enhance

development. Section 2.6.2 identifies whether there is subsidized housing at-risk of converting to market rate housing in the next ten years. Although the data suggested two projects were at-risk of converting, City staff thought differently, so they contacted the operators and received assurances that both intend to continue as is for at least the next ten years. The City’s Social Services Commission and City Manager’s office provided detailed information on how the City is addressing homelessness, including a project to construct a tiny home village on City property near City Hall specifically for those experiencing homelessness. Local knowledge from City staff and local developers and real estate professionals also provided key information regarding the sites inventory.

1.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation played an important role in the development of the Housing Element. Section 65583(c)(6)(B) of the Government Code states: “The local government shall make diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort.” This process not only includes residents of the community, but also coordinates participation among local agencies and housing groups, community organizations, housing sponsors, and organizations serving low-income and special needs groups. All segments of the Torrance community were encouraged by the City to participate in the preparation of the Housing Element.

Torrance Strategic Plan. In Spring of 2021, the City completed a two-year process of updating the City’s Strategic Plan. The process included considerable public outreach, including two statistically valid surveys (one for residents and one for the business community). For the *Residents Survey*, 1,336 Torrance residents over the age of 18 were surveyed. The survey was conducted online and by telephone. To ensure the representation of all adult residents, a random sample of those without publicly available email addresses or telephone numbers received a postcard in the mail with an invitation to take the survey online. Results were weighted slightly using figures from the U.S. Census to ensure the sample proportions reflect demographic and geographic proportions within the actual population as a whole. Several of the questions were open-ended. When asked what is the biggest issue of concern facing the residents, 11 percent stated housing costs/affordable housing, and three percent responded “homelessness.” The survey tested eight issues facing the City, and 75 percent cited the number of homeless residents as extremely important/very important, and 59 percent cited affordable housing as extremely important/very important. Residents want to see Torrance as a City that provides a wide-range of affordable housing options, with 73 percent ranking this as very/somewhat important.

The *Business Survey* consisted of interviews among 300 Torrance business owners, executives, and middle managers. The survey results showed that businesses support policies that could make the City more business-friendly, e.g., 69 percent in favor of increasing the amount of affordable housing in the City.

The City also conducted 29 *Focus Groups* totaling over 435 participants. The focus group sessions were held with such diverse groups as the City’s Homeowner Associations, Commission on Aging, Cultural Arts Commission, Downtown Association, Faith-based group, residents of senior housing, service organizations, School District, Youth Council, Women’s Club, and many more. Lack of affordable housing/high cost of housing and homelessness were some of the major topics listed by participants when asked what they like least about Torrance. When asked what the City can do to plan for the

future, addressing affordable housing and homelessness were two high-ranking topics raised by respondents.

Further, a *Community Profile and Environmental Scan* was prepared to inform the Strategic Plan update, and included a section that discussed housing costs and the resulting impact on the labor force and affordable housing. The study connects housing’s impact on business and economic growth, and acknowledges that a major reason businesses are finding it difficult to attract and retain employees is the cost of housing within an acceptable commute distance.

The data, through surveys, focus groups and the Community Profile and Environmental Scan, all pointed to community concerns with increasing homelessness, the high price of housing in the area and the need for a broader range of housing prices and products to allow younger generations as well as service workers the ability to purchase or rent near to employment. The data is available on the City’s website: <https://www.torranceca.gov/government/city-manager/strategic-plan>.

The update was guided by a Strategic Plan Committee, comprised of residents and business owners with a sincere interest and investment in the future of Torrance. The Strategic Plan Committee reviewed all the input and data and were responsible for updating strategic priorities and goals and sub-goals to reflect the data and community input. The Committee decided that housing was such an important issue for Torrance that they created a new Strategic Priority with associated goals and sub-goals to address housing. The updated Strategic Plan was accepted by the City Council in May of 2021. As a community-driven plan, the input provided by the community and the housing-related goals and sub-goals in the Strategic Plan were considered as part of the development of this Housing Element and provided important direction in its update.

Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan. Beginning in the early part of 2020, the City commenced on a revitalization study for Downtown Torrance. An important component to the effort was examining market feasibility for uses and new development to help define and target development and businesses that could be compatible and practical for the area, including housing opportunities. Considerable efforts were made to include the public.

Between August 27, 2020, and September 10, 2020, a total of seven focus group meetings were held with property owners, business owners, Old Torrance Neighborhood Association members, and Downtown Torrance Business Association members. Housing-related feedback included an interest in additional opportunities for mixed-use housing development in and near Downtown to increase the number of customers and activate the space. Large business owners in the commercial district shared that most of their employees commute to Torrance and patronize downtown businesses at lunchtime. More rental housing opportunities would offer their employees an opportunity to live near work and support the downtown. Most stakeholders were open to high-density, mixed-use housing development in Downtown.

A second set of stakeholder meetings were conducted on December 1, 2020, and December 3, 2020. The meetings were held virtually between the consultant team and property owners, business owners and residents in the area. On December 15, 2020, a workshop was held with the Torrance City Council to review the progress of the plan.

A two-week online community survey was launched in April 2021 to solicit input and feedback on draft goals and priorities for the Downtown Plan study area. The survey was publicized and shared with the

community through two pop-up demonstrations at the Torrance Antique Fair and El Prado and Sartori Avenue, and the Torrance Farmers Market at Wilson Park. The demonstration included project information boards that displayed goals, priorities and ideas for downtown, and provided the link to the online survey where community members could provide their feedback. In addition, project flyers publicizing the survey were distributed to businesses to display in storefronts, and the survey link was shared through the City's social media channels and through an email blast. Overall, the responses were supportive of all the goals for the Study Area, and respondents selected specific measures under each goal that were a high priority to them. Many respondents also provided written comments on the suggested goals and priorities, that highlighted the types of improvements and ideas for the Study Area, in particular Downtown Torrance, that were most desired by the community. The key takeaway for housing was that in general, there was support for new mixed-use development in Downtown and the sub-areas, but the respondents supported the combination of housing and retail rather than housing on its own. The study was presented to the City Council on July 13, 2021.

Torrance Housing Corridor Study. At the same time the 6th Cycle Housing Element was being prepared, the City was working on a Housing Corridor Study. The purpose of the Housing Corridor Study is to promote housing development by creating housing corridors. This can be accomplished by rezoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right, which supports the Housing Element by providing additional sites that contribute to the City's RHNA (see Chapter 4, Housing Resources).

To better understand the issues or concerns associated with the Housing Corridor Study, the City gathered community feedback through several engagement events, as follows:

- Two stakeholder meetings on May 19th, 2021. Both meetings were an hour long and conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. The City specifically reached out to local developers of market-rate and affordable housing, as well as local housing services providers.
- Two stakeholder meetings on June 29th, 2021. Both meetings were an hour long and conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. A range of participants familiar with the City of Torrance, the development process, and the properties within the study areas attended the meetings, including property owners, residents, and members of the local real estate community.
- Two Housing Element public workshops on April 28th, 2021, and July 28th, 2021. Both workshops were conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. City staff presented on the goals and process for the Housing Element effort, provided a brief background on the Housing Corridors Study, and answered questions from Planning Commissioners and attending members of the public. The workshops included poll questions to help identify the needs and desires of the community, as well as gathering feedback on specific strategies to comply with State law.

The community shared important considerations and contextual takeaways with City staff for each study area for the Housing Corridor Study as well as for the general citywide effort to enable housing production. Appendix A contains the full summary of themes and issues as expressed by the stakeholders, and the major concerns are discussed below:

1. **Compatibility of Uses.** Stakeholders repeatedly shared that the interface between industrial and commercial properties with residential properties was something for the City to look out

for. They varied on how compatibility issues such as noise, odor, and visual impacts could be addressed; or whether they could be addressed at all. Several participants emphasized that industrial uses should be allowed to continue no matter the results of the Study, and not be labeled “nonconforming”.

2. **Housing Product Types.** Stakeholders expressed their opinions about the possible range of product types and densities new housing in the study areas. There was some concern about higher density multi-family housing, especially in regard to their possible parking and privacy impacts.
3. **Parking.** Stakeholders expressed that new residential development had to establish enough parking to be successful. The Border Avenue study area, due to its proximity to Downtown, was identified as needing particular consideration for parking solutions.
4. **School Impacts.** Stakeholders were concerned about the possible impacts of new residential development on Torrance’s school system. One participant stressed the need to coordinate with school districts to ensure that additional housing does not adversely affect capacity or quality of public schools.
5. **Other Issues.** Stakeholders brought up specific concerns about each study area, such as lot size and zoning inconsistencies. Additionally, stakeholders expressed that property owners should not be required to go along with residential development if they don’t want to and brought up the issue of eminent domain.

1.6.1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

The City held three Community Workshops during the preparation phase of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Community Workshops 1 and 2 were held in a virtual format due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Community Workshop 3 was held in-person in the City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall. The City provided noticing for the workshops in a number of ways. They published display ads in the Daily Breeze newspaper and on Facebook, Twitter, Digital Sign, and on COVID-19 Today. Notices were posted on the City’s Housing Element Website, and the City Council announced the upcoming workshops/meetings at City Council meetings during orals. The City also distributed workshop flyers using mailing lists of interested residents, stakeholders, developers, community groups, faith-based organizations, housing groups and sponsors, HOA’s, social service agencies, and others, including those who specifically requested to be notified of housing-related meetings. For those who preferred to submit written comment, an email address was provided for that purpose. A copy of the mailing list of the organizations receiving notice of the workshops appear in Appendix A. Workshop summaries are also found in Appendix A.

Community Workshop 1 was held April 28, 2021, at 7 pm, hosted by the City Planning Commission at a special meeting devoted exclusively to the Housing Element. Fifteen members of the public participated via Zoom. City staff and consultants first provided an overview of the Housing Element update process using a PowerPoint presentation. The Planning Commissioners posed a number of questions to staff and the consultants regarding the timelines involved with the Housing Element, clarification of terms, and a substantial number of questions about the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the potential to impact the City. Public comment is summarized below in Section 1.5.6.

Community Workshop 2 was held July 28, 2021, at 6 pm. Due to technical difficulties, the meeting started at 6:30 pm. Fourteen members of the public participated via Zoom, and eight email comments were received. City staff and consultants first provided a PowerPoint presentation explaining the City's proposed strategy to accommodate the RHNA, and then solicited questions and input from the public. Because of the technical difficulties, the survey questions that were to be part of the presentation did not display and would instead be put online and made available in the coming weeks. See Appendix A for further detail on the survey and responses.

Community Workshop 3 was held at 7 PM October 20, 2021, as part of a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. The Draft Housing Element was previously made available for public review on October 1, 2021, and Community Workshop 3 provided an opportunity for the public and the Planning Commission to have a forum for asking questions and providing further input after having the opportunity to read the draft document. The project team presented a summary of the Draft Housing Element and fielded questions from the Planning Commission and the public. Planning Commission and public comment is summarized below in Section 1.5.6, and Appendix A contains the minutes from Community Workshop 3.

1.6.2 FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

Two Focus Group sessions were held on May 19, 2021, to gather input from housing developers, both those who build market rate housing and those involved with building affordable housing. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, these sessions were held in a virtual format. The sessions are summarized below, and the full meeting summaries are found in Appendix A.

Focus Group Session 1 - Service Providers and Affordable Developers: City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers to better understand the issues and needs of lower income residents and those with special needs, and to identify constraints to development of affordable housing so that programs can be developed to address those needs and constraints. Five service providers, two affordable housing developers, an architect, and a real estate representative participated. Input was received covering a number of important topics. Examples of successful partnerships with religious institutions were provided; and concern with Torrance's rising homeless count, including school district reports of homeless families, were discussed. Much of the input centered on the City's development standards and how changes to certain aspects of the development approval process could improve the feasibility of affordable housing, such as streamlining the entitlement process, relaxing parking standards, and increasing density. The group then discussed how assistance with financing, incentives and concessions are critical for the development of affordable units. Miscellaneous feedback included observations about political will in Torrance, the need for stigma associated with affordable housing to be removed, and the example of an attractive project in nearby Rancho Palos Verdes that is a 100% affordable low-income senior project.

Focus Group Session 2 – Market Rate Developers: City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with market rate developers to understand their issues and concerns regarding development of housing in Torrance, and to identify constraints to development as is required by Housing Element law so that programs can be developed to address those constraints. Four developers attended in person, and one submitted written comments. Valuable input was received concerning the City's development standards and entitlement process. Participants stated that higher densities are needed as well as relaxed parking standards; open space requirements are high; and the

low maximum FAR standards stifle development. Financing, incentives, and concessions were discussed, and participants favored using the density bonus, streamlining the entitlement process, and mitigating challenges associated with acquiring funding to build affordable housing developments. Miscellaneous feedback included comments about property owners often not willing to sell for affordable housing because of neighborhood pushback; sellers having unrealistic expectations about land cost and development timing; and the need for the City to add a substantial residential component around the Del Amo Mall to revive the area.

Focus Group Session 3 - Service Providers and Affordable Developers/Market Rate Developers:

Following receipt of HCD's comments on the first draft of the Housing Element, City staff and the consultant team conducted a third Focus Group session, inviting market rate housing developers, developers of affordable housing, and service providers. Held in a virtual format on February 16, 2022, this session was intended to solicit feedback for the City's Draft Housing Element prior to completing responses to HCD's comment letter and resubmitting a second draft for HCD review. Participants were asked to provide feedback regarding the proposed programs and actions, and to provide any other suggestions on programs and/or actions for the 2nd submittal of the Draft Housing Element that would enhance opportunities to provide housing for households across all income categories and those with special needs. Six participants, including two developers of both affordable and market rate housing, one developer of market rate housing, and one representative of a non-profit that provides housing for those with developmental disabilities were in attendance, and two participants remained anonymous. Participants provided a considerable amount of valuable input, including providing a list of what constrains the development of housing in Torrance, and explaining what development standards should be relaxed. The developers in the group explained how important certainty is for the development community, and how the City can help by publishing clear rules, e.g., for density bonus requirements. Some of the developers have experience with inclusionary housing and described their suggestions for how to make it work better. Suggestions were offered for additional sites for the Sites Inventory. A representative of HOPE housing expressed an interest in partnering with the City to help fill the large need for more housing for those with developmental disabilities, and offered suggestions as to how the City could assist.

1.6.3 HOUSING ELEMENT WEBPAGE

A Housing Element webpage was added to the City's website at the commencement of the Housing Element planning process, to inform the public and to keep the public apprised of opportunities to be involved and provide input. The webpage provided background information that explained what a Housing Element is, why it must be updated, and what's included. It also explained what the RHNA is and Torrance's share of the RHNA. The webpage also explained how interested parties could be involved and provided both notice of upcoming workshops and links to the PPT presentations and workshop summaries.

Following Workshop 2, a survey was made available to the workshop attendees and any other interested parties. The survey was made available for a period of one week. Survey responses are summarized in Section 1.5.6 and presented in Appendix A.

1.6.4 1ST DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT REVIEW

The first Draft City of Torrance 6th Cycle Housing Element was made available for public review on October 1, 2021, and because the City was open to continuing to receive public comment on the Housing Element, the City kept the first review period open through the month of March 2022. The second Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element was made available for public review on April 11, 2022. Public review closed on April 29, 2022. During the public review comment period for the second Draft, one item of correspondence was received by the City. A resident sent an email with questions about the potential impact of future residential development planned to meet the RHNA, and the impact on water, wastewater, and electricity in the City. Appendix A includes the text of the email and the response from the City's Public Works Department.

1.6.5 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND CITY RESPONSES

The following paragraphs summarize the public comment and city responses at each of the three Community Workshops. More detailed workshop summaries are found in Appendix A.

WORKSHOP 1: Comments from the public included a participant who favored affordable housing throughout Torrance and was in favor of rent control and the development of high-rise housing. This participant also felt that empty parking lots should be made available for persons who have to live in their cars. Another participant stressed the importance of the City making a diligent effort with outreach, spreading out the affordable housing opportunities throughout the City, and aiding underrepresented individuals in Torrance. This participant also stated that more could be done to ensure the City's outreach is inclusive. Another asked whether neighboring cities can share their RHNA, asked about future opportunities to stay involved in the process. The City responded that there is currently no provision in State law for that, although there was once such a provision and it expired. A participant asked about public review of the Housing Element, and the City responded that all materials would be placed on the City's website when available. The workshop closed with comments from Planning Commissioners. One asked whether the City's standard procedure for notification of opportunities for outreach meets state guidelines, and City staff responded that the City has gone above and beyond the necessary requirements for outreach, and have also reached out to affordable housing developers, social service agencies, HOA, and others. A Planning Commissioner pointed out that the RHNA would house less than 4% of the current population of Torrance, and the City will continue to look for ways to accommodate the RHNA and reduce any adverse effects on existing residents.

As part of the PowerPoint presentation, a live poll was conducted intermittently throughout the presentation. The full poll and results are found in Appendix A and summarized here.

A survey of participants included the following:

- 54% of the attendees reported being a resident of Torrance
- 46% of respondents reported being either a developer of market-rate housing, affordable housing, or a representative of a service agency serving Torrance residents
- 50% of attendees have lived in Torrance more than 10 years
- 42% did not reside in Torrance

When asked which groups have the highest need for housing and related services in the community (respondents could select up to 3):

- 90% selected young adults
- 70% selected families with children
- Categories of Seniors and Homeless were each selected by 40% of respondents.

Attendees were also asked which housing type is most needed in Torrance and allowed up to 3 selections:

- 70% selected both the Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units, and Rental Housing
- Residential Mixed-use was chosen by 60%

When asked if streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities should be an important consideration:

- 50% replied yes
- 40% replied no or I do not know.

WORKSHOP 2: One participant was concerned about proposed housing legislation at the State level and the impact on quality of life in Torrance and stated the City should continue to oppose their RHNA. This participant was concerned about densification of the City without infrastructure improvements and opposed relaxing parking requirements. City staff responded that one of the goals of this effort is to preserve the City’s single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident’s desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance. That is why the focus is on corridors and underutilized parcels. Staff also explained that the City has also been actively following State housing legislation and responding when concerns arise about proposed legislation. This participant further asked about plans for two specific areas of the City. City staff responded that all plans are in draft form for now, and there will be additional opportunities to provide future input.

Another participant pointed out the housing problems in the City including the rapidly rising homeless crisis and cost burden for renters. This participant asked how the Housing Element would be implemented, and how equal distribution of the sites was being ensured. City staff responded that we are talking to property owners and developers, and looking at land value and vacancies, trying to be as accurate as possible. Further, while the corridors identified for the Corridor Study are in the more centralized part of the City, corridors are located in all Council districts in the City except for one. For the current draft Sites Inventory, the sites are pretty well distributed in all locations in the City.

A student participant referred to making Torrance more walkable, connected the housing crisis to the climate crisis, and encouraged more compact development. Questions were put forward about potential zoning changes and noticing to affected property owners, and whether the City will use eminent domain or condemnation. City staff responded that the City is using a public process to study the issues and will continue to involve the property owners as the process moves forward. The City will initiate with the required zone changes if the Council decides to do so. The City would create the

standards that would streamline development as a part of the rezoning process. There are no plans to use eminent domain or condemnation.

A final participant asked about how the legislation works that allows religious institutions to build housing on their sites. The presenter explained that the legislation is AB 1851. It requires a City to allow religious institutions to build affordable housing on their existing parking lot without requiring them to replace any lost parking, as an incentive. Some cities are placing a “Congregational Overlay” on these properties to encourage and incentivize this type of development. When asked if congregational housing units would pay property taxes, City staff stated they would research the answer to those questions and respond either online or at a future Housing Element workshop.

The online survey that followed Workshop 2 was taken by 59 participants, with 32% of the respondents indicating they had participated in the first Community Workshop in April. The results are summarized below.

When asked to select 2 preferred strategies for ways to accommodate the RHNA in Torrance:

- 68% preferred to change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to mixed-use
- 46% chose to change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to multifamily residential
- 42% selected to change zoning of certain industrial sites to multifamily residential
- 15% chose to actively encourage the production of ADUs

Respondents were given two choices to select their preferred method to increase density to accommodate the 6th cycle RHNA:

- 78% chose to increase the density or establish higher density for residential uses (stand-alone and or mixed-use if allowed) along key commercial corridors
- 22% chose to increase the residential densities throughout Torrance

WORKSHOP 3: The consultant team provided a brief background and overview of the Housing Element project. The topics covered included summaries of the first and second Housing Element workshops, draft Housing Element, explanation of the RHNA, goals and programs, public outreach and the next steps. The Planning Commission was informed the Draft Housing Element had been submitted to HCD on October 15, 2021, after a 14-day public review period.

The Planning Commissioners posed a number of questions. One wondered why the RHNA was so high, and staff explained the process of developing the RHNA in the SCAG region. Another asked about the consequences of not having a certified Housing Element, and the consultant explained some potential consequences that could be imposed such as a moratorium on issuing building permits for up to a year, and the State withholding grant funding. The proposed number of ADU’s used to meet the RHNA was discussed as a strategy for including affordable housing in more affluent neighborhoods, as well as complying with new state law that allows Religious Institutions to build affordable housing on their sites. Another Commissioner had questions about planning for more than what is required, and staff explained that a buffer is needed in order to accommodate underdevelopment and to show the potential for compliance with the RHNA.

Staff explained the process moving forward, and told the Planning Commission that following HCD review, a letter outlining areas that would need to be revised would be sent from HCD to the City. A revised document would be prepared, and once the revisions are approved by HCD, the document is reviewed by the Commission and recommended for approval to the City Council, who does the final approval. The final document is then sent to HCD.

A member of the public shared concerns about direction to the City coming from an outside agency and about the lack of action on helping the homeless population. The speaker expressed appreciation for the City's efforts.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE – SEE APPENDIX A

1.6.6 2ND PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

The second public review draft of the Housing Element (dated May 9, 2022) was posted on the City's website on May 9, 2022. An email was sent to interested parties, including the website link. It also informed them of the May 18, 2022, Planning Commission hearing to consider the second public review draft (see Section 1.7). The information provided meets the 7-day timeframe specified in AB 215. The submittal date of the second public draft Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development was May 17, 2022. (Noticing is included in Appendix A)

1.6.7 ADOPTION HEARINGS

Planning Commission Consideration: The Planning Commission considered the draft Housing Element (the second public review draft dated May 9, 2022) on May 18, 2022. Notices of the Planning Commission public hearing were mailed to properties identified on the sites inventory and to organizations and individuals who requested such notice, or who have directly submitted correspondence to the City. A notice of public hearing was posted on the Public Notice Board at the City of Torrance, and legal advertisement was published in the local newspaper. Notices were also emailed to interested parties who have submitted an email address during the study. The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element. At the Planning Commission meeting of May 18, 2022, staff and the consultant team presented a summary of the Housing Element Update process, the contents of the document, and a summary of the revisions based on the comments from HCD. The Commission inquired about the hearing process, the notification efforts of the city, the relationship of the Housing Corridor Study to the Housing Element update as well as a clarification of the zoning updates that will be required subsequent to the update of the Housing Element. The hearing was opened for public comment, however no member of the public opted to speak. The City received four comment letters from members of the public, which are provided in Appendix A. A motion to adopt a resolution recommending that the City Council approve the Housing Element Update and Negative Declaration was approved by a vote of 5 to 2. The Community Development Director and the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council Adopt a Resolution to approve the Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21- 00003).

City Council Adoption: The City Council considered and adopted the draft Housing Element (the second public review draft dated May 9, 2022) on June 3, 2022. Notices of a public hearing scheduled for the City Council meeting of June 14, 2022, were mailed to properties identified on the sites

inventory and to organizations and individuals who requested such notice, or who have directly submitted correspondence to the City. A notice of public hearing was posted on the Public Notice Board at the City of Torrance, and legal advertisement was published in the local newspaper. Notices were also emailed to interested parties who have submitted an email address during the study. The City Council Resolution for adoption of the Housing Element duly authorizes the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from HCD to support state certification of the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The City received 3 letters regarding adoption of the Housing Element (see Appendix A). The City Council adopted the Resolution to approve the Housing Element by a vote of 6 to 1.

1.7 ACRONYMS USED

This element includes use of many acronyms to identify agencies, housing programs, funding sources, and planning terms. The most commonly used acronyms are:

ACS	American Community Survey
AMI	Area Median Income
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant
CHPC	California Housing Partnership Corporation
CHAS	Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy
DOF	State of California Department of Finance
HAMFI	HUD Area Median Family Income
HCD	State of California Department of Housing and Community Development
HUD	Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development
MFI	Median Family Income
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments

1.8 TERMS USED

By Right: For the purposes of this Housing Element, the term “by-right” means that the City review is ministerial and therefore must not require conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval.

2. COMMUNITY PROFILE

Introduction

Like many residents of communities throughout the South Bay and Southern California, Torrance residents face significant issues regarding housing availability and affordability. Key concerns are a high demand for housing and limited opportunities for new residential development. Being an older City in the midst of a well-established area, Torrance is virtually built out, with limited land available for future residential development. As a result, Torrance and many built-out communities in California have experienced a tight housing market for several years, with home prices skyrocketing and rents increasing dramatically. The City's reputation for quality schools and neighborhoods has contributed to the high demand and cost for housing in Torrance. Concerns about cost and availability are magnified for special needs groups such as seniors, large families, and disabled residents who face severe limitations in their ability to find decent housing due to physical or economic constraints.

The Community Profile presents information that forms the basis for the objectives, policies, and programs that seek to address housing needs. This section addresses population characteristics, employment patterns, and income levels. The information illustrates how Torrance has grown and changed and identifies patterns and trends that serve as the basis for defining the City's housing policies and programs. Projections are also provided to show how the community is expected to change over the next two decades. To provide a regional context, conditions in Torrance are compared with surrounding communities and Los Angeles County in general.

Data Sources

This section utilizes a variety of sources to compile the most updated data, to the extent feasible. Data sources include: Decennial Census; American Community Surveys (ACS); SCAG projections and forecasts; State Employment Development Department employment and wage data; State Department of Finance estimates; Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data on mortgage financing; and CoreLogic home sales data; among others. (Note: Because multiple sources were used to prepare the Community Profile, at times the data is not completely consistent.)

The ACS, the Census Bureau's annual sample survey, is designed to provide more detailed information about a community. Depending on the size of the community, ACS may collect annual estimates, three-year estimates, or five-year estimates. Given Torrance's population over 20,000, ACS surveys the city at least once every five years. The majority of variables used in this Housing Element are obtained from the 2014 – 2018 and 2014 – 2019 five-year estimates. Sources are denoted below each table.

2.1 POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Torrance's proximity to the coast, location near regional freeways, a desirable school system, and stable residential neighborhoods make the City an attractive destination for homebuyers and renters. As demand for housing grows in this built-out City, housing need must be met through Low/Moderate Housing Funds, infill development, and neighborhood revitalization. To clarify the type of housing that will be needed to meet future demand, Housing Element law requires an assessment of population and employment trends. Characteristics such as age, ethnicity, and employment influence the type

and cost of housing needed or in high demand in the City. Tracking demographic changes can also help the City better respond to or anticipate changing housing demand.

2.1.1 POPULATION GROWTH

Torrance was founded in 1912 and incorporated in 1921 with a population of 1,649. The City’s founders touted Torrance as “a balanced city,” with housing development occurring in tandem with industrial development so that employees could live close to work. Early residential development trends in Torrance generally followed the pattern of the greater Los Angeles regions, with the largest population surge occurring in the post-World War II years. Between 1950 and 1960, the population more than quadrupled and the housing stock grew by eightfold. During that time, housing production rates outpaced population growth because of a significant decrease in household size. In 2020, the California Department of Finance indicated that the City had reached a population of 145,546, with a higher percentage of women (51.2%) than men (48.8%). Between 2010 and 2020, Torrance’s population increased by just 108 persons, a .07 percent increase. This population change was the smallest of the surrounding communities although most of the surrounding communities show very modest growth rates over the past decade. The City of Los Angeles showed the highest growth rate at 5.7 percent, as shown on Table H-1.

Table H-1: Regional Population Growth

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	% Change 2000-2010	% Change 2010-2020
Torrance	137,946	145,438	145,546	5.4%	0.07%
Carson	89,730	91,714	93,108	2.2%	1.5%
Gardena	57,746	58,829	60,937	1.9%	3.6%
Hawthorne	84,112	84,293	86,903	0.2%	3.1%
Hermosa Beach	18,566	19,506	19,614	5.1%	0.6%
Los Angeles	3,694,820	3,792,621	4,010,684	2.6%	5.7%
Lomita	20,046	20,256	20,549	1.0%	1.4%
Manhattan Beach	33,852	35,135	35,250	3.8%	0.3%
Redondo Beach	63,261	66,748	66,994	5.5%	0.4%
Los Angeles County	9,519,338	9,848,605	10,014,009	3.5%	1.7%

Sources: U.S. Census 2000 and 2010. CA Department of Finance, 2020.

A look at historical growth rates demonstrates very slight growth over the past decade. Table H-2 shows the population increase for Torrance between 1980 and 2010 was 12 percent, while the population increase between 2010 and 2020 was just .07%. SCAG estimates that the population of Torrance will top 159,800 by the year 2040, however these estimates were based on a higher forecasted growth estimate for 2020 than what the actual count was from the 2020 Census, as reported below. No 2030 growth estimate is included in the most recent 2016 SCAG RTP forecast. Therefore, the 2040 estimate may be overstated. The COVID 19 pandemic may further affect SCAG’s growth forecast.

Table H-2: Population and Housing Growth 1940-2040

Year	Population		Housing Units	
	Number	% Growth from Previous Decade	Number	% Growth from Previous Decade
1940	9,950	--	2,313	--
1950	22,241	124%	3,457	49%
1960	100,991	354%	28,704	730%
1970	134,584	33%	45,293	58%
1980	129,881	-3%	50,982	13%
1990	133,107	2%	54,957	8%
2000	137,946	4%	55,967	2%
2010	145,138	5%	58,377	4%
2019	145,546	.07%	N/A	--
2040	159,800	N/A	N/A	--

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020; 2016 SCAG Adopted RTP Forecast

2.1.2 AGE CHARACTERISTICS

Population age distribution serves as an important indicator of housing needs, as housing needs and preferences change as an individuals or households grow older. Young families tend to focus more on cost and the ability to become first-time homebuyers. Cost and access to services are important to seniors because they may be on fixed incomes and have mobility limitations. Table H-3 shows the age distribution of Torrance residents. Currently, middle age (45-64 years) constitutes the largest age group, at 29 percent, followed by the young adults (25-44 years) group, at 26 percent. These numbers have stayed very consistent over the last decade. The share of the population of Torrance which is under 18 years of age is 20.9%, which is lower than the regional share of 23.4%. Torrance’s seniors (65 and above) make up 16.7% of the population, which is higher than the regional share of 13%. An aging population indicates that in the future, demand will be higher for smaller housing units and housing programs such as housing repair services for seniors.

Table H-3: Age Distribution

	2000		2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age group						
Preschool (0-4 years)	7,834	6%	7,520	5%	8,988	6.1%
School Age (5-17 years)	23,906	17%	24,311	17%	21,543	14.7%
College Age (18-24 years)	9,338	7%	10,875	7%	12,403	8.5%
Young Adult (25-44 years)	44,627	32%	38,296	26%	38,043	26%
Middle Age (45-64 years)	32,814	24%	42,710	29%	42,524	29%
Senior Adults (65+ years)	19,427	14%	21,726	15%	24,488	16.7%
Total	137,946	100%	145,438	100%	146,392	100%
Median Age	38.7		41.3		41.3	

Source: U.S. Census 2000, 2010 and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates

2.1.3 RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Table H-4 shows the racial/ethnic distribution of population in Torrance. The City has become more racially and ethnically diverse since 2000, a trend seen throughout California. In 2019, the most prevalent groups in the City were Whites at 38 percent, and Asian/Pacific Islanders at 37 percent. The third most prevalent group in the City is Hispanic at 18%.

Table H-4: Racial/Ethnic Groups

Racial/Ethnic Groups	2000		2010		2018	
	Torrance	LA County	Torrance	LA County	Torrance	LA County
White	52%	31%	42%	28%	38%	26%
Hispanic	13%	45%	16%	48%	18%	48%
Black	2%	9%	3%	8%	2%	8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	28%	12%	35%	14%	37%	15%
Other	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: ACS 2014 – 2018 5-year estimates

2.1.4 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Employment has an important impact on housing needs. Incomes associated with different jobs and the number of workers in a household determines the type and size of housing a household can afford. In some cases, the types of jobs themselves can affect housing needs and demand (such as in communities with colleges or military installations). Employment growth typically leads to strong housing demand, while the reverse is true when employment contracts.

Between 2010 and 2018, the three largest occupational categories for City residents were Education/Health/Social Services, Professional Services, and Manufacturing (Table H-5). These categories accounted for a large proportion of jobs (48%) held by Torrance residents.

Table H-6 displays mean annual wage data for occupations compiled by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) for the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Glendale Metropolitan Division in 2021. Building and maintenance, farming, fishing and forestry, and healthcare support occupations offer the lowest wages while management, legal, and computer and mathematical occupations offer the highest wages in the area. According to the ACS, between 2014 and 2018, approximately 15% of Torrance’s residents worked in the higher paying Professional Services occupations, and approximately 20% worked in the Education, Health and Social Service occupations which typically generate employment at the moderate income levels.

Close to 23% worked in the manufacturing and retail industries which generally provide jobs at the lower income scales as shown in Table H-6.

Table H-5: Employment characteristics 2010 - 2018

Industry	2006 – 2010 ACS City Employment	2014 – 2018 ACS City Employment
Agriculture, Mining	107	129
Construction	2,688	2,270
Manufacturing	11,566	9,638
Transportation and Warehousing	4,976	4,647
Wholesale Trade	3,661	2,722
Retail Trade	7,479	6,827
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	5,642	5,476
Professional Services	9,175	11,179
Education, Health and Social Services	13,926	14,359
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation	5,287	6,814
Other Services	3,249	3,520
Public Administration	2,470	2,314
Total	72,573	72,573

Sources: ACS 2006-2010, 2014-2018 5-year estimates

Table H-6: Mean Salary by Occupation – LA, Long Beach, Glendale Region (2021)

Occupations	Average Salary
Management	\$140,550
Legal	\$137,750
Computer and Mathematical	\$104,033
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	\$105,055
Architecture and Engineering	\$104,271
Business and Financial Operations	\$87,545
Education, Training, and Library	\$75,433
Construction and Extraction	\$64,680
Protective Service	\$67,082
Community and Social Service	\$64,145
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	\$60,025
Sales	\$51,016
Office and Administrative Support	\$48,540
Production	\$43,266
Transportation and Material Moving	\$45,165
Building, Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	\$40,499
Healthcare Support	\$36,196
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	\$37,535
Food Preparation and Serving Related	\$34,405
All Occupations	\$65,702

Source: California Employment Development Division, Occupational Wage Data, (1st Quarter 2021)

2.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

The Census defines a household as “all persons who occupy a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood and unrelated individuals living together.” Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories or other group living

situations are not considered households. Household type and size, income levels, the presence of special needs populations, and other household characteristics determine the type of housing needed by residents, their preferences, and their ability to obtain housing that meets their needs. This section details the various household characteristics affecting housing needs.

2.2.1 HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND SIZE

In 2018, there were 54,991 households in the City. As Table H-7 indicates, Torrance appears to be a stable family-oriented community, with two-thirds of all households classified as families. Regarding the percentage of family households, the City (68.4 percent) has a similar proportion compared to the County (66.7 percent), the State (68.3 percent), and the nation (66.4 percent). This proportion has remained relatively stable since 2000. However, the proportion of families with children has decreased significantly since 2000, whereas families with no children have increased substantially, possibly reflecting the city’s aging population where family members have left to form their own households.

Table H-7: Household Characteristics

Household Type	2000		2010		2018	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Total Households	54,542	100.0%	56,001	100.0%	54,991	100.0%
Families	36,276	66.5%	38,412	68.6%	37,638	68.4%
with children	18,253	33.5%	18,416	32.9%	16,133	29.3%
with no children	18,023	33.0%	19,996	35.7%	21,601	39.1%
Non-Families	18,266	33.5%	17,589	31.4%	17,353	31.6%
Singles	15,005	27.5%	14,472	25.8%	14,771	26.9%
Others	3,261	6.0%	3,117	5.6%	2,582	4.7%
Average Household Size	2.51		2.58		2.61	
Average Family Size	3.10		3.14		3.19	
Renter-Occupied	42.9%		43.5%		44.1%	
Owner-Occupied	54.6%		56.5%		55.9%	

Source: U.S. Census 2000, 2010, and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates

Household size and composition are often two interrelated factors. Communities with a large proportion of families with children tend to have a large average household size. In Torrance, however, the proportion of families with children has decreased while the average family size has slightly increased since 2000. The modest increase in family size may be correlated to an increase in the proportion of families with extended family members sharing the home and is balanced by the increase in the senior population, who tend to have a smaller average family size.

Since 2000, renter-occupied households have increased. Owner-occupied households increased slightly between 2000 and 2010, and then decreased slightly between 2010 and 2019.

2.2.2 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Household income is an indication of wealth in a community and therefore is directly connected to the ability to afford housing. As household income increases, the more likely that household is a homeowner. As household income decreases, households tend to pay a disproportionate amount of

their income for housing and the number of households occupying unsound and overcrowded housing increases.


The median household income in Torrance is \$94,492 according to ACS 2014-2019 5-year estimates. significantly higher than the median household income for Los Angeles County (\$68,044). Table H-8 shows that overall, 47% of the households in Torrance earn over \$100,000 annually, and approximately 26% of households earn less than \$50,000 per year. When compared to nearby communities, median household income in Torrance is higher than nearby Carson and Gardena, and considerably lower than the adjacent communities of Redondo Beach and Rolling Hills Estates as shown on Table H-9.

Table H-8: Torrance Household Income

Income Range	2019	
	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000	2,141	3.9
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,314	2.4
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2,979	5.5
\$25,000 to \$34,999	2,954	5.4
\$35,000 to \$49,999	5,088	9.3
\$50,000 to \$74,999	7,551	13.9
\$75,000 to \$99,999	6,965	12.8
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11,047	20.3
\$150,000 to \$199,999	5,956	10.9
\$200,000 or more	8,442	15.5
Total	54,437	100.0
Median Income	\$94,492	

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Table H-9: Median Income Household Comparison



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

2.2.3 HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME GROUP

For purposes of the Housing Element, the State of California has established five income groups based on income limits provided by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The established standard income groups are generally defined as follows:

- Extremely low income: **households earning 0 to 30 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) of the County of Los Angeles;**
- Very low income: **households earning between 30 and 50 percent of the AMI;**
- Low income: **households earning between 50 percent and 80 percent of the AMI;**
- Moderate income: **households earning between 80 percent and 120 percent of the AMI; and**
- Above moderate income: **households earning over 120 percent of the AMI.**

For a household of four in Los Angeles County, the AMI for 2020 was \$77,300. Table H-10 is based on the estimated household income for Torrance for 2013-2017. The proportions of extremely low, very low, and low income groups comprised approximately 50 percent of city households. Approximately 50 percent of households in the city are classified as moderate or above moderate income.

Table H-10: Households by Income Groups

Income Group	% of County Median	Income Range (\$) ¹	% of Households ²
Extremely low	0–30	\$23,700-\$36,550	12%
Very low	30–50	\$39,450-\$60,850	21%
Low	50–80	\$63,100-\$97,350	17%
Moderate	80–120	\$64,900-\$100,150	17%
Above moderate	>120		33%

Notes:

1. Income range based on 1 to 5 person households for 2020.
2. Income distribution is based on SCAG RHNA Methodology (2013-2017 ACS) data.

Sources: SCAG RHNA Methodology, 2020; HCD Income Limits - Los Angeles County, 2020, SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.3 HOUSING PROBLEMS

2.3.1 OVERCROWDING

Overcrowding is defined by state law as having more than one person per room in a single housing unit. Generally, a room is defined as a living room, dining room, bedroom, or finished recreation room; bathrooms and kitchens are not considered. In Torrance, 529 owner-occupied and 2,639 renter-occupied households had more than 1.0 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for overcrowding. Eighty-one owner-occupied households and 712 renter-occupied households had more than 1.5 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for severe overcrowding (Table H-11).

Table H-11: Overcrowded Households

Persons per Room	Renter-Households	Owner-Households	Total Households
1.01-1.50	2,639	529	3,136
1.51+	712	81	793
Total Households	3,351	612	3,929

Source: ACS 2014-2018 estimates, SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.3.2 COST BURDEN

Measuring the portion of a household’s gross income that is spent for housing is an indicator of the dynamics of demand and supply. This measurement is often expressed in terms of “overpayers”: households paying an excessive amount of their income for housing, therefore decreasing the amount of disposable income available for other needs. This indicator is an important measurement of local housing market conditions as it reflects the affordability of housing in the community. Federal and state agencies use cost burden/overpayment indicators to determine the extent and level of funding and support that should be allocated to a community.

State and federal programs typically define overpayers as those paying over 30 percent of household income for housing costs. For this evaluation, household income is based on HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI), which is estimated annually for each metropolitan area using data from the American Community Survey (Median Family Income in the Past 12 Months). A household is considered to be experiencing a cost burden if it spends more than 30 percent of its gross income on housing and experiencing a severe cost burden if it spends more than 50 percent of its gross income on housing.

Table H-12 shows that over 20,000 households, (37.5 percent) of Torrance households were overpaying for housing during the period 2012-2016. The number of households overpaying was significantly higher for lower-income households compared to those with higher incomes. Nearly 82 percent of households in the lowest income category (0-30 percent of HAMFI), representing 4,709 households were overpaying for housing, compared to less than 15 percent of households in the highest income category (over 100 percent of HAMFI), or 4,279 households.

Table H-12: Cost Burden

Household Income	Households by Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost:		
	<30%	30-50%	>50%
0-30% HAMFI	995	629	4080
30-50% HAMFI	1,765	1,845	2,985
50-80% HAMFI	3,340	3,360	1,275
80-100% HAMFI	3,290	1,570	399
>100% HAMFI	24,585	3,909	370
Total households	33,975	11,313	9,109

Source: HUD CHAS Data (2012-2016), SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

HAMFI = HUD Area Median Family Income.

Cost Burden = Paying over 30% of HH income in housing costs

While the previous table breaks down cost burden by area-relative income, the ACS also allows for the analysis of Torrance’s 23,049 renter households (for which income data are available) by spending on rent by income bracket (dollar amounts). As one might expect, Table H-13 shows the general trend is that low-income households spend a higher share of income on housing (e.g., over 50%) while high-income households are more likely to spend under 20% of income on housing.

Table H-13: Spending on Rent by Income (Number of Renter Households)

Income Category	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$100,000 or more
>50%	2,202	1,955	1,099	264	39	9
30-49%	274	771	1,308	2,439	570	392
20-29%	133	84	379	1,408	1,774	2,338
<20%	0	59	9	240	900	4,403

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates, SCAG Pre-certified data, April 2021.

Mortgage-holding households in Torrance can be broken down by income and the percentage of income spent on mortgage costs. As one might expect, the general trend is that lower-income households spend a higher share of income on housing costs, while high-income households may spend a lower share of income on housing. The income category most prevalent amongst Torrance mortgage-holding households is \$75,000 or more (15,888 households) and the most prevalent share of income spent on mortgage costs is over 30% (7439 households), as shown on Table H-14.

Table H-14: Costs for Mortgage Holders by Income

Percent of income spent on mortgage costs	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 or more
Over 30%	619	668	935	1,310	3,907
20-29%	7	13	58	280	5,722
Under 20%	0	0	20	136	6,259

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

2.4 SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

Certain segments of the population require special needs for housing. These special needs groups include seniors, disabled, female-headed households with children, large households, farmworkers, persons living in poverty (extremely low income households), and people experiencing homelessness. Often, these are low income households who have limited access to housing choices.

The City of Torrance has three City Commissions and Councils comprised of residents dedicated to advising the City Council on issues related to special needs groups in the City. The Commission on Aging deals with the needs and issues confronting senior citizens in the community and provides a voice for senior citizens as a community group. The Social Services Commission addresses issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities, and children with special needs. The Youth Council advises the City Council on matters pertaining to youth in the City.

Table H-15 shows the presence of special needs populations in Torrance. Senior-headed households (28%) were the largest special needs group in the City, followed by persons aged 65 and older (17%) and persons with disabilities (8.5%). The specifics of special needs groups will be explored in the following discussions.

Table H-15: Special Needs Populations

Special Needs Group	# of Persons or Households	# of Owners	# of Renters	% of Total Households or Persons
Persons 65+	24,488	–	–	17
Senior-headed households	15,480	10,900 (70%)	4,580 (30%)	28
Seniors living alone	6,088	4,301 (71%)	1,787 (29%)	11
Persons with Disabilities	12,307	–	–	8.5
Large households (7+)	317	211 (66%)	109 (34%)	.6
Female-headed households with children	2,207	--	--	4
Farmworkers	7	--	--	0
Extremely-low income households	6,390	2250 (7%)	4140 (17%)	11.6
People experiencing homelessness	225	--	--	.15

Sources: American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates, SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

2.4.1 SENIORS

Seniors often age in place, which can result in many seniors living in housing that is too expensive for their fixed incomes or that structurally does not accommodate their specific needs for assistance. Even though seniors may have difficulty living in their own homes, oftentimes they do not have the option or mobility afforded to other segments of the population to relocate to a more suitable housing arrangement. They commonly have to leave their home community and relocate away from family and friends to find a suitable unit. The purpose of this section is to determine the housing needs of the senior community, which is defined as persons aged 65 or over.

As shown in Table H-16, 21,726 seniors resided in Torrance in 2010, representing 14.9 percent of the total population. As of 2018, the senior population had risen to 24,488 persons or 17 percent of the total population.

Table H-16: Senior Population

Year	Number of Seniors	Change	% Change	Average Annual % Change
2010	21,726			
2019	24,488	2,762	11.3	1.4

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2010 and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Table H-17 shows the number of homes within the City that were occupied by seniors. The 2010 Census estimates that 16,490 households in the city were occupied by seniors and that number grew to 18,238 in 2018, almost a 10% change. In 2010, there were 4,871 seniors living alone; by 2018, that number rose to 6,088 seniors. These trends indicate a need for more of a variety of housing options for seniors in the community.

Table H-17: Senior Household Trends

Year	Number of Senior Occupied Homes	Change	% Change
2010	16,490		
2019	18,238	1748	9.6

Sources: 2010 ACS, and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Table H-18 relies on federal housing data which define a household type as “elderly family” if it consists of two persons with either or both age 62 and over. As shown in Table H-18, approximately 30 percent of seniors in the city were renters in 2016. Senior homeowners are considerably more prevalent in Torrance than senior renters. Senior homeowners represented 70 percent of all senior households in 2019. Of Torrance’s 15,480 senior households, 20.1% earn less than 30% of the surrounding area income, (compared to 24.2% in the SCAG region), 38.2% earn less than 50% of the surrounding area income (compared to 30.9% in the SCAG region).

Table H-18: Senior Households by Income and Tenure

Income Category, relative to surrounding area:	Owner	Renter	Total	Percent of Total Elderly Households
<30% HAMFI	1,595	1,515	3,110	20.1%
30-50% HAMFI	1,785	1,020	2,805	18.1%
50-80% HAMFI	1,845	590	2,435	15.7%
80-100% HAMFI	1,045	345	1,390	9.0%
100% HAMFI	4,630	1,110	5,740	37.1%
Total	10,900	4,580	15,480	100%

Source: HUD CHAS, 2012 – 2016. HAMFI refers to Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income. SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, April 2021.

2.4.2 PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Persons with disabilities include those who are physically, mentally, and/or developmentally disabled. Each type is unique and requires specific attention in terms of access to housing, employment, social services, and medical services. Both physical and mental disabilities can hinder access to traditional housing facilities and the ability to earn adequate income. Disabled individuals have particular housing needs in terms of location and design requirements. For example, physically disabled individuals may require special housing design features, such as wheelchair ramps, holding bars, special bathroom designs, wider rooms, and other features. Similar to older adults, persons with disabilities also have special housing needs in terms of location, and often need to be located near public facilities and alternative transportation services.

The ACS estimates that 27,897 residents (19.2 percent of the population) in Torrance had one or more disabilities in 2019. The majority of the city’s disabled population is comprised of seniors with hearing, ambulatory and independent living difficulties (Table H-19).

Table H-19: Disability Status

Type of Disability	Population with Disabilities			
	Age 5-17	Age 18-64	Age 65+	Total %
Hearing	33	1,121	3,147	15.4
Vision	96	747	1,156	7.2
Cognitive	598	2,357	1,790	17.0
Ambulatory	111	2,329	4,331	24.3
Self-Care	250	886	1,969	11.1
Independent Living	0	2,224	3,664	21.1
Total Disabled Persons	1,088	10,752	16,057	27,897

Note: A person can have multiple disabilities.

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Four factors – affordability, design, location, and discrimination – significantly limit the supply of housing available to households of persons with disabilities. The most obvious housing need for persons with disabilities is housing that is adapted to their needs. Most single-family homes are inaccessible to people with mobility and sensory limitations. Housing may not be adaptable to widened doorways and hallways, access ramps, larger bathrooms, lowered countertops, and other features commonly necessary for accessibility. Location of housing is also an important factor for many persons with disabilities, as they often rely upon public transportation to travel to necessary services and shops. “Barrier free” housing, accessibility modifications, proximity to services and transit, and group living opportunities are important in serving this group. Incorporating barrier-free design in new multi-family housing is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for the disabled. Housing that applies universal design principles is considered barrier free and accessible to persons of a wide range of abilities/disabilities.

State and federal legislation mandate that a specified portion of units in new or rehabilitated multi-family apartment complexes be accessible to individuals with limited mobility.¹ The City also allows residential retrofitting to increase the suitability of homes for persons with disabilities in compliance with accessibility requirements. The City works with applicants who need special accommodations in their homes to ensure that application of zoning and building code requirements does not create a constraint. In 2014, the City adopted a formal procedure for review and approval of reasonable accommodation requests (Ordinance 419 § 39). Program 15 in this Housing Element (Chapter 5) would strengthen and codify the City’s Reasonable Accommodation process.

2.4.2.1 Persons with Developmental Disabilities

A recent change in state law requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. As defined by state law, “developmental disability” means a severe, chronic disability of an individual that:

- is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- is likely to continue indefinitely;
- results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: self-care; receptive and expressive language; learning; mobility; self-direction; capacity for independent living; or economic self-sufficiency; and
- reflects the individual’s need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

In Torrance, there are 1,926 people with developmental disabilities according to the California Department of Developmental Services. This represents about 1% of the total population of the City and is about evenly split between adults and children. Table H-20 shows the number of persons with developmental disabilities by age and zip code where they reside within the City.

¹The State of California regulates accessibility through Title 24 of the California Building Standards Code and federal Americans with Disabilities Act mandate residential accessibility requirements.

Table H-20: Persons with Developmental Disability by Age and Zip Code

Zip code	Age		Total all ages
	0-17 years	18+	
90501	284	254	538
90502	97	95	192
90503	239	172	411
90504	200	224	424
90505	208	153	361
Total	1,028	898	1926

Source: CA Department of Developmental Services

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals often require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because many developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person’s living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

2.4.3 LARGE HOUSEHOLDS

Large households are defined as households consisting of five or more persons. Generally speaking, the needs of large households are not targeted in the housing market, especially in the multi-family housing market. As shown in Table H-21, approximately 7 percent or 3,808 households in Torrance met the definition of large households. Homeowners comprised 55 percent of the large households in the city, while 45 percent are renters. The city has a substantial number of large homes which could accommodate the needs of large households, but it is not known if large households occupy these homes. The County had a larger percentage of large households at 14 percent.

Table H-21: Household Size by Tenure

Household Size (Persons)	Owner	Renter	Total	Percentage
1	6,124	7,763	13,887	25.5
2	10,435	6,313	16,748	30.8
3	5,959	4,966	10,925	20.1
4	3,532	5,460	8,992	16.5
5	1,412	1,116	2,528	4.6
6	462	501	963	1.8
7 +	211	106	317	0.6
Total	28,135	26,225	54,360	100.0

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates.

2.4.4 SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

Single-parent households, particularly female-headed families with children, often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. Female-headed families with children are a particularly vulnerable group because they must balance the needs of their children with work responsibilities, often while earning limited incomes.

As shown in Table H-22, a significant portion of single-parent households had a female as the head of the household. The 2010 Census counted 17,256 family households with children under 18 years of age in Torrance. Of these households, 3,521 or about 20 percent were headed by a single adult, with the majority being headed by females. In 2019 the number of households with children under 18 years of age decreased slightly to 16,117. Of the households headed by a single adult, the majority continued to be headed by females.

In Torrance, 811 (14%) of the female-headed households were living in poverty. In addition, 437 (19.8%) of the female-headed families with children were living in poverty. The City’s Parks and Recreation Department offers low-cost after-school and before-school childcare at many of the elementary and middle schools.

Table H-22: Households with Children

Household Type	2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Married couple households	29,754	53.1	29,739	54.7
With children under 18 years old	13,735	46.2	13,106	44
With no children	16,019	53.8	16,633	56
Female householder*	6,148	11	5,689	10.5
With children under 18 years old	2,621	42.6	2,207	38.8
With no children	3,527	57.4	3,482	61.2
Male householder*	2,510	4.5	2,543	4.7
With children under 18 years old	900	35.8	804	31.6
With no children	1,610	64.1	1,739	68.4
Non-family households	17,589	31.4	16,389	30.1
Total Households	56,001	100.0	54,360	100.0

*No spouse present

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates. SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.4.5 FARMWORKERS

Farmworkers are defined by the Census as “agricultural workers and their supervisors” and represent a very small percentage of the City’s total population. According to the SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021, 149 persons in the City of Torrance were employed in the agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining industry, and 7 persons reported their occupation as farmworker. The Torrance farmworker population accounts for 0.2% of the total employment in the City. The total number of farmworkers for LA County is 3266, according to the 2017 Census of Agriculture, 2017. Farmworkers

generally receive much lower wages than other local occupations. According to the State Employment Development Department, farm workers earned an average annual salary of \$37,535 (Table H-5).² These wages severely limit housing options for farmworkers in Southern California’s expensive housing market. Overcrowding and substandard housing conditions are often the only option.

The USDA Census of Agriculture, 2017, documents the labor arrangements between farmworkers and producers, providing insight into their uncertain working conditions. As shown on Table H-23, only 54% of farmworkers reported working over 150 days, or roughly 5 months. Approximately 12% were migrant workers, and 25% were unpaid workers.

Table H-23: Permanent and Seasonal Farmworkers for LA County

	Total	Percentage
Farm workers	3266	--
Farm workers by days worked:		
• over 150 days	1749	54%
• less than 150 days	1517	46%
Migrant workers	395	12%
Unpaid workers	822	25%

Source: 2017 Census of Agriculture, USDA.

2.4.6 HOUSING NEEDS OF EXTREMELY-LOW INCOME (ELI) HOUSEHOLDS

Housing the extremely low-income population (below 30% of area median income) can be especially challenging, as this is below the poverty level. HUD’s CHAS dataset provides a wealth of information on such households in Torrance. Table H-24 below provides a breakdown of extremely-low income households by race and ethnicity. The race/ethnicity with the highest share of extremely-low income households in Torrance is Black, non-Hispanic (19.4% compared to 11.6% of total population). In the SCAG region, the highest share of extremely-low income households is Black, non-Hispanic (27.1% compared to 17.7% of total households).

Table H-24: Extremely-low Income Housing Needs

	Total Households	Households below 30% HAMFI	Share below 30% HAMFI
White, non-Hispanic	26,745	3,175	11.9%
Black, non-Hispanic	1,520	295	19.4%
Asian and other, non-Hispanic	19,467	2,090	10.7%
Hispanic	7,375	825	11.2%
TOTAL	55,107	6385	11.6%
Renter-occupied	24,785	4,140	16.7%
Owner-occupied	30,330	2,250	7.4%
TOTAL	55,115	6,390	11.6%

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

² California Employment Development Department, Occupational Wage Data (1st Quarter, 2019).

Very few housing units are available to persons and households in the extremely low-income category. Families with incomes below the poverty level, typically with very low and extremely low incomes, are at the greatest risk of becoming homeless and typically require special programs to assist them in meeting their rent and mortgage obligations so as not to become homeless. Table H-24 shows that close to 12%, or 6,390 households in Torrance are living in poverty. These households need assistance with housing subsidies, utility and other living expense subsidies, and other supportive services.

Persons living with incomes below the poverty level can benefit from City programs and services that provide assistance to lower income households in general, such as the Housing Choice Voucher Program, which offers rental assistance to residents. Table H-25 lists various assistance services for households living in poverty.

Table H-25: Resources for Special Needs Groups

Special Needs Group	Program	Description
Female Headed Household and Large Households	Federal Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic
	South Bay Youth Project	Counseling, parenting classes, youth activities
Households in Poverty	Torrance 1st Baptist Church	Hot meal served on the first Saturday of each month from 11am-1pm. (During COVID it is sack lunches to go)
	Torrance YMCA Senior Center	Nutritious lunch M-F, at 12 noon for seniors 60 and older. No membership required for lunch.
	Walteria United Methodist Church	Full hot meals served the 2 nd Saturday for each month from 11am-1pm for the needy and homeless.
	St. Andrews Episcopal Church	Hot meals served the 3 rd Saturday of the month. No charge for meals.
	St. Catherine Laboure Catholic Church	Food distribution for the needy on the last Saturday of the month, 11am-1pm
	Meals on Wheels	One hot meal provided per person.
	First United Methodist Church of Torrance	Hot meals served the 4 th Saturday of the month at 11am.
	Harbor Gateway South Neighborhood Council	Provides food items for families on the 2 nd and 4 th Tuesday of every month at 9:30am or until the food runs out.
	Harbor Gateway/Torrance Outreach	Provides food items for homeless persons over 18 and low-income families on the 2 nd and 4 th Tuesday and the last Saturday of the month at 9:30am.
	Bartlett Senior Citizens Center	Hot lunch (\$2.50) for adults 50 years and older, M-F at 11:30am.
	New Challenge Ministries Torrance	Program to serve the community and those in need. Food offered varies from day-to-day, but usually includes milk, eggs, cheese, bread, vegetables, fruits, and/or juices.
	Coast Christian Fellowship	Partner with the LA Food Bank to give out free groceries to those in need.

Households in Poverty, Disabled Persons and the Elderly	City of Torrance Section 8	Housing assistance payments on behalf of eligible elderly and low income families, and disabled persons
Disabled Persons	Access Services	Transportation service throughout Los Angeles County for individuals with disabilities
	Harbor Regional Center – Torrance	Private, non-profit corporation benefitting individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by providing diagnosis and evaluation, information and referral, individual or family service planning, family support and assistance in finding and using community resources.
	Social Vocational Services – Torrance	Adult day programs, supported employment, residential assistance, transportation, and financial management services for adults with developmental disabilities.
	Disabled American Veterans of Los Angeles	A non-profit organization that provides lifetime support for veterans and their families, including transportation to medical appointments, assistance with benefits claims, connection to meaningful employment, and other resources related to veterans and their families.
	Village for Vets	Fills critical gaps in key services for homeless and at-risk veterans in greater Los Angeles. Through programs providing meals, emergency grants, support for basic needs, social support, and links to additional services. Helps ensure Los Angeles’ homeless and at-risk veterans do not fall through the cracks.
Elderly and Disabled Persons	Home Improvement Program (HIP) - Torrance	Free program in which Disabled Individuals and Senior Citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include: Disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, year services, paint and minor repairs.
	Torrance Community Transit Program (TCTP) – Torrance	A transportation assistance program for residents of the City of Torrance. TCTP includes both the Senior and Dial-a-Taxi

		Swipe Card programs. TCTP enables low-income seniors and those with disabilities to purchase credits for taxi rides at a discounted personal cost.
--	--	--

Source: City of Torrance, 2022

2.4.7 EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

The category “extremely low-income households” is a subset of “very low-income households,” and is defined as 30 percent (or less) of the area median income. The housing element must quantify existing and projected extremely low-income households, analyse their housing needs, and assess the kind of housing available and suitable for extremely low-income households.

Table HE-26 below identifies 5,490 households in Torrance that are considered extremely low-income households, or approximately 10% of all the households in the city. Of the 5,490 ELI households, 3,505 are renter-occupied, and 1,985 are owner-occupied. Table HE-26 provides information on housing problems by income level for various categories of households in Torrance. These problems include:

- Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom);
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room);
- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30 percent of gross income; or
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50 percent of gross income.

The types of problems experienced by different households vary by income level and tenure. Renters generally experience housing problems at a higher rate than owners, with about 53% of all renter households experiencing a housing problem compared to 29% of owner households. Renters also experience a cost burden more than owners (45% compared to 28%).

Although extremely low-income households do have higher rates of housing problems than households in the city overall, both very low income and low-income renter households experience higher rates of housing problems than extremely low-income households. Similarly, the percentage of households with a housing cost burden is higher for very low- and low-income renter households than for extremely low-income renter households. For owner households, the percentage of households with any housing problem, including any housing cost burden, decreases as income level increases.

Table H-26. Extremely Low Income Housing Needs

Household by Tenure, Income, and Housing Problem	Total Renters	Total Owners	Total Households
Extremely Low Income (0-30%AMI)	3,505	1,985	5,490
% with any housing problem	75%	79%	76%
% with cost burden >30%	74%	78%	76%
% with cost burden > 50%	68%	65%	67%
Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)	3,275	2,025	5,300
% with any housing problem	93%	53%	78%
% with cost burden >30%	90%	53%	76%
% with cost burden > 50%	66%	34%	54%
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	4,555	3,130	7,685
% with any housing problem	83%	46%	68%
% with cost burden >30%	76%	45%	64%
% with cost burden > 50%	18%	25%	21%
Moderate/Upper Income (>80% AMI)	12,960	22,925	35,885
% with any housing problem	27%	20%	23%
% with cost burden >30%	14%	19%	17%
% with cost burden > 50%	1%	3%	2%
Total Households	24,295	30,065	54,360
% with any housing problem	53%	29%	40%
% with cost burden >30%	45%	28%	35%
% with cost burden > 50%	22%	12%	17%

Source: CHAS data book (2014-2018)

2.4.8 HOMELESS

Factors contributing to the rise in persons experiencing homelessness include high rates of unemployment and underemployment, a lack of housing affordable to low and moderate income persons, increases in the number of persons whose incomes fall below the poverty level, reductions in public subsidies to the poor, and the de-institutionalization of the mentally ill. Homelessness has long been an issue in Los Angeles County, reflecting high costs of housing in the region. Along with cuts in public funding, lasting impacts of the Great Recession, and recent economic and social impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, local communities are increasingly strained in their limited resources to provide assistance to the persons experiencing homelessness.

Section 65583(1)(7) mandates that municipalities address the special needs of persons experiencing homelessness within their jurisdictional boundaries. “Homelessness” as defined by HUD, describes:


- Individuals/families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, including:
 - Place not meant for human habitation;
 - Living in a shelter; or

- Exiting an institution.
- Individuals/families who will imminently (within 14 days) lose their primary nighttime residence.
- Unaccompanied youth (under 25 years of age) or families with children/youth.
- Individuals/families fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence.

This definition does not include persons living in substandard housing (unless it has been officially condemned); persons living in overcrowded housing (for example, doubled up with others); persons being discharged from mental health facilities (unless the person was experiencing homelessness when entering and is considered to be homeless at discharge); or persons who may be at risk of experiencing homelessness (for example, living temporarily with family or friends). Torrance Unified School District representatives reported during a Housing Element focus group session they are aware of a number of students experiencing homelessness who live temporarily with family or friends.

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is a Joint Powers Authority established in 1993 as an independent agency by the County and the City of Los Angeles. As the lead agency in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care, LAHSA coordinates and manages federal, state, County, and city funds for homeless services across Los Angeles County. LAHSA also performs policy and planning research and analysis, with the goal of supporting, creating, and sustaining solutions to homelessness. As shown in Figure H-1, in January 2020, LAHSA conducted the annual Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. The count showed that there were 332 people experiencing homelessness in Torrance, a 308% increase from the 2015 count of 77. The 2021 count was canceled due to the COVID-19 pandemic, complicating efforts to keep pace with this issue. The 2022 count was held in February 2022, however the results have not yet been released.

Figure H-1: Torrance Homeless Count 2020
2020 HOMELESS COUNT BY COMMUNITY/CITY



The City of Torrance is located in the County of Los Angeles Public Health Department Service Planning Area 8 (SPA-8). While there are many service providers in the Torrance area addressing homeless issues, the City promotes a focused Coordinated Entry System (CES) approach, to help file everyone through the same starting point, so that professionals can link those in need to the appropriate service providers and resources.

Two dedicated outreach staff for those experiencing homelessness are currently working in Torrance. One is a City employee, and the other is funded by a non-profit who provides services for those experiencing homelessness.

In June of 2021, the City approved the first homeless shelter of its own, a temporary community of 40 tiny homes to be placed in the parking lot to the rear of the Torrance Superior Courthouse, according to the Torrance Daily Breeze. This was in response to the rapidly growing population of persons experiencing homelessness in Torrance. The goal of temporary housing is for individuals experiencing homelessness to have housing stability for a short term, while they work with Housing Navigators (professional trained case managers) to attain permanent housing. Stays at the temporary housing units are typically three to six months, and in some cases, can be longer, depending on the needs of the individual. The projected shelter beds are equipped with heating, air conditioning and power. Separate showers and bathrooms will also be located on site. The shelter will be staffed 24 hours per day by caseworkers and security. The shelter is expected to be constructed when funding becomes available, anticipated in early 2022.

At the same City Council meeting, Torrance also passed a comprehensive homeless plan directive, and an amendment to the City's anti-camping law that would allow police to write citations and possibly arrest people for camping on city sidewalks and parks if shelter beds in the City were available. The idea behind the anti-camping laws is to encourage a person experiencing homelessness to seek help through an outreach worker, a process that often takes up to 10 encounters before the person is receptive, according to caseworkers.

According to the Torrance Municipal Code, emergency shelters are permitted in the M-2 Heavy Manufacturing Zone. As stated previously, Torrance approved the temporary homeless shelter on public land in the City Hall complex as a critically needed measure; however, the City plans to continue to search for a site within the M-2 zone where the use is allowed, should such a site become available.

At the January 25, 2022, City Council meeting, the City awarded a product and services agreement to Pallet SPC for the purchase and assembly of the temporary housing units and accessory units at 3290 Civic Center Drive. In July 2022, the City opened the tiny home village to temporarily shelter people experiencing homelessness until they can be connected to a home of their own. Called 3290 Temporary Housing Village at Civic Center Drive, the project is the result of close collaboration among Los Angeles County [Supervisor Janice Hahn](#) and the [City of Torrance](#), as well as the Los Angeles County [Homeless Initiative](#), [South Bay Cities Council of Governments](#), and [Harbor Interfaith Services](#). The goal of the Village is to provide housing stability and support services with long-term goals of assisting residents attain permanent housing.

Built by Pallet, the tiny home village includes 40 individual living units, each encompassing 64 square feet of living space, air conditioning, power, and other basic necessities. Residents will also have access to restrooms, laundry facilities and daily meals, along with wraparound services in the form of case management and housing navigation.



Photo Credit: Los Angeles County Newsroom

Harbor Interfaith Services, a nonprofit homeless services provider based in the South Bay, will operate the site. Its professionally trained staff will develop a housing plan for each client with the goal of finding them a more permanent housing solution. Some of the support offered to clients at the tiny home village will range from life and job skills training to substance use disorder treatment and healthcare services, in partnership with the [Venice Family Clinic](#).

Torrance's Homeless Plan was made available on the City's website on July 12, 2021. The plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to the community. As the City's initial homeless response guiding document, it outlines a prudent number of approaches that can be developed and achieved over the next three years, with regular check points to evaluate effectiveness, to keep the plan fresh in the dynamic environment of homeless services in Los Angeles County.

Program 11 demonstrates the City’s commitment to maintain an emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law. Table H-27 provides an inventory of services and facilities located in the area.

Table H-27: Inventory of Homeless Services and Facilities

Name	Services	Location
Los Angeles Homeless Outreach Portal (LA-HOP)	LA-HOP is designed to assist people experiencing homelessness in LA County with outreach services.	http://la-hop.org
1736 Family Crisis Center	Emergency Youth Shelter, Domestic Violence Shelter Program, and Community Service Center Program offering comprehensive services to community members in crisis.	21707 Hawthorne Blvd., Suite 300, Torrance, CA 90018
City of Torrance Homeless Shelter	New temporary 40-unit tiny home community to include showers, bathrooms, caseworkers, and security. Construction expected in early 2022.	Torrance Superior Court Parking Lot
Torrance Community Service Center	City’s Outreach Coordinator (connected to Harbor Interfaith Shelter) works with unsheltered residents seeking services to determine need and provide referrals.	Torrance City Hall, 3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503
Salvation Army "His House Family Services"	Social service ministry that provides brown bag lunches, homeless meals, groceries, rental assistance, clothing vouchers, and referrals to shelters.	20830 S. Vermont Ave. Torrance, CA 90502
Torrance Unified School District -- Foster Youth and Homeless Liaison	Operates McKinney Vento support services that ensure that homeless children and youth have the same access to the same educational experience and resources as all students.	enrollment@tusd.org
Community’s Child	Social service organization committed to offering women and their infants with healthy alternatives by providing safe living environments, training and education to end poverty, neglect, abuse, additions and hopelessness.	25520 Woodward Ave., Lomita, CA 90717 www.communityschild.org
Harbor Interfaith Shelter	Provides support services including shelter, transitional housing, food, job placement, advocacy, childcare, education, and life skills training to the homeless and working poor.	670 W. 9th St., San Pedro, CA 90731
Operation Healthy Homecoming, MHA of Los Angeles	Serves veteran families who are homeless or at risk of being homeless due to unstable housing situations or severe financial difficulties.	https://www.mhaohh.org/
Habitat for Humanity of Greater Los Angeles	Strives to eliminate substandard housing through advocacy, education and partnership with families and individuals in need to build decent, sustainable, and affordable housing.	18,600 Crenshaw Blvd., Torrance, CA 90504
Doors of Hope Women’s Shelter	Provide services to homeless women in the South Bay providing food, clothing, temporary shelter, and spiritual encouragement.	529 Broad Ave, Wilmington, CA 90744
Beacon Light Mission	Provide services to homeless men in the South Bay providing food, clothing, temporary shelter, and spiritual encouragement.	525 Broad Ave., Wilmington, CA 90744
Catholic Charities: 1. Elizabeth Ann Seton Residence	Offers emergency shelter to families, pregnant women, the disabled, and the elderly who are homeless.	Long Beach, Pico Rivera, Wilmington

2. Project Achieve

Gratitude Retreat	Provides funds to qualified applicants for the first few months of residency in sober living for a more permanent solution to homelessness.	Confidential location
Family Promise of the South Bay	Community-based approach to solving homelessness. Families receive resources, support, and training.	2930 El Dorado Street, Torrance, 90503
Rainbow Services	Serves individuals and families who are experiencing violence in their homes, or who face homelessness due to domestic violence with transitional shelter, emergency shelter, supportive services, legal services, and counseling.	453 W. 7 th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90731

Source: City of Torrance, CityPlace Planning, Inc., 2021.

2.5 HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

The characteristics of the housing stock, including growth, type, age and condition, tenure, vacancy rates, housing costs, and affordability are important in determining the housing needs for the community. This section details the housing stock characteristics of Torrance to identify how well the current housing stock meets the needs of current and future residents of the city.

2.5.1 HOUSING GROWTH

Torrance experienced very modest housing growth between 2010 and 2021 (Table H-28). The housing stock increased by 231 units, from 58,377 to 58,608, representing an increase of .4 percent. This slight increase in the housing stock was in contrast to the 4.7 percent increase experienced by the County, but was comparable to the other nearby cities of Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach, where the increase in number of units was also 1 percent or less. Carson, Gardena, and Hawthorne each experienced small increases in the number of housing units in the same time period. Torrance has very little remaining vacant land for development, and the majority of vacant parcels are infill parcels to be redeveloped.

Table H-28: Housing Growth

Jurisdiction	2010	2021	2010–2021
			Percent Change
Torrance	58,377	58,608	.4
Carson	26,226	26,676	1.7
Gardena	21,472	22,004	2.4
Hawthorne	29,869	30,662	2.6
Hermosa Beach	10,162	10,090	-.7
Los Angeles	1,412,006	1,535,606	8
Manhattan Beach	14,929	15,043	.76
Redondo Beach	30,609	30,928	1
Los Angeles County	3,443,087	3,614,809	4.7

Sources: State Department of Finance, 2010 and 2020.

2.5.2 HOUSING TYPE

Providing for a diverse range of housing types is an important consideration in a community. A diverse range of housing types helps ensure that all households in a community, regardless of income level, size, age, and family type, have the ability to find adequate housing that meets their needs.

Table H-29 shows the composition of Torrance’s housing stock by unit type in 2010 and 2021. The composition of the city’s housing stock has remained virtually unchanged over the timeframe, with single-family detached and attached homes comprising the majority of the housing stock in Torrance (58.7 percent). The remaining share of homes in Torrance consists of multi-family units and mobile homes, which together accounted for approximately 41.3 percent of units.

Table H-29: Housing Unit Types

Housing Type	2010		2021	
	Number of Units	% of Total Units	Number of Units	% of Total Units
Single-Family				
Detached	30,688	52.6	30,744	52.5
Attached	3,638	6.2	3,666	6.3
Subtotal	34,326	58.8	34,410	58.7
Multi-Family				
2-4 units	3,647	6.2	3,680	6.3
5+ Units	19,269	33	19,383	33.1
Subtotal	22,916	39.3	23,063	39.4
Mobile homes	1,135	1.9	1,086	1.9
Total units	58,377	100	58,559	100
Vacancy rate		4.1%		4.7%

Source: State Department of Finance 2013 and 2021. Mobile home unit count was updated to reflect the number reported by HCD, 2022. <https://casas.hcd.ca.gov/casas/cmip/onlineQuery>

2.5.3 HOUSING AVAILABILITY AND TENURE

Household tenure, or the ratio between owner- and renter-occupied households, can be influenced by many factors, such as: housing cost (which is influenced by interest rates, economics, land supply, and development constraints), housing availability, income, employment structure, and consumer preference. As shown below in Table H-30, homeowners in Torrance (56%) outnumber renters (44%). In comparison to Los Angeles County, the percentages are reversed. In 2019, the County homeownership rate (at 45%) is considerably lower and the rental rate (at 55%) is higher than in Torrance.

Table H-30: Tenure Comparison

Occupied Units	2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Los Angeles County				
Owner	1,544,749	47.7	1,511,628	45.3
Renter	1,696,455	52.3	1,816,770	54.7
Total	3,241,204	100.0	3,328,398	100.0

Torrance				
Owner	31,599	58.9	30,419	55.9
Renter	22,049	41.1	24,018	44.1
Total	53,648	100.0	54,437	100.0

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Table H-31 shows the average household size by tenure. In both 2010 and 2019, the average household size for renter-occupied households was slightly lower than that for owner-occupied households, with both average household size for owner-occupied households and renter-occupied households trending upward.

Table H-31: Household Size by Tenure (2010-2019)

Tenure	Average Household Size	
	2010	2019
Owner	2.70	2.75
Renter	2.42	2.52
Total	2.58	2.70

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

2.5.3.1 Vacancy Rate by Tenure

Vacancy rates are an important housing indicator because they demonstrate the degree of choice available. High vacancy rates usually indicate low demand and/or high supply conditions in the housing market. Too high of a vacancy rate can be difficult for owners trying to sell or rent. Low vacancy rates usually indicate high demand and/or low supply conditions in the housing market. Too low of a vacancy rate can force prices up, making it more difficult for low and moderate income households to find housing. Vacancy rates between two to three percent are usually considered healthy for single-family housing, while a vacancy rate of five to six percent for multi-family housing is considered healthy.


According to the American Community Survey (2014-2019 estimates), the city’s homeowner vacancy rate was 0.7 percent, and the rental vacancy rate was 2.5 percent, although the data does not explain what portion of the rental vacancy rate is for single family or multi-family housing. Both rates indicate housing choice is very limited in Torrance.

2.5.4 HOUSING AGE AND CONDITION

Generally, housing older than 30 years of age will require minor repairs and modernization improvements. Housing units over 50 years of age are more likely to require major rehabilitation, such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. After 70 years of age a unit is generally deemed to have exceeded its useful life without major repairs or renovations.

Figure H-2: Age of Torrance Housing Units

Housing Units by Year Structure Built



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

The city of Torrance is characterized by older neighborhoods, many dating from the post-World War II era. Homes in Torrance are generally older than those of many communities in Los Angeles County. The time period where the highest share of Torrance’s housing units were built is 1950 – 1959, while in the SCAG region, more units were built during 1970 - 1979 than any other period. As shown in Figure H-2, the largest proportion of Torrance’s housing (37%) was built between 1950 and 1969, making it approximately 52 to 71 years old. Housing units of this age are more likely to require major rehabilitation and repairs. The city has few newer units, as more than 82 percent of the housing stock was built before 1970.

The ACS includes surveys about three factors of what may be considered substandard housing. Table H-32 shows the number of units in Torrance lacking telephone service, lacking plumbing facilities, and lacking complete kitchen facilities, and compares the overall percentages with the SCAG region.

Table H-32: Substandard Housing

	# of units	Torrance Percentage comparison	SCAG Percentage comparison
No Telephone Service Available	1,109	2.04%	1.95%
Lacking Plumbing Facilities	152	0.28%	0.39%
Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	1,075	1.98%	1.29%

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Community Services Department (CC). HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department

(HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own. A total of 104 Torrance residents have received assistance between 2019 and 2021, averaging approximately 35 recipients/year. Recipients’ incomes range from approximately \$5,000/year to \$54,000/year with an average annual income of \$23,978.

Overall, the housing stock in the city is generally in very good condition. Presumably, homeowners with higher incomes, such as those in Torrance, make it a priority and can afford to repair and renovate when needed. The city has a strong history of individual homeowners redeveloping their properties, particularly in the Hillside areas, west Torrance, and central and southeast Torrance. Coupled with a history of property owners of both single-family and multi-family housing performing routine maintenance of homes and apartments throughout the city, there tends to be relatively low number of properties considered to be substandard.

In the 5 years from 2017 through 2021, the City received a total of 1,762 residential property maintenance complaints, as shown in Table H-33. The annual numbers of complaints were consistently approximately 300, however that number jumped to 565 in 2021. City staff are of the opinion that the increased number of residential property complaints in 2021 was related to the pandemic, as residents spent more time at home. Likewise, commercial property complaints also rose considerably in 2020 and 2021, again likely attributable to the pandemic and residents spending more time in the community. Abatement of property maintenance issues has been difficult due to material and labor shortages related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Figures H-3 and H-4 show the locations of the residential and commercial property complaints spatially in the City.

Table H-33: Residential and Commercial Property Maintenance Complaints

Year	Residential	Commercial
2021	565	164
2020	307	242
2019	314	85
2018	276	104
2017	300	80
Total	1,762	675

Source: City of Torrance, 2022.

The City of Torrance’s Code Enforcement Unit recently audited their code enforcement cases for the last three years as well as conducted a windshield survey on the residential units to determine the percentage of dilapidate housing in need of repair/replacement. Torrance defines a “deteriorated or deteriorating” housing as one in which three or more of the deficiencies below are present.

1. Substandard housing, including illegal garage conversions and illegal additions.
2. Inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities.
3. An aging and obsolete housing unit.
4. Conditions resulting from a defect that normal maintenance cannot correct.
5. Vacant, condemned, or demolished property due to noncompliance with laws, ordinances or regulations.

6. Structures with creaks or holes in ceilings, walls, floors.
7. Broken or cracked plaster, peeling paint.
8. Rodent vermin infestation.
9. Inadequate heat or no heating.
10. Damaged roofing and broken windows.
11. Other equally significant building or environmental deficiencies.

Upon completion of the audit of the code enforcement cases along with the windshield survey, it is Staff's estimate that approximately three to four percent of Torrance housing is dilapidated and in need of some type of repair, while less than one percent is in need of replacement.

DRAFT

Figure H-3: Residential Property Complaints





Figure H-4: Commercial Property Complaints



2.5.5 HOUSING COST AND AFFORDABILITY

Housing costs vary widely from one community to the next, being affected by a range of factors. The type and style of homes, neighborhood characteristics, quality of schools and public services, crime rates, and access to employment opportunities are qualities that many home buyers consider when looking for a new home in a particular community.

Torrance’s attractive neighborhoods, tree-lined streets, low crime rate, and highly ranked school district are all factors that contribute to the high quality of life in the community. According to local realtors, the primary reasons cited by home buyers that relocate to Torrance are the high caliber of the local school district and the quality of homes in the community. These qualities make Torrance a highly desirable location for families with school-aged children.

2.5.5.1 Ownership Housing Costs

The city’s single-family housing prices are higher than several adjacent communities, but not the highest in the vicinity. According to SCAG data, median home prices in Torrance increased 147% between 2000 and 2018, while prices in the SCAG region increased 151 percent. As shown in Table H-43, the city’s median home price was approximately \$1,046,305 in September 2021. This is due to steeply rising home prices in the first half of 2021. This value is seasonally adjusted and only includes the middle price tier of homes. Home values in Torrance have risen approximately 18.5% in the 2020-2021 time period.

Table H-34: Home Prices

City/Community	Median Home Price	Distance from Torrance
Carson	\$703,554	3.7 miles
Redondo Beach	\$1,320,455	3.5 miles
Lomita	\$854,644	4.0 miles
Gardena	\$728,159	5.2 miles
Rolling Hills Estates	\$1,762,395	6.2 miles
Torrance	\$1,046,305	-

Source: Zillow, September 2021

2.5.5.2 Rental Housing Costs

According to the 2013-2019 ACS, the median contract rent was \$1,675 per month in Torrance, compared to \$1,614 for Los Angeles County. Approximately 34 homes/townhomes are available for rent as of September 2021 according to Zillow.com, and 75 apartments are listed for rent. At the same time as housing prices have increased, the price of rental listings has also increased over the ACS estimates, and indicate the following range and average (where several units are available in a single category) of rental rates as of September 2021:

- Studio apartment (2 available): \$1395 - \$1640
- One-bedroom apartment: \$1395 – \$2,150, average \$1,885
- Two-bedroom apartment: \$1,950 - \$3,000, average \$2,375

- Three-bedroom apartment (2 available): \$3,300 - \$3,4000
- Two-bedroom homes/townhomes: \$2,250 - \$3,199, average \$2,767.
- Three-bedroom homes/townhomes: \$2,795 - \$6,500, average \$4,515
- Four-bedroom house (3 available): \$3,750 - \$7,800
- Five-bedroom house (1 available): \$4,500

2.5.5.3 Housing Affordability by Income Level

The ability to afford a home is an important factor affecting the quality of life in a community. Housing affordability in Torrance can be determined by comparing the costs of owning or renting a home with the maximum amount which households with different income levels can afford to pay for housing. This information can reveal what type and size of housing is affordable in the community and what types of households will likely experience overcrowding and overpayment.

HUD conducts annual household income surveys nationwide to determine a household's eligibility for federal housing assistance. Based on this survey, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) developed income limits that can be used to determine the maximum price that could be affordable to households in the upper range of their respective income category. Households in the lower end of each category can afford less by comparison than those at the upper end. According to HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, as of 2017, the income distribution of Torrance's households was as follows (See Table H-10):

- Extremely Low income: 12%
- Very Low income: 21%
- Low income: 17%
- Moderate or Above Moderate income: 50%

The maximum affordable home and rental prices for residents in Los Angeles County are shown in Table H-35. This amount can be compared to current housing asking prices (Table H-34) and market rental rates (Section 2.5.5.1) to determine what types of housing opportunities a household can afford.

Extremely Low Income Households

Extremely low income households earn 30 percent or less of the County AMI, up to \$23,700 for a one-person household and up to \$36,550 for a five-person household in 2020. An extremely low income household can generally afford homes offered at prices between \$61,790 and \$86,953, adjusting for household size. After deductions for utilities, a one-person extremely low income household could afford to pay up to \$442 in rent per month and a five-person low income household could afford to pay as much as \$650. Extremely low income households cannot afford market-rate rental or ownership housing in Torrance without assuming a cost burden.

Very Low Income Households

Very low income households earn between 31 and 50 percent of the County AMI – up to \$39,450 for a one-person household and up to \$60,850 for a five-person household in 2020. A very low income household can generally afford homes offered at prices between \$129,241 and \$191,020, adjusting for household size. Given the costs of ownership housing in Torrance, very low income households would

not be able to afford a home in the city. Very low income renters would not be able to find affordable appropriately-sized market-rate rental units in Torrance without assuming a cost burden.

Low Income Households

Low-income households earn between 51 percent and 80 percent of the County AMI – up to \$63,100 for a one-person household and up to \$97,350 for a five-person household in 2020. The affordable home price for a low income household at the maximum income limit ranges from \$230,534 and \$347,334. Based on the average home sale price of \$1,046,305 in 2021 (Table H-34), ownership housing would not be affordable to low income households. After deductions of utilities, a one-person low income household could afford to pay up to \$1,427 in rent per month and a five-person low income household could afford to pay as much as \$2,170. Based on current rental listings (Zillow, September 2021) one studio apartment was available in Torrance that would provide housing for a one-person low income household. The vast majority of low income households in Torrance would not be able to find adequately sized affordable apartment units without assuming a cost burden.

Moderate Income Households

Moderate-income households earn between 81 percent and 120 percent of the County AMI – up to \$100,150 depending on household size in 2020. The maximum affordable home price for a moderate income household is \$238,233 for a one-person household and \$359,325 for a five-person family. Moderate income households in Torrance are not able to afford adequately-sized homes for purchase. The maximum affordable rent payment for moderate income households is between \$1,472 and \$2,240 per month. Studio apartments (two available), one-bedroom apartments, and a few two-bedroom apartments would be affordable to moderate income households in this income group. Appropriately-sized market-rate rental apartments would not be affordable to most moderate income households in this income group, and no market-rate homes or townhomes would be affordable in this income group.

Table H-35: Housing Affordability by Income Group

Household (Persons)	Annual Income	Affordable Costs	Utilities	Taxes, Ins., HOA (Ownership)	Affordable Rent	Affordable Home Price
Extremely Low Income (0–30% AMI)						
1	\$23,700	\$593	\$151	\$207	\$442	\$61,790
2	\$27,050	\$676	\$166	\$237	\$510	\$72,096
3	\$30,450	\$761	\$190	\$266	\$571	\$80,244
4	\$33,800	\$845	\$223	\$296	\$622	\$86,069
5	\$36,550	\$914	\$264	\$320	\$650	\$86,953
Very Low Income (31–50% AMI)						
1	\$39,450	\$986	\$151	\$345	\$836	\$129,241
2	\$45,050	\$1,126	\$166	\$394	\$960	\$149,182
3	\$50,700	\$1,268	\$190	\$444	\$1,077	\$166,966
4	\$56,300	\$1,408	\$223	\$493	\$1,185	\$182,427
5	\$60,850	\$1,521	\$264	\$532	\$1,257	\$191,020

Low Income (51–80% AMI)						
1	\$63,100	\$1,578	\$151	\$552	\$1,427	\$230,524
2	\$72,100	\$1,803	\$166	\$631	\$1,637	\$265,026
3	\$81,100	\$2,028	\$190	\$710	\$1,837	\$297,157
4	\$90,100	\$2,253	\$223	\$788	\$2,030	\$327,179
5	\$97,350	\$2,434	\$264	\$852	\$2,170	\$347,334
Moderate Income (81–120% AMI)						
1	\$64,900	\$1,623	\$151	\$568	\$1,472	\$238,233
2	\$74,200	\$1,855	\$166	\$649	\$1,689	\$274,020
3	\$83,500	\$2,088	\$190	\$731	\$1,897	\$307,435
4	\$92,750	\$2,319	\$223	\$812	\$2,096	\$338,527
5	\$100,150	\$2,504	\$264	\$876	\$2,240	\$359,325

Assumptions: 2020 HCD income limits; 30 percent of gross income as affordable housing cost; 35 percent of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance in determining ownership housing affordable price; 10 percent down payment and 3.0 percent interest rate for 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan; utilities based on Los Angeles County Utility Allowance.

Sources:

1. State Department of Housing and Community Development 2020 Income Limits.
2. Veronica Tam and Associates, 2021.

2.6 AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TORRANCE

State law requires the City to identify, analyze and propose programs to preserve existing rental units that are currently restricted to lower income housing use and that will become unrestricted and possibly be lost as lower income housing (i.e., at-risk units). Although the CHPC identified two such rental housing units with expiring affordability covenants in the coming ten years, the Community Development Department at the City of Torrance received assurance from that they do not intend to convert from their current use.

2.6.1 PUBLIC HOUSING

The Torrance Housing Authority is a Section 8 only Housing Authority (HA). It does not own or operate public housing units. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. As of September 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed. The HA maintains a residence preference, which gives priority to households that live or work in the City, and priority is given to families, disabled persons, and seniors.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD’s VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

2.6.2 INVENTORY OF AT-RISK HOUSING UNITS

The City uses various funding sources, including Low/Moderate Housing Funds, HUD funding sources, and Section 8 rental assistance to preserve and increase the supply of affordable housing in Torrance through the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of renter-occupied units and the rehabilitation of owner-occupied units. Financial assistance is provided to both non-profit and for-profit housing developers. Table H-36 presents the inventory of affordable housing developments in Torrance. In 2021, 10 affordable rental housing projects were located in Torrance, providing 669 affordable units to lower-income households.

Table H-36: Assisted Housing Developments

	Total Units	# of Affordable Units	Elderly	Non-Elderly	Funding Program	Year Built	Earliest Conversion Date
Federally Assisted Developments							
Golden West Towers 3510 Maricopa Street Torrance, CA 90503 (Senior Housing)	179	178	178	1	HUD; LIHTC; CalHFA	1973	2058
JCI Gardens Community Housing Management Services 2000 W. 162nd Street Torrance, CA 90504	101	100	--	101	HUD	1982	7/7/2033
Accessible Apartments 2 United Cerebral Palsy 22520 Ocean Avenue Torrance, CA 90505	13	12	--	13	HUD	1984	5/1/2024, however the operator assured the City they do not intend to convert (see Appendix E)
Scalabrini House 22410 Evalyn Avenue Torrance, CA 90505	1unit/ 6 beds	1unit/ 6 beds	--	6	HUD	n/a	2045
Caribou House 4226 W. 231st Street Torrance, CA 90505	1unit/ 6 beds	1unit/ 6 beds	--	6	HUD	n/a	2045

Table H-36: Assisted Housing Developments

	Total Units	# of Affordable Units	Elderly	Non-Elderly	Funding Program	Year Built	Earliest Conversion Date
Cabrillo Family Apartments 1640 Cabrillo Ave. Torrance, CA 90501	44	43	--	43	LIHTC	2015	2069
State Assisted Development							
Harmony Court Apartments 4494 196th Street 4502 186th Street Redondo Beach, CA 90278 (Senior housing)	187	185	185	2	LIHTC	1996	2026, however the operator assured the City in writing that they do not intend to convert (see Appendix F)
Former Redevelopment Agency							
Coleman Court 1421 Cravens Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	79	78	--	79	Housing Set-aside	1987	7/1/2041
Ocean Terrace 3851 W. 226th Street Torrance, CA 90505	36	35	--	36	Housing Set-aside	1988	7/1/2041
El Prado Apartments 1215 El Prado Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	26	26	--	26	Housing Set-aside	1993	7/1/2029
Brisas Del Sol (for sale units) 1201-1211 Cabrillo Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	33	33	--	33	Housing Set-aside	1993	12/31/2029
Total	710	702	363	346			

Source: City of Torrance, 2022, CHPC.

Several housing developments are age restricted to provide housing for Torrance’s senior population. Golden West Towers is a federally assisted 179-unit senior affordable housing project that was originally funded with HUD 236 funds and is now financed through the HUD 542(c) program with a contract through 2058.

Harmony Court Apartments is a state assisted 185-unit senior affordable housing project funded by HCD tax credits with a contract through 2026, whose operator has provided written assurance to the City that they do not intend to convert in the next 10 years (see Appendix F). JCI Gardens, built in 1982

with a federal Section 202 loan, has a 40-year low-income use restriction. The HUD affordability contract was renewed through July 7, 2033.

The nonprofit United Cerebral Palsy Foundation developed the 13-unit Accessible Apartments 2 complex for people with disabilities using Section 202 funding and a 20-year Section 8 contract. According to the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), this facility has a contract through May 1, 2024, however the operator has assured the City they do not intend to convert within the coming 10-year period (see Appendix F).

Two group homes for the elderly or disabled are included in the HUD Multifamily Assistance and Section 8 Contracts database. Both facilities consist of a single-family home with a six-bed capacity.

2.6.3 PRESERVATION OF AT-RISK HOUSING UNITS

State Housing Element law requires the analysis of government-subsidized multi-family housing that may change from low-income housing to market-rate housing during the next ten years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers the period from October 15, 2021, to October 15, 2031.

Over the next ten years (2021-2031), two subsidized multifamily developments which provide 197 affordable units have expired affordability covenants (Table H-35). Affordability covenants in Torrance include developments that are financed with Low/Moderate Housing set aside funds or federal programs (HUD 202, HUD 811, and HUD 542[c]) or State of California LIHTC's. Accessible Apartments 2 is owned and operated by a nonprofit organization (United Cerebral Palsy), whose operators have informed the City that they do not intend to convert to market rate units in the next 10 years. Harmony Court Apartments is a 187-unit senior affordable housing project offering 185 affordable units. The owners have stated to the City in writing that they do not intend to convert to market rate units during the next 10 years, so there is no risk of conversion for this project.

The El Prado Apartments are owned by the City of Torrance and will not convert when their contract expires in 2029. The contract for Brisas del Sol expires in 2029. Because this is a moderate-income, for-sale condominium complex of 33 units, the likelihood is high of these units converting. Nevertheless, ownership housing is not covered in the at-risk analysis. These ownership units are subject to resale provisions that either ensure the continued affordability of the units or recuperation of the funding for other affordable housing activities.

The City will continue to monitor the status of these units. Should a Notice of Intent to opt out of the Section 8 program be filed, the City will ensure that tenants are properly notified of their rights under California law.

Preservation and Replacement Options

To maintain the existing affordable housing stock, the City works to preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of units to non-profit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants using other funding sources; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units. Since the only at-risk units

are for-sale units, and state law does not require analysis of the loss of for-sale units, these options are not discussed in detail.

Transfer of Ownership: Long-term affordability of the units at risk can be secured by transferring ownership of these projects to non-profit housing organizations. However, Accessible Apartments 2 are already nonprofit owned, therefore, transferring ownership to a nonprofit organization applies only to Harmony Apartments. A search on LoopNet shows 14 rental properties for sale in the South Bay region, averaging about \$468,000 per unit. The at-risk units are smaller and older units in a larger complex than those are listed on sale and therefore likely to command lower market prices. Assuming \$400,000 per unit, transferring ownership or purchasing replacement units would require significant resources.³

Purchase of Affordability Covenant: Another option to preserve the affordability of at-risk projects is to provide an incentive package to the owners to maintain the project as low-income housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, and/or supplementing the Section 8 subsidy amount received to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the property is highly leveraged. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable.

Rent Subsidy: Tenant-based rent subsidies could be used to preserve the affordability of housing. Similar to Section 8 vouchers, the City through a variety of potential funding sources could provide assistance to very low income households. The level of the subsidy required to preserve the at-risk affordable housing is estimated to equal the Fair Market Rent for a unit minus the housing cost affordable by a very low income household. Table H-37 shows the rent subsidies required for both of the projects with at-risk units. As shown, subsidizing the very low income at-risk units would require approximately \$1,427,856 annually, an average of \$604 per unit per month.

Unit Size/Household Size	Number of Units	Fair Market Rent¹	Household Annual Income	Affordable Housing Cost³	Monthly per Unit Subsidy⁴	Total Monthly Subsidy
Very Low Income (50% AMI) ²						
1 Bedroom/ 2-person household	197	\$1,604	\$47,650	\$1,000	\$604	\$119,988
Source: Veronica Tam and Associates, 2022.						
Notes:						
1. Fair Market Rent (FMR) is determined by HUD. These calculations use the 2022 HUD FMR for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Area.						
2. Rents are restricted to 50% AMI, which puts residents in the Very Low Income Category, set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).						
3. The affordable housing cost is calculated based on 30% of the AMI, minus utilities for rentals.						
4. The monthly subsidy covers the gap between the FMR and the affordable housing cost						

³ At \$400,000 per unit, the cost to transfer ownership of Harmony Apartments is estimated at \$75 million. This figure represents a rough estimate for the purpose of illustrating the potential magnitude of costs, and cannot be used to determine the market value of the property.

Replacement Housing Cost: The cost of developing new housing depends on a variety of factors such as density, size of units, location and related land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average development cost of \$500,000 per unit for multifamily rental housing, replacement of the 197 at-risk units would require approximately \$98.5million.

DRAFT

3. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Governmental, market, infrastructure, and environmental factors may constrain the provision of adequate and affordable housing in a city. State law requires that Housing Elements analyze potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for all persons of all income levels and disabilities. Should constraints preclude the achievement of housing goals, state Housing Element law requires jurisdictions to address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. This section addresses these potential constraints that affect the supply of housing in Torrance.

3.2 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Local government housing regulations are necessary to assure: (1) that housing is constructed and maintained in a safe manner, (2) that the density and design of housing is consistent with community standards, and (3) that adequate infrastructure to support new housing is provided. Local policies and regulations can also impact the price and availability of housing and, in particular, the provision of affordable housing. Land use controls, site improvement requirements, fees and exactions, permit processing procedures, and other factors may constrain the maintenance, development, and improvement of housing.

The City of Torrance has not adopted growth control measures or taken measures to reduce potential housing development. The City has acted to preserve existing high-density, multiple-family projects and provided development opportunities for a variety of housing types. Given the age and built-out condition of Torrance, the City has implemented an aggressive capital improvement program to upgrade infrastructure throughout the City.

Consistent with State law (Section 65583) this section addresses five potential constraints to housing development:

- Land use controls
- Building codes and their enforcement
- Site improvements (on and off-site)
- Fees and exactions
- Processing and permit procedures
- Housing for people with disabilities

3.2.1 LAND USE CONTROLS

The Land Use Element (2010) of the Torrance General Plan sets forth the policies which guide development in the city, while the zoning regulations (in Division 9 of the Torrance Municipal Code, or “Zoning Code”) serve to implement these policies. In Torrance, 50.5 percent of the land is designated for residential use in the Land Use Element. The vast majority of housing in the City is low-density,

single-family housing, (averaging approximately seven units per acre) which occupies approximately 4,000 acres, or approximately 38 percent of land area. The Land Use Element and Zoning Code also provide for mixed use development (residential uses in conjunction with commercial) in the three commercial land use designations, and in several commercial districts where appropriate.

The Land Use Element also includes “expected density” (used for residential designations) and “expected intensity” (used for nonresidential designations) for the purpose of estimating future development and population projections as provided for by the Land Use Element. This Housing Element update includes a program (Program 1) to utilize the expected densities as “target densities” to encourage residential development to occur at the expected density of the Land Use Element. The expected densities are included below and are described in greater detail in Sections 4 and 5, where they are proposed as target densities.

As shown in Table H-23 in Section 2 (Community Profile), the housing stock in Torrance has increased by only 231 units over the past decade (Department of Finance); nearly 64 percent of the new units were multi-family residential or part of a mixed use development, which demonstrates the lack of vacant land available for typical single-family residential subdivisions.

3.2.1.1 General Plan Land Use Element

The Land Use Element provides for five residential land use classifications, with allowable densities ranging from up to nine units per acre in low density areas to over 44 units per acre in the higher density multiple family designation, as described below. In addition, one land use category is intended for development of a mix of low intensity offices and residential units. Two commercial land use categories allow residential development in conjunction with office or retail uses. See Figure H-5 for the Land Use Map.

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-LO): The Low-Density Residential designation provides for the development of single-family residences within a density range of up to 9 dwelling units per acre, with an expected density of 6.8 dwelling units per acre. Development is characterized generally by detached single-family dwellings on individual lots forming a cohesive neighborhood.

LOW-MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-LM): The Low-Medium Density Residential designation provides for the development of small-lot single-family homes, duplexes, attached multi-unit developments, and mobile home parks within a density range of 9.1 to 18 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 13.5 dwelling units per acre.

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-MD): The Medium Density Residential designation allows townhouses and low-rise multi-unit buildings within a density range of 18.1 to 31 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 23.25 dwelling units per acre. The City plans to revise the density range by increasing the minimum density to 20 dwelling units per acre (Program 1), although the expected density will remain the same.


MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-MH): Residential development accommodated in the Medium-High Residential designation includes low- and medium-rise multi-unit attached developments. Residential development may occur within a density range of 31.1 to 44 dwelling units per acre, with an expected density of 33 dwelling units per acre. Areas in the City with an R-MH designation are appropriate for subterranean parking.

HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-HI): The High Density Residential designation accommodates multi-family housing, and specifically housing development of a more intensive form, including medium and high-rise apartment buildings with a minimum density of 44.1 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 45 dwelling units per acre. The R-HI designation is appropriate for senior and affordable housing.

RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (R-OF): The Residential Office designation permits the location of office and compatible commercial uses adjacent to residential uses. The designation is intended to accommodate neighborhoods where businesses and residential uses are gradually being combined. Residential-Office will provide opportunities for mixed-use residential and commercial developments as well as live-work arrangements. Professional offices are the most desirable office use in this designation. Housing can include low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots, with a density between 18.1 and 31 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 23.35 dwelling units per acre. Developments that integrate residential and office or commercial on a single site require approval of a conditional use permit.

DRAFT

Figure H-5: General Plan Land Use Policy Map



3.2.1.2 Correlation Between General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning

Torrance is a charter city and is governed on the basis of a charter that establishes its powers and authorities, as contrasted with a general law city that enjoys only those powers specifically granted to it by the state. While general law cities are required by Section 65860 of the California Government Code to have zoning ordinances that are consistent with the General Plan, zoning ordinances in charter cities like Torrance are not required to be consistent with the General Plan. Nonetheless, the City strives to have a Zoning Code that is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs in the General Plan.

Table H-38 shows the correlation between the land use designations and zoning districts.

DRAFT

Table H-38: Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts Permitting Residential Uses

Land Use Designation/Density		Corresponding Zoning Districts/Densities	Typical Residential Types
R-LO	Low Density (0 - 9 du/acre; Expected density: 6.8 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-1 – Single-Family Residential (0 - 9 du/acre) ▪ A-1 – Light Agricultural District (1 SFR unit per lot) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detached single-family dwellings on individual lots forming a cohesive neighborhood, except as approved in P-D
R-LM	Low-Medium Density (9.1 - 18 du/acre; Expected density: 13.5 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-2 – Two Family District (2 du/lot) ▪ RTH – Residential Townhouse District (0 – 12 du/ac in developments of less than 5 acres; 0 – 15 du/ac in developments of 5 acres or more) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small-lot single-family homes, duplexes, attached multi-unit developments, and mobile home parks
R-MD	Medium Density (18.1 - 31 du/acre; Expected density: 23.5 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-3 – Limited multiple family residential district (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-R-3 – Restricted multiple family residential district (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-3-3 – Three-Unit Multiple-family Residential (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-P – Residential Professional (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use only in certain districts; density determined via CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Townhouses and low-rise multi-unit buildings
R-MH	Medium-High Density (31.1 - 44 du/acre; Expected density: 33 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-4 – Unlimited multiple family residence district (0 - 43 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use only in certain districts; density determined via CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low- and medium-rise multi-unit attached developments, often with subterranean parking
R-HI	High Density 44.1+ du/acre (Expected density: 45 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-5 Highrise residential district ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use or multi-family in DA-1 & DA-2 districts; minimum density 27 du/ac w/ maximum density determined by CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-family housing, and specifically housing development of a more intensive form, including senior housing
R-OF	Residential Office 18.1 - 31 du/acre (Expected density: 23.25 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L-P – Limited professional office district ▪ C-R – Restricted commercial district (Senior housing only) ▪ R-P – Residential Professional (0 - 27 du/ac) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots

Land Use Designation/Density		Corresponding Zoning Districts/Densities	Typical Residential Types
C-GEN	General Commercial (Density for mixed-use development governed by maximum 1.0 FAR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-1 – Retail commercial district (27 du/ac with a CUP) ▪ C-2 – General commercial district ▪ C-3 – Solely commercial district ▪ C-5 – Conditional commercial district ▪ C-R – Restricted commercial district (Senior MFR) ▪ P-D (Planned Development District*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed-use development consisting of commercial and residential uses is permitted where appropriate
C-CTR	Commercial Center (Density for mixed-use development governed by FAR; maximum 1.0 FAR can be exceeded with CUP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-4 – Shopping center district ▪ D-RMF – Downtown Residential Multiple Family District (0-43 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed-use development consisting of commercial and residential uses is permitted where appropriate ▪ D-R District allows higher-density multiple-family residential development in the vicinity of Downtown Torrance

*The Planned Development (PD) District allows densities, unit types, and development standards to be customized as per an approved PD; therefore, densities can range across the residential spectrum.)

3.2.1.3 Zoning

The Planning and Land Use Code (commonly referred to as the Zoning Code) within the Torrance Municipal Code serves as the primary implementation tool for the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Whereas the Land Use Element is a policy document and sets forth direction for development decisions, the Zoning Code is a regulatory document that establishes specific standards for the use and development of all properties in the city, such as heights, parking, setbacks, and open space. The Zoning Map (see Figure H-6) depicts the zones that are referred to in the Zoning Code.

Zoning Districts


Single-family and two-family residences are permitted by right in most residential districts, and single-family residences are also permitted by right in the A-1 (light agricultural) district. The implementation of SB 9 (approved 2021, effective January 1, 2022) allows lot splits and two-unit residential development by right in some locations. The City has complied with SB 9 by adopting language into Section 92.29.34 of its Zoning Code in accordance with state law. Multiple-family residences are permitted by right in many residential districts and are also allowed with a Conditional Use Permit in a number of commercial districts. A conditional use permit is required for projects that exceed established development standards (with a floor-area ratio [FAR] above 0.65 and higher than two stories for the R-2 zone, and for projects with a FAR above 0.60 and higher than two stories for the R-3 zone). Multiple owner-occupied residential structures are subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit, as are multiple family residential developments of more than three stories in height (i.e., in excess of established development standards) or more than 100 units.

Planning Commission review is required of projects in the R-4, Unlimited Multiple Family Residential District, where a maximum density of 43 units per acre is allowed; and in the R-5, High Rise Residential District, for which there is no density limit. Due to the almost built-out nature of the City, a 100-unit development is not common, and the impacts on long-established neighborhoods are a concern to the City. As such, the purpose of a discretionary permit is not to discourage new development, but to ensure that it is well designed and fits into the context of surrounding residential development within the zoning district, and to ensure adequate public review of and input on all land uses which could potentially impact the community, as well as to ensure adequate review.

Staff records indicate that most development (including multiple owner-occupied residential structures and other types of multi-family developments that exceed development standards) have been approved with close City coordination with applicants in the pre-application process. This process ensures that proposed developments fit into the context of surrounding residential development within the zoning district. As further evidence that this requirement is not a constraint to development, the majority of residential units built, approved, or under construction in the City have been multiple -family developments. Demand for residential development remains high in South Bay in general and in Torrance in particular.

The Downtown Residential Multiple-Family District (R-MF) was created to implement the Commercial Center General Plan designation and provide for more housing opportunities, especially multi-family developments, in the Downtown area. The Residential Multiple Family District was created to allow multi-family residential development in the former the Industrial Redevelopment Project Area. A Conditional Use Permit is required for all development within these zones to ensure conformance with these goals.

Figure H-6: Zoning Map



Other zoning districts allow for originality and flexibility in design. The Planned Development (P-D) District allows for development standards to be tailored to individual projects of five acres or more as proposed by the developer, subject to Planning Commission and City Council review. Density is determined by General Plan designation. A significant amount of new residential development in recent years has occurred by planned development, including attached townhouse projects, and detached single-family homes. The Residential Townhouse (RTH) District allows for clustered development at 15 units per acre on properties with a minimum area of five acres or 12 units per acres on less than five acres.

General Residential Development Standards

The City of Torrance regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development in order to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents, as well as implement the policies of the General Plan. The City's Zoning Code establishes development standards for lot size and area, yards and setbacks, lot coverage, building height, parking, and minimum unit size. Development standards for housing are established by the Zoning Code. The development standards summarized in Table H-39 include the most pertinent development standards development standards outside of the Hawthorne Blvd Corridor specific Plan in Torrance. These regulations can have an effect on the ability of property owners to construct and maintain housing.

Table H-39: Residential Development Standards¹

Development Standards	R-1 1 story	R-1 2 story	R-2	RTH	R-P	R-3	R-R-3	R-3-3	R-4	R-5	RD
Minimum Lot size	6000 sf	6000 sf	6000 sf	none	6000 sf	6000 sf	none	6000 sf	6000 sf	1 acre	15,000 sf
Setbacks											
Front yard	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	none	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	15 ft
Side yard (interior)	10% of lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% of lot width, and 3-5 ft	Min. 15' between 1-story buildings and 20' between 2+ story buildings	3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	30 ft	5 ft
Side Yard (street)	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	none	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	30 ft	10 ft
Rear Yard	15 ft	20 ft	10 ft	none	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	30 ft	10 ft
Building Height	18 ft	27 ft	27 ft	35 ft	18/27 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	50 ft	per Building Code	35 ft
Lot Coverage	50%	40%	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
Minimum Lot Depth	80 ft	80 ft	80 ft	none	80 ft	80 ft	none	80 ft	80 ft	200 ft	none
Lot Width (interior)	50 ft	50 ft	50 ft	none	50 ft	50 ft	none	50 ft	50 ft	200 ft	none
Lot Width (exterior)	60 ft	60 ft	60 ft	none	60 ft	60 ft	none	60 ft	60 ft	200 ft	None
Minimum Dwelling Size ²	700-1450	700-1450	none	700 sf - 1350 sf	none	none	1400 SF	none	none	700 sf, 500 sf if studio	none

Table H-39: Residential Development Standards¹

Development Standards	R-1 1 story	R-1 2 story	R-2	RTH	R-P	R-3	R-R-3	R-3-3	R-4	R-5	RD
Maximum Density/floor area ratio	0.6:1	0.6:1	0.65:1	12-15 du/ acre	1 du/ 1600 sf	1 du/ 1600 sf, 0.6:1 FAR, 1.0 FAR for 3-7 units, 1.25 FAR for 8- 10 units	1 du/ 1600 sf	1 du/ 1600 sf, 0.6:1 FAR, & only 3 du/lot	1 du/ 1000 sf	0.13:1 to 3.12:1	1 du/ 1000 sf

Source: City of Torrance Municipal Code

¹ Per Land Use Code Sec. 95.3.28, condominium development can exceed development standards with a CUP.

² The Land Use Code (Sections 92.20.3 and 92.20.4) govern minimum dwelling unit sizes for single-family, two-family (R-2) and multiple-family units

The Zoning Code also regulates minimum unit size for single-family, two-family, and multiple-family residential units. Minimum unit size is based on the number of bedrooms, as per Table H-40. Establishing a minimum unit size can constrain the maximum density allowed, especially for lower and moderate income developments and can limit the flexibility a developer has to respond to a wide variety of resident preferences. Program 3 proposes to examine development standards in the Zoning Code to reduce constraints, including minimum unit size.

Table H-40: Minimum Unit Size

Number of bedrooms	Single-family dwellings	Two-family dwellings	Multiple-family dwellings
Bachelor or single	n/a	n/a	450 sf
One-bedroom	700 sf	700 sf	700 sf
Two-bedroom	900 sf	900 sf	900 sf.
Three-bedroom	1,200 sf	1,200 sf	1,200 sf
Four-bedroom	1,450 sf	n/a	n/a

Parking Standards

City parking standards for residential developments are tailored to the vehicle ownership patterns associated with different residential uses. The Zoning Code requires parking based on the number of units on the property. Parking requirements for residential uses are listed in Table H-41. For single family developments, the Zoning Code requires two parking spaces within an enclosed garage. Multi-family residential requirements vary based on the number of bedrooms in each unit, and also require guest parking.

Table H-41: Parking Requirements

Use	Required Parking Spaces
Single-family home	2 spaces in an enclosed garage
Flag Lot	2 spaces in an enclosed garage + 1 uncovered guest space
Duplex	4 spaces in an enclosed garage per lot
Multiple-family dwelling units	
2 bedrooms or less	2 spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and 1 guest parking space for each 5 dwelling units or portion thereof
3 or more bedrooms	3 spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and 1 guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof
Mobile home park	2 spaces per individual site
Boarding/lodging	2 spaces plus 1 space for each guest room or 1 space for each 150 square feet of sleeping area, whichever is greater, enclosed in garage.
Community residential care facility	1 space per 3 beds
Senior citizens housing	1 space per unit and 1 additional visitor parking space for each 5 dwelling units
ADUs	1 space per unit

Source: Torrance Municipal Code, 2021

Parking requirements for residential uses are closely associated with the actual demand for parking generated by the particular development. Multiple-family units with two or fewer bedrooms require two spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and one guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof. Multiple-family units with three or more bedrooms require three spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and one guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof. To offset the additional parking space in the 3+ bedroom developments, the City allows two of the three spaces to be provided as tandem parking. The guest parking space requirement of one space per five units for all multiple family developments is very low and comparable to other cities in the area.

However, parking space requirements are reduced for uses that have lower parking needs, such as senior housing and special needs housing. To facilitate equal access to housing for special needs groups, such as seniors and the disabled, the Zoning Code provides for a variety of parking space reductions. Parking requirements are more moderate for senior housing, with only one space required per unit and one guest space for every five units. Community residential care facilities require only one space for every three beds. Reduced parking can also be applied to affordable residential developments through the density bonus provisions. At the request of the applicant and pursuant to compliance with state density bonus law, the City can permit an alternative parking ratio and other parking incentives. The City’s density bonus provisions provide for the granting of at least one regulatory concession, including but not limited to, a reduction in setback requirements or reduction in the requirement of parking spaces. For newer mixed-use developments, the City has allowed the required guest parking and commercial parking to overlap, instead of requiring separate parking for each. Several developments in Downtown Torrance (including affordable units) have no on-site parking or reduced parking.

Input received from market-rate and affordable developers as part of the stakeholder outreach conducted for the Housing Element update indicate that the City’s existing parking standards for multiple-family and mixed use projects are a constraint to development, reducing the maximum density that can be realized and negatively impacting development costs. For example, costs

associated with structured parking are significantly higher than surface parking. The City's policy has been to require parking standards at this rate to assure certain quality standards for multiple-family housing and to ensure spillover parking does not negatively impact existing single-family residential neighborhoods. The City offers flexibility in parking such as tandem parking, reduced parking for senior and special needs housing, and parking incentives for affordable developments in order to reduce housing cost. However, in response to developer input, the City will be considering reduced parking standards for new residential and mixed use development along corridors that have been identified for new infill housing in the Sites Inventory (see Section 4), including implementation of the Housing Corridor Study and the Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (Program 3).

Open Space Standards

To improve the living environment of residential neighborhoods, communities typically require housing to have a certain amount of open space, such as yards, common space, and landscaping. In Torrance, open space is reflected in setbacks and lot coverage requirements, as well as open space ratios. For single-family homes in the R-1 and R-2 districts, one third of the lot area must be reserved for open space.

Zones R-P, R-3, R-R-3, and R-3-3 all require half of one square foot to be set aside for every one square foot of dwelling developed, but the open space need not exceed 600 square feet for each dwelling unit. At least 50 percent of this open space must be provided as usable private open space and must therefore be directly accessible from the dwelling unit. Front yards and enclosed areas designated for recreational purposes can contribute to a maximum of 25 percent of the open space requirement.

In the RTH and R-4 zones, a standard amount of open space is required for each dwelling unit—1,000 square feet per dwelling unit and 300 square feet per dwelling unit, respectively. In the RTH zone, both common and private open space must be provided, in proportions to be determined by the applicant. The R-4 zone allows roof decks to contribute up to one-third of the required open space, and enclosed areas for recreation may contribute one-quarter of the required space.

The High Rise Residential District (R-5) requires open space based on the number of stories in the development. For buildings with a small number of stories, the open space requirement is proportionately higher, starting at 6.0 square feet of open space per 1.0 square foot of floor area. A thirteen story building is required to have an open space ratio of 0.40, and a 24 story building requires 0.26 square feet of open space for each square foot of floor area.

In the Downtown Residential Multiple-Family District, open space is required dependent on the size of the dwelling unit. For units less than 900 square feet, 250 square feet of open space are required. For units between 901 and 1449 square feet, 500 square feet of open space are required. For units with a total living area of more than 1450 square feet, 750 square feet of open space is required. There is no minimum requirement for private open space.

Input received from market-rate and affordable developers as part of stakeholder outreach indicates that the City's open space standards for multiple-family and mixed use projects are a constraint to development because they reduce the maximum density that can be realized and negatively impact development costs. The City will be reevaluating its open space standards to reduce constraints (see Program 3).

Overlay Districts

Hillside and Local Coastal Overlay District

The Hillside and Local Coastal Overlay District in the City of Torrance consists of 104 acres of land, which lie west of Palos Verdes Boulevard, north of the City of Palos Verdes Estates and Rolling Hills Estates, and south of the City of Redondo Beach. A portion of the Overlay District in the southwest part of the district, adjacent to the City of Palos Verdes Estates, is within the Coastal Zone. The Coastal Zone area is almost entirely developed with well-established and well-maintained residential properties, both multi-family and single-family dwellings. The balance of the Coastal Zone encompasses 13.3 acres of Public Use (beach and parkland) and 3.5 acres of Commercial Center designated properties.

Development regulations within the Overlay District restrict lot coverage to 50 percent and building heights to one story and 14 feet. Development within the Coastal Zone is subject to further regulations in accordance with the Coastal Act. Within the Overlay District, there is a design review process that is performed either at an administrative level or before the Planning Commission, depending on certain criteria. The overall intent of the design review process is not to preclude new housing development, but to afford protection of views, light, air corridors, and privacy and to address hillside construction and safety issues.

Torrance Tract Overlay District

Within the Torrance Tract Overlay District, Planning Commission review is required for most development, with the exception of minor repairs and maintenance, or low-density residential development. New development must conform with the character of the neighborhood and provide adequate parking and storage. There is a recently adopted historic preservation ordinance that covers the Torrance Tract area.

Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District

Within the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District special development criteria are imposed in the interest of protecting existing homes in an area of small and narrow lots (typically 5,000 square feet and 40 feet wide). In order to address the problem of designing accessible parking on narrow width lots, parking standards are more flexible, allowing the fourth required parking spaces to be uncovered or in tandem configuration with Planning Commission review. Because existing homes are older and relatively small, especially when compared to new homes, they are comparatively less expensive than homes elsewhere in the City.

Commercial/Residential Transition Overlay District

The Commercial/Residential Transition Overlay District applies to properties on the west side of Ashley Avenue between the public alley south of 182nd Street and 186th Street. Underlying zoning is either R-2 Two Family Residential District, or HBCSP Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan District. Parcels of land zoned R-2 remain subject to the provisions of that district, until the Torrance Planning Commission approves a change to a commercial parking lot. At this point, the underlying zoning of the subject parcel will automatically change from R-2 to HBCSP. Parcels of land located east of the alley and zoned HBCSP must be used exclusively as parking lots in support of those parcels of land located on the west and/or north side of the alley.

Providing for a Variety of Housing Types

The Land Use Element and Zoning Code contain the policies and basic standards that allow for the development of a variety of housing types. The Torrance Zoning Code accommodates the widest range of housing, from single-family residential to high-density residential units, as well as special needs housing. Table H-42 lists the allowed location of specific uses. To better facilitate the understanding of housing types permitted in zones in the city, a matrix of approved uses in residential zones will be incorporated into the Land Use Code (Program 11).



Table H-42: Permitted Uses in Land Use Code

Residential Use	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-R-3	R-4	R-P	R-5	L-P	R-3-3	A-1	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-R	M-1	M-2	M-L	P-1	P-U	HMD	R-TH	R-D
Single Family Residence	P	P	P		P	P	C		P	P	C	C											P	P
Multi-family Residential Uses																								
Two Family Residence		P	P	P	P	P			P		C	C												P
Flat building, apartment house, bachelor apartment			P	P	P	P			P		C	C												
Bungalow court or garage apartment			P		P	P					C	C												
Multiple Family Residence							P				C	C	C		C									C
Multiple owner-occupied residential structures		C	C	C	C	C	C		C		C	C	C		C									
Senior Citizen Housing			C	C	C	C	C	C		C	C	C	C	C	C	C						C	C	C
Supplemental Housing for the Elderly	C	C	C	C	C		C		C	C													C	
Trailer Parks	C	C	C	C	C	C					C	C					C	C						
Residential Care Facilities	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*		P*	P*	P*												P*	P*
Rest homes, convalescent homes, guest homes, homes for the aged			C	C	P	P					P	P	P		P							P		
Emergency Shelters																			P					
Long-term facility for the chronic mentally ill, Institutions for the treatment of alcoholics, Mental hygiene home					C	C					C		C	C	C							C		

Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan

The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (Specific Plan), adopted in July 1996, was developed to guide municipal and private actions within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor to spur development, increase the City’s retail tax base, and provide for the maintenance and beautification of the City’s major commercial corridor. The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also allows residential development on select sites along the corridor. Allowable densities vary, with an unlimited maximum density on sites within the H-DA-1 Sub-District.

The Specific Plan provides for eight land use sub-districts along Hawthorne Boulevard: the North Torrance Sub-District (H-NT), Promenade Sub-District (H-PR), Del Amo Business Sub-District One (H-DA-1), Del Amo Business Sub-District Two (H-DA-2), Meadow Park Sub-District (H-MP), the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway Intersection Area Sub-District (H-H/PCH), the Hospital/Medical (H-HMD) Sub-District, and the Walteria Sub-District (H-WT). Each of these sub-districts has a list of uses that are permitted by right and related development standards. Mixed-use developments that incorporate residential units are conditionally permitted in all sub-districts, excluding the H/PCH and HMD Sub-Districts. In addition, both stand-alone multi-family residential development (with a density of at least 27 units/acre) and stand-alone senior citizen housing developments are conditionally permitted in the DA-1 and DA-2 zones. The Specific Plan provides opportunities for potential housing along the entire Hawthorne Boulevard corridor, as identified in the Sites Inventory. The City proposes to amend the Specific Plan to further increase opportunities for housing by allowing residential development in the H/PCH and HMD Sub-Districts (Program 1).

During a stakeholder meeting, developers and architects noted that existing development standards in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts of the HBCSP were constraints to mixed-use development—they include a 100-foot setback from Hawthorne Boulevard for residential portions of mixed-use projects, and a requirement for at least 30 percent of the floor area of the development be commercial. The lack of development in these three sub-districts, compared with several mixed-use projects that have been constructed and/or proposed in the Walteria Sub-District and a pipeline project in the H-DA-2 Sub-District, indicate that the identified standards may be constraining the development of mixed-use projects in the three identified sub-districts. Both identified standards, as well as others, including FAR, will be reviewed under Program 3.

Mixed-Use Development

Mixed-use development, specifically the integration of residential and commercial uses, is a familiar housing concept in Torrance. Since the City’s inception, Downtown Torrance has incorporated mixed-use in the traditional style of residential living area above ground-floor commercial uses.

The General Plan Land Use Element identifies mixed-use development as a viable opportunity in Torrance as “...a way to incorporate a mix of housing on a small scale while enhancing the aesthetic character of commercial areas.” The Land Use Element includes an objective and policies to facilitate its development, but currently proposes a case-by-case approach. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, the Sites Inventory includes new opportunities for mixed-use development on a variety of sites. This will require an update to the City’s mixed-use policies in the Land Use Element and revisions to the Zoning Code and Zoning Map for implementation.

The General Plan Land Use Policy Map provides opportunity for new mixed-use development in three commercial land use designations while preserving neighborhoods where mixing of uses has already occurred. The General Commercial (C-GEN) designation encourages commercial and office or residential mixed-use developments by allowing a higher intensity of development (1.0 FAR), compared with solely commercial uses.⁴

In neighborhoods where office/business and residential uses are already gradually being combined, the Residential-Office (R-OF) land use designation allows the location of small, less-intense mixed use development adjacent to single-family neighborhoods. Residential-Office housing can include low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots. Developments that integrate residential and office uses within one structure currently require some form of discretionary review, such as a Conditional Use Permit. The Sites Inventory includes many sites that are located in the R-OF land use designation. The Residential Professional District (R-P), which implements the R-OF land use designation, allows various combinations of residential and commercial uses. Mixed use development within one building requires a Conditional Use Permit. The amendment of the R-OF land use designation and R-P zone are proposed (Program 1) to allow stand-alone residential uses in addition to the existing mixed use projects via a ministerial permit, and the Zoning Code will be amended to include new objective design standards and modifications to existing the development standards to facilitate multiple-family and mixed use residential development while mitigating impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

The Commercial Center (C-CTR) designation applies to areas with a concentration of diverse or intense commercial uses. Mixed-use commercial and residential uses are permitted within this designation. Mixed use development is encouraged by allowing the maximum FAR of 1.0 to be exceeded with a Conditional Use Permit for mixed use projects.

In the former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area (DRP), densities are based on unit size. Development with units with living areas less than 700 square feet in size are allowed a density of 43 units per acre. Development with units with living areas between 700 and 1,500 square feet and over 1,500 square feet are allowed densities of 27 and 21 units per acre respectively. Senior Housing is permitted at 58 units per acre. These density parameters are exclusive of density bonuses allowed under State law. Based on development trends in Downtown Torrance, more recent developments have averaged densities of about 52 units per acre.

Also, as noted above, the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also provides for mixed-use development and the City is proposing an expansion of mixed use in other Specific Plan districts.

Accessory Dwelling Units

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is an attached or detached residential unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more people. A Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) is an ADU contained entirely within a single-family residence. Recent state legislation, including AB 68, AB 881, AB 587, AB 671, and SB 13, modified the way local jurisdiction are allowed to regulate ADUs and JADUs. This legislation promotes the construction of new ADUs and JADUs and limits the ways cities can regulate their design. Under current state law, no lot coverage, floor area ratio, open space, or minimum lot size can preclude the construction of a “statewide exemption ADU,” which is an ADU

⁴ Solely commercial developments will be limited to 0.6 FAR.

with an area up to 800 square feet, height up to 16 feet, and 4-foot side and rear yard setbacks. The City recently updated its ADU regulations to comply with these changes.

ADU and JADUs are permitted within Designated Areas and Limited Designated Areas identified in the Municipal Code, on lots located within zones that permit residential uses by right or by conditional use, and that contain an existing or proposed single-family dwelling or accessory structure. Accessory dwelling units are subject to the provisions of the Torrance Municipal Code, except for any provisions that do not allow a statewide exemption ADU. Accessory dwelling units required by state law are allowed on any lots located within a residential or mixed-use zone as provided in Section 65852.2(e) of the Government Code. The City will maintain its ADU ordinance to remain in compliance with state law (Program 6).

Multi-Family Housing

Multi-family housing is permitted by right in most residential zones in Torrance. Two-family units are permitted in the R-2, R-3, R-R-3, R-3-3, R-4, R-5, RTH, and R-P zones. Apartment houses are permitted in all residential zones, with the exception of the R-1 and R-2 zones. In addition, residential uses are conditionally permitted in the C-1 and C-2 zones, allowing convenient access to transportation and commercial activities to persons living in the commercial zones. Larger multi-family structures are allowed in both the R-4 and R-5 zones, permitting buildings up to 50 feet in height in the R-4 zone, and up to 24 stories and an FAR of 3.12 in the R-5 zone.

Senior Citizen Housing

Senior citizen housing (multi-family housing units that are restricted to persons 55 years or older and that meet the state and federal requirements for senior housing) is conditionally permitted in all residential and commercial zones in the City, with the exception of the R-1 and R-2 zones, which do not permit multi-family housing. The Torrance Municipal Code permits senior citizen housing at a density of 58 dwelling units per acre. The City has established development standards for senior citizen housing related to minimum unit size and open space requirements. Two hundred square feet of open space is required for each dwelling unit, which is generally less than the amount required as a standard residential condition. Further, the City encourages ancillary uses such as laundry, recreation, central cooking facilities, and a small pharmacy be provided on site to serve the residents’ needs, especially those with limited mobility. In order to further facilitate housing for this special needs group, the City has reduced parking requirements for senior housing to 1 parking space per dwelling unit.

The Torrance Land Use Code currently includes a provision allowing for conversion of existing detached single-family residences into supplemental housing for the elderly (Section 95.30.40), subject to a conditional use permit. The single family residence to which the supplemental residence unit is added must be owner occupied, and the residence must be occupied by no more than two persons, one of whom is related to the owner occupant of the primary residence, and one of whom must be at least 60 years old. This is a hold-over from the existing Zoning Code that inadvertently was not deleted when the ADU ordinance was updated. The City will delete this provision as part of the update to the Zoning Code that is identified in Program 6.

Residential Care Facilities

The Zoning Code defines residential care facilities as those facilities that are licensed by the state to provide 24-hour residential care to persons in need of personal services, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of the individual, excluding jails and other facilities. Such facilities may provide nursing, dietary and other personal services, but not surgery or other primary medical treatments such as are customarily provided in convalescent facilities or hospitals. This classification includes retirement homes. Consistent with state law, the City facilitates the development of small residential care facilities by treating licensed facilities that serve six or fewer persons as regular residential uses. The City permits large residential care facilities serving more than six persons in all residential zones subject to approval of a large family day care permit. Although a ministerial permit, state law now requires large family day care to be treated the same as small family day care, allowed as a permitted use with no differentiation between it and any other permitted residential use. The City has not adopted a spacing requirement for residential care facilities. The City will revise the Zoning Code to ensure consistency with state law (Program 11).

Emergency Shelters and Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Emergency shelters are defined facilities that provide immediate and short-term housing and supplemental service, such as food, counseling, and access to other social programs, to persons or families experiencing homelessness. According to the 2020 Homeless Count in Los Angeles County, the total unhoused population in Torrance was 332, with 270 of these unsheltered. State law requires emergency shelters to be permitted by right in at least one zone within a city, and that the zone provide sufficient capacity to accommodate this population.

Emergency shelters are permitted by right in the M-2 district. The M-2 zone encompasses 2,273 acres and is comprised of a variety of industrial uses. Specific uses range from refineries to office buildings and accessory commercial uses. The heaviest industrial uses are related to oil refinery operations. However, the majority of land zoned for M-2 is outside of refinery operations. The Torrance Municipal Airport is also located in the M-2 zone. Combined, the refineries and the airport comprise less than half (940 acres) of the M-2 zone. The remaining acreage is defined by lower intensity industrial uses and accessory commercial uses. This area (exclusive of the airport and refineries), approximately 1,333 acres, is substantial in size.

According to the research that was conducted for development of the City's emergency shelter ordinance, the average lot size in the M-2 zone outside of refinery operations is two to four acres. There are four identified vacant parcels located in the M-2 zone ranging in size from one to 23 acres, with an average size of 9.7 acres. Opportunities for homeless shelter siting also exists in developments that can accommodate tenants in large, ready-to-occupy spaces that would be appropriate for reuse as a homeless shelter. There are no minimum setbacks or maximum lot coverage requirements in the M-2 zone, and building heights are determined based on Building Code requirements.

The area is well served by major regional transportation as the City's industrial areas are adjacent to or very near major regional corridors. Based on the amount of available industrial land, vacant properties, range of lot sizes available, and opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, the zone has sufficient capacity to accommodate the identified homeless need in at least one year-round shelter, and there are no development standards that constrain the creation of an emergency shelter in the M-2 zone.

Emergency shelters may also be treated as a hotel or motel use based on the character of development, and as such are conditionally permitted in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones.

AB 101 requires jurisdictions to allow a Low Barrier Navigation Center development of up to 50 units by right in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones permitting multi-family uses if the development meets specified requirements. The City may also choose to allow larger Low Barrier Navigation Center developments by right in these zones. A “Low Barrier Navigation Center” is defined 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.” The Housing Plan includes Program 11, to maintain the emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law and to adopt a low barrier navigation center ordinance as required by state law.

Supportive Housing

California Government Code Section 65582 defines supportive housing as housing with no limits on the length of stay that is occupied by a “target population” and links this population with the provision of housing and social services. “Target population” means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.

State law requires supportive housing to be defined as a residential use and subject only to the same regulations as comparable residential uses. Supportive housing is not subject to any regulations beyond what is required for other residential uses in the same zone.

AB 2162 further requires supportive housing projects of 50 units or fewer to be permitted by right in zones where multi-family and mixed-use developments are permitted, when the development meets certain conditions. The City may choose to allow larger supportive housing projects by right in these zones. The bill also prohibits minimum parking requirements for supportive housing within ½ mile of public transit. Program 11 includes an action to update the Zoning Code to explicitly allow supportive housing consistent with state law.

Transitional Housing

Transitional housing provides longer term housing (up to two years), coupled with supportive services such as job training and counseling to individuals and families who are transitioning to permanent housing. State law requires transitional housing to be defined as a residential use and subject only to the same regulations as comparable residential uses.

The Torrance Land Use Code does not currently reference transitional housing directly. Siting for transitional housing is based on the character of development (residential, commercial, etc.), not the population these developments serve. Consistent with State law, small transitional housing serving six or fewer people is considered a single-family residential use and permitted in all zones where residential uses are permitted. Transitional housing for more than seven people and operated as a residential care facility is permitted in both the R-P and R-4 zones. Transitional housing that functions

as a regular multi-family use (such as apartments) is permitted where multi-family uses are permitted. Program 11 includes an action to update the Zoning Code to explicitly allow transitional housing consistent with state law.

Transitional housing may also be treated as a hotel or motel use based on the character of development, and as such are conditionally permitted in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones.

Single Room Occupancy Facilities

Single-room occupancy (SRO) buildings house people in single rooms with tenants often sharing bathrooms and kitchens. SROs are conditionally permitted as hotels or motels in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones of the City. Several SROs are located within the City including one in Downtown area that is part of a mixed-use development. The private property owners have undertaken several rehabilitation projects to preserve and improve existing SRO units.

Manufactured and Mobile Homes

Manufactured housing is permitted by right on all lots which permit single family houses, pursuant to State law. Mobile homes and mobile home parks developments (termed trailer court and trailer parks in the Torrance Land Use Code) are conditionally permitted in the R-1, R-2, R-3, R-R-3, R-4, R-P, C-1, and C-2 zones. In addition, mobile homes developments can be permitted as a temporary use in the M-1 and M-2 zones.

Farmworker and Employee Housing

As indicated in the Community Profile, there are only 129 Torrance residents that held “Agriculture, Mining” occupations, according to the 2014-2018 U.S. Census American Community Survey estimate. These persons are most likely employed in plant nurseries, landscaping, or gardening companies, as City records indicate that there are no agricultural operations in Torrance. However, the City does permit agricultural uses, including flower and vegetable gardens, orchards, the raising of tree crops, berry or bush crops, for the purpose of propagation, culture, or wholesaling, in many zones, including:

- Light Agricultural (A-1)
- Single Family Residential (R-1)
- Two Family Residential (R-2)
- Limited Multiple Family Residential (R-3)
- Three Unit Multiple Family Residential (R-3-3)
- Unlimited Multiple Family Residential (R-4)
- Residential Professional (R-P)
- Residential Townhome (RTH)

In addition, orchards are permitted to locate within the C-1 and C-2 zones. Very little land in the City is zoned A-1, limited to the Southern California Edison Easement and a portion of vacant land in the southern hillside region. For any agricultural uses in the City, the City will comply with the State Employee Housing Act (Section 17000 of the Health and Safety Code) that allows employee/farmworker housing in zones allowing agricultural uses. The City will update the zoning code to clarify that employee and farmworker housing must be allowed in accordance with state law (Program 11)

Density Bonus

Consistent with State law (SB 1818), developers in Torrance can receive density bonuses of 20 to 35 percent, depending on the amount and type of affordable housing provided, and "concessions," exceptions from normally applicable zoning and other development standards. The State density bonus provisions have not been incorporated into the City’s Land Use Code; however, the City will adopt a density bonus ordinance in compliance with state law (Program 5). Although the City does not have a density bonus ordinance, cities are still required to comply with state law (Table H-43). For example, state density bonus provisions were applied to a 44-unit affordable, mixed-use, workforce housing development in Downtown Torrance. The development provides 43 units affordable to very low and low income households. Additionally, one pipeline project has been submitted that proposes utilizing the State density bonus to provide units for low-income households. Developers of several potential projects are currently discussing utilization of the density bonus with City staff, although the projects have not yet been submitted.

Table H-43: Density Bonus Opportunities

Group	Minimum % of Units	Bonus Granted	Additional Bonus for Each 1% Increase in Target Units	% Target Units Required for Maximum 35% Bonus
Very Low-Income	5%	20%	2.5%	11%
Low-Income	10%	20%	1.5%	20%
Moderate Income (Condo or PUD Only)	10%	5%	1%	40%
Senior Citizen Housing Development	100%	20%	--	--

Developers may seek a waiver or modification of development standards that have the effect of precluding the construction of a housing development meeting the density bonus criteria. The developer must show that the waiver or modification is necessary to make the housing units economically feasible.

State density bonus regulations also include incentives and concessions. A developer can receive an incentive or concession based on the proportion of affordable units for target groups. Incentives or concessions may include, but are not limited to, a reduction in setback and square footage requirements and a reduction in the ratio of vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions.

Short term rentals

Short Term Rentals (STRs) are defined as the rental of any residence, or portion thereof within a legally permitted residential structure which is occupied or intended or designed for occupancy, for a period of 30 consecutive calendar days or less. The City adopted a short term rental ordinance in 2019, which allows STRs to be permitted in the vast majority of the City, including the Coastal Zone. In 2020, the California Coastal Commission approved local regulation of short term rentals in the Coastal Zone, and in May 2021 the City Council adopted amendments to the STR ordinance. The City’s ordinance differentiates between commercial and residential zones, as follows:

- Commercial Zones: STRs are permitted in residences with or without a host living onsite.
- Residential Zones: STRs are permitted in residences solely as a home share with a host living onsite. In STRs located within a multifamily residence, the following standards apply:

- Only one unit per every 30 residential units within a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental per lot or parcel of land located in a commercial or residential zone.
- In the Torrance Coastal Overlay, within residential zones all residential units located in a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental, and within commercial zones only one unit per every 30 residential units located in a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental per lot or parcel of land.

Requirements include: approval of an STR permit; the limitation of one short term rental period, reservation, booking, or stay by guests per residence; a minimum of one off-street parking space for the STR, in addition to the required parking for the residence; and compliance with a variety of citywide policies, programs, and standards, such the City’s Noise Ordinance, Municipal Collection of Solid Waste Ordinance, and Property Maintenance Ordinance. In the summer of 2021, the City started an enforcement program to bring existing STRs into compliance with City standards and approval procedures.

3.2.2 BUILDING CODES AND ENFORCEMENT

The City of Torrance has adopted the 2019 California Building Code (CBC), which establishes standards and requires inspections at various stages of construction to ensure code compliance. The City’s building code also requires new residential construction to comply with the federal American Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, which specifies that a minimum percentage of dwelling units in new developments must be fully accessible to the physically disabled. Amendments to the CBC have been related to administrative procedures, fire safety requirements, and geological standards. While the incorporation of these measures may raise housing construction costs, these standards are necessary to provide access to homes for people with disabilities and to ensure a safe living environment for the community. Further, the CBC is adopted by many cities throughout California and does not, in general, pose a constraint to residential development.

The City uses a building code and a Land Use (zoning) code enforcement program to help maintain the quality of residential neighborhoods. The Environmental Section of the Community Development Department is responsible for the enforcement of City zoning and land use codes, property maintenance and nuisance codes (both community noise and airport noise codes) and the Building Division is responsible for the enforcement of unpermitted buildings. The program allows residents to report conditions in their neighborhoods. Code enforcement staff will generally respond by making a site inspection to determine if there is a violation and if there is, notice will be given to the resident that explains what needs to be done to correct the violation. While assessing the complaint, the City will also do a cursory inspection of the immediate area.

The Torrance Municipal Code sets the standards for enforcement, and the Environmental Section uses education, enforcement, and dispute mediation to ensure that these standards are maintained. The Code includes property maintenance, nuisance abatement, and vacant building/lot ordinances (Sections 92.32.1, 92.35.1, and 92.38.1) that establish standards of home and property maintenance practices and provide a legal basis for enforcement of the ordinance by code enforcement staff. The ordinances require property owners to keep their housing units in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

The City had two home rehabilitation programs in place to assist homeowners and property owners. The Low-Interest Home Rehabilitation Loan Program and the No-Interest Home Rehabilitation Deferred Loan Program were available to qualified homeowners and owners of rental property to rehabilitate dwelling units in need of repair. Due to loss of redevelopment funding, these programs are being phased out.

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Workforce Investment Network Partners. HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own.

3.2.3 ON- AND OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Site improvements are a necessary component of the new development process. Improvements include the laying of sewer, water, and streets to serve the new development. Most residential areas in Torrance are served with existing infrastructure due to the built-out nature of the City. For new residential development, additions to existing residences, or residential conversions, the following site improvements are typically required: resident and guest parking, paved vehicular and pedestrian circulation areas, private and common open space, landscaping, trash enclosure, and private storage areas. Required street widths vary depending on the category of street on which the development is located.

Right-of-way standards are consistent with those established by the General Plan:

- Local Residential Street – 34'-40' (street width only, exclusive of sidewalks and parkways)
- Collector Street – 40'-60' (street width only, exclusive of sidewalks and parkways)
- Minor Arterial Street – 66'-74' (street width only, includes median parkway)
- Major Arterial Street – 70'-82' (street width only, includes median parkway)

Site Improvements for Residential Developments:

- Parking
- Open space, private and common
- Trash enclosure
- Landscaping and perimeter walls
- Pedestrian access from sidewalk to entry
- Personal storage areas
- Exterior lighting
- Stormwater drainage facilities
- Fire suppression apparatus and fire exits

- Water pressure apparatus – related to fire safety and water quality
- ADA accessibility requirements
- Service utilities, sidewalk, and property lighting – more common for larger developments
- Necessary Sewer Improvements – staff experience indicates that this is more common for larger developments and due to the infill nature of development in Torrance is not as common.
- Necessary street and traffic enhancements– this is more prevalent in commercial development and very large residential developments.
- Curb, gutter, sidewalk facilities
- Alley and alley drain reconstruction – applies to developments with alleys.

In Torrance, improvements required of new developments are mostly related to basic site function that allow for use/habitation and address health and safety considerations. The City provides flexibility in many cases. In cases where site improvements pose a hardship and or a request is made for a modification, City staff can work with the applicant to identify alternatives to satisfying the improvement requirement in the pre-application or plan check process. The City provides greater flexibility on improvements not directly related to safety and health issues (fire, basic site necessities such as utility connections).

Developments using the State density bonus provisions may benefit from the concession/incentive requirements of SB 1818 that require localities to offer up to three concessions/incentives (including incentive or concession proposed by either party that results in an “identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions”⁵) based on the percentage of targeted units.

3.2.4 FEES AND EXACTIONS

The City of Torrance charges planning and development fees to process and review permits for residential developments. These application and development review fees help offset the cost of processing a particular type of case (see Table H-44). The City’s fees have been calculated to recoup City costs associated with review and approval of proposed projects while not unduly constraining the financial feasibility and development of market rate and affordable housing. Fees charged in Torrance are, in general, comparable to those of surrounding communities in Los Angeles County. A survey of neighboring jurisdictions (Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Manhattan Beach) indicates that permit fees in Torrance are average for the three neighboring jurisdictions, and slightly higher for General Plan amendments, zone changes, and variances (see Table H-45).

Multiple family developments not requiring any discretionary approval (which do not exceed established development standards) would not be subject to any planning fees and would only be subject to applicable building permit, plan check, and inspection fees which are based on project valuation (approximately \$8,816 in fees for building permit and plan check on a development with a \$400,000 value plus an energy fee and a handicap fee at \$2,112 each), in addition to development impact fees normally associated with residential construction (effective July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021).

⁵ Gov. Code § 65915

Table H-44: Planning Permit Application Fees

Permit Type	Base Fee	Fee for Multiple Filing	Notification Fee	Engineering Mapping Fee
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Tier 1 ¹	\$5,704	\$2,852	\$439	\$78
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Tier 2 ²	\$16,283	\$8,141	\$439	\$78
Development Permit (DVP)	\$5,289	\$2,645	\$439	---
Division of Lot (DIV)	\$3,681	\$1,840	\$439	\$78 per lot
Environmental Assessment (EAS)	\$11,213	---	\$439	---
General Plan Amendment (GPA)	\$10,189	\$7,642	\$439	---
Modification of CUP, PRE, PCR, DVP (MOD)	\$5,801	\$2,901	\$439	---
Planned Development (PD)	\$13,114	\$9,835	\$439	---
Planning Commission Review (PCR)	\$4,631	\$2,316	\$439	\$78
Precise Plan of Development (PRE)	\$5,411	\$2,706	\$439	\$78
Tentative Tract Map (TTM)	\$8,190	\$4,095	\$439	\$78 per lot
Validation Permit (VAL)	\$7,898	---	\$439	---
Variance (VAR)	\$10,871	\$8,153	\$439	---
Waiver (WAV)	\$2,803	\$1,402	---	---
Zone Change (ZON)	\$11,749	\$8,812	\$439	---

Source: City of Torrance, 2021

¹CUP Tier 1: use changes, 7 or fewer residential units, less than 15,000 SF of Commercial or Industrial space

²CUP Tier 2: 8 or more residential units, 15,000 SF or greater Commercial or Industrial space

Table H-45: Comparison of Residential Permit Application Fees to Surrounding Cities

Fee	Torrance	Redondo Beach	Hermosa Beach	Manhattan Beach
Conditional Use Permit (CUP)	\$5,157 (Tier 1 ¹) - \$14,236 (Tier 2 ²)	\$3,055	\$5,070	\$8,393
Variance	\$10,992	\$3,060	\$3,907	\$8,421
Zoning Map Amendment	\$10,411	\$5,7655	\$4,226	\$20,000
Tract or Parcel Map	\$7,408	\$1,530-\$2,370	\$4,879	\$1,301-\$4,074

Source: City of Torrance (2019), City of Redondo Beach (2021); City of Hermosa Beach (2020); City of Manhattan Beach (2020)

*Indicates deposit amount

¹CUP Tier 1: use changes, 7 or fewer residential units, less than 15,000 SF of Commercial or Industrial space

²CUP Tier 2: 8 or more residential units, 15,000 SF or greater Commercial or Industrial space

As with most other jurisdictions, the City also charges impact fees to ensure that services and infrastructure are in place to cover the cost of added services required by new residential development. Although impact fees and requirements for offsite improvements add to the cost of housing, these fees and requirements are necessary to maintain the quality of life within a community.

Torrance's impact fees include (see Table H-46):

- Dwelling Unit Fee (established by the City in 1989 and adjusted periodically according to the Consumer Price Index);
- Parks and Recreation Facilities Fee (established by the City in 1975 for the acquisition, improvement and expansion of public park, playground and/or recreation facilities); and
- Torrance Unified School District Fees.
- Development Impact Fee (adopted in 2005 and updated in 2020 with a phased-in adjustment (70%, 85%, 100%) over next 5 years)

Los Angeles County provides sewer to the City and charges a separate sewer connection fee.

The fees are intended to provide funds to recoup the cost of providing infrastructure and services to the developments, while not unduly constraining the feasibility of both market-rate and affordable housing.

Table H-46: 2021 Torrance Impact Fees

Impact Fees	Single Family (assumes 1,800 sf du)	Multi-Family (assumes 1,000 sf du)
Dwelling Unit Fee	\$1,665	\$1,665
Park & Recreation Fee	\$550	\$550
School Fees	\$7,344	\$4,080
Development Impact Fee (FY 2020/2021)	\$6,224.40	\$5,290.60
Torrance Subtotal:	\$9,559	\$6,295
LA Co. Sewer Connection Fee	\$1,910/unit	\$1,146/unit
Total:	\$11,469	\$7,441

Source: City of Torrance, 2021

Development impact fees charged in Torrance are comparable to, and even less than, those of surrounding communities in Los Angeles County. Due to differences in the types of fees charged in other jurisdictions, an exact comparison can be difficult to make. However, Redondo Beach reports development impact fees of \$15,000 for a typical single-family residence (excluding Quimby fees) and \$18,000 per unit (excluding Quimby fees) for a typical multi-family unit (source: 2021-2029 Redondo Beach Draft Housing Element). The City of Gardena reports development impact fees of \$13,450 for a typical single-family unit and \$13,650 for a typical multi-family unit (source: 2021-2029 Gardena Draft Housing Element). The reasonable costs of development impact fees in the City are not considered a deterrent to development in Torrance as they are also lower than neighboring cities.

The City Council has the discretion to waive a portion or all of the permit application fees for a project. The Community Development Director also has some discretion in waiving building permit fees and development impact fees. Staff records indicate that the City has deferred developer-responsible improvements to help with project feasibility. As part of Program 3, the City will evaluate reducing permit fees to lower development costs, particularly fees for Tier 2 Conditional Use Permits.

3.2.5 PROCESSING AND PERMIT PROCEDURES

The development review process is an important tool that helps ensure that new housing meets all necessary health and safety codes and is supplied with all necessary utilities and infrastructure. Yet,

the development review process can also constrain opportunities for the development of lower income housing, particularly through the indirect cost of time in the process and the direct cost in fees.

The Community Development Department is the lead agency in processing residential development applications, and as appropriate, coordinates the processing of these applications with other City departments and agencies. The City uses various development permits to ensure quality housing while minimizing the costs associated with lengthy reviews and provides a procedural guide to facilitate the submittal process.

SB 330 requires jurisdictions to allow developers to submit a preliminary application for residential development projects in advance of submitting a full application. The preliminary application includes a limited amount of information about the proposed development. If a preliminary application is deemed complete, the City may not modify fees or development standards for the project subsequently, provided there are no significant changes to the proposed project. The developer must submit a full application for the project within 180 days from the date that the preliminary application is deemed complete. The City does not have a preliminary application form available. The City will use HCD's standard Preliminary Application Form for residential development projects, and modify if necessary to address any local requirements (Program 3).

Development processing times for residential projects vary according to the complexity of the proposal but are relatively short and expeditious due to streamlined procedures (see Table H-47 for typical time frames). Single-family homes generally are allowed ministerially (by right) and simply require a building permit. This is true as well for rental duplexes or multiple-family projects that comply with development standards for their zone.

For-sale multiple-family housing, two-unit or multiple-family housing that exceed development thresholds for height and FAR, residential uses within commercial zones, senior citizen housing require a discretionary Conditional Use Permit. Conditional Use Permits are approved by the Planning Commission and may be appealed to the City Council. Most residential uses within the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan require a discretionary Development Permit. Development Permits are approved by the Planning Commission and may be appealed to the City Council. Minor Development Permits, used for minor expansions and alternations of existing uses are approved by the Planning Director and may be appealed to the Planning Commission. A public hearing is required for Planning Commission approval.

To be approved, the following findings are required for Conditional Use Permits:

1. The proposed use is one conditionally permitted within the subject zoning district, complies with all the applicable provisions of this Division and any applicable Specific Plan or Redevelopment Plan, complies with any conditions imposed on the property on which the use is proposed to be located, and any Code violations are abated. This paragraph shall not be interpreted to impose new requirements on legal nonconforming uses and structures under Article 22 of Chapter 2 of this Division;
2. The proposed use will not impair the integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located;
3. The subject site is physically suitable for the type of land use being proposed;

4. The proposed use is compatible with the land use presently on the subject property if there is more than one (1) land use on the property;
5. The proposed use will be compatible with existing and proposed future land uses within the zoning district and the general area in which the proposed use is to be located;
6. The proposed use will encourage and be consistent with the orderly development of the City as provided for in the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan or Redevelopment Plan;
7. The proposed use will not discourage the appropriate existing or planned future use of surrounding property or tenancies;
8. There will be adequate provisions for water, sanitation, and public utilities and services to ensure that the proposed development is not detrimental to public health and safety;
9. There will be adequate provisions for public access to serve the proposed use;
10. The proposed location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or welfare, or to the property of persons located in the area;
11. The proposed use will not produce any or all of the following results:
 - A) Damage or nuisance from noise, smoke, odor, dust or vibration,
 - B) Hazard from explosion, contamination or fire,
 - C) Hazard occasioned by unusual volume or character of traffic or the congregating of large numbers of people or vehicles;

Guidance on projects that require discretionary development permits is provided through established development standards and design guidelines in City documents. For example, developers of projects within the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan area that trigger discretionary review can refer to the City’s Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan, which includes clearly written and detailed standards and guidelines. These standards and guidelines provide developers a comprehensive template for designing their projects to ensure maximum compatibility in the design stage, before an application is formally submitted to the City and subject to further review. Designs of projects within the parameters of established specific plans, standards and other guidelines, help ease the review process and reduce processing time.

From submittal to Planning Commission hearing, a subdivision request (Tract Map or Parcel Map) takes on average 3 months. Other zoning entitlements required for the project are processed concurrently with the subdivision request. A project that requires CEQA review, Variance, Zone Change, or General Plan Amendment generally adds about four to six weeks to the process. Additionally, while Building Permits generally take four to six weeks to process, applicants have the option to pay an expedited plan check fee which can significantly reduce processing time.

Table H-47: Development Review Time Frames

Application	Estimated Processing Time
Conditional Use Permit	3 months
Planning Commission Review	3 months
Waiver	3 months
Variance	3 - 4 months
Parcel Map or Tract Map	3 months

Table H-47: Development Review Time Frames

Application	Estimated Processing Time
Zoning Map Amendment	4-6 months
General Plan Amendment	4-6 months
Environmental Review	4-6 months
Building Permit	Varies

Source: City of Torrance Staff, 2021

Processing times may be substantially longer if an environmental impact report (EIR) is required for a project. However, processing time relative to environmental review has been reduced substantially in recent years. Combined environmental and project review has shortened the review process on average by two months.

The average length of time between receiving approval of a housing development and submittal of application for the building permit is approximately seven months for projects consisting of six or fewer units and 11 months for projects consisting of more than six units.

3.2.6 STREAMLINING PROGRAMS

The City offers a number of services designed specifically to assist property owners/developers/investors with many key services with the goal of expediting the development of affordable housing units.

- **One Stop Permit Center**
 The City offers a single place for property owners/developers/investors to submit and coordinate projects and plan checks to ensure efficient and effective service and support from Building and Safety, Planning, and Engineering personnel.
- **Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Mapping**
 The City has created applications for viewing and investigating zoning, land use policy, subdivision activity, aerial imagery, and many other features pertaining to land use within the City of Torrance. These applications can be found at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/gis-and-mapping> and are a great resource in the planning and development of a project.
- **Preliminary Plan Review**
 Torrance is committed to a good start for every project, and that begins with offering preliminary plan review service for projects in early development phase. At no charge, electronic plans are submitted directly to the Planning Division for in-house review and comment by all City Departments.
- **Lower Cost of Doing Business**
 Torrance has a longstanding reputation for being business friendly, and that means having the lowest permit fees in the South Bay region. The cost of doing business is less in Torrance, and less means more for business. Torrance has an easy to interpret cost schedule (<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/fee-schedule/-fsiteid-1>), which aids in the planning and budgeting of a project.

- **Permit Streamlining**

Torrance operates a streamlined permit and plan check process that offers quick turnaround times and excellent customer service. Plans are submitted at the one-stop Permit Center through a single point of contact, Building & Safety Division, thus eliminating multiple plan submittals.

Additionally, our public patrons can view live updates at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/building/building-permits> on the current wait time within the Permit Center to find the best time to visit.

- **Expedited Plan Review**

The expedited plan review service is provided at the request of the applicant and approved by an authorized staff member. In order to obtain expedited plan review, the owner or the owner’s agent must request expedited review and submit a complete set of plans and documents, required clearances from other agencies, and pay a surcharge of 60% above regular plan review fee upon first submittal. The plans are placed under expedited plan review queue and initial plan review service is 10 working days from first plan submittal date. Expedited plan review is for the Building Division only. Planning and Engineering turnaround times are based on regular turnaround times.

- **Next Day Inspections**

Torrance has an easy to use scheduling system for next day inspections. All inspections are scheduled through a single point of contact, Building & Safety Division, thus avoiding schedule conflicts and unnecessary delays.

- **Online Citizen Portal**

Torrance has developed a Building and Safety Division Records Search Portal that allows our public patrons to search for the following:

- Active Building Permits- provides information regarding active Building and Safety permits.
- Permit Records- grants access to scanned Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Grading, Sign, and Engineering permit records.
- Property Information- provides information regarding parcel profile attributes such as zoning, special overlay areas (Hillside, Expansive Soils, etc), assessor parcel number, year built, legal description, and more.

The Building and Safety Division Records Search Portal can be found at <https://www.torranceca.gov/services/community-development/properties-permits-and-records-search#!/>

The City will continue to offer these programs and, as noted in various programs in the Housing Plan, will seek input from homeowners and developers as to how streamlining can be improved and will update and/or add new programs as appropriate.

3.2.7 TRANSPARENCY IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

To increase transparency and certainty in the development application process as required by law, the City has links to its zoning and development standards and fee schedule posted on its website. Links to the zoning maps can be found here:

- <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/gis-and-mapping/map-gallery>

Links to development standards and allowed uses can be found here:

- <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Torrance/>

Fee schedules can be found here:

- <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/fee-schedule>

3.2.8 COASTAL ZONE DEVELOPMENT

Torrance has approximately 123 acres of property that is within the Coastal Zone and is subject to oversight by the California Coastal Commission (see Figure H-7). The City has not completed a Local Coastal Plan; as a result, for properties located in the Coastal Zone, projects must first go through the local planning process at the city (such as Minor Hillside Exemptions, Precise Plans, and CUPs if needed). Once acted on at the City, the applicant then has to apply at the Coastal Commission for any process the project may be subject to. Once approved by the Coastal Commission, applicants can go through plan check at the City and obtain building permits.

California Government Code Section 65588(c) requires each periodic revision of the Housing Element to include the following information relating to housing in the Coastal Zone: a) the number of new housing units approved for construction within the Coastal Zone since January 1, 1982; b) the number of housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income required to be provided in new housing developments either within the Coastal Zone or within three miles of the Coastal Zone as a replacement for the conversion or demolition of existing coastal units occupied by low or moderate income persons; c) the number of existing residential units occupied by persons and families of low or moderate income that have been authorized to be demolished or converted since January 1, 1982 in the coastal zone; and d) the number of residential units for persons and families of low or moderate income that have been required for replacement units.

The majority of residential areas in the coastal zone are single family in nature and very stable (limited development activity). Since 1982, 58 new residential units have been constructed in the Coastal Zone. Since 2013, no new units have been constructed. An existing 12-unit multiple-family unit was approved to be replaced with a new 8-unit building; however, building permits have yet to be issued. None of the units involved were affordable to low- and moderate-income households and are not subject to the replacement requirements. Program 16 ensures compliance with the Coastal Zone as it relates to replacement housing of units occupied by low- and moderate- income households. The City has no formal inclusionary housing policy for the coastal area. However, as part of the City's Housing Plan for this 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will be adding a Religious Institution Overlay to various

properties throughout the City to facilitate (but not require) development of affordable housing on properties owned by religious institutions, including several properties within the R-H Overlay Zone (Program 7).

DRAFT

3.2.9 HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Pursuant to State law, Torrance permits state-licensed residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons in all of its residential zoning districts by right. Currently the City requires a Large Family Day Care Permit in all its residential zones, which is not consistent with SB 234, which became effective on January 1, 2020. The City will revise the Zoning Code to permit large family day care uses in all residential zones as required by state law (Program 11).

Several housing types for persons with various disabilities require a CUP in certain residential and commercial zones. Many of the existing uses that are permitted either ministerially or with discretionary review via a CUP are outdated and do not reflect all the types of uses that provide appropriate housing for persons with disabilities. Although the CUP requirement is no more stringent than for other conditional uses, the City will review its current uses and permit requirements to include and reflect a broader range of uses and to facilitate housing for persons with disabilities (Program 11).

The City has adopted the 2019 California Building Code. Standards within the Code include provisions to ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities. These standards are consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act. No local amendments that would constrain accessibility or increase the cost of housing for persons with disabilities have been adopted. To accommodate disabled persons in public facilities, the City defers to Title 24 of the California Handicap Accessibility Code.

The redefinition of “family” may limit access to housing for persons with disabilities when municipalities narrowly define the word, illegally limiting the development of group homes for persons with disabilities, but not for housing similar sized and situated families. The definition of “Family” was removed from the Torrance Municipal Code to eliminate any potential limitations on development, to implement Program 12 of the 5th Cycle Housing Element.

3.2.10 REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

The Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, requires that cities and counties provide reasonable accommodation to rules, policies, practices, and procedures where such accommodation may be necessary to afford individuals with disabilities equal housing opportunities. While fair housing laws intend that all people have equal access to housing, the law also recognizes that people with disabilities may need extra tools to achieve equality. Reasonable accommodation is one of the tools intended to further housing opportunities for people with disabilities. For developers and providers of housing for people with disabilities who are often confronted with siting or use restrictions, reasonable accommodation provides a means of requesting from the local government flexibility in the application of land use and zoning regulations or, in some instances, even a waiver of certain restrictions or requirements because it is necessary to achieve equal access to housing. Cities and counties are required to consider requests for accommodations related to housing for people with disabilities and provide the accommodation when it is determined to be “reasonable” based on fair housing laws and the case law interpreting the statutes.

State law allows for a statutorily based four-part analysis to be used in evaluating requests for reasonable accommodation related to land use and zoning matters and can be incorporated into reasonable accommodation procedures. This analysis gives great weight to furthering the housing needs of people with disabilities and also considers the impact or effect of providing the requested

accommodation on the City and its overall zoning scheme. Developers and providers of housing for people with disabilities must be ready to address each element of the following four-part analysis:

- The housing that is the subject of the request for reasonable accommodation is for people with disabilities as defined in federal or state fair housing laws;
- The reasonable accommodation requested is necessary to make specific housing available to people with disabilities who are protected under fair housing laws;
- The requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the local government; and
- The requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the local zoning code.

The City has adopted a procedure to allow requests for reasonable accommodation using a simple form available at the public counter or by request. Requests for reasonable accommodation may not be appealed by residents of adjacent properties. During the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will adopt an ordinance in the Zoning Code to formalize the City’s existing procedure (Program 15).

3.2.11 DISSOLUTION OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN CALIFORNIA

The City of Torrance had a Redevelopment Agency with a total of four redevelopment project areas, including Meadow Park Project Area, Skypark Project Area, the Downtown Project Area, and the Industrial Project Area. As a result of passage of ABX1 26 (known as the “Dissolution Act”) in 2011 as a part of the state budget, all Redevelopment Agencies in the state were dissolved. As part of this dissolution, Redevelopment Agencies were required to establish Successor Agencies, which would be charged with handling any outstanding debts and winding down the activities of the former Redevelopment Agencies, under the direction of the Oversight Board. The City of Torrance has been established as the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Torrance.

Redevelopment was a tax increment financing tool that allowed cities and counties to retain a higher share of the growth in property taxes in designated “blighted” areas to invest in those areas to remediate blight. Over 400 cities and counties in the state used this tool before 1979. Since 1994, Redevelopment projects were required to allocate 20 percent of all tax increment (known as housing set-aside funds) for affordable housing in the community. The Torrance Redevelopment Agency used its set-aside funds to produce a total of 702 affordable units. The state’s dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies has had a profound effect on the quantity and complexity of affordable housing development in the State. On a statewide level, over two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) was lost annually for affordable housing due to this change in state law. Despite state legislative efforts to replace Redevelopment with Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and Community Revitalization and Investment Areas, these financing tools generate a tiny fraction of the local funding that Redevelopment did previously, which is the reason that only a few Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and no Community Revitalization and Investment Areas have been adopted over the last 10 years.

The state has not provided an adequate replacement for affordable housing funding available under Redevelopment and the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment has resulted in a significant loss of

funding that the Torrance Redevelopment Agency previously used to construct and rehabilitate affordable housing in the city.

3.2.12 OTHER REGULATORY CHALLENGES THAT PRESENT BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Complying with State regulations and energy standards, greenhouse gas reduction requirements, and other environmental conditions help to preserve the environment—however, they add to development costs.
- Prevailing wages, a federal and state legal requirement for publicly funded projects, can add 13–20 percent to hard construction costs. These additional costs are added to already-high construction and materials costs and can push an affordable housing project to be financially infeasible.

3.2.13 REDUCTIONS TO CONSTRAINTS

Land use and development standards, fees, and permitting schedules can constrain residential development in Torrance. In particular, required minimum unit sizes, the number and type of required off-street parking spaces, the amount of required open space, the mix and density of allowed uses, restrictions on accessory dwellings and housing for populations with special needs, setbacks, density bonuses, and permit fees will be evaluated and modified to encourage residential development as identified in Section 5.2 (Housing Program). Section 5.2 also identifies revisions that will be made to the Zoning Code to implement state-mandated residential development processes and procures, such as SB 330, AB 1397, and others.

The City also provides a comprehensive streamlining program to facilitate the development process—see Section 3.2.6 for an overview—see also see Program 3.10. Additionally, many programs identified in Section 5 include methods to provide information and technical assistance to property owners and developers to help them navigate the City’s development process, with the intent to reduce constraints to development.

3.3 NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Many factors that relate to housing costs are related to the larger housing market in general. Land costs, construction costs, and labor costs all contribute to the cost of housing and can hinder the production of affordable housing. Additionally, the availability of financing can limit access to homeownership for some low-income households. Market-related constraints are part of regional and national trends related to housing, over which local jurisdictions have little to no control.

3.3.1 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Construction costs for housing can vary significantly, depending on the type of housing, such as single-family, townhomes, and apartments. However, even within a particular building type, construction costs vary by unit size and amenities. One indicator of construction costs is Building Valuation Data compiled by the International Code Council (ICC). The unit costs compiled by the ICC include structural, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical work, in addition to interior finish and normal site preparation.

The data are national and do not take into account regional differences, nor include the price of the land upon which the building is built. In 2021, according to the latest Building Valuation Data release, the national average for development costs per square foot for apartments and single-family homes in 2021 are as follows:

- Type I or II, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$157.74 to \$179.04 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$120.47 to \$125.18 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-3 Residential One and Two Family Dwelling: \$130.58 to \$138.79 per sq. ft.
- R-4 Residential Care/Assisted Living Facilities generally range between \$152.25 to \$211.58 per sq. ft.

Other factors related to construction costs is the number of units in a development—as the number of dwelling units increases, overall costs generally decrease as builders can benefit from the economies of scale. The difficulty of developing awkward infill sites can also add to costs. Furthermore, neighborhood resistance to some developments can lengthen development time, driving up the holding costs for developers.

Construction costs are relatively constant throughout Los Angeles County, and therefore high construction costs are a regional constraint on housing development rather than a local constraint. The City’s ability to mitigate high construction costs is limited without direct subsidies.

3.3.2 LAND COSTS

Land is perhaps the major variable cost component in producing new housing. The high cost of land is a contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing in all of Southern California, but especially in coastal areas such as Torrance. The impact of land costs is exacerbated in Torrance due to the fact that there is very limited amount of vacant land available in mostly built-out Torrance. Land costs may vary depending on whether the site is vacant or has existing structures that must be removed. Similarly, site constraints, such as environmental conditions, including steep slopes, soil stability, seismic hazards, or flooding, can also be factored into the cost of land. The cost of land in Torrance and surrounding cities has risen substantially due to a decrease in the availability of vacant or otherwise developable land in the South Bay area. A survey of listings on realtor.com in September 2021 found only one vacant parcel for sale, a 0.35-acre site, with a land use designation of C-GEN and zoning of ML, priced at \$1,390,000 or approximately 4.6 million per acre. This site was still available as of March 2022 and is included in the Sites Inventory.

3.3.3 HOME FINANCING

The availability of financing for a home greatly affects a person’s ability to purchase a home or invest in repairs and improvements. The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) requires lending institutions to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by income, gender, and race/ethnicity of applicants. Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates.

Table H-48 presents the disposition of home purchase loan applications in 2020 by income of the applicants. The data is for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA),

of which Torrance is a part. The data includes purchases of 1 to 4 unit homes as well as manufactured homes. Approximately 65.5 percent of the loan applications were received from above moderate-income households (earning greater than 120 percent of Median Family Income [MFI]), which is 3.5 percent higher than 2011 (as reported in the 5th Cycle Housing Element). Moderate-income households (80 to 120 percent of MFI) accounted for 20.3 percent of total loan applications, which is 1.3 percent higher than in 2011. Lower-income households (less than 80 percent MFI) accounted for 14.1 percent of total loan applications, which is 1.1 percent lower than in 2011. Origination refers to loans approved by the lender and accepted by the applicant. The overall loan origination rate in 2020 was approximately 69.2 percent, which is 7.3 percent higher than in 2011; as in 2011, this rate decreased as income decreased. However, in 2020 the percent of loans denied increased for lower income applicants as compared to 2011, while they decreased for moderate and above-moderate income applicants. This may reflect a tightening of lending standards as a result of the Great Recession, which impacts lower income applicants more than those with moderate and above-moderate incomes.

Table H-48: Disposition of Conventional Home Purchase Loan Applications for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale MSA

Applicant Income	Total Apps.	Percent of Total	% Orig.	% Denied
Lower Income (<80% MFI)	71,478	14.1%	49.9%	23.9%
Moderate Income (80 to 120% MFI)	103,071	20.3%	61.5%	13.5%
Above Moderate Income (>120% MFI)	331,968	65.5%	75.9%	12.1%
All	506,517	100%	69.2%	14.1%

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), 2020.

*Totals may not add up due to rounding.

3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Torrance has several environmental constraints that affect potential development. These constraints are due to endangered species and sensitive habitat, heightened seismic activity, noise levels in excess of City standards, potential mineral extraction facilities, and other constraints which preclude or restrict the development of housing. This section briefly outlines these constraints.

As part of the Housing Element update, a Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) in compliance with CEQA Guidelines, was prepared to identify and analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, and the ways in which any potential significant effects could be avoided or mitigated. The IS/ND was made available for public review from November 1, 2021, through November 30, 2021. Based on the initial evaluation presented in the IS, it was concluded that the Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts, which is the rationale for the preparation of the ND.

Attachment B of the IS/ND presents a comprehensive list of standard Mitigation Measures, Conditions and Requirements that are generally applicable to ground disturbing land development projects in the City. These mitigation measures include those in the City's adopted 2010 General Plan EIR and 2013 Addendum to the FEIR or are the standard, current Mitigation Measures generally applicable to land development projects in the City.

As determined to be applicable by the City, these measures are to be implemented before, during and after construction and can be incorporated as Conditions of Approval for any future or subsequent

ground disturbing land development projects in the City to ensure all potential impacts are avoided, minimized or reduced to less than significant levels.

3.4.1 ENDANGERED SPECIES AND SENSITIVE HABITAT

Torrance contains few areas where native habitat hosts endangered or sensitive species, as most of the City's open space is developed as programmed urban parks. Torrance has one significant resource to the natural habitat of Southern California, the Madrona Marsh, which was established as a permanent ecological preserve in 1986. The Marsh is a remnant of a natural vernal wetland sustained by a historic drainage basin that no longer exists. The Marsh covers approximately 11 acres within a larger open space preserve area; the balance of the area is sandy upland and wetland, all of which has been designated by Los Angeles County as a Significant Ecological Area. Vernal marshes are distinct in that they flood during the rainy season and dry out after the rainy season has passed. This wetland regime produces a unique ecosystem, and its significance is evidenced by the diversity of life that resides there. This 42-plus acre site is home to over 110 species of plants, over 65 families of insects, two amphibian species, three species of reptiles, about 160 types of birds, and at least four mammal species. The Marsh, dedicated as an ecological preserve, cannot be developed for urban uses.

3.4.2 SEISMIC ACTIVITY

The potential for seismic activity and ground shaking in Torrance depends on the proximity to the affected fault and the intensity of the seismic event along the fault. Currently no active or potentially active faults are known to exist within Torrance. However, the city lies in a seismically active region where numerous faults are capable of generating moderate to large earthquakes that could impact structures and infrastructure. Since Torrance is close to multiple fault zones, movement along any of the zones has the potential of adversely affecting the City. As indicated by nearly two centuries of earthquake records, the impacts of ground shaking related to seismic activity are expected to remain a risk in Torrance and have the potential to be severe.

The City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies the maximum likelihood of earthquake events on the most likely faults by size and fault over the next 30 years. Table H-49 below identifies these faults and the percent of likelihood of an earthquake, measured using the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale, according to seismic forecasts conducted by the US Geological Survey (USGS).

Table H-49: Maximum Likelihood of Earthquake Events by Size and Fault in the Next 30 Years

Fault	6.7 M _w	7.0 M _w	7.5 M _w	8.0 M _w
Palos Verdes	3.17%	2.84%	0.1%	---
Puente Hills	0.78%	0.58%	0.19%	---
Puente Hills (Coyote segment)	0.95%	0.65%	0.19%	---
Puente Hills (Los Angeles Segment)	1.01%	0.51%	0.15%	---
Puente Hills (Santa Fe Springs segment)	0.96%	0.76%	0.29%	<0.01%
Newport-Inglewood (onshore only)	0.99%	0.88%	0.43%	---
Elysian Park	0.06%	0.05%	0.02%	---
Santa Monica	1.19%	1.02%	0.29%	<0.01%
Malibu Coast	0.75%	0.65%	0.37%	<0.01%
Hollywood	1.59%	1.18%	0.29%	<0.01%
Upper Elysian Park	1.26%	0.78%	0.07%	---
Anacapa-Dume	0.90%	0.66%	0.25%	<0.01%
Whittier	1.58%	1.43%	0.80%	<0.01%
Raymond	1.70%	1.18%	0.35%	<0.01%
Verdugo	0.51%	0.45%	0.32%	<0.01%
San Andreas*	22.34%	19.68%	18.74%	6.91%

* Only fault sections in the greater Los Angeles region are included. This does not represent the risk of future events on the entire San Andreas fault.

Note: The magnitude of the events shown in this table are for the site of the earthquake. Depending on the locations of the earthquake, the magnitude may be less severe within Torrance itself.

Source: City of Torrance Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2017-2022 – USGS 2015a

The City has a mandatory retrofit seismic ordinance that was adopted in 1987, applicable to the most susceptible building type to earthquake damage, unreinforced masonry. The City used subsidies to bring almost all of the older buildings into compliance with the City’s mandatory strengthening requirements.

3.4.3 FLOODING

According to the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2017-2022), the main area at risk of flooding in Torrance is the western half of the Madrona Marsh nature preserve, which lies partly in the 100-year floodplain and partly in the 500-year floodplain. Some land north of the nature preserve across Plaza del Amo is within the 500-year floodplain, and a block of land northeast of the preserve (bordered by Plaza del Amo, Del Amo Circle East, West Carson Boulevard, and Madrona Avenue) is within the 100-year floodplain. Elsewhere in the city, the areas around the intersections of California Street and Alaska Avenue and of Amsler Street and Dormont Avenue are both in the 100-year floodplain, as is part of an undeveloped area near the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte. Some land west of Crenshaw Boulevard between 235th and 237th Streets is within the 500-year floodplain, as are parts of the St. Lawrence Martyr School along the city’s border with Redondo Beach. Torrance’s beaches also are at risk of coastal flooding, but beachside development is outside of both the 100-year and 500-year floodplains.

Torrance has largely been free of significant flood events. Localized flooding has occurred occasionally, particularly prior to the construction of modern storm drains and water retention basins. Localized flooding is likely to continue to occur in the future, especially during significant storm events.

Major storms in California are frequently the result of meteorological phenomena called atmospheric rivers, which are narrow bands of very moist air which in effect act as pathways for heavy precipitation. Although these storms make up a relatively small number of weather systems that affect the western United States, they typically cause 30 to 50 percent of all precipitation in the area (NOAA 2015d). Another type of event, the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO, or El Niño), can cause more intense storms and higher levels of precipitation in the western United States, especially in Southern California. Although Torrance does not have a history of significant flooding, a particularly severe storm or series of intense storms may cause more widespread flooding emergencies.

Torrance is also at risk of flooding from infrastructure failure. The Walteria and Ben Haggot Reservoirs, both owned by the City, are two buried water storage facilities with a combined capacity of 28.7 million gallons located along Crenshaw Boulevard near the city's border with Rolling Hills Estates. The failure of one or both facilities could create flooding in the area below the reservoirs. The prime risk of infrastructure failure to either reservoir is a significant earthquake, although the most likely outcome is cracks in the reservoirs that cause leaks and some localized flooding. However, a significantly strong earthquake could cause catastrophic failure of the reservoir walls. This "worst-case" scenario would drain the reservoirs in as little as 18 minutes and could inundate 215 acres. The inundation zone includes numerous residential and commercial properties, as well as the southeast portion of Torrance Municipal Airport.

In 2015 the City adopted an ordinance to require Low Impact Development (LID) strategies to manage the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff by setting standards and practices to maintain or restore the natural hydrologic character of a development site, reduce off-site runoff, improve water quality, and provide groundwater recharge. The ordinance applies to new and redevelopment projects that require building permits.

In accordance with Government Code Section 65302, as part of the current Housing Element Plan update process, the City is required to review and revise the Safety Element to identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to flood hazard zones, National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA, information about flood hazards, designated floodway maps, dam failure inundation maps, areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of levees or floodwalls, etc. as listed in Section 65302(9)(2) and establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding. This will reduce potential constraints related to flooding (see Program 19 in Section 5).

3.4.4 ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The City promotes energy conservation through the implementation of State of California Title 24 building code energy performance requirements. Title 24 measures require, for example, minimum ceiling, wall, and raised floor insulation, and minimum heating, ventilating, air conditioning and water heating equipment efficiencies.

In 2017, the City of Torrance, in cooperation with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The purpose of the CAP is to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions within the city. The City's CAP serves as a guide for action by setting GHG emission reduction goals and establishing strategies and policies to achieve desired outcomes over the next 20 years. The City's website includes an overview of the City's targets outlined in the CAP, includes updates

regarding the status, and includes links to the City’s CAP and specific energy generation and storage measures and methodology.

The City also recognizes the role of sustainable building practices in achieving energy efficiency and is home to one of the largest and most publicized examples of green building, the Toyota headquarters building. The City will undertake a phased approach to adopting green building practices through public education and recognition as the key to implementing green building design and construction on a wide scale. Multiple sustainability and energy conservation measures are identified in General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Programs.

3.4.5 MINERAL EXTRACTION

According to the State Mining and Geology Board, the majority of land within Torrance is classified as MRZ-1 (no significant mineral deposits are likely) and MRZ-3 (significance of mineral deposits cannot be determined). A small strip of land within the City is designated as MRZ-2, indicating that significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present. The area is located south of Pacific Coast Highway, and roughly east of Hawthorne Boulevard.

The classification system is intended to ensure consideration of statewide or regionally significant mineral deposits by the City in planning and development administration. These mineral resource designations are intended to prevent incompatible land use development on areas determined to have significant mineral resource deposits.

3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS

Another factor adding to the cost of new construction is the provision of adequate infrastructure: major and local streets; curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; water and sewer lines; storm drains; and street lighting. All of these improvements are required to be provided—either as upgrades or new infrastructure—in conjunction with new development. In most cases, these improvements are dedicated to the City, which is then responsible for their maintenance. The cost of these facilities is borne by developers, added to the cost of new housing units, and eventually passed on to the homebuyer or property owner.

The City of Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) utility serves approximately 78 percent of Torrance, with the remaining portions of the City in West Torrance and the Hollywood Riviera area served by the California Water Service Company. The City of Torrance is a direct member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who wholesales imported potable supplies (drinking water) to its member agencies in Southern California, including Torrance. Currently MWD supplies, approximately 75 percent of TMW’s potable water demands. However, the City has embarked on local water source diversification program that will increase local supplies to approximately 70 percent and reduce imported water to 30 percent or less within the next five years. This will help “drought proof” the community. The City’s North Torrance Wellfield Project (NTWP) project will be operational this summer and will triple our local potable groundwater production and increase of local supplies to 45% more of our potable water requirements.

Based on the City’s RHNA for the 2021-2029 cycle, the Draft Housing Element forecasts that 4,939 new dwelling units will need to be constructed in the City. Assuming 2.6 people per household, this would

result in an additional population of 12,841 if all units are built. In 2009, a bill (SBx7-7) was passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20 percent by 2020 (referred to as the “20 by 20” plan). TMW’s 2020 target was set at 142 gallons per day per capita (GPCD); the City actually reduced this demand by 15 percent below the target to 121 GPCD, as documented in Torrance’s 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Thus, the projected additional housing units would increase water use in the TMW service area over time between 1.554 million gallons per day (mgd) using the actual 121 GPCD number or at 1.838 mgd using the higher 142 GPCD target number.

TMW water demand is generally expressed in acre-feet rather than gallons (1 AF equals approximately 326,000 gallons). Thus, the projected increase in annual potable water use would total between 1,740 AF (at 121 GPCD) to 2,045 AF (at 142 GPCD). In either case, TMW has more than sufficient system capacity and water resources to meet the projected additional demands, without taking into account the demand-damping effects of ongoing conservation efforts. Over the last 25 years, TMW’s potable water demand has decreased by over 26 percent from approximately 26,050 AF to 19,200 AF, due to the concerted conservation efforts of the City’s customers. The TWD infrastructure system was sized to meet higher demands of past years, and currently has a total system delivery capacity of more than two and one-half times of our current average demand.

The City of Torrance Public Works Department maintains local sewer and storm drainage systems. The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) is the regional agency responsible for the collection and treatment of wastewater. The nearest wastewater treatment facility to Torrance is the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson. The design capacity of the JWPCP is greater than the facility’s current wastewater flows. There is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity for the increase in wastewater that projected development levels on the General Plan would generate.

With utility and services system providers coordinating their planning and construction consistent with General Plan land use policy, future needs, including the 2021-2029 RHNA, can be met.

While utility and service connections would be needed to accommodate the new housing units, and some utilities and service system would need to be extended or enlarged to and from the new housing opportunity sites (e.g., sewer, storm water runoff, electrical, etc.), these new connections would not result in a need to modify the larger off-site infrastructure. Future housing in the City is anticipated to be on urban infill development/redevelopment sites surrounded by existing development on all sides. All wet and dry public utilities, facilities and infrastructure are in place and available to serve the new housing opportunity sites identified in the HEU for the eight-year planning period and infrastructure is not a constraint to development of housing.

4. HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES

The resources available for the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing in Torrance are addressed in this section of the Housing Element. This section provides an overview of available land resources and residential sites for future housing development and demonstrates the City’s ability to satisfy its share of the region’s future housing need. Also discussed are the financial and administrative resources available to support affordable housing and energy conservation opportunities.

4.1 FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS

4.1.1 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)

State law requires that a community provide an adequate number of sites to allow for and facilitate production of the regional share of housing. To determine whether a jurisdiction has sufficient land to accommodate its share of regional housing needs for all income groups, that jurisdiction must identify “adequate sites.” Under State law (California Government Code section 65583[c][1]), adequate sites are those with appropriate zoning and development standards, with services and facilities, needed to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing for all income levels. Torrance’s RHNA (developed and adopted by SCAG) covers the 6th Cycle planning period, which is from June 30, 2021, through October 15, 2029. The RHNA assigns a housing production to each jurisdiction in the region. Torrance must identify adequate land with appropriate zoning and development standards to accommodate its allocation of the regional housing need.

According to the RHNA, Torrance’s share of regional future housing need for the 2021-2029 planning period has been determined by SCAG to be a total of 4,939 housing units. This allocation is distributed into five income categories, as shown below in Table H-50. The RHNA includes a fair share adjustment that allocates future housing need by each income category in a way that meets the state mandate to reduce over-concentration of lower income households in historically lower income communities or areas within the region (analyzed in Appendix D—Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing).

Table H-50: RHNA 2021-2029

Income Group	% of County AMI	Total Housing Units Allocated	Percentage of Units
Extremely Low*	30% or less	584	12%
Very Low*	31-50% AMI	1,037	21%
Low	51-80% AMI	846	17%
Moderate	81-120% AMI	853	17%
Above Moderate	120%+ AMI	1,619	33%
Total		4,939	100%

Source: Final RHNA, SCAG (March 2021)

AMI = Area Median Income, which is based on the HCD 2020 State Income Limits for Los Angeles County of \$77,300 for a 4-person household

*Note: The City has a RHNA allocation of 1,621 very low-income units (inclusive of extremely low-income units). Pursuant to state law (AB 2634), the City must project the number of extremely low-income housing needs based on Census income distribution or assume 50 percent of the very low-income units as extremely low. According to the CHAS data developed by HUD (Table H-10) 12 percent of the City households were extremely low income and 21 percent were very low income.

4.1.1.1 Credits Toward RHNA—Entitled & Pipeline Projects

The 6th cycle RHNA covers a planning period that is approximately 8.3 years, starting on June 30, 2021. Housing units entitled (approved) or under review (in the pipeline) but that were not expected to be issued building permits as of June 30, 2021 can be credited toward meeting the City’s RHNA for the 6th Cycle. These units can be subtracted from the City’s share of regional housing needs. The City must demonstrate in this Housing Element its ability to meet its remaining housing needs through the provision of sites, after subtracting units that have been entitled or are in the pipeline and are anticipated to be approved. Table H-5149 summarizes the entitled and pipeline projects that are credited toward meeting the City’s RHNA.

Table H-51: Credits Toward RHNA

	Project Description	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
RHNA		1,621	846	853	1,619	4,939
Net Units Entitled/Pending Permits as of 1/5/22:						
175 th and Prairie Ave.	Mixed-use: senior condos + 3 commercial condos	---	---	---	53	53
1750 Manuel Ave.	Detached townhouse condo development	---	---	---	6	6
2706 182 nd St.	Townhouse development + church use	---	---	---	48	48
18419 Western Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	15	15
24449 Hawthorne Blvd.	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	10	10
18080-18090 Prairie Ave.	Townhouse condo project	---	---	---	25	25
18045 Western Ave.	Mixed use: apartments + commercial space	---	---	---	32	32
22422 Ocean Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
22424 Ocean Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
2463 Torrance Blvd.	Apartments (conversion of retail space into residential)	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
18522 Grevillea Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
18530 Amie Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
1621 Crenshaw Blvd.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
Entitled Subtotal:		---	---	---	195	195
Net Units Pending Approval or In Process as of 7/1/2021 (Not Entitled/Pipeline):						
East side of Hawthorne Boulevard, 210 feet north of Rolling Hills Road APNs 7547-004-040 to 046	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	18	18
24601 Hawthorne Blvd. (APNs: 7534-028-005, -006, -021, -022, -024, -027)	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	11	11
22501 Hawthorne Boulevard APN 7368-001-015	Mixed use: apartments + commercial use	17*	---	---	201	218
4111 Pacific Coast Highway APN 7529-019-003	Residential: Convert existing 92-room hotel to 108 senior apartments	11*	---	---	97	108
4100 Spencer Street (APN 7524-008-12)	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	2 (1 net)
22600 Crenshaw Bld. (APN 7370-001-018)	Mixed use apartments + commercial space	---	---	---	72	72
812 Crenshaw Blvd. (APN 7354-011-041)	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	2 (1 net)
Not Entitled/Pipeline Subtotal:		28	---	---	401	429

Table H-51: Credits Toward RHNA

	Project Description	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
All Total:		28	---	---	596	624
Remaining RHNA:		1,593	846	853	1,023 (net)	4,315 (net)

* These two projects include a density bonus request. Conditions of approval have been incorporated to require that the developer and City enter into a Density Bonus Agreement. The Agreement will require that the designated affordable units remain affordable for at least 55 years and reports substantiating that the affordable units are being rented to qualified households be submitted to the City periodically.

4.1.1.2 Credits Toward RHNA—Anticipated Accessory Dwelling Units

The City allows and regulates accessory dwelling units (ADUs), including junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs), in compliance with California Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22, with the most recent ADU/JADU ordinance amended in April 2021. In Torrance, ADUs and JADUs can provide smaller and less expensive housing in a way that disperses new housing throughout the community and blends in well with existing community character. ADUs can be a valuable addition to Torrance’s housing stock, serving as a resource for seniors aging out of their homes and for multi-generational accommodations—issues that have been raised by the community for both the 5th and 6th Cycle Housing Elements. As indicated in the Constraints section of this Housing Element, Torrance permits ADUs consistent with state law.

New state laws passed since 2017 have substantially relaxed the development standards and procedures for the construction of ADUs. As a result, the City has seen significant increases in ADUs in the community, increasing from just three ADU permits issued in 2017 to 87 permits issued in 2021. Table H-50 below summarizes this trend, based on amended Annual Progress Reports (APRs) submitted to HCD by the City on January 7, 2022 and again on June 23, 2022, and building permits issued for 2021 (see Table H-52). The average number of permits issued for ADUs over the three-year period of 2019–2021 is 55.3 ADUs per year. However, as of August 1, 2022, the City has already issued permits for 94 ADUs, which demonstrates the continuation of this trend.

Table H-52 ADU Permits Issued from 2018-2020

Year	Number of ADU Permits Issued*
2019	39
2020	40
2021	87
Average:	55.3

*These numbers are based on amended APRs submitted to HCD on January 7, 2022

Based on this steeply upward trend and the City’s plans to incentivize the production of ADUs (see Program 6), the City assumes 60 ADUs annually for a total of 480 ADUs over the eight-year planning period of the Housing Element for the purpose of RHNA credits.

The SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis (for LA County I), which has been reviewed and approved by HCD, provides local governments in the SCAG region with assumptions for ADU affordability that can be used to assign ADUs to income categories for the purposes of 6th Cycle Housing Elements. According to the SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis, the

following percentages of units may be applied to the required income categories:

- 15 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to extremely low-income households;
- 2 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to very low-income households;
- 43 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to low-income households;
- 6 percent to moderate income households; and
- 34 percent to above-moderate income households.

The Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis that was prepared by SCAG and approved by HCD is the estimate the City of Torrance uses to estimate the income distribution of ADUs for the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Torrance’s estimated number of ADUs is provided in Table HE-53.

Table H-53: Estimated Number of ADUs During 6th Cycle Planning Period

Income Category	Percent of Units Per Income Category	Number of Units Per Income Category
Extremely Low	15%	72
Very Low	2%	10
Low	43%	206
Moderate	6%	29
Above Moderate	34%	163
Total:	100%	480

4.1.1.3 Remaining RHNA

After accounting for the credits discussed in Section 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.2 (units approved and pending approval and the anticipated ADUs for the 6th Cycle planning period) (see Table H-54), a remaining need of 3,835 units exists to accommodate the RHNA. However, pursuant to SB 166 (No Net Loss Law, Government Code Section 65863), all jurisdictions must maintain adequate sites in their Housing Elements to accommodate their remaining unmet RHNA by each income category at all times throughout the entire planning period. If, at any time during the planning period, a jurisdiction finds that there is a shortfall of sites to accommodate its remaining RHNA, the jurisdiction must take immediate action to correct the shortfall by amending its Housing Element sites inventory to either include sites previously unidentified with capacity to accommodate the shortfall, or sites that have been rezoned to correct for the shortfall. Failure to do so constitutes a violation of the No Net Loss law. The State recommends a buffer of 15-30 percent to provide for the No Net Loss requirements.

Table H-54: Remaining RHNA Obligation

	Very Low*	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Official RHNA	1,621	846	853	1,619	4,939
Credits toward RHNA (per Table H-49)	28	---	---	596	624
ADUs credited toward RHNA (per Table H-51)	82	206	29	163	480
Remaining RHNA Obligations	1,511	640	824	860	3,835

*Inclusive of Extremely Low

4.1.2 RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY

4.1.2.1 Overview of Sites Inventory Requirements and Strategy

Overview: State law requires that jurisdictions demonstrate in the Housing Element that their land (sites) inventory is adequate to accommodate that jurisdiction’s share of the region’s projected growth during the planning period. The purpose of the Housing Element’s Sites Inventory is to identify and analyze specific sites that are available and suitable for residential development to determine the jurisdiction’s capacity to accommodate residential development and reconcile that capacity with the jurisdiction’s RHNA. The available and suitable sites are referred to as “adequate sites.” The Sites Inventory enables the jurisdiction to determine whether there are sufficient adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA by income category. A Sites Inventory and analysis determines whether program actions must be adopted to “make sites available” with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the new development need. Sites are considered suitable for residential development if they are zoned appropriately and are available for residential use during the planning period. If the inventory demonstrates that there are insufficient sites to accommodate the RHNA for each income category, the inventory must identify sites for rezoning to be included in a Housing Element program to identify and make available additional sites to accommodate those housing needs early within the planning period.

As shown in Section 4.1.1.2, the City has a remaining RHNA of 3,835, after accounting for units entitled (approved) and in the pipeline. Torrance does not currently have enough residentially zoned available sites to accommodate its required RHNA or the No Net Loss buffer. Therefore, the City of Torrance has identified sites that could accommodate its future housing needs in accordance with the 6th Cycle RHNA as required by state Housing Element law. Appendix C (Sites Inventory) provides a list of the vacant and underutilized properties in the City that have been identified to accommodate the RHNA.

Strategy: There has been a significant trend within Torrance over the past 10-15 years to construct residential and mixed-use development on non-residentially zoned property. New standalone commercial, office, and industrial development has been declining, consistent with the trend throughout the region, which is discussed throughout Section 4. With very little vacant land left in Torrance—and much of that topographically constrained—the City has taken a multi-pronged strategy to accommodate its 6th-Cycle RHNA:

1. **ADUs:** Encourage and facilitate ADUs.
2. **Facilitate Conversion of Non-Residential Sites on Housing Corridors to Mixed Use and Multi-Family Residential Uses:** Identify vacant properties and underutilized sites along and near key transportation corridors that have a likelihood of transitioning from non-residential to residential and mixed-use development during the planning period, with an emphasis on facilitating “housing corridors.” This strategy includes promoting both stand-alone residential and mixed-use development. The sites will be rezoned and redesignated as necessary.
3. **Facilitate Residential Infill:** Identify sites that offer opportunities to increase infill residential density. The City’s Housing Corridor Study (HCS), discussed later in this section, identifies sites that will be rezoned to provide additional residential infill opportunities. The HCS also supports the Housing Corridors strategy.

4. **Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay:** Facilitate affordable housing on sites owned and operated by religious institutions by adding an overlay to identified properties to facilitate construction of housing that is affordable to lower- and moderate-income households.

4.1.2.2 Development Trends Substantiating City's Sites Inventory Strategy of Conversion of Non-Residential Sites on Housing Corridors to Mixed Use and Multi-Family Residential Uses

Torrance has no vacant sites designated and zoned for higher density residential development—the remaining vacant residentially zoned properties are currently designated and zoned for low density single-family residential development (23 sites) and low-medium residential development (3 sites). In fact, much of the residential development that has been constructed over the past several decades has occurred via redesignation and rezoning of non-residential sites to allow for higher density residential infill for single-family and multiple-family housing types. Mixed use development has increased considerably as well during the past decade, especially in recent years (as demonstrated in Tables H-49 and H54), as demand for housing in Torrance remains high but vacant residentially designated and zoned land is not available. These trends support the City's strategy, which is described in the sections that follow.

Torrance has a long history of the conversion of non-residential sites to residential uses. As a built out city, there is very little vacant land available. As such, a majority of development in Torrance occurs from the recycling of property from one use to another. Mixed use (residential with commercial) development has been occurring in areas where constructing mixed use provides a benefit to the applicant, such as a higher FAR or greater density, or in when standalone housing is not allowed per code.

In many instances, developers have indicated to City Staff that they would prefer to propose projects which are 100 percent residential. Fully residential developments are typically easier to design, construct, and to finance. Often, developers report that buyers tend to prefer fully residential projects over a mixed use situation. Many of the smaller developers we work with only develop standalone residential.

A trend City Staff are also seeing is that the commercial portion of mixed use projects can take a great deal of time to be leased out. Some mixed use projects can take several years before the commercial component is occupied. Recently, a mixed use project was constructed near the Downtown area. While the leasing activity of the residential portion has been robust, the retail portion has been slow. As a result, the developer has recently requested that the City consider the potential to convert a majority of the ground floor commercial space to Live-Work residential space. The City has provided initial comments and City Staff expect to see a revised plan in the near future.

The City has additionally been approached by several over developers interested in the Live-Work concept. Due to the increased desire of telecommuting, which was facilitated significantly due to the COVID pandemic, as well as the entrepreneurial spirit of workers, the City is aware of this new trend. As a result, the City is currently reviewing its Zoning Code to enable and regulate Live-Work uses within designated areas of the community.

Another factor that influenced the City’s housing strategy is the City’s desire to retain and support its long-standing goal of remaining a “balanced city,” which includes retaining its commercial, service, industrial, and other establishments to preserve the employment and tax base and provide for the goods and services upon which the community depends. The City also has a long-standing goal of increasing the amount of active and passive recreational facilities and open space, which is a key factor in continuing to preserve the high quality of life in Torrance for existing and future residents of all income levels. These two goals were reiterated by the community in the recently updated Torrance Strategic Plan.

Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Torrance: As noted previously, with the lack of vacant land in Torrance, and especially residentially designated and zoned land, the City’s strategy of encouraging and implementing residential development on underutilized non-residential land is supportable based on local trends. Table H-47 summarizes a sampling of 15 (seven entitled and eight constructed) projects, including seven of the 10 entitled projects from Table H-42 and eight constructed projects from the 5th Cycle. While not inclusive of all residential and mixed-use projects that have been entitled or constructed over the past 20 years, they demonstrate that the approach the City has taken for the Sites Inventory regarding types and locations of residential and mixed-use projects with densities greater than single-family residential is valid and supportable. Two projects from earlier cycles (Project IDs M and N) are included because they illustrate the continuation of this trend in Torrance over the recent past. Table H-55 summarizes all 15 projects and Figure H-6 identifies their locations. Each project is described in more detail in Appendix E.




Table H-55: Recycling Trends—Summary of Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Torrance

ID	Address	Status Year Approved	Type of Project	Land Use Designation		Density (du/ac)		Number of Units	Vacant	Lot Consolidation	Lot Size (acres, (consolidated))
				Existing	Proposed	Target	Actual				
A	18045 Western Ave.	Entitled (2021)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	26.7	32	Part vacant	Yes (6 lots)	1.2
B	18080-18090 Prairie Ave.	Entitled (2021)	Residential	R-MD	No change	23.25	24.7	24	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.97
C	24449 & 24453 Hawthorne Blvd.	Entitled (2020)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	25.7	9	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.35
D	18419 Western Ave.	Entitled (2020)	Residential	C-GEN	No change	36	23.1	15	Yes	No	0.65
E	2706 182nd St.	Entitled (2020)	Townhouse + church	R-MD	No change	23.25	17.2	48	No	Yes (2 lots)	3.7
F	1750 Manuel Ave.	Entitled (2019)	Residential	R-MD	No change	23.25	18.8	6	No	No	0.34
G	1954-1978 Carson St.	Constructed (2018)	Mixed Use	C-CTR	No change	36	38.5	39	No	Yes (5 lots)	0.88
H	20411 Earl St.	Constructed (2016)	Residential	R-LM	No change	13.5	17.8	25	No	No	1.4
I	23625-23649 Arlington Ave.	Constructed (2015)	Residential	R-OF	No change	23.25	25	16	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.66
J	24444 Hawthorne Blvd.	Constructed (2015)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	25.4	8	No	No	0.32
K	1008 Sartori Ave.	Constructed (2014)	Residential	C-CTR	R-MD	36	21 du	4	Parking lot	Yes (2 lots)	0.19
L	1640 Cabrillo Ave.	Constructed (2013)	Mixed Use (100% lower-income)	C-CTR	No change	36	51.2*	44	No	Yes (4 lots)	0.86
M	2829 Maricopa St.	Constructed (2003)	Residential	I-LT	R-LM	13.5	10.4	104	No	No	10.0
N	3520 Torrance Blvd.	Constructed (2003)	Residential (37.5% senior)	C-GEN	C-GEN	33	29.8	160	No	No	5.37
O	East side of Prairie Ave., approx. 100 feet north of 176th St.	Entitled (2020)	Mixed Use (100% senior)	C-GEN	C-GEN	33	33.1	53	Yes	No	1.6

*Project received approval of a density bonus for 100% low and very low-income households

A summary of the information in Table 54 is provided below.

- Five of the 15 (33.3 percent) projects meet or exceed the newly proposed target density (the expected density of the land use designation, as identified in the Land Use Element). With the implementation of Program 1, Action 4, which is intended to incentivize projects to be constructed at or above target densities, as well as modifications to development standards to reduce constraints (Programs 3 and 8), it is realistic to assume that actual densities of future projects will achieve the densities assumed in the Sites Inventory.



*Rendering of recently entitled mixed use project at 18045 Western Ave. (formerly 1802—18141 Western Ave).
(See Project A in Table H-47 above and a summary of the project in Appendix E)*


- Six of the 15 projects (40 percent) are mixed use developments.
- Two-thirds (10 out of the 15 projects) were developed on property that was designated for non-residential land uses. This is a trend that provides evidence to support the City’s Sites Inventory strategy of using underutilized sites that are currently designated with non-residential land use designations in the Land Use Element.
- One project is a 100% affordable development, constructed on City-owned property in Downtown Torrance (see Project ID “L”).
- Eight of the 15 projects (53.3 percent) required lot consolidation (from two to six lots), which demonstrates that lot consolidation is not a constraint to development in Torrance; however, implementation of Program 4, Action 9 will further facilitate lot consolidation.
- One project (Project ID “E”) took an existing church property, retained the sanctuary, and added 48 units on the remainder of the site. This example demonstrates the validity of adding the Religious Institution Overlay as provided in Program 7 and discussed in greater detail in Section 4.1.3.5.
- The projects range in size from a 4-unit condominium to a 160-unit project with townhouses and stacked flats. Lot sizes range from 0.19 to 10 acres.
- The projects are distributed throughout Torrance. Many are located along key transportation corridors that have been identified in the City’s Sites Inventory strategy,

including Hawthorne Boulevard, Western Avenue, and Torrance Boulevard. Many others are located in or near the study areas (from the Land Use Element) that are being addressed in the Housing Corridor Study (see Section 4.1.3.5).

- Two projects include senior citizen housing—Project ID “O” is a 100 percent senior development, while Project ID “N” has 37.5% of its units set aside for senior citizens.

DRAFT

Figure H-8: Map of Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Residential and Mixed-Use Projects



Recycling Trends—Sites on the Torrance Sites Inventory with Public Interest Expressed for Residential Development: The trend in Torrance for developing residential projects on non-residentially designated/zoned property is further evidenced by the number of sites on the Housing Element Sites Inventory with expressed public (property owner or developer or both) interest in developing housing.

Recycling Trend—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions: The trend for developing residential and mixed use projects on non-residentially designated/zoned property that has been observed and demonstrated in Torrance in the previous section is also a trend in neighboring jurisdictions. Table H-56 shows 11 recent projects in Redondo Beach and Gardena that have been developed with residential on formerly non-residential sites. Like Torrance, both cities are built out and must rely on non-residentially zoned properties to accommodate their respective RHNAs.

Table H-56: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions

ID	Jurisdiction	Address or Location	GP/Zone	Description	Previous Use(s)	Units	Acres	Density (du/ac)	Approval
AA	Gardena	16958 S. Western Ave.	Specific Plan	Residential Townhomes	Vacant, recreational vehicle storage	46	2.31	20	2017
BB	Gardena	12850 Crenshaw Blvd.	Specific Plan	Apartment rental units	Warehouse use	265	1.33	199	2021
CC	Gardena	16831-16911 S. Normandie Ave.	Specific Plan	Apartment rental units/Residential townhomes	Warehouse use	349	5.3	66	Pending
DD	Gardena	14504 S Normandie Ave.	Specific Plan	Residential Townhomes	Plant nursery	96	4.69	20	2015
EE	Gardena	14321 S. Van Ness Ave.	General Commercial-Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	35 Residential Townhomes; 5 Live/Work Units	Vacant lot, previous auto dealership	40	2.04	20	2018
FF	Gardena	16819 S. Normandie Ave.	Industrial/M-1	Residential (SROs)	Plant nursery	63	0.69	91	2018
HH	Gardena	2101/2129 Rosecrans Ave.	General Commercial-Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	Residential	Warehouse use	113	5.47	21	2020
II	Gardena	2500 Rosecrans Ave.	General Commercial-Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	49 Residential Townhomes; 3 Live/Work Units	Stand-alone restaurant, vacant	52	2.35	22	2020
JJ	Gardena	13126 S. Western Ave	Industrial/M-1	100% Residential & Density Bonus (SROs)	Stand-alone auto repair	121	1.01	120	Pending
KK	Redondo Beach	1700 South Pacific Coast Highway	Mixed Use 3/MU-3A	Mixed use—115 units, 22,000 sq. ft. of retail and restaurant	Hotel & retail space including Bristol Farm grocery store, massage parlor, salon, & guitar school	115	4.28	27	2018
LL	Redondo Beach	1815 Hawthorne Blvd.	Commercial Regional/Commercial Regional	300 residential units (including 20% lower-income or 10% very-low income units)	Redevelopment of South Bay Galleria (existing mall) into a mixed use project	300	29.85	N/A	2019

MM	Lomita	2457 Lomita Blvd.	/Specific Plan	220 luxury studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom apartments	Equipment rental yard	220	2.7	81	Under construction
NN	Lomita	24805 Narbonne Ave.		Mixed-use project medical office, 5 live-work units with ground floor commercial space & 10- townhome residential units					Under construction
OO	Lomita	24830-24838 Narbonne Ave.		Mixed-use project ground floor commercial and 11 residential units with one two-bedroom unit for a very-low-income household					Approved
PP	Lomita	26109 Narbonne Ave.		8 Townhome-Unit Project					Under construction
QQ	Lomita	26016 Oak Street							

4.1.2.3 Realistic Capacity Assumptions For Sites Inventory

The capacity assumptions used in the 6th Cycle Housing Element are shown below in Table H-53 and described in more detail in this section. As discussed earlier, the City's Sites Inventory is required to accommodate SB 166 (No Net Loss Law). There are several strategies cities can take to ensure that sufficient capacity exists in the Housing Element to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period in accordance with the No Net Loss Law. HCD prepared a memorandum identifying various strategies jurisdictions can take to implement SB 166 in their Housing Elements. Due to the lack of production of units for lower- and moderate-income households in Torrance during the last planning period, the City's Housing Element is applying two key strategies, as described below.

Reduced Density Assumption Strategy: The first strategy jurisdictions can take is to create a buffer by projecting capacity less than what is allowed from the maximum density to allow for some reductions in density. For the purpose of estimating future population and development assumptions as a result of theoretical build-out under the Torrance Land Use Element, the Land Use Element identified “development assumptions” based on *density* (expressed as du/ac) for residential land use designations and *intensity* (expressed as FAR) for non-residential land use designations. These development assumptions are referred to as “*expected density*” and “*expected intensity*” in the Land Use Element (see Table LU-2 in the Land Use Element).

Expected densities for the land use categories in the Land Use Element are based on 75 percent of maximum allowable density. There is no maximum density provided for the Commercial City Center (C-CTR) land use designation, so the City is assuming a density of 36 dwelling units per acre, which is just three dwelling units per acre above the expected density for the Commercial General (C-GEN) land use designation—the City considers this to be a conservative estimate.

Target Density for Capacity Estimates: Since these assumptions are already being used in the Land Use Element, the City chose to use the “*expected density*” from the Land Use Element as the “**target density**” for production of future housing in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. This is consistent with the reduced density strategy suggested by HCD—see Table H-57.

Table H-57: Assumed Target Densities for Capacity Estimates

General Plan Land Use Designation	Existing Density (du/ac)	Target Density (du/ac)	Density Factor	Percent Assumed to be Developed Residential
R-LO (Res. Low)	0-9	6.8	1	100
R-LM (Res. Low-Medium)	9.1-18	13.5	1	100
R-MD (Res. Medium)	18-31	23.25	1	100
R-MH (Res. Medium-High)	31.1-44	33	1	100
R-HI (Res. High)	44.1+	45	1	100
R-OF (Res. Office)	18.1-31	23.25	1	100
C-GEN (Comm. General)	Up to 44	33	1	100
C-CTR (Comm. City Center)	No maximum	36	1	100
C-GEN w/proposed Housing Overlay	Up to 44	33	1	100
C-GEN in HBSPC (mixed use only) ¹	Up to 44	33	1	75
C-CTR in DA-1 & DA-2 (HBCSP) ²	No maximum	36	1	100
All sites with Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ), with any underlying GP land use designation	As per site	23.25 du/ac	1	25

¹ Excludes DA-1 & DA-2 districts of the HBCSP

² Assumes development in the DA-1 and DA-2 districts of the HBCSP will be developed 100% residential as 80% market-rate and 20% lower income

Surplus Sites Strategy: The second strategy identified by HCD is to create a buffer in the Housing Element Sites Inventory of at least 15 to 30 percent more capacity than required, especially for capacity to accommodate the lower-income and moderate-income RHNA. While technically not a capacity “estimate” for the Sites Inventory, the City also is utilizing HCD’s second strategy to maintain consistency with the No Net Loss Law. The Sites Inventory provides a 25.415.6 percent surplus for the lower-income category and a 41.979.1 percent surplus for the moderate-income category. When estimated ADUs are included, the surplus rises to 38.228.3 percent for the lower-income category and an 45.382.5 percent surplus for the moderate-income category. (See Table H-55 for the summary of the adequacy of sites to accommodate the RHNA.)

The remainder of this section describes the considerations used to develop these realistic capacity assumptions. Because the City is relying on both residential and non-residential designated sites and a new Religious Institution Housing Overlay, the discussions of the various capacity assumptions are organized accordingly.

Capacity Assumptions For Residentially Designated Sites

As noted previously, the capacity assumptions for residentially designated sites (Table H-53) are 75 percent of the maximum allowable density for the associated land use designations. The residential land use designations in the Land Use Element include Residential Low (R-L), Residential Low-Medium (R-LM), Residential Medium (R-M), Residential Medium-High (R-MH), and Residential High (R-H). These designations range from a maximum of nine dwelling units per acre for the R-L land use designation to a maximum of 44 dwelling units per acre for the R-H land use designation.

However, as noted in Section 3 and discussed in this section, the Torrance Zoning Code currently allows lower residential housing types and densities in higher density zones—for example, R-3 allows R-1 and R-2 uses/densities, and R-4 allows any use permitted in R-3, which allows R-1 and R-2 uses. In

other words, the minimum density for R-3 and R-4 allows single-family residential development as a permitted use. The R-P (Residential-Professional) zone has a maximum density consistent with R-3, and it, too, allows single-family residential, although Planning Commission approval is required via a discretionary permit. The advantage of this approach is that it provides a wide degree of flexibility for developers, especially those who specialize in market-rate, lower density single-family housing products, including low-medium density “patio home” housing types, which are very popular in Torrance. The disadvantage is that it can make it difficult for the City to promote development at the higher densities by not having a minimum density that ensures a development that is consistent with expected densities in the Land Use and Housing Elements.

As shown in Table 54, two of the 15 identified projects were residential projects in existing residential land use designations; two others applied for and received approval to redesignate and rezone the lots from non-residential designations (one was industrially designated while the other was commercially designated). However, only one of the projects achieved the target density for the land use designation. As shown in Table H-49, five of the entitled projects and two of the pipeline projects are two-unit condominiums. Due to the built-out nature of the residential neighborhoods and the scarcity of residentially designated sites in the city, two-unit infill condominiums, which typically result in only one new net unit, are the most typical types of residential infill projects in Torrance. The implementation of SB 9 (which was approved in 2021 and became effective on January 1, 2022) may result in additional infill development in existing neighborhoods. The City has complied with SB 9 by adopting a new ordinance (SECTION 92.29.34 TWO-UNIT PROJECTS AND URBAN LOT SPLITS IN THE R-1 ZONE) in its Zoning Code. Due to the timing of SB 9, jurisdictions cannot allocate units that may be constructed in accordance with SB 9 to their Sites Inventory; however, if SB 9 is effective, it is reasonable to assume that additional infill housing will occur in Torrance.

To promote the development of multi-family housing on residentially designated sites at or above the target density in the 6th Cycle, the Housing Plan includes several actions to incentivize development at or above the capacity assumptions and to promote a wider range of housing types and affordability levels on Torrance. Implementation of the actions summarized below, in addition to many other programs and associated actions, demonstrate that the capacity used for residentially designated sites is reasonable for the Sites Inventory.

- Implementation of the results of the Housing Corridor Study (described later in this section) will result in adding a new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay (R/MU-OZ) to 69.9 acres of property across 132 parcels to accommodate a potential of 1,677 new residential units (at target capacity, not maximum allowable capacity) across all income categories. The Housing Corridor Study also will streamline development of housing in the identified areas of Torrance (see Figure H-6 and Program 3) and facilitate development at the maximum allowable densities. The sites will be rezoned to implement the results of the study.
- Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate the RHNA and No Net Loss) includes an action to incentivize development of housing (whether stand-alone residential or mixed use) in the R-3, R-4, mixed use, and other sites at or above the expected densities, by adopting an ordinance that will establish the expected density as the “target” density for production of future housing. The ordinance will consider various options to incentivize housing production at the target density and/or will include disincentives if the project proposes housing below the target density.

- Program 1 also includes an action to revise the minimum densities for several existing zones, including all the residential zones, so that the minimum densities are consistent with the density ranges in the Land Use Element. New overlay zones also will be zoned to comply with the densities necessary for sites to be considered able to accommodate moderate- and lower-income developments. Additionally, incentives will be developed to incentivize development at or above the target densities, and disincentives for projects that propose lower than target densities will be developed.
- Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) will reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce constraints to development of housing to enable developers to achieve maximum allowable densities, which will support achievement of the capacity assumptions expressed as target densities. Standards that have been identified as constraints by developers include parking, open space, FAR, building height, and minimum unit size. These standards (as well as others that may be determined to be constraints to achieving target densities) will be revised.

With implementation of these Programs, the assumed capacity assumption for residentially designated property in the Sites Inventory is reasonable and realistic.

Capacity Assumptions For Commercially Designated Sites

Torrance has three commercial land use designations—General Commercial (C-GEN), Commercial Center (C-CTR), and Residential Office (R-OF).

Residential Development on Commercially Designated Sites: For the purposes of the Housing Element, the City has identified target densities of 33 dwelling units per acre for the C-GEN land use designation (75 percent of the maximum) and 36 dwelling units per acre for the C-CTR land use designation, which does not have a maximum density. The R-OF land use designation allows 18.1 to 31 du/ac for residential development.

The Zoning Code currently allows stand-alone residential development in the C1 and C2 zones at a maximum density of 27 dwelling units per acre. The development standards for Downtown Torrance allow up to 58 dwelling units per acre depending on the size of the dwelling unit.

As demonstrated in Table 54, several recent residential projects have been developed on commercially designated property. One pipeline project proposes to convert an existing motel to a 100 percent residential use for seniors, including a density bonus. This demonstrates the viability of the City's strategy of identifying non-residential sites for residential development in its Sites Inventory.

Program 1, Objective 3 creates a residential/mixed use housing overlay zone (R/MU-OZ) for certain commercially designated properties to facilitate residential development. This program, coupled with Program 1, Objectives 1 and 2, demonstrates the City's capacity assumption for residential development in commercially designated zones.

Mixed Use Development on Commercially Designated Sites: The Land Use Element also allows mixed-use development in these commercial land use designations; however, rather than providing an "expected density" (expressed as dwelling units per acre), "expected intensity" is provided for each non-residential land use designation, where "intensity" is expressed as floor area ratio (FAR). The C-GEN land use designation allows a maximum FAR of 0.6 for commercial uses and a maximum 1.0 FAR

for mixed use development, while the C-CTR land use designation allows a maximum FAR of 1.0 for all development, but it can be exceeded for mixed-use projects with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

Because requests for mixed-use developments in the C-GEN and C-CTR land use designations are not limited by a maximum density, but instead are limited by the FAR, actual density of mixed-use projects is determined by the size of the residential units and the amount of commercial floor area proposed. However, for the purposes of the Housing Element, the City is using 33 dwelling units per acre to estimate capacity for mixed-use projects in the C-GEN land use designation and 36 dwelling units per acre in the C-CTR land use designation. Mixed-use development in the R-OF land use designation is 23.25, which is 75 percent of the maximum allowable density.

As noted previously, mixed-use developments have become prevalent in Torrance. Six of the 15 projects (40 percent) identified in Table H-54 are mixed-use developments, and four of the seven pipeline projects are mixed-use developments. All have a commercial land use designation. Of the six mixed use projects shown in Table H-54, three are below the target density for the land use designation, one is at the target density, and two exceed the target density.

Programs:

- The Land Use Element will be revised to incorporate these target densities via Program 1, Objective 1.
- Based on review of many previously approved mixed-use projects, it appears that FAR can be a constraint to achieving target and higher densities. Program 1, Objective 1 will increase the maximum FARs in the C-GEN and C-CTR land use designations to allow densities for mixed use developments to reach or exceed the target densities.
- The City has added a new Program (Program 3, Objective 4) that will revise the Zoning Code to increase the maximum allowable FAR to be consistent with the revisions to the Land Use Element described in Program 1, Objective 1 (above).
- Currently, the Zoning Code allows mixed use projects to exceed densities of stand-alone residential densities in commercial zones, because mixed use is regulated by FAR rather than density. The City has included a Program (Program 1, Objective 2) that revises the Zoning Code to allow stand-alone residential to be developed at the new target densities in commercial zones.

The capacity assumptions for sites located in non-residential land use designations assume that any site that is proposed as either a mixed use or stand-alone residential project will develop at 100 percent of the target density, with two exceptions that are discussed below. This assumption is based on the Programs identified in the Housing Plan that are intended to incentive development at or above the target capacity. As demonstrated in Table 54, several recent mixed-use projects have developed or are proposed to develop at or above the target density *without* benefit of the proposed Programs; therefore, this trend, coupled with the implementation Programs, justify this capacity approach as realistic and supportable.

One of the exceptions to the 100 percent assumption noted above is regarding certain properties within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP). The properties in the HBCSP that are not within the DA-1 and DA-2 sub-districts assume that 75 percent of the floor area of the proposed development will develop with residential uses based on the requirements of the HBCSP. However,

the capacity assumption is that 100 percent of the portion of the mix-use development that is developed with residential uses will develop at 100 percent of the target density. The other exception is described below in the capacity assumption for the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone.

Capacity Assumptions for Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ)

The Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OOZ) is a proposed program (Program 7) to facilitate affordable multi-family residential throughout Torrance; the strategy is described in Section 4.1.3.5. The City has used a capacity assumption that 25 percent of a site could be developed with housing, which could occur on undeveloped portions of a property such as portions of parking lots and open areas. Based on trends identified in Section X, it also may be possible that existing structures that are no longer being utilized could be replaced with housing. Since the potential sites are varied, the 25 percent assumption is an average—some sites could add less than 25 percent, while others, such as the example described in the following paragraph, involved 75 percent of the site.

This is a new overlay zone that will be implemented after the 6th Cycle Housing Element has been adopted, and therefore the City has not processed any applications to demonstrate the capacity assumption under the new RIH-OZ program. However, in 2020 an application was submitted (and eventually approved) for a 48-unit townhouse (condominium) development on a church property in Torrance that included retention of the church sanctuary and demolition of the existing chapel, office, and preschool. The existing land use designation of R-MD was retained and a rezoning from A-1/R-2 to R-3 was approved. Approximately 75 percent of the total project site was developed with townhouses. Although the project was not processed under the proposed RIH-OZ, it demonstrates that the City's capacity assumption of 25 percent is reasonable. During stakeholder meetings the City had with non-profit and market-rate developers, religious institution sites were identified as viable and promising candidates for new housing.

4.1.2.4 Criteria Used to Identify Suitable Sites in the Sites Inventory

Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, nonvacant sites comprise more than half of Torrance's Sites Inventory. Because of this, Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(2) requires the City to analyze the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development. In addition to describing past experience in converting non-residential uses to residential development, market trends and conditions (described in Section XXX), and regulatory or other incentives to encourage recycling/redevelopment (as provided in the Housing Plan), the City must identify the criteria used to select sites to meet its RHNA. Based on the trends described previously and the criteria described below, the City has determined that the criteria demonstrate that the sites are not an impediment to development with housing during the Planning Period. Following are the criteria the City used to select sites for the Sites Inventory.

1. **Developer or property owner interest to develop/redevelop the site.** Properties with expressed interest in development are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.
2. **Vacant lot, parking lot, or open storage that includes only minor existing improvements on site.** Vacant properties, parking lots, or those with limited improvements are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.

3. **Sites that meet a minimum of 2 of the following criteria:**

- a. Site is included in the Housing Corridor Study. As described in the Housing Element, the detailed evaluations of the properties have been conducted for the Housing Corridor Study, including feasibility analysis and economic analyses to verify development feasibility. Sites in the HCS also will have the benefit of having CEQA review already prepared for sites in the study area, which offer an incentive to development by streamlining the development process.
- b. City-owned site. The Sites Inventory includes multiple sites owned by the City that are available for housing within the 6th Cycle Planning Period.
- c. Land value is greater than improvement value (LV>IV), when adjusted for current assessment values. According to the methodology developed by the University of California at Berkeley for the State of California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, the ratio of land improvements to land value can facilitate identification of underutilized sites with potential for infill or redevelopment with higher density residential and/or mixed use developments. An improved site may be considered underutilized if it is located in a non-single-family area (e.g., commercial, industrial, multi-family, etc.) and the total value of improvements on the site is less than the total value of the underlying land (i.e., LV<IV). *(Please note that due to the age of structures, lack of improvements that would trigger a new assessment, and/or lack of transfer of ownership in many years, many sites have not been reassessed in decades—some in as many as 48 years. The land value of these sites does not reflect what the current assessed value would be based on recent reassessments of similar properties in Torrance, which we reviewed and can be confirmed based on our analysis. Therefore, wherever the criteria for land value is indicated to be higher than improvement value, either it is higher or would be higher if it had been reassessed within the past several years to reflect recent market value. We also note that some sites that have been identified as having developer interest do not have a current LV>IV, which supports this approach.)*
- d. Structure was built before 1992 (and therefore over 30 years old). An improved site may be considered as having the potential for redevelopment if it is older than 30 years. Analysis indicates that several sites that have been redeveloped or approved in recent years or are or in the pipeline in Torrance have been less than 30 years old.
- e. Site is in disrepair and/or has had ongoing Code violations, as identified by City Staff.
- f. Presence of low-intensity or low-value uses, such as small structures surrounded by large parking lots.
- g. If residential, the site can accommodate an increase in the number of dwelling units (based on allowable or proposed density).

- h. If a religious institution with the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ), the site has parking areas and/or other open space that could accommodate the addition of housing to the site, which means existing structures would not be an impediment to development. (Please note that for the purposes of the capacity assumption for the RIH-OZ, the Housing Element assumes an average of only 25 percent of a site would be developed with housing based on availability of parking lots/open space. The capacity assumption does not include potential demolition of existing buildings that may no longer be used. The discussion and examples in the RIH-OZ section also substantiate the assumptions the City has made regarding potential availability of the site for added residential use.)
- i. There is or has been an ongoing presence of vacancies.

Property owners in the Sites Inventory (excluding the Housing Corridor Sites) were contacted to inform them of their inclusion in the Sites inventory and what it would mean to them, and were asked to contact the City if they wanted to be excluded from the Sites Inventory. A representative of one property owner responded to ask to be removed because he is pursuing a non-residential project; his site was removed. The City also received many calls for property owners to confirm that their sites were included. Outreach to the property owners in the Housing Corridor Study is described below.

ADEQUACY OF SITES INVENTORY CONCLUSION: The City considers that the sites in the Sites Inventory do not pose an impediment to recycling from non-residential to residential or mixed use developments due to the following factors: (1) the documented development trends of non-residentially used and zoned properties to mixed use and residential in both Torrance and nearby cities; (2) the significant interest Staff receives regularly by developers and property owners who want to recycle non-residentially used and zoned property to residential and mixed use; (3) the local, regional, and national trends of diminishing need for stand-alone retail and office uses due to e-commerce and more people and working from home due to the COVID pandemic; (4) the ability of developers who want to retain or construct commercial uses in addition to residential, which is being facilitated by programs in Section 5 (Housing Plan); (5) the outreach the City conducted to property owners on the Sites Inventory; (6) the capacity assumptions discussed in Section 4.1.2.3 and the City's programs incentivize densities at or above the target density are not only realistic but conservative; and (7) the City has a 31.1 percent buffer built into the sites inventory, not including ADUs, pipeline, or approved projects.

4.1.2.5 Lot Consolidation

The residential sites inventory includes many small sites that are clustered and offer excellent opportunity for consolidation in order to facilitate high-quality and well-designed developments. The Sites Inventory includes the assumption of lot consolidation for certain identified sites. As demonstrated in Table H-44 (residentially designated) and Table H-45 (non-residentially designated projects), many mixed use and stand-alone residential developments include lot consolidation. While consolidating lots is not as easy or convenient as having only one parcel to develop, lot consolidation occurs frequently in Torrance and does not appear to be a significant constraint to development. The Sites Inventory includes properties that more than likely will have to rely on lot consolidation to be viable. To encourage lot consolidation, Program 3 includes existing and proposed actions to facilitate future lot consolidation.

4.1.2.6 Additional Information Regarding Sites Inventory Strategies

Create Housing (Residential/Mixed Use) Corridors

The City's housing strategy builds on the direction provided in the City's General Plan Land Use Element and Strategic Plan to identify recyclable land along and in proximity to major commercial and transportation corridors and in Downtown Torrance as an opportunity to facilitate new housing (multiple-family and mixed use). This strategy helps the City meet the local housing demand while encouraging the recycling of older and underutilized buildings and uses, vacant buildings and sites, and problem properties, while creating tax generation opportunities. The Land Use Element noted that in Torrance, future residential and mixed-use developments will most likely be located in Downtown Torrance, along major commercial corridors, and at key activity nodes such as major commercial intersections where development is compatible with surrounding land uses. Consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, residential and mixed-use developments should be located in areas where services and transportation are most available and do not interfere with established residential neighborhoods. In several areas, stand-alone residential is also proposed, as many housing developers either are not familiar with or choose not to develop mixed use developments.

There are several benefits to introducing and encouraging housing near and along key commercial and transportation corridors, including benefits to affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities. It supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile, which is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation. It also provides greater opportunities to distribute housing for all income levels throughout the city. It has economic benefits as well, as additional residents in proximity to businesses provides an enhanced customer base.

This strategy also implements input from the community that influenced several sub-goals in the City's recently updated Strategic Plan (May 2021). Mixed use development is encouraged in both the Economic Development and Housing Strategic Priorities. The Economic Development Strategic Priority encourages flexible, creative, and innovative land uses and development types, including mixed-use development. The Housing Strategic Priority proposes to address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential infill housing in locations that are close to local-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.

Another factor that is making mixed use and residential development more viable along predominantly commercial corridors is the impact of e-commerce on local and national retail shopping. The last decade has brought a significant increase in online sales, with e-commerce sales rising steadily from 6.4 percent in 2010 to 21.3 percent in 2020.⁶ This national trend, which was exacerbated by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic (which started in 2019 and is still ongoing as of the date of adoption of this Housing Element), is not expected to decline. The economic impact of the COVID-19 lockdown is the number of businesses that have permanently closed, with small businesses especially hard hit. Many services also are moving to an online platform, such as banking and insurance. The impact of the pandemic also has resulted in more people working remotely (usually from home);

6 US Ecommerce Grows 44.0% in 2020 (<https://www.digitalcommerce360.com/article/us-ecommerce-sales/#:~:text=Online's%20share%20of%20total%20retail,2019%20and%2014.3%25%20in%202018.>) Accessed 4.22.21

although many will return to their places of employment after the pandemic, estimates are that as many as 25-30% of the workforce will continue to work at home on a multiple-days-a-week basis.⁷

As a result of these and other factors, cities across the country are recognizing the need to provide flexibility in land uses in traditionally commercial areas by allowing a greater mix of uses, including mixed use development, as well as stand-alone residential uses in traditionally commercial areas to create mixed use “nodes” and mixed use “corridors.”

Torrance is experiencing the impacts of this trend as well. Additionally, due to the City’s history (incorporation in 1921) and its most rapid period of development between 1950 and 1969, there are many buildings in Torrance that are at least 50 years old. Many of these underutilized and older properties exhibit similar characteristics in terms of conditions and existing operations as other properties that have been redeveloped within the recent past. In fact, prior to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies by the state in 2012, Torrance had four redevelopment project areas that experienced significant recycling of older and underutilized property.

A significant number of sites have been chosen with the criteria of underutilization and age in mind. Due to the scarcity of developable vacant land in the city, these properties offer an economic incentive to the property owner to develop higher density residential and mixed-use products, as evidenced by the increasing number of applications and developer interest to recycle existing non-residential properties to residential uses. As described in Section 3, Torrance provides the opportunity for mixed use development in several commercial land use designations on a case-by-case basis and in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. The Housing Plan includes several programs and actions to facilitate mixed use and stand-alone residential development in traditionally non-residential land use designations, including allowing them by-right in certain designations and providing a new housing overlay in other areas.

The City also acknowledges that development on small lots may be more difficult; thus, the City has included only those smaller properties that have the potential for sufficient added capacity to make recycling of land economically feasible. However, recently approved projects, new applications, and developer interest indicate that lot consolidation can make development projects economically viable. Table H-54 shows that six out of 10 mixed use development or residential projects on non-residentially designated properties include lot consolidation, ranging from two to six parcels. To support and encourage continued assembly of smaller properties into larger sites, the City has a program (Program 3, Objective 10) to facilitate lot consolidation.

The Housing Plan (Section 5) includes several programs and objectives to facilitate multi-family and mixed-use development along key corridors. Program 1, Objective 3 will add one or more new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays (R/MU-OZ), tailored to the specific target density, to identified sites on Redondo Beach Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, as well as other scattered sites on other key transportation corridors, such as Western Avenue, Torrance Boulevard (not in the HBCSP), Pacific Coast Highway, and other locations. Other programs include adding residential and mixed-use as allowable uses to certain districts in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and increasing the density and allowing stand-alone residential along Crenshaw Boulevard.

⁷ <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/work-at-home-after-covid-19-our-forecast>. Accessed 4.23.21

The key areas included in the sites inventory with the potential and reasonable likelihood to develop with higher density residential and mixed-use development are summarized below. Together, these sites can accommodate a full range of income levels, including lower income housing as defined by State law⁸.

Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan: The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) is the only specific plan in Torrance. Adopted in 1996, it introduced the concept of mixed-use development on underutilized sites along the length of Hawthorne Boulevard, with higher density stand-alone residential and senior housing developments also allowed in the two Del Amo districts to support a walkable, dynamic city center. During the 5th Cycle Housing Element, this vision began to take shape, as a market-rate townhouse style development and a senior apartment development were constructed in the Del Amo 1 Sub-District directly north of Del Amo Fashion Center, and three new mixed-use projects were constructed in the Walteria district (see Table H-54).

Continued and increasing developer interest in the HBCSP and the changing nature of retail indicate the growing economic feasibility of redeveloping a variety of sites along Hawthorne Boulevard with residential uses. For example, the disappearance of national department store chains has impacted the Del Amo Fashion Center—the mall’s southern end, which used to be home to Sears and presents a significant opportunity for revitalization, including the introduction of residential uses, which is a national trend that is stimulating reinvestment in malls across the country. This trend is reflected in plans to add residential development to the South Bay Galleria, which is a mall located on Hawthorne Boulevard in Redondo Beach that shares a boundary with Torrance (see Project LL in Table H-55: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions), which proposes 300 residential units including 20% lower-income or 10% very-low income units on the South Bay Galleria site.



Examples of new mixed-use developments in the Walteria District in the HBCSP

⁸ California Government Code Section 65583.2: if a local government has adopted density standards consistent with the population based criteria set by 65583.2 (at least 30 du/ac for Torrance), the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is obligated to accept sites with those density standards (30 units per acre or higher) as appropriate for accommodating the jurisdictions share of regional housing need for lower-income households.

The Sites Inventory identifies a wide range of opportunities for housing throughout the corridor at a variety of scales and housing types, from smaller mixed-use projects in WALTERIA to larger-scale residential opportunities within the Del Amo districts, to medium-scale mixed use projects in other districts. The sites range from under-utilized properties with existing buildings to parking lots directly adjacent to the Del Amo Fashion Center, which has undergone significant redevelopment and expansion over the past decade or more, including the addition of several residential developments as noted above. The sites identified and proposed programs also encourage opportunities for developments to have a mix of income levels, including mixed income within individual developments. The mixed-income sites assume that 80 percent of the units will be available to above-moderate households with the remaining 20 percent available to lower-income households. The intent is to recognize the demand for above-moderate units in Torrance while encouraging a mixed of income levels on larger sites consistent with the goal of affirmatively furthering fair housing,

Density and use are not proposed to change in the HBCSP; however, Program 1, Objective 5 would add mixed use as an allowable use in the HMD and H/PCH districts of the Specific Plan, increasing the HBCSP’s ability to provide additional housing opportunities. Program 1, Objective 5 also proposes to




*Mixed Townhouse/Senior Stacked Flat (Podium) Development
in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Del Amo Sub-District 1*

consider allowing stand-alone residential in the districts that currently are limited to mixed use development. Program 3, Objective 5 will evaluate and remove governmental constraints to development standards in the HBCSP, such as reconsidering the 100’ setback requirement for residential portions of mixed-use developments in the NT, PR, and MP Districts, and modifications to other development standards that have been identified by local developers as constraints to development. A total of 76 sites are identified along the entire length of Hawthorne Boulevard corridor, providing the opportunity for 2,301 units, including above-moderate, moderate, and lower-income households as well as mixed-income developments.

The City has received developer interest regarding many of the sites identified in the Sites Inventory, including several in the Del Amo DA-1 and DA-2 Sub-Districts. There are two mixed use developments that are in the pipeline in the WALTERIA district, both of which are processing applications for lot consolidation, further demonstrating the trend toward recycling existing buildings into residential uses via lot consolidation. There is also a pipeline project in the Del Amo DA-2 Sub-District, which includes units available for low-income households. The trend of developing multi-family residential and mixed use development on non-residential sites has already occurred in the HBCSP and continues to increase. The interest is so high that the City expects requests to add residential units to sites in the HBCSP that are not already included to continue through the Housing Element Planning Period.

Crenshaw Boulevard (south of Sepulveda Boulevard): A significant stretch of Crenshaw Boulevard between Sepulveda and Pacific Coast Highway is currently designated R-OF (Residential-Professional-Office), with a Residential-Professional (RP) zone. Many of these properties were developed in the 1950s and 1960s as office and service uses but have seen declining tenancy over the years as demand for Class A offices caused office uses to move to other areas of Torrance. The shift toward working remotely is exacerbating this trend, and many tenant spaces along this corridor area have experienced high vacancy rates and continue to do so. Due to the age and location of this area, many of these sites are smaller and do not meet state criteria for lower income housing.



Examples of Sites on Crenshaw Boulevard

The R-OF land use designation currently allows 18.1-31 dwelling units per acre. The allowable densities for R-OF properties will be increased to 31.1-44 dwelling units per acre and the R-P zone will be revised accordingly to facilitate and encourage mixed-use and stand-alone residential uses on the Crenshaw corridor, as well as for other R-OF designated and R-P zoned sites (pursuant to Program 1, Objectives 1 and 2).

There are also several properties on the Crenshaw Boulevard corridor directly south of the R-OF designated properties that are designated and zoned commercial, which also provide opportunities to introduce housing along the corridor; these two sites also are candidates for the new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay (R/MU-OZ) identified above. During the rezoning process, additional sites may be added if appropriate. Objectives in Program 3 will reduce government constraints to development. The trend of redeveloping non-residentially zoned properties to residential uses is demonstrated along the Crenshaw corridor as evidenced by the new residential development that is under construction on Crenshaw Boulevard in Lomita, directly adjacent to and south of the City's sites on Crenshaw Boulevard south of Sepulveda Boulevard—see project MM in Table H-XX: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions). The City fully expects this trend to continue in Torrance along the Crenshaw corridor.

A total of 21 sites providing an estimated capacity of 214 units identified for moderate- and lower-income are identified on Crenshaw Boulevard south of Sepulveda Boulevard (note that there are additional sites on Crenshaw Boulevard in the Housing Corridor Sites Study Area, discussed below).

Redondo Beach Boulevard: During the General Plan update process, Redondo Beach Boulevard was an area that was identified as a transition area experiencing land use changes, and where properties are underutilized and/or undervalued. The 6th Cycle Sites Inventory expands the number of properties on Redondo Beach Boulevard appropriate for residential development, as identified in the Sites Inventory. Located at the northern boundary of the City along a major thoroughfare, the sites are adjacent to goods, services, and the El Camino College on the north side of Redondo Beach Boulevard

in Los Angeles county. Another benefit is that they are easily accessible to regional transit since the majority of Redondo Beach Boulevard in Torrance is identified as a High-Quality Transit Area (HQTA) as part of SCAG's Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Availability of efficient, affordable transportation can be used to measure fair housing and access to opportunities; therefore, facilitating housing along Redondo Beach Boulevard promotes additional affordable housing opportunities. This trend to add residential units to non-residentially zoned sites along Redondo Beach Boulevard is reflected in plans to add 300 market-rate and low-income residential units to the South Bay Galleria, located in Redondo Beach at the intersection of Hathorne and Redondo Beach Boulevards (discussed previously and shown in Table H-56).

Unlike Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan that allows residential and mixed-use development, or the portion of Crenshaw Boulevard that is designated R-OF and zoned RP, mixed use development is allowed on Redondo Beach Boulevard on a case-by-case basis via a Conditional Use Permit. However, to facilitate and incentivize mixed use and multi-family housing along Redondo Beach Boulevard, the City will add a new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay (R/MU-OZ) to the identified sites (Program 1, Objective 3), similar to what is being proposed via the Housing Corridors Study (HCS) discussed later in this section. During the rezoning process, additional sites along this corridor may be added if appropriate.

Sepulveda Boulevard: Portions of Sepulveda Boulevard also provide opportunities to introduce mixed use development due to underutilization of retail and service buildings. Sepulveda Boulevard is also a key transportation corridor and is located in proximity to goods and services, employment, and open space (Madrona Marsh). Unlike Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan that allows residential and mixed-use development, or the portion of Crenshaw Boulevard that is designated R-OF and zoned RP, mixed use development is allowed on Sepulveda Boulevard on a case-by-case basis via a conditional use permit. To facilitate mixed use and multi-family residential development on this section of Sepulveda Boulevard, the Housing Element proposes to adopt and apply the proposed Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(R/MU-OZ) to properties identified for the Sites Inventory. Not only will the overlay facilitate residential uses along in this area, but it will also take into consideration the need to mitigate impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Increase Residential Infill Via Housing Corridors Study (HCS)

The Land Use Element identifies seven land use study areas, representing areas in transition that may be experiencing land use changes, physical blight, stagnation, vacancies, or underutilization, and/or otherwise may not be functioning at their full potential. The City initiated a Housing Corridors Study in 2020 to evaluate these and other potential study areas as possibilities to aid in providing new opportunities for housing and attractive placemaking. Each study area was selected based on direction provided in the General Plan, proximity to primary commercial corridors, and adjacency to public transit lines, which are all key factors in providing housing that affirmatively furthers fair housing and housing choice.

The study areas that are being evaluated in the Housing Corridors Study are shown in Figure H-9 and discussed in greater detail below.

1. **Gramercy Place:** The Gramercy Place Study Area includes 12 parcels (6.85 acres). All properties are designated R-LM, although they are all zoned M1 (Light Manufacturing), with the majority currently developed with small-scale industrial uses. All the parcels are proposed to retain their

R-LM land use designation and an overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the allowable density for the R-LM land use designation of 9.1-18 dwelling units per acre. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 100.


6. **Spencer Street:** The Spencer Street Study Area includes 10 parcels (approximately three acres). All properties are designated R-LM and zoned ML(M1-PP) (Limited Manufacturing with a Light Manufacturing-Precise Plan overlay) and are developed with small-scale light manufacturing uses. All parcels are proposed to be redesignated to the R-MD land use designation, which allows 18.1-31 dwelling units per acre. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the R-MD density. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 62. A similar property in the vicinity (on Earl St.) that was also designated R-LM and zoned industrial was recycled to a residential development in 2016 (see Project ID “H” in Table H-54).
7. **Maricopa Street:** The Maricopa Street Study Area includes nine parcels (28.2 acres). Eight of the nine parcels are designated I-LT (Light Industrial); the remaining parcel is designated I-HVY (Heavy Industrial). The parcels are zoned either M2 or M2/P1, which is Heavy Manufacturing (P1 is a Planting/Parking zone). Existing uses include light manufacturing, a church, and the City-owned property adjacent to the Torrance Transit Center. Proposed land use designations range from R-LM to R-HI. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density ranges. Based on the assumed target capacities, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 640. An industrially designated and zoned property on Maricopa Street adjacent to this study area was recycled to a residential development in 2003—see Project ID “M” in Table H-54.
8. **Border Avenue:** The Border Avenue Study Area is an area that was identified in the *Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan* as a location for recycling to residential development, in accordance with the strategies to incentivize mixed use and residential development on infill sites in Downtown and in the surrounding corridors and to ensure new housing includes affordable units. Eighty-nine of the 136 original parcels included in the Border Avenue Study Area have been included in the Sites Inventory. The current land use designations for the parcels are R-OF, R-MD, and C-CTR; the current zoning varies and includes M1 (Light Manufacturing), C1 (Retail Commercial), R3 (Limited Multiple Family Residential), and DRP (Downtown Redevelopment Plan). A determination has not yet been made as to how to designate and ultimately apply an overlay zone to these properties; therefore, for the purposes of estimating potential capacity in the Housing Element, the target densities for the existing land use designations were used. Applying those target densities, a potential of 442 dwelling units could be achieved. In 2013, a 44-unit, 100 percent affordable mixed-use development was constructed directly west of several of the properties identified in the Border Avenue Study Area (see Project ID “L” in Table H-54). Public interest has been expressed to develop housing on at least five parcels in the Border Avenue Study Area in recent months. See also the discussion regarding Downtown Torrance later in this section.
9. **Western Avenue:** The Western Avenue Study Area includes nine parcels (5.6 acres). The parcels are designated I-BP (Business Park) and zoned M1 (Light Manufacturing). Existing uses include small-scale manufacturing, light industrial, and a vacant property. The parcels north of Lincoln Avenue are proposed to be designated R-MH (Residential Medium-High), while those south of Lincoln Avenue are proposed to be designated R-MD (Residential Medium Density). An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density ranges. Based on the assumed target capacities, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 152.

There have been two recently entitled projects on Western Avenue in 2020—one a mixed-use development and the other a residential project; both were developed on property designated C-GEN.

10. **Lomita & Madison:** The Lomita And Madison Study Area consists of one parcel that is 8.3 acres. The existing land use designation is I-BP and the zoning is M1-PP. Existing uses include light industrial, places of worship, and office. The parcel is proposed to be redesignated to R-MH (Residential Medium-High). An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the R-MH density. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 274.
11. **Prairie Avenue:** The Prairie Avenue Study Area includes two parcels (0.7 acres). The existing land use designation is C-GEN and the zoning is C5. The property is proposed to be redesignated to R-LM. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density range. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 7. There have been two entitled projects in Prairie Avenue—one in 2020 and one in 2021 (see Project IDs “B” and “O.”)


Outreach was conducted with property owners for each of the study areas to inform them of the project and receive input.

Figure H-9: Housing Corridors Study Areas




The Torrance Housing Corridors Study was funded by a SB 2 grant from the state of California. Specific goals related to SB 2 grant funding are provided below:

- Make funding available to all local governments in California for the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans that streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production.
- Facilitate planning activities that will foster an adequate supply of homes affordable to Californians at all income levels. It is designed to help local governments meet the challenges of preparing and adopting land use plans and integrating strategies to promote housing development.
- SB 2 funded activities are intended to achieve the following program objectives:
 - Accelerate housing production
 - Streamline the approval of housing development affordable to owner and renter households at all income levels
 - Facilitate housing affordability for all income groups
 - Promote development consistent with State Planning Priorities (Government Code Section 65041.1)
 - Ensure geographic equity in the distribution and expenditure of allocated funds



Prototype/Concept Analyzed—Townhouse



Prototype/Concept Analyzed—Walk-Up (Podium Alternative)

Although not yet complete, the Torrance Housing Corridors Study is being prepared concurrently with the Housing Element update to position the City to better address the increases in RHNA allocations

for the 6th Cycle planning period and implement the City’s housing goals, policies, and objectives consistent with state law. The Housing Corridor Study is supplying 132 parcels in the Sites Inventory, or approximately 30.6 percent of the total number of parcels in the Sites Inventory (431 parcels) and approximately 34 percent of required units (based on a RHNA of 4,934). Note that not all parcels in the Housing Corridor Study have been included in the Sites Inventory due to lack of ability to meet key criteria or a property owner’s desire not to redevelop their property at this time.

All seven study areas are undergoing analysis and preparation of context-appropriate standards for future residential development. This includes the preparation of a Feasibility Study of four building concepts (prototypes) that could be used in the various study areas, depending on the applicable density. The intent is to determine if the proposed densities can be achieved by applying specified development standards. The building prototypes range from a townhouse development at 23.5 dwelling units per acre, a podium apartment development at 32.5 dwelling units per acre, a walk-up apartment at 30.2 dwelling units per acre, and a “split” project that includes both townhouses and apartments, for an average density of 40.5 dwelling units per acre. A financial pro forma fiscal analysis was then performed for five prototypes (the “split” townhouse/apartment was evaluated as two prototypes—the townhouse and the apartment component) to determine project feasibility. The financial factors for the prototypes were generally developed based on the industry-standard cost factors, which reflected a review of site design requirements associated with various zoning districts, and historic property sale data. The analysis was also informed by input from development/design professionals active in the South Bay and comparable southern California markets. The prototypes were evaluated based on the City’s existing parking standards. The fiscal analysis determined that, in many cases, densities could be achieved if the parking standards were reduced. This finding will inform finalization of the development and design standards for the study area. The fiscal analysis did not consider impacts of other development standards that have been identified as constraints to development, such as height, open space, and FARs.

The results of the Housing Corridor Study will culminate in the preparation of specified zones (and/or overlay zones) for the various Study Areas, each with development and design standards tailored to the particular area. The Housing Corridor Study is being implemented via Program 8. The detailed prototype and fiscal evaluations and analyses conducted for the HCS and the resulting development and design standards also will provide direction for other amendments to the Zoning Code to implement the Housing Element programs, such as preparation of the Residential/Mixed Use Overlay Zone and modifications to existing development standards to reduce development constraints.

Downtown Torrance

In Downtown Torrance, commercial properties with potential to redevelop to mixed-use are identified on the sites Inventory. These areas offer the opportunity for development on contiguous sites at the appropriate densities to accommodate housing opportunities. The former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area (DRP) encompasses 88.5 acres and contained the original commercial core of the city when it was founded in 1912. Historically, the pattern of redevelopment in the Downtown area has not been limited to construction of projects dedicated solely for commercial uses. The Redevelopment Agency was instrumental in providing funds for new development and property maintenance and rehabilitation prior to the demise of redevelopment agencies in 2012.

Trends indicate that the Downtown area has been consistently redeveloped with mixed-use developments that integrate a residential component. In Downtown Torrance, mixed-use development has revitalized older buildings and added to the charm and character of the area. It has

been common practice for projects in Downtown to consist of ground-floor commercial uses and an above-ground-floor residential use, and stand-alone residential development also has occurred, including a townhouse-style development and a senior apartment project. Examples of mixed-use developments in the DRP within the last 30 years include Brisas del Sol (at 96 du/ac) and Brisas del Prado (at 84 du/ac), which were made possible through the former Torrance Redevelopment Agency.

The General Plan identifies intensification of uses as a means to revitalize the area. Currently, the area is experiencing a renaissance with the development of and reinvestment in the Downtown commercial



Cabrillo Family Apartments, a 44-unit, 100% affordable development in Downtown Torrance

area. In early 2013, the City approved an affordable, mixed-use, workforce housing development consisting of 44 dwelling units and approximately 3,700 square feet of commercial space in Downtown Torrance. The development utilized a density bonus and provided 43 units affordable to very low- and low-income households plus a manager's unit. The project was developed on City-owned property.

To continue and support the momentum in Downtown Torrance, the City recently approved a *Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan* (Downtown Plan) in July of 2021. The Downtown Plan includes the commercial core of Downtown Torrance, also referred to as Old Torrance, as well as portions of four surrounding corridors that constitute the balance of the “greater” Downtown Torrance area (see Figure H-10). Note that the Border Avenue study area in the HCS is also one of the identified corridors in the Downtown Plan.

Figure H-10: Downtown Torrance Study Area



The Downtown Plan evaluated current regulations pertaining to the Downtown Commercial District and reviewed the market feasibility for uses and new development to help define and target businesses or development that could be compatible and practical for the area. Utilizing the background information and considerable public input, the Plan provides a detailed vision concept for the Downtown, and goals, strategies, and actions to implement the vision. In particular, Goal 5 proposes to support infill development of underutilized retail and commercial sites with mixed use and stand-alone housing. The key strategies and supporting future recommended actions in the Downtown Plan regarding the incentivization of mixed use and residential development are highlighted below.

Strategy M: Incentivize mixed use housing development on infill sites in Downtown and in the surrounding corridors.

- **M.1. Modify internal processes for approving mixed-use projects.** Front load the environmental use design considerations and reduce discretionary actions to attract investment interest and increase speed of project approvals. Develop a streamlined development process to incentivize mixed use housing projects in Downtown and corridors.
- **M.2. Remove parking barriers to development by evaluating right-sizing parking ratios to 1.5 spaces for residential units over 700 square feet to encourage mixed-use housing development.** The cost of developing subterranean parking in downtown is a barrier to financial feasibility. With reduced parking ratios, developers can generate higher profit margins and are more likely to pursue projects in Downtown Torrance. Permitting lower

parking ratios as part of the municipal code will also streamline the development process and reduce the need for developers to request a variance from development standards.

- **M.3. Relax open space requirement for residential projects, especially apartments with inclusionary units.** This existing open space requirement for multi-family housing is onerous and restricts the opportunity for more residential density and units. See Appendix A for suggested modifications to the existing requirements within Downtown and in the Corridor Study Areas.
- **M.4. Develop incentives to encourage market rate and affordable housing development near Downtown.** Consider fee waivers for affordable and inclusionary housing projects in Downtown and the surrounding corridors.



Examples of potential types of infill housing provided in the Downtown Plan

Strategy N: Incentivize mixed-use redevelopment in the Commercial Study Area so it can become an extension of Downtown Torrance.

- **N.1. Create a zoning overlay or rezone the area to permit mixed-use development.** Developers are most likely to pursue a wrap typology, which is conducive for the larger sites in the commercial area.
- **N.2. Consider expedited site plan review.** This would be for new construction and adaptive reuse projects located in the overlay/area. Expediting the development review process reduces developer holding costs and incentivizes development.

Strategy O: Ensure new housing includes affordable units.

- **O.1. Explore adoption of an inclusionary zoning (IZ) ordinance for properties in the Study Area.** Any IZ requirements should be calibrated to current market conditions and parallel density bonus requirements for implementation effectiveness.
- **O.2. Prioritize bids to develop on City-owned land that include affordable housing.** There are several City-owned parcels in the Study Area, including parking lots in Downtown Torrance. Under a request for bids, the City can prioritize affordable housing be part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.
- **O.3. Consider offering zoning incentives to mixed-use and residential projects that provide affordable housing.** Incentives could apply to many areas including open space and parking requirements. For instance, the recommended parking ratio of 1.5 spaces for residential units over 700 square feet could be further reduced to 1.0 spaces per unit.

As can be seen from the strategies and implementing actions above, the City is planning many ways to incentivize mixed-use and residential development within the Downtown area and associated corridors. All sites that fall within these areas can benefit from these proposed implementation efforts. (Please note that not all sites that fall within these areas are identified in the Sites Inventory as in the “Downtown,” even though they fall within the Downtown Plan are therefore subject to the strategies and actions listed above). “Downtown Torrance” is commonly known as the area on the map that is identified as such. As noted in the Sites Inventory, there are many sites that fall within these areas that already have public interest for development of housing. Implementation of the strategies and actions will only serve to enhance interest and continue the long-standing trend in the area.

The Sites Inventory identifies a number of properties within the Downtown Torrance study area where the conditions of existing uses are conducive to private redevelopment in the future. Such conditions include expressed developer interest, City ownership, large parking areas, older buildings, marginally operating businesses, and significant capacity for additional units. Strategy O under Goal 5 in the Downtown Plan is to “ensure new housing includes affordable units.”

There are several City-owned parcels in the Study Area that are included in the Sites Inventory, including parking lots in Downtown Torrance and the Border Avenue Housing Corridor Study, which also is included in the Downtown Plan. A recommended action (Strategy O.2. noted above) in the Downtown Plan states the following: “Under a request for bids, the City can prioritize affordable housing be part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.” The City-owned sites in the Downtown area are located in an area which is zoned to allow residential densities as envisioned in the Housing Element. To the City’s knowledge there are no known conditions that preclude residential development of City-owned properties. As noted in Strategy O.2. above, and as evidenced by the City’s history of utilizing City-owned property in Downtown Torrance for affordable housing, the City intends to continue to consider City-owned sites for affordable development. For example, the City is in current discussions with a developer for the construction of a maximum 20-unit affordable housing complex on a parcel owned by the City located at 1956 Torrance Boulevard (Site 499). The site is currently being used as a parking lot. It is the City’s intention to expand the number of affordable units within the City with the development of this site, in accordance with the strategies in the Downtown Plan (described above).

Religious Institution Overlay Zone

Throughout California, the development of affordable housing on religious properties has become an increasing trend. Nonprofit organizations such as Many Mansions and National CORE have assisted many religious facilities to incorporate housing on site. AB 1851 (Religious Facility Housing, 2020) incentivizes religious institutions to construct housing on their properties by allowing religious facilities to partner with nonprofit developers to provide affordable housing on-site and receive parking relief to facilitate development—a local agency is prohibited from requiring the replacement of religious-use parking spaces that a developer of a religious institution affiliated housing development project proposes to eliminate as part of that project. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, religious institutions in the city provide the potential to accommodate housing on their sites to assist the City in meeting the RHNA.

The City proposes to facilitate housing on religious institution properties by establishing an affordable housing overlay (Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone [RIH-OZ], Program 7). The Sites Inventory includes 26 properties owned by and operated as religious institutions that have been identified as potential candidates for the addition of housing. These properties would be appropriate for the

addition of multifamily housing, as many are located near transit, services, businesses, and other resident-serving uses. These sites also are scattered throughout the city, which supports the City's goals, policies, and programs to affirmatively further fair housing.

Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, this is a valuable strategy to provide additional housing opportunities for lower income households. Utilizing church land for affordable housing also provides an attractive opportunity for affordable housing developers by minimizing their cost for land, risk, and time to process development applications. This approach also helps congregations further their missions to support lower-income populations while providing enhanced financial stability for religious institutions, many of which have been impacted by declining attendance, which has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Not all religious institutions in the city are proposed for the RI-OZ due to a variety of factors, including the built-out nature of their properties. It is not the City's intent to limit potential RIH-OZ sites; additional properties may be identified via the rezoning process and could be included at that time or in the future. The RIH-OZ is a tool that could be utilized by any religious institution as conditions change. During the first focus group session with service providers and affordable developers, examples of successful partnerships with religious institutions were provided and the proposed concept for the RIH-OZ was supported. During the second focus group with service providers and affordable and market-rate developers, support for the RIH-OZ was again supported and one of the attendees noted that a 48-unit townhouse development has been entitled recently for the Christ the King Lutheran Church site in Torrance. This is a project for above-moderate income housing that would retain the existing church sanctuary and demolish the chapel, office, and preschool. Forty 3-bedroom units and eight 4-bedroom units are proposed on a 2.79-acre site. Although the RIH-OZ will only be applicable for affordable housing, the recently entitled project demonstrates that identifying religious institution properties for residential development is a reasonable strategy.

There has been significant expressed interest from church operations throughout Southern California to partner with nonprofit developers such as National CORE and Many Mansions to provide affordable housing onsite. Typical development model involves the church to provide a ground lease of the surplus or parking areas for affordable housing in exchange for lease payments, new facility, and/or affordable units for staff. An action is included in the Housing Plan for the City to actively pursue such opportunities. Following are three examples of an affordable housing developer adding housing to existing religious institution sites as proposed by the City's RIH-OZ.

1. The Southern California affordable housing developer National Community Renaissance (National CORE) has worked with several religious institutions to construct infill housing on sites they own. One example is Santa Angelina Senior Apartments in Placentia, California. National CORE is redeveloping an existing church site, retaining the church building, and constructing 65 units of senior affordable housing, new community garden, a new parish hall (to replace the existing parish hall), and a new memorial garden for the church.
2. A second example is Orchard View Apartments in the City of Buena Park, California. This is an existing church with a vacant portion of the site on which National CORE is building 66 units affordable to seniors. The church building will remain, and because of the passage of AB 1851, the remaining parking on the site is adequate. Amenities include a community center, outdoor seating areas, and BBQ picnic area.

3. A third example in the Los Angeles region is Legacy Square in the city of Santa Ana. This site was made available because a local church wanted to consolidate two campuses located in proximity to each other, and they wanted to further the church's legacy in the neighborhood. One of the two sites retains the church buildings, and on the other, National CORE is constructing 93 affordable housing units for families on a 1.74-acre site (53.4 du/ac). These units are 100 percent affordable. The project includes amenities such as a tot lot playground, community center, landscaped outdoor courtyards, and BBQ areas.

Because of the recently entitled project in Torrance for construction of a residential development on the site of a religious institution in Torrance, and the three other examples of affordable housing on religious sites elsewhere in Southern California, this constitutes an important trend that likely will gain in popularity over the next eight years, assisting the City of Torrance in meet its affordable housing goals.

While the actual size and/or development potential of any religious institution for multifamily housing would vary from site to site, the City has made an assumption for the purposes of the Sites Inventory that approximately 25 percent of a site could be developed with residential uses. Development could occur on vacant or underutilized portions of the property and/or may include redeveloping portions or all of existing buildings into residential units. The City is proposing a density of 20-31 dwelling units per acre for the proposed RIH-OZ, with a target density of 23.25 dwelling units per acre. Given the fact that most affordable housing requires density bonuses, and because only affordable housing would qualify for the parking relief, the City assumes residential development proposed for these sites will be on the higher sides of the density range and therefore considers the assumed density factor to be not only reasonable, but conservative.

4.1.2.7 Other Recyclable Residential Land

As noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the land designated for residential use in Torrance has been essentially built out for years. However, analysis conducted for the Sites Inventory reveals that there are still underutilized residential properties in Torrance—that is, properties that are designated for higher residential density but are currently developed at less than the maximum permitted density, most commonly with single-family dwellings. Given the scarcity of developable land in Torrance, infill development on underutilized properties has been an ongoing trend for many years. Table H-42 identifies six properties that are zoned R-2 that either have received approval of or are in the application process to redevelop with two units per site. While this is only a net increase of 6 units, it represents the continuation of a trend.

Another opportunity for increased density on existing residentially designated property includes the potential to subdivide properties into flag lots. For example, if a single lot were to be subdivided into three lots through a flag lot subdivision, each one of the new lots also could accommodate an ADU and a JADU. If one existing lot with one single-family unit were to be subdivided into three lots, the potential net increase could be up to eight dwelling units, counting the ability to add an ADU and JADU to each site. Community input received during public outreach for the Housing Element update indicates a continued interest in creating flag lots.

These ongoing trends demonstrate that the City facilitates and encourages recycling and that there is a demand and market for recycling of residentially designated land to higher densities. The Sites Inventory identifies many of these sites—general descriptions include Apple Avenue, Santa Fe

Avenue, Gramercy Avenue (separate from the Housing Corridors Study sites on Gramercy Avenue), and flag lots.

4.1.2.8 Scattered Sites

There are other opportunities for infill development at scattered sites throughout the City that have not already been discussed in previous sections. These scattered sites represent recyclable properties that contain existing non-residential uses that are likely candidates for conversion to residential uses. These properties are located in areas where the pattern of development has demonstrated a trend of conversion of existing underutilized and non-residential uses into multi-family uses. Also, many of these properties contain parcel sizes and configurations that make these sites conducive for recycling to multi-family uses. As has been noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the age of the structures on the scattered sites also will encourage redevelopment, as many are over 50 years old.

The scattered sites include a wide range of types of properties, from existing single-family units that are currently designated and zoned to allow more units and/or become flag-lot subdivisions, to larger industrial sites along key transportation corridors that will benefit from proposed redesignation and rezoning, and everything in between. Eleven sites have been identified as having public interest for development of housing. The various programs and actions identified in the Housing Plan will further incentivize the recycling of these sites into mixed-use and residential units.

4.1.3 INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABILITY

Torrance is a built-out community with existing infrastructure throughout. As discussed on Section 3.5 and in the Initial Study/Negative Declaration prepared for this project, no significant public service or infrastructure constraints have been identified. Public infrastructure improvements required of new developments, impact fees, and planned City improvements of facilities help to ensure that services are available to both current and future residents. Parks, schools, emergency facilities, and other public facilities area also extended in this manner. Ongoing development and maintenance of an efficiently functioning infrastructure is an ongoing priority for the City. It is one of the 10 strategic priorities in the City's Strategic Plan. The City has implemented an aggressive capital improvement program to upgrade infrastructure throughout the City.

4.1.4 ADEQUACY OF SITES INVENTORY TO MEET RHNA

Identified properties in the sites inventory have the combined capacity to accommodate a total of 6,471 income-targeted housing units on underutilized and vacant residential (Table H-58) sites, which exceeds the City's total RHNA for the 2021-2029 planning period by 31 percent (see Table H-57). When anticipated ADUs and entitled and pipeline projects are included, the RHNA is exceeded by 53.4 percent.

Table H-58: Adequacy of Sites to Accommodate the 2021-2029 RHNA

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	---	28	288	2,850 ²	3,166 ²	28.3%
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		---	---	29	1,528	1,557	82.5%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,041 ²	2,800 ²	72.3%
Total	4,939		195	429	480	6,473	7,577	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among and added to their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

Table H-59 summarizes the sites as identified by General Description in the Sites Inventory and as described in Section 4. The sites identified in the “Other” category are a compilation of the categories that are otherwise not specified in the table.

Table H-59: Adequacy of Sites to Accommodate the 2021-2029 RHNA by General Description

General Descriptions	Affordability Category			Total Units
	Lower Income ^{1,2}	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income ²	
Housing Corridor Study (HCS):				
▪ HCS-Border	---	442	---	442
▪ HCS-Gramercy	---	---	100	100
▪ HCS-Lomita-Madison	274	---	---	274
▪ HCS-Maricopa	125	81	434	640
▪ HCS-Prairie Ave.	---	7	---	7
▪ HCS-Spencer	---	29	33	62
▪ HCS-Western	126	26	---	152
Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan	975	209	1,117	2,301
Crenshaw Blvd. south of Sepulveda Blvd.	119	95	---	214
Redondo Beach Blvd. (not in HBCSP)	111	450	9	570
Sepulveda Blvd. east of Maple Ave.	163	43	15	221
Downtown Torrance (not otherwise accounted for)	---	128	---	128
Religious Housing Institution Overlay Zone	270	---	---	270
All Other Sites	687	72	333	1,092
Total	2,850	1,582	2,041	6,473

Note: All capacity assumptions based on Table H-53.

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; **the mixed income total has been divided among, and added to, their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.**

4.2 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Torrance has access to a variety of funding sources for affordable housing activities. These include programs from local, state, federal, and private resources. The City uses various funding sources,

including Low/Moderate Housing Funds, HUD funding sources, and Section 8 rental assistance to preserve and increase the supply of affordable housing in Torrance through the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of renter-occupied units and the rehabilitation of owner-occupied units. Financial assistance is provided to both non-profit and for-profit housing developers. With the elimination of redevelopment, Torrance has limited funding for affordable housing activities. As noted previously the former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area was responsible for assisting with the development of several hundred units in Downtown Torrance over the years, including mixed use, residential, and SRO developments.

During the course of the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will pursue funding opportunities as provided for in the Housing Plan (Section 5). Financial incentives, such as fee waivers, are another strategy that can incentivize housing.

4.2.1 HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER (SECTION 8) RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The federal Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program provides rental assistance to very low-income households overpaying for housing. In general, the HCV program assists a very low-income household by paying the difference between 30 percent of the gross household income and the cost of rent. The Torrance Housing Authority is a Section 8 only Housing Authority (HA). It does not own or operate public housing units. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. As of September 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed. The City is constrained in the number of households it can assist by this program based on the way the federal government funds the program; the City go assist up to 650 households if federal funding was more appropriate. The HA maintains a residence preference, which gives priority to households that live or work in the City, and priority is given to families, disabled persons, and seniors.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD's VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

4.2.2 LOW & MODERATE HOUSING SET-ASIDE FUNDS

The City annually receives low- and moderate-income housing funds for the purpose of creating new affordable housing and maintaining existing affordable housing. The funds also assist with the monitoring of affordability restrictions and administering housing activities. Currently, the City has \$1.9 million in low- and moderate-income funds.

4.2.3 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FUNDS

Through the CDBG program, HUD provides funds to local governments for funding a wide range of community development activities for low-income persons. Since 2011, the City has received approximately \$7.2 million dollars in total of CDBG funds with another \$754,897 of CDBG funds to be received in Fiscal Year 2020-2021. In recent years, the City has used CDBG funds to successfully

complete projects throughout the City by providing accessibility and mobility through the improvement of sidewalks. The City identifies areas where the sidewalk is either damaged or displaced, causing a non-continuous path of travel to anyone, including senior citizens and those with disabilities. The City then uses CDBG grant fund to address the accessibility issues by removing the barriers via the removal/replacement of damaged sidewalk.

4.2.4 HOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Community Services Department. HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own.

4.2.5 LOCAL EARLY ACTION PLANNING (LEAP) GRANTS

In the 2019-20 Budget Act, Governor Gavin Newsom allocated \$250 million for all regions, cities, and counties to do their part by prioritizing planning activities that accelerate housing production to meet identified needs of every community. With this allocation, HCD established the Local Early Action Planning Grant Program (LEAP) with \$119 million for cities and counties. LEAP provides one-time grant funding to cities and counties to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that will facilitate the acceleration of housing production and help local governments prepare for their 6th cycle RHNA much like the SB2 Planning Grants. The City of Torrance was awarded \$155,000, which was used to fund the Housing Element update.

4.2.6 SB2 GRANTS

In 2017, Governor Brown signed a 15-bill housing package aimed at addressing the State's housing shortage and high housing costs. Specifically, it included the Building Homes and Jobs Act (SB 2, 2017), which establishes a \$75 recording fee on real estate documents in order to increase the supply of affordable homes in California. Because the number of real estate transactions recorded in each county will vary from year to year, the revenues collected will fluctuate.

The first year of SB 2 funds are available as planning grants to local jurisdictions. The City of Torrance received \$310,000 for planning efforts to facilitate housing production. The City allocated \$50,000 to develop a program to promote ADU production and \$260,000 to fund the Housing Corridor Study. For the second year and onward, 70 percent of the funding will be allocated to local governments for affordable housing purposes. A large portion of year two allocations will be distributed using the same formula used to allocate federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

4.2.7 SOUTH BAY REGIONAL HOUSING TRUST

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) is currently in the process of trying to create a Regional Housing Trust (RHT), specific to South Bay cities, through a Joint Powers Authority (JPA)

to fund and finance the planning and construction of homeless housing, and extremely low, very low, and low-income housing projects. The South Bay Regional Housing Trust (SBRHT) funding would make the construction of affordable housing more appealing to developers. The City has already provided a Letter of Support for SB 1444 (Allen), which would create the SBRHT. It is the City's intent to continue to work with the SBCCOG as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance.

4.3 ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

The following agencies and organizations are important components of the City's housing services delivery system. These agencies and entities have administrative capacity to implement programs contained in the Housing Element to help construct, preserve, and improve housing in Torrance, including preserving affordable housing that is at risk of converting to market-rate housing. They include the City of Torrance, other public agencies, and local and national non-profit private developers.

4.3.1 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The City of Torrance Community Development Department is the lead department implementing a number of the programs outlined in this Housing Element. The Community Development Director is responsible for the management of all City building and planning activities including building permits, environmental/code enforcement, engineering permits and records, GIS and mapping and housing activities. Responsibilities of the Community Development Department include:

- Advanced Planning
- Building Permits & On-Line Permitting
- Construction Plan Check and Inspections
- Development Review
- Engineering Permits
- Engineering Records
- Environmental/Code Enforcement
- Housing Programs (including Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8)
- Transportation Planning
- GIS and Mapping

As noted above, the Community Development Department runs the City of Torrance Public Housing Authority (PHA), which is located at Torrance City Hall.

According to the draft 2022 Annual PHA Plan Executive Summary, the City of Torrance PHA has been allocated 690 Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV), 25 Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers (VASH), and 33 Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV). The PHA is currently assisting approximately 500 families, including 12 transfer families whose current agencies are billing Torrance for the families' housing assistance payments.

The main changes from the 2021 Annual PHA Plan to the 2022 Annual PHA Plan are due to the increased voucher programs, to maximize lease-up, that the PHA is administering. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA applied for and received an additional allocation of 15 VASH vouchers. These vouchers are administered in partnership with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of supportive services. The PHA now has 25 VASH vouchers. On May 20, 2021, the PHA accepted a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allocation of 33 EHV's. These vouchers are targeted to assist the following populations: homeless; at risk of homelessness; fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking or human trafficking; recently homeless and for whom providing rental assistance will prevent the family's homelessness or having high risk of housing instability. These new voucher programs changed the PHA's expected financial resources and have assisted the PHA in meeting the 5-Year Plan goal of expanding the supply of assisted housing. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA increased the voucher payment standards in an effort to compete with the increasing market rate rents in the area and thus increase the assisted housing choices for voucher holders. In January 2022, the PHA applied for an expedited HUD regulatory waiver to establish payment standards between 111% and 120% of Fair Market Rent (FMR). The PHA has continued to issue replacement vouchers and provide voucher mobility information to program participants. The PHA will continue to evaluate budget, per unit cost, and fair market rents to determine if the payment standards for all voucher types can be increased in Plan Year 2022.

In addition to maximizing lease-up, there are 10 major initiatives in the 2021 Annual Plan, which the PHA intends to continue the following efforts in the 2022 Annual Plan:

1. Continue quality control inspections.
2. Continue the review of 100% of case files by supervision.
3. Continue working with social service agencies in the community including those serving the homeless, seniors and handicapped/disabled households.
4. Continue working with HUD's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and local law enforcement to follow up on fraud reports and collect any money owed to the Housing Authority as a result of such fraud.
5. Review the operations and procedures of the program in order to serve clients in a more efficient manner.
6. Utilize the Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) to electronically verify the accuracy of tenant reported data to ensure that program participants pay their fair share of the rent.
7. Require families who fail to report income in a timely manner to the PHA to reimburse overpayments on the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) made on their behalf by the agency. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA entered into three repayment agreements for overpaid HAP.
8. Maintain and update the database for the rent reasonableness system.
9. Follow up on Social Security number discrepancies that have occurred since HUD began matching the records of program participants with the Social Security Administration records. PHA staff are also monitoring the Megan's Law and Los Angeles County Sheriff's website in an effort to monitor applicants and participants for criminal activity.

10. Continue to comply with the HUD submission requirements using the Multi-Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) during the next fiscal year. Information about program participants is electronically transmitted to HUD using MTCS. HUD requires that at least 95% of the records for program participants be successfully submitted to MTCS.

The City of Torrance is proposing a project for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) funding, which identifies projected use of funds for submission for fiscal years 2020-22 for to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). CDBG CARES funds must be used to benefit primarily low and moderate-income persons who have been adversely affected by COVID-19. There is one project submitted for consideration for Community Development Block Grants CARES, which is for the purchase of non-congregate shelter units for individuals experiencing homelessness (\$39,310). The temporary housing program will include case management and housing navigation, which will provide critical support services essential for transitioning people experiencing homelessness into permanent housing.

The Community Development Department is also responsible for tracking the number and affordability of new housing units that will be built during this planning period and administering the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program. The Environmental Division is responsible for responding to code violations for substandard housing issues.

4.3.2 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The City of Torrance Community Services Department offers Torrance residents the unique opportunity to help achieve a sense of purpose, identity, self-worth, and improved self-esteem within the specialized areas of Cultural Arts, Library, and Parks and Recreation. The Community Services Department is responsible for administering the Home Improvement Program (HIP), which is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed, provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs.

The City of Torrance Community Services Department is also responsible for coordinating homeless services. Torrance is located in Service Provider Area (SPA) 8 of Los Angeles County. The Community Services Department has local resources available to assist the community's residents in their greatest times of need. While there are many service providers in the area, the Department promises to promote a focused 'Coordinated Entry System' or CES, to help escort everyone through the same starting point, so that professionals can link those in need to the appropriate service providers and resources. The Community Services Department also prepares and administers the Permanent Local Housing Allocation Five-Year Plan (2019-2023).

4.3.3 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMISSIONS

The City of Torrance has several commissions that are directly or indirectly responsible for supporting the City's efforts to improve housing and the quality of life for its residents.

The City's seven-member **Planning Commission** works with the Community Development Department to prepare updates to the Torrance General Plan, including the Housing Element and the Land Use Element, which plays a key role in implementing the Housing Element. The Planning Commission also

assists the Community Development Department in updating the City's Zoning Code and other zoning-related plans, which also implement the Housing Element.

The City has a seven-member **Social Services Commission**, which addresses issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.

The City also has a seven-member **Commission on Aging**, which deals with the needs and issues confronting senior citizens in the community and provides a voice for senior citizens as a community group.

4.3.4 NON-PROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS

Due to the high cost of housing development in Los Angeles County, many communities have found that partnerships with non-profit housing developers are an effective tool for creating affordable housing units. Nonprofit housing developers active in Southern California include:

- Habitat for Humanity
- National CORE
- Bridge Housing
- Meta Housing
- Jamboree Housing
- Linc Housing
- Many Mansions

4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESOURCE CONSERVATION

4.4.1 CITY PROGRAMS

Energy-related housing costs can directly impact the affordability of housing. Although sometimes energy efficient measures can increase initial construction costs, over time providing energy conservation features reduces costs by lowering energy consumption. The City promotes energy conservation through the implementation of State of California Title 24 building code energy performance requirements. Title 24 requires energy efficient design measures, such as minimum ceiling, wall, and raised floor insulation, and minimum heating, ventilating, air conditioning and water heating equipment efficiencies.

In 2017, the City of Torrance, in cooperation with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP sets greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals, and outlines strategies to achieve those goals. These include strategies such as promoting solar panel installation, grid modernization, encouraging electric vehicle use, and land use changes. The targets are consistent with state goals for emission reduction and include an overall goal to reduce emissions by 49 percent from 2005 levels by 2035.

The City of Torrance has also created an Interdepartmental Sustainability Team to further the City's Sustainability Goals and create a Sustainability Plan to guide the City's sustainable programs and policies. The Team includes representatives from several departments or divisions working on sustainable initiatives. Its mission is to work together to expand ongoing sustainable initiatives into a more effective movement towards a more sustainable city. Some specific projects and programs that can help encourage energy efficient housing and reduce energy costs include:

- The Torrance “1 Mile, 1 Charger” Project, which provides publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Participation in the Tree City USA program
- Streamlined solar permitting and inspections

4.4.2 UTILITY PROVIDER PROGRAMS

Utility providers also offer assistance to encourage and facilitate energy conservation and to help residents minimize energy-related expenses.

Southern California Edison (SCE) offers a variety of energy conservation and assistance programs. The Energy Savings Assistance Program helps income-qualified households conserve energy and reduce their electricity costs. The program pays all costs of purchasing and installing energy-efficient appliances and equipment, which are free to eligible customers. In addition, SCE offers ongoing and one-time bill assistance, including reduced bills for qualified households through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA) programs.

The Southern California Gas Company offers various rebates, incentives, and assistance programs for customers. These include programs such as the Energy Savings Assistance Program, which provides no-cost energy-saving home improvements and furnace repair or replacement services, the Medical Baseline Allowance Program, which offers assistance to customers with major health concerns, and the Residential Advance Clean Energy Program, which provide eligible customers a complimentary walkthrough energy assessment and the installation of energy technologies.

A Direct Assistance Program (DAP) is available for qualified low-income customers. DAP provides no-cost weatherization and furnace repair or replacement services. The Gas Company also operates the Gas Assistance Fund (GAF), which helps low-income households pay their gas bills. Southern California Gas participates in the state's CARE program, which provides a 20 percent discount on the monthly gas bills of income-eligible households. In addition, the Gas Company participates in the Medical Baseline Allowance Program. Customers with a qualifying medical condition are eligible for a free medical baseline allowance 0.822 therms per day. Under this program additional gas usage is billed at the baseline rate, which is the lowest rate for residential customers.

In addition to the assistance programs, residents may qualify for assistance through the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP is a federally funded energy assistance program that may help residents pay the utility bill if they are income-qualified. Funds pledged to assist customers of SoCalGas are distributed through local community-based organizations, assistance agencies and certain government agencies.

4.4.3 REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The South Bay Environmental Services Center (SBESC) is the South Bay's local clearinghouse for energy efficiency, water conservation and environmental information, training, materials, and outreach. SBESC assists public agencies including cities, schools, and special districts as well as businesses and residents of the South Bay to best utilize the many resources available to them through a wide variety of statewide and local energy efficiency and water conservation programs.

SBESC has expanded its services through its Energy Efficiency Plus (EE+) program to deliver significant and measurable energy savings by working directly with public agencies on joint procurement of energy efficient equipment as well as providing information on more energy efficient practices.

DRAFT

5. HOUSING PLAN

This Housing Plan sets forth the City’s overall housing objectives in the form of Goals, Policies, and Programs that guide housing policy for the City for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period. The goals, policies, and programs are consistent with the direction of the other General Plan elements, specifically the Land Use Element, and also reflect the direction provided by the City’s recently updated Strategic Plan (May 2021). While many of the programs have been carried forward from the previous (5th Cycle) Housing Element, many others have been revised or added to reflect the community’s needs and constraints as identified in previous sections of the Housing Element, input from the community (see Section 1—Introduction and Appendix A), and to respond to new circumstances and significant changes in Housing Element law over the past four+ years.

The Housing Element goals, policies, and programs aim to:

- Provide adequate sites to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA;
- Assist in the development of housing to meet the needs of lower income households;
- Address and where appropriate, and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to housing development;
- Conserve, preserve, and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; and
- Promote equal housing opportunity (affirmatively furthering fair housing).

These objectives are required by and delineated in State Law (California Code Section 65583 [c][1]).

Torrance is a built-out community with a long-standing goal of maintaining a balance of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. The extremely limited amount of remaining vacant land creates a significant challenge for the City to promote a variety of individual choices regarding tenure, type, location, and affordability of housing throughout the community that accommodates the 6th Cycle RHNA, while maintaining the balance of land uses that is important to maintain a desirable quality of life for existing and future residents, and a healthy economy. This section presents the City’s eight-year Housing Plan for the 2021-2029 planning cycle, which is intended to mitigate these challenges, address the identified housing needs of the community, accommodate the City’s allocated RHNA, and promote equal opportunity for all residents to reside in decent, safe, affordable housing.

5.1 HOUSING GOALS AND POLICIES

5.1.1 HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Meeting the housing needs of all residents of the community requires the identification of adequate sites for all types of housing.

GOAL H.1:	Enhance housing opportunities for all existing and future Torrance residents.
Policy H.1.1:	Provide a range of different housing types and unit sizes for varying income ranges and lifestyles, including low density single-family homes, duplexes, bungalow courts, cottage/courtyard housing, accessory dwelling units, apartments and condominiums, and mixed-use residential development, to accommodate the City’s RHNA.
Policy H.1.2:	Continue to provide appropriate land use designations and zones to facilitate residential development and maintain an inventory of suitable sites for residential development.
Policy H.1.3:	Address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential infill housing in locations that are close to resident-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.
Policy H.1.4:	Encourage higher-density housing development along transit corridors and smart growth focus areas in order to encourage preservation of natural resources; reduce energy consumption and emissions of greenhouse gasses and other air pollutants; and promote active transportation with its associated health benefits.
Policy H.1.5:	Encourage housing for seniors and persons with disabilities near public transportation, shopping, medical, and other essential support services and facilities.
Policy H.1.6:	Encourage developers to employ innovative solutions to meet housing needs, including adaptive reuse of existing non-residential buildings.
Policy H.1.7:	Employ place-based strategies ⁹ in making neighborhood improvements.

5.1.2 HOUSING TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL INCOME LEVELS

Torrance encourages the development of housing units affordable to all segments of the population. The Low- and Moderate-Income funds facilitate the production of affordable for-sale and rental housing through the provision of both financial and regulatory incentives.

GOAL H.2:	Assist in the provision of safe, decent, affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents of Torrance of all income levels, including persons with low and moderate incomes.
Policy H.2.1:	Explore approaches to residential development that decrease the cost of housing and increase the opportunity for homeownership.

⁹ Place-based strategies address the physical, social, structural, and economic conditions of a community that affect the well-being of the children, families and individuals who live there. Place-based strategies include any effort to enhance the livability and quality of life in a given community. From <https://www.ddcf.org/globalassets/17-0118-nga-place-based-strategies-to-address-poverty-issue-brief.pdf>

Policy H.2.2:	Continue to utilize federal and state subsidies to the fullest extent in order to meet the needs of lower income residents.
Policy H.2.3:	Use the City’s regulatory powers to promote affordable housing.
Policy H.2.4:	Work with large employers to facilitate the development of workforce housing.
Policy H.2.5:	Provide incentives and/or support to nonprofit development corporations for the development of affordable housing.
Policy H.2.6:	Provide incentives for market-rate developers to include units that are available to moderate- and lower-income households.
Policy H.2.7:	Encourage the development of housing for low- and moderate-income households in areas with adequate access to employment opportunities, community facilities, and public services.
Policy H.2.8:	Encourage the distribution of low- and moderate-income housing opportunities throughout all areas of the City.
Policy H.2.9:	Prioritize development of housing for moderate- and lower-income households on City-owned property.
Policy H.2.10:	Continue the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program to the full extent of the availability of funding from the federal government.

5.1.3 REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Factors that pose constraints to the provision of housing include the costs of developing both ownership and rental housing, which are ultimately passed to the consumers; the availability and cost of mortgage and rehabilitation financing; and restrictive zoning or other development regulations. These factors tend to disproportionately impact lower- and moderate-income households due to their limited resources for absorbing the costs. The City of Torrance will, where legally possible, remove governmental constraints affecting the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

GOAL H.3:	Mitigate potential governmental constraints to housing production and affordability.
Policy H.3.1:	Review and revise City regulations, ordinances, permitting processes, development fees, and impact fees to ensure that they do not constrain housing development and are consistent with state law.
Policy H.3.2:	Continue to allow multiple-family legally non-conforming units to rebuild to existing densities.
Policy H.3.3:	Offer financial and/or regulatory incentives, where feasible, to offset or reduce the costs of developing quality housing affordable to a wide range of Torrance households.
Policy H.3.4:	Accommodate housing needs for extremely low-income households and special needs persons in the City’s development regulations.

5.1.4 CONSERVE, PRESERVE, AND IMPROVE THE HOUSING STOCK

Preserving the existing housing stock in Torrance is a high City priority. Continued maintenance of the existing housing stock ensures high-quality neighborhoods. Housing activities that help achieve these

goals include rehabilitation of single- and multi-family housing units and preservation of assisted housing units that may be at risk of converting to market-rate housing.

GOAL H.4:	Maintain and improve the quality of existing housing and residential neighborhoods in Torrance.
Policy H.4.1:	Encourage the maintenance and enhancement of the existing housing stock.
Policy H.4.2:	Promote increased awareness among property owners and residents of the importance of property maintenance.
Policy H.4.3:	Support preservation of existing affordable low-income housing that is considered at risk of converting to market level rents.
Policy H.4.4:	Encourage the rehabilitation of residential properties by homeowners and property owners.
Policy H.4.5:	Continue to enforce the City’s Short Term Rental ordinance to ensure dwelling units remains available as housing for Torrance residents.
Policy H.4.6:	Continue to utilize the City’s code enforcement program to bring substandard units into compliance with City codes and to improve overall housing quality and conditions in Torrance.

5.1.5 PROMOTE EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY

In 2018, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) into California state law. AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. Specifically, these meaningful actions must aim to accomplish the following:

- Address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity;
- Replace segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns;
- Transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity; and
- Foster and maintain compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.

AB 686 creates new requirements that apply to all Housing Elements due for revision on or after January 1, 2021, which includes the 6th Cycle Housing Element update for the SCAG region. Each jurisdictions’ Housing Element must include an assessment of fair housing (AFH) in each of five analysis areas:

1. Fair housing enforcement and outreach;
2. Segregation and integration;
3. Disparities in access to opportunity;
4. Disproportionate needs/displacement; and
5. Racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty.

Per HCD, the Sites Inventory required for the Housing Element also “...must assess whether the identified sites serve the purpose of replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns. Analysis should not be limited to the identification of sites for lower income households but should incorporate the jurisdiction’s projected housing development at all income levels. It should assess the extent to which it either further entrenches or ameliorates existing patterns of segregation and/or exclusion of protected class members.”

In order to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all segments of the community, the City must ensure equal and fair housing opportunities are available to all residents. This means that through its goals, policies, and programs, the City must identify meaningful actions to expand the range of housing opportunities provided in Torrance, including extremely low, lower, and moderate-income households, housing for seniors on fixed incomes, the disabled, large families, female-headed households with children, and people experiencing homelessness.

GOAL H.5:	Promote equal housing opportunity for all residents, regardless of race, religion, family status, age, or physical disability.
Policy H.5.1:	Continue to enforce state and federal fair housing laws prohibiting discrimination in the building, financing, selling, or renting of housing on the basis of race, ethnicity, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, marital status, familial status, source of income, sexual orientation, or any other arbitrary factor.
Policy H.5.2:	Promote housing along with supportive services to meet the special housing and service needs of seniors, homeless individuals and families, large households, single parents, and persons with disabilities.
Policy H.5.3:	Assist in the enforcement of fair housing laws by cooperating with local fair housing agencies to promote fair housing practices, and monitor, investigate, and enforce violations of fair housing laws.
Policy H.5.4:	Facilitate and incentivize the construction of housing for moderate- and lower-income households and special needs populations in a manner that mitigates segregation and concentration of poverty and increases access to opportunities.
Policy H.5.5:	Refer individuals concerned with possible violations of applicable fair housing laws to the fair housing service provider to ensure timely and effective response to such concerns.
Policy H.5.6:	Provide increased outreach and education for the broader community of residents, residential property owners, and property managers regarding fair housing practices and requirements.

5.2 HOUSING PROGRAMS

The programs contained in this section of the Housing Element describe specific actions the City of Torrance will carry out over the 2021-2029 Housing Element cycle to implement the City’s housing goals and policies, satisfy the community’s housing needs, and meet the requirements of state law. The City’s quantified objectives for the 2021-2029 Housing Element follow the program descriptions. Most programs include specific objectives/actions to implement them. Where a time frame is not specifically identified, the objective is considered ongoing—something the City is already doing—and which the City commits to continue doing throughout the course of the Planning Period.

PROGRAM 1: ADEQUATE SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE RHNA AND NO NET LOSS

The City of Torrance has a RHNA of 4,939 units for the 2021-2029 RHNA period. The residential sites inventory consists of 292.7 acres of vacant and underutilized land with capacity to yield at least 6,473 new units. These sites can accommodate the City's RHNA for all income levels through year 2029. Since the City's existing Land Use Element, Zoning Code, and Zoning Map do not provide adequate sites, the actions identified below will be taken during the planning period to redesignate and rezone sites in accordance with the Sites Inventory.

To ensure that the City monitor its compliance with SB 166 (No Net Loss), the City will develop a procedure (see Objective 8, below) to track:

- Unit count and income/affordability assumed on parcels included in the sites inventory.
- Actual units constructed and income/affordability when parcels are developed.
- Net change in capacity and summary of remaining capacity in meeting remaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Revise Density Ranges in the Land Use Element:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Land Use Element to implement the density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA. The FARs for the commercially designated land uses also will be increased in the Land Use Element to accommodate the assumed densities in the Housing Element.
2. **Revise Density Ranges in the Zoning Code:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to implement the "target" density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA, including adding minimum density standards for the zones identified in the Sites Inventory to accommodate the City's allocated RHNA and to implement the "expected" density ranges in the Land Use Element.
3. **Add Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays (R/MU-OZ):** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to add one or more new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays (R/MU-OZ) on properties designated in the Sites Inventory, to implement the density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA and to allow stand-alone multi-family residential and mixed-use without discretionary action and incentivize its development. Consideration may be given to tailoring the requirements of the R/MU-OZ to incentivize construction of moderate- and lower-income units on property identified for this overlay. (Note: more than one R/MU-OZ may be necessary to ensure the identified sites can be developed to the target densities while considering impacts on adjacent properties. For example, some sites in the Sites Inventory that are designated with the R/MU-OZ are adjacent to non-residential uses, while others are adjacent to low-density residential uses. Tailoring the R/MU-OZs based on location can facilitate construction of higher-density development in a manner that protects adjacent uses from impacts.)
4. **Incentivize the Target Density:** By October 15, 2024, the City will establish an ordinance to incentivize the production of housing at or above the expected density that is identified in the Land Use Element (existing Table LU-2, and as updated pursuant to the subsequent amendment of the Land Use Element to implement Program 1/Objective 1). The ordinance will

establish the expected density as the “target” density for production of future housing, in accordance with the Housing Element. The ordinance will consider various options to incentivize housing production at the target density and/or will include disincentives if the project proposes housing below the target density. The City may decide that a separate ordinance is required or may incorporate the incentives and disincentives into existing and new ordinances as proposed in this Housing Plan.

5. **Revise Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP):** By October 15, 2024, the City will review and update the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan to consider the following actions, at a minimum:
 - a. Add mixed-use as an allowable use to H/PCH sub-district.
 - b. Add mixed-use and stand-alone residential as allowable uses to the HMD and H/PCH sub-districts.
 - c. Consider allowing stand-alone residential uses in districts where only mixed-use is currently allowed, either as a non-discretionary use or via a Conditional Use Permit.
6. **Implement Housing Corridor Study (HCS):** By October 15, 2024, implement results of the Housing Corridor Study, which is an SB 2 grant-funded plan to promote housing development in identified areas of the city via zones and/or overlay zones with tailored development and design standards. (See also Program 8)
7. **Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to add a new Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential and mixed-use without discretionary action. Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards.
8. **Develop “No Net Loss” Sites Inventory Monitoring Procedure:** No later than April 1, 2023, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available throughout the 6th Cycle Planning Period to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis. The procedure will monitor:
 - a. Unit count and income/affordability assumed on parcels included in the sites inventory.
 - b. Actual units constructed and income/affordability when parcels are developed.
 - c. Net change in capacity and income/affordability and a summary of remaining capacity and income/affordability in meeting the City’s remaining RHNA.
9. **Publicize Inventory of Available Sites:** By the end of 2022, the City will prepare an inventory of available sites for residential development and will make it available on the City’s website, as well as provide it to prospective residential developers upon request. The City will update and publicize the inventory no less than annually.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 2: BY-RIGHT APPROVAL FOR PROJECTS WITH 20 PERCENT AFFORDABLE UNITS AND THAT REQUIRE REZONING

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **AB 1397 Implementation:** Pursuant to AB 1397 passed in 2017, by October 15, 2024, the City will amend the Zoning Code to require by-right approval of housing developments that include 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower income households, applicable to sites being used to meet the 6th cycle RHNA that meet the following:
 - a. A “reuse” of sites previously identified in the 5th cycle Housing Element. This applies to units developed for both rental and ownership. The “reuse” sites are specifically identified in the inventory (see Appendix C).
 - b. Rezoning of sites where the rezoning occurs past the October 15, 2021, statutory deadline

(Note: “By-right” means that the City review is ministerial and therefore must not require conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval.)

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 3: REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT CONSTRAINTS

The City periodically reviews its development standards to ensure they are not unduly constraining to residential development. As identified through preparation of Section 3 and public input from market-rate and affordable housing developers received through this Housing Element update process, there are constraints to development of affordable housing that can be mitigated via actions the City can take. The City will review and amend the Zoning Ordinance to mitigate the potential constraints or to identify alternative mechanisms to mitigate constraints and ensure compliance with state law, as identified below.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **SB 35 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a streamlined, ministerial review process for qualifying multi-family residential projects consistent with SB 35.
2. **SB 330 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a preliminary application for residential development projects consistent with SB 330.
3. **SB 1087 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a written procedure to provide affordable housing with priority for water and sewer services consistent with SB 1087.
4. **Revise Development Standards in Zoning Code to Reduce Constraints:** By October 15, 2024, the City will reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce identified constraints to development of housing. Standards the City will reassess include the following:
 - a. Parking standards for multi-family and mixed-use development. May consider developing a sliding scale that is location-based (e.g., lower standards for housing that is near or on transit corridors, in mixed-use developments, etc.).
 - b. Open space requirements for multi-family and mixed-use developments.

- c. FARs for multi-family and mixed-use developments.
 - d. Maximum building heights for multi-family and mixed-use developments.
 - e. Modify the method by which the City measures building height.
5. **Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards:** The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households.
6. **Mitigate Impacts to Existing Single-Family Development:** Concurrent with the revisions to the Zoning Code to mitigate constraints to development, but no later than October 15, 2024, the City will ensure that the new residential and mixed-use development mitigates impacts on adjacent single-family neighborhoods to the extent feasible. Actions the City will take include the following:
- a. Review and potentially revise setbacks and other development standards to protect existing single-family development.
 - b. Prepare objective design standards for multi-family and mixed-use development to ensure quality development that considers impacts on adjacent single-family neighborhoods without unduly constraining development of affordable housing.
6. **Revise the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) to Reduce Constraints:** By October 15, 2024, review and update the HBCSP to consider reducing the following constraints, at a minimum, based on specific input and feedback from developers who have and propose to construct mixed-use and residential developments in the HBCSP:
- a. Reduce setback requirements for the residential portions of Mixed-Use developments in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts.
 - b. Reduce the minimum percent of commercial uses required for Mixed-Use projects.
 - c. Review the maximum FARs for all sub-districts and increase them if necessary to ensure that projects can develop to the allowable densities.
 - d. Add objective design standards—tailor them to each district and sub-district as appropriate.
 - e. Consider reducing parking standards for the HBCSP, including developing a sliding scale that is location-based (e.g., lower standards for housing that is near or on transit corridors, in mixed-use developments, etc.).
 - f. Reduce open space requirements.
 - g. Revise maximum building heights (in association with modification of the method by which the City measures building height, which would apply to all development within the City, including the HBCSP—see Objective 4.e. above).
 - h. Consider modifying other development standards that may be identified during the review process as constraints to development to eliminate potential constraints.
7. **Revise Method of Calculating Density:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code to allow fractional units to be rounded up to the next whole number when calculating density based on the number of dwelling units per acre. This is consistent with the state density bonus law.

8. **Assess Development Fees:** By October 15, 2024, the City will reassess development fees to ensure they do not unduly constrain development. The City will consider reducing permit fees to lower development costs if they are found to be a constraint, particularly fees for Tier 2 Conditional Use Permits. The City will consider fee waivers for affordable and inclusionary housing projects.
9. **Technical Assistance:** Continue to provide technical development assistance to developers to promote construction of new housing in Torrance. By October 15, 2023, survey developers to identify methods that would best assist them to promote construction of new housing in Torrance and implement those measures as appropriate.
10. **Streamlining Program:** The City currently offers a number of services designed specifically to assist property owners/developers/investors with many key services with the goal of expediting the development of affordable housing units, which are discussed in Section XXX of the Housing Element. No less than every two years, the City will conduct periodic, informal surveys with local developers to monitor the success the City's streamlining efforts and will revise or develop new streamlining programs as appropriate and as funding allows.
11. **Facilitate Lot Consolidation:** The residential sites inventory includes many small sites that are clustered and offer excellent opportunity for consolidation in order to facilitate high-quality and well-designed developments. The City will continue to encourage and facilitate lot consolidation as a means of maximizing development and redevelopment potential. As funding permits, the City will develop lot consolidation incentives to help achieve full use of limited land resources and promote larger residential developments that can facilitate a wide range of housing types and affordability levels. Lot consolidation incentives may include but are not limited to:
 - a. Financial assistance: At the discretion of the City and contingent upon available funding as determined by the City of Torrance, fee assistance and other financial incentives may be made available to encourage lot consolidation activities.
 - b. Technical assistance: The City will assist applicants with development counseling on the lot consolidation process. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will prepare and provide literature to applicants or interested developers regarding the lot consolidation process and list assistance available, if any, from the City for lot consolidation activities.
 - c. Processing of lot consolidation requests: Process lot consolidation applications concurrently with other applications for development.
 - d. Sites inventory with lot consolidation potential: At least annually and on an ongoing basis, provide the sites inventory to interested developers and assist in identifying sites with lot consolidation potential. At least annually and on an ongoing basis, the City also will identify vacant and underutilized parcels that become available and were not included in the Sites Inventory for potential lot consolidation.
 - e. Evaluate trends and requests for lot consolidation: By October 15, 2023, and annually after that, re-evaluate the trend of lot consolidation and make modifications as necessary to promote housing and mixed use development on smaller sites.
 - f. Surveys: No less than every two years, beginning by October 15, 2023, the City will conduct periodic, informal surveys with local developers to monitor the success of lot consolidation efforts. Revise or develop new lot consolidation incentives as

appropriate. This objective may be combined with other outreach and information-gathering objectives identified in this Housing Element.

- g. Incentives: Based on information received via Objectives 11.e. and 11.f. of this Program, evaluate the City’s lot consolidation activities and adopt appropriate incentives. Incentives to be considered include, but are not limit to: waiver or subsidy of development fees, reduction in parking standards, allowance for shared parking, and reduction in commercial FARs for projects in mixed use zones. Consider enhanced incentives for projects that include lower- and/or moderate-income units.
- h. Information regarding lot consolidation: By October 15, 2023, the information and actions (including assistance, incentives, and all other actions) identified in this Lot Consolidation objective will be made available to interested parties on a new Lot Consolidation webpage. The Lot Consolidation webpage will be updated at least annually and on an ongoing basis as new information and/or incentives occur.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 4: INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

An Inclusionary Housing Program is a program that requires developers of new market-rate residential developments to provide affordable units as well. According to “Inclusionary Housing—Creating and Maintaining Equitable Communities,” prepared by the Lincoln Institute (available at: https://www.lincolninst.edu/sites/default/files/pubfiles/inclusionary-housing-full_o.pdf):

Research into the very real benefits and limitations of mixed-income development suggests that the creation and preservation of affordable homes in asset-rich neighborhoods is one of the few successful strategies for overcoming economic segregation. It also demonstrates that integration within each new market-rate development does not always make sense. Successful economic integration requires careful attention to a number of policy design choices.

The City does not currently have an Inclusionary Housing Program. In order to determine if an inclusionary housing program/ordinance would be appropriate for Torrance to help implement the City’s housing objectives and policies, analysis is necessary.

Objectives and Time Frame:

- 1. By October 15, 2024, the City will study the option of preparing an Inclusionary Housing Program and determine whether to proceed with a program/ordinance. This action is citywide and includes the action identified in the Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (2021).

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 5: DENSITY BONUS

The City does not have a density bonus ordinance in the Zoning Code. However, as required by state law, the City applies the state density bonus to applicable projects as requested.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Adopt Density Bonus Ordinance:** By October 15, 2023, the City will revise the Zoning Code to adopt a density bonus ordinance in compliance with state law.
2. **Monitor State Density Bonus Legislation:** The City will monitor changes in state density bonus law annually and will revise its density bonus ordinance within six months of revisions to the state density bonus law to remain in compliance with state law.
3. **Density Bonus Information:** The City will promote the use of density bonus incentives to developers and provide technical assistance to developers in utilizing density bonus for maximized feasibility and to meet local housing needs. This will be done by posting information and the ordinance on the City’s website as soon as the ordinance is adopted, and discussing it with developers who express interest in developing housing and in pre-application meetings.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund

PROGRAM 6: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) units represent a viable means of dispersing lower cost rental housing in and throughout the community, while providing homeowners an opportunity to obtain rental income to assist them with their own mortgage payments.

The City has an ADU ordinance that was amended in April 2021. The City has seen a significant increase in the number of ADUs that have been constructed in Torrance in recent years as many property owners have developed accessory dwelling units pursuant to the City’s ADU ordinance to use for guests, family members, domestic workers, and as independent rental units. The City’s goal is to encourage continued development of ADUs and JADUs to provide opportunities for rental housing to low- and moderate-income households and to increase the number, type, and affordability levels of housing in Torrance.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Develop ADU Monitoring Program:** To facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, by April 1, 2023, the City will develop a data collection and monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction and income goals. Develop a monitoring metric that evaluates locations of affordable ADUs. The City will evaluate the production and income data annually thereafter. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU construction and income/affordability goals, the City will review and revise policies and efforts to increase ADU construction and meet its income/affordability goals as necessary. Additionally, if monitoring results indicate limited ADUs in higher resource areas, develop incentives to encourage ADU production in those areas.
2. **Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs:** The City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental. The City will begin investigating funding sources within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and will reevaluate funding options annually.
3. **Zoning Code Clean-Up:** By October 15, 2024, the City will delete Section 95.3.40 (Supplemental Housing for the Elderly), because it has been replaced by the City’s adopted ADU ordinance,

consistent with state law. It was inadvertently left in the Zoning Code when the ADU ordinance was adopted.

4. **Monitor Changes to State ADU Laws:** The City will continue to monitor changes in state law regarding ADUs on an annual basis. Within six months of revisions to state law regarding ADUs, the City will update the Zoning Code regularly to remain consistent with state law.
5. **Expedited Application for Affordable ADUs:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, staff will create a program whereby if the property owner is willing to commit to developing an affordable ADU (i.e., very low, low, or moderate-income), then their entitlement application would be expedited and reviewed within 15 working days.
6. **Promote Housing Voucher Program for ADUs:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, staff will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household.
7. **ADU Amnesty Program:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will adopt an amnesty program to allow conversion of unpermitted, existing, accessory structures into accessory dwelling units without penalty, provided that all other applicable Code requirements are met.
8. **Outreach and Information to Promote ADU Construction:** The City will maintain and distribute literature on funding opportunities and programs promoting construction of affordable rental ADUs. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will create and maintain an ADU Webpage to promote the construction of ADUs, with particular emphasis on development of affordable ADUs. The ADU Webpage will provide information to the public regarding ADUs, including their benefits, procedures for approval, and any new program(s) the City develops when they are completed, including the existing and new objectives included in this ADU Program. As part of this effort, staff also will develop a checklist to help to simplify the application process for homeowners by identifying the materials required for submittal. The City will continue to utilize the City’s newsletters, promotional brochures, Torrance CitiCABLE, utilizing social media, and other means to provide information and education.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 7: RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION HOUSING OVERLAY ZONE

Encouraging religious institutions to build housing on property owned by religious institutions (also known as “congregational land”) would provide sites that otherwise would not be available for affordable housing. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, this is a valuable strategy to provide additional housing opportunities for lower income households. Adopting a religious institution housing overlay zone (RIH-OZ) would enable religious institutions to build or partner with others to build affordable housing by-right. This is a significant opportunity in built-out cities such as Torrance that have so few vacant sites. Utilizing congregational land for affordable housing also provides an attractive opportunity for affordable housing developers by minimizing their cost for land, risk, and time to process development applications. This approach also helps congregations further their missions to support lower-income populations while providing them with enhanced financial stability, as many have been impacted by declining attendance that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Preparing an RIH-OZ is a program that builds on the provisions of AB 1851, adopted in 2020, which facilitates housing on religious institution properties. Pursuant to AB 1851, a local agency is prohibited from requiring the replacement of more than 50 percent of religious-use parking spaces that a developer proposes to eliminate as part of that housing development project.

During the Housing Element stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers (See Appendix A), partnering with religious institutions was cited as an effective way to provide affordable housing, and several examples were identified.

Objectives and Timeframe:

1. **Add RIH-OZ to Zoning Code:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to establish a Religious Institution Housing Overlay (RIH-OZ) that can apply to all properties owned by and operated by religious institutions in the city. In order to qualify for the RIH-OZ, the units must be affordable to lower (below 80% AMI) households. Outreach to religious institutions and affordable housing developers that are known to partner with religious institutions to develop affordable housing on their sites will be conducted as part of this revision to the Zoning Code.
2. **Update Parking Requirements for RIH-OZ:** Concurrently with the establishment of the RIH-OZ, the City will update parking requirements in the Zoning Code to provide flexibility in accommodating housing on religious institutions' property.
3. **RIH-OZ Information and Outreach:** Concurrently with the establishment of the RIH-OZ, the City will develop a program to inform religious institutions of the new RIH-OZ and to assist them through the newly established process. The outreach program would outline the ins and outs of development timelines, construction, housing options and regulations, and provide information regarding potential partnerships with affordable housing developers.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Source: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 8: INCENTIVIZE INFILL ON RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE CORRIDORS

As noted, Torrance has no vacant and/or greenfield land available for development that is currently designated for multi-family residential development; therefore, the 6th Cycle RHNA cannot be accommodated by existing residentially designated and zoned land. One of the City's key RHNA strategies is to identify remaining vacant properties and underutilized sites, primarily focusing along key urbanized corridors in Torrance, that can accommodate growth through stand-alone and mixed-use residential infill and redevelopment. Due to a variety of factors, cities across the country are recognizing the need to provide flexibility in land uses in traditionally commercial areas by allowing mixed use development and stand-alone residential uses in traditionally commercial areas to create mixed use areas and corridors. These factors include the rapidly increasing trend to online sales and services, local and national "brick and mortar" businesses closing, and more people working remotely. Adding housing in these areas has the benefit of adding potential customers to support local businesses and services. In Torrance, many buildings are 30 to 50 years old-with eight on the Sites Inventory 100 or more years old. The average age of the buildings in the Sites Inventory is 1958, which is 64 years old. This provides a key opportunity for recycling or major reinvestment.

In addition to offering availability for additional housing, promoting housing in mixed use areas via mixed use and stand-alone residential development also supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile. This is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation, including lower-income households and residents with special needs. This strategy also promotes sustainable development and reduced GHG emissions by:

- Directing traffic from new development directly onto the City’s existing key transportation corridors;
- Supporting the use of the City’s transit system;
- Providing easier access to employment centers and the businesses and services which households need; and
- Locating new housing in areas that already have infrastructure to accommodate increased development capacity.

The City’s General Plan already provides for opportunities for housing integrated with commercial uses. The Commercial Center, General Commercial, and Residential-Office General Plan designations allows multi-family residential units as part of a mixed-use project, or as separate projects integrated into the larger commercial center site plan via pedestrian or transit connections. The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also currently allows mixed use development in the majority of the districts, and also allows stand-alone residential in the two Del Amo districts.

The City is already in the process of implementing this Residential/Mixed Use Corridors strategy through the following two programs, which are intended to complement and support the Housing Element efforts to develop additional housing capacity in a manner that supports the City’s goals and strategic priorities.

- **Housing Corridor Study:** Using grant funding from SB 2 to streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production, the City is undertaking a Housing Corridor Study to explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. Seven areas have been identified and are undergoing analysis and preparation of context-appropriate standards for future residential development, as described in Section 4.1.3.5. All these areas are included in the Sites Inventory. The Housing Corridor Study includes accompanying CEQA documentation that will enable compliant development to be built if consistent with the City’s environmental policies and state CEQA law. This approach may be applied to in the future, depending on the availability of funding.
- **Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan:** The City prepared a Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (Downtown Plan) that was adopted by City Council in July 2021. Three strategies in the Downtown Plan focus on incentivizing mixed use and residential development, including affordable units, on infill sites in Downtown and in surrounding corridors that were identified in the Downtown Plan. An overview of the strategies and recommended actions are provided in Section 4.1.3.5 One corridor in the Downtown Plan—the Border/Cabrillo corridor—is being implemented via the Housing Corridor Study, described above.
- **Other Mixed Use/Housing Corridors:** The results of the HCS will be used to incentivize mixed use and multi-family development on other corridors of the City already discussed, including

Redondo Beach Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, Crenshaw Boulevard, other sites on Western Avenue that are not already included in the HCS, and on and near other corridors for which the proposed Residential/Mixed Use Overlay Zones(s) (already discussed in Section 4 and throughout the Housing Plan) will be applied.

The City is and will continue to identify and implement additional opportunities for residential and mixed-use development along corridors throughout the City. Many programs and associated objectives identified throughout this Housing Plan are designed specifically to facilitate and incentivize the production of housing along key corridors in Torrance. Many programs and objectives have already been discussed, but this section provides a summary of several programs.

1. **Objectives and Time Frame: Implement Housing Corridor Study:** By October 15, 2024, implement the Housing Corridor Study. This strategy may be applied to other corridors of the City as part of implementation of the Housing Plan, as described elsewhere.
2. **Implement Downtown Torrance Revitalization Plan:** By October 15, 2024, implement Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan as it relates to incentivizing the production of housing and mixed-use development.
3. **Implement R/MU-OZ:** By October 15, 2024, implement the Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(s) (R/MU-OZ) along the mixed-use/housing corridors identified in Sections 4 and 5 and on the Sites Inventory. Consider expanding the overlay to additional appropriate sites/corridors, as time and funding permit.
4. **Ongoing.** Continue to allow residential development either as a component of a mixed-use development or as a separate development in appropriate areas designated as Commercial Center in the Land Use Element.
5. **Ongoing.** Continue to allow mixed-use residential and commercial uses in the City's designated commercial areas.
6. **Revise Zoning Code:** By October 15, 2024, revise the Zoning code to allow stand-alone multi-family residential uses in addition to mixed-use residential uses in the Residential-Office (R-OF) land use designation and the Residential-Professional (RP) zone along key commercial corridors, as described in the Housing Element.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 9: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

For-profit and non-profit developers can play a significant role in providing affordable housing in Torrance. The City provides land, regulatory incentives, and in limited cases, financial assistance to developers to complete both ownership and rental housing for extremely low-income, lower-income, and special needs households such as lower-income renters, seniors, and persons with disabilities, including developmental. Many programs and associated objectives identified throughout this Housing Plan are designed specifically to facilitate and incentivize the production of housing that is affordable to moderate- and lower-income households. While they are not all repeated here, their implementation will contribute significantly to the production of housing in Torrance to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA and implementation of key goals and sub-goals in the City's Strategic Plan. In addition to the identified programs and objectives, on a case-by-case basis, the City will assess

other/additional incentives it may be able to provide to facilitate the development of affordable housing.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Outreach to Affordable Housing Developers:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and at least every other year thereafter, conduct an affordable housing meeting with affordable housing developers. If the City has City-owned land that is available and ready for development, invite proposals from interested developers.
2. **Outreach Regarding RIH-OZ:** As part of implementation of the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone, coordinate discussions between affordable housing developers and church properties to promote affordable housing onsite. Ensure that religious institutions are aware of and understand the benefits of the overlay. (See Program 7, Objective 3).
3. **Support Applications for Developers of Affordable Housing:** Support funding applications for projects that include a portion of the units as housing affordable to extremely low-income households, especially those with special housing needs (such as seniors and persons with disabilities, including those with developmental disabilities), provided that the proposed projects are consistent with the City's General Plan and applicable specific plans.
4. **Pursue Funding:** Pursue additional State (e.g., State funds for transit-oriented development and infrastructure improvements) and federal funding for affordable development. No less than annually check the websites of HUD, State HCD, and Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) for potential funding sources and apply for eligible programs.
5. **Regional Housing Trust:** Continue to work with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance.
6. **Facilitate RHNA for Lower Income Units:** Facilitate the development of 3, 166 housing units affordable to lower income households through incentives, project conditions, development agreements, and/or other mechanisms identified in this Housing Plan.
7. **Inclusionary Ordinance:** Consider adoption of an inclusionary ordinance as per Program 4.
8. **Affordable Housing Production Monitoring:** Per Program 1/Objective 8, monitor the production of affordable housing in Torrance and evaluate the degree to which the sites that have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments (at least 20 percent of the units assumed to be available to lower-income households), have been or are being developed in those income categories. As part of monitoring program, develop a metric to evaluate success in adding affordable housing (including new residential or MU developments, ADUs, and housing in RIH-OZs) in areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas
9. **Prioritize Water and Sewer Service for Affordable Housing:** Establish procedures for granting priority water and sewer service to developments with lower-income units in compliance with Government Code Section 65589.7.
10. **City Prioritization for Infrastructure for Affordable Housing:** Prioritize areas with sites designated for low-income developments for needed infrastructure. This could be accomplished via the CIP program, annual budgeting, and/or pursuing infrastructure-related grants to be used for specific projects/areas.

11. **Incentives:** Provide regulatory incentives to private developers to increase the supply of affordable housing, including reduced parking where feasible and appropriate as identified in the Programs of this Housing Element. Offer local non-profit developers and agencies technical assistance and information on City funding sources.
12. **Prioritization of City-Owned Sites for Affordable Housing:** The Sites Inventory includes multiple sites owned by the City that are available for housing within the 6th Cycle Planning Period. By October 15, 2024, the City will develop a process, consistent with the State Land Use Act, under a request for bids to prioritize affordable housing as part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.
13. Ongoing. Encourage the development of rental projects that meet the needs of lower-income renters, seniors, and persons with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.
14. Ongoing. Encourage use of the Density Bonus provisions through technical assistance and information dissemination.
15. Ongoing. Alert housing developers with known interest in developing affordable housing within Torrance when opportunities are available (e.g., sites, partnerships, prioritization of City-owned sites per the Downtown Plan, etc.).
16. Ongoing. Continue to conduct pre-application conferences with developers interested in building affordable housing.
17. Ongoing. Utilize Low and Moderate Housing funds for affordable housing on a case-by-case basis.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and other departments, such as Public Works, as appropriate

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 10: RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Housing Choice Voucher Program extends rental subsidies to very low-income households, as well as seniors and disabled persons. The subsidy represents the difference between 30 percent of the monthly income and the allowable rent determined by program guidelines. Vouchers permit tenants to locate their own housing and rental units beyond the federally determined fair market rent in an area. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. In 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD’s VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

The Torrance Senior Citizen Rental Assistance Program provides rental assistance to residents at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments. As of February 2021, 2 households were receiving assistance, down from 11 in 2013. This reduction is due to the elimination of the redevelopment agency, which provided funding for this program. Due to the loss of funding, this program is being phased out.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Housing Choice Voucher Program:** Support efforts to maintain, and possibly to increase, the current number of Housing Choice Vouchers, and direct eligible households to the program.
2. **Housing Choice Voucher Program Information:** Provide information and referrals to landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Advise property owners of ADUs of the City's Section 8 Voucher Program.
3. **Rental Assistance:** Continue to provide rental assistance to senior households at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments as feasible based on financial resources.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department; Housing Authority

Funding Sources: HUD; General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM11: SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Persons and households with special needs have limited housing options. Housing types appropriate for these groups include emergency shelters, low barrier navigation centers, transitional housing, supportive housing, and single-room occupancy (SRO) units. Special needs persons may also find housing opportunities in residential care facilities and group homes.

As part of the Governmental Constraints analysis, the following revisions to the Torrance Land Use Code, as required by State law, are identified as appropriate to better facilitate the provision of a variety of housing types:

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Amend the Zoning Code for Special Needs Housing:** Within one year of the statutory deadline for adoption of the 6th Cycle Housing Element, amend the Zoning Code in conformance with state law to accomplish the following:
 - a. **Emergency Shelters:** Revise existing parking standards for shelters based solely on staffing level. Maintain an emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law.
 - b. **Low Barrier Navigation Centers:** Revise the Zoning Code to allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones that permit multi-family uses.
 - c. **Transitional and Supportive Housing:** Explicitly allow transitional and supportive housing as a residential use to be permitted as similar uses in the same zone and to ensure compliance with AB 2162.
 - d. **Large Group Homes:** Review and revise the provisions for permitting large group homes to be similarly permitted as small group homes or develop other mitigating strategies to remove constraints to the development of group homes for more than six persons.
 - e. **Residential Facilities/Group Homes:** Evaluate provisions regarding development of residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development. If substantial constraints are identified, revise the Land Use Code accordingly. Update uses by deleting outdated uses and adding uses that more accurately reflect contemporary facilities and uses.

- f. **Employee & Farmworker Housing:** Update the Zoning Code to clarify that employee and farmworker housing must be allowed in accordance with state law.
2. **Matrix of Residential Uses:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, a matrix of approved uses in residential zones will be incorporated into the Land Use Code to clearly identify and facilitate the understanding of all housing types permitted in zones in the City, including special needs uses. The table will reflect the permitted and conditionally permitted residential uses in the City.
3. **City of Torrance Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness:** Ongoing. Continue to implement the City’s three-year *Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness*, which was adopted in July 2021. Due to the comprehensiveness of the Plan, the details are not repeated here. Refer to the City of Torrance “Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness,” which is available at: <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67099/637617075561400000>
By June 2024, update the plan to extend it a minimum of another three years.
4. **Temporary Housing Units for Persons Experiencing Homelessness:** Ongoing. The City will continue to develop and implement its program to establish and secure an operator for its temporary housing program for persons experiencing homelessness, located on City-owned property at 3290 Civic Center Drive. Community outreach sessions will be conducted so that the community can understand site design and operations.
5. **Social Services Commission Workplan:** Ongoing. Continue to implement the City’s Social Services Commission workplan, which includes strategies for addressing homelessness in the City of Torrance.
6. **Senior Citizen Development Standards.** Ongoing. Continue to implement the Senior Citizen Housing Development Standards. Monitor their effectiveness in continuing to produce housing for senior citizens and revise them if constraints to development are identified.
7. **Special Housing Needs of Seniors:** Ongoing. Continue to monitor and assess the special housing needs of senior citizens, in collaboration with the Torrance Commission on Aging.
8. **Technical Assistance & Information:** Ongoing. Provide technical assistance and information on available City-owned parcels for lower-income developments to private or non-profit housing providers. Prioritize bids to develop on City-owned land that include affordable housing.
9. **Torrance Community Transit Program (TCTP):** Continue to implement the TCTP, a transportation assistance program for residents of the City of Torrance that enables low-income seniors and those with disabilities to purchase credits for taxi rides at a discounted personal cost.
10. **Discount Program for Water Bills:** Continue the Torrance Municipal Water program that offers low income senior or disabled customers a discount on their water bills. (Note that approximately 400 customers are currently enrolled.)

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, Community Services Department, Public Works Department, Social Services Commission, Torrance Commission on Aging.

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 12: HOME REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The Home Improvement Program, administered by the Workforce Investment Network Partners, provides home repairs for low-income seniors and disabled residents. The repairs are completed by persons in need of employment who have been trained. Most participants are Torrance youths who face barriers to employment. The Home Improvement Program assists in the City's housing preservation objectives and in the enhancement of employment opportunities. The number of home improvement projects anticipated is approximately 35 per year, or approximately 2,000 for the planning period, which is more than double the anticipated rehabs estimated for the 5th Cycle.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Home Improvement Program (HIP):** Ongoing. Continue to provide home improvement assistance through the Home Improvement Program, in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Assist in at least 35 home improvement projects annually.
2. **HIP Annual Reporting:** Ongoing. Continue to conduct annual reporting throughout the planning period.

Responsible Agency: Community Services Department

Funding Sources: Low and Moderate Housing Funds

PROGRAM 13: PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING

Over the next ten years (2021-2031), two subsidized multifamily developments, which provide a total of 197 affordable units, will have expired affordability covenants (Table H-35). Affordability covenants in Torrance include developments that are financed with Low/Moderate Housing set aside funds or federal programs (HUD 202, HUD 811, and HUD 542[c]) or State of California LIHTC's.

- Accessible Apartments 2 is owned and operated by a nonprofit organization (United Cerebral Palsy), whose operators have informed the City in writing that they do not intend to convert their 12 units to market rate units in the next 10 years. (See Appendix F)
- Harmony Court Apartments is a 187-unit senior affordable housing project offering 185 affordable units. The owners have stated to the City in writing that they do not intend to convert to market rate units during the next 10 years, so there is no risk of conversion for this project either. (See Appendix F)

Recognizing the two affordable complexes discussed above are not expected to change in the next ten years, the City still understands the importance of continuing to monitor their status. See Section 2.6.3 for a more detailed explanation.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Existing Affordable Housing Units:** Ongoing. Support in the preservation of 197 affordable units at risk of converting to market rents by:
 - a. The City will consult annually with property owners of affordable housing in the City to gauge the likelihood of conversion of affordable units and discuss opportunities for the preservation of affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rents.

- b. The City will offer technical assistance to affordable housing owners with at-risk units such as providing information on transfer of ownership opportunities and funding opportunities (federal, state, or local).
2. **Existing Affordable Housing Units-Noticing:** Ongoing. Within 60 days of notice of intent by any property owners of affordable developments of plan to convert to market rate, the City will contact qualified entities to inform them of opportunities to acquire and continue affordability of at-risk units and will work with residents to provide tenant education in regard to affordable housing options, including the potential availability and priority for Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. The City will work with potential purchasers using HCD's current list of Qualified Entities. (<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/tech/presrv/>).

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund, HUD, Low/Mod Housing Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 14: COMMUNITY PRESERVATION

The Environmental Division of the Community Development Department provides a number of services that preserve the appearance, character and quality of the city's neighborhoods and the larger community. These efforts promote and maintain the high standards that make Torrance such a desirable place to live and do business. The services include code enforcement, which is intended to ensure the safety of residents and prevent structures and properties from falling into substandard condition. Code Enforcement's goal is to gain compliance, as quickly as possible, by working with Torrance residents and businesses. In some cases, however, Enforcement staff may also issue citations, hold administrative or abatement hearings or use other legal means to achieve compliance.

The City allows short-term rentals (as described in Section 9.3) in compliance with a STR Ordinance in place. In order to ensure that STRs do not generate problems and retain dwelling units as housing (via the home-share requirement in single-family neighborhoods), the City has an enforcement program that was initiated in 2021.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Property Maintenance Standards:** Ongoing. Continue to enforce property maintenance standards to preserve existing units, maintain property values, and support a high quality of life for residents. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, review the City's Code Enforcement Program to ensure that it:
 - a. Identifies any areas of concentrated rehabilitation needs.
 - b. Assists in the repairs and mitigate potential costs associated with rehabilitation to the extent feasible utilizing existing, expanded, and/or new programs.
 - c. Reduces the displacement of residents through support of rehabilitation.
2. **Funding for Rehabilitation Assistance:** At least annually, pursue funding at the State level to expand housing rehabilitation assistance.
3. **Property Maintenance Assistance for Low-Income Seniors and Disabled Residents:** Low-income seniors and disabled residents with property maintenance violations will be referred to the City's Home Improvement Program for assistance with bringing their properties into compliance.

4. **Short-Term Rental Ordinance:** Ongoing. Continue to enforce the City’s short-term rentals (STR) ordinance to bring existing STRs into compliance with City standards and approval procedures, and to retain dwelling units as housing.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department (Environmental Division)

Funding Sources: General Fund, Home Improvement Program (funded through Workforce Investment Network Partners), Low/Mod Housing Fund, and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 15: REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

The Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, requires that cities and counties provide reasonable accommodation to rules, policies, practices, and procedures where such accommodation may be necessary to afford individuals with disabilities equal housing opportunities. While fair housing laws intend for all people to have equal access to housing, the law also recognizes that people with disabilities may need extra tools to achieve equality. Reasonable accommodation is one of the tools intended to further housing opportunities for people with disabilities. Reasonable accommodation provides a means of requesting from the local government flexibility in the application of land use and zoning regulations or, in some instances, even a waiver of certain restrictions or requirements because it is necessary to achieve equal access to housing, recognizing that sometimes the request is urgent. Cities and counties are required to consider requests for accommodations related to housing for people with disabilities and provide the accommodation when it is determined to be “reasonable” based on fair housing laws and case law interpreting the statutes.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Reasonable Accommodations Regulations:** Although the City developed a process for making requests for reasonable accommodation to land use and zoning decisions and procedures regulating the siting, funding, development, and use of housing for people with disabilities during the 5th Cycle Housing Element, by October 15, 2024, the City will codify the process by updating the Zoning Code and will provide expedited processing for urgent requests.
2. **Reasonable Accommodations Information:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and on an ongoing basis thereafter, the City will provide information to residents on reasonable accommodation procedures via public counters and the City website. The City will investigate and implement additional methods to provide information.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 16: REPLACEMENT HOUSING

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **AB 1397 Implementation:** Development on nonvacant sites with existing residential units is subject to replacement requirement, pursuant to AB 1397. The City will amend the Zoning Code to require the replacement of units affordable to the same or lower income level as a condition of any development on a nonvacant site consistent with those requirements set forth in State Density Bonus Law.
2. **Coastal Zone Replacement Housing:** Approximately 123 acres of Torrance is within the Coastal Zone (see Figure H-5). This requires the City to ensure the replacement of any units occupied

by low- and moderate-income households lost through demolition. On an ongoing basis, the City will:

- a. Maintain records of existing housing units serving lower and moderate-income households in the Coastal Zone and continue to monitor development activities within the Coastal Zone, including new construction, conversion, and demolition of affordable housing.
- b. Ensure compliance with the replacement requirements. The emphasis of this program will be on retention of affordable units with replacement (Government Code 65590) on a unit-by-unit basis when removal cannot be avoided.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 17: WATER AND SEWER SERVICE PROVIDERS

In accordance with Government Code Section 65589.7 as revised in 2005, immediately following City Council adoption, the City must deliver to all public agencies or private entities that provide water or sewer services to properties within Torrance a copy of the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. Within 30 days of adoption of the Housing Element, deliver the Torrance Housing Element to all providers of sewer and water service within the City of Torrance.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 18: ENFORCE FAIR HOUSING LAWS

To assist in education and understanding of fair housing rights and protections, the City’s Housing Office provides information packets about fair housing laws to all participants of the rental assistance programs and maintains a website with information and resources regarding fair housing. The City will continue to distribute information on fair housing and refer fair housing questions and housing discrimination claims to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (www.hud.gov). Appendix D summarizes the fair housing issues and concerns in Torrance based on findings of the research conducted as part of this Housing Element update.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Fair Housing Laws:** Ongoing. Continue to abide by and enforce fair housing laws.
2. **Fair Housing Information:** Ongoing. Continue to provide information to help increase awareness of fair housing protections. Hold at least one outreach event annually.
3. **Fair Housing Referral and Assistance:** Ongoing. Provide referral and assistance to people who claim to be victims of housing discrimination.
4. **Fair Housing Advertising:** Ongoing. Advertise the availability of fair housing services through flyers at public counters. Posting of available fair housing services will also be made available on the City’s website and other community locations. Additional methods to advertise the availability of fair housing services will be assessed and implemented to reach the broadest

possible cross-section of the community. Provide all outreach and fair housing information in the three languages most spoken by City residents.

5. **Fair Housing Outreach Plan for Landlords:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, create an outreach plan to educate local landlords. Hold at least one outreach event annually.
6. **Survey Residents:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, survey residents for feedback on effective communication procedures and what is most beneficial for residents when it comes to outreach activities and accessing information.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 19: FLOOD MANAGEMENT

In accordance with Government Code Section 65302, as part of the current Housing Element Plan update process, the City shall review and revise the Safety Element to identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to flood hazard zones, National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA, information about flood hazards, designated floodway maps, dam failure inundation maps, areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of levees or floodwalls, etc. as listed in Section 65302(9)(2) and establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding.

Objectives and Time Frame: Ensure that flood risks are considered and mitigated when making land use decisions by updating and adopting the Safety Element of the General Plan by 2025.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Public Works Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 20: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Environmental justice is the movement to recognize and improve the disproportionate burden of environmental pollution and other toxins faced by low-income communities and communities of color. Senate Bill 1000 (SB 1000) was signed into law in 2016 which requires local jurisdictions that have disadvantaged communities to incorporate environmental justice policies into their general plans. For the purpose of general plan requirements, environmental justice is defined as: “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of people of all races, cultures, incomes, and national origins, with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies” (California Government Code §65040.12). Residents living in or near neighborhoods with high levels of pollution are at an increased risk for developing respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Pregnant women living in highly polluted neighborhoods are also at an increased risk for experiencing poor birth outcomes, such as preterm birth. The environmental justice element is intended to confront these types of inequities by addressing the specific environmental hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy.

In accordance with SB 1000, the City will incorporate environmental justice policies into its General Plan to address the following environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives as required by State law:

- Reduction of pollution exposure and improving air quality

- Promoting access to public facilities
- Promoting access to healthy foods
- Promoting safe and sanitary homes
- Promoting physical activity
- Promoting civic engagement

Objectives and Time Frame: Adopt Environmental Justice Element by 2025 to ensure that there is fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Public Works Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 22: REMOVAL OF RACIAL COVENANTS

Although racial covenants and similar race-based deed restrictions have long been illegal and unenforceable, this language has not always been removed entirely from home titles. In order to confirm its commitment to making housing available to people of all races and ethnicities, the City will provide homeowners with instructions detailing how to remove these types of restrictions from their property titles. Information will be provided via public bulletins at the planning counter, as well as on the City’s website.

Quantified Objectives and Timeframe:

1. By October 15, 2023, the City will develop detailed instructions for removing race-based restrictions from residential property titles, and provide as public information online and at the planning counter.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department

PROGRAM 21: AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

Appendix D (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) provides the City’s assessment of fair housing issues in Torrance. Section D.2.7 provides a summary of fair housing issues identified in the Fair Housing Assessment. According to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas composite map, the majority of Torrance is considered to be in the “highest resource” and “high resource” areas. One small area is located in the “moderate resource” area, while the only area identified as a “high segregation and poverty area” is the area where the Torrance Refining Company and other industrial uses are located, which is not a residential area (see Figure D-19). As seen on Figure D-19, the majority of the RHNA sites are located in “highest” and “moderate” resources areas.

Overall, the Fair Housing Assessment analysis shows that the primary (priority) barrier to fair housing in Torrance is high housing cost, which has the effect of limiting access by lower- and moderate-income households to the high opportunities and resources available in the City. The Housing Plan includes many programs and objectives to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development, as well as the provision of accessory dwelling units, which can expand affordable housing

opportunities for lower-income persons such as seniors, female-headed households, and others working in service occupations

There is no evidence to suggest that discrimination against racial groups or persons with disabilities is a significant issue. However, the City will continue to enforce Fair Housing requirements and will enhance its outreach efforts.

The City's Housing Plan includes programs and objectives that address all the issues identified in the Housing Element, including those to mitigate AFFH issues identified in Appendix D. As required, Table H-60 below highlights meaningful actions to address the priority issues identified in Appendix D, including the programs/objectives, specific commitments, timeline, geographic targeting, and metrics.

DRAFT

Table H-6o: AFFH Meaningful Actions Matrix

HE Programs or Other Activities	Specific Commitment	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	2021-2029 Metrics
Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach				
Program 18 (Enforce Fair Housing Laws)	Continue to provide information to help increase awareness of fair housing protections. Hold at least one outreach event annually.	Ongoing, with annual event	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Outreach to 1,000 residents, landlords, and housing professionals
	Create an outreach plan to educate local landlords. Hold at least one outreach event annually.	By June 2023, with annual event	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
	Advertise the availability of fair housing services using diverse methods.	Ongoing	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
Income Diversity				
Program 6 (ADUs) / Objective 1 (ADU Monitoring)	Evaluate production of ADUs, including income distribution. Develop a monitoring metric that evaluates locations of affordable ADUs. If monitoring results indicate limited ADUs in higher resource areas, develop incentives to encourage ADU production in those neighborhoods	April 1, 2023	Target West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Achieve 75% of ADUs affordable to lower and moderate income in higher resource neighborhoods
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objectives 12 (Pursue/Prioritize Funding)	Pursue additional State and federal funding for affordable development. Prioritize use of City grant funds to incentivize/partner with developers to pursue affordable housing in the City	No less than annually check the websites of HUD, State HCD, and Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) for potential funding sources and		Facilitate the development of 250 affordable housing units through additional funding/grants

		apply for eligible programs.		
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 1 (Housing Choice Voucher Program)	Support efforts to maintain, and possibly to increase, the current number of Housing Choice Vouchers, and direct eligible households to the program Evaluate the distribution of HCVs in North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods and endeavor to promote equitable distribution	Evaluate annually	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 2 (Housing Choice Voucher Program Information)	Provide information and referrals to landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program	Ongoing, at least annually	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 3 (Rental Assistance)	Continue to provide rental assistance to senior households at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments as feasible based on financial resources.	Ongoing	N/A	
Displacement				
Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA) / Multiple Objectives	Rezone per identified objectives in Program 1 to implement additional and affordable housing opportunities in areas of city with populations vulnerable to displacement (Figure D-31)	By October 15, 2024	Target North, Central, Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 1.7: Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA (Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone or RIH-OZ)	Add a new RIH-OZ on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential & mixed-use without discretionary action. (Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards and would be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, if adopted)	By October 15, 2024	Citywide ordinance, but creates new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate development of 268 affordable housing units in RIH-OZ

Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 5 (Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards)	The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households	By October 15, 2024	Citywide opportunity, as expanded use of Senior Housing Standards would facilitate more affordable housing for renters and owners	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)	City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.	By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)	City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household	By June 14, 2023, and ongoing	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)	City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.	By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)	City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household	By June 14, 2023, and ongoing	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent
Environmental Health				
Program 20: Environmental Justice	Adopt and implement an Environmental Justice Element (EJE) to reduce inequities by addressing specific environmental hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy and action When preparing the EJE, ensure that the North, East, and Central neighborhoods receive targeted attention. Conduct focused	By October 15, 2024	Target North, East, Central neighborhoods	As part of development of the new EJE, establish metrics that are related to the identified issues and track them not less than every 2 years

	outreach to residents in those neighborhoods to ensure their issues are understood and they are involved in developing policies and actions.			
Lack of Affordable Housing				
Program 1.7: Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA (Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone or RIH-OZ)	Add a new RIH-OZ on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential & mixed-use without discretionary action. (Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards and would be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, if adopted)	By October 15, 2024	Citywide ordinance, but creates new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate development of 268 affordable housing units in RIH-OZ
Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 5 (Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards)	The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households	By October 15, 2024	Citywide opportunity, as expanded use of Senior Housing Standards would facilitate more affordable housing for renters and owners	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 4: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance	Study the option of preparing an Inclusionary Housing Program and determine whether to proceed with an inclusionary ordinance.	By October 15, 2024	Citywide ordinance, but would create new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods. Also, would benefit neighborhoods with a higher renter cost	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units

			burden, such as North Torrance.	
Program 5: Density Bonus	Promote use of density bonus incentives to developers and provide technical assistance to developers in utilizing density bonus for maximized feasibility and to meet local housing needs.	By October 15, 2023	Citywide ordinance. Promote use of density bonus to developers who propose to develop in LMI neighborhoods	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)	City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.	By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)	City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household	By June 14, 2023, and ongoing	Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 1 (Outreach to Affordable Housing Developers)	Conduct an affordable housing meeting with affordable housing developers. If the City has City-owned land that is available and ready for development, invite proposals from interested developers.	By June 14, 2023, & at least every other year thereafter	Citywide	Minimum of 4 outreach events
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 4 (Pursue Funding)	Pursue additional state and federal funding for affordable housing development.	No less than annually, beginning in 2023	Citywide	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 5 (Regional Housing Trust)	Continue to work with South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance	Ongoing	Citywide	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 8 (Affordable Housing Production Monitoring)	Monitor production of affordable housing in Torrance and evaluate the degree to which sites that have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments have been or	By April 1, 2023, and ongoing.	Citywide	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units

	are being developed in those income categories. If not, reevaluate programs and objectives accordingly.			
Program 13 (Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing)	Support the preservation of affordable units at risk of converting to market rents	Ongoing	N/A	Preserve 197 affordable housing units
Historic Patterns that Affect Exclusion				
Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA) / Multiple Objectives	<p>Revise Land Use Element and Zoning Code to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase density ranges as per programs; • add new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(s) (R/MU-OZ); • incentivize new target densities; • revise the HBCSP to add MU to more districts and consider allowing stand-alone residential in more districts; • implement the Housing Corridor Study areas; and • add the RIH-OZ. 	By October 15, 2024	Target highest and high resources areas	Monitor development of affordable housing units to facilitate 53% in highest resources areas and 39% in high resources areas.
Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 4 (Revise Development Standards to Remove Government Constraints)	Reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce identified constraints to development of housing, including parking, height, open space FARs, etc.	By October 15, 2024		Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 8 (Outreach and Information to Promote ADU Construction)	Maintain and distribute literature on funding opportunities and programs promoting construction of affordable rental ADUs.	By June 14, 2023, and ongoing throughout the Planning Period	Although a citywide objective, focus on highest resource areas and Central and Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 8 (Housing Production Monitoring)	Monitor production of affordable housing and evaluate the degree to which the sites that have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments have been or are being developed in those income categories.	By April 1, 2023, and annually thereafter	Although a citywide objective, evaluate areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas (per data in Appendix D)	Monitor development of affordable housing units to facilitate 53% in highest resources areas and 39% in high resources areas.

	As part of monitoring program, develop a metric to evaluate success in adding affordable housing (including new residential or MU developments, ADUs, and housing in RIH-OZs) in areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas			
Program 22 (Removal of Racial Covenants)	Develop detailed instructions for removing race-based restrictions from residential property titles, and provide as public information online and at the planning counter.	By October 15, 2022; advertise and make available on an ongoing basis	Although a citywide objective, focus on areas that are predominantly white	Reduce dissimilarity index by 10 percent

DRAFT

5.3 SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Table H-61 summarizes the City’s quantified objectives for the 2021-2029 planning period by income group.

- The Construction Objective represents the City’s RHNA of 810 units for extremely low-income households, 811 units for very low-income households, 846 units for low-income households, 853 units for moderate-income households, and 1,619 units for above-moderate-income.
- The Rehabilitation objective represents home improvement repairs for an average of approximately 250 low-income seniors and disabled residents per year through the City’s Home Improvement Program.
- The Conservation objective represents the conservation of the 197 units in two subsidized multifamily developments, which will have expired affordability covenants during the planning period. Although both owners have stated in writing to the City that they do not intend to convert their units to market rate units during the next 10 years, the City will monitor the status of these units.

**Table H-61
Summary of 2021-2029 Quantified Objectives**

	Income Level					Total
	Extremely Low ¹⁰	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Construction Objective (RHNA)	810	811	846	853	1,619	4,939
Rehabilitated Objective	1,000		1,000	--	--	2,000
Conservation Objective	197			--	--	197

¹⁰ State law allows local jurisdictions to use 50% of the very low income category to represent households of extremely low-income (less than 30 percent of the MFI).

APPENDIX A: OUTREACH EFFORTS

DRAFT

Appendix A: Outreach Efforts

Appendix A comprehensively presents the outreach efforts for the Torrance Housing Element. It is organized as follows:

Section 1: Presents the noticing for public meetings that provide the public the opportunity for involvement in the preparation of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Includes comment letters received from the public. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the 1st Draft Housing Element for public review, including invitation to participate in Community Workshop 3 during the public review period. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the second submittal to HCD for the public's review, and includes a comment letter received from a member of the public. Includes the City's noticing for the Planning Commission's hearing set for May 18, 2022.

Section 2: Presents the results of the online polling from **Community Workshop 1**, and the survey from **Community Workshop 2**.

Section 3: Presents the full Workshop Summaries for the **3 Community Workshops**.

Section 4: Presents the full **Focus Group** summaries for the sessions with the Service Providers and Affordable Developers, and the Market Rate Developers.

Section 5: Presents the Mailing Lists used to invite participants to the **Community Workshops** and **Focus Group** sessions, as well as to promote the City's website as a way to keep informed of progress of the Housing Element and the ways to submit written input.

Note: New information was added to each of the above sections in April 2022 and May 6, 2022, in preparation for the 2nd HCD review period anticipated to begin May 2022. The new information is preceded by a cover sheet in each section, titled "New Information, added April 2022 and May 6, 2022."

Section 1

Section 1: Presents the noticing for public meetings that provide the public the opportunity for involvement in the preparation of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Includes comment letters received from the public. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the 1st Draft Housing Element for public review, including invitation to participate in Community Workshop 3 during the public review period.

Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the second submittal to HCD for the public's review, and includes a comment letter received from a member of the public. Includes the City's noticing for the Planning Commission's hearing set for May 18, 2022.

New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled "New information"

CITY OF TORRANCE
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

Refer to: **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

Tel: **(310) 618-5990**

Fax: **(310) 618-5829**

Date: April 16, 2021

Legal Desk
Daily Breeze
400 Continental Boulevard Suite 600
El Segundo, CA 90245
Phone: (310) 543-6635
FAX: (310) 316-6827

Attached herewith for publication at our contracted rate for legal advertising is notice described as follows:

(LEGAL AD)

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs.....

Please publish 1 time on the date indicated below.

Tuesday – April 20, 2021

Thank you!

Special Instructions to Publisher:

- Advance Proofs required
Important: please email Ad Proof to BeatrizPerez@TorranceCA.Gov
- Proofs of Publication required
- Tear Sheets required

Attachment

Betty Perez
Administrative Assistant
Community Development Department

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 7:00 P.M., APRIL 28, 2021 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Orange Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued April 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means in our continuing effort to practice social distancing to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:

Webinar ID: 924 1869 4169

Password: 859371

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: April 20, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Community Development Director

Screenshot of Workshop 1 notice on City's website

EVENT	DATE/TIME	AGENDA	MINUTES
Commission on Aging	05/11/2021 9:30 AM - 11:30 AM	May 11, 2021	Not Included
Civil Service Commission	05/10/2021 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM	May 10, 2021	Not Included
Environmental Quality Commission	05/06/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 6, 2021	Not Included
License Review Board	05/04/2021 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM	May 4, 2021	Not Included
Youth Council	05/05/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 5, 2021	Not Included
Planning Commission	05/05/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 5, 2021 - CANCELLED	Not Included
City Council Meeting	05/04/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	Not Included	Not Included
Traffic Commission	05/03/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 3, 2021	Not Included
Planning Commission Workshop for Housing Element Update	04/28/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	April 28, 2021 Workshop	Not Included
Water Commission	04/28/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	April 28, 2021	Not Included
City Council Meeting	04/27/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	Not Included	Not Included
Civil Service Commission	04/26/2021 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM	April 26, 2021	Not Included

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Orange Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued April 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means in our continuing effort to practice social distancing to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Webinar ID: 924 1869 4169
Password: 859371

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.



PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission meets the first and third Wednesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. All meetings are open to the public via teleconference. No new items will be discussed after 11:00 p.m. If there are items remaining, they will be heard at the next regular meeting.

General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes and Variances require a public hearing before the Planning Commission and the City Council. They will automatically be submitted to City Council for hearing approximately 45 days after the Planning Commission hearing.

Actions of the Community Development Director or Planning Commission may be appealed by the applicant, City Council, City Manager, or other interested parties by filing a written notice of appeal along with the required appeal fee with the City Clerk within 15 days of the action.

Staff reports are available for review at the Community Development Department, Civic Center Main Library and the City Clerk's Office. Questions or concerns may be directed to Planning & Environmental Manager, Oscar Martinez, at 310.618.5990. Agendas and Minutes are posted on the City of Torrance Home Page www.TorranceCA.Gov.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if special assistance is needed to participate in this meeting, please call 310.618.5990. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR 35.102-104 ADA Title II]

**PUBLIC COUNTER
HOURS OF OPERATION
Monday through Friday from
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

**Offices are closed alternate Fridays.
City Hall will be closed:
Friday, May 7, 2021**

CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION

VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

"There's no place like home."

~Dorothy Gale

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM LISTED ON THE AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. FLAG SALUTE
3. ROLL CALL / MOTIONS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCE
4. REPORT ON POSTING OF AGENDA
The agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard on April 22, 2021.
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS
7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC #1
(Limited to a 30 minute period)

This portion of the meeting is reserved for comment on items not on the agenda. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Planning Commission cannot act on items raised during public comment, but may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed; request clarification; or refer the item to staff. Speakers under Orals are limited to either Oral Communications #1 or Oral Communication #2 and no longer than 3 minutes per speaker. To participate, please use the Zoom credentials provided at the top of the page at <https://zoom.us> and use the "Raise Your Hand" feature when prompted. Your comments to the Planning Commission meeting will be recorded as part of the Planning Commission meeting. By staying online and making public comment during the Planning Commission meeting, you are agreeing to have your audio recorded.

8. TIME EXTENSIONS

9. SIGN HEARINGS

10. CONTINUED HEARINGS

11. WAIVERS

12. FORMAL HEARINGS

13. RESOLUTIONS

14. PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS

A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

15. MISCELLANEOUS

16. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS

17. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES

18. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC #2

19. ADJOURNMENT

A. Future meetings (subject to change):

1. May 5, 2021
2. May 19, 2021
3. June 2, 2021

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14A

TO: Members of the Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Division
SUBJECT: Land Use Study LUS21-00002/City of Torrance (Housing Element Update)
LOCATION: Citywide

The purpose of this workshop is to provide information on the City of Torrance General Plan Housing Element update addressing the Sixth Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle covering 2021 through 2029.

BACKGROUND

The City of Torrance is currently updating its Sixth Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State’s overall housing need. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying, the State’s overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State’s housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process by attending workshops, which will be held virtually. Concurrently with the update of the Housing Element, the City is conducting a Housing Corridor Study to identify locations to facilitate streamlined housing review.

Purpose and Requirements of the Housing Element

Since 1969, California has required that all local governments adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community. The Housing Element is a State-mandated policy document within the General Plan that guides the implementation of various programs to meet future housing needs for residents and households of all income levels. The housing needs are determined through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. The Housing Element identifies available land that is suitable for housing development, as well goals, policies, and programs to accommodate the City’s housing need, provide opportunities for new housing, and preserve the existing housing stock.

California Housing Element law requires that local jurisdictions update the Housing Element every eight years. These frequent updates are required because housing is critical to ensure economic prosperity and quality of life throughout the State. The update also helps to ensure that jurisdictions are responding to their residents’ changing needs. The revised Housing Element must be adopted by the Torrance City Council and submitted to HCD by October 15, 2021, although there is a 120-day grace period. Housing Elements must be certified (approved) by HCD as complying with State law. Jurisdictions that are not in compliance with Housing Element law could lose eligibility for significant sources of funding currently provided by the State and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Noncomplying jurisdictions also run the risk of being sued by the State Attorney General.

Key components of the Housing Element include:

- A demographic profile and analysis of population growth and trends in the community;
- Identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community;
- Identification of adequate sites that are zoned and available within the 8-year housing cycle to meet the city's fair share of regional housing needs at all income levels, as prescribed by the RHNA;
- An evaluation of local constraints or barriers to housing development as well as opportunities to develop housing; and
- Housing goals, policies, quantified objectives and scheduled programs to preserve, improve and develop housing within the City.

Because the Housing Element is updated every eight years, the current 5th Cycle (2013–2021) Housing Element provides a foundation for this update. Please refer to the City's current 5th Cycle (2013–2021) Housing Element for more information on existing goals, policies, and programs. It can be accessed on the City's website: (<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showdocument?id=2740>).

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

RHNA stands for Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Every eight years, "housing need"—both the total number of units and the distribution of those units by affordability levels—is determined by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the entire State. HCD then distributes this housing needs assessment to each regional planning body in California; this housing needs assessment is the amount of housing that must be planned for by each region. Torrance is located in the six-county regions (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura and Imperial) administered by SCAG, which is the regional planning body for our area. SCAG takes the number of housing units it receives from the State housing needs assessment and allocates it to all jurisdictions in its planning area, including Torrance. This allocation is the RHNA. On September 11, 2020, for the 6th Cycle period, Torrance was allocated at total of 4,939 units, compared to 1,450 units for the 5th Cycle period. On October 14, 2020, on behalf of the residents of Torrance, the City Council submitted a letter appealing the Final Draft RHNA Allocation and methodology used, which was based on local planning factors, land use constraints and available land and density constraints. The appeal was denied in January of 2021. The appeal letter is available on the City's website:

(<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument?id=62867>).

To comply with State law, each jurisdiction's Housing Element must be updated to ensure its policies and programs can accommodate its share of the number of housing units identified by the State. For the upcoming Sixth Cycle (2021-2029) Housing Element update, the City's share of the RHNA is 4,939 units, divided among a range of income or affordability levels (based on Area Median Income, or AMI), as shown in the following table.

6th Cycle RHNA for Torrance		
Income Category/Affordability Level*	Number of Units	Percent of Total Units
Very Low Income (0-50% of AMI)	1,621	33%
Low Income (50-80% of AMI)	846	17%
Moderate Income (80-120% of AMI)	853	17%
Above Moderate Income (More than 120% of AMI)	1,619	33%
Total Units	4,939	100%

*Income/affordability categories are grouped into the four categories shown in the table above; average median income (AMI) is the average household income for each Metropolitan Statistical Area. The AMI for Los Angeles County is currently \$77,300 for a four-person household.

Through the Housing Element update process, the City must show that it has the regulatory and land use policies to accommodate its assigned RHNA. Local governments are not required to build the housing—the actual development of housing is typically done by for-profit and non-profit developers. However, the Housing Element is required to demonstrate potential sites where housing can be accommodated to meet all the income levels of a jurisdiction’s RHNA. Identification of a site’s capacity does not guarantee that construction will occur on that site. If there are insufficient sites and capacity to meet the RHNA allocation, the Housing Element is required to identify a rezoning program to accommodate the required capacity. As previously noted, if the City does not identify capacity for its RHNA allocation, the City could be deemed out of compliance and risk losing important sources of funding currently provided by the State as well as facing legal challenges.

Housing Element implementation

The Housing Element sets goals, objectives, policies, and programs that are implemented after the plan is adopted. When a new housing program, project, or idea is considered, the Housing Element provides guidance for decision-makers to evaluate the proposal. The Housing Element must remain consistent with the other elements of the General Plan. This may require amendments to certain elements, most often the Land Use Element.

Strategies for Accommodating RHNA:

- To ensure the City has adequate sites zoned appropriately to accommodate the total number of units with the RHNA, and the following steps are being taken:
 - Identify entitled projects (not expected to issue permit until July 1, 2021)
 - Identify “pipeline projects” (in application/review/approval stages)
 - Estimate of future permits for Accessory Dwelling Units (based on recent trends from 2018, 2019 and 2020)
 - Sites Inventory (available vacant and underutilized properties):
 - That already permit residential development
 - That need to be redesigned and rezoned to permit residential development
 - For lower income housing – must meet certain requirements to be deemed adequate sites:
 - At least 10 dwelling units per acre allowed density
 - Between 0.5-10 acres.

The City will be holding additional outreach efforts to obtain input from residents and stakeholders. Additional community workshops are tentatively scheduled for May through July and formal public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council will occur before the Housing Element updates can be adopted. Public notification of both the workshops and the formal public hearings will occur. The workshops will be in a virtual public format to provide information on the Housing Element update and receive public comments.

Following the review by the Planning Commission, the Draft Housing Element will be submitted to the HCD for a 60-day review period, during which the Draft Housing Element will remain available for public review. Copies will be made available at the City Clerk's Office, Planning Counter at City Hall, all six Torrance Libraries and on the Community Development website. (<https://www.torranceca.gov/services/community-development>). Following the 60-day review period, the Housing Element will be brought before the Planning Commission for a second review before being presented before the City Council for adoption.

Housing Identification Corridor Study

The Housing Corridor Study is a grant funded Planning effort aimed at facilitating streamlined housing production in the city. The purpose of the project is to promote the development of housing by identifying and analyzing presently non-residentially zoned areas in the City that may be re-zoned to multifamily residential. Utilizing the current Torrance Housing Element and data showing inconsistently zoned properties in the City, staff identified six preliminary study areas that may be strong candidates for this purpose. The consultant will prioritize these areas based on best use of grant funding, and most efficient yield of housing units, taking into consideration surroundings, scale, services and access. Staff will work with the consultant to draft potential re-zoning of the studied areas as a result of the completed Housing Identification Corridor Study. Staff notes that any future rezoning would require consideration by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

RECOMMENDATION

The Community Development Director recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public workshop, provide feedback and take public comment on the 2021-2029 Housing Element update.

Prepared by,



Carolyn Chun
Senior Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg D. Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachments:

1. Correspondences

From: Aidan Schwing <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 11:14:41 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Aidan Schwing using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Aidan Schwing



From: Aron Sanchez <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 21, 2021 at 11:39:40 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Aron Sanchez using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Aron Sanchez

[REDACTED]

From: Ciera Coronado <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 16, 2021 at 1:00:38 AM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Ciera Coronado using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Ciera Coronado



-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Chen, George <GChen@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member George K. Chen,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Kari Gallegos using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Kari Gallegos
[REDACTED]

From: Margaret Gilbert <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 16, 2021 at 1:00:15 AM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Margaret Gilbert using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Margaret Gilbert

[REDACTED]

From: Morgan Bennyworth <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 29, 2021 at 12:49:15 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: End Exclusionary Zoning
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a local constituent writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. In particular, I'm writing to express my opposition to policies that ban apartments in much of our city. This misguided policy promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in our neighborhoods.

Apartments are banned on over 80% of the residentially-zoned land in Los Angeles County; this share is often even higher in high-income cities and neighborhoods. This form of exclusionary zoning, which mandates single-family detached homes as the only legal housing option in most of the county, has led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities. With the County's median home value over \$750,000, and with affordable rental apartments scarce, single-family zoning effectively guarantees that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households, who tend to be white.

Fortunately, cities across California are recognizing that ending exclusionary zoning and legalizing apartments will help make our neighborhoods more affordable, diverse, and environmentally sustainable. Sacramento recently voted to allow up to four homes on any residential parcel, and Berkeley is poised to do the same. Oakland's city council is exploring a similar policy. Portland and Minneapolis legalized small apartment buildings citywide several years ago. However, no cities in Los Angeles County have yet adopted these reforms.

As a city with positive values, we must emulate the example of our Bay Area neighbors and also legalize apartments citywide. I urge you to support an end to exclusionary zoning and apartment bans in our city. This bold reform will help us fix our city's housing affordability crisis, creating a city where everyone is welcome and everyone can thrive.

Personally sent by Morgan Bennyworth using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool.
Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Morgan Bennyworth
[REDACTED]

From: Prabhu Reddy <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 5:17:22 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Prabhu Reddy using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Prabhu Reddy

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on
behalf of Scarlett Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:07 PM
To: Chen, George
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member George K. Chen,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Scarlett Davis using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Scarlett Davis



From: Sunny Zhou <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 8:49:03 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Sunny Zhou using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Sunny Zhou

[REDACTED]

From: Yazmine Mihojevich <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 30, 2021 at 2:21:25 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: End Exclusionary Zoning
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a local constituent writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. In particular, I'm writing to express my opposition to policies that ban apartments in much of our city. This misguided policy promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in our neighborhoods.

Apartments are banned on over 80% of the residentially-zoned land in Los Angeles County; this share is often even higher in high-income cities and neighborhoods. This form of exclusionary zoning, which mandates single-family detached homes as the only legal housing option in most of the county, has led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities. With the County's median home value over \$750,000, and with affordable rental apartments scarce, single-family zoning effectively guarantees that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households, who tend to be white.

Fortunately, cities across California are recognizing that ending exclusionary zoning and legalizing apartments will help make our neighborhoods more affordable, diverse, and environmentally sustainable. Sacramento recently voted to allow up to four homes on any residential parcel, and Berkeley is poised to do the same. Oakland's city council is exploring a similar policy. Portland and Minneapolis legalized small apartment buildings citywide several years ago. However, no cities in Los Angeles County have yet adopted these reforms.

As a city with positive values, we must emulate the example of our Bay Area neighbors and also legalize apartments citywide. I urge you to support an end to exclusionary zoning and apartment bans in our city. This bold reform will help us fix our city's housing affordability crisis, creating a city where everyone is welcome and everyone can thrive.

Personally sent by Yazmine Mihojevich using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool.
Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Yazmine Mihojevich
[REDACTED]

Supplemental #1 to Agenda Item No. 14A

To: Members of the Planning Commission
From: Community Development Department
Date: April 28, 2021
Subject: LUS21-00002, Housing Element Update

Correspondence was received after the item was published and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Carolyn Chun
Senior Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 11:09 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

<https://torranceforeveryone.com/#platform>

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

From: T <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Public Comment

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Regarding item # 14

PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Hello,

When it comes to affordable housing it should include both rent and homeownership options for the working class, seniors, students, those with low or no income, and any other residents in need of such housing! *It's time to end REDLINE, racist & classist zoning that is ruining the lives of so many residents in LA County that currently has over 60,000+ unhoused residents!* We ALL deserve housing that we can afford, rent was never meant to take more than 30% of a residents income and it is currently taking over 80% of some residents income and that is NOT acceptable!

Within the last 10 years in SoCal, rent has increased by over 65% and during that time period the number of unhoused residents increased by over 50%! That large increase in rent has nearly WIPED OUT the working class that may not exist in the state of CA anymore! That has to change, it's time to return affordable housing, both rent and homeownership, for residents in need!



The housing types that we support include *affordable tiny & small homes, apartments, condos, and townhomes!* As a friendly reminder, *the state can capture land from local sub cities that do not meet housing element requirements!* Thank You for your time regarding this urgent matter.

--

Best,
Tieira
www.HTWWS.org

--

Best,
Tieira Ryder
<https://www.youtube.com/c/BlackRavenCinema>



From: "c.dreike" [REDACTED]

Date: April 27, 2021 at 8:18:20 PM PDT

To: "Furey, Pat" <PFurey@torranceca.gov>, "Goodrich, Tim" <TGoodrich@torranceca.gov>, "Chen, George" <GChen@torranceca.gov>, "Griffiths, Mike" <MGriffiths@torranceca.gov>, "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>, "Mattucci, Aurelio" <AMattucci@torranceca.gov>, "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>

Subject: RHNA

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Mayor, Council, City Manager, City Clerk

First, I am so sorry that you all have to endure the abuse from BLM under orals.

Please have a look at my attached 1 page analysis of the housing needs for the State of California for the next 10 years.

I hope that it will provide you with some insight about the what is really needed to provide housing going forward.

Possibly this will encourage Torrance to join with any legal actions against SCAG, HCD and the Legislature regarding the false RHNA numbers.

While my analysis is very a simple view, HCD used a complicated and convoluted process dictated by the legislature to calculate their false and misleading number. Generally a simple explanation is the most correct one. Generally a complicated explanation is the least correct. In this case our legislature was fooled into believing that we have a housing problem.

As you will understand after reading my analysis, we do not need HCD ordering cities to build.

Will Torrance join in lawsuits against the state to correct this problem?

Would Torrance join with other cities to repeal SB828 which is one root of the RHNA problem and SB35 which would punish cities if the RHNA ordered housing is not built?

Thanks,
Chris Dreike
[REDACTED]

--

Scientists seek to understand what is, while engineers seek to create what never was. As the "Bad Astronomer" Phil Plait says, "Teach a man to reason, and he can think for a lifetime."

4/27/2021

Thank you Senator Allen for meeting with us today. I will provide some population growth perspective on why the current raft of housing bills are unnecessary. I have found this information in a May 1, 2020 report by the California Department of Finance (1) and also from Dept. of Housing and Community Development (2) and SCAG (3). I also use a current report from the Public Policy Institute (4).

In 2019 California's population grew by only 0.2 percent, continuing an historically slow growth trend since the Great Recession. 0.2% equates to an increase of 80,000 people per year. According to the charts, the population growth rate has been declining consistently since 1991 and there is no indication that the growth rate will increase. The current growth estimate is now between .05% and .06%. It has fallen dramatically since May 2020.

Los Angeles County, the state's most populous county, has now lost population the last two years, dropping 0.3 percent in 2018 and 0.1 percent in 2019. Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan, Carson all lost population.

2019 is the first time the state has added more housing units than people. We are now building more housing than we need. Continuing an 8 year trend, we are now building more apartments than single family homes by about 8600 units. California continues to add housing faster than we are growing. The wrong types of housing may be getting built. The market is looking for single family homes judging from the rapid increase in pricing.

In looking at Housing and Community Development RHNA calculations, HCD is projecting a need for over 1.3 million housing units by October 2029 ONLY in the SCAG region. Further, SCAG has objected (3) to this large number and countered with a total need of 800-900,000. Juxtapose both of these estimates with a constant 0.2% population growth driven need for housing of approximately 400-600,000 units for the entire state over this period.

Now using the NEW high side growth estimate of .06%, growth is only 24,000 a year for the entire state. Extrapolating that out to the end of the RHNA cycle in 2031 that is a total statewide increase over the next 10 years of only 240,000 new residents. Using census data of 2.93 residents per dwelling in California, we only need 81,911 housing units over the next 10 years. That's only 8,191 per year for the entire state!

And the questions arise, "Why is the legislature creating all of these housing bills?" and "Why have the RHNA estimates not been reduced to match the data?"

Thank you for your time and please consider a NO vote on the housing measures.

If you like I can provide a pdf copy of this write up which includes links to the reports.

1) http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/e-1/documents/E-1_2020PressRelease.pdf

2) https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/southern_california_association_of_governments_regional_housing_need_determination_for_the_sixth_housing_element_update_1.pdf

3) <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/scag-objection-letter-rhna-regional-determination.pdf?1602190274>

4) [https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-population/#:~:text=According%20to%20estimates%20by%20the,halt%20\(0.05%25%20gain\).](https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-population/#:~:text=According%20to%20estimates%20by%20the,halt%20(0.05%25%20gain).)

-----Original Message-----

From: Aziz Fellague [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 10:50 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,5ZRAyDGjIjGL_SJOqpBUWmYJoXoCGy-3jIDYGR3JHhcRxVZTgeZO4OYjavwi5X89wGQYVoNO0muHt3Uzz3slBzx3LQr1oGUsRsukJIJUTnb1x1cll7XWHsO2Rpc,&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

I want to be able to live in Torrance just like my parents did, so the Housing Element would be a bold step to ensure this.

Aziz

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,Byil3e7r3CpWKDbEqUWVbS7esu3Jt7J4Glr-4lVqyPTsqFXHqFCpjVR992ydUtDsL0JW903rGxnY7XjR-KM5AshNp7s31U0l-luV51U962milHE,&typo=1>

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

April 27, 2021

Members of the Planning Commission
City Hall
Torrance, CA

PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov,
Via Email

Re: Housing Element Update

Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing on behalf of Torrance For Everyone to provide input on the Housing Element Update. To that end, I have attached 4 documents:

1. Brutal Facts: This document lays out some of our greatest concerns with respect to Torrance's housing crisis including (a) more than 45% of Torrance renters are cost-burdened, and (b) 9x increase in homelessness since 2013.

2. Our Platform: This document includes 17 policies across 4 key areas: (i) legalize more homes, (ii) fund affordable housing, (iii) support our unhoused neighbors, and (iv) strengthen renters rights.

3. Public Outreach: This letter is a reminder of Government Code § 65583(c)(9), which requires the City of Torrance to make "a diligent effort...to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort." The state routinely rejects draft housing elements from cities for not doing sufficient public outreach.

4. Site Inventory Analysis: This letter prepared by Abundant Housing LA summarizes state law. I'd like to draw your attention to Component #3 of the letter which summarizes AB 686 (2018) which requires the housing element update to "affirmatively further fair housing". This means that zoned capacity, especially sites identified for lower income housing, should be distributed across the City of Torrance.

Sincerely,

Prabhu Reddy
email@torranceforeveryone.com
<https://linktr.ee/torranceforeveryone>



-----Original Message-----

From: Keiko Thomas <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 12:45 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,Hx403ZNbpLg31fCeR3WM-YTwCycGAiPiSZ_Z2v9AauictUj56lvBW6uSa0VPU8db3TOC7NvRkrJ6fJrRcz3cUjA00mKVKN2tAmRQcQB77CusFyE,&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: Yahoo <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 11:43 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,IgOillOG0I5xT_5jrHYgUcs8131DHD7yW9uCRrIZVanQWKN7Mhek4kqEaszLZY3PaS0U7FGgsuweJ88XjhnaSaC6wcs64KFDaycV4Vp7rl95&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE AT **6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is approximately 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Yellow Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued May 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: June 24, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

Workshop #2 Notice: Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government

July 23 · 🌐

The Community Development Department will be hosting a virtual community outreach meeting on the Housing Element update at a special Workshop on Wednesday, July 28th at 6 P.M. This virtual workshop will provide information on the Housing Element Update and Housing Corridor Study process. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process


For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate . If you have any questions, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov.



Workshop 2 Notice: City Calendar

			Planning Commission 7:00 PM Youth Council - DARK			
<p>25 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>8:00 AM Torrance Antique Street Fair</p>	<p>26 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>Magic Color Scratch Butterfly Ornaments</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p> <p>6:00 PM Civil Service Commission</p>	<p>27 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM Free COVID-19 Testing at the YMCA</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p> <p>6:30 PM City Council Meeting</p>	<p>28 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>9:30 AM California Competes Tax Credit Webinar</p> <p>10:00 AM Babytime</p> <p>12:00 PM Carcenter Wagon</p> <p>6:00 PM Housing Element Update Workshop</p> <p>7:00 PM Water Commission</p>	<p>29 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM UCLA Blood Drive</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p>	<p>30 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM "Take and Make" Craft Kits for Adults</p> <p>10:00 AM Toddler Time</p>	<p>31 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p>

Workshop #2 Promotion: COVID-19 TODAY
COVID-19 TODAY <https://youtu.be/yHQ2mduTBgA?t=766>




COVID-19 TODAY
CORONAVIRUS NEWS UPDATE
ROSE PARADE FLOAT
HOUSING OUTREACH MEETING
ULTRA! ART EXHIBITION

12:46 / 16:21 • HOUSING OUTREACH MEETING >





COVID-19 [LEARN MORE](#)

Get the latest information from the CDC about COVID-19.

 See more resources on Google [↗](#)

COVID-19 TODAY - JULY 26, 2021 - City of Torrance

85 views • Jul 26, 2021

 0  0  SHARE  SAVE ...

Community Development Department

**Virtual community outreach
meeting on the Housing Element
update.**

Wed., July 28th | 6 P.M.

TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate

Advertising Order Confirmation

AdTaxi | Press-Telegram • The Beach Reporter
Daily Breeze • Palos Verdes Peninsula News

07/22/21 12:42:12PM

Page 1

<u>Ad Order Number</u> 0011477197	<u>Customer</u> CITY OF TORRANCE	<u>Payor Customer</u> CITY OF TORRANCE	<u>PO Number</u>
<u>Sales Representative</u> Pauline Fernandez	<u>Customer Account</u> 5007865	<u>Payor Account</u> 5007865	<u>Ordered By</u> BeatrizPerez@torranceca.gov
<u>Order Taker</u> Pauline Fernandez	<u>Customer Address</u> FINANCE DEPT.ACCOUNTS PAYABLE 3031 TORRANCE BLVD TORRANCE, CA 90503	<u>Payor Address</u> FINANCE DEPT.ACCOUNTS PAYABLE 3031 TORRANCE BLVD TORRANCE, CA 90503	<u>Customer Fax</u>
<u>Order Source</u> Select Source	<u>Customer Phone</u> 310-618-2870	<u>Payor Phone</u> 310-618-2870	<u>Customer EMail</u>
<u>Current Queue</u> Ready	<u>Invoice Text</u> BeatrizPerez@torranceca.gov		
<u>Tear Sheets</u> 0	<u>Affidavits</u> 0	<u>Blind Box</u> _____ <u>Materials</u> _____ <u>Promo Type</u> _____	<u>Special Pricing</u> _____

Advertising Order Confirmation

Ad Number 0011477197-01 Ad Size 4 X 94 Li Color Production Color Ad Attributes Production Method AdBooker Production Notes

External Ad Number Pick Up Ad Type Legal Liner Released for Publication

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD AT 6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 (as extended by Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-08-21), which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's A Safer Return Together At Work And In The Community - Beyond The Blueprint For A Safer Economy - Encouraging COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage With Limited Risk Reduction Measures (issued June 15, 2021), staff and the city consultants will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

Pub July 24, 2021 (1t)DB(11477197)

Advertising Order Confirmation

AdTaxi | Press-Telegram • The Beach Reporter
Daily Breeze • Palos Verdes Peninsula News

07/22/21 12:42:12PM

Page 3

<u>Product</u>	<u>Requested Placement</u>	<u>Requested Position</u>	<u>Run Dates</u>	<u># Inserts</u>
Daily Breeze	Legals CLS	General - 1076~	07/24/21	1

Order Charges:

<u>Net Amount</u>	<u>Tax Amount</u>	<u>Total Amount</u>	<u>Payment Amount</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
637.88	0.00	637.88	0.00	\$637.88

If this confirmation includes an advertising proof, please check your proof carefully for errors, spelling, and/or typos. Errors not marked on the returned proof are not subject to credit or refunds.

Please note: To meet our printer's deadline, we must have your proof returned by the published deadline, and as indicated by your sales rep.

Please note: If you pay by bank card, your card statement will show the merchant as "SoCal Newspaper Group".

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, the undersigned, am a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. I am employed by the City of Torrance, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance California 90503.

On **July 23, 2021**, I caused to be mailed **303** copies of the within notification for the **General Plan Housing Element Workshop on July 28, 2021** to the interested parties in said action by causing true copies thereof to be placed in the United States mail at Torrance California.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed **July 23, 2021** at Torrance, California.



(signature)

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE AT **6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is approximately 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Yellow Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued May 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDinfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: June 24, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

New Information

Added: April 2022, May 6, 2022

Language for the “Seasons” publication

The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State’s overall housing need by updating their General Plan’s Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Sample of Seasons publication

TORRANCE
SEASONS
FALL 2021

TORRANCE THEATRE COMPANY
PRESENTS

Nursesense
THE MEGA-MUSICAL

August 13-21, 2021
James Armstrong Theatre

FOR MORE INFORMATION SEE PAGE 25.

Check out the Fall Season Programs and Classes
Registration Information is on Page 6.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE SURVEY

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The Draft Housing Element Update is available for review on the City's Website and will be presented to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 7:00 pm. This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd. The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Posted flyers at the California Welcome center, located at the Del Amo Mall

The City has a special section for all Torrance Related Activities and Events

**The City of Torrance
Housing Element Update
RHNA Allocation -
6th Planning Cycle (2021-2029)**

The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:
<https://bit.ly/3mui3yK>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990.

Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

The Draft Housing Element Update is scheduled to be presented to the **Planning Commission at 7 p.m. Wednesday, October 20, 2021.**

This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd.

Thank you!





[Read about the coalition here](#)



DISABILITY COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER





John Jackson



November 1, 2021

Torrance City Council
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503

Dear Councilmembers:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the process of updating the housing element of Torrance's general plan. We are writing on behalf of the **Our Future LA Coalition** regarding the 6th Cycle housing element update.

Why does this matter? Because we face a cascade of housing crises in our region. And while nearly everyone in Los Angeles County feels the crush of our housing crisis, Black and Latino residents feel it more than most:

- Black households have 1.12% the wealth of white households, and Latino households less than 5% (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco)

- Black people make up 8% of the county population, but 33.7% of people experiencing homelessness (LAHSA)
- Even under COVID-related eviction moratoriums, Black and Latino neighborhoods face disproportionately higher eviction threats (Los Angeles Times, UCLA)
- One in four AAPIs pay more than half of their income toward housing costs compared to whites (16 percent), putting many on the edge of financial vulnerability. This segment of the population is considered severely cost-burdened (Crisis to Impact Report, A joint publication of the National Coalition of Asian Pacific American Community Development and the University of California, Los Angeles)

These are the effects of decades of racist policies that we have not eradicated: Restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning, and redlining made it impossible for Black families to build wealth through homeownership, and result in lower homeownership and higher rents today. The California Constitution's Article 34 and local "crime-free housing" policies put roadblocks in the way of addressing racial divisions in Californians' housing affordability and security.

This impact was felt devastatingly during the pandemic, when essential workers living in overcrowded housing were exposed to COVID at work and had no choice but to expose their families at home, leading to disproportionate deaths among Black and Latino people. Neighborhoods in South and Southeast LA, where nearly 20% of homes are overcrowded (defined as more than one person per room) had COVID rates of roughly 14,000 cases per 100,000 people. Neighborhoods on the Westside, where less than 5% of homes are overcrowded, had rates well under 5,000 cases per 100,000 people.¹ Death rates were similarly disproportionate -- at a time (January 2021) when the city of Beverly Hills was reporting 21 COVID deaths, and the neighborhood of Brentwood 9, the city of Compton reported 147, and the neighborhood of Westlake 202.² In all, COVID-19 mortality rates in LA County were roughly twice as high for Black people (31 deaths/100,000 individuals) and Latinos (29/100K) as for whites (15/100K) (from CGLA).

Of the 3,007 counties in the United States, L.A. County ranks last in housing affordability, overcrowding, and unsheltered homelessness. We are not doing enough to preserve and create homes for working class and lower-income people. The affordable housing crisis, rampant speculation, lack of tenant protections and rent control, and affordable housing shortage have gotten so bad that lower-income Black, Latino and AAPI families are being pushed out of their homes and communities at an alarming rate. At the rate we're going, next generations won't be able to live in Los Angeles County.

Los Angeles County is legally required to build 341,000 affordable homes by 2030. [To truly address our needs, we need more than double that.](#) At the rate we're going today, we might build 25,000. That's 7% of what's needed. That kind of failure will fall hardest on Black and Latino families, who disproportionately face eviction, homelessness and having to choose between rent and food. Our Future LA demands we not let that happen.

¹ ["When coronavirus invaded their tiny apartment, children desperately tried to protect dad". LA Times. 1/29/21](#)

² ["We Are Forced to Live in These Conditions': In Los Angeles, Virus Ravages Overcrowded Homes". NY Times. 1/23/21](#)

In order to create a better housing future, we must make every neighborhood resource-rich so people can live where they want to live and don't have to leave their community to find opportunity. The Housing Element must also consider the intersection between housing, public health, and environmental justice. The very communities facing the highest rent burden are often the same communities who bear the brunt of the negative impacts brought on by environmental contamination and exposure to the worst air and soil qualities. For example, in LA County, 75% of active oil wells are located within 2,500 feet of homes, the vast majority of which are occupied by low-income people of color. We must also achieve equitable land use and zoning so that historically exclusionary communities build at greater densities, with value capture, while also ensuring that areas already zoned for density are protected from environmental and spatial racism and displacement pressures. As the region plans for growth, there must be no conversion of wildlife habitat to housing or further development in wildfire hazard areas, as identified by CalFire. We understand that the City cares deeply about these issues, and we hope to offer assistance in addressing them.

As it stands right now, the draft housing element will not meet the City's goals around equity and affordability. We submit these comments in the spirit of collaboration in order to partner and provide research, grounded data to help in meeting housing needs. We are interested in having a meeting to discuss these comments more.

Our Future LA Housing Element Comments

1. Protections

- A. The housing element should expand just-cause eviction protections to cover all tenants and establish a corresponding enforcement program.
- B. The housing element should implement a local RSO or strengthen/reduce the annual allowable rent increase for the existing RSO program.
- C. The housing element should codify a tenant's right to counsel in an eviction proceeding.
- D. The housing element should create a permanent tenant education program to inform tenants of their rights and how to access eviction defense resources.
- E. The housing element should create and implement a tenant anti-harassment ordinance combined with enforcement resources.

2. Preservation

- A. The housing element must do more to prioritize rezoning - with value capture - in high-resource neighborhoods which are transit- and job-rich, including single-family zoned

areas. This is necessary to expand affordable housing opportunities while minimizing the impact on existing renters in multifamily-zoned areas.

B. The housing element should exclude parcels containing RSO housing units in the housing element’s site inventory.

C. The housing element should require that no net loss provisions apply to parcels in the site inventory and rezoning program with a monitoring and implementation program.

D. The housing element should institute local programs and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing.

3. Prioritization of affordable housing

A. The housing element should utilize a value capture mechanism, such as inclusionary zoning, to locally fund and/or incentivize affordable housing.

B. The housing element should prioritize creation of affordable housing on public land.

C. The housing element should streamline affordable housing production.

D. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas.

E. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas currently zoned R1.

4. Site Capacity Assessment

A. The housing element should estimate and report both the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, both vacant and nonvacant.

Comparison of claimed capacity vs. estimated realistic capacity

Income Category	Claimed Capacity in			Estimated Add'n Dev Potential in Draft HE (13% dev likelihood)	Recommended Add'n Dev Potential w/20% NNL	Gap in Add'n Dev Potential
	RHNA Target	Draft HE	NNL Buffer			
VLI + LI	2,467	3,135	27%	408	2,960	-2,553
MI	853	936	10%	122	1,024	-902
AMI	1,619	2,902	79%	377	1,943	-1,566
Total	4,939	6,973	41%	906	5,927	-5,020

We estimate that the draft housing element will fall short of the RHNA goal, by 5,020 units of realistic capacity. The City must *fairly* estimate the likelihood of development for all parcels on the suitable sites inventory.

B. The housing element should report the proportion of sites from the previous housing element's inventory that were developed during the previous planning period, and HCD-recommended methodologies and data sources should be used in order to conduct a thorough "factors" analysis of sites' realistic development capacity.

C. The housing element assigns more than 50% of the lower-income RHNA target to nonvacant sites, but should use statistical methods (e.g. surveying a random sample of owners of nonvacant sites) to determine that the sites' existing uses are likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

D. A buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity is not included in the housing element site inventory. This capacity buffer is especially necessary in order to accommodate the lower-income RHNA target.

See No Net Loss (NNL) section of 4A.

E. The housing element should provide a quantitative estimate of the likelihood that in-pipeline projects will be completed, based on historical data, and should adjust the number of in-pipeline units counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA target accordingly.

F. The housing element should commit to a mid-cycle review to verify the housing element's assumptions about development probabilities.

5. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

A. The housing element should meaningfully increase the concentration of lower-income households in areas of the city where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low.

B. The housing element should meaningfully reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with significant exposure to noise/pollution, and commit to reducing/addressing noise and pollution.

C. The housing element should ensure community-serving investment in historically disinvested areas. This includes place-based strategies that create a net gain of affordable housing and stop displacement, prioritize environmental justice, enhance community health and strengthen equitable community leadership in land use planning.

D. The housing element should include a thorough analysis of local patterns in socioeconomic/racial segregation and integration, including patterns of overt racial or ethnic discrimination in the housing and land development market.

E. The housing element should adequately prioritize high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities.

F. The housing element should adequately identify funding sources, public resources, and density bonus programs to maximize the likelihood that projects with below-market-rate units are built.

G. The jurisdiction did not adequately solicit public feedback and commentary on the housing element in a way that accurately reflects the jurisdiction's socioeconomic makeup.

6. Forecasts of ADU Development

A. The housing element did not use an HCD-recommended safe harbor methodology for forecasting future ADU production.

B. The housing element should provide for mid-cycle adjustments if inventory sites are developed at lower rates, or lesser densities, than the housing element anticipated and if ADU production falls short of projections. Mid-cycle adjustments should automatically implement a by-right density bonus on inventory sites, starting mid-cycle, and be large enough to make up for an ADU shortfall.

C. The housing element should assess the affordability of forecasted ADUs using city-specific data; it instead uses a regional average.

We request the opportunity to meet with you and your colleagues to address the concerns raised in this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hirsch Marin
COO, Wellnest, Emotional Health & Wellness
[Our Future LA Steering Committee Member](#)

CC: Jason Elliott, Senior Counselor to Governor Gavin Newsom
Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director, Housing Policy Development, HCD

Melinda Coy, Land Use and Planning Manager, HCD
Tyrone Buckley, Assistant Deputy Director of Fair Housing, HCD
Paul McDougall, Housing Policy Development Manager, HCD



November 5, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Michelle Ramirez
Director of Community Development
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503
Email: community_development_dept@torranceca.gov; cddinfo@torranceca.gov

RE: Request for additional analysis and evidence regarding treatment of nonvacant sites in the City's Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

Dear Ms. Ramirez:

Californians for Homeownership is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization devoted to using legal tools to address California's housing crisis. Our organization is monitoring local compliance with the law governing housing elements.

As you know, housing element law places strict requirements on the sites inventory that the City must include with its Sixth Cycle Housing Element. We have reviewed the inventory provided with the City's draft Housing Element submitted to the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Based on this review, we are concerned that the inventory is legally inadequate, and that the City will not be able to meet its obligation to support the inventory with evidentiary findings as the law requires.

These inadequacies may expose the City to the risk of litigation. This letter is intended to assist the City in identifying additional information and facts now, before it has adopted its Housing Element, so that the City can reduce this risk and comply with the law.

State Law Governing the Use of Nonvacant Sites to Satisfy Housing Element Obligations

Under Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(1), for each nonvacant site, a city must "specify the additional development potential . . . within the planning period," and it must explain how the developmental potential for each site was measured. The methodology must consider the extent to which the existing use may impede development.

Additionally, if a city intends to rely on nonvacant sites to make up more than fifty percent of its lower income housing need, it is also subject to Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(2). This provision requires the city to make an affirmative factual showing that the existing use is not an impediment to development. More specifically, the city must present "findings based on



substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.” Without these findings, the existing use is “presumed to impede additional residential development.”

Inadequacy of the City’s Draft Housing Element

The sites inventory in the City’s draft Housing Element does not meet these requirements. The inventory does not adequately account for the impediment created by the existing uses on the listed nonvacant sites, including the possibility that a site will be maintained in its current use rather than redeveloped during the planning period. Indeed, the inventory appears to assume that every listed nonvacant site will be redeveloped during the planning period. Also, the information about the existing uses is woefully underspecified as it simply identifies a broad category such as industrial, residential, or commercial.

What’s more, the City’s draft housing element appears to rely on nonvacant sites to satisfy over 50% of the City’s lower income RHNA. But the inventory does not identify evidence that the existing uses on each of these sites will be discontinued during the planning period. Instead, the draft housing element provides a general overview of various possible housing corridors and makes the following broad statements regarding sites in these areas:

[T]here are many buildings in Torrance that are at least 50 years old. Many of these underutilized and older properties exhibit similar characteristics in terms of conditions and existing operations as other properties that have been redeveloped within the recent past A significant number of sites have been chosen with the criteria of underutilization and age in mind. Due to the scarcity of developable vacant land in the city, these properties offer an economic incentive to the property owner to develop higher density residential and mixed use products, as evidenced by the increasing number of applications and developer interest to recycle existing non-residential properties to residential uses.

The draft also contains the following broad statements regarding scattered sites:

These scattered sites represent recyclable properties that contain existing non-residential uses that are likely candidates for conversion to residential uses. These properties are located in areas where the pattern of development has demonstrated a trend of conversion of existing underutilized and non-residential uses into multi-family uses. Also, many of these properties contain parcel sizes and configurations that make these sites conducive for recycling to multi-family uses. As has been noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the age of the structures on the scattered sites also will encourage redevelopment, as many are over 50 years old.

This comes nowhere near meeting the City’s obligations under Section 65583.2(g)(2). Indeed, the City’s repeated (and unsupported) reference to the claim that “many” of the listed sites have features that could result in a discontinuation of the existing use seems to betray the fact that, for other sites, the City has no such evidence. Accordingly, as it stands, the existing uses of the non-vacant sites listed in the City’s inventory would be presumed to impede additional residential development, making those sites inappropriate for inclusion.

November 5, 2021

Page 3

Request for Additional Information

Because the City's draft Housing Element does not meet the requirements in subdivisions (g)(1) and (g)(2) of Government Code Section 65583.2, the City may face the significant risk of litigation if it adopts the Housing Element in its current form. Accordingly, we have prepared a table (below) to offer the City an opportunity to provide the additional analysis and evidence that the law requires. We ask that you complete this table and return it to us within 14 days, so that we can review it with sufficient time to make informed comments on the City's draft Housing Element.

In the table, we have listed the nonvacant sites identified for lower income housing in the City's sites inventory. The table includes a space to describe the analysis the City undertook under Section 65583.2(g)(1); as part of this analysis, the City should identify the percentage of similar sites that were redeveloped in the Fifth Cycle or otherwise explain how its prior experience justifies its assumptions. It also includes a space to identify the site-specific evidence required by Section 65583.2(g)(2).

If the City does not respond to this letter, we will assume that it does not have further analysis or evidence to provide. We or another organization may use the City's failure to respond as evidence for inadequacy of the City's analysis and evidence under Section 65583.2. And we may argue that the City's failure to timely provide this information hindered our right to make informed public comments regarding the City's draft Housing Element. For these reasons, we urge you to comply with our request.

* * *

Time is of the essence, so please respond to this letter within 14 days of receipt. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of this with me, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (213) 739-8206.

Sincerely,



Matthew Gelfand

cc: City of Torrance
Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager (by email to glodan@torranceca.gov)
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate (by email to cchun@torranceca.gov)
Patrick Sullivan, Esq., City Attorney (by email to psullivan@torranceca.gov)

California Department of Housing and Community Development
Dulce Ochoa-Hernandez (by email to dulce.ochoa-hernandez@hcd.ca.gov)

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7371-009-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7374-006-037	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-007-032	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-006-050	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-006-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-019-053	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-019-020	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-022-903	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7355-022-902	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-027-144	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-021	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-022-017	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-026	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-025	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-026-900	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-026-016	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
7378-003-121	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-039	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-044	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7368-001-015	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-183	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-001-002	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-048	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-182	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7534-012-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7534-019-021	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-133	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-008-028	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-048	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-047	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-025	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7524-020-024	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-023	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-022	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7368-021-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7377-004-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-011-019	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-002-911	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-030-003	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7357-030-005	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-030-018	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-037-019	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-037-013	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4067-013-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4067-012-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4092-001-904	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7519-025-049	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7370-002-002	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4088-007-026	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-010-012	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7514-023-030	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-016	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4087-016-033	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-010-009	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-015-104	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
7547-003-015	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7528-005-009	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-032	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7534-006-012	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7511-021-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4088-006-027	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-032-008	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-023-038	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7524-006-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4096-009-067	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7519-026-040	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-007-035	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7514-005-005	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7362-014-011	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-041	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4095-020-030	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
4096-001-053	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-009-017	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-013-064	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4096-001-054	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-039-006	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7529-019-003	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-012-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7379-001-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____



January 4, 2022

Gustavo Velasquez, Director
California Department of Housing & Community Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

Dear Director Velasquez:

We are writing on behalf of **Abundant Housing LA** regarding Torrance's 6th Cycle housing element update. As you know, we have shared several comment letters with HCD describing our concerns about major deficiencies in the City's housing element update. Among our concerns is the City's failure to identify enough parcels in its site inventory and proposed rezoning program to achieve its RHNA target of 4,939 homes by 2029.

Assembly Bill 1397 (2017) requires cities to provide an accurate assessment of realistic site capacity, including "the city's or City's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, the current demand for the existing use, and an analysis of existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment."

When cities allocate over 50% of their lower-income RHNA targets to nonvacant sites, they must demonstrate through *substantial evidence* that the current use of these sites is likely to be discontinued during the planning period. This is necessary in order to ensure that enough parcels for affordable housing production are identified, and that the lower-income RHNA targets are ultimately achieved. **To date, the City has not yet adequately provided this substantial evidence.**

Abundant Housing LA has partnered with [MapCraft Labs](#), an economic and policy analysis firm with expertise in housing elements and quantitative real estate analysis, to forecast the true realistic capacity of the City's site inventory and proposed rezoning program. The analysis considers the likely impact of housing element updates on housing production and proposes alternative rezoning scenarios that are more likely to achieve the RHNA target. In particular, MapCraft analyzed the market feasibility of the unit capacity claims made on parcels included in jurisdictions' site inventories.

This analysis calls into question the City's conclusion that its housing element creates the conditions for achieving the RHNA target. Among our core findings:

- While the City's site inventory and rezoning program claimed capacity for about 6,600 housing units, **our analysis suggests that expected housing capacity could fall short by 1,800 to 3,600 housing units.**

- On 374 sites where the City has claimed 6,018 housing units, our analysis found that these sites are either unlikely to be redeveloped to the density that the City is claiming, or are unlikely to be redeveloped altogether. **This represents 95% of the housing units in the City's site inventory.**

In light of this information, we respectfully recommend that HCD urge the City to reassess its site capacity claims, and revise its site inventory and proposed rezoning program. The City should add more parcels to its site inventory and expand its proposed rezoning program, particularly for low-density parcels in high-demand neighborhoods like Old Town Torrance and WALTERIA. The City should also consider eliminating or reducing on-site parking requirements, which would greatly improve the economic feasibility of denser housing development.

We encourage you to review Abundant Housing LA and MapCraft's full report describing how these conclusions were reached. We would be happy to discuss our findings with you and your colleagues. Thank you for your team's continued hard work and dedication to solving California's housing shortage and affordability crisis.

Sincerely,

Leonora Camner
Executive Director
Abundant Housing LA

Anthony Dedousis
Director of Policy and Research
Abundant Housing LA

MAPCRAFT

Abundant Housing LA Feedback on Torrance Housing Element

Date: December 22, 2021
To: Abundant Housing LA
From: MapCraft Inc
Subject: Housing Element Feedback Analysis Results

Executive Summary

Based on an analysis of the sites found in Torrance's site inventory, which claimed total capacity for nearly 6,600 total units across roughly 460 sites, our analysis suggests that Torrance's expected housing capacity could fall short by between 1,800 and 3,600 units.

Torrance could consider the following actions to meet RHNA goals:

- Right-sizing claimed capacity on sites in the current site inventory, both reducing expectations on many sites and being more ambitious in upzoning other sites. The City could revisit additional opportunities to rezone more parcels in the inventory, particularly in areas like Old Town Torrance and Waltheria.
- Adding more sites to the site inventory and evaluating rezoning of those sites. The inventory includes 10% of the City's 4,622 parcels, so there are many places that could be explored further to address this potential shortfall.
- Reducing or eliminating parking requirements and promoting automobile alternatives to reduce households' demand for parking. If developers could meet household demand with fewer on-site parking stalls, it could make multifamily development in many parts of the City more economically feasible.
- Introducing new economic incentives to increase the financial feasibility of redevelopment, especially for projects that include below-market-rate units.
- Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity.

Purpose of this Analysis

The State of California requires local jurisdictions to periodically update their housing elements to address housing needs, as identified by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Cities in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region are in the process of developing updates to their housing elements, as part of the 6th cycle of the RHNA Allocation Plan, which will cover the planning period October 2021 through October 2029.

In March 2021, California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) approved SCAG's adopted RHNA Allocation Plan, apportioning the region's housing growth target to its jurisdictions. City governments in SCAG are responsible for updating their Housing Elements and

MAPCRAFT

submitting them to HCD by October 2021. The Housing Elements must include an inventory of parcels suitable and available for residential development. The total capacity of the sites must be sufficient to accommodate the total housing need, by income level, allocated throughout the planning period.

Abundant Housing LA (AHLA) is a pro-housing, nonprofit advocacy organization working to help solve Southern California's housing crisis. AHLA is providing feedback on housing elements to jurisdictions during the public comment period, and communicating to HCD staff its assessment of the housing elements. AHLA's review of housing elements is intended to ensure that jurisdictions develop high-quality housing element updates, and fully comply with state housing element law.

To that end, AHLA partnered with MapCraft to assess the site inventories shared by jurisdictions as part of their housing element updates. The analysis considers the likely impact of the draft housing elements on housing production and suggests alternative rezoning scenarios that are more likely to achieve cities' RHNA goals. MapCraft worked with a team to determine the likelihood that new housing production would be possible at the scale assumed by draft housing elements. In particular, MapCraft analyzed the market feasibility of the unit capacity claims made on sites included in jurisdictions' site inventories. This memorandum serves as the documentation for the results of various analyses completed by MapCraft for assessing Torrance's Housing Element.

Categorizing Site Inventory Claims

We conducted multiple tests of Torrance's proposed site inventory. For each site for which data was available, we assessed the following:

1. How historic development patterns compared with the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory
2. How physical zoned capacity, taking into account major zoning constraints, beyond just the allowed units per acre, compared with the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory
3. How the scale of pipeline developments identified in the site inventory compare to the unit capacity claims made on similar sites in the site inventory
4. How financially feasible scales of development compared to the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory

Based on the tests on each site, we classified the housing capacity claimed on each site in the site inventory as one of three categories: reasonable, questionable, or unreasonable. Although the tests were nuanced, in general these categories meant:

- Capacity estimates were categorized as "reasonable" when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity on the site was greater than what the jurisdiction claimed in the inventory
- Capacity estimates were categorized as "questionable" when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity was roughly similar to, though lower than, the claim in the inventory

MAPCRAFT

- Capacity estimates were categorized as “unreasonable” when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity was deemed substantially less than what was claimed

Multiple feasibility tests were performed for each site. If the number of claimed units on a site was found to be unreasonable according to multiple tests, we are confident that a reevaluation of the site is warranted.

- More specifically, if the site’s claimed capacity resulted in “unreasonable” for more than one third of the applicable tests, we concluded the site’s claim was unreasonable.
- If none of the tests resulted in an “unreasonable” finding, and more than one third of the applicable tests resulted in “reasonable”, then we concluded the site’s claim was reasonable.
- The rest of the sites, which fall between our thresholds for “reasonable” and “unreasonable,” were defined as “questionable.”

We analyzed 464 sites in Torrance’s site inventory, with a total claimed capacity of 6,561 units.¹ Of that number, Torrance’s draft housing element claimed 2,061 units on sites where rezoning was not proposed. This includes 233 units that are projects that are already pending, entitled, or pipeline projects; however, we were only able to match six of those projects (using addresses and APN numbers) to sites in the inventory which accounted for 98 units, which we assumed to be reasonable capacity claims. We therefore assume that the remaining pending, entitled, or pipeline projects were among the rest of the sites we analyzed where rezoning was not proposed - a total of 176 sites with 1,968 units - which we analyzed further. We also analyzed 277 site inventory parcels that are part of the Housing Corridor Study in Torrance and might be rezoned. These sites claim an additional 4,483 units of capacity.

Our analysis suggests that on 374 sites where Torrance has claimed 6,018 units, the capacity claims we analyzed were “unreasonable” or “questionable”. This represents 95% of the total capacity claimed in the site inventory.

Table 1: Results of Site Inventory Categorization

	Number of Sites	Claimed Units	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	79	335	17%	5%
Questionable	332	4,834	73%	76%
Unreasonable	42	1,184	9%	19%
Subtotal	453	6,353	100%	100%
Incomplete Data*	5	110	N/A	N/A
Total	458	6,463	100%	100%

*Sites with Incomplete data needed for our tests. These Sites were not included in our Analysis

¹ Torrance’s site inventory had net units. For the majority of our tests we needed total capacity. To arrive at total capacity we joined the APNs of the sites in the inventory to the Los Angeles County assessor data and added the existing total units to the net units estimated in the site inventory. Any mention of units in this memo refers to the total capacity instead of net capacity.

MAPCRAFT

Exhibit 1: Sites Inventory Categorization – Percent of Sites





Exhibit 2: Sites Inventory Categorization – Percent of Units



Additionally, we estimated the scale of development that might reasonably be expected on parcels in the site inventory. Our analysis suggests that Torrance’s **expected capacity could fall short by anywhere between 1,801 units and 3,601 units, as compared to the 6,353 units claimed** in the site inventory.

To arrive at a range of unit assumptions, we applied two different sets of assumptions about the viability of units being developed on sites deemed reasonable, questionable, or unreasonable. For a more conservative estimate, we assumed 100% viability for reasonable, 50% viability for questionable, and 0% viability for unreasonable, whereas for a more lenient estimate, we assumed 100%, 75%, and 50% respectively and subtracted those units from the total.

MAPCRAFT

Table 2: Expected Capacity Shortfall

Site Classifications	Claimed Units on Sites	Conservative Estimates		Lenient Estimates	
		<i>Expected viability of Units on Site</i>	<i>Claimed units that are not viable</i>	<i>Expected viability of units on sites</i>	<i>Claimed units that are not viable</i>
Reasonable	335	100% Viable	-	100% Viable	-
Questionable	4,834	50% Viable	2,417	75% Viable	1,209
Unreasonable	1,184	0% Viable	1,184	50% Viable	592
Total	6,353		3,601 (57% Not Viable)		1,801 (28% Not Viable)

The the City has multiple potential policy actions available to increase the viability of redevelopment on the site inventory parcels, such as:

- Add more market-feasible sites to the site inventory
- Upzone sites more ambitiously to enable more intense market-feasible housing development opportunities on sites already in the inventory and any sites added to the inventory
- Consider introducing new incentives and other “carrots” to encourage housing production, such as fee waivers or direct subsidies, a faster permitting process, and greater flexibility on setback size or maximum lot coverage
- Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity

Test Results

The following tests were conducted on sites in the Torrance site inventory to assess whether the claimed development density in the housing element was reasonable. This was based on a comparison of the inventory claims to historic development patterns, sites’ zoned capacity, similar projects under development, and the current financial feasibility of projects of a similar scale.

1. Analysis of Historic Development Patterns (Utilization of Zoned Capacity)

MapCraft evaluated projects built in the last ten years, using Torrance tax assessor data, to estimate whether the claimed development density of a site inventory parcel was comparable with Torrance’s recent record of housing production.

Test 1a – Historic Development Scale

As a first test, we searched for projects built anywhere in unincorporated Torrance over the last 10 years that were on sites whose size was within 20% of the site size identified in the inventory and with development densities (units per acre) that were within 20% of the density claimed in the inventory (units divided by site size).

MAPCRAFT

If recent developments matched the claimed density of a site inventory parcel, we categorized the parcel as “Reasonable.” If no similar historical developments existed, we assumed that zoning had prohibited such developments or other factors precluded such developments from being built in Torrance, and categorized the parcel as “Questionable.” Given that **Torrance recognizes the need to rezone 283 parcels (or approximately 62% of the sites we analyzed) to arrive at 4,483 units (or 71% of the units we analyzed)**, restrictive zoning may contribute to the lack of recent development projects at certain scales. We refrained from categorizing any site inventory parcel as “unreasonable” based on the historic development scale test.

Table 3: Analysis of Historic Development Scale Results (Test 1a)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	9%	1%
Questionable	91%	99%

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Test 1b – Historic Development in Zones

For site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed in the housing element, we conducted two other tests comparing the historic development patterns to the number of units claimed on sites in the site inventory.

Test 1b determined whether development occurred in the last 10 years on parcels whose zoning matches the zoning of the site in the inventory. Sites were categorized as “reasonable” if there was development in that zoning category in the last 10 years, or “unreasonable” if there was not.

Table 4: Analysis of Historic Development in Zones Results (Test 1b)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	79%	39%
Unreasonable	21%	61%

*This test was applicable on 38% of the sites we analyzed

Test 1c – Historic Development Scale in Zones

Test 1c compared the observed density of historic developments in a given zoning category to the claimed density of sites in the inventory in the same zoning category. This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the density of recent projects in the same zoning category, “questionable” if the parcel’s proposed density for redevelopment was within 10% of the maximum historic development density in the same zoning category, or “unreasonable” if the parcel’s proposed density for redevelopment exceeded 10% of the maximum historic development density in the same zoning category.

MAPCRAFT

Table 5: Analysis of Historic Development Scale in Zones Results (Test 1c)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	21%	15%
Questionable	54%	35%
Unreasonable	23%	49%

*This test was applicable on 30% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- Only 9% of the sites in the inventory have claimed densities that match recent developments in Torrance, which corresponds to a reasonable claim for just 1% of the units.
- Of sites where rezoning is not proposed, the vast majority (79%) of sites are in zones that have seen some scale of development in the last 10 years. However, these are typically zoned for low-density development. As a result, these sites contain less than two-fifths (39%) of the total claimed units on sites that will not be rezoned. Thus, just 21% of sites where rezoning is not proposed account for 61% of the related units.
- For sites in zones that have experienced development, less than one-quarter of the sites (21%) have claimed densities that are reasonable (i.e. less than the average density observed in those zones in the last 10 years). This accounts for 15% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- For sites in zones that have seen development, a little less than one-quarter of the sites (21%) have claimed densities that are unreasonable and greater than the average density observed in those zones in the last 10 years. However, this accounts for about half (49%) of the claimed units for this subset of sites.

2. Evaluation of Zoned Capacity

For site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed, MapCraft conducted tests based on the physical capacity of the zoning code, acknowledging that various zoning parameters might result in a lower effective capacity than the units per acre allowed in a zone. We collected several zoning attributes for each zone listed in the inventory, including maximum height limits, maximum FAR, maximum impervious coverage, minimum lot area per unit, maximum dwelling units per lot, and maximum dwelling units per acre. Using the zoning category noted for each site in Torrance’s site inventory, we estimated how many units could be accommodated on the site under the relevant zoning limits and compared the result to what was claimed in the site inventory.

This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the density resulting from any of the zoning attributes, “questionable” if the claimed density was less than the maximum density resulting from the majority of zoning attributes (e.g. based on height, based on FAR, etc.) but the claimed density was up to 10% greater than what one or more zoning attributes would accommodate, or “unreasonable” if the claimed density was greater than what a majority of zoning attributes would accommodate.

MAPCRAFT

Table 6: Evaluation of Zoned Capacity Results (Test 2)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	61%	79%
Questionable	2%	1%
Unreasonable	37%	19%

*This test was applicable on 38% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- A majority of the sites in the inventory that are not expected to be rezoned (61% of these sites), have density claims that are reasonable. This corresponds to 79% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- About 37% of the sites in the inventory that are not expected to be rezoned, have density claims that are unreasonable, but these sites account for just one fifth (19%) of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- These DUA limitations would impact both market-rate and 100% affordable projects.

3. Analysis of Site Inventory Pipeline

To understand the current conditions for housing development on site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed, MapCraft used the pipeline project data in Torrance’s site inventory as another way of determining what scales of development could be expected on other sites in the inventory. The scale of the pipeline projects planned on sites in a given zone provided a sample of real-world development densities for other developments in those Torrance zones. Our sample was limited to those sites in the inventory that could be matched to APNs through an address search, which represents just over two-fifths (42%) of the pipeline units. The limited samples were used to compare the development density (units per acre) of upcoming projects to the claimed density on each site in the inventory that was not expected to be rezoned.

This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the pipeline patterns in the zone, “questionable” if it was within 10% of the maximum pipeline development density, or “unreasonable” if it exceeded 10% of the maximum pipeline development density.

Table 7: Analysis of Site Inventory Pipeline Results (Test 3)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	67%	45%
Questionable	0%	0%
Unreasonable	33%	55%

*This test was applicable on 11% of the sites we analyzed

MAPCRAFT

Key Takeaways:

- This test was applicable for only 11% of the sites in the inventory, meaning that most of the sites (89%) are in zones that currently do not have any pending or approved projects listed among pipeline sites.
- The substantial majority of the sites (67%) that could be compared to pipeline projects in the same zone had claimed densities that are reasonable. This corresponds to 45% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.

4. Financial Feasibility Analysis (Market-Driven Development Expectations)

MapCraft assessed the financial viability of the claims made in the site inventory by evaluating the financial feasibility of developing housing at a scale similar to the densities claimed on each site in the inventory.

MapCraft used real estate pro formas to analyze the financial feasibility of a variety of housing development types. To determine whether the unit capacity claimed on each site in the inventory might be financially feasible, MapCraft evaluated the financial feasibility of development types that had densities that were within 10% of the claimed density on each site.

Pro forma analyses can help identify market feasible development types by determining whether the value of a potential development is greater than the project's construction costs, land costs, and other costs. MapCraft estimated the land cost for each site in the inventory, using the market values provided by the Torrance tax assessor. This comparison also helps to demonstrate that the existing use of a parcel is likely to be discontinued. Costs also included parking provision, which was tested in two ways: 1) based on current parking provision in the Torrance submarket and 2) assuming an aggressive reduction in mandated parking ratios and parking demand. To ensure the results reflected the market conditions applicable to each site in the inventory, the pro forma for each development type was run with the corresponding neighborhood-level market inputs.

Test 4a – Feasibility with Historic Parking Provision

For the first test, which considered parking provided at rates observed in existing development in the submarket, MapCraft categorized sites as “reasonable” if there were feasible development types that matched the scale of development claimed on each site. Sites were categorized as “questionable” if there were not feasible prototypes with similar densities. We did not include the option for an “unreasonable” result because this tested the feasibility of development using current observed parking provision, which may be higher than what is possible in new development today.

Table 8: Feasibility Analysis Results - historic parking provision (Test 4a)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	1%	2%
Questionable	99%	98%
Unreasonable	N/A	N/A

*This test was applicable on 96% of the sites we analyzed

MAPCRAFT

Test 4b – Feasibility with Reduced Parking Provision

The second test considered more lenient parking provision, which can contribute to development feasibility by reducing cost and saving space. MapCraft categorized sites as “questionable” if there were feasible development types that matched the scale of development claimed on each site. Sites were classified as “unreasonable” if the most financially feasible of the prototypes with similar densities could not pay for land based on the assessor’s estimate of total value. We did not include the option for a “reasonable” result for this test, given the more lenient parking assumptions may not be viable in all submarkets.

Table 9: Feasibility Analysis Results - reduced parking provision (Test 4b)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	N/A	N/A
Questionable	100%	100%
Unreasonable	0%	0%

*This test was applicable on 96% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- We found that today’s housing market does not support the scales of development claimed on most sites in the inventory.
- We found that today’s housing market could support the scales of development claimed on many sites in the inventory if less parking were demanded and required than what has historically been provided. The City could reduce or eliminate parking requirements and promote automobile alternatives to reduce households’ demand for parking, thereby making it economically feasible to develop multifamily housing in many areas.

Test Results of Alternative Rezoning Scenarios

We analyzed 453 sites to assess whether there was market potential to exceed the capacity claimed in the site inventory should Torrance upzone site inventory parcels more ambitiously than what’s proposed in the housing element. For this analysis, we considered all sites in the inventory, both the sites that Torrance is already planning to rezone and sites where the existing zoning is expected to persist.

We conducted two different tests, using MapCraft pro forma feasibility assessments (for more details, see approach outlined in Test 4) to estimate the market potential on the sites in the inventory. By comparing MapCraft’s market feasible unit estimates to the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory, we were able to identify sites where upzoning may yield more capacity than currently tabulated.

Test 5a – Maximum density of potential upzoned sites

As a first test, we considered the most intense housing options that could be feasibly built on each site. We first identified the array of feasible housing development prototypes on each site, which may include both high- and low-density housing options. In this case, financial feasibility was based

MAPCRAFT

on a development project’s prospects of paying more for the site than the current property value. We compared the housing capacity of the densest of those feasible prototypes to the capacity claimed in the site inventory to determine if further upzoning could yield more capacity.


Across all of the 453 sites that we analyzed, only 289 could be financially feasible for redevelopment at a capacity that exceeded the capacity proposed for the parcel in the site inventory. Of those sites, 126 were sites slated to be rezoned and 163 were sites that were not slated to be rezoned. The table and charts below show the resulting estimated units, based on the greatest density of development types that had market potential to displace the existing use, and how that estimate compares to the total claimed units in the inventory.

Table 10: Estimated Units from Max Density of Potential Upzones (Test 5a)

	Number of sites where feasible development exceeded claimed capacity (% of all inventoried sites in that category)	Potential Incremental Units Identified by Test 5a (Claimed Units)
Site planned for rezone in site inventory	126 (28%)	10,395 (1,566)
Site NOT planned for rezone in site inventory	163 (36%)	6,240 (918)

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Exhibit 3: Estimated Units from Max Density of Potential Upzones (Test 5a)



MAPCRAFT

Test 5b – Maximum feasibility of potential upzoning

We conducted a second test that considered the most financially feasible options that could be built on each site. As in Test 5a, we considered the array of feasible housing development prototypes on each site. For Test 5b, we compared the housing capacity of the most feasible prototype to the capacity claimed in the site inventory to determine if further upzoning could yield more capacity. Because the most feasible prototype could be lower density than other feasible prototypes, this approach produced more conservative outcomes than Test 5a.


Accordingly, there were 287 sites that had feasible development options with capacity that exceeded what was claimed in the site inventory. Of those sites, 126 were sites slated to be rezoned and 161 were sites that were not slated to be rezoned. The table and charts below show the resulting estimated units, based on the greatest density of development types that had market potential to displace the existing use, and how that estimate compares to the total claimed units in the inventory.

Table 11: Results of Test 5b

	Number of sites where feasible development exceeded claimed capacity (% of all inventoried sites in that category)	Potential Incremental Units Identified by Test 5a (Claimed Units)
Site planned for rezone in site inventory	126 (28%)	5,446 (1,566)
Site NOT planned for rezone in site inventory	161 (36%)	3,526 (895)

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Exhibit 4: Estimated Units from Max Feasibility of Potential Upzones (Test 5b)




MAPCRAFT

Given these results, we believe that there is substantial capacity “left on the table” for sites currently in the site inventory - for both sites already planned to be rezoned as well as sites not expected to be rezoned. But there are opportunities to identify additional parcels where market feasible capacity exists and add those sites to the proposed site inventory.

Viable upzoning opportunities exist in many parts of the City, and we observed concentrations of sites with greater market feasible housing capacity in the Old Town Torrance and Waltheria neighborhoods. These locations may be areas where Torrance could effectively add more market-feasible sites to the inventory by rezoning these sites to allow for denser development.

Exhibit 5: Map of Concentrations of Potential Upzoning Opportunities



MAPCRAFT

Key Takeaways:

- Additional capacity could be achieved on the majority of sites in the inventory where market-feasible opportunities to upzone exist. Inclusion of additional parcels in the site inventory, and potentially rezoning those parcels to allow denser development, will be needed in order to reasonably achieve the RHNA target.
- Comparing results from Test 5a to 5b, it appears that the most financially feasible development options may be less intense than other feasible development options in some cases. For example, for-sale townhomes may be more profitable than small rental apartment buildings with more housing units. For that reason, the city may consider establishing site utilization minimums so that sites redevelop at higher intensities.



February 28, 2022

Policy Recommendations for 6th Cycle Housing Element

Dear Planning staff:

YIMBY Law submits this letter to share our policy goals and recommendations for the Policies and Programs section of your Housing Element. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Housing Element process.

The Policies and Programs section of the city's Housing Element must respond to data, analysis and findings presented in the Housing Needs section. We repeatedly see findings that housing prices are high, segregation exists, and there is a lack of housing for special populations, but the Policies and Programs don't respond to these findings or try to change outcomes. The overview of the city's housing environment should set the scene, and the policies and programs should explain what the city is going to do to fix it.

Our policy goals are as follows:

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

- 1. Prioritize rezoning in high resource, historically exclusionary neighborhoods.** Many of the highest resource neighborhoods with the best access to jobs, good schools, and other amenities have histories of exclusion which are still reflected in their zoning. Cities should rezone to allow more housing opportunities in those neighborhoods, particularly those with low Vehicle Miles Traveled, as part of their

Housing Elements.

- 2. Establish a strong tenant protection ordinance so that new housing benefits everyone.** Development should not permanently displace current residents. Housing replacement programs, temporary housing vouchers, right of return, and demolition controls will create stability for renters while allowing new homes to be built for new households and to accommodate the growth associated with RHNA. In your sites inventory and rezoning programs, you should prioritize development on sites with owner-occupied housing & commercial uses over those with existing rent-controlled apartments or other rental housing with lower income residents.

- 3. Support homeownership opportunities for historically excluded groups.** Homeownership continues to be a path to building financial security and inter-generational wealth, which has been systematically denied to many Americans. As a society, we need to make this right by intentionally offering opportunities to communities who have been excluded. The housing element should identify opportunities to create a variety of for-sale housing types and create programs to facilitate property ownership among excluded groups.

Site Capacity

- 4. Adequately plan for density.** Ensure that a site's density will accommodate the number of homes that are projected to be built. In addition, make sure height limits, setback requirements, FAR, and other controls allow for adequate density and the ability to achieve a site's realistic capacity. Housing will not be feasible if you have a high density paired with low height limits. This density should be emphasized around jobs and transit and should go beyond the Mullin density in those areas.

- 5. Provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels, including a minimum No Net Loss buffer of 30%.** Not every site will be developed at maximum density during the eight-year planning period. Identify an ample amount of opportunity sites and zone the sites to accommodate lower-income housing types (usually a statutory minimum of 30 dwelling units per acre) to give the city the best chance at meeting its RHNA.

- 6. Use data from the 5th Cycle to calculate the likelihood of development for your 6th Cycle site inventory.** Likelihood of development is a measure of the probability of an inventory site being developed during the planning period. The median likelihood of development across the state is 25%, meaning only one of every four sites will likely be developed during the planning period for the median city. Incorporating the likelihood of development into the zoned capacity will set the city up to successfully achieve their RHNA, making the housing element less of a paper exercise and more of an actionable, functional document.

Accessory Dwelling Units

- 7. Commit to an automatic mid-cycle adjustment if ADU permitting activity is lower than estimated in the housing element.** We highly recommend complying with HCD's standards of using one of its "safe harbor" methodologies to anticipate future ADU production. However, if the city is optimistic about ADU growth, then creating an automatic mid-cycle adjustment will automatically facilitate alternative housing options (i.e., a rezoning program, removing development constraints, ADU incentives, etc.) if the city falls behind the estimated ADU production.
- 8. Incentivize new ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers.** Consider offering low- or no-interest loans, forgivable loans, impact fee waivers for ADUs that are 750 square feet or larger, allowances to facilitate two-story and second-story ADU construction, etc.

Zoning

- 9. Allow residential to be built in areas that are zoned for commercial use.** There are a myriad of ways to do this, but a housing overlay is one common policy. Additionally, consider eliminating new commercial space in mixed-use developments where there is not a strong demand or there is otherwise a glut of commercial space that is unused or frequently vacant.
- 10. Allow flexibility in inclusionary zoning.** Cities should require different percentages for different AMI levels. Additionally, we urge cities to incentivize land

dedication to affordable developers in order for market-rate developers to meet their inclusionary requirements. Avoid getting trapped into thinking that the affordable units must be “sprinkled throughout” the market-rate units, or require the market-rate units to look exactly the same as the affordable ones. This should be balanced against not locating all of the affordable units in one place and ghettoizing neighborhoods by creating or perpetuating racially concentrated areas of poverty.

Better Entitlement Process & Reducing Barriers to Development

- 11. Ensure that the city has a ministerial process for housing permitting, especially multi-family housing, and remove impact fees for deed-restricted housing.** A discretionary process for housing development creates uncertainty and adds to the cost of construction. For example, multi-family housing should not require a conditional use permit or city council approval unless the builder is asking for unique and extraordinary concessions. Right-sizing governmental constraints, entitlement processes, and impact fees will help the city successfully meet its RHNA.
- 12. Reduce parking standards and eliminate parking minimums.** Minimum parking requirements are a major constraint on housing, especially for lower cost housing types. They can cost in excess of \$30,000 per spot and can raise rents by as much as 17%, and eliminating them is particularly important for smaller & other spatially constrained sites. Consider adopting a parking maximum.
- 13. Cap fees on all new housing.** Most construction costs are outside the City’s control, but reducing impact fees can demonstrate that a city is serious about building new housing. At a minimum, cities should delay the collection of impact fees until the issuance of the certificate of occupancy to reduce financial impacts on new housing and make the units cheaper by not asking the developer to carry impact fee charges or debt throughout the construction phase.
- 14. Provide local funding.** One of the largest barriers to building new affordable homes is the lack of city/county funds available to assemble sites, provide gap funding, and to pay for dedicated staff. Without new funding, especially at the local level, we will not be able to build more affordable homes. There are three

new revenue streams that should be considered: 1) **Transfer tax**, a one-time payment levied by a jurisdiction on the sale of a home, may be utilized to raise much needed revenue to fund affordable homes; 2) **Vacancy tax** may be collected on vacant land to convince landowners to sell their underutilized properties and be used to fund the construction of affordable homes; 3) **Commercial linkage** fees should be adopted or revisited for increases on new commercial developments.

We urge you to include these policies in your 6th cycle Housing Element.

Best regards,

Sonja Trauss

Executive Director

YIMBY Law

sonja@yimbylaw.org



March 4, 2022

Michelle Ramirez
City of Torrance
Email: mramirez@torranceca.gov

RE: Torrance's failure to timely adopt a Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

Dear Ms. Ramirez:

Californians for Homeownership is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization that uses impact litigation to address California's housing crisis. We are monitoring local compliance with the law governing housing elements. Our understanding is that the City has not adopted a sixth cycle housing element, which it was required to do by October 15, 2021.¹ It also missed the second compliance deadline of February 12, 2022, subjecting it to additional penalties.² We are currently preparing for litigation against cities that have not timely adopted housing elements, like yours.

In light of the City's failure to timely adopt its housing element, our organization could immediately sue the City under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 to compel it to adopt a compliant housing element.³ As a result of this litigation, in addition to being ordered to adopt a housing element on a short timeline,⁴ the City could also face a number of serious penalties. For example, the court could suspend all non-residential permitting,⁵ or could judicially approve housing development projects within the City.⁶ And the court could impose these penalties while the litigation is pending, even before reaching a final decision.⁷ Housing element litigation is given priority in the court system,⁸ and a successful plaintiff can obtain attorneys' fees under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5. Indeed, in a recent case involving the City of Huntington Beach's housing element, a court awarded another non-profit organization over \$3.5 million in fees.⁹

The purpose of this letter is to offer the City a pathway to avoid immediate litigation by our organization. Enclosed is an Acknowledgment that sets forth some of the penalties to which the City is currently subject in light of the City's failure to adopt a housing element. If the City signs and returns the Acknowledgment, we will not initiate litigation against the City at this time.

¹ Gov. Code § 65588(e)(3).

² Gov. Code §§ 65583(c)(1)(A), 65583.2(c), and 65588(e)(4)(C).

³ Gov. Code §§ 65587, 65751.

⁴ Gov. Code § 65754.

⁵ Gov. Code § 65755(a)(1).

⁶ Gov. Code § 65755(a)(4).

⁷ Gov. Code § 65757.

⁸ Gov. Code § 65752.

⁹ <https://www.communitylegalsocal.org/kennedy-commission-awarded-3-5-million-in-attorneys-fees-for-advocacy-in-huntington-beach-low-income-housing-case/>



March 4, 2022

Page 2

We ask that you return the Acknowledgement by March 11, 2022. If you decline to do so, understand that we may initiate litigation against the City, using the City's refusal to acknowledge these basic requirements of state housing law to demonstrate the existence of a dispute necessitating judicial intervention. As part of the litigation, we would likely seek a judicial declaration that the City is subject to the same penalties described in the Acknowledgment, among other remedies. We have dedicated in-house resources sufficient to maintain at least 10 simultaneous housing element lawsuits as part of our commitment to enforcing this important aspect of state housing law.

We look forward to receiving the signed Acknowledgment. If you would like to discuss any of this with me, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (213) 739-8206.

Sincerely,



Matthew Gelfand

cc: Patrick Sullivan, Esq., City Attorney (by email to psullivan@torranceca.gov)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The City of Torrance hereby acknowledges that it has not timely adopted a sixth cycle revised housing element of its general plan within the deadline set forth in Government Code Section 65588, and that its housing element is therefore not in substantial compliance with Article 10.6 of the Government Code. As a result, the City is subject to the following:

1. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 65583(c)(1)(A), 65583.2(c), and 65588(e)(4)(C), the City will be required to complete any rezoning required under housing element law in connection with the City’s sixth cycle housing element by October 15, 2022.

2. The City is currently prohibited from rejecting housing development projects based on subdivisions (d)(1) and (d)(5) of the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), Government Code Section 65589.5. The City acknowledges that this means that, unless another exception within subdivision (d) applies, the City is prohibited from using its general plan and zoning standards to reject a proposal that meets the affordability requirements described in subdivision (h)(3) of the HAA.

The public, including without limitation any applicant to develop any project involving residential units, may rely on this Acknowledgment as the City’s binding commitment to comply with the provisions of state law described above.

DATED: _____, 2022

CITY OF TORRANCE

By: _____
[Signature]

[Name]

Its: _____
[Title]

Leo,

Thank you for the detailed voicemail.

Carolyn,

Thank you as well for all of your time on the phone. As discussed, please let us know what we can do to help advise the City of Torrance regarding "market conditions" in your tailoring of any Zoning Ordinance updates where housing and/or mixed use is concerned. It is important to create the right balance and flexibility to create win/win developments for the community and to help meet your RHNA goals. Generally, older ULI concepts of vertically/horizontally integrated mixed use have evolved with the onslaught of internet retail. The necessity for this change can be witnessed by the high vacancy rate of commercial in non-core/downtown areas and mixed use communities.

Of particular focus, we'd suggest a re-visit of commercial standards along the **Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan**. We believe that the 25% gross floor area requirement has prohibited significant residential development on the corridor. Not only has the market shifted from needing this much commercial, but the parking requirements directly affect capabilities to develop meaningful residential. This is especially true in those Districts that allow lesser maximum densities of 27 units/acre.

Our division has been involved with over 10,000 units of residential development in Southern California and we have included some case studies for your reference.

Please let us know how we can be of service and we wish you all the best in your General Plan and Zoning Updates.

Sincerely,

Greg Sullivan | First Vice President | Lic. 00920305
CBRE | Infill Land
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 100 | Newport Beach, CA 92660

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] www.cbre.com/greg.sullivan

Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message.

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 3:41 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: HBCSP (Promenade District)

External

Hi Greg,

Per my voicemail, if you have any questions I can be reached directly at [REDACTED]

For questions related to the Housing Element Update, please contact Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate, copied with this email. Ms. Chun can also be reached by telephone at [REDACTED]

LEO OORTS

Senior Planning Associate – Community Development Department
City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia | www.TorranceCA.Gov/COVID19

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 10:02 AM

To: [REDACTED] >

Subject: HBCSP (Promenade District)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Hi,

Just looking for more details on the 25% gross floor commercial requirements and if visitor parking and community amenities would be allowed within the 100' setback from Hawthorne for the benefit of the residential component. Also, interested if any changes being proposed to the SP in the current Housing Element Update?

Thanks,
Greg

Greg Sullivan | First Vice President | Lic. 00920305
[CBRE | Infill Land](#)
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 100 | Newport Beach, CA 92660

[REDACTED] www.cbre.com/greg.sullivan

Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message.

5. Committee Meetings and Announcements

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by the State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The revised Draft Housing Element Update was made available for public review on the City's Website until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the City, but not necessarily directly addressed.

The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include “Housing Element Update” in the subject line of any correspondence.



Explore



Settings



Tweet



9:36 AM · Apr 14, 2022 · Twitter Web App

Search Twitter

By signing up, you agree to the [Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), including [Cookie Use](#).

Relevant people



City of Torrance
@TorranceCA

Follow

This is the official Twitter page for the City of Torrance, California.

What's happening


NHL · LIVE

Hurricanes at Bruins



Input · Earlier today


"A complete, colossal failure":
The story of VENN, the TV network that vanished



USA TODAY · This morning



Search Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government
April 14 at 9:26 AM · 🌐

The revised Housing Element Update document has been posted on the City's website, Monday April 11. The revised Draft Housing Element Update is available for public review at www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022.

👍👎🗨️ 7

1 Comment 11 Shares



Like



Comment



Share

Most relevant ▾



Sandra Goetz

so 50% of the mandated RHINA number is roughly 2500 units of low income housing.

Like Reply 3w



Write a comment...



Subject: Notice of Public Hearing - Housing Element Update

Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 at 5:09:55 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Chun, Carolyn

To: Lodan, Gregg

CC: Joe, Kevin

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:

Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969

Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Subject: FW: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 at 10:44:46 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Chun, Carolyn
To: Patricia Bluman, Claudia Tedford
CC: Lodan, Gregg, Joe, Kevin

Fyi

This was sent out to the Old Torrance Neighborhood Association

From: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Subject: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good morning, OTNA Members! The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State's overall housing need.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying the State's overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State's housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The Revised Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link: <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the city, but not necessarily directly addressed.

Debbie Hays 😊

Community Relations, OTNA

www.OldTorranceNeighbors.org

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Comment received from mark hansen

From: Yahoo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2022 9:55 AM
To: Chun, Carolyn [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: REVISED DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed for the City of Torrance bases on a 7% when in reality it was only 0.07% or 1% of the prediction of 7%.

Per the recent Los Angeles County Census there are 2.6 people per household. Housing Element # 6 requires that 4939 households with 2.6 people be constructed during that time frame. That will increase the population of Torrance by 12,841.

The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Torrance section 4.7 Projected Water Demand states " Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD." Those numbers assume we do not experience a serious drought .

2020
URBAN WATER
MANAGEMENT PLAN
CITY OF TORRANCE

4.7 PROJECTED WATER DEMAND

Future water use projections must consider significant factors on water demand, such as development and/or redevelopment, and climate patterns, among other less significant factors that affect water demand. Although redevelopment is expected to be an ongoing process, it is not expected to significantly impact water use since the City is already in a "built-out" condition. Rainfall, however, will continue to be a major influence on demand as drought conditions will increase demand at a time when these supplies are limited, and may therefore result in water use restrictions in accordance with the City's Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 3717 and Ordinance 3782). As the City's population continues to grow incrementally over time and as water conservation measures continue to be implemented, the City should experience only minor increases in its water consumption over the long term, due mostly to overall population increases along with limited redevelopment. Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD.

So an increase in Torrance population of 12,841 people at a water demand of around 142 GPCD will require an increase of water usage of 1,823,422 gallons per day. Because Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of water on the City of Torrance with no help from the state where is this additional water reserve going to come from?

Also, Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of sewage on the City of Torrance and again there is no help from the state to address the additional impact this will have on the City's limited waste water system infrastructure .

The States Electrical Grid is already at its breaking point and now with the push to stop the sale of gas powered vehicles by 2035 by Governor Newsome and go electric where is this additional electrical power going to come from and how is this electricity going to be transmitted on a limited and antiquated electrical grid?

In conclusion, the State is requiring the City of Torrance to implement a policy that is not attainable because of limited resources in the form of water, electrical, and infrastructure which will lead to a deterioration of our quality of life. Its unfair for the state to mandate this type of policy without first identifying if there are the basic resources that can support their lofty endeavors.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

5. Committee Meetings and Announcements

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by the State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The revised Draft Housing Element Update was made available for public review on the City's Website until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the City, but not necessarily directly addressed.

The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include “Housing Element Update” in the subject line of any correspondence.



Explore

⚙ Settings



Tweet



9:36 AM · Apr 14, 2022 · Twitter Web App

🔍 Search Twitter

By signing up, you agree to the [Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), including [Cookie Use](#).

Relevant people



City of Torrance ✓
@TorranceCA


Follow

This is the official Twitter page for the City of Torrance, California.

What's happening

NHL · LIVE

Hurricanes at Bruins



Input · Earlier today


"A complete, colossal failure":
The story of VENN, the TV network that vanished



USA TODAY · This morning



Search Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government
April 14 at 9:26 AM · 🌐

The revised Housing Element Update document has been posted on the City's website, Monday April 11. The revised Draft Housing Element Update is available for public review at www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022.

👍👎🗨️ 7

1 Comment 11 Shares

Like Comment Share

Most relevant ▾



Sandra Goetz
so 50% of the mandated RHINA number is roughly 2500 units of low income housing.

Like Reply 3w



Write a comment...



Subject: Notice of Public Hearing - Housing Element Update

Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 at 5:09:55 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Chun, Carolyn

To: Lodan, Gregg

CC: Joe, Kevin

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:

Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969

Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Subject: FW: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 at 10:44:46 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Chun, Carolyn
To: Patricia Bluman, Claudia Tedford
CC: Lodan, Gregg, Joe, Kevin

Fyi

This was sent out to the Old Torrance Neighborhood Association

From: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Subject: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good morning, OTNA Members! The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State's overall housing need.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying the State's overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State's housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The Revised Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link: <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the city, but not necessarily directly addressed.

Debbie Hays 😊

Community Relations, OTNA

www.OldTorranceNeighbors.org

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Comment received from mark hansen

From: Yahoo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2022 9:55 AM
To: Chun, Carolyn [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: REVISED DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed for the City of Torrance bases on a 7% when in reality it was only 0.07% or 1% of the prediction of 7%.

Per the recent Los Angeles County Census there are 2.6 people per household. Housing Element # 6 requires that 4939 households with 2.6 people be constructed during that time frame. That will increase the population of Torrance by 12,841.

The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Torrance section 4.7 Projected Water Demand states " Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD." Those numbers assume we do not experience a serious drought .

2020
URBAN WATER
MANAGEMENT PLAN
CITY OF TORRANCE

4.7 PROJECTED WATER DEMAND

Future water use projections must consider significant factors on water demand, such as development and/or redevelopment, and climate patterns, among other less significant factors that affect water demand. Although redevelopment is expected to be an ongoing process, it is not expected to significantly impact water use since the City is already in a "built-out" condition. Rainfall, however, will continue to be a major influence on demand as drought conditions will increase demand at a time when these supplies are limited, and may therefore result in water use restrictions in accordance with the City's Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 3717 and Ordinance 3782). As the City's population continues to grow incrementally over time and as water conservation measures continue to be implemented, the City should experience only minor increases in its water consumption over the long term, due mostly to overall population increases along with limited redevelopment. Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD.

So an increase in Torrance population of 12,841 people at a water demand of around 142 GPCD will require an increase of water usage of 1,823,422 gallons per day. Because Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of water on the City of Torrance with no help from the state where is this additional water reserve going to come from?

Also, Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of sewage on the City of Torrance and again there is no help from the state to address the additional impact this will have on the City's limited waste water system infrastructure .

The States Electrical Grid is already at its breaking point and now with the push to stop the sale of gas powered vehicles by 2035 by Governor Newsome and go electric where is this additional electrical power going to come from and how is this electricity going to be transmitted on a limited and antiquated electrical grid?

In conclusion, the State is requiring the City of Torrance to implement a policy that is not attainable because of limited resources in the form of water, electrical, and infrastructure which will lead to a deterioration of our quality of life. Its unfair for the state to mandate this type of policy without first identifying if there are the basic resources that can support their lofty endeavors.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

Section 2

[Presents the results of the online polling from Community Workshop 1, and the survey from Community Workshop 2.](#)

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”](#)

Deleted: Workshop Notices and full Workshop Summaries for the 3 Community Workshops.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE SURVEY

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The Draft Housing Element Update is available for review on the City's Website and will be presented to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 7:00 pm. This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd. The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Workshop 1 Live Poll and Results
April 28, 2021

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
1. Are you a _____:		
a. Torrance resident	7/13	54%
b. Torrance landlord	1/13	8%
c. Torrance business owner	0/13	0%
d. Developer of market-rate housing	3/13	23%
e. Developer of affordable housing	1/13	8%
f. Representative of service agency serving Torrance residents	2/13	15%
g. None of the above	2/13	15%


Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
2. How long have you lived in Torrance?		
a. Less than 5 years	1	8%
b. 5-10 years	0	0%
c. More than 10 years	6	50%
d. None of the above	5	42%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
3. Which group do you think has the highest need for housing and related services in the community? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Seniors	4/10	40%
b. Persons with disabilities	0/10	0%
c. Young adults	9/10	90%
d. Families with children	7/10	70%
e. Homeless	4/10	40%
f. Veterans	1/10	10%
g. Others	1/10	10%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
4. Which housing type is most needed in the City of Torrance? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Single-family homes (detached)	1/10	10%
b. Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units	7/10	70%
c. Residential Mixed-use (residential use with commercial or office components)	6/10	60%
d. Transitional or Supportive Housing (affordable or special needs housing linked to supportive services, particularly for persons experiencing homelessness or with disabilities)	4/10	40%
e. Rental	7/10	70%
f. Senior (age restricted)	0/10	0%
g. Assisted Living Facilities	1/10	10%
h. Affordable Housing (restricted by deed or special agreement)	2/10	20%
i. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU or second unit/granny flat)	2/10	20%
j. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless	3/10	30%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
5. Is streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities an important consideration for the City?		
a. Yes	5	50%
b. No	2	20%
c. No preference	1	10%
d. I do not know	2	20%

Screenshot of Housing Element Workshop Survey on Facebook



Workshop 2
Survey Questions and Results
August 2021

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
1. Did you participate in the first Housing Element Workshop in April of 2021?		
a. Yes	19	32%
b. No	40	68%

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
2. Please select 2 preferred strategies for ways to accommodate the RHNA in Torrance.		
a. Actively encourage production of ADUs	9	15%
b. Change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to mixed-use	40	68%
c. Change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to multifamily residential	27	46%
d. Change zoning of certain industrial sites to multifamily residential	25	42%
e. Other	17	29%

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
3. What is your preferred method to increase density to accommodate the 6 th cycle RHNA?		
a. Increase the density for most or all residential uses (stand-alone and/or mixed-use if allowed) throughout Torrance	13	22%
b. Increase the density or establish higher density for residential uses (stand-alone and/or mixed-use) along key commercial corridors	46	78%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
4. Which housing type is most needed in the City of Torrance? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Single-family homes (detached)	1/10	10%
b. Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units	7/10	70%
c. Residential Mixed-use (residential use with commercial or office components)	6/10	60%
d. Transitional or Supportive Housing (affordable or special needs housing linked to supportive services, particularly for persons experiencing homelessness or with disabilities)	4/10	40%
e. Rental	7/10	70%
f. Senior (age restricted)	0/10	0%
g. Assisted Living Facilities	1/10	10%
h. Affordable Housing (restricted by deed or special agreement)	2/10	20%
i. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU or second unit/granny flat)	2/10	20%
j. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless	3/10	30%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
5. Is streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities an important consideration for the City?		
a. Yes	5	50%
b. No	2	20%
c. No preference	1	10%
d. I do not know	2	20%

Section 3

Presents the full Workshop Summaries for the 3 Community Workshops.

New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”

Deleted: Online polling results from **Community Workshop 1**, and **¶** survey results from **Community Workshop 2**

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP #1

Special Planning Commission Workshop

April 28, 2021

MEETING SUMMARY

The City of Torrance held its first community workshop regarding the update of the 6th Cycle Housing Element (2021-2029). Staff from the Community Development Department introduced the workshop and answered questions. A PowerPoint presentation was provided by members of the consultant team, who also answered questions. The PowerPoint presentation provided at the workshop can be viewed at

<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67532/637631623241100000>.

Below is a summary of the discussion, questions, and input from the workshop. The minutes from the workshop are available at <https://www.torranceca.gov/government/city-clerk/commissions-and-advisory-boards/planning-commission/agendas-and-minutes/-folder-5015/-npage-3>.

Opening Questions from Planning Commission Members:

- What does “Housing for All” mean?
 - A. It is about access to fair housing, not actually providing housing for everyone that requires it.
- Would City have to come up with laws for rent control?
 - A. It would not be necessary. There are already measures in place that can accommodate fair housing requirements. Rent control is not required.
- What do the timelines look like?
 - A. The City is mandated to prepare a draft Housing Element and send it to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) first to get comments. HCD has up to 60 days for their review. The City then tries to resolve the comments within 60 days. Once the comments are resolved, the plan can be adopted. The City can utilize the grace period of 120 days beyond the official deadline of October 15, 2021, so the City has until February 12, 2022, to adopt the Housing Element.
- Does the General Plan have to be amended?
 - A. The current Housing Element expires on October 15, 2021, so there needs to be a replacement, which is considered an amendment of the General Plan.
- How does this affect the Hawthorne Corridor?
 - A. Another project team is working on the Housing Corridor study so this question would have to go to the other consulting team. The Hawthorne

Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan is separate from the Housing Element and the Housing Corridor Study, although both may provide sites for the Housing Element.

Planning Commission Questions about the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA):

- What is the RHNA appeal process and who does it go through? What if the Planning Commission doesn't agree with the rejection (of the City's appeal)?
 - A. SCAG officially adopted the RHNA and there is no avenue to change it once it is adopted. State law limits the appeal process.
- What if we don't agree with the RHNA?
 - A. Consultant and City staff both explained that the City is moving forward with the numbers it was assigned. If there are further actions the Council wishes to take, that would be a parallel process. 54 jurisdictions appealed the RHNA and only 2 were approved, one due to a math error in calculation.
- What qualifies for low income tier, senior living facilities, hospital zones?
 - A. Some independent senior living facilities and the Cabrillo Family Apartments, and perhaps some older units in the City qualify as low to moderate income units.
- Concern expressed about traffic with increased densities.
 - A. One strategy is to look for housing near transit.
- Question about how ADU numbers impact the RHNA? Can they be counted?
 - A. Explanation provided about making assumptions of future accessory dwelling units (ADUs) based on averaging the past 3 year's trends. SCAG's affordability review determines how many can be counted toward the low income RHNA numbers.
- What factors accounted for the 250% increase in RHNA for Torrance?
 - A. Two main reasons: One is that the last cycle (5th cycle housing element) was done in a recession, so the projection was substantially lower. The current 6th cycle is at the peak of the housing market, which accounts for the inflation. The other main reason is new legislation that requires the RHNA to not just project future need but make up for housing that was not built in previous decades, and also requiring the RHNA consider the cost burden of paying for housing on households.
- What is the purpose of public input if the City cannot challenge the RHNA?
 - A. Public input is needed regarding where to accommodate the units and other policies and programs. Numbers, sites, and strategies will all be discussed in future workshops.

- Since California's population has decreased as shown by the recent census, could the RHNA be changed?
 - A. Nothing will affect the current RHNA, but there might be future legislation that could reflect the change.
- A few additional questions were asked, specifically relating to State law and how the RHNA could be amended.
 - A. The RHNA process is complete, and the City must plan for the allocated units.
- Would a standard development without a low income component still count toward the RHNA?
 - A. Yes, it would count toward the RHNA category of moderate and above.
- Would the RHNA be affected in any way if people living in cars in parking lots were allowed to do so?
 - A. The RHNA is related to housing units, so the answer is no.
- Do mobile homes count for the RHNA?
 - A. Yes, if they are parked, but not when they are being towed around.
- How can we build 2400 low and very low income units in just 8 years?
 - A. It is in those 8 years that Torrance should be trying to accommodate those units, plus plan for a buffer of additional units in case some of the units are lost to a different use.
- Question about understanding non-profit builder activity, and if units must be rented for a certain cost?
 - A. City staff responded with an example: For the Cabrillo Family Housing development, the City bought the land with the intention of a non-profit builder constructing in the range of 39 to 44 affordable rental units. Regulations are in place for what the rents can be. Most affordable housing requires multiple layers of assistance or subsidies. They also sometimes use low income tax credits which makes rent affordable.
- Statement that City would need to rezone ½ to ¼ of industrial land to residential to accommodate the new density requirements.
 - A. Since there is very little vacant land in the City, redevelopment of existing land will be needed.
- Comment: How will we call ourselves a balanced City? If we meet all the State's requirements, we have no ability to change that imbalance.
- How do we motivate people to actually build these units?
 - A. The density bonus (state-mandated) can help. With a density bonus, a developer can increase the number of units in exchange for a lower parking ratio, or lower open space requirements, as examples.

Miscellaneous Questions from the Planning Commission:

- Is there any plan to use the Del Amo Mall or the Toyota property for housing, such as condominiums?
 - A. Malls around the country are incorporating housing in close proximity, and mall owners seem very receptive to the idea.
- What is the connection between the CEQA process and the Housing Element? Does CEQA have an effect on the RHNA?
 - A. They are on a parallel track, and CEQA has no effect on the RHNA.

Public Comment from Meeting Participants:

Participant #1: Renter – likes the idea of affordable housing everywhere in Torrance. City should establish rent control. Use empty lots. People should have a place to park if they have to live in cars. Affordable units shouldn't be segregated. High rise development is good.

Participant #2: Shared four points –

1. Submitted printed material for the public record.
2. Public Outreach – City must do diligent outreach, to include renters, minorities and underrepresented persons. Needs to be across all income levels.
3. AFFH (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) – City cannot put all affordable housing in one place. It should be spread out and near high opportunity areas.
4. The policies and programs section of the Housing Element should be comprised of aiding underrepresented individuals in Torrance.
5. Question from a Planning Commissioner for the Participant – Do you have a concern about outreach?
 - A. Participant: I think more can be done to be more inclusive.

Participant #3:

- Question – can two adjacent cities share their response to the RHNA if they combined them?
 - A. There is no state provision to allow for that currently. There was once such a provision that is now expired.
- Question - Can the public review the draft Housing Element prior to the 2nd Housing Element Workshop?
 - A. If there are materials to provide the public in advance of the second workshop, they will be put on the City's website. The Housing Element will not be ready for public review at that time. (*Subsequent note:* the Draft Housing Element will be put on the City's website prior to the 3rd public workshop, before the draft Housing Element is submitted to HCD.)



Closing Comments from Planning Commissioners:

- Question regarding whether the City's standard procedure for notification of opportunities for outreach meets state guidelines?
 - A. City has gone above and beyond the necessary requirements for outreach, and have also reached out to affordable housing developers, social service agencies, HOAs, and others.
- Comment: Torrance has approximately 150,000 residents, so the RHNA requirement is less than 4% of the population. RHNA requirements may not be so detrimental as led to believe at first.
 - A. City is looking for ways to accommodate the number and reduce the negative effect on the existing residents.
- Comment: The strategies put forward will help with this endeavor.

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP #2

Community Workshop

July 28, 2021

MEETING SUMMARY

The City of Torrance held its second community workshop regarding the update of the 6th Cycle Housing Element (2021-2029). Due to technical difficulties, the workshop started nearly 30 minutes late. Twenty-one members of the public participated via Zoom. Staff from the Community Development Department introduced the workshop and answered questions. A PowerPoint presentation was provided by members of the consultant teams who are preparing the Housing Element and the Housing Corridor Study; they also answered questions. The PowerPoint presentation provided at the workshop can be viewed at <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67530/637631557256430000>. Below is a summary of the discussion, questions, and input from the workshop. There were no formal minutes taken.

Public Comment from Meeting Participants:

Early in the presentation a participant asked if the presenter was using her own words or the State's Housing Element and legislation language. The presenter replied she was summarizing State Housing Element guidance.

Participant #1: Comment – Participant has spent the better part of three years fighting the State's efforts to take away local control, including zoning control from local governments. Expressed concern over proposed State changes to zoning that would affect single-family neighborhoods and urged the other participants to contact their legislators to tell them to vote no on this proposed legislation. Personal preference is to have the City continue to fight the RHNA numbers. Concerns include possible densification of existing neighborhoods with no required upgrades to infrastructure. Also expressed disagreement with relaxing parking requirements and used an example of a senior development in the City where visitors have considerable difficulty finding parking. Expressed concern about the proposed Butcher Solano project, and said it is proposed on the site of a toxic waste dump.

City staff responded that one of the goals of this effort is to try to preserve the City's single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident's desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance. That is why the focus is on corridors and underutilized parcels. Staff also explained that the City has also been actively following State housing legislation and responding when concerns arise about proposed legislation.

Participant #1: Questions

- Q. How do the Border Avenue renderings compliment Old Torrance?
 - A. The Housing Corridor Study is in the initial phases and the renderings provided this evening are just examples of possible building types and styles. There will be more opportunity for community input as the project progresses.
- Q. Where are the sites specifically in the Riviera neighborhood?
 - A. The City will post **the list of the draft Sites Inventory and Map on the City's website** so that all interested parties can view them. The power point presentation and meeting summary will be posted as well. The presenter explained that some of the sites in the Riviera area are religious institution properties and provided additional detail regarding new State legislation that allows religious facilities to build affordable housing on 50% of their parking lots. Further clarification was provided that this is not an effort to get rid of religious institutions, rather responding to the fact that some religious institutions find that they have excess parking and are expressing interest in looking further into this possibility.

Participant #2: Comment – South Torrance homeowner – Noted that he had submitted written comments. Stated that this Housing Element work will put a dent in the housing crisis in the City. Provided statistics about how homelessness in the City has grown by nine times over the past 10 years, increasing from approximately 30 persons to over 300, and 45% of renters in the City experience a cost burden which means they must pay over 30% of their income for housing.

Participant #2: Questions

- Q. How are you estimating development potential in terms of realistic capacity, so we actually see growth in our housing stock?
 - A. Staff responded that we are talking to property owners and developers, and looking at land value and vacancies, trying to be as accurate as possible.
- Q. How are the sites being distributed and how are you ensuring equal distribution?
 - A. While the corridors identified for the Corridor Study are in the more centralized part of the City, corridors are located in all Council districts in the City except for one. For the current draft Sites Inventory, the sites are pretty well distributed in all locations in the City.

Participant #3: Comment – Student – Stated appreciation for efforts to make Torrance more walkable. Referred to climate crisis as well as housing crisis, so likes the idea of locating new residential development on or near transit to support fewer cars. Favors mixed-use developments spread equitably throughout the City, which also encourages people to shop locally. Encourages revitalization of the City and neighborhoods by getting rid of large parking lots of which the City has too many.

Participant #4 – Questions

- Q. For the parcels the City has identified as needing changed from being zoned Light Industrial to Residential (referring to the Housing Corridor Study), how does that get accomplished? Does the City propose to use eminent domain or condemnation?
 - A. City staff responded that the City is using a public process to study the issues and will continue to involve the property owners as the process moves forward. The City

will initiate the required zone changes if the Council decides to do so. The City would create the standards that would streamline development as a part of the rezoning process. There are no plans to use eminent domain or condemnation.

- Q. How do we express how we feel about the proposed changes?
 - A. Staff encouraged the participant to write letters and continue to attend the workshops for both the Housing Element update and the Housing Corridor Study. The City will post a poll online to replace the polling questions that were to be used before the City experienced technical difficulties with the workshop this evening. Also, please **continue to monitor the City's Housing Element website** and the Housing Corridor Study website. Provide written comments to cddinfo@Torrance.gov.

Participant #5 – Comment - Thanked the City and consultants for the presentation. Urged City staff and team to reach out to affected homeowners. Stated that the participant is a leader of a religious institution.

Participant #5 Question


- Q. Asked for additional information about the ability of religious institutions to build housing on their parking lots; unfamiliar with this legislation?
 - A. Presenter explained that the legislation is AB 1851. It requires a City to allow religious institutions to build affordable housing on their existing parking lot without requiring them to replace any lost parking, as an incentive. Some cities are placing what is often referred to as a “**Congregational Overlay**” on these properties to encourage and incentivize this type of development and mentioned Pasadena as a recent example. In response to a follow-up question by another participant, the presenter clarified that parking can be reduced up to 50% for religious institutions if used for affordable housing, without have to replace the parking; the legislation does not require that institutions be allowed to reduce parking to zero.

Miscellaneous Participant Questions and Staff/Consultant Responses:

- Q. Will congregational housing units be paying property taxes?
 - A. **City staff will research the answer to that question and respond either online or at a future Housing Element workshop.**

New Information

Added: April 2022



City of Torrance

Housing Element Update: Workshop #3

Planning Commission

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

7:00 p.m.

Meet the Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager

Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate

Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



Agenda

Housing Element Update

- Summary of HE Workshops 1 and 2
- Draft Housing Element
- Accommodating the RHNA, Goals and Programs
- Public Outreach
- Next Steps
- Comments, Questions, & Discussion

Next Steps

Workshop 1: Overview

What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for meeting the City's share of regional housing needs as determined by the State
- Provides an assessment of the City's housing needs and how best to accommodate the housing needs
- The City "plans for" housing so that developers can build projects consistent with the City's General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other planning documents

Housing Element Requirements:

- Accommodate projected housing demand, as mandated by the State
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet this demand
- Improve the safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate the development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all

Workshop 1: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

State (HCD):

Assesses total number of housing units needed statewide; assigns each region their share

SCAG Region:

1,341,827 units

SCAG then allocates units to each jurisdiction in the region

Los Angeles County:

813,082 units

City of Torrance:

4,939 units

Workshop 1: Torrance RHNA (by Income Category)


Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 – 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes “Extremely Low,” which is up to 30% of AMI

Workshop 1: RHNA Comparison with Nearby Cities



Workshop 1: Housing Element Strategies and CEQA

- Discussed initial strategies to accommodate the RHNA, such as:
 - Use leftover vacant/underutilized sites from 5th Cycle Housing Element; identify entitled projects and pipeline projects; estimate potential ADUs
 - Facilitate housing on religious institution properties
 - Housing Corridor Study
 - Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan
 - Encourage ADU production
- CEQA:
 - Process
 - Topics evaluated



Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Workshop 2: Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- General community concerns re: housing (based on statistically valid survey and focus groups):
 - High price of housing
 - Need for broader range of housing products and prices to allow younger generations and service workers the ability to purchase or rent near employment
 - Increasing homelessness

Workshop 2:

Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.1: Evaluate ways to encourage and accommodate more housing choices at various price points and housing types to meet the diverse needs of Torrance residents.

Sub-goal 1.2: Address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential infill housing in locations that are close to local-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.

Workshop 2:

Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.3: Explore ways to work with/encourage (e.g., development standards, zoning) developers, community partners, and stakeholders to provide housing that meets the needs of the community, both in terms of housing type, such as bungalow housing, duplexes, cottage/courtyard housing, etc., and affordability.

Sub-goal 1.4: Encourage the rezoning of underused and unused commercial zoned property into residential zoning.

Workshop 2: Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.5: Encourage additional implementation of mixed-use office and residential space through creative collaboration and exploration of partnerships with community stakeholders, including employers.



Workshop 2:

Approach to Accommodate RHNA

Since Torrance is mostly built out and does not have much vacant land, a creative approach is needed to accommodate the RHNA while retaining the city's character and quality of life:

- Minimize impact on existing single-family neighborhoods to extent feasible
- Allow new/increased residential density along identified corridors and areas:
 - Identify locations along major corridors in Torrance that are near services, employment, transit and bicycle facilities, and parks and recreation
 - Identify areas and corridors that could benefit from opportunities for revitalization by repurposing existing underutilized or vacant commercial space
- Establish “target densities” to incentivize development
- Encourage production of ADUs

Workshop 2: Sites Inventory Discussion

- Reviewed Proposed Sites Inventory and Rationale:
 - Housing Corridors (Mixed Use & Stand-Alone Residential)
 - Residential Infill
 - Religious Institution Housing Overlay
 - Must ensure that sites that are feasible for affordable units are distributed throughout City and are located in “high resource” areas
- Presentation provided on Housing Corridor Study

Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**
- **Chapter 2: Community Profile**
 - Population Characteristics
 - Household Characteristics
 - Housing Problems
 - Special Needs Groups
 - Housing Stock Characteristics
 - Affordable Housing in Torrance



Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents (cont.)

■ Chapter 3: Housing Constraints

- Governmental Constraints
- Non-governmental Constraints
- Environmental Constraints
- Infrastructure Constraints

■ Chapter 4: Housing Opportunities and Resources

- Future Housing Needs
- Financial Resources
- Administrative Resources
- Opportunities for Energy Conservation

Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents (cont.)

■ Chapter 5: Housing Plan

- Housing Goals and Policies
- Housing Program
- Summary of Quantified Objectives

■ Appendices

- Appendix A: Outreach Efforts
- Appendix B: Review of Past Accomplishments
- Appendix C: Sites Inventory
- Appendix D: Assessment of Fair Housing

Accommodating the RHNA via the Sites Inventory (6th Cycle)

- City's RHNA for the 6th cycle is 4,939 units, assigned as follows:
 - 2,467 Very Low Income/Low Income
 - 853 Moderate Income
 - 1,619 Above Moderate Income

- City identified 5,940 sites with capacities to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation in all income categories, as follows:
 - 2,655 Very Low Income/Low Income
 - 888 Moderate Income
 - 2,397 Above Moderate Income

- **Conclusion:**
 - Identified properties in the sites inventory have the combined capacity to accommodate the City's 4,939 income-targeted housing units and meet the RHNA for the 2021-2029 planning period.
 - Provides adequate sites to accommodate the "no net loss" requirements

Housing Goals (6th Cycle)

- Section V of the HEU contains Goals, Policies, and Programs that address the identified housing needs in Torrance for the 2021-2029 cycle. The Programs are described in detail in the HEU.

- **Overall Goals:**
 1. Enhance housing opportunities for all existing and future Torrance residents.
 2. Assist in the provision of safe, decent, affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents of Torrance of all income levels, including persons with low and moderate incomes.
 3. Mitigate potential governmental constraints to housing production and affordability.
 4. Maintain and improve the quality of existing housing and residential neighborhoods in Torrance.
 5. Promote equal housing opportunity for all residents, regardless of race, religion, family status, age, or physical disability.

Outline of Housing Programs (6th Cycle):

1. Adequate Sites
2. By-Right Approval (certain cases)
3. Removal of Government Constraints
4. Inclusionary Housing
5. Density Bonus
6. Accessory Dwelling Units
7. Religious Institution Housing Overlay
8. Residential and Mixed-use Corridors
9. Affordable Housing Development
10. Rental Assistance Programs
11. Special Needs Housing
12. Home Rehabilitation & Improvement
13. Preservation of Affordable Housing
14. Community Preservation
15. Reasonable Accommodation
16. Coastal Zone Replacement Housing
17. Water & Sewer Service Providers
18. Enforce Fair Housing Laws
19. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Public Outreach (Appendix A)



- 3 Community Workshops, including Online Polling and Survey; Results
- Project Website
- 2 Focus Group sessions with Affordable Developers and Service Providers, and Market-rate Developers; Meeting Summaries Posted on Website
- Legal Notices, City Website Notices, Posted Notices in Downtown Torrance and Del Amo Mall, and on City's Digital Sign
- Email Blast, Facebook and COVID Today Workshop Promotion
- Mailing List for Workshop Notices

Next Steps:

- Public Review of Draft Housing Element: October 1 to December 15, 2021
- HCD Review of Draft Housing Element (60 days): Started October 15, 2021
- Public Review of Draft CEQA Document (30 days): Starts November 3, 2021
- Respond to HCD comments: Prior to December 15, 2021
- Finalize Housing Element and CEQA Document: Prior to December 15, 2021
- Planning Commission Review/Recommendation to City Council:
December 15, 2021
- City Council adoption of Housing Element & certification of CEQA Document:
January 2021

Public Comment Period



Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any final comments or questions?



Thank you for Participating!

- If you have any questions or comments, please email them to the web address below and include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence:

CDDinfo@torranceca.gov

- Please check the City's website for additional information at:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/HousingElementUpdate>

INDEX
TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION – OCTOBER 20, 2021

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>OPENING CEREMONIES</u>	
1. Call to Order/Roll Call	1
2. Flag Salute	1
3. Posting of the Agenda	
4. Withdrawn, Deferred, and/or Supplemental Items	1
5. <u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS</u>	1
6. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>	
6A. Approval of Minutes	1
7. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u>	
7A. LUS21-00002: Housing Element Update: City of Torrance	3-6
7B. EXT21-00018: Continental Development Corporation <i>Res. 21-061</i>	2
8. <u>HEARINGS</u>	6
9. <u>RESOLUTIONS</u>	6
10. <u>COMMISSION AND STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS</u>	6
11. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	7

At 9:31 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, November 3, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, in the Council Chamber at Torrance City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Anunson, Choi, Kartsonis, Pino, and Chairperson Sheikh.

Absent: Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao.

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez, Senior Planning Associate Chun, Planning Associate Joe, Community Development Director Ramirez, and Assistant City Attorney Strader.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to grant Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao an excused absence for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Choi and passed by a 5-0 roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Community Development Director Ramirez.

3. POSTING OF THE AGENDA

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez reported that the agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and on the City's website on October 15, 2021.

4. WITHDRAWN, DEFERRED, AND/OR SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS

Supplemental material was available for item 7A.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez suggested moving Item 7B out of order to ensure sufficient time for Item 7A.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to take Item 7B before Item 7A. Commissioner Kartsonis seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 5-0 roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

*

Chairperson Sheikh reviewed the policies and procedures of the Planning Commission, including the right to appeal decisions to the City Council.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None.

7. **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Agenda Item 7B was considered out of order at this time.

7B. **EXT21-00018: CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Time Extension of a previously approved Division of Lot (DIV19-00007) to allow the subdivision of one lot into two lots on property located in the H-MP Zone at 23420 Hawthorne Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15315 – Minor Land Divisions. (Res. No. 21-061)

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Associate Joe introduced the request.

Toni Reina, representative of Continental Development Corporation, provided a brief overview of the proposal. She conveyed that the COVID-19 pandemic was one of the reasons for the time extension request.

In response to Commissioner Choi's inquiry, Ms. Reina explained that they did not submit the application due to various challenges created by the economic impact of the pandemic such as trying to attract tenants. She specified that the division of lot map on the Staff Report was submitted and approved by the City. She confirmed that the map must be approved by Los Angeles County for the map check process.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez revealed that the applicant would have to file a new division of lot if the time extension was denied.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the frequency of approvals for similar situations. Mr. Martinez reported that requests for time extensions were common due to similar hardships relating to the pandemic. He detailed that the original approval was good for a maximum of a 2-year extension.

Assistant City Attorney Strader informed the Commission that denial of the extension is up to the discretion of the Commission, but not advisable due to the current economic state.

Chairperson Sheikh invited public comment, and no members of the public spoke.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kartsonis and passed with a unanimous vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to concur with staff recommendation and approve EXT21-00018. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino with a 5-0 roll call vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to adopt Resolution No. 21-061. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino and passed with a unanimous vote.

7A. LUS21-00002 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input on the Public Review Draft of the Housing Element from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the next Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Associate Joe introduced the request.

Planning Manager Lodan distributed copies of the presentation and opened the presentation on the Housing Element Update Workshop.

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate at CityPlace Planning, Inc., provided a brief background and overview of the project. The topics covered included summaries of the first and second Housing Element workshops, draft housing element, accommodation of the (RHNA) Regional Housing Needs Allocation, Goals and Programs, Public Outreach, and the Next Steps.

In reference to the first workshop, Ms. Bluman presented visuals on the number of units that Los Angeles County and the City of Torrance must satisfy based off State and SCAG Region requirements. Torrance must demonstrate potential satisfaction of needs for 4,939 units out of the total 813,082 units in Los Angeles County. She noted that the 6th cycle of RHNA requirements were almost 3 ½ times the amount required than the 5th cycle, which was 1,450 units. She communicated that all cities have experienced an increase.

Commissioner Anunson inquired about the magnitude difference from the State level. Ms. Bluman responded that each city had about a 2 to 4 times increased amount than the 5th cycle.

Commissioner Choi questioned the entire process. Ms. Bluman explained that evaluations are completed by cities to develop conclusions on demographics such as income and estimated cost of living. She emphasized the focus on density and density proxy, which is 30 dwelling units. Ms. Bluman summarized that even if not actually built, the city must demonstrate the potential to provide and accommodate affordable housing on qualifying sites, which fulfill the (HCD) California's Department of Housing and Community Development requirements and the specified percentages of each income category. These potential sites were labeled by income on the Housing Element map.

Ms. Bluman explained that there are some developers who specialize in low income to obtain tax credit. She added that Torrance must make sure that no net loss requirement is maintained to ensure that certain number of sites are available for certain income brackets.

Commissioners Anunson and Choi asked about the consequences of not meeting state requirements. Ms. Bluman answered that the state could penalize the City by providing disincentives like prohibition of issuing both commercial and residential building permits. She advised on compliance as it could lead to a lawsuit against the City by the state attorney general, housing advocates, or individuals. Planning Manager Lodan emphasized that although there is no strict penalty or law, grant funding is often tied to being compliant and having a certified housing element.

In response to Commissioner Kartsonis' inquiry about religious institutions, Planning Manager Lodan addressed that these sites were market rate developments, and the item of topic is focused on affordable housing.

Chairperson Sheikh asked whether Torrance met the 5th RHNA cycle requirements. Planning Manager Lodan answered that as of 2020, the City has built 234 of the required units, but has fallen short of the goal. Commissioner Anunson reminded the Commission that the City only had to show potential to construct, which Planning Manager Lodan affirmed. Planning Manager Lodan stressed the state's aggression to meeting the requirements and suggested preparing the necessary documents to maintain local control and make decisions accordingly.

Planning Manager Lodan stated that the 4,939-unit requirements are for the next cycle and not additive to the 5th cycle, in response to Chairperson Sheikh's inquiry.

Commissioner Pino inquired about the inclusion of (ADUs) accessory dwelling units in the requirements and Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that it would be a contributing factor to meeting the requirements.

Commissioner Choi learned that ADUs alone would only cover a portion of the requirements. Planning Manager Lodan reported that the City allocated 800-units in the strategy based of the number of units tracked on applications.

Planning Manager Lodan disclosed a new law that allows religious institutions to construct affordable housing on their lot. Ms. Bluman noted that some institutions across Los Angeles and California have started to pursue this route to retain the property from the effects of COVID-19 and declining church attendance. When asked by Commissioner Choi if Torrance pursued this, Planning Manager Lodan stated that exact numbers were undetermined since it depends on multiple factors and only the potential capacity is calculated. Ms. Bluman added that conservative assumptions were made because HCD will be observing them.

In reference to the second workshop, Commissioner Pino challenged the method of providing affordable housing in expensive neighborhoods such as the Hillside Overlay District. Planning Manager Lodan suggested some strategies to create these opportunities were by building through churches, ADUs, or junior ADUs.

Commissioner Pino inquired about ADUs categorization as affordable housing, but not as property for sale. Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that ADUs are traditionally rentals and that affordable ADUs require covenants with the property owner. He predicted that junior ADUs were more affordable than larger ones due to their smaller and simplified structure. He suggested that the City could encourage these developments in the Hillside Overlay area to limit square footage.

Commissioner Pino requested clarification on the new legislation allowing homeowners to sell ADUs. Planning Manager Lodan disclosed that the City is working on an ordinance that would impact the ability to divide lots and sell off new units on traditional single-family households.

In response to Commissioner Kartsonis' inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan announced that target density would encourage higher density to help meet the RHNA numbers. He concluded that the City has prepared a 20% buffer of affordable units to accommodate underdevelopment.

Chairperson Sheikh and Planning Manager Lodan examined that the main idea was to strategize ways to meet the requirements. Planning Manager Lodan elaborated on the reason for the document. Staff identify the merits of a particular development and explain how those properties comply with the Housing Element to make an educated decision on a project, which would create opportunities to make development easier or more affordable.

Commissioner Choi wondered if any employers in Torrance provide affordable housing. Planning Manager Lodan was uncertain and reported that unanswered questions will be addressed in the future.

In response to Commissioner Choi's inquiry about the housing element approval process, Planning Manager Lodan detailed that staff will present a draft to the Commission and Environmental Study, then the recommendations of staff and the Commission will be presented to Council before the deadline.

In response to Commissioner Choi's concerns, Community Development Director Ramirez elaborated on the process that once the document is submitted to HCD, it is returned with comments to staff. Once the revisions are approved by HCD, the document is reviewed by the Commission for approval to the City Council, who does the final approval. The final document is then sent to HCD. Assistant City Attorney Strader communicated that this process is the state of the law.

Assistant City Attorney Strader disclosed that public opinion workshops and polls have been completed and taken into consideration by experts, in response to the concerns of the Commission.

Ms. Bluman summarized each section of the 6th cycle Housing Element.

Planning Manager Lodan recounted that the document was reviewed and finalized by staff in the last 2 months.

Commissioners Choi and Kartsonis inquired about the itemized list of all the properties. Commissioner Kartsonis asked if zoning changes happened once the final version of the document is approved. Planning Manager Lodan responded that an approval would not create a zoning change and that future zone changes will have to be individually processed. He indicated that the document is for the purpose of identifying sites.

In response to Chairperson Sheikh's inquiry about state and city funding on low to moderate income funds, Planning Manager Lodan explained how the programs are funded through tax increments. The City purchased properties to develop affordable housing. Planning Manager Lodan informed the Commission that these properties are individually managed, and tenants must continuously meet eligibility requirements.

Commissioner Kartsonis requested eligibility clarification of property types that count towards the RHNA. Ms. Bluman stated that housing must be permanent to qualify.

Ms. Bluman announced that state law requires an update to zoning codes to allow ordinances in accommodation of certain housing facilities such as supportive housing, transitional housing, single-room occupancies, and emergency shelters.

Community Development Director Ramirez expressed that the 20% buffer will help the City prepare for the unknown numbers of meeting the capacity. In response to Commissioner Choi, she emphasized that the City must only show potential to meet the requirements. She and Assistant City Attorney Strader concluded that the purpose was to demonstrate willingness to meet the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Bluman continued presenting the public outreach efforts. She concluded with the announcement of deadlines and next steps.

Planning Manager Lodan revealed that the CEQA document will be presented to the Commission in a future commission meeting.

Chairperson Sheikh invited public comment.

Mark Hansen, 823 Beech Ave, shared his concerns about direction coming from an outside agency and about the lack of action on helping the homeless population. He appreciated the City's efforts. Planning Manager Lodan listed some efforts that were affiliated with such concerns.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the letters of correspondence listed on the supplemental material.

Commissioner Kartsonis, Commissioner Anunson, and Chairperson Sheikh commended staff for their hard work. Commissioner Anunson and Chairperson Sheikh applauded the staff's process on developing the document.

Chairperson Sheikh wondered if staff intend to reach out to and incentivize homeowners with older properties. Planning Manager Lodan relayed programs will be put into place to prepare for a smoother development process in accordance with the City's budget.

8. HEARINGS – None.

9. RESOLUTIONS – None.

10. COMMISSION AND STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Kartsonis recounted a previous item that was reviewed and denied by the Commission but approved by the City Council. He thanked the staff for their hard work.

Assistant City Attorney Strader indicated that the Commission would not have to be informed of an item's substantial change unless it directly affected them. Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez noted that it was not a common occurrence.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez announced that in their next meeting, the City Council will hear an item that the Commission approved.

Planning Manager Lodan thanked the Commission for a thorough review of the materials and for asking questions. He informed that public comments should be directed to cddinfo@torranceca.gov or to visit the website at torranceca.gov/housingelementupdate.

Planning Manager Lodan and Chairperson Sheikh appreciated Patricia Bluman and Claudia Tedford from CityPlace Planning, Inc.'s efforts. Chairperson Sheikh also gave thanks to the public for attending the meeting.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: At 9:31 p.m., Commissioner Kartsonis moved to adjourn this meeting to November 3, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino with a unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

###

Approved as submitted December 1, 2021 s/ Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk

Section 4

Focus Group summaries for the Service Providers and Affordable Developers, and the Market Rate Developers.

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”](#)

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: Service Providers and Affordable Developers

May 19, 2021

As a part of the Housing Element update process, City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers to better understand the issues and needs of lower income residents and those with special needs, and to identify constraints to development of affordable housing so that programs can be developed to address those needs and constraints. Five service providers, two affordable housing developers, an architect, and a real estate representative participated. Below is a summary of the input received.

Partnering with Religious Institutions

- Example of large project in San Jose: 250 units of affordable housing constructed on church parking lot, partner with Palo Alto Housing Authority.
- San Pedro UMC is another example: 48 units in church parking lot, including mixed-income, singles and families. Used 10/10 development, tax credits, additional investments

Homeless

- Torrance's homeless count in 2020 was 322 people, up 42%.
- More and more seniors falling into homelessness.
- Families are also suffering during the pandemic.
- Rental vacancy market is in crisis.
- Torrance Unified representative reported that homeless families are not new to Torrance. Currently have 130 homeless children that have been in Torrance 4 years or more. If children are doubled up, meaning they are currently living with others, like perhaps family members, they are not eligible for funding, and this is happening.

Development Standards in General/Entitlement Process

- Torrance development rules are set up for for-sale housing.
- Tough open space and parking standards.
- City needs to be more flexible with standards.
- Streamlining the entitlement process helps considerably.
- Get rid of CEQA or look for CEQA exemptions.
- For affordable housing to work, the development approval process must be cost-effective and efficient.

- Staff explained that the goal of the Housing Corridor Study, currently in the beginning stages, is to facilitate development and allow developers to go straight to pulling building permits, effectively eliminating the entitlement process, including CEQA.

Parking

- Developers need concessions for parking – they get that in the City of Los Angeles.
- Parking is very expensive to build, brings up the price of development overall.
- Bureaucracy demands excessive parking.
- Senior parking requirements should be max of ½ space/unit.
- Seniors often give up their cars after moving into senior housing – because they are too expensive.
- Affordable developers looking to locate next to transit.

Density

- If developer can't achieve a certain density, it's very hard to make affordable housing work.
- City needs to be more flexible with standards.
- Density – “sweet spot” for affordable housing is 1 level of podium parking, 4-5 levels of residential above: 100 du/acre at 4 stories is Type 5 construction, and at least 5 stories is type 3 construction.

Financing/Incentives/Concessions

- Torrance has historically not had subsidies for affordable housing.
- Must have close to 100 units for tax credits to apply.
- Projects need to be a little smaller, rental or mixed-income for affordable to be feasible in City.
- Question: Does Torrance have a Consolidated Plan? Affordable developers who use HUD financing weren't allowed to build in Torrance because the City didn't have a Consolidated Plan. Answer: Yes, Torrance is currently part of a regional Consolidated Plan.
- Example of City of Los Angeles, TOC program – tier system established near transit that allows for greater density, and higher density bonus concessions, including reduced parking, increased building height and additional stories, the closer a project is to transit
- One developer stated they are doing the first density bonus project in Manhattan Beach.
- The City of Carson has done several density bonus projects.
- The City of Los Angeles has special rules for 100% affordable projects.
- 100% affordable is different than mixed-income projects.
- Mixed-income has been very successful. Despite early community opposition, projects are not problematic once open and operating.

- Concessions are very important for making a project work with affordable units.
- Redevelopment used to help but is no longer available.
- City helping with installing public improvements can help make an affordable project financing work.
- City can waive or defer fees to assist.
- Fee transparency is needed so developers know what to expect up front.
- City can help facilitate affordable housing by looking at their own excess property for potential housing sites and offering it free or at reduced prices.
- When using a Housing Trust Fund, non-profits score higher if cities can offer some type of assistance, such as city land and city funds. Helps with getting tax credits.

Miscellaneous Feedback

- Political will in Torrance is tough.
- City needs to change its mindset and get on board with helping solve the housing crisis.
- 100% low-income senior project in Rancho Palos Verdes is nice project. No one would be able to tell by looking at the project that it is affordable.
- Stigma associated with low income housing needs removed.
- Some developers are keeping an eye on vacant commercial properties that might have potential to transform into residential development. Would like to see them change to mixed-use or residential only.
- Question about Torrance opposing inclusionary housing ordinance. City staff provided more explanation on the City's position.
- Affordable family housing is a severe need.
- Pet ownership should be allowed in all affordable housing and is required if the pet is an emotional support animal.

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: Market Rate Developers

May 19, 2021

As a part of the Housing Element update process, City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with market rate developers to understand their issues and concerns regarding development of housing in Torrance, and to identify constraints to development as is required by Housing Element law so that programs can be developed to address those constraints. Four developers attended in person, and one submitted written comments. Below is a summary of the input received.

Development Standards in General / Entitlement Process

- The recently initiated Housing Corridor Study will help with process and timing. No entitlement risk will help with financing.
- The more density the City allows, the better.
- Streamlining the process helps, as does reduced parking requirements.
- Torrance is very easy to work with. Example of project – had a good planner that moved the project through the process and helped come up with workable solutions.
- Torrance has the strictest parking requirements compared to other cities. Couldn't reach the allowed density because of parking requirements. Three spaces per unit is too much.
- Open space requirements are high.
- Example of project in Torrance that was zoned for 39 du/ac. Ended up with 13 du/ac because of parking and open space requirements.
- Tandem parking should be considered.
- Example provided of a project where bike parking fulfilled part of the parking requirement.
- Hard to make projects of under 20 du/ac work.
- The faster a project makes it through approvals, the less risk for the developer.
- The existing maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.6:1 is stifling developers' ability to build. All the 0.6 FAR does is make developers build less units on their sites. Look at Carson and how great they have done lately. Their FAR is 1.5.
- Torrance need to zone a lot of properties to R-4 with no FAR.

Financing / Incentives / Concessions

- Affordable housing projects present a challenge for acquiring funding. Example – tax credit projects.
- Density bonus is helpful.
- When you change zoning to allow certain types of housing, the sellers raise their prices.
- Challenge is seller's expectation of land value and what a developer can pay, and with building costs so high right now, it raises the cost for building affordable housing too high to make it pencil out.
- Incentives from the City can include relief on fees, relief on parking requirements, higher density.
- Developers need certainty without so many variables, such as cost of raw land, cost to complete projects in a timely manner.
- Developers also have to get a property owner to continue to work with them through the process. Can be hard to do with a long entitlement process.

Miscellaneous Feedback

- 100% affordable not looked on favorably by neighbors.
- Staff provided the example of some developers building ADUs as part of single-family residential developments.
- Sellers not usually willing to sell for affordable housing.
- Religious institution example is 2 acres carved out of existing church site of 4 acres for housing, too large for what church campus needs in Torrance.
- When City Council is on the same page as Planning, process is easier.
- Sellers often have unrealistic expectations about land cost and development timing.
- The City needs to add a substantial residential component around the Del Amo mall to revive the area.

New Information

Added: April 2022

Focus Group Meeting Summary
Torrance 6th Cycle Housing Element
February 16, 2022
2:30 pm

The virtual session started at 2:30 pm with a total of 12 participants, representing market rate developers, developers of mixed-income and affordable housing, and service providers. City staff introduced themselves, and the consultant team. A short presentation was provided that summarized the key Housing Element Programs and Actions in the Draft Housing Element. Participants were asked to provide feedback regarding the proposed programs and actions, and to provide any other suggestions on programs and/or actions for the 2nd submittal of the Draft Housing Element that would enhance opportunities to provide housing for households across all income categories and those with special needs. The following is a summary of the input received:

Certainty for the development community is key

- Updating the General Plan, Land Use Map and Zoning helps developers reduce risk.
- Clear density bonus rules in the Zoning Ordinance are very helpful. Used example of the City of Los Angeles published density bonus rules.

What constrains the development of housing?

- CEQA is a constraint. CEQA takes time and money, both of which are deterrents to the development of housing.
- Bureaucracy is a constraint to development. When a city's development review/permitting process is slow, it can cost a developer to lose funding, such as low-income tax credit (LIHTC) financing. Time and money again.
- Requiring retail as part of mixed-use development is tough, especially in today's economic climate. Too much commercial is a constraint.
- Rules imposed by the Fire Department can be a constraint. Sometimes rules are imposed that are stricter than what the code requires and/or are not identified early in the process.
- FAR rules reduce density that can be achieved.
- Senior projects that are designed in accordance with the City's senior citizen housing development standards, with smaller units and reduced parking standards, can only be used for seniors. There is a strong demand for the same type of development by young singles and couples, but with current restrictions, developers cannot build them for the younger demographic.

Development standards need to be relaxed

- FAR
- Setbacks along busy corridors should be allowed to be closer to the roadway. Makes the corridor more to scale, and creates a more vibrant and walkable cityscape. For example, the HBCSP requires a 100' setback from the Hawthorne Boulevard ROW, which is a significant constraint.
- Reduced parking standards
- Reduced open space requirements
- Flexibility is key

- Look at sliding scale for concessions for development of housing, e.g., smaller units with reduced parking if in walkable area/neighborhood, near transit, etc.

If the City pursues Inclusionary Housing

- Many cities require developers to provide the identical size housing product for someone paying considerably less than full market rate.
- Would like to be able to reduce the square footage somewhat for those paying less to make it more attractive for developers.
- If requirements are reduced, developers could build more mixed-income housing.
- Developers cannot afford to build housing for the extremely low-income group because the income is so low, persons are almost homeless.

Housing for those with developmental disabilities

- Representative from Hope Housing ,who assists with providing housing for those with developmental disabilities, explained there is a large need for this type of housing.
- Suggested the City could help them with: the purchase of homes, rehab assistance, providing HOME HUD funding, and/or Mainstream vouchers.
- Expressed an interest in partnering with the City to help meet need.

Suggestions for additional sites for the Housing Element

- Suggested the City include sites developers are looking at for housing projects in the Sites Inventory of the Draft Housing Element. They were encouraged to provide potential sites to City staff.
- Suggested including all the religious institutions in the City. His firm is currently building 3 projects on church sites. Said the proposed Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) is a good program.
- Suggested building housing along busy commercial corridors that are walkable and near jobs
- Suggested using parking lots of hotels
- Suggested looking at underutilized sites in Industrial zones, empty school sites, Sears at Del Amo Mall, vacant and unused retail spaces. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, the majority of new development has to go on already developed sites. The age of properties in Torrance, declining retail, and general underutilization make many developed sites appropriate for residential and mixed-use development.

Section 5

Mailing Lists

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled "New information"](#)

organization	address	city
Salvation Army "His House Family Services"	20830 S. Vermont Avenue	Torrance, CA 90502
Rebuilding Together South Bay Los Angeles	P.O. Box 6367	Torrance, CA 90504
Kenny Nickelson Memorial Foundation for Homeless Veterans and Children Inc.	P.O. Box 3098	Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
LA County Deptment of Children and Family Services	2325 Crenshaw Boulevard	Torrance, CA 90501
Social Vocational Services (SVS)	2441 W. 205th St, Ste C-100	Torrance, CA 90501
Catholic Charities LA	1530 James M Wood Blvd #1112,	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Catholic Charities	123 E. 14th Street	Long Beach, CA 90803
Disabled Resource Center	2750 E. Spring Street, Ste #100	Long Beach, CA 90806
Focal Point on Aging	1339 Post Avenue	Torrance, CA 9501
The Arc -- South Bay	1735 W Rosecrans Ave,	Gardena, CA 90249-3023
South Bay Senior	2510 W. 237 th Street, Suite 204	Torrance, CA 90505
Torrance Unified School District --Foster Youth and Homeless Liaison	2335 Plaza Del Amo	Torrance, CA 90501
Harbor Regional Center	21231 Hawthorne Blvd.	Torrance, CA 90503
Access Community Housing, inc	222 N Sepulveda Blvd #2000,	El Segundo, CA 90245
Episodes International	3480 Torrance Blvd., Suite 100	Torrance, CA 90503
Home Instead Senior Care Veterans Salute Program	3625 Del Amo Blvd UNIT 105,	Torrance, CA 90503
Walteria Senior Citizens Center	3855 W. 242nd Street,	Torrance, CA 90505
Tillim Senior Citizens Center	3612 W. Artesia Boulevard,	Torrance, CA 90504
Bartlett Senior Citizen's Center	1318 Cravens avenue	Torrance, CA 90501
Shelter Partnership	520 S. Grand Avenue #695	Los Angeles CA 90071
Harbor Interfaith Shelter	670 W. 9th St.	San Pedro, CA 90731
House of Yahweh	4046 Marine Avenue,	Lawndale, CA 90260
Mission Beacon Light	525 Broad Ave,	Wilmington, CA 90744
Pacific Gateway Workforce investment network	<u>3447 Atlantic Ave.</u>	Long Beach CA 90807
home ownership for personal empowerment (HOPE, Inc)	21231 Hawthorne Blvd,	Torrance, CA 90503
habitat for humanity of greater los angeles	18600 Crenshaw Blvd.	Torrance CA 90504
easter seals torrance	1740 W. Carson Street	Torrance, CA 90505
gratitude retreat foundation	3535 Lomita Blvd	Torrance, CA 90505
gratitude retreat foundation	18411 Crenshaw Blvd #350	Torrance CA 90504
South Bay Family Promise	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance CA 90503
LINC Housing	3590 Elm Ave,	Long Beach, CA 90807
META Housing	11150 W Olympic Blvd Suite #620	Los Angeles, CA 90064
MAR ventures	721 N Douglas St,	El Segundo, CA 90245
AMCAL Housing	30141 Agoura Road, Suite 100,	Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Abode Communities	1149 S. Hill Street, Ste 700	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Amercian Communities		
national Community Renaissance	9421 Haven Ave,	Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Related California	333 South Grand Avenue Suite 4450	Los Angeles, CA 90071
witheemalcolm	2251 W 190th St,	Torrance, CA 90504
Board of realtors	22833 Arlington Avenue	Torrance, CA 90501
Hart Community Homes	208 n lemon st	fullerton CA 92832
Century Housing Corporation	1000 Corporate Pointe	Culver City, CA 90230
Adobe Communities	1149 S. Hill Street, Ste 700	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Jamboree Housing Corporation	17701 Cowan Ave, Suite 200	Irvine, CA 92614
Housing Corporation of America	6330 Variel Avenue Suite 201	Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Doty-Burton Associates	3787 Worsham Avenue	Long Beach, CA 90808
A Community of Friends	3701 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700	Los Angeles, CA 90010
Century Pacific Equity Corporation	10100 Santa Monica Blvd Ste 300	Los Angeles, CA, 90067-4107
CitiHousing Real Estate Services	11432 South Street #244,	Cerritos, CA 90703-6611
Coalition for Economic Survival	14320 Ventura Blvd. - PMB 537	Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
FAME Housing Corporation	1968 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90018	
Hope - Net	760 S. Westmoreland Ave.	Los Angeles, CA 90005
Korean Youth & Community Center, Inc.. (KYCC)	680 S. Wilton Place	Los Angeles, CA 90005
LINC Community Development Corporation	same as Linc Housing- see above	
Menorah Housing Foundation	10991 W. Pico Blvd.	Los Angeles, CA 90064
Poker Flats II LLC	not found (KJ)	
Winnetka King, LLC	not found (KJ)	
Foundation for Quality	not found (KJ)	
Community Rehabilitation Services, Inc	not found (KJ)	
Veteran Aid.org	none	
Home and Community	not found	
BROOKS + SCARPA California	3929 W. 139th Street	Hawthorne, CA 90250
Flyaway Homes	2116 Arlington Avenue, Suite 100	Los Angeles, CA 90018
LifeArk	831 Meridian St.	Duarte, CA 91010
United Dwelling	150 E. 57th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90011

RNLA (Restore Neighborhoods LA, Inc.)	315 West 9th St #503	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Skidrow Housing Trust	1317 E. 7th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90021
Brilliant Corners	527 W 7th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90014
La Mas	2806 Clearwater Street,	Los Angeles, CA 90039
Venice Community Housing	200 Lincoln Blvd.	Venice, CA 90291
Volunteers of America LA	3600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1500	Los Angeles CA 90010
Community Corporation of Santa Monica	1423 2ND ST. SUITE B	SANTA MONICA, CA 90401
Coalition for Responsible Community Development	3101 S. Grand Ave.	Los Angeles, CA 90007
Clifford Beers Housing	11739 Victory Blvd	Los Angeles, CA 91606
PATHVentures		
Weingart Center	501 E 6th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90021
GenesisLA	801 S. GRAND AVE., STE. 775	LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
Daylight Community Development		

RMG Housing	<i>329 Pacific Coast Highway</i>	Hermosa Beach CA 90254
RxLA		
Many Mansions	1259 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.	Thousand Oaks, CA 9

CONTACT	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	
Pastor Dean Mayeda	Nova Community Church	4345 Emerald Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Dr. William (Bill) Hurst	First Lutheran Church and School	2900 West Carson Street	Torrance CA 90503
Vicar Erin Armstrong	First Lutheran Church and School	2900 West Carson Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Milton Herring	Living Word Christian Church	18119 S. Prairie Avenue	Torrance CA 90504
Pastor Cinda Herring	Living Word Christian Church	18119 S. Prairie Avenue	Torrance CA 90504
Minister Jhonny Saavedra (+5)	Cristo Para Las Naciones	700 Maple Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Sang Boo	Good Community Church of Torrance	19950 Mariner Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Sr. Pastor Paul Kim	Good Community Church of Torrance	19950 Mariner Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Eric Anderson	First Baptist Church of Walteria	3711 Newton Street	Torrance CA 90505
Sr. Warden Thomas Winfrey	Christ Our Savior Anglican Church	1108 Sartori Avenue, #220	Torrance CA 90501
Daniel Park	Blessed South Bay Church	24817 Western Avenue	Lomita CA 90717
Kevin Leathers	Crenshaw Baptist Church	18749 Crenshaw Boulevard	Torrance CA 90504
Nick Rasmussen	Family Promise of the South Bay	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Ken Johnson	Resurrection Lutheran Church & School	330 Palos Verdes Boulevard	Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Monsignor Mike Meyers	St. James Parish	124 N Pacific Coast Highway	Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Rev. Mark Ger	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Rev. Daniel Low	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Rev. Wilson Lee	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Pastor Glen Moore	Torrance New Life Church	2300 Sepulveda Boulevard	Torrance CA 90501
Senior Pastor Bill Schwartz	South Bay Christian Community	2549 W. 190th Street	Torrance CA 90504
Pastor Gary Shiohana	South Bay Community Church	2549 W 190th Street	Torrance CA 90504
Rabbi Didi Thomas	Temple Emet	2051 W. 236th Street	Torrance CA 90501
Manuel Lares	Behavioral Health Services, Inc.	2510 W 237th Street, #204	Torrance CA 90505
Dr. Rogers Govender	Behavioral Health Services, Inc.	2510 W 237th Street, #204	Torrance CA 90505
Reverend Hùng Tran	Nativity Catholic Church	1447 Engracia Avenue	Torrance CA 90501
Keeley Gilmore	Department of Mental Health- LAC	1000 W Carson St,	Torrance, CA 90502
Dr. Tim Morey	Life Covenant Church	2390 Crenshaw Blvd. #213	Torrance CA 90501
Pastor Bill MacPhee	The River Church of the South Bay	3525 Lomita Blvd.	Torrance CA 90505
Opal Booth	United Evangelist Association	2008 W Carson St # 207	Torrance CA 90501
Linda Cruz	United Evangelist Association	2008 W Carson St # 207	Torrance CA 90501
Josh Wicker	Torrance Church of Nazarene	700 Maple Ave,	Torrance, CA 90503
Pastor Julian Birkenstock	Karros Ministries		
Steven Fietz	Fire Christian Church of Torrance	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance, CA 90503
Pastor Joel V. Petermann	Zion Lutheran Church	1001 W 223rd St	Torrance, CA 90502

Beacon Light Mission & Doors of Hope Women's Shelter

Tiffany Rashel	(guest of Dr. Rogers)		
Lionel Pieterse	(guest of Dr. Rogers)		

New Information

Added: April 2022

company	Address 1	City
lennar homes	12103 Summer Ln,	Whittier, CA 90602
don wilson builders	23705 Crenshaw Blvd STE 200	Torrance, CA 90510
anastasi development company	511 Torrance Blvd 2nd Floor	Redondo Beach, CA 9027
The olson company	3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100	Seal Beach, CA 90740-2751
withee malcolm	2251 W 190th St	Torrance, CA 90504
cambridge Pacific Ventures		
mark vasey	1983 190 th street	Torrance CA 90504
tony ashai	9744 Wilshire Boulevard #305	Beverly Hills CA 90212
doug maupin	23505 Crenshaw Blvd #208	Torrance CA 90505
Derek Empey, ReyLenn Properties LLC	444 S. Cedros Ave. #180	Solana Beach, CA 92075
city ventures	2000 Avenue of the Stars 9th floor South	Los Angeles, CA 90067
Cyrus Paykan	11444 Acacia Avenue	Hawthorne, CA 90250
MAR ventures	721 N Douglas St,	El Segundo, CA 90245
Diana Coronado Building Industry Association BIA		
Watt Companies	2716 Ocean Park Boulevard Suite 2025	Santa Monica, CA 90405
INTRACORP SW, LLC Christopher Piers	895 Dove St, Suite 400	Newport Beach CA 92660
Storm Bird Storm Properties	23223 Normandie Ave	Torrance, CA 90501
Derek Reylenn Reylenn Properties L	444 S. Cedros Avenue, Suite 180	Solana Beach, CA 92075

Mailing List **Affordable Housing Advocates**

Organization

Salvation Army "His House Family Services"

Rebuilding Together South Bay Los Angeles

Kenny Nickelson Memorial Foundation for
Homeless Veterans and Children Inc.

LA County Deptment of Children and Family
Services

Social Vocational Services (SVS)

Catholic Charities LA

Catholic Charities

Disabled Resource Center

Focal Point on Aging

The Arc -- South Bay

South Bay Senior

Torrance Unified School District --Foster Youth
and Homeless Liaison

Harbor Regional Center

Access Community Housing, inc

Episodes International

Home Instead Senior Care Veterans Salute
Program

Walteria Senior Citizens Center

Tillim Senior Citizens Center

Bartlett Senior Citizen's Center

Shelter Partnership

Harbor Interfaith Shelter

House of Yahweh

Mission Beacon Light

Pacific Gateway Workforce investment network

Home Ownership for Personal Empowerment
(HOPE, Inc)

Habitat for Humanity of Greater Los Angeles

Easter Seals Torrance

Gratitude Retreat Foundation
South Bay Family Promise
LINC Housing
META Housing
MAR ventures
AMCAL Housing
Abode Communities
Americian Communities
National Community Renaissance
Related California
Withee Malcolm
Board of Realtors
Hart Community Homes
Century Housing Corporation
Adobe Communities
Jamboree Housing Corporation
Housing Corporation of America
Doty-Burton Associates
A Community of Friends
Century Pacific Equity Corporation
CitiHousing Real Estate Services
Coalition for Economic Survival
FAME Housing Corporation
Hope - Net
Korean Youth & Community Center, Inc..
(KYCC)
LINC Community Development Corporation
Menorah Housing Foundation
Poker Flats II LLC
Winnetka King, LLC
Foundation for Quality
Community Rehabilitation Services, Inc
Veteran Aid.org

Veteran Aid.org
Home and Community
BROOKS + SCARPA California
Flyaway Homes
LifeArk
United Dwelling
RNLA (Restore Neighborhoods LA, Inc.)
Skidrow Housing Trust
Brilliant Corners
La Mas
Venice Community Housing
Volunteers of America LA
Community Corporation of Santa Monica
Coalition for Responsible Community
Development
Clifford Beers Housing
PATHVentures
Weingart Center
GenesisLA
Daylight Community Development
RMG Housing
RxLA
Many Mansions

Mailing List – Market Rate Housing Developers

Company

Lennar Homes

Don Wilson Builders

Anastasi Development Company

The Olson Company

Withee Malcolm

Cambridge Pacific Ventures

Mark Vasey

Tony Ashai

Doug Maupin

Derek Empey, ReyLenn Properties LLC

City Ventures

Cyrus Paykan

MAR Ventures

Diana Coronado Building Industry Association BIA

Watt Companies

INTRACORP SW, LLC Christopher Pierson | VP, Acquisitions

Storm Bird Storm Properties

Derek Reylenn, Reylenn Properties LLC

Related California

Mailing List
Churches and Faith-based Organizations

ORGANIZATION
Nova Community Church
First Lutheran Church and School
Living Word Christian Church
Cristo Para Las Naciones
Good Community Church of Torrance
First Baptist Church of Walteria
Christ Our Savior Anglican Church
Blessed South Bay Church
Crenshaw Baptist Church
Family Promise of the South Bay
Resurrection Lutheran Church & School
St. James Parish
Bread of Life Church
Torrance New Life Church
South Bay Christian Community
South Bay Community Church
Temple Emet
Behavioral Health Services, Inc.
Nativity Catholic Church
Department of Mental Health- LAC
Life Covenant Church
The River Church of the South Bay
United Evangelist Association
Torrance Church of Nazarene
Karros Ministries
Fire Christian Church of Torrance

Zion Lutheran Church

ADDITIONS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

ADOPTION HEARING

May 18, 2022

CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Wednesday, May 18, 2022
Via Teleconference or Other Electronic Means



CHAIR: CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Tonight, the Planning Commission is conducting this Planning Commission Meeting under a National, State and City – State of Emergency.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361 members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

AGENDA



1. Call Meeting To Order
- Roll Call
2. Flag Salute

CHAIR: CAN I GET A ROLL CALL PLEASE

STAFF: ROLL CALL

CHAIR: Commissioner _____,
would you lead us in the flag salute?

FLAG SALUTE



AGENDA



3. Report on Posting of Agenda
- May 13, 2022

4. Announcement of Withdrawn, Deferred, and/or
Supplemental Items

CHAIR: CAN I HAVE THE REPORT OF THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA?

STAFF: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED ON THE PUBLIC NOTICE BOARD AT 3031 TORRANCE BLVD ON May 13, 2022.

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY WIDTHRAWN, DEFERRED AND/OR SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS?

STAFF: (Will respond and request item 8A to be continued to a date certain of 5/4/22)

AGENDA



5. Oral Communications from the Public #1
 - Limited to a 15 Minute Period;
 - Use “Raise your Hand” feature if you would like to speak. Press *9 if you are using a phone.

CHAIR: This portion of the meeting is reserved for comment on items not on the agenda. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Planning Commission cannot act on items raised during public comment, but may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed; request clarification; or refer the item to staff. Speakers under Orals are limited to Oral Communications #1 and no longer than 3 minutes per speaker. To participate, please use the “Raise Your Hand” feature when prompted. If you are using a touchtone phone, please press *9 (star 9) to raise your hand. Your comments to the Planning Commission meeting will be recorded as part of the Planning Commission meeting. By staying online and making public comment during the Planning Commission meeting, you are agreeing to have your audio recorded.

IS THERE ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WISHES TO SPEAK?

STAFF: WILL RESPOND AND/OR STATE: “(NAME) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTED” IF ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WISHES TO SPEAK
(STAFF WILL TIME SPEAKERS AND MUTE THEM AT 3-MINUTES)



Announcement by Chairman Sheikh

Before the meeting begins, there are a few matters of general information I would like to explain:

1. The meeting will be conducted in an informal manner:
 - Formal rules of evidence, such as those used in a court of law, will not apply
 - Everyone with an interest in the matter will be heard
 - Our decision will be based on the evidence presented; including, the staff report, any pictures or drawings presented by staff, oral testimony heard tonight, any written or graphic material presented during the meeting, and each Commissioner's personal observations upon viewing the site.

2. If you wish to address an item before the Commission, you are asked to keep your remarks pertinent to the case before us, refrain from making personal remarks about the other people involved, and refrain from

repeating comments or observations already made. Repetition of evidence usually is neither necessary nor helpful to the matter.

Tonight's proceedings are being recorded. The minute secretary will prepare minutes based upon notes taken during the meeting and the contents of the recording. Therefore, when you speak to the Commission you are asked to:

- Use the "Raise your Hand" feature;
- Although not required, you may provide your name and address for the record;

3. Zone Changes, Variances and General Plan Amendments go to the City Council automatically for a decision. Everything else is final with this Commission unless appealed to the City Council.

Appeals may be filed any time within 15 calendar days after our decision is made by going to the City Clerk's office, filling out the application, and paying the necessary fee. Matters appealed to the City Council generally are heard by the Council within 45 days.

4. The matters to be considered by the Commission tonight will be heard in the following manner:

- Staff will present the matter by reading a short description of the case and will respond to questions posed by Commissioners.
- The applicant, or proponent, will then be asked to come forward and make any presentation he or she may wish to make and to respond to Commission inquiries.
- Anyone interested in the matter will be asked to raise your hand and when instructed present his or her remarks and respond to any questions the Commission may have.
- The proponent will be invited to make any closing comments and respond to further questions by the Commission.
- At the conclusion of the presentation of evidence, the Commission will discuss the matter publicly and will vote upon their decision.

STAFF MEMBERS FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUILDING & SAFETY DIVISION AND ENGINEERING DIVISION AS WELL AS THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE ARE ON HAND TO RESPOND TO QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION REGARDING TONIGHT'S CASES.

THAT CONCLUDES MY COMMENTS. MAY WE HAVE THE NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

AGENDA

- 6. Consent Calendar
 - A. None
- 7. Administrative Matters
 - None
- 8. Hearings
 - 8A

CHAIR: ARE THERE MINUTES FOR APPROVAL?

STAFF: None

CHAIR: Administrative Matters?

STAFF: NONE

CHAIR: HEARINGS?

STAFF: Yes,

THEY HAVE BEEN CONTINUED/POSTPONED??

CHAIR: CAN I HAVE THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA PLEASE?

AGENDA



8. Hearings

B. Consideration of LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003, HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE

Planning Commission consideration of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

CHAIR: IS THE APPLICANT PRESENT?

STAFF: YES CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE A PRESENTATION PREPARED

~~(APPLICANT NAME) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTTED, WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. THE APPLICANT~~

~~CHAIR: (APPLICANT NAME) PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROJECT~~

~~APPLICANT: (TURN TO SPEAK)~~

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(YES/NO)

CHAIR: IS THERE ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON THIS ITEM?

PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND

STAFF: (STAFF WILL RESPOND, IF ANYONE WISHES TO SPEAK AND WILL UNMUTE THE MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTTED, WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD?

CHAIR: (ALLOW MEMBER OF PUBLIC TO SPEAK, IF NO SPEAKERS REQUEST A MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING)



City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

Planning Commission

Wednesday, May 18, 2022

6:30 p.m.

STAFF: Good Evening, I am Gregg Lodan with the Community Development Department. Tonight we will be initiating the process for updating the City of Torrance Housing Element. Briefly, the Housing Element allows a city to plan for housing related needs in the city. As part of our presentation tonight we will be going into more detail later.
Next Slide Please

The Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director
Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate
Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal
Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



10

STAFF:

The Team working on this update includes both city staff and our consultants:

City Staff

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate
Kevin Joe, Planning Associate

CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal
Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate

Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal

Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal

At this point I will turn the meeting over to Veronica Tam to discuss the agenda and begin the presentation

What is the Housing Element?

- One of the 7 mandated elements of the General Plan
- Subject to detailed statutory requirements rather than guidelines—most regulated element of the General Plan
- Must be updated every 8 years per State law
- Reviewed for compliance by State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)



11

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for meeting each jurisdiction's share of regional housing needs (Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA) as determined by State law
- Provides an assessment of the City's housing needs and how best to accommodate the housing needs
- The City "plans for" housing so that developers can build projects consistent with the City's General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other plans and programs



12

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Housing Element Requirements

- Demonstrate that the jurisdiction can accommodate its RHNA as mandated by State law
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet demand
- Improve the safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate the development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all (AFFH)



13


STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

RHNA for 6th Cycle



14

CONSULTANT:

Sites Inventory Overview

- Each jurisdiction must identify available vacant and/or underutilized properties to accommodate its RHNA by income category
- For lower income housing, site must meet certain requirements to be deemed adequate
- Allowable "credits" toward RHNA:
 - Already entitled and pipeline projects
 - Accessory dwelling units



15

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Torrance Required RHNA by Income Category

Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 - 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes "Extremely Low," which is up to 30% of AMI

CONSULTANT:

Adequacy of Sites to Meet RHNA by Income Category

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	—	28	288	3,094 ^{2,3}	3,410 ²	38.2%
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		—	—	29	1,210 ⁴	1,239	45.3%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,167 ²	2,926 ²	80.7%
Total	4,939		195	429	480	6,471	7,575	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among and added to their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

³ 32.2% of lower-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

⁴ Approximately 45% of moderate-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

CONSULTANT:

Process to Date

- 3 Planning Commission Workshops (April 28, 2020, July 28, 2021, & October 20, 2021)
- 1st Submittal to HCD October 15, 2021 (Housing Element dated October 1, 2021)
- HCD Response December 14, 2021
- Revised version made available to public on April 11, 2022
- 2nd Submittal version made available to public on May 9, 2022
- 2nd Submittal to HCD on May 17, 2022



18

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 1: Introduction**
 - Background information, data sources
 - Includes summary of public outreach
- **Section 2: Community Profile**
 - Population characteristics
 - Special needs groups
 - Housing problems, housing stock characteristics
 - Affordable housing



19

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 3: Housing Constraints**

- Governmental
- Non-governmental
- Environmental
- Infrastructure

- **Section 4: Housing Opportunities & Resources**

- Future Housing Needs (Entitled/pipeline, ADUs, sites)
- Financial & administrative resources
- Opportunities for energy conservation



20

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 5: Housing Plan**
 - Goals and policies
 - Housing programs, including actions and timeframes
- **Appendices**



21

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- Updates were made to address HCD and public comments
- **Section 1: Introduction**
 - Outreach methods used were updated and expanded.
 - Review process updated.



22

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ **Section 2: Community Profile**

- Data and evaluation of housing needs expanded
- Inventory of at-risk units clarified

■ **Section 3: Housing Constraints**

- Various constraints were added, clarified, and expanded per HCD comments
- Impact of dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies and other State constraints were added



23

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ Section 4: Housing Opportunities and Resources

- Number of estimated ADUs to be constructed was reduced from 600 to 480 (per HCD comments)
- Realistic capacity assumptions for Sites Inventory were clarified and expanded; examples were provided
- Sampling of 15 entitled and constructed projects was prepared (details in a new Appendix E)
- Conclusions from Feasibility Study of building prototypes and pro forma fiscal analysis for the Housing Corridor Study were provided
- Sites Inventory was updated to reflect deletions & additions & figures were revised
- Outreach to property owners on Sites Inventory was discussed



24

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ Section 5: Housing Plan

- Several policies were added to address HCD and/or public input
- Many programs and objectives were expanded or added to address HCD and/or public input
- Time frames for objectives were revised consistent with AB 1398, which took effect January 1, 2022



25

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix A: Outreach Efforts**
 - All new noticing the City did, comment letters received, and summaries of additional outreach were added
- **Appendix B: Review of Past Accomplishments**
 - No change



26

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ **Appendix C: Sites Inventory**

- Expanded to include additional information for each site, including criteria for selection
- Sites were deleted that did not meet criteria or per property owner request
- Sites were added based on public interest and identification of additional opportunities based on HCD criteria
- Revised figures were provided



27

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix D: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)**
 - Expanded evaluation of AFFH data per direction from HCD
 - Provided additional information regarding actions to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH)
 - Summary of fair housing issues was added
 - Data and figures were revised to reflect revisions to Sites Inventory



28

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix E: Sampling of Entitled & Constructed Projects (NEW)**
 - Provides details of projects discussed earlier
- **Appendix F: Correspondence from Providers of Affordable Housing (NEW)**
 - Letters received from providers of affordable housing in Torrance stating that they plan to remain affordable for the next 10 years



29

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix G: Response to Public Comments (NEW)**

- All public comments that were received were summarized in a table and each was responded to



30

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Environmental compliance to support Housing Element Update
- Not a project-specific or construction-level CEQA review
- Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared by City
- 30-Day public review conducted Nov. 1 – Nov. 30, 2021
- Housing Element adoption would not create significant impacts
- Additional CEQA for future proposed construction projects



31

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Next Steps

- City Council adoption of Housing Element & certification of CEQA Document on June 14, 2022
- HCD responds to 2nd Submittal mid-July
- City Manager authorized to make minor revisions to address HCD comments for certification



32

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Recommendation:

- The Community Development Department recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing to receive comments from the public, provide staff their comments on the draft Housing Element and adopt a RESOLUTION recommending that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element Update and a Negative Declaration.



33

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.



Planning Commission Discussion and Voting Period for Agenda Item:

8B. LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Staff Recommendation:

The Community Development Department recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a RESOLUTION recommending that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element Update and a Negative Declaration.

31

- DISCUSSION
- WAIT FOR MOTION – FIRST AND SECOND

CHAIR: ROLL CALL

STAFF: (ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE)

CHAIR: IS THERE A RESOLUTION?

STAFF: YES, (ALLOW STAFF TO INTRODUCE RESO)

- WAIT FOR MOTION – FIRST AND SECOND

CHAIR: ROLL CALL

STAFF: (ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE)

CHAIR: STAFF, CAN I HAVE THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA PLEASE

AGENDA



9. Resolutions

- None

10. Commission and Staff Oral Communications

11. Adjournment

A. Adjournment of Planning Commission Meeting to Wednesday,
June 1, 2022, at 6:30pm

35

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY RESOLUTIONS?

STAFF: NONE

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY COMMISSIONER OR STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS? IF SO,
PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND AND I WILL CALL ON YOU.

CHAIR: MOTION TO ADJOURN TO JUNE 1, 2022

STAFF: ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE

On May 5, 2022, at 5:10 PM, Chun, Carolyn <CChun@torranceca.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., MAY 18, 2022 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Chun, Carolyn

Contact Group Name: Housing Element interest list

Members:

56oreo@gmail.com
agill@intracorphomes.com
aidanrschwing@gmail.com
alex@charingcp.com
amsanc9@gmail.com
amy@josefekassoc.com
andreareilly6@aol.com
anelson@redoakinv.com
anthony@abundanthousingla.org
arwheat@gmail.com
birvin@provincegroup.com
bluewejustgotaletter@gmail.com
Bob.Patterson
brandon@mitchtsailaw.com
brent_stoll
brett@buchmann-design.com
brian_huang7757@elcamino.edu
briannajoice@gmail.com
briggs@cityventures.com
cannulli@yahoo.com
mark_capellino
'carlsgoode@earthlink.net'
cgomez@landadvisors.com
chrishall@prodigy.net
Claudia Tedford
contact@caforhomes.org
david@abundanthousingla.org
dcoronado@bialav.org
debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com
derek.caldwell@marcusmillichap.com
dominic mazza - intracorphomes
donleefarmers@gmail.com
Santana, Danny
dtsmith90505@gmail.com
dwithie@witheemalcolm.com
efa4402@ucla.edu
email@torranceforeveryone.com
Beacon Light mission
gnoble@verizon.net
hamiddari@yahoo.com
hema gujjari (heu)
honeybobaboba@yahoo.com
mitch tsai law
james tu (housing element)
'james@trustee.pro'
Janet Payne
jd@jdholdings.com
jeremymiddleton@gmail.com
jimgallagher@cox.net
jminer831@gmail.com
Nulty, Jennifer

56oreo@gmail.com
agill@intracorphomes.com
aidanrschwing@gmail.com
alex@charingcp.com
amsanc9@gmail.com
amy@josefekassoc.com
andreareilly6@aol.com
anelson@redoakinv.com
anthony@abundanthousingla.org
arwheat@gmail.com
birvin@provincegroup.com
bluewejustgotaletter@gmail.com
Bob.Patterson@socalmultihousing.com
brandon@mitchtsailaw.com
brent_stoll@yahoo.com
brett@buchmann-design.com
brian_huang7757@elcamino.edu
briannajoice@gmail.com
briggs@cityventures.com
cannulli@yahoo.com
capellinos@yahoo.com
'carlsgoode@earthlink.net'
cgomez@landadvisors.com
chrishall@prodigy.net
claudia.tedford@cityplaceplanning.com
contact@caforhomes.org
david@abundanthousingla.org
dcoronado@bialav.org
debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com
derek.caldwell@marcusmillichap.com
dmazza@intracorphomes.com
donleefarmers@gmail.com
DSantana@TorranceCA.gov
dtsmith90505@gmail.com
dwithie@witheemalcolm.com
efa4402@ucla.edu
email@torranceforeveryone.com
gfigueroa@blmission.org
gnoble@verizon.net
hamiddari@yahoo.com
hgujjari@gmail.com
honeybobaboba@yahoo.com
info@mitchtsailaw.com
james@2-bit-toys.com
'james@trustee.pro'
janhpayne@sbcglobal.net
jd@jdholdings.com
jeremymiddleton@gmail.com
jimgallagher@cox.net
jminer831@gmail.com
JNulty@TorranceCA.gov

joel.calplanningconsultants@gmail.com

'Jon Wizard' <jon@yimbylaw.org>
jperry@theolsonco.com
keelyinla@gmail.com
kgalvin@socal.rr.com
Joe, Kevin
adrian young
lare98@aol.com
lauralohnes@yahoo.com
laurie love
leon@mitchtsailaw.com
leonora camner
Leora Tanjuatco Ross <leora@yimbyaction.org

llcraig543@gmail.com
llopez912@sbcglobal.net
lmdryer@earthlink.net
management@c7properties.com
Manuela Tobias (cal matters)
marc@danziger.org
marianne hamada
mariselaalonzo1956@yahoo.com
mark hansen
matt gelfand (californians for homeownership)

matt@caforhomes.org
matthew.doyle@marcusmillichap.com
mbennyworth@gmail.com
Ottoson, Matthew B.
mcerletti@aol.com
melanie dreike
city ventures
mike@inland-west.net
missd628@yahoo.com
mitch@mitchtsailaw.com
moogtorran@att.net
najme.rezaee@yahoo.com
news@layimby.com
NHCivicAffairs@gmail.com
norally (norally@horizonmgmt.com)
office.drilpro@sbcglobal.net
onorio.marsella@gmail.com
pampop1@verizon.net
Patricia Bluman
'Phil Lam'
powersoft_4@msn.com
prabhu.r.reddy@gmail.com
ray prayer
Couto, Rachel
'Rfragapane@mullerco.com'
'richardk@paragonlabsusa.com
robert (interested in HEU)

joel.calplanningconsultants@gmail.com

jon@yimbylaw.org
jperry@theolsonco.com
keelyinla@gmail.com
kgalvin@socal.rr.com
KJoe@TorranceCA.gov
ladeea49@aol.com
lare98@aol.com
lauralohnes@yahoo.com
laurieLove@socal.rr.com
leon@mitchtsailaw.com
leonora@abundanthousingla.org

LeoraTanjuatcoRoss <leora@yimbyaction.org
llcraig543@gmail.com
llopez912@sbcglobal.net
lmdryer@earthlink.net
management@c7properties.com
manuela@calmatters.org
marc@danziger.org
marianne.ntha@att.net
mariselaalonzo1956@yahoo.com
mark.hansen37@yahoo.com

matt@caforhomes.org
matt@caforhomes.org
matthew.doyle@marcusmillichap.com
mbennyworth@gmail.com
mboottoson@rrmdesign.com
mcerletti@aol.com
melaniedreike@gmail.com
michellet@cityventures.com
mike@inland-west.net
missd628@yahoo.com
mitch@mitchtsailaw.com
moogtorran@att.net
najme.rezaee@yahoo.com
news@layimby.com
NHCivicAffairs@gmail.com
norally@horizonmgmt.com
office.drilpro@sbcglobal.net
onorio.marsella@gmail.com
pampop1@verizon.net
patricia.bluman@cityplaceplanning.com
plam@theolsonco.com
powersoft_4@msn.com
prabhu.r.reddy@gmail.com
ray584prayer@yahoo.com
rcouto@torranceca.gov
'Rfragapane@mullerco.com'
richardk@paragonlabsusa.com
robert@networkerservices.net

samuelgallegoswas@everyactionadvocacy.com

sandimonda1239@gmail.com
sasha.burik@gmail.com
sbird@storm-properties.com
scarlettrosedavis@gmail.com
sedwards@cityventures.com
sheablanco@gmail.com
slacanfora@yahoo.com
sliversun2009@yahoo.com
smc@camm-inc.com
Southwood.homeowners@gmail.com
Stacy Metcalfe <stacymetcalfe@yahoo.com>

'stanlwong@yahoo.com'
steve.martin (housing element)
'steve@surfmanagement.com'
Julie Randall
therealaziz@icloud.com
tie.ryder@gmail.com
'timsymington@gmail.com'
'tony@huntermason.com'
usscowell@yahoo.com
yhawkstar28@icloud.com
ymihojevich@gmail.com

samuelgallegoswas@everyactionadvocacy.com

sandimonda1239@gmail.com
sasha.burik@gmail.com
sbird@storm-properties.com
scarlettrosedavis@gmail.com
sedwards@cityventures.com
sheablanco@gmail.com
slacanfora@yahoo.com
sliversun2009@yahoo.com
smc@camm-inc.com
Southwood.homeowners@gmail.com

stacymetcalfe@yahoo.com
'stanlwong@yahoo.com'
steve.martin@greystar.com
'steve@surfmanagement.com'
streetfaire@gmail.com
therealaziz@icloud.com
tie.ryder@gmail.com
'timsymington@gmail.com'
'tony@huntermason.com'
usscowell@yahoo.com
yhawkstar28@icloud.com
ymihojevich@gmail.com

Supplemental #1 to Agenda Item No. 8A

To: Members of the Planning Commission

From: Long Range Planning Division

Date: May 18, 2022

Subject: LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Correspondence was received after the staff report for this item was prepared and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Kevin Joe, AICP
Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: Dennis Piotrowski <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 10:22 AM
To: CDD Info <cddinfo@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Housing Element Update, public comment

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Torrance City Staff, City Council, and Planning Commission,

I'm writing in response to the "Public Review Draft Housing element 5/9/22."

As a long-term Torrance resident, I am pleased that City staff responded in this draft that "one of the goals of this effort is to preserve the City's single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident's desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance."

Please do all that you can to challenge (and mitigate the impacts of) harmful state legislation that is and will negatively impact our single-family home neighborhoods, homes that we have worked hard for all of our lives.

Thank you,
Dennis Piotrowski
Torrance resident

ATTACHMENT 1



Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP

Andrew K. Fogg

File No. 088988

April 28, 2022

VIA E-MAIL

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
City of Torrance
Planning Department
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503
CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov

Re: Torrance General Plan Housing Element Update - 21515 Western Avenue

Dear Ms. Chun and Messrs. Lodan and Joe:

We write on behalf of our client, Rexford Industrial Realty (“Rexford”) to object to the potential rezoning of the property commonly known as 21515 Western Avenue, APN 7355-031-054 (the “Property”) discussed for the first time in the City’s Housing Element (2021-2029) Public Review Draft dated April 11, 2022. As explained below, the Property is not appropriate as a potential housing site, and Rexford requests that the City remove this site from the Sites Inventory Appendix in the draft Housing Element.

As an initial matter, we would like to express Rexford’s disappointment with the process relating to the City’s proposal to add the Property to the City’s draft Housing Element Sites Inventory Appendix. This change was made without any consultation with or notice to Rexford, the Property owner. This is surprising because Rexford has been engaged in detailed conversations with the City for nearly a year regarding the potential redevelopment of the site consistent with the existing zoning. For your reference, enclosed is a detailed chronology of Rexford’s conversations with the City leading up to, and immediately following, Rexford’s acquisition of the Property. The potential for including the Property as a potential housing site was never raised by the City during any of these meetings. As described in the attached, these activities included the submission of a Preliminary Site Plan Review, meetings with City staff regarding the Preliminary Site Plan Review, and the filing of a current pending application for the proposed redevelopment project.

Additionally, the draft Housing Element Sites Inventory Appendix mischaracterizes the status of the use of the Property by stating that the Property is a potential opportunity site because it is a “vacant grocery store.” This ignores the fact that the Property was leased, at significantly below-market rental rates, from August 2021 through April 2022 (and may in the near future be leased again) to a warehouse user for the purpose of assembling and warehousing

COVID test kits, as well as a drive through COVID testing site, which provided a tremendous benefit to the community at large during a difficult time that presented serious logistical challenges across the region.

Further, the identification of the Property as a potential housing site makes no sense given its context. The Property is located in the eastern portion of the City, west of Western Avenue, south of 213th Street, north of West Carson Street, and east of Mullin Avenue. The Property is located in the City's I-BP General Plan land use category and is zoned M2 – Heavy Manufacturing.¹ The Property is completely surrounded on all sides within the City with lands that have identical I-BP and M2 zoning. There are no other properties located in the City proximate to the Property that are zoned for residential uses – the nearest residential use in the City is more than 1000 feet from the Property. Introducing new residential uses in an existing industrial zone has the potential to create use conflicts that are confusing and inefficient, at best, and are detrimental and contrary to public policy, at worst. By contrast, the pending development redevelopment project application would facilitate the Property being redeveloped with uses that complement, rather than conflict with, surrounding development in the City.

Finally, we would like to bring to your attention that the Property is part of a larger development plan known as the Torrance Center II Project. The Torrance Center II Project is a 36-acre planned industrial business park that was approved originally in the mid to late 1980s. The entire Torrance Center II Project area is subject to recorded CC&Rs, which were approved by the City's Redevelopment Agency and recorded against all properties within the project area on July 15, 1988 as Document Number 88-1116926 and, as amended and restated, on August 2, 1989 as Document Number 89-1238617. The CC&Rs include a comprehensive set of Design Guidelines that limit and control all development within the project area. The Design Guidelines describe the Torrance Center II Project as follows:

Torrance Center is a 36-acre, mixed-use business park located in the City of Torrance Industrial Redevelopment Project. The site is bounded by Western Avenue, Carson Street, 213th Street and Border and Bow Avenue. Proposed uses for the site are office, light industrial, research and development, and commercial. Commercial uses include a retail center, hotel and restaurants.

(Design Guidelines, P.1). Notably, residential uses are not permitted under the Design Guidelines or the CC&Rs. There is no process for developing a residential development on the Property without securing the approval of all of the industrial users located in the Torrance Center II Project development. As such, it would likely be impossible to develop any project if the City were to change the zoning as contemplated because any residential use would be precluded under the CC&Rs and any non-residential use would be inconsistent with the proposed

¹ The Housing Element incorrectly identifies the Property's existing zoning as M1 when it is, in fact, M2.

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
April 28, 2022
Page 3

zoning. Eliminating all ability to use the Property could constitute a taking and has the potential to create significant exposure for the City.

For all of these reasons, we respectfully ask that the Property be removed from the Sites Inventory and that the existing General Plan and zoning classification be maintained. We are available to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Andrew K. Fogg.

Andrew K. Fogg

AKF

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Aram Chaparyan, City Manager
Mr. Danny Santana, Assistant City Manager
Ms. Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director
David Lanzer Esq., Rexford General Counsel

Attachment 1

**Chronology of Events Regarding
Proposed Redevelopment of Property**

- Seller Offering Memo dated April 2021
- Purchase Agreement signed 6/23/21 – for Rexford purchase of site from seller for industrial development
- Meeting with City 6/23/21 – City: Danny Santana, Director of Community Development (prior to promotion to Assistant City Manager) and Oscar Martinez, Planning Manager with Rexford: (Patrick Schlehuber, Steve Masura, Felix Vollrath, Daniel Murphy); Discussed proposed industrial/warehouse project; In summary, Danny Santana relayed the following information in regard to the proposed project, which he believed to be feasible given the subject's M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning with the following suggestions:
 - Building needs to be high image, with a large office component
 - Building loading must be protected from the street and neighboring residential by architectural features or landscaping
 - Parking requirements have been relaxed in the I-BP (Industrial Business Park) General Plan designation to encourage developments similar to this project
 - At a high level, they do not see any major issues related to the CC&Rs that would prevent our development plans
 - Exterior aesthetics will be a key feature they will look for in site-plan review
 - It was also discussed that the City's Downtown Torrance plan document refers to the subject site to be considered in a potential "Gateway Mixed Use District", and that since Rexford would be only developing the site for industrial use per the existing zoning that the City would not recommend including this site in any housing opportunity inventory.
- Close of Escrow 10/12/21
- Preliminary Site Plan Review application submittal to City 12/2/21 for new industrial development
- Preliminary Site Plan Review meeting held with City to review City comments 12/20/21; the City's comments included some minor recommended changes to the design and included fairly typical comments from the Public Works Department and Police Department, and there was reference to some standards from the CC&Rs.
- Meeting with City 1/24/22 – City: Danny Santana, Assistant City Manager; Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director; Oscar Martinez, Planning Manager; Fran

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
April 28, 2022
Page 5

Fulton, Economic Development Manager; Kevin Joe, Assistant Planner - Rexford (Patrick Schlehber , Steve Masura, Felix Vollrath, Daniel Murphy, Ben Martin, Erin Thrash, Bruce Herbkersman, Nicole Morse (Rexford's Land Use Consultant)); Discussed proposed project and Preliminary Site Plan submitted to City. Danny Santana and staff again generally indicated support of the project reiterating the comments from the 6/23/21 meeting.

- Full application for entitlements for Site Plan Review and CUP submittal to City 4/20/22 - the final plans submitted were modified to address the City's concerns for high quality design and architectural treatment, options in parking layouts to allow for tenant flexibility for additional office and/or manufacturing space, and maintaining existing large setbacks and mature trees.

088988\14868692v3

From: Manuela Tobias [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 2:03 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: CalMatters question: Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Hi,

My name is Manuela Tobias, I'm a reporter writing about California housing for CalMatters. I'm based in Sacramento and mainly cover the Capitol. I'm working on a story about the Housing Element/RHNA and am surveying a few cities about their practices. Was wondering if you could help me answer a few questions about Torrance's process for a potential statewide story?

Did your city contract out preparation of the Housing Element?
Who is the contractor?
Who else bid for the job?

Thanks so much for your help.

Best,
Manuela

--
Manuela Tobias
Housing Reporter

CAL MATTERS

www.calmatters.org

[REDACTED]

Supplemental #2 to Agenda Item No. 8A

To: Members of the Planning Commission


From: Long Range Planning Division

Date: May 18, 2022

Subject: LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Additional correspondence was received after the staff report for this item was prepared and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Kevin Joe, AICP
Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 3:22 PM
To: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Re: Housing Element #6

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.
Good Day Carolyn,

Thank you for taking the time and directing me to where my comments.

In the original letter I tried to point out that the actual population growth of Torrance is sufficiently less than the predicted growth rate as stated in Housing Element #6. The growth rate is the driving force behind Housing Element #6 to justify additional growth. The inaccuracy of Housing Element #6 population predicts should be taken in consideration when attempting to determine how many units should be constructed. Building 617 units a year to accommodate a population growth rate of 163 people per year does not compute. I agree with Chris Drieke that RHNA estimates are greatly overestimated.

From Original Email

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed.

The TMW statement was very informative. In 2009 a bill SBx7-7 passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20% by 2020. TMW 2020 target was 142 GPCD and we achieved a potable water demand of 121 GPCD which was 15% less than required. While I think we still have more work to conserve the City of Torrance should take a lot of pride in hitting those types of numbers.

Torrance Municipal Water did a good job in their draft response in explaining where cities potable water supply will be coming from and time will tell.

Likewise, the Sewer System draft response showed that the department has used foresight and taken the necessary steps to make sure the system works flawlessly.

I agree with the analysis that the wet and dry public utilities and infrastructure are in place and available for housing opportunities. I just wonder how much you are going to change the original feel of Torrance by over building. To many households casing to few people.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

Is Dan Walker behind Housing Element #6?

On Tuesday, May 17, 2022, 11:28:27 AM PDT, Chun, Carolyn <cchun@torranceca.gov> wrote:

Hi Mark,

Your comments, in the Housing Element document, start on page 549 (page 29 of appendix G) here's the link. <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/74100/637877125086170000>

ATTACHMENT 1

The Planning Commission meeting will be held Virtually on Wednesday, May 18.

Here's a link to the PC agenda with the Zoom and telephonic meeting info.

<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/74274/637880486226730000>

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at:
<https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials: Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

CAROLYN CHUN
Senior Planning Associate --Office of the Community Development Department

City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | 310 618 5869 | 310 618 5829 fax |
CChun@TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia |
www.TorranceCA.Gov/COVID19 |

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Housing Element #6

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

Could you please direct me to where my concerns about Housing Element #6 are recorded?

I checked the workshop and others meeting notes were individuals made comments and stated concerns, but I could not locate my points.

Is the Planning Commission meeting this coming week open to in person attendance?

Thank You

Mark Hansen

ADDITIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL

ADOPTION HEARING

June 14, 2022

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The Draft Housing Element Update will be reviewed by the City Council on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, Please see the notice below for more information.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager



CITY OF TORRANCE
Community Development Department
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council appoints the day of **June 14, 2022** at the hour of **6:30 p.m.**, for a public hearing regarding **the Housing Element Update**: Conduct Public Hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002 and Adopt RESOLUTION Approving Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003) that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (310) 618-5880. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's office at (310) 618-2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title ii]

Direct questions or concerns to the City Council at (310) 618-2801, the City Manager at (310) 618-5880, or an individual department head prior to submission to the City Council. Parties will be notified if the complaint will be included on a subsequent agenda.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, the City Council and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means. **The Council Chamber is closed to the public in the interest of maintaining appropriate social**

distancing and in order to reduce the risk of spreading COVID-19. The public can view the meeting and participate in the meeting as outlined below.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW THE MEETING via CitiCABLE Channel 3 (Spectrum) and Channel 31 (Frontier), streaming online at www.TorranceCA.Gov, Facebook @ City of Torrance CA Government, and YouTube Channel TorranceCitiCABLE.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by email to CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email include the title of this item "HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE". All comments received by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2022 will be included as "Supplemental" on the City's website prior to the meeting. Comments received after 2:00 p.m., but prior to the end of the meeting, will be added to the record and will be available on the City webpage the following day.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE DURING THE HEARING by telephone at (310) 618-2404.

For further information, contact the COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at (310) 618-5990.

Published: June 3, 2022

**REBECCA POIRIER
CITY CLERK**



CITY OF TORRANCE
Community Development Department
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council appoints the day of **June 14, 2022** at the hour of **6:30 p.m.**, for a public hearing regarding **the Housing Element Update**: Conduct Public Hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002 and Adopt RESOLUTION Approving Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003) **that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (310) 618-5880. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's office at (310) 618-2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title ii]

Direct questions or concerns to the City Council at (310) 618-2801, the City Manager at (310) 618-5880, or an individual department head prior to submission to the City Council. Parties will be notified if the complaint will be included on a subsequent agenda.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, the City Council and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means. **The Council Chamber is closed to the public in the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing and in order to reduce the risk of spreading COVID-19.** The public can view the meeting and participate in the meeting as outlined below.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW THE MEETING via CitiCABLE Channel 3 (Spectrum) and Channel 31 (Frontier), streaming online at www.TorranceCA.Gov, Facebook @ City of Torrance CA Government, and YouTube Channel TorranceCitiCABLE.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by email to CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email include the title of this item "HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE". All comments received by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2022 will be included as "Supplemental" on the City's website prior to the meeting. Comments received after 2:00 p.m., but prior to the end of the meeting, will be added to the record and will be available on the City webpage the following day.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE DURING THE HEARING by telephone at (310) 618-2404.

For further information, contact the COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at (310) 618-5990.

Published: **June 3, 2022**

**REBECCA POIRIER
CITY CLERK**

CAROLYN CHUN

Senior Planning Associate –Office of the Community Development Department
City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | 310.618.5869 | 310.618.5829 Fax
| CChun@TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia | www.TorranceCA.Gov/COV1019 |

Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 3:39 PM

To: Council Meeting Public Comment <CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.gov>

Cc: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>; Lodan, Gregg <GLODAN@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: Public Comment From Doug Maupin, Developer

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

To The Torrance City Council

Ms / Sirs I have been a developer in The South Bay and specifically in the City of Torrance for over 30 years.

I have, through many partnerships bought land, entitled land, and either built and or sold entitled projects to Public Development companies.

My projects have totaled over 800 residential units, built-in Torrance.

I'm happy the city is considering the changes to the General Plan and updating the Housing element.

In the past, the hardest impediments to a successful development have been the following.

1. The FAR
2. The parking ratios and Gust parking
- 3 The open space and how it's calculated

Another impediment to housing was the No Growth Era where almost 0 housing was allowed.

FAR R-3 Land was supposedly zone 1 unit per 1600 sq ft of land. But 1600 sq ft X .06 FAR = 960 sq ft of living area Not enough to be practical

So almost every r-3 development in the last 25 years was built to about a 65% density. Which Made these units VERY Expensive.

Parking The Zoning imposed 3 cars for a 3 bedroom unit + one guest for every 4 units Also Very expensive for the Builder and the eventual Home Buyer.

Open space was also a Hard Number to reach, as some had to be on Grade and directly accessible for each unit.

I With the Watt Companies built a 45 unit Senior housing development on Torrance Blvd and Amie next to 100 Unit condo we entitled
We had dozens and dozens of single people and young couples who wanted to buy. But we had to turn them down because they needed to be 55 years old to occupy what was designated senior housing.

Promote the density bonus now available for senior housing to allow non-age restricted projects to take place in the appropriate locations.

I believe you should eliminate the FAR to make it 1.5 to one in the R-3 zone and cut back parking to a max of 2 cars per unit and less for one-bedroom units Reduce open space requirements and increase height limits.

Il believe about 1000 seniors a year Graduate from Torrance High schools and when they return from college, get into other Careers, and try to move back to Torrance there are VERY FEW good options for them.

Fewer Rules More density are the Key success in creating the needed housing for this City,

Best Regards Doug Maupin

June 14, 2022

Dear City Council members,

We have been informed by the City's Community Development Department that Torrance's Housing Element is in the process of being updated.

As long-time stake holders in the City of Torrance, we welcome the opportunity to participate in this discussion by providing feedback that will assist future development in addressing the City's long term housing needs.

We (Old Town Redlands, LLC) purchased a property at 20505-20555 Hawthorne Blvd in 2008. Two years later we acquired an adjoining parcel of vacant land. The combined site is approximately 4 1/2 acres in size and is located on the South-West corner of Hawthorne Blvd. & Spencer Avenue. The property has the "Promenade" designation in the Hawthorne Blvd Corridor Specific Plan. Other than the car wash and a small sales office for Hertz, the site is undeveloped.

Our objective when we purchased these properties was to wait for the long-term leases to expire which would then allow us the opportunity to develop a new project on this rather large (and essentially undeveloped) property located in the Hawthorne Blvd. corridor. That opportunity will finally present itself in approximately 2 years' time.

As you are considering changes to the existing zoning, we would like to share with you how the changes proposed in the draft Housing Element compare to other properties we own in the region, specifically, as it relates to residential development. We believe you will find this very informative.

The manner in which the draft Housing Element has been crafted essentially dictates density based on the permissible FAR, which (in this case) currently stands at 0.6. The proposed changes would bump the FAR to 1.0 - provided the new development had a mixed-use component. While this is a welcome and much needed boost to the FAR, it falls woefully short of what would be required to make a residential development financially feasible on this property.

To put this into context, if the proposed 1.0 FAR is adopted (as currently proposed in the draft Housing Element), that would translate to a residential project with a maximum density of approximately 105 residential units.

By way of comparison, we also own a 14,000 sq ft commercial property on Melrose Ave., in the City of Los Angeles. Current zoning would permit a 53-unit apartment project on that parcel. If the Torrance site had the same zoning, that would enable us to bring 742 residential units to the community.

While we understand that level of density may not be the best fit for Torrance, we thought it helpful to illustrate just how constraining the proposed zoning is towards any meaningful redevelopment. To get to the point, we strongly believe a compromise somewhere in-between the two zoning densities described above, would be required to have any consequential impact in addressing Torrance's housing needs.

We therefore would like to suggest that the City considers allowing greater density of housing in larger projects along the Hawthorne corridor, as this area has excellent transport hubs and a residential component would be a great addition to the commercial activities along the Boulevard. Not to do so would be short sighted, and squandering what we should all agree, is a very limited resource.

Further, this would give the city of Torrance an opportunity to provide new market rate, moderate & low-income housing and address the state requirements for these product types.


We are available to discuss this further and would be happy to provide some preliminary conceptual ideas to illustrate how the density can be designed to accommodate the City's housing goals, whilst maintaining the character that is Torrance.

Regards,


John Rohan
Manager
Old Town Redlands, LLC



Keith Hagaman
Manager
Old Town Redlands, LLC

City of Torrance

6th Cycle Housing
Element Update

City Council

Tuesday, June 14, 2022
6:30 p.m.

The Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager

Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate

Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



What is the Housing Element?

- One of 7 mandated elements of the General Plan
- Subject to detailed State statutory requirements rather than guidelines—most regulated element of the General Plan
- Must be updated every 8 years per State law
- Reviewed for compliance by State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)



What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for each jurisdiction to meet its share of regional housing needs (Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA), as determined by State law
- **Provides an assessment of each jurisdiction's** housing needs and how best to accommodate them
- **Jurisdictions “plan for” housing so that developers** can build projects consistent the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other plans and programs



Housing Element Requirements

- Demonstrate that each jurisdiction can accommodate its RHNA as mandated by State law
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet demand
- Improve safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all (AFFH)



Contents of Housing Element

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Community Profile
- Section 3: Housing Constraints
- Section 4: Housing Opportunities & Resources
- Section 5: Housing Plan
- Appendices



RHNA for 6th Cycle

State (HCD):
Assesses total
number of
housing units
needed
statewide;
assigns each
region their
share

SCAG Region:
1,341,827 units

SCAG then
allocates units to
each jurisdiction
in the region

Los Angeles
County:
813,082 units

City of
Torrance:
4,939 units

Torrance Required RHNA by Income Category

Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 – 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes “Extremely Low,” which is up to 30% of AMI

Requirements to Accommodate RHNA

- Sites Inventory – each jurisdiction must identify available vacant and underutilized properties to accommodate RHNA for each income category
- **“No Net Loss” Law** – Requires sufficient adequate sites to be available at all times throughout entire RHNA planning period
- Fair Housing Requirements – Sites feasible for affordable units must distributed throughout City and **must be located in “high resource” areas**



Approach to Accommodate RHNA

- Meet community needs and reflect public input
- Minimize impact on existing neighborhoods to the extent feasible
- Identify locations along/near major transportation corridors that are near services, employment, transit/bicycle facilities, and parks and recreation
- Identify non-residential areas and corridors that could benefit from opportunities for revitalization via housing



Strategy to Accommodate RHNA

1. Start with leftover vacant/underutilized sites from 5th Cycle Housing Element that still meet new criteria
2. Identify entitled **and “pipeline” projects**
3. Estimate potential accessory dwelling units (ADUs) based on recent trends and incentives (2018, 2019, & 2020)



Strategy to Accommodate RHNA

4. Identify additional opportunities, such as:
 - A. Housing Corridor Study (underway)
 - B. Downtown Revitalization & Connectivity Plan
 - C. Facilitate housing on religious institution properties (builds on AB 1851 for affordable housing or other housing)
 - D. Other Sites / Corridors / Areas



Adequacy of Sites to Meet RHNA by Income Category

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	---	28	288	3,094 ^{2,3}	3,410 ²	38.2%
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		---	---	29	1,210 ⁴	1,239	45.3%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,167 ²	2,926 ²	80.7%
Total	4,939		195	429	480	6,471	7,575	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among and added to their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

³ 32.2% of lower-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

⁴ Approximately 45% of moderate-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

Process to Date

- 3 Planning Commission Workshops
(April 28, 2020, July 28, 2021, & October 20, 2021)
- 1st Submittal to HCD October 15, 2021 (Housing Element dated October 1, 2021)
- HCD Response December 14, 2021
- Revised Housing Element for 2nd submittal to HCD; made it available to public on April 11, 2022



Key Changes for 2nd Submittal

- Expanded population and housing data and evaluation of housing needs
- Updated housing constraints and clarified processing and permit procedures
- Updated list of entitled and pipeline projects
- Revised estimated number of ADUs per input from HCD
- Expanded discussion of Sites inventory, including rationale for sites and realistic capacity assumptions



Key Changes for 2nd Submittal

- Revised Sites Inventory to delete certain sites and add new sites based on public interest and identification of additional opportunities
- Provided additional information regarding actions to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) and expanded evaluation of AFFH data
- Expanded list of objectives/actions to implement programs in Housing Plan



Process to Date, continued

- Revised the April 11, 2022 version of draft Housing Element; made it available to public on May 9, 2022
- Planning Commission considered and made recommendation for City Council to adopt 6th Cycle Housing Element at public hearing on May 17, 2022
- 2nd Submittal made to HCD on May 18, 2022



California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Environmental compliance to support Housing Element Update
- Not a project-specific or construction-level CEQA review
- Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared by City
- 30-Day public review conducted Nov. 1 – Nov. 30, 2021



California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Finding that adoption of 6th Cycle Housing Element would not create significant impacts
- Additional CEQA for future proposed construction projects



Next Steps

- HCD responds to 2nd Submittal mid-July
- Resolution authorizes the City Manager to make minor revisions to address HCD comments for certification



Recommendation of Community Development Director and Planning Commission:

1. Conduct a public hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002; and
2. Adopt a RESOLUTION to approve the Housing Element Update for the 6th Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) Cycle (2021-2029); and
3. Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003); and
4. Authorize the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, if any comments are received.

APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Government Code Section 65588(a) requires each jurisdiction to review its Housing Element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate:

- The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal;
- The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community’s housing goals and objectives; and
- The progress of the city, county or city and county in implementation of the housing element.

This section documents the City’s achievements under the 2013-2021 (5th Cycle) Housing Element with respect to the actions and objectives contained therein. This section describes the relative success of the City’s efforts to implement the 5th Cycle programs, and contains recommendations for program retention, revision, deletion or addition to address current and projected needs and state requirements for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Table B-1 summarizes the City’s progress regarding the 5th Cycle RHNA for new construction, rehabilitation, and conservation/preservation. Table B-2 provides a review of the Program accomplishments for the 5th Cycle Housing Element.

Table B-1: Objectives and Accomplishments

Income Category	RHNA Objective	New Construction		Rehabilitation		Conservation/Preservation	
		Objective	Accomplishment	Objective	Accomplishment	Objective	Accomplishment
Extremely Low	190	190	0	262	43	28	0
Very Low	190	190	0		31	29	0
Low	227	227	0	263	106	57	0
Moderate	243	243	5	--	--	--	--
Above Moderate	600	600	297	--	--	--	--
Total	1,450	1,450	302	525	180	114	0

B.1 EFFECTIVENESS IN ADDRESSING SPECIAL NEEDS

The City of Torrance continues to provide technical assistance and information to both housing developers that serve populations with special needs, as well as individuals and households within those populations. The City provides financial assistance via various rental assistance programs, and also distributes information about available funding via its website and public counter.

The City also adopted an emergency shelter ordinance in 2013, to bring its zoning code into compliance with state law. This ordinance permitted in the M-2 Heavy Manufacturing Zone. In June of 2021, the City approved the first homeless shelter of its own, a temporary community of 40 tiny homes to be placed in the parking lot to the rear of the Torrance Superior Courthouse. At the January 25, 2022, City Council meeting, the City awarded a product and services agreement to Pallet SPC for the purchase and assembly of the temporary housing units and accessory units. The City plans to continue to search for a site within the M-2 zone where the use is allowed, should such a site become available.

The City also has a Homeless Plan, which was made available on the City’s website in July 2021. As the City’s initial homeless response guiding document, it outlines several approaches that can be developed and achieved over the next three years, with regular check points to evaluate effectiveness.

DRAFT

Table B-2: Review of Past Program Accomplishments

Goal and Associated Programs	Accomplishments
Providing New Housing Opportunities	
Program 1: Adequate Sites	<p>Ongoing: The City implements the Land Use Element of General Plan & maintains an inventory of sites available for higher density and mixed-use development. An inventory of vacant residential land is available. The City also works with developers on lot consolidation and parcel assembly to facilitate residential development.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Housing to Meet the Needs of All Income Levels	
Program 2: Mixed Use Development	<p>Ongoing: The City continues to encourage multi-family residential units as part of mixed-use development where appropriate. Several mixed-use developments have been approved within Torrance during the 5th Cycle.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. New mixed-use overlays and other revisions to facilitate mixed-use are proposed.</p>
Program 3: Affordable Housing Development	<p>Ongoing: The City will continue to provide technical assistance and information to developers. The City has approved developments for senior housing during the 5th Cycle.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Development standards are proposed to be revised and land use designations and revisions to the Zoning Code and Map are proposed to facilitate the accommodation of the City's RHNA.</p>
Program 4: Rental Assistance Programs	<p>Ongoing: The City provided assistance to 600 households and distributed 100% of rental assistance funds during 2021. Provided rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD's VASH voucher program and applied for 10 additional vouchers. City secured 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness. City provides pamphlets at public counter for first-time home</p>

		<p>buyers. City also has a dedicated webpage regarding its Section 8 Rental Housing Program.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Removal of Government Constraints		
Program 5: Land Use Code Housing Types	Update land use code to accurately reflect residential uses that are permitted & conditionally permitted in all zones.	<p>Ongoing: This program was proposed to be conducted as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update. Due to budgetary constraints, the comprehensive Zoning Code update has been postponed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. If the comprehensive Zoning Code update is not able to be funded during the 6th Cycle, the City will prepare a focused update to implement this program.</p>
Program 6: Extremely Low Income and Special Needs Housing	Amend the Land Use Code to facilitate housing opportunities for extremely low-income persons by addressing provisions for transitional housing, supportive housing, SRO housing, and emergency shelters. Evaluate provisions regarding development of residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development.	<p>Ongoing: The City adopted an emergency shelter ordinance in 2013. City's first temporary emergency shelter was approved in June 2021. Construction is expected in early 2022.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element to adopt ordinances for transitional housing, supportive housing, and SRO housing, and to implement provisions residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development.</p>
Program 7: Water and Sewer Service Providers	Deliver the Torrance Housing Element to all providers of sewer and water service within the City of Torrance.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element in compliance with state law.</p>
Program 8: Multi-Family Provisions	Identify modifications to development standards and permit requirements to remove constraints on multi-family development.	<p>Ongoing: This program was proposed to be conducted as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update. Due to budgetary constraints, the comprehensive Zoning Code update has been postponed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. If the comprehensive Zoning Code update is not able to be funded during the 6th</p>

		Cycle, the City will prepare a focused update to implement this program.
Conserve, Preserve, and Improve the Housing Stock		
Program 9: Home Rehabilitation and Improvement Programs	Provide low or no interest loans to qualified households to rehabilitate housing units and home repairs for senior & disabled residents.	<p>Ongoing: The City will continue to administer these programs as funding allows.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Program 10: Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing	Preserve affordable units at risk of converting to market rents by consulting annually with property owners of affordable housing, offering technical assistance to affordable housing owners with at-risk units and contacting qualified entities to inform them of opportunities to acquire and continue affordability of at-risk units.	<p>Ongoing: The City continues to consult with the property owners of these at-risk units to gauge the likelihood of conversion & seek to find a qualified entity to acquire properties to maintain affordability. None of the affordable rental units are considered at-risk for the period between 2021 and 2031.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity		
Program 11: Reasonable Accommodation	Create a process for making requests for reasonable accommodation and provide information to residents on reasonable accommodation procedures via public counters and the City website.	<p>Ongoing: The City has adopted a procedure to allow requests for reasonable accommodations using a simple form available at the public counter or by request. Requests for reasonable accommodations may not be appealed by residents of adjacent properties.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: During the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will adopt an ordinance in the Zoning Code to formalize the City's existing procedure.</p>
Program 12: Land Use Code Definitions	Revise the definition of family to be flexible for a variety of household types consistent with State and Federal Law.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program is completed and is no longer necessary to be continued.</p>
Program 13: Enforce Fair Housing Laws	Educate and promote fair housing protections to participants of the rental assistance program.	<p>Ongoing: The City will continue to enforce and abide by fair housing laws, increase awareness of fair housing protections & provide assistance to victims of housing discrimination.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>

APPENDIX C

Table C-1—SITES INVENTORY

3RD Submittal

CRITERIA LEGEND (Please see Section 4.1.2.4 for details)

1. **Developer or property owner interest to develop/redevelop the site.** *Properties with expressed interest in development are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.*
2. **Vacant lot, parking lot, or open storage that includes only minor existing improvements on site.** *Vacant properties, parking lots, or those with limited improvements are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.*
3. **Sites that meet a minimum of 2 of the following criteria:**
 - a. Site is included in the Housing Corridor Study
 - b. City-owned site
 - c. Land value is greater than improvement value (LV>IV), when adjusted for current assessment values
 - d. Structure was built before 1992 (and therefore over 30 years old)
 - e. Site is in disrepair and/or has had ongoing Code violations
 - f. Presence of low-intensity or low-value uses, such as small structures surrounded by large parking lots
 - g. If residential, the site can accommodate an increase in the number of dwelling units (based on allowable or proposed density)
 - h. Identified for new Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ)
 - i. There is or has been an ongoing presence of vacancies

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria	
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning								Criteria per Criteria Legend	Additional Information/Comments
Apple Avenue	7	7359-016-005	2401 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.20	23.25	1	yes		SFR 3 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	17	7359-016-002	2409 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	54	7359-015-011	2623 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.11	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	80	7359-016-006	2325 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.20	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	108	7359-015-010	2617 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	132	7359-015-005	2611 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.18	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	235	7359-016-004	2103 Lincoln Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	301	7359-016-001	2405 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
													LV<IV; new construction, little chance of build-out to allowable density	---	---	
Crenshaw_MU-1	450	7371-009-051	23804 Crenshaw Blvd	C-GEN	C-5	C-GEN	C-5 (R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.88	33	29	no		Commercial building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Crenshaw_MU-1	451	7374-006-037	23900 Crenshaw Blvd	C-GEN	C-5	C-GEN	C-5 (R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.40	33	13	no	Lot size	Commercial building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential Site is directly north of a new residential development in the City of Lomita being constructed on property formerly zoned and used for light industrial and general commercial
Crenshaw_RP	8	7370-007-032	22930 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	11	7370-020-022	23210 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	21	7370-007-062	22910 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	58	7370-020-058	23150 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.21	33	6	no		Medical office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	62	7370-006-050	22850 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	152	7370-006-051	22700 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	194	7371-001-011	23314 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.23	33	7	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	276	7370-019-053	23000 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3. i.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	278	7370-007-061	22920 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Crenshaw_RP	344	7370-020-059	23110 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.34	33	11	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	397	7370-019-020	23026 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	412	7370-020-021	23224 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	422	7370-007-060	22924 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	444	7371-005-100	2480 236th St	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	445	7371-005-099	2481 236th Pl	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	446	7371-006-108	2480 236th Pl	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	447	7371-006-107	23632 Crenshaw Blvd	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.12	33	3	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	448	7371-008-045	23730 Crenshaw Blvd	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw_RP	449	7371-008-072	2481 238th St	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Hair studio in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Downtown	37	7355-022-903	Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.14	36	5	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2. 3.b., 3.c.	City-owned parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	43	7355-022-902	Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.16	36	5	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2. 3.b., 3.c.	City-owned parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	165	7355-027-144	1256 Sartori Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.35	36	12	yes	Lot size	Parking lot	2. 3.c.,	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	175	7355-024-047	1610 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.33	36	11	yes		Commercial/L-I building - unoccupied, and parking area	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	211	7355-024-021	1614 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.09	36	3	yes	Lot size	Small commercial bldg. 1/2 unoccupied	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	244	7355-022-017	1529 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.29	36	10	yes	Lot size	Small commercial office/parking area	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	295	7355-024-026	1424 Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.10	36	3	yes	Lot size	Small commercial/office building	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	393	7355-024-025	1430 Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.29	36	10	yes	Lot size	Large parking lot	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	406	7355-026-900	Post Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.21	36	7	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2. 3.b., 3.d.	City-owned parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	425	7355-026-016	1324 Post Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.32	36	11	yes	Lot size	Parking lot	2. 3.b., 3.d.	Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	465	7355-023-030	1925 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.27	36	7	no		Restaurant	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	466	7355-023-031	1951 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.14	36	5	no		Dance studio	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Downtown	467	7355-023-029	1931 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.25	36	9	no		surface parking lot	1., 2. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	468	7355-023-027	S. OF GRAMERCY AVE/CRAVENS AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.14	36	5	no		surface parking	1., 2. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	469	7355-028-014	1831 213TH st	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.21	36	7	no		Car wash	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Car wash; adjacent to parcel owned by same owner (Site 470); directly south of residential condo development
Downtown	470	7355-028-008	N of CORNER OF 213 TH/BORDER	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.11	36	3	no		Car wash	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Car wash; adjacent to parcel owned by same owner (Site 446); directly south of residential condo development
Downtown	472	7355-024-009	1639 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.12	36	4	no		Commercial on ground floor and hotel on upper floors	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	473	7355-003-015	1646 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.2	36	6	no		Mixed use/commercial ground floor; hotel on upper floor	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	474	7355-003-016	1644 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no		Parking	1., 2. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	499	7355-027-91	1956 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Lower	0.06	36	2	no		City-owned parking lot		Even though this site is less than ½ acre, the City is in discussion with an affordable housing developer to construct up to 20 affordable units on this site.
Flag Lots	85	7374-009-041	2354 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.27	6.8	0	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	240	7371-027-049	2265 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.45	6.8	2	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	271	7374-009-040	2356 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.30	6.8	1	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	289	7374-009-096	2332 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.27	6.8	0	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	357	7374-009-101	2322 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.33	6.8	1	no		SFR	3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	415	7371-027-038	2279 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.45	6.8	2	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Gramercy Avenue	44	7357-005-010	2439 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	66	7357-012-023	2404 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	124	7357-005-008	2431 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	130	7357-005-011	2443 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.23	23.25	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	143	7357-012-016	2432 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	1	yes		SFR 2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	188	7357-012-022	2408 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	207	7357-012-017	2428 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	315	7357-012-014	2440 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.27	23.25	5	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	386	7357-012-021	2412 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	408	7357-005-009	2435 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.11	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Gramercy Avenue	433	7357-012-015	2436 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	1	yes		SFR 2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
HBCSP	6	4085-015-049	4234 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Moderate	0.33	33	8	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	10	7534-012-018	3760 242nd St.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	29	7534-020-028	24474 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	31	7534-012-013	24211 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	46	7534-013-017	24218 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	51	7534-013-020	24212 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial - Walteria Liquor (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	56	7534-019-012	24418 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.24	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	57	7534-013-025	24222 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	73	7534-014-029	24238 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.13	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.j.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	76	4085-015-050	4232 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Moderate	0.33	33	8	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	89	7378-003-121	3655 Lomita Blvd	C-GEN	H-MP	C-GEN	H-MP	Lower	2.45	33	60	yes		Office Building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	109	7534-014-021	24242 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	113	7534-013-012	24230 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	118	7534-020-018	24454 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	119	7534-012-002	24245 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-Gen	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.29	33	7	no		Commercial (1- & 2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	126	7534-012-033	24217 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	145	4085-015-039	4240 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	0.65	33	16	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	148	7534-019-016	24430 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.20	33	4	no		Commercial office (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	153	7534-019-015	24428 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	174	4085-015-044	4310 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	0.98	33	24	no		Commercial (1-story) (1963)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	187	7534-021-001	24401 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.31	33	7	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	206	7534-012-012	24213 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
													Pipeline Project		3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	210	7534-014-019	24250 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	218	7534-021-038	24449 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	2	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit) (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	225	7534-019-013	24424 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	0	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	232	7534-021-016	24423 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story front & 2-story rear)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	242	7366-019-183	S/W Corner-Fashion Way/Madrone	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	6.64	36	238 (190 above/48 lower)	no		Vacant building and parking lot	1., 2. 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
													Entitled project		---	

Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments	
			Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning										
HBCSP	274	7534-012-035	No Address (Parking Lot)	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.11	33	2	no		Parking lot	2 3.d.	Identified trend in WT for MU
HBCSP	279	7352-001-002	19040 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	1.73	33	42	no		Auto service use	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	282	7534-014-033	24262 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.44	33	10	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	283	7534-012-019	3768 242nd St.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	287	7534-020-016	24448 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	291	7534-013-028	24214 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story) (1984)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	292	4085-015-048	17490 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	5.92	33	146	no		Commercial shopping center	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	294	7534-020-027	24460 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Commercial 1- and 2-story	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	296	7534-013-024	24222 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Parking lot	2. 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	302	7534-012-009	24221 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	309	7534-019-014	No Address (Parking Lot)	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	0	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit (1-story))	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	316	7534-013-027	24216 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story) (1962)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	322	7534-013-026	24202 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.25	33	6	no		Commercial - Hawthorne Market (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	323	7534-014-020	24244 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	333	7534-021-019	24411 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	338	7366-019-182	21515 Madrona Ave	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	7.32	36	263 (210 above/53 lower)	no		Parking lot @ Del Amo Mall	1., 2. 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	340	7534-012-034	24207 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	354	7534-012-043	24239 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Lower	0.65	33	16	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	356	7534-020-017	24450 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	372	7534-013-023	24226 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.17	33	4	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	373	7534-019-021	24400 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Lower	0.59	33	14	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	374	7534-013-011	24232 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	378	7534-012-017	24203 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	2	no		Commercial hair salon (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	382	7534-012-016	24205 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial hair salon (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	392	7534-021-017	24421 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	1	no		Mixed use (Commercial plus 2 units) (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	411	7534-020-011	Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.20	33	4	no		Parking lot for adjacent office building	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	413	7534-021-042	24415 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	419	4085-015-043	4212 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	1.00	33	24	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce setback an incentive for MU

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HBCSP	423	7534-020-025	3735 Newton St./Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	435	7366-019-133	22100 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed	21.11	36	760	no		Sears property	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	452	7524-008-028	20555 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	3.53	33 (26 above/7 lower)	87	no		Car rental (Hertz)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	453	7524-020-048	Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.25	33	6	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	454	7524-020-047	20617 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.20	33	4	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	455	7524-020-025	20625 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.23	33	5	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	456	7524-020-024	20627 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.34	33	8	no		Body shop	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Lack of site amenities. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	457	7524-020-023	20703 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.34	33	8	no		Auto collision	3.c., 3.d.	Lack of site amenities. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	458	7524-020-022	20705 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.48	33	11	no		Industrially assessed use, minimal improvements	3.c., 3.d.	Poor site condition, underutilized. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	462	7368-021-043	3735 Newton St./Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	4.48	33	110 (88 above/22 lower)	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	463	7378-009-072	3825 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	H-P/PCH	C-GEN	H-P/PCH	Moderate	0.72	33	17	no		Vacant lot	1., 2. 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Vacant. Program to add MU to H-P/PCH an incentive
HBCSP	477	7524-014-110	3475 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2	Lower	1.23	36	33	no		Office building	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	482	7524-010-021	3730 SPENCER ST	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.46	33	11	no		Vacant auto repair	1. 3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	483	7524-010-023	20502 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.21	33	5	no		Commercial (CA Home Fitness)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	484	7524-010-020	20522 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	0.61	33	15	no		Commercial (Budget Car Rental)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	489	7366-019-101	3610 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Lower	4.03	36	108	no		Retail building	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	490	7524-014-117	3535 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2	Lower	1.14	33	28	no		Commercial center	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HBCSP	491	7366-019-123	3405 CARSON ST	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	1.92	36	51 (41 above/10 lower)	no		Restaurant	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	493	7524-015-081	20901 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Above Moderate	1.48	33	36	no		Commercial-retail	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district
HBCSP	494	7524-015-082	20821 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	0.88	33	21	no		Commercial-medical	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	9	7357-024-006	1741 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	13	7357-022-011	2121 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	19	7355-029-018	1511 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.09	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---
													Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	24	7357-022-005	2023 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---
													Net negative number of units	---	---	---
													Net negative number of units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	35	7357-022-020	2012 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	3	no	Added new overlay zone	parking lot for religious institution	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	36	7355-029-901	1316 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned building	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Net negative number of units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	41	7355-029-027	1420 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	49	7357-023-008	1913 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	52	7357-024-008	Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot for industrial building	1, 2, 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	53	7357-024-004	1731 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	60	7355-029-013	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.11	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	surface parking for auto paint and body shop	2., 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Border	61	7355-030-021	1612 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	65	7355-029-012	1415 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.12	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	67	7357-023-007	1907 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.32	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	70	7357-022-021	2006 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.35	23.25	8	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	71	7357-023-005	1823 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial+1 du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	82	7357-023-010	1923 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing+ 1du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	83	7357-023-002	1809 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	86	7355-030-006	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	3.a., 3.c., 3.i.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	87	7355-029-038	1503 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.35	36	12	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	91	7357-023-015	1904 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	95	7357-022-002	1800 220th St	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													No new units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	98	7357-021-021	1865 Plaza Del Amo	R-OF	R3	R-OF	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.52	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
													No new units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	101	7357-022-001	SW Corner Of W220th/Border	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Added new overlay zone	vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	104	7357-024-023	1870 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.64	36	22	no	Added new overlay zone	shopping center	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	105	7355-030-005	1619 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking/outdoor storage	2., 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS_Border	111	7355-030-015	1646 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	mixed-use commercial, hotel above	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	114	7357-022-009	2113 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	116	7357-022-003	2013 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR-1 du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	117	7357-022-008	2107 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	120	7357-023-001	1801 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	125	7355-030-003	1611 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	129	7355-030-012	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Border	133	7357-022-004	2019 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
													Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	147	7355-029-019	1513 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	149	7355-029-044	1408 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.32	36	11	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	150	7355-029-041	1424 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	158	7357-022-007	2029 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 3-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	161	7357-023-017	1824 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	163	7355-030-022	1610 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	166	7357-023-006	1829 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	168	7355-030-007	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	173	7357-021-023	2305 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.48	33	15	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	176	7357-021-024	2326 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.91	23.25	20	no	Added new overlay zone	Masonic Temple	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of condo development	---	---	---
													Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	190	7357-022-010	2117 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	192	7357-024-009	1870 218th St	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR-2 units	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS_Border	203	7355-029-042	1518 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.37	36	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	205	7357-024-024	1724 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.43	23.25	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Motel	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	209	7357-024-012	1746 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
													Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS_Border	221	7355-030-008	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS_Border	233	7355-030-010	1635 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5 th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Border	234	7355-029-020	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	245	7355-029-039	1328 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.23	36	8	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													15-unit apartment building—net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	248	7357-024-022	1880 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.44	36	15	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS_Border	257	7357-023-011	1924 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	258	7355-029-900	1312 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	2. 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.,	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	259	7357-024-007	1745 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													City-owned water tank	---	---	---
													City-owned water tank	---	---	---
													Net loss of units	---	---	---
													LV>IV (reassessed in 2020)	---	---	---
HCS_Border	269	7357-021-010	2323 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.28	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	281	7355-029-902	1320 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.08	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	2. 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.,	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	293	7355-029-003	1405 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.13	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	299	7355-030-009	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	300	7357-023-003	1813 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Affordable MU project developed during 5 th cycle	---	---	---
													Net loss of units	---	---	---
													Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS_Border	312	7355-030-004	1617 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	313	7357-021-020	2207 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.32	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	317	7355-030-011	1641 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	318	7355-030-024	1600 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													---	---	---	---
													---	---	---	---

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Border	331	7355-029-028	1420 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	336	7357-024-020	1725 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.29	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone Net loss of units	auto paint and body shop ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	339	7357-022-016	2100 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone Net loss of units Net loss of units	MFR ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	345	7357-024-010	1754 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone Net Loss of units	Mixed use ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	347	7355-030-016	Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	349	7355-030-002	1609 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	355	7357-023-016	1830 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	358	7355-030-001	1603 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.21	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone Part of condo development	Commercial-service shop ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	370	7355-030-025	1875 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.21	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-service shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	371	7357-024-015	1732 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone No new units	MFR ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	388	7355-029-010	1324 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone Net loss of units	Commercial-service shop ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	396	7357-021-004	2217 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	398	7355-029-014	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.08	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	399	7357-024-005	1737 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone Net loss of units	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	403	7357-021-003	2213 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	404	7357-021-013	2230 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.25	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	407	7357-023-014	1908 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone No new units	MFR ---	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---
HCS_Border	417	7357-021-009	2317 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	424	7357-022-018	2022 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	426	7357-023-004	Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone No new units	Vacant land ---	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d. ---	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling ---

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Border	434	7357-022-006	2027 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	439	7357-023-009	1917 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.16	33	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Border	441	7355-029-024	1504 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	36	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS_Gramercy	4	4094-009-039	2008 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.13	13.5	1	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	23	4094-009-012	16809 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.72	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	38	4094-009-062	2016 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.60	13.5	8	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	47	4094-009-015	16709 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.72	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	93	4094-009-045	2044 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.37	13.5	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	123	4094-009-037	Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.41	13.5	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	127	4094-009-016	16659 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.69	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													No new units	---	---	---
HCS_Gramercy	191	4094-009-007	16639 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.93	13.5	12	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	239	4094-009-067	16619 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.40	23.25	8	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	261	4094-009-014	16719 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.71	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Gramercy	306	4094-019-037	16933 Gramercy Pl	R-LO	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.48	23.25	11	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													No new units	---	---	---
HCS_Gramercy	364	4094-009-068	16649 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.71	23.25	16	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Lomita-Madison	183	7377-004-051	3521 Lomita Blvd	I-BP	M1-PP	R-MH	M1-PP(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	8.32	33	274	no	Added new overlay zone	light industrial business park	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	14	7352-010-002	612 Maple Ave	I-LT	M2	R-MD	M2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	2.26	23.25	52	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	75	7352-011-020	2515 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-MD	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	1.27	23.25	29	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-public storage/mini-warehouse	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	180	7352-011-021	2645 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	2.71	13.5	36	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	184	7352-010-001	700 Maple Ave	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	2.08	13.5	28	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3., h.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Maricopa	238	7352-011-143	625 Alaska Ave	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	2.97	13.5	38	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	328	7352-011-019	2535 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-MH	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Mixed	9.14	33	301	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	381	7352-011-003	2727 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	4.29	13.5	57	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	440	7352-010-003	615 Hawaii Ave	I-LT	M2	R-MD	M2(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	1.50	23.25	34	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Maricopa	459	7352-002-911	Crenshaw Blvd	I-HVY	M2	R-MH	M2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.99	33	65	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land, City owned, next to transit	2. 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Prairie Area	185	4084-008-018	18129 Prairie Ave	C-GEN	C5	R-LM	C5(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.39	13.5	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant restaurant & 2 dwelling units	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Identified trend for housing on Prairie. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Prairie Area	405	4084-008-019	4015 182nd St	C-GEN	C5	R-LM	C5(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.33	13.5	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Liquor store, vape/smoke shop, bicycle shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing on Prairie. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	26	7524-006-039	4215 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	27	7524-006-057	4227 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.60	23.25	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	121	7524-006-064	4209 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	159	7524-006-042	4203 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	162	7524-006-029	20433 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	179	7524-006-038	4221 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	182	7524-006-025	20433 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
													No new units	---	---	---
HCS_Spencer	305	7524-006-058	20441 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	379	7524-006-046	20445 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Spencer	395	7524-006-088	20427 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.45	23.25	10	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_N	40	7357-030-003	22501 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.68	33	22	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS_Western_N	97	7357-030-005	22597 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.52	33	17	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_N	102	7357-030-018	22501 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.04	33	34	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_N	367	7357-030-004	22593 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_S	84	7357-037-021	22717 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.26	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_S	136	7357-037-016	22707 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.26	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_S	164	7357-037-019	22701 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.58	23.25	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_S	265	7357-037-013	22625 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.76	23.25	40	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS_Western_S	376	7357-037-020	22771 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.22	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
Other_RP	137	7371-021-003	23536 Arlington Ave.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other_RP	138	7371-021-072	2175 236th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.12	33	3	no		Commercial-office building w/1 SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other_RP	199	7371-018-073	2173 237th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.20	33	5	no		SFR (1 unit existing)	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other_RP	255	7371-018-074	2165 237th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		SFR (1 unit existing)	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Redondo Beach Blvd	290	4067-013-001	2500 Redondo Beach Blvd	C-GEN	C-3PP	C-GEN	C-3PP(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	13.64	33	450	yes	Corrections to land use designations and zoning (clean-up)	Old drive in/open air swap meet	2. 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	380	4067-012-001	2700 Redondo Beach Blvd	R-OF	C-2PP	R-OF	C-2PP (R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.64	33	21	yes	Correction	parking lot	2. 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	431	4067-012-014	Redondo Beach Blvd	C-GEN	C-3PP	C-GEN	C-3PP (R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.30	33	9	yes	Correction	Old drive in/open air swap meet	2. 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	460	4092-001-904	Redondo Beach Blvd	PBLC		PBLC/R-HI	R4 or R5 or PBLC/R/MU-OZ	Lower	2.00	45	90	no	Correction	El Camino College parking lot	2., 3.c., 3.d.	Program to redesignate/rezone provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Religious Institution	33	7519-025-049	21100 Victor St.	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.44	23.25	14	no	Correction	Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	63	7370-002-002	2300 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3/P1	C-GEN	C3/P1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.46	23.25	2	no	Correction	Torrance New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	88	7359-010-012	1900 Crenshaw Blvd.	C-GEN	M2	C-GEN	M2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.88	23.25	16	no	Correction	Torrance First Presbyterian	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	94	7514-023-030	330 Palos Verdes Blvd	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay)	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.87	23.25	10	no	Correction	Resurrection Lutheran Church & Riviera Hall Lutheran School	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Religious Institution	106	7371-020-016	2051 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.40	23.25	2	no	Correction	Temple Emet	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	131	4087-016-033	16831 Ainsworth Ave.	PBLC	R3/C2	PBLC	R3/C2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.34	23.25	25	no	Correction	St. Catherine Laboure	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	146	7370-010-009	2150 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.92	23.25	5	no	Correction	South Bay Christian Community	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	177	7524-015-104	3611 Torrance Blvd	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.60	23.25	9	no	Correction	St. Abraam Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	193	7547-003-015	3646 Newton St.	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R-MD (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.88	23.25	5	no	Correction	Walteria United Methodist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	216	7528-005-009	22605 Kent Ave.	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.17	23.25	18	no	Correction	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	231	7371-020-032	2059 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R-1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.21	23.25	0	no	Correction	South Bay New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	241	7534-006-012	4000 Pacific Coast Highway	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.62	23.25	15	no	Correction	Calvary Church of Torrance	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	254	7511-021-004	375 Palos Verdes Blvd	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay)	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.63	23.25	9	yes	Correction	Riviera United Methodist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	311	4088-006-027	17910 Prairie Ave.	PBLC	R3	PBLC	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.68	23.25	21	no	Correction	Ascension Lutheran Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	314	4085-032-008	18015 Prairie Ave.	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.84	23.25	4	no	Correction	Faith Christian Assembly	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	332	7359-023-038	2900 Carson St.	R-LM	R2	R-LM	R2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.38	23.25	19	no	Correction	First Evangelical Lutheran Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	353	7524-006-001	4527 Spencer St	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.44	23.25	2	no	Correction	Anza Baptist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	361	4096-009-067	2115 182nd St	C-GEN	C3/P1	C-GEN	C3/P1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.33	23.25	7	no	Correction	Faith United Methodist	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	366	7519-026-040	4915 Emerald St./20730 Victor St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.58	23.25	9	no	Correction	Baycities South Bay Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	369	7524-007-035	4345 Emerald Ave.	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-LM	ML(M1-PP) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.33	23.25	25	no	Correction	Nova Community Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	391	7514-005-005	6122 Pacific Coast Highway	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.73	23.25	4	no	Correction	Redondo Beach Church of Christ)	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	400	7362-014-011	2930 El Dorado St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.70	23.25	9	no	Correction	First Christian Church of Torrance	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	420	7371-020-041	2077 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.80	23.25	4	no	Correction	South Bay New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	492	7527-021-006	4565 SHARYNNE LN	R-LO	A-1	R-LO	A-1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.67	23.25	8	No		Evangelical Formosan Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	495	7377-013-001	2701 237TH ST	I-LT	M1-PP	I-LT	I-LT (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.38	23.25	25	no		The 103 Saints Korean Catholic Center	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Santa Fe Avenue	3	7359-013-031	2116 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	42	7359-013-033	2124 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	154	7359-013-051	2130 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	167	7359-013-032	2120 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	15	7357-011-011	2424 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	16	7524-014-017	21027 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	33	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	18	7357-011-023	2435 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	45	7378-003-091	3630 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	48	7357-007-008	2757 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	55	4087-013-021	3606 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	59	7357-011-008	2412 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	64	4092-005-014	3535 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	77	4089-024-012	3615 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	81	4089-020-001	3511 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	90	7357-011-022	2431 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
													Entitled Project		---	
Scattered Sites	103	4089-020-002	18923 Cerise Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	139	4092-005-016	3547 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	140	7514-006-001	100 Vista Del Parque	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	142	4092-019-014	17022 Yukon Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above moderate	0.12	33	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	144	7357-010-011	2420 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	155	4092-005-070	3553 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	156	4095-020-027	2700 182nd St	R-MD	RP	R-MD	RP	Above moderate	0.18	23.25	4	yes		Office Building		Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	157	7378-003-093	3616 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	169	7357-011-020	2423 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	170	4089-025-014	18919 Cranbrook Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	200	7357-011-012	2428 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	201	4096-001-053	18655 Western Ave	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.31	33	43	yes	Correction	Vacant industrial building	3.c., 3.d., 3, 3.i., 3.j.*	*Trend for residential on Western. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	204	4087-013-022	3602 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	212	4089-020-018	3519 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	213	7357-011-021	2427 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	214	7524-014-018	21101 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	33	4	yes		MFR-2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	223	7359-009-017	2255 Jefferson St.	I-BP	M2	R-MD	R3	Lower	2.38	23.25	55	no		Industrial-warehouse/distribution		GP/rezoning program an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	228	4089-018-013	18924 Cerise Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	249	7357-011-018	2415 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	253	4087-012-022	3616 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	256	4087-013-020	3610 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	270	7378-003-120	3640 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	272	7378-003-096	23012 Samuel St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.18	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	273	4092-005-018	3559 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	275	7524-013-064	3520 Emerald St	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R4	Lower	2.41	33	79	yes	Correction	Religious institution	3.c., 3.d.	Program to rezone consistent with GP an incentive
Scattered Sites	277	4087-012-023	3610 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit		
Scattered Sites	280	4092-019-013	17016 Yukon Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R-4	Above moderate	0.12	33	2	yes		SFR 1 unit		Program to rezone consistent with GP an incentive
Scattered Sites	284	4096-001-054	18715 Western Ave	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	2.15	33	71	yes	Correction	Small scale nursery	3.c., 3.d., 3.f., 3.j.*	*Trend for residential on Western. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	308	7378-003-090	3634 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	319	4089-025-012	3635 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	320	4087-012-021	3622 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	325	4089-025-011	18918 Kornblum Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	327	7378-003-095	3604 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	329	7357-011-024	2439 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	330	4089-024-011	18918 Cranbrook Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	335	4089-020-017	18924 Patronella Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	348	7378-003-092	3624 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	350	7524-014-019	21105 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Moderate	0.16	33	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	360	4089-018-014	3445 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	362	7357-011-042	2443 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	363	7357-007-009	2765 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.30	23.25	6	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	368	7357-010-010	2416 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	377	4089-024-013	18923 Yukon Ave	R-MD	C2	R-MD	(R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes	Correction	SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	394	7357-011-019	2419 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	416	4092-005-015	3541 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	418	7378-003-094	3610 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	421	7357-011-009	2416 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	428	4087-007-022	3638 168th St	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above moderate	0.20	33	5	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	432	7357-011-007	2408 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	436	7359-039-006	1780 Oak St.	R-MD	PD	R-MD	PD	Lower	1.12	23.25	26	no		Commercial gym/event rental	3.c., 3.d.	Site underutilized based on allowable density

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	437	4087-012-002	3605 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	443	4089-024-014	18919 Yukon Ave	R-MD	C2	R-MD	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Above Moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes	Correction	SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	461	4094-017-037	17010 Van Ness Ave	R-LO	R-1	R-LO	R-1	Above Moderate		6.8	5	no		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density. Potential for lot subdivision potential, portion of lot contains vacant dairy building
													Pipeline Project	---	---	---
Scattered Sites	471	7535-004-004	3110 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.63	33	53	no	Owner requested removal:	shopping center	1. 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	475	7355-031-054	21515 WESTERN AVE	BP	M1	R-MD	R-3	Lower	4.04	23.25	93	no		vacant grocery store	---	Public interest in residential. Program to revise GP/zoning an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	476	7359-028-233	2325 CRENSHAW BLVD	C-GEN	PD	C-GEN	PD(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	5.5	33	181	No		Office building (Park Del Amo PD)	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	478	4089-028-025	3709 190th ST	C-GEN	R1/C1-PP	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.56	33	18	No		Commercial/store	1. 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	479	4087-021-017	3977 171st St	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	480	4087-021-018	3977 171st ST	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.12	33	3	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	481	4087-021-016	3977 171ST ST	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.23	33	7	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	485	7524-003-041	4011 SPENCER ST	BP	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	R3	Lower	2.26	23.25	52	no		RV storage yard	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for GP/zoning an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	486	7373-019-064	2427 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.42	33	13	No		Preschool	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	487	7373-019-063	2439 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.5	33	16	No		Restaurant	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	488	7524-027-028	4501 TORRANCE BLVD	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.07	33	35	No		Shopping center	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	497	4096-016-027	17905 S WESTERN AVE	C-GEN	ML	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.18	33	5	No		Restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	12	7379-001-015	2780 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.22	33	7	no	Correction	Commercial-service	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	28	7379-001-012	2732 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial-store (part of shopping center)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	134	7379-001-010	2720 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	217	7359-012-004	2407 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	M2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Lower	0.85	33	28	no	Correction	Building supply	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	222	7379-001-039	2770 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Shopping center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	224	7379-001-004	2606 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Lower	0.78	33	25	no	Correction	Furniture store	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	263	7379-001-040	2738 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.76	33	25	no	Correction	Shopping center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	267	7370-002-019	2340 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Above Moderate	0.28	33	9	no	Correction	Office building	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	285	7379-001-001	2630 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Above Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial building	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	303	7379-001-011	2724 Sepulveda Blvd	C-Gen	C2	C-Gen	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	343	7379-001-013	2734 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial-restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	387	7379-001-037	2700 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.97	33	32	no	Correction	Commercial-store (Ethan Allen Furniture)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Sepulveda East of Maple	390	7370-002-018	2350 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.66	33	21	no	Correction	Shopping center	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	410	7379-001-002	2722 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	496	4096-016-028	2880 Sepulveda Blvd.	C-GEN	C3-PP	C-GEN	C3-PP(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.99	33	32	no		Vacant restaurant	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	
Vacant Sites	2	7547-002-011	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	1.70	6.8	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
													City-owned; removed because of hillside & terrain	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	25	7547-002-007	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.03	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	50	7531-016-049	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.10	6.8	0	yes	Correction	vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	68	7519-023-026	4605 Torrance Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY)	Lower	0.52	33	17	yes		vacant (parking for commercial center)	2., 3.c., 3.d.	Vacant. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Vacant Sites	69	7547-001-009	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.28	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	74	7524-008-063	Spencer St	R-LM	ML(C4)	C-GEN+HBCSP-MU	H-PR	Mixed (Assumes 80% above-moderate/20% below moderate)	0.85	13.5 33	11	yes		vacant (portion of adjacent auto lot)	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	79	7547-002-010	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.07	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	110	7547-001-019	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.32	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
													City-owned site. Removed because of hillside & terrain	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	115	7547-001-024	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.23	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
													City-owned. Removed because of proximity to refinery	---	---	---
													Owned by Water Replenishment District	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	178	7547-001-021	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.31	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	195	7547-001-014	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.09	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
			N/A										Parcel deleted by assessor	---	---	---
													Parcel deleted by assessor	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	202	7531-016-047	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.05	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	226	7547-001-008	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.28	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	227	7547-002-006	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.01	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant

	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
													Land-locked parcel	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	236	7516-001-007	Torrance Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2	Above Moderate	0.10	33	3	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	237	7547-001-015	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.06	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	243	7547-002-005	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	18.07	6.8	122	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	246	7547-001-025	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.14	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	251	7547-001-018	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.69	6.8	4	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	252	4096-002-027	2150 Artesia Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2	Above Moderate	0.35	33	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	286	7547-001-026	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.12	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	288	4084-008-058	Hickman Dr	R-LM	R2	R-LM	R2	Above moderate	0.21	13.5	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
														---	---	---
Vacant Sites	298	7547-002-008	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.05	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	321	7547-001-020	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.32	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
													Owned by Water Replenishment District	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	352	7520-001-008	Beryl St	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C3	Above moderate	0.18	33	5	yes	Lot size	vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	359	7547-001-028	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.04	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	383	7532-009-901	Vista Largo	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.59	6.8	4	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	384	4084-008-059	Hickman Dr	R-LM	R2	R-LM	R2	Above moderate	0.21	13.5	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	385	4096-018-006	N/A	C-GEN	CR	C-GEN	CR	Lower	0.13	33	4	yes	Parcel Deleted By Assessor	---		---
Vacant Sites	414	7371-021-022	Arlington	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Above Moderate	0.34	33	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	429	7547-001-007	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.40	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	430	7531-016-048	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.07	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	438	7547-002-009	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.06	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant

APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

APPENDIX D. ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

D.1 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF AB 686

In 2017, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) into California state law. AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. The Bill added an assessment of fair housing to the Housing Element which includes the following components:

- A summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the jurisdiction’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity;
- An analysis of segregation patterns, racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunities and disproportionate housing needs;
- An assessment of contributing factors; and
- An identification of fair housing goals and actions.

The AFFH rule was originally a federal requirement applicable to entitlement jurisdictions (with population over 50,000) that can receive U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds directly from HUD. Before the 2016 federal rule was repealed in 2019, entitlement jurisdictions were required to prepare an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) or Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI). AB 686 states that jurisdictions can incorporate findings from either report into the Housing Element.

For the purpose of HUD CPD funds (CDBG, HOME, and ESG), the County of Los Angeles (county) functions as the lead agency to receive these funds on behalf of 47 small cities (with population less than 50,000), including Torrance, and the unincorporated county areas. Collectively, this geography is known as the Urban County. Some of the data provided by HUD for the purpose of housing and community development and AFFH analysis is based on this collective Urban County geography.

D.2 Fair Housing Assessment

D.2.1 Enforcement and Outreach

Regional Trends

Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. In FY 2019-2020, HRC received 2,038 calls for general housing inquiries and 356 calls related to fair housing inquiries. Among the 356 inquires, fair housing issues relating to disabilities (physical and mental) represented the majority (82%) of the protected classifications. Trailing behind was source of income at 5% of the inquiries.

During the FY 2019-2020, 83 fair cases were opened, with the majority being reconciled or withdrawn. Two cases were referred to litigation and three cases were referred to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). Among the 83 cases opened, physical disability (47%), mental disability (22%), and source of income (19%) represented the majority of the protected classes.

Annually, HRC conducts outreach and education throughout the Los Angeles Urban County. Typical activities include Public Service Announcements/media/advertisements; community presentations; literature distribution; and management trainings.

The Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) policy prohibits discrimination in any aspect of housing on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status, or sex. Furthermore, the HRC, under contract with LACDA, monitors fair housing compliance for both state and federal fair housing laws.

Local Trends

Housing Element Outreach

To assist in the development of fair housing programs and recommendations within the Housing Element, the City gathered input from local service providers and affordable housing developers during two focus group sessions, as well as more general input from community members at three public workshops. The City reached out to HOAs, City Commissions, and others who work developing both affordable and market-rate housing to encourage their participation in the development of the Housing Element, as well as other agencies that assist low-income residents. The City also conducted a Housing Corridor Study, provided information about the Housing Element on its webpage, provided updates about the process at Planning Commission and City Council meetings, and promoted the Housing Element via social media and notices posted at the City information kiosk at the mall, library and Downtown information kiosk. The City Cable Station also broadcast virtual meetings related to the development and review of the Housing Element. The City also met with representatives of Abundant Housing over a Zoom session on November 15, 2021.

In addition to in-person meetings, the City has received comment letters and written communication from multiple groups and individuals focused on promoting fair and affordable housing within the City. A summary of this outreach is included in Section 1 of the Housing Element, and copies of written communication received during the development of the Housing Element are included in Appendix A.

Fair Housing Outreach

According to HUD’s fair housing records, Torrance received 48 fair housing inquiries from January 2013 to March 2021, an average of approximately 5.3 inquiries per year.


Torrance also provides information about Fair Housing and Homeless resources on its website, along with information about local housing programs. The City has a Housing Assistance Office that facilitates its Section 8 Rental Assistance Program, as well as a Home Improvement Program that provides services for disabled and senior homeowners that meet income qualifications.

Torrance has a Social Services Commission whose roles include helping to address the needs of Veterans, people experiencing homelessness, adults with developmental disabilities, and children with special needs within the city. In addition to monthly meetings, the Social Services Commission webpages include links to resources for these populations. Fair housing resources, including links to rental assistance resources and housing discrimination forms, are also located on the City’s website.

For federally funded Urban County programs, Torrance has committed to complying with the Fair Housing Act, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq., by ensuring that housing is available to all persons without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status (having children under age 18), or sex.


As shown in Figure D-1, there is no data for housing choice vouchers in the majority of Torrance tracts. To protect the confidentiality of those receiving Housing Choice Voucher Program assistance, tracts containing 10 or fewer voucher holders have been omitted. The tracts with the highest percentage of renters receiving vouchers are located in the northwest and southeast areas of the city. These tracts include 227 units where renters receive vouchers, representing 5-15% of renters in these tracts. There are no public housing buildings located in Torrance.

Figure D-1: Housing Choice Vouchers, Public Housing Buildings, and FHEO Inquiries



8/12/2021, 9:29:11 AM

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Housing Choice Vouchers - Tract > 0 - 5%
- > 5% - 15%
- > 15% - 30%
- > 30% - 60%
- > 60% - 100%
- No Data



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

D.2.2 Integration and Segregation

Race/Ethnicity

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it can demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences, and mobility.

Regional Trends

HUD tracks racial or ethnic dissimilarity trends for the Los Angeles Urban County, which includes Torrance, and the Los Angeles County region.¹¹ Dissimilarity indices show the extent of distribution between two groups, in this case racial/ethnic groups, across census tracts. The following shows how HUD views various levels of the index:

- <40: Low Segregation
- 40-54: Moderate Segregation
- >55: High Segregation

The indices for the Urban County and Los Angeles County from 1990 to 2020 are shown in Table D-1. Dissimilarity between non-White and White communities in the Urban County and countywide has worsened since 1990. In the Urban County and countywide, dissimilarity between Hispanic/White and Asian or Pacific Islander/White communities has worsened, while dissimilarity between Black and White communities has improved. Based on HUD’s definition of the various levels of the index, segregation between Asian or Pacific Islander and White communities is moderate, while Non-White/White, Black/White, and Hispanic/White communities are highly segregated.

Table D-1: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index

	1990	2000	2010	2020
Los Angeles Urban County				
Non-White/White	53.33	53.62	53.85	55.87
Black/White	68.29	63.51	60.24	64.21
Hispanic/White	62.81	64.99	64.38	65.12
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	41.58	48.57	49.62	52.79
Los Angeles County				
Non-White/White	56.66	56.72	56.55	58.53
Black/White	73.04	67.4	64.99	68.24
Hispanic/White	60.88	63.03	63.35	64.33
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	46.13	48.19	47.62	51.59

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Database, 2020.

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as

¹¹ Index of dissimilarity is a demographic measure of the evenness with which two groups are distributed across a geographic area. It is the most commonly used and accepted method of measuring segregation.

household size, locational preferences, and mobility. Tables D-2 and D-3 show the racial/ethnic makeup of Los Angeles County, Torrance, and several surrounding cities in 2010 and 2020. As show in these tables, the majority of Los Angeles County residents belong to a racial or ethnic minority group. Between 2010 and 2020, the number of residents belonging to a racial or ethnic minority group increased slightly from 72 percent to 74 percent.

Table D-2: 2010 Regional Race/Ethnic Groups

	Los Angeles County		Gardena		Hermosa Beach		Lomita		Palos Verdes Estates		Rancho Palos Verdes		Redondo Beach		Rolling Hills Estates		Torrance	
Race	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Total	9,818,605	100%	58,829	100%	19,506	100%	20,256	100%	13,438	100%	41,643	100%	66,748	100%	8,067	100%	145,438	100%
Hispanic or Latino	4,687,889	48%	22,151	38%	1,632	8%	6,652	33%	631	5%	3,556	9%	10,142	15%	499	6%	23,440	16%
White	2,728,321	28%	5,484	9%	15,780	81%	8,797	43%	9,868	73%	23,323	56%	43,531	65%	5,134	64%	61,591	42%
Black	815,086	8%	14,034	24%	216	1%	964	5%	156	1%	988	2%	1,772	3%	107	1%	3,740	3%
American Indian & Alaska Native	18,886	0%	100	0%	28	0%	76	0%	14	0%	54	0%	163	0%	12	0%	304	0%
Asian	1,325,671	14%	15,149	26%	1,097	6%	2,850	14%	2,306	17%	11,998	29%	7,858	12%	1,995	25%	49,707	34%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	22,464	0%	382	1%	43	0%	112	1%	8	0%	39	0%	177	0%	8	0%	473	0%
Other	25,367	0%	174	0%	52	0%	60	0%	22	0%	92	0%	287	0%	19	0%	505	0%
Two or more races	194,921	2%	1,355	2%	658	3%	745	4%	433	3%	1,593	4%	2,818	4%	293	4%	5,678	4%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census

Table D-3: 2020 Regional Race/Ethnic Groups

	Los Angeles County		Gardena		Hermosa Beach		Lomita		Palos Verdes Estates		Rancho Palos Verdes		Redondo Beach		Rolling Hills Estates		Torrance	
Race	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Total	10,014,009	100%	61,027	100%	19,728	100%	20,921	100%	13,347	100%	42,287	100%	71,576	100%	8,280	100%	147,067	100%
Hispanic or Latino	4,804,763	48%	24,503	40%	2,064	10%	7,691	37%	1,003	8%	4,535	11%	12,497	17%	640	8%	28,080	19%
White	2,563,609	26%	4,819	8%	14,563	74%	7,269	35%	8,544	64%	20,480	48%	40,796	57%	4,492	54%	51,913	35%
Black	760,689	8%	13,006	21%	195	1%	1,129	5%	166	1%	1,086	3%	2,103	3%	90	1%	4,781	3%
American Indian & Alaska Native	18,453	0%	106	0%	31	0%	57	0%	16	0%	38	0%	187	0%	13	0%	235	0%
Asian	1,474,237	15%	15,813	26%	1,371	7%	3,436	16%	2,713	20%	13,424	32%	10,085	14%	2,492	30%	51,857	35%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	20,522	0%	356	1%	20	0%	128	1%	4	0%	32	0%	183	0%	7	0%	523	0%
Other	58,683	1%	364	1%	152	1%	133	1%	85	1%	301	1%	532	1%	71	1%	980	1%
Two or more races	313,053	3%	2,060	3%	1,332	7%	1,078	5%	816	6%	2,391	6%	5,193	7%	475	6%	8,698	6%

Source: 2020 Decennial Census

The racial composition of Torrance in 2020 differs from many other nearby cities. The percentage of the population in Torrance that is White is smaller than several of the nearby coastal cities, such as Palos Verdes Estates (73% White) and Hermosa Beach (81% White), while the percentage of the population that is Asian is larger than other cities in the vicinity. Like most other cities in the area, the percentage of the population that is Black or Hispanic or Latino is lower than in Los Angeles County overall. Figures D-2 and D-3 show the racial composition in the vicinity of Torrance in 2010 and 2018.

Local Trends

In Torrance, the racial composition has not changed significantly between 2010 and 2020. Whites continue to make up the largest percentage of the population, but the Asian population in Torrance is also large (35% in 2020) and as of 2020 is nearly the same as the White population. Hispanics or Latinos are the only other significant racial or ethnic minority group in Torrance (19% in 2020), with all other groups making up less than 10 percent of the population in 2010 and 2020.

Figure D-4 and Figure D-5 compare racial or ethnic minority concentrations in 2010 and 2018. There has been an increase in racial/ethnic minority populations since 2010, particularly in the central and north parts of the city. The only part of Torrance where racial/ethnic minorities make up less than 40% of the population is in the southwest area, at the coast.

Distribution of RHNA Units by Percent Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration


Figure D-5 also shows the sites inventory used to meet the City’s 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Table D-4 shows how RHNA units are distributed across block groups by non-white population.

As shown in Table D-4, the majority (60.0%) of sites are located in census block groups where the non-white population is between 61 and 80 percent. This includes 65.2% of lower income units, 68.1% of moderate income units, 44.2% of above moderate units, and 55.3% of mixed-income units (mixed-income is assumed to be 80 percent above-moderate and 20 percent lower income). Areas where 41-60 percent of the population is non-white also have a high percentage of RHNA units (32.7%), including 53.4% of above moderate income units. This roughly corresponds to the distribution of the non-white population throughout the City, where block groups with a non-white population between 61 and 80 percent make up 50 percent of the City, and block groups with a non-white population between 41 and 60 percent make up 30 percent of the City.

Table D-4: RHNA Distribution by Percent Racial/Ethnic Minority Population

Block Group by Non-White Population		RHNA Units by Income Level				
<u>Non-White Population in Block Group</u>	<u>% of Total Block Groups</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>Mixed</u>
≤ 20%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21 - 40%	15%	0.5%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
41 - 60%	30%	32.7%	19.9%	30.0%	53.4%	44.7%
61 - 80%	50%	60.0%	65.2%	68.1%	44.2%	55.3%
> 81%	5%	6.7%	13.8%	1.8%	2.2%	0.0%
Total	99	6,473	2710	1582	1479	702

Figure D-2: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2010)




2/1/2022, 10:36:59 AM

City/Town Boundaries


(A) Racial Demographics (2010) - Block Group

- ≤20%
- 21 - 40%
- 41 - 60%
- 61 - 80%
- > 81%










City of Carson, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-3: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2018)




2/1/2022, 10:42:10 AM

-  City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group
-  ≤ 20%
-  21 - 40%
-  41 - 60%
-  61 - 80%
-  > 81%



City of Carson, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-4: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2010)




8/12/2021, 9:36:50 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Racial Demographics (2010) - Block Group


- ≤20%
- 21 - 40%
- 41 - 60%
- 61 - 80%
- > 81%

1:144,448



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-5: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2018)



Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Data Viewer, 2022.

Disability

Regional Trends

Like most cities in the vicinity, the percentage of the population of Torrance with a disability is no more than 20 percent, with many areas having a lower percentage of the population with a disability. According to 2019 ACS 5-year estimates, disabilities are very low in the younger population, but increase as the population ages. Older people in Torrance (65 or older) are far more likely to have a disability than the rest of the population, with nearly 2/3 of the population having at least one type of disability.

Overall, the percent of the population in Torrance with disabilities is similar to other regional cities, with the exception of Gardena, which has a higher percentage of people with disabilities than others in the area. Torrance's disabled population is notably lower than Los Angeles County overall, particularly people 65 years or older. In Los Angeles County generally nearly 75 percent of people 65 years or older have at least one disability, while in Torrance only about 60 percent of people 65 years or older are disabled in some way. Table D-5 shows the 2019 population with a disability in Torrance and the surrounding cities.

Regionally there are higher concentrations of people with disabilities away from the coast, particularly in central Los Angeles. Many of the locations with higher concentrations of people with disabilities also have higher percentages of racial and ethnic minority populations. Figure D-6 shows the 2019 percentage of the population with a disability in the region.

Local Trends

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, approximately 9.0% of Torrance residents experience a disability, compared to 9.9% countywide. The overall percentage of people with a disability has decreased since 2010, as compared to Los Angeles County, which had a slight increase in the percentage of people with a disability. However, the percentage of people 65 years or older with a disability has nearly doubled since 2010, and there has been an increase in the number of people over 18 with a disability as well. Table D-6 compares the 2010 and 2019 population with a disability in Los Angeles County and Torrance.

Figure D-7 and Figure D-8 compare the disabled population during the 2010-2014 ACS and 2015-2019 ACS. The disabled population is spread fairly evenly across tracts in the city, with no major concentration of people with disabilities.


Torrance has a Social Services Commission whose roles include helping to address the needs of adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs within the city. In addition to monthly meetings, the Social Services Commission webpages include links to resources for these populations. Figure D-8 includes the City's sites inventory used to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA. While some sites are located in areas with higher concentration of people with disabilities, given the low concentration of people with disabilities in Torrance, most RHNA sites are in areas where less than 10 percent of the population has a disability.

Table D-5: 2019 Population with a Disability

	LOS ANGELES COUNTY		GARDENA		HERMOSA BEACH		LOMITA		PALOS VERDES ESTATES		RANCHO PALOS VERDES		REDONDO BEACH		ROLLING HILLS ESTATES		TORRANCE	
	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Population	992,719	9.9%	7,621	12.9%	1,295	6.7%	2,198	10.8%	1,131	8.4%	4,098	9.8%	4,369	6.5%	789	9.7%	12,994	9.0%
Under 5 years	3,554	0.6%	21	0.6%	78	7.0%	13	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%
With a hearing difficulty	2,474	0.4%	0	0.0%	78	7.0%	13	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%
With a vision difficulty	2,242	0.4%	21	0.6%	78	7.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5 to 17 years	62,051	3.9%	321	3.9%	51	2.2%	53	1.9%	64	2.7%	130	1.8%	169	1.6%	65	4.3%	779	3.7%
With a hearing difficulty	7,430	0.5%	76	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	1.2%	28	0.4%	76	0.7%	0	0.0%	33	0.2%
With a vision difficulty	10,493	0.7%	78	0.9%	13	0.5%	0	0.0%	15	0.6%	10	0.1%	47	0.5%	20	1.3%	96	0.5%
18 to 64 years	466,385	13.4%	3,546	16.8%	459	6.3%	1,191	16.8%	236	8.4%	864	8.8%	2,214	9.4%	229	13.8%	5,159	10.4%
With a hearing difficulty	80,715	1.2%	697	1.8%	99	0.7%	125	1.0%	42	0.6%	161	0.7%	619	1.4%	22	0.5%	1,121	1.2%
With a vision difficulty	95,218	1.5%	1,002	2.7%	148	1.1%	173	1.4%	31	0.4%	184	0.8%	499	1.1%	62	1.5%	747	0.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	198,645	3.1%	1,275	3.4%	222	1.6%	499	4.0%	91	1.3%	325	1.4%	911	2.1%	77	1.8%	2,357	2.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	219,273	3.4%	1,838	4.9%	122	0.9%	653	5.2%	54	0.8%	285	1.3%	1,020	2.3%	109	2.6%	2,329	2.6%
With a self-care difficulty	101,174	1.6%	683	1.8%	46	0.3%	166	1.3%	70	1.0%	151	0.7%	412	0.9%	61	1.4%	886	1.0%
With an independent living difficulty	179,055	2.8%	1,181	3.1%	95	0.7%	419	3.3%	121	1.7%	326	1.5%	858	2.0%	76	1.8%	2,244	2.5%
65 years and over	460,729	74.5%	3,733	79.7%	707	69.1%	941	61.0%	831	46.1%	3,104	56.2%	1,966	51.4%	495	45.5%	7,045	59.5%
With a hearing difficulty	162,288	12.4%	1,499	15.6%	330	13.7%	358	10.3%	388	10.7%	1,393	13.0%	878	9.9%	184	8.9%	3,147	13.0%
With a vision difficulty	88,130	6.7%	1,138	11.8%	120	5.0%	149	4.3%	92	2.5%	508	4.8%	325	3.7%	35	1.7%	1,156	4.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	138,704	10.6%	1,069	11.1%	209	8.7%	332	9.6%	177	4.9%	986	9.2%	430	4.9%	88	4.3%	1,790	7.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	310,046	23.7%	2,128	22.1%	343	14.2%	581	16.7%	427	11.8%	1,624	15.2%	1,215	13.7%	331	16.1%	4,331	17.9%
With a self-care difficulty	152,154	11.6%	1,056	11.0%	169	7.0%	315	9.1%	104	2.9%	876	8.2%	273	3.1%	134	6.5%	1,969	8.2%
With an independent living difficulty	245,624	18.8%	1,984	20.6%	370	15.3%	385	11.1%	328	9.0%	1,372	12.8%	698	7.9%	260	12.6%	3,664	15.2%

Source: 2015-2029 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-6: Percentage of the Population with a Disability (2019)



2/3/2022, 12:48:50 PM

City/Town Boundaries

(R) Population with a Disability (ACS, 2015 - 2019) - Tract

- < 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- > 40%





Table D-6: 2010 and 2019 Population with a Disability

	2010						2019					
	Los Angeles County			Torrance			Los Angeles County			Torrance		
	Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability	
		Total	Pct	Total	Pct		Total	Pct	Total	Pct		
	9,755,188	904,804	9.3%	144,819	14,991	10.4%	10,012,895	992,719	9.9%	144,652	12,994	9.0%
Under 5 years	644,843	3,512	0.5%	8,044	0	0.0%	611,448	3,554	0.6%	8,792	11	0.1%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	2,779	0.4%	NA	0	0.0%	NA	2,474	0.4%	NA	11	0.1%
With a vision difficulty	NA	2,225	0.3%	NA	0	0.0%	NA	2,242	0.4%	NA	0	0.0%
5 to 17 years	1,753,870	63,017	3.6%	24,713	1,137	4.6%	1,599,642	62,051	3.9%	21,156	779	3.7%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	9,815	0.6%	NA	135	0.5%	NA	7,430	0.5%	NA	33	0.2%
With a vision difficulty	NA	12,051	0.7%	NA	68	0.3%	NA	10,493	0.7%	NA	96	0.5%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	44,820	2.6%	NA	1,003	4.1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	9,567	0.5%	NA	69	0.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
With a self-care difficulty	NA	13,841	0.8%	NA	69	0.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
18 to 64 years	6,315,320	441,188	7.0%	88,151	6,379	7.2%	6,493,258	466,385	13.4%	90,574	5,159	10.4%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	74,623	1.2%	NA	1,693	1.9%	NA	80,715	1.2%	NA	1,121	1.2%
With a vision difficulty	NA	83,337	1.3%	NA	576	0.7%	NA	95,218	1.5%	NA	747	0.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	182,865	2.9%	NA	2,171	2.5%	NA	198,645	3.1%	NA	2,357	2.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	221,761	3.5%	NA	3,558	4.0%	NA	219,273	3.4%	NA	2,329	2.6%
With a self-care difficulty	NA	100,280	1.6%	NA	861	1.0%	NA	101,174	1.6%	NA	886	1.0%
With an independent living difficulty	NA	175,028	2.8%	NA	2,271	2.6%	NA	179,055	2.8%	NA	2,244	2.5%
65 years and over	1,041,155	397,087	38.1%	23,911	7,475	31.3%	1,308,547	460,729	74.5%	24,130	7,045	59.5%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	141,295	13.6%	NA	3,187	13.3%	NA	162,288	12.4%	NA	3,147	13.0%
With a vision difficulty	NA	80,236	7.7%	NA	1,267	5.3%	NA	88,130	6.7%	NA	1,156	4.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	122,172	11.7%	NA	1,870	7.8%	NA	138,704	10.6%	NA	1,790	7.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	272,766	26.2%	NA	5,175	21.6%	NA	310,046	23.7%	NA	4,331	17.9%
With a self-care difficulty	NA	136,069	13.1%	NA	2,181	9.1%	NA	152,154	11.6%	NA	1,969	8.2%
With an independent living difficulty	NA	221,140	21.2%	NA	3,940	16.5%	NA	245,624	18.8%	NA	3,664	15.2%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-7: Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 9:40:22 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Population with a Disability (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract


- < 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS), 2021.

Figure D-8: Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Disability

As shown in Figure D-8, the overall percentage of the population with a disability is relatively low, so most RHNA units are located within census tracts that have few people with disabilities. Table D-7 shows the how RHNA units are distributed across census tracts by the percentage of the population with a disability. Overall, 8.9% of RHNA units are located in places where the population with a disability is between 10 and 20 percent, while all remaining units are located in areas with less than 10 percent of the population that has a disability. Throughout the City, 32 percent of tracts have a disabled population over 10 percent, while only 8.9 percent of RHNA units are located within these tracts.

Table D-7: RHNA Distribution by Disability

Tract by Disability		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Disabled Population in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 10%	68%	91.1%	83.7%	95.6%	95.7%	100.0%
10 - 20%	32%	8.9%	16.3%	4.4%	4.3%	0.0%
20 - 30%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
30 - 40%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
> 40%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Familial Status

Familial status is used to indicate the presence of children under the age of 18 within a household, whether or not the child is biologically related to the head of household, and regardless of the marital status of the head of households. Families may face housing discrimination by landlords who fear that children will cause property damage. Some landlords may have cultural biases against children of the opposite sex sharing a bedroom. Differential treatments such as limiting the number of children in a complex or confining children to a specific location are also fair housing concerns.

Regional Trends

Table D-8 shows the number of families with children in Torrance and surrounding cities, including the percent of children in married-couple families, male-headed families, and female-headed families. In 2019, approximately 29% of Torrance households had one or more child under the age of 18, which is about the same as the percentage of households with one or more children in Los Angeles County overall (28%). While the exact percentage of children living in married-couple households has changed slightly throughout the region between 2010 and 2019, children living in married-couple households continue to make up the majority of families in Torrance and the surroundings cities.

Single-parent families are more likely to be female-headed, rather than male-headed. In Los Angeles County overall in 2010, 24 percent of families were female-headed, compared to only 8 percent male-headed. This split remains nearly the same in 2019. However, in several of the coastal cities surrounding Torrance, the percentage of single-parent households (male-headed or female-headed) is significantly lower. For instance, in 2019 Palos Verdes Estates had only 11 percent single-parent households, and Ranchos Palos Verdes had even fewer (8 percent). In contrast, in 2019 over one-quarter of the families in Gardena and Lomita were headed by a single parent. Torrance falls in between these extremes, with about 20 percent of families headed by a single male (5 percent) or female (14 percent).

Local Trends

Single parent households are also protected by fair housing law. In 2019 there were 2,984 single-parent households in the city representing 19% of all family households. Female-headed households with children require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. In Torrance, 14% of family households are single female-headed households, which represents about 4.1% of total households in the City.


As shown in Figure D-9, the percent of children in married-couple households are spread fairly evenly in the city, with at least 60 percent of children living in married-couple households throughout Torrance. Conversely, in most city tracts, less than 20% of children live in single female-headed households (Figure D-10). There are areas, particularly in the central and northeast parts of the city, where there is a higher concentration of both single female-headed households and racial/ethnic minority populations (Figure D-11).

Table D-8: Families with Children (2010 and 2019)

Household Type	2010								2019							
	Total	Married-couple		Male-headed		Female-headed		Total	Married-couple		Male-headed		Female-headed			
		Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct		Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct		
Los Angeles County																
Total households	3,217,889	1,465,486	NA	213,313	NA	491,428	NA	3,316,795	1,495,658	NA	226,505	NA	488,776	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,087,704	735,852	68%	90,266	8%	261,586	24%	937,890	639,936	68%	86,362	9%	211,592	23%		
Gardena																
Total households	21,043	8,424	NA	1,481	NA	3,726	NA	20,612	9,263	NA	1,086	NA	3,438	NA		
With own children under 18 years	6,351	3,906	62%	627	10%	1,818	29%	5,101	3,535	69%	295	6%	1,271	25%		
Hermosa Beach																
Total households	9,389	3,185	NA	320	NA	302	NA	8,956	3,570	NA	286	NA	363	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,542	1,314	85%	113	7%	115	7%	1,751	1,390	79%	118	7%	243	14%		
Lomita																
Total households	7,791	3,819	NA	410	NA	876	NA	8,062	3,615	NA	326	NA	1,097	NA		
With own children under 18 years	2,485	1,876	75%	126	5%	483	19%	2,111	1,519	72%	117	6%	475	23%		
Palos Verdes Estates																
Total households	4,916	3,700	NA	64	NA	294	NA	4,909	3,579	NA	244	NA	247	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,686	1,535	91%	12	1%	139	8%	1,373	1,215	88%	75	5%	83	6%		
Rancho Palos Verdes																
Total households	15,044	10,556	NA	495	NA	1,063	NA	15,488	10,557	NA	264	NA	836	NA		
With own children under 18 years	5,258	4,525	86%	101	2%	632	12%	4,372	4,025	92%	92	2%	255	6%		
Redondo Beach																
Total households	28,540	12,334	NA	1,200	NA	2,480	NA	27,663	13,596	NA	1,173	NA	1,915	NA		
With own children under 18 years	7,549	5,850	77%	503	7%	1,196	16%	7,916	6,347	80%	663	8%	906	11%		
Rolling Hills Estates																
Total households	2,926	1,987	NA	86	NA	230	NA	2,920	2,185	NA	58	NA	72	NA		
With own children under 18 years	952	799	84%	50	5%	103	11%	955	920	96%	14	1%	21	2%		
Torrance																
Total households	55,576	29,194	NA	2,516	NA	5,900	NA	54,437	29,626	NA	2,428	NA	5,748	NA		
With own children under 18 years	17,557	13,637	78%	1,012	6%	2,908	17%	15,752	12,768	81%	717	5%	2,267	14%		


Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-9: Percent of Children in Married Couple Households




Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

Figure D-10: Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.


Figure D-11: Female-headed Households and Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration



2/4/2022, 1:13:19 PM

1:72,224

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group - Graduated Dots
 - 0 - 20%
 - 20% - 40%
 - 40% - 60%
 - 60% - 80%
 - 80% - 100%
- (F) Percent of Children in Female Household, No Spouse/Partner Present Households (ACS, 2015-2019) - Tract
 - ≤ 20%
 - 20% - 40%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Familial Status

Tables D-9 and D-10 show the distribution of RHNA units by familial status, including the percent of children in married-couple households and the percent of children in single female-headed households. Throughout the City, most children live in married-couple households, so RHNA units are located in census tracts with higher concentrations of children in married-couple households. Over 65% of RHNA units are located in census tracts with more than 80% of children in married-couple households, including 76.6% of lower-income RHNA units, 37.6% of moderate-income RHNA units, 73.3% of above-moderate income RHNA units, and 87.6% of mixed-income RHNA units.

Table D-9: RHNA Distribution by Children in Married-Couple Households

Tract by Children in Married-Couple Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Children in Married-Couple HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20 - 40%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
40 - 60%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60 - 80%	40%	32.5%	23.4%	62.4%	26.7%	12.4%
> 80%	60%	67.5%	76.6%	37.6%	73.3%	87.6%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Most RHNA units are located in census tracts with a low concentration of children in single female-headed households, as most children do not live in these types of households. Nearly three quarters (73.5%) of RHNA units are located in census tracts with less than 20 percent of children living in single female-headed households. Over 75 percent of tracts in the City have less than 20 percent of children living in single female-headed households.

Table D-10: RHNA Distribution by Children in Single Female-Headed Households

Tract by Children in Single Female-Headed Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Children in Single Female-headed HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	77%	72%	83.9%	39.8%	75.7%	87.6%
20 - 40%	23%	28%	16.1%	60.2%	24.3%	12.4%
40 - 60%	0%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60 - 80%	0%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
> 80%	0%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Income

Identifying areas of poverty and low income is important to overcome patterns of segregation. These locations often correlate with other factors such as race/ethnicity and disability status.


Regional Trends

In the Los Angeles region, households with lower incomes are concentrated in the central parts of the region, while coastal areas are wealthier. Figure D-12 shows the percentage of households experiencing poverty in the central Los Angeles region. As shown in the figure, coastal cities such as Torrance have generally few households experiencing poverty.


Table D-11 shows the 2019 poverty status for Los Angeles County, Torrance, and the surrounding cities. Overall, 15 percent of Los Angeles County residents have incomes below the poverty level. Children are more likely to experience poverty, while older people are slightly less likely to experience poverty. Poverty rates are higher among the Black, Other, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian/Alaska Native populations, while the White population experiences poverty at a lower-than-typical rate.

Many of the coastal cities in the vicinity of Torrance have poverty rates significantly lower than the County generally. In Ranchos Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills Estates, and Hermosa Beach, only 5 percent of the population or less has an income level below the poverty level. Torrance has a slightly higher percentage of the population with incomes below the poverty level, but overall poverty levels are still lower in Torrance than in the County overall. As can be seen on Figure D-12, the majority of the city has a poverty rate below 10 percent, with a few areas have a poverty rate of 10-20 percent; no area of Torrance has a poverty rate that exceeds 20 percent.

Figure D-12: 2019 Regional Poverty Status



2/4/2022, 1:17:14 PM



County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Table D-11: Regional Poverty Status (2019)

	Population	AGE		SEX		RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN							
		Under 18	65+	Male	Female	American Indian & Alaska Native	Black	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	Other	Two or more races	Hispanic or Latino	White
Los Angeles County	9,928,773	2,184,080	1,308,509	4,888,596	5,040,177	799,551	71,877	1,449,582	27,126	2,097,544	393,536	4,835,446	2,593,271
Below Poverty Level	1,480,446	454,064	172,458	670,676	809,770	166,068	13,014	160,890	3,115	402,176	45,999	876,303	249,492
% Below Poverty Level	15%	21%	13%	14%	16%	21%	18%	11%	12%	19%	12%	18%	10%
Gardena	58,886	11,429	9,631	28,265	30,621	13,156	387	14,749	706	12,626	2,848	23,322	5,392
Below Poverty Level	8,071	2,188	1,261	3,792	4,279	1,813	22	1,475	0	2,349	334	3,778	770
% Below Poverty Level	14%	19%	13%	13%	14%	14%	6%	10%	0%	19%	12%	16%	14%
Hermosa Beach	19,523	3,474	2,414	10,485	9,038	189	119	1,002	0	328	1,360	1,829	15,235
Below Poverty Level	877	206	97	535	342	0	15	6	0	3	0	80	776
% Below Poverty Level	5%	6%	4%	5%	4%	0%	13%	1%	-	1%	0%	4%	5%
Lomita	20,344	4,297	3,470	9,982	10,362	1,258	170	3,305	69	2,538	1,463	6,792	8,039
Below Poverty Level	2,137	600	453	953	1,184	285	76	549	0	160	129	714	524
% Below Poverty Level	11%	14%	13%	10%	11%	23%	45%	17%	0%	6%	9%	11%	7%
Palos Verdes Estates	13,434	2,871	3,633	6,466	6,968	51	2	3,083	0	32	602	1,045	8,782
Below Poverty Level	796	142	235	405	391	6	2	333	0	2	40	122	333
% Below Poverty Level	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	12%	100%	11%	-	6%	7%	12%	4%
Ranchos Palos Verdes	41,796	8,788	10,692	20,059	21,737	770	98	13,112	367	1,419	2,570	4,330	21,030
Below Poverty Level	1,719	152	647	588	1,131	97	9	397	0	35	115	147	963
% Below Poverty Level	4%	2%	6%	3%	5%	13%	9%	3%	0%	3%	5%	3%	5%
Redondo Beach	67,208	14,663	8,842	33,971	33,237	2,318	284	9,112	63	2,652	5,085	10,646	40,632
Below Poverty Level	2,633	378	410	1,209	1,424	209	34	234	1	258	155	458	1,567
% Below Poverty Level	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	9%	12%	3%	2%	10%	3%	4%	4%
Rolling Hills Estates	8,158	1,892	2,057	4,017	4,141	160	6	2,359	0	253	378	831	4,471
Below Poverty Level	270	55	74	108	162	19	0	116	0	20	0	20	115
% Below Poverty Level	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	12%	0%	5%	-	8%	0%	2%	3%
Torrance	144,593	29,825	24,130	69,899	74,694	4,099	1,031	52,308	710	9,006	10,056	26,786	54,089
Below Poverty Level	9,939	2,059	1,906	3,945	5,994	453	93	3,878	18	720	717	2,048	3,256
% Below Poverty Level	7%	7%	8%	6%	8%	11%	9%	7%	3%	8%	7%	8%	6%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Local Trends

The total number of people with income below poverty level in Torrance has remained relatively consistent between 2010 and 2019, with a slight decrease from 8 percent to 7 percent of the population with income below poverty level. Generally, poverty in Torrance is less than in Los Angeles County overall, but certain groups within the City experience more poverty than others. For example, the block group in the northeast corner of the city, as well as the block group north of Torrance Blvd between Hawthorne Blvd and Anza Ave both have higher concentrations of people below poverty level and children living in single female-headed households (see figures D-11 and D-13). In addition, the Black, American Indian, and Alaska Native populations have a higher percentage of people below the poverty level, while the White population is lower than the citywide average. While a slightly higher percentage of people 65 years are below the poverty level, overall the percentage of older people in poverty in Torrance is less than in Los Angeles County overall. Table D-12 shows the poverty status in Los Angeles County and Torrance in 2010 and 2019.


Table D-12: Poverty Status (2010 and 2019)

	2010						2019					
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY			TORRANCE			LOS ANGELES COUNTY			TORRANCE		
	Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level	
		Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct
POPULATION	9,678,817	1,697,465	18%	144,823	11,745	8%	9,928,773	1,480,446	15%	144,593	9,939	7%
AGE												
Under 18 years	2,367,269	579,151	25%	32,692	3,920	12%	2,184,080	454,064	21%	29,825	2,059	7%
65 years and over	1,041,155	135,654	13%	23,911	1,675	7%	1,308,509	172,458	13%	24,130	1,906	8%
SEX												
Male	4,764,325	772,821	16%	71,311	6,473	9%	4,888,596	670,676	14%	69,899	3,945	6%
Female	4,914,492	924,644	19%	73,512	5,272	7%	5,040,177	809,770	16%	74,694	5,994	8%
RACE												
Black	809,080	183,691	23%	NA	NA	NA	799,551	166,068	21%	4,099	453	11%
American Indian & Alaska Native	40,644	10,939	27%	NA	NA	NA	71,877	13,014	18%	1,031	93	9%
Asian	1,340,907	172,752	13%	48,383	5,044	10%	1,449,582	160,890	11%	52,308	3,878	7%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	23,215	3,498	15%	NA	NA	NA	27,126	3,115	12%	710	18	3%
Other	1,999,996	497,306	25%	NA	NA	NA	2,097,544	402,176	19%	9,006	720	8%
Two or more races	359,352	48,476	14%	NA	NA	NA	393,536	45,999	12%	10,056	717	7%
Hispanic or Latino	4,654,635	1,049,860	23%	22,163	2,874	13%	4,835,446	876,303	18%	26,786	2,048	8%
White	2,663,753	267,523	10%	62,887	3,046	5%	2,593,271	249,492	10%	54,089	3,256	6%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

As shown in Figure D-12, most of the areas within Torrance that have the highest percentages of people in poverty also have higher concentrations of racial and ethnic minorities. These areas are generally located in the eastern and central parts of the city, away from the coastal neighborhoods.

Figure D-13: Race and Poverty Status



2/4/2022, 1:11:40 PM

1:72,224


City/Town Boundaries

(R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group - Graduated Dots

- 0 - 20%
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- 80% - 100%

(R) Poverty Status (ACS, 2015 - 2019) - Tract

- < 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021

HUD’s 2013-2017 CHAS data (Table D-13) shows that 36.1 percent of Torrance residents earn 80% or less than the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) and are considered lower income, compared to 51.6 percent countywide. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the median household income in Torrance is \$116,447, higher than \$68,044 for the county.

Table D-13: Income Level Distribution

Income Category	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
<30% HAMFI	6,080	11.1%	641,055	19.5%
31-50% HAMFI	6,085	11.1%	482,070	14.6%
51-80% HAMFI	7,630	13.9%	578,285	17.5%
81-100% HAMFI	4,835	8.8%	312,595	9.5%
>100% HAMFI	30,285	55.2%	1,281,195	38.9%
Total	54,905	100.0%	3,295,200	100.0%

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data (based on 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS)), 2020.


Figure D-14 shows the Lower and Moderate Income (LMI) areas in the city by census block group. HUD defines a LMI area as a census tract or block group where over 51% of the population is LMI. There are nine block groups in Torrance with LMI populations over 51%, mostly located in the centra, east, and north parts of the city. In general, LMI concentration increases farther from the coastline. Overall, Torrance has a lower concentration of LMI populations compared to surrounding cities to the north and east, but a higher concentration of LMI populations than cities to the west and southwest (adjacent to the coast).

Table D-14 shows the distribution of RHNA units based on the concentration of low and moderate income population throughout the City. As shown in Table 14, most RHNA units (over 96%) are located within census tracts that have a low and moderate income population below 50 percent. This is expected, since most of the City’s population (93 percent of census tracts) has higher-than-average household incomes. Nearly 65% of the RHNA units are located within census tracts that have a low and moderate income population between 25 and 50 percent, with 71.9% of lower-income RHNA units, 49.6% of moderate-income RHNA units, 71.3% of above-moderate income RHNA units, and 57.1% mixed-income RHNA units located within these areas.

Table D-14: RHNA Distribution by Percent Low and Moderate Income Population

Low and Moderate Income Population		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Low and Moderate Income HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 25%	19%	31.7%	21.2%	49.3%	26.6%	42.9%
25% - 50%	74%	64.7%	71.9%	49.6%	71.3%	57.1%
50% - 75%	6%	3.6%	6.9%	1.1%	2.0%	0.0%
< 75 – 100%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Figure D-14: Concentration of LMI Households




Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD LMI Database, 2021.

D.2.3 Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50%) with a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. According to HCD's 2020 R/ECAP mapping tool based on the 2009-2013 ACS, there are no R/ECAPs in Torrance. The R/ECAPs closest to the city are located to the southeast and northeast (Figure D-15).

Figure D-15: Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)




Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD R/ECAP Database, 2022.

Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas

In February 2017, HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened a group of independent organizations and research centers that worked together to with create an opportunity map to identify areas in every region of the state whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children. The TCAC opportunity areas of high segregation and poverty in the region are shown outlined in red in Figure D-16. As shown in the figure, there are no TCAC areas of high segregation and poverty in the City—the entire city is identified as an area whose characteristics have been shown to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income households. The nearest TCAC opportunity areas of high segregation and poverty are located to the east and southeast of the City.

Figure D-16: Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD R/ECAP Database, 2021.

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs)


While racially concentrated areas of poverty and segregation (R/ECAPs) have long been the focus of fair housing policies, racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) must also be analyzed to ensure housing is integrated, a key to fair housing choice. A HUD Policy Paper defines racially concentrated areas of affluence as affluent, White communities.¹² According to this report, Whites are the most racially segregated group in the United States and “in the same way neighborhood disadvantage is associated with concentrated poverty and high concentrations of people of color, conversely, distinct advantages are associated with residence in affluent, White communities.” Based on their research, HCD defines RCAAs as census tracts where 1) 80% or more of the population is White, and 2) the median household income is \$125,000 or greater (slightly more than double the national median household income in 2016).

As shown in Figure D-17, all of Torrance is predominantly White in the area adjacent to the coast, becoming less White farther to the east and north. This is consistent with demographics in nearby cities, where the White population is also concentrated along the coastline. However, as shown in Figure D-17, there are no areas in Torrance with racial/ethnic minority concentrations below 20%. While nearly all block groups in the city have a median income greater than the state median of \$87,100, median income varies throughout the city, with no clear concentration of higher or lower median incomes (Figure D-18).

The sites used to meet the City’s 2021-2029 RHNA are shown in Figure D-17. Sites are generally spread throughout the city, but only three sites are located in the southwest part of Torrance near the coastline, where more of the population is White.

¹² Goetz, Edward G., Damiano, A., & Williams, R. A. (2019) Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation.’ Published by the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* (21,1, 99-124).

Figure D-17: White Predominant Areas



8/12/2021, 9:54:48 AM

1:144,448


City/Town Boundaries

(R) Predominant Population - White Majority Tracts

Slim (gap < 10%)

Sizeable (gap 10% - 50%)


Predominant (gap > 50%)



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure D-18: Median Income by Block Group



8/12/2021, 9:56:09 AM

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Median Income (ACS, 2015-2019) - Block Group
- < \$30,000
- < \$55,000
- < \$87,100 (HCD 2020 State Median Income)
- < \$125,000
- Greater than \$125,000



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2014 ACS, 2021.

D.2.4 Access to Opportunities

HUD developed an index for assessing fair housing by informing communities about disparities in access to opportunity based on race/ethnicity and poverty status. Table D-15 shows index scores for the following opportunity indicator indices (values range from 0 to 100):

- **Low Poverty Index:** The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.
- **School Proficiency Index:** The higher the score, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.
- **Labor Market Engagement Index:** The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood.
- **Transit Trips Index:** The higher the trips transit index, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.
- **Low Transportation Cost Index:** The higher the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.
- **Jobs Proximity Index:** The higher the index value, the better access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.
- **Environmental Health Index:** The higher the value, the better environmental quality of a neighborhood.

In the Urban County, Hispanic residents are most likely to be impacted by poverty, low labor market participation, and poor environmental quality. White residents in the Urban County and countywide are least likely to be exposed to poverty and have the highest exposure to better environmental quality. White residents also have the best access to high quality school systems and employment opportunities and have the highest labor market participation rates in both the Urban County jurisdictions and county.

Urban County residents, regardless of race or ethnicity, have less access to public transit and pay more for transportation. However, Los Angeles County residents as a whole are more exposed to poor environmental quality compared to Urban County jurisdictions.

Table D-15: HUD Opportunity Indicators

	Low Poverty	School Proficiency	Labor Market	Transit	Low Transportation Cost	Jobs Proximity	Environmental Health
Los Angeles Urban County							
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	70.12	72.18	68.22	76.66	67.60	55.10	22.89
Black, Non-Hispanic	46.29	41.09	42.82	84.10	73.91	41.10	14.44
Hispanic	40.70	43.31	34.05	84.98	73.75	44.48	11.98
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	68.38	72.86	66.73	82.22	68.98	51.22	13.86
Native American, Non-Hispanic	54.75	55.06	48.03	77.80	69.62	45.65	20.02
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	61.23	66.91	61.96	79.48	71.75	55.51	20.59
Black, Non-Hispanic	29.03	29.31	27.29	85.47	76.25	30.59	12.84
Hispanic	28.75	35.77	26.10	87.23	76.67	41.99	10.38
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.63	70.67	62.58	83.88	72.41	51.16	13.30
Native American, Non-Hispanic	41.92	47.90	41.36	84.81	73.95	51.00	12.82
Los Angeles County							
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	62.59	65.09	65.41	82.63	74.09	55.80	18.99
Black, Non-Hispanic	34.95	32.37	34.00	87.70	79.18	40.13	11.66
Hispanic	33.91	38.38	33.18	87.19	77.74	41.53	11.91
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	53.57	59.34	55.94	86.52	76.45	51.82	12.16
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45.04	46.90	44.50	83.17	75.65	44.24	16.74
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	50.68	58.06	57.49	86.42	79.48	57.52	16.66
Black, Non-Hispanic	23.45	27.16	25.52	88.65	81.18	36.59	11.62
Hispanic	23.66	32.87	27.66	89.45	81.02	42.84	10.30
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	42.97	54.52	50.06	89.62	81.49	54.19	9.84
Native American, Non-Hispanic	29.85	35.12	32.02	85.23	78.70	46.35	16.01

Sources: HUD AFFH Database, 2020.

To assist in this analysis, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task Force (Task Force) to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD).” The Task force has created Opportunity Maps to identify resource levels across the state “to accompany new policies aimed at increasing access to high opportunity areas for

families with children in housing financed with 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)”. These opportunity maps are made from composite scores of three different domains made up of a set of indicators. Based on these domain scores, tracts are categorized as Highest Resource, High Resource, Moderate Resource, Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing), Low Resource, or areas of High Segregation and Poverty. Table D-16 shows the full list of indicators.

Table D-16: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps

Domain	Indicator
Economic	Poverty Adult education Employment Job proximity Median home value
Environmental	CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values
Education	Math proficiency Reading proficiency High School graduation rates Student poverty rates
Poverty and Racial Segregation	Poverty: tracts with at least 30% of population under federal poverty line Racial Segregation: Tracts with location quotient higher than 1.25 for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, or all people of color in comparison to the county

Sources: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, 2020.

Opportunity map scores for Torrance census tracts are presented in Figure D-19. All tracts in the city are categorized as Moderate to Highest Resource, with the exception of one area that is identified as an area of high segregation and poverty—however, the entire area has industrial uses, including a 750-acre refinery and industrial and business park uses. Resource levels are higher in the west half of the city and lower in the east half. Regionally, the surrounding areas along the coastline are generally classified as Highest Resource areas, with Low Resource areas located east of the city. The economic, environmental, and education scores for Torrance are further detailed below.


Table D-17 shows the distribution of RHNA units by TCAC Opportunity Area Category. As most of the City is within a Highest or High Resource category, most RHNA sites are located within one of those two categories. Over 56 percent of the RHNA are located within the Highest Resource category, and nearly 40 percent are located within the High Resource category. Similarly, over 60 percent of census tracts in the City are within the Highest Resource category, and over 30 percent are within the High Resource category.

The City’s Sites Inventory distributes lower-income units equitably and does not concentrate them in lower-resource areas. As discussed previously and shown in Table D-16, 53.2 percent of lower-income units are located in the Highest Resources areas in Torrance and 38.9 percent are located in High Resources Areas. Only 7.9 are located in Moderate Resource Areas, and none are located in Low Resource Areas or High Segregation & Poverty areas, because none exist in Torrance.

Table D-17: RHNA Distribution by TCAC Opportunity Area Category

TCAC Opportunity Area Category		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Category	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
Highest Resource	61%	56.7%	53.2%	19.4%	82.4%	100.0%
High Resource	33%	39.6%	38.9%	79.1%	17.3%	0.0%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	3%	3.7%	7.9%	1.5%	0.3%	0.0%
Low Resource (None in Torrance)	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High Segregation & Poverty (None in Torrance)	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Missing/Insufficient Data	3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Units	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Figure D-19: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Composite Scores



Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2022

Economic

As described previously, the Fair Housing Task Force calculates economic scores based on poverty, adult education, employment, job proximity, and median home values. According to the 2021 Task Force maps presented in Figure D-20, all tracts in Torrance have economic scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has an economic score of less than 0.25—however, this tract is primarily industrial uses with no residents. Figure D-20 shows a correlation between race and economic scores, with areas of the City with higher concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities having slightly lower economic scores.

Education

As described above, the Fair Housing Task Force determines education scores based on math and reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and student poverty rates. As shown in Figure D-21, all parts of Torrance have education scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has a score of less than 0.25—however, this tract is primarily industrial uses with no residents.

Environmental

Environmental health scores are determined by the Fair Housing Task Force based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values. Figure D-22 shows that about half of the tracts in Torrance have the highest environmental scores, between 0.75 and 1.0. However, many of the central and northeast tracts in the city have the lowest environmental scores (under 0.25). Environmental scores are generally better in the surrounding areas to the southwest, with areas to the east and north having low scores.

Figure D-23 shows more recent environmental data from CalEnviroScreen 4.0. As shown in the figure, environmental quality is best closer to coastal areas, while further to the east environmental quality becomes progressively worse. In Torrance, environmental quality does not reach worst (highest) scores, but there are several areas of the east and central City above the 50th percentile for poor environmental quality.


Transportation

HUD's Job Proximity Index, described previously, can be used to show transportation needs geographically. Block groups with lower jobs proximity indices are located farther from employment opportunities and have a higher need for transportation. As shown in Figure D-24, the central parts of the city have the best access to employment opportunities, while areas around the city's boundaries score increasingly poorer. All sites used to meet the City's 2021-2029 RHNA are in block groups with job proximity scores of 40 or above, and about half of the sites are in locations with the highest job proximity.

Availability of efficient, affordable transportation can be used to measure fair housing and access to opportunities. SCAG developed a mapping tool for High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) as part of the Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). SCAG defines HQTAs as areas within one-half mile from a major transit stop and a high-quality transit corridor. Figure D-25 shows that there are limited HQTAs in Torrance, with HQTAs in the north-central part of Torrance, as well as along its eastern boundary.



Figure D-26 shows the AllTransit Performance Score for Torrance, which rates the City at 6.1 (moderate) overall for transit access, with better transit scores within the central part of the City.

Figure D-20: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Economic Scores



2/7/2022, 10:13:05 AM


1:72,224



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021


Figure D-21: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Education Scores



8/12/2021, 9:58:44 AM

1:144,448

City/Town Boundaries




(R) TCAC Opportunity Areas (2021) - Education Score -Tract

- < 0.25 (Less Positive Education Outcomes)
- 0.25 - 0.50
- 0.50 - 0.75
- > 0.75 (More Positive Education Outcomes)
- No Data

City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, DeLorme, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021

Figure D-22: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Environmental Scores



8/12/2021, 9:59:00 AM

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) TCAC Opportunity Areas (2021) - Environmental Score -Tract
- < .25 (Less Positive Environmental Outcomes)
- .25 - .50
- .50 - .75
- .75 - 1 (More Positive Environmental Outcomes)



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, UNIGIS, LPA, NPES, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021

Figure D-23: CalEnviroScreen 4.0





Figure D-24: Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group




8/12/2021, 10:00:29 AM

1:144,448

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Jobs Proximity Index (HUD, 2014 - 2017) - Block Group

- < 20 (Furthest Proximity)
- 20 - 40
- 40 - 60
- 60 - 80
- > 80 (Closest Proximity)



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD Opportunity Indices, 2021.

Figure D-25: High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA)



Source: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), 2021.

Figure D-26: All-Transit Performance Score



AllTransit™ Performance Score

6.1

City: Torrance, CA
 Moderate combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible enabling moderate number of people to take transit to work

On Average Households have:

1,260	Transit Trips per Week within ½ Mile
7	Transit Routes within ½ Mile
224,996	Jobs Accessible in 30-minute trip
2.28%	Commuters Who Use Transit

D.2.5 Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing problems for Torrance were calculated using HUD’s 2020 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data based on the 2013-2017 ACS. Table D-18 breaks down households by race and ethnicity and presence of housing problems for Torrance and Los Angeles County households. The following conditions are considered housing problems:

- Substandard Housing (incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities)
- Overcrowding (more than 1 person per room)
- Cost burden (housing costs greater than 30%)

In Torrance, 29.8% of owner-occupied households and 53.9% of renter-occupied households have one or more housing problem. The city had a slightly lower proportion of households with a housing problem compared to the county, where 39.9% of owner-occupied households and 62.3% of renter-occupied households experience a housing problem. In Torrance, non-White owner-occupied households generally experience higher rates of housing problems than White owner-occupied households. In renter-occupied households, more than half of Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experienced a housing problem. In both Torrance and the county, renter-occupied households tend to experience housing problems at a higher rate, with the exception of “Other” households in Torrance.

Table D-18: Housing Problems by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
White	29.0%	50.2%	32.1%	52.6%
Black	69.0%	49.3%	41.5%	63.7%
Asian	30.4%	56.8%	38.3%	56.3%
American Indian	17.6%	34.5%	39.7%	56.4%
Pacific Islander	--	78.1%	39.7%	55.5%
Hispanic	28.8%	60.0%	48.2%	71.1%
Other	35.3%	3.0%	36.5%	55.7%
All	29.8%	53.9%	38.9%	62.3%

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021.

Cost Burden

Cost burden by tenure based on HUD CHAS data is shown in Table D-19. For owner-occupied households, a higher percentage of Black households (over 60 percent) are cost burdened. However, Black households make up a small portion of the total owner-occupied households in the city. While a smaller percentage of Asian owner-occupied households are cost burdened (27 percent) compared to Black households, these make up a much larger portion of the owner-occupied households in Torrance.

For renter-occupied households, a higher percentage (78 percent) of Pacific Islander households are cost burden. However, these also make up a minor portion of the overall renter-occupied households

in the city. While a lower percent of Asian (45 percent) and Hispanic (48 percent) renter-occupied households have a cost burden, these populations make up a much larger portion of renter-occupied households in Torrance.


Figures D-27 (A) through (D) compare overpayment by tenure over time using the 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS. The proportion of overpaying homeowners has lowered somewhat over these time periods. Currently, 20% to 60% of owners in most tracts in the City are cost burdened, with more overpaying owners generally in the north and south boundaries of the city. Overpayment by renters has decreased overall, but in most of the city 40-60 percent of renters overpay.

Table D-19: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Cost Burden (>30%)	Severe Cost Burden (>50%)	Total Households
Owner-Occupied			
White, non-Hispanic	28.4%	12.1%	15,895
Black, non-Hispanic	61.9%	26.2%	210
Asian, Non-Hispanic	27.1%	12.0%	10,080
American Indian	16.5%	11.8%	85
Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	35
Hispanic	25.1%	11.9%	2,985
Other	34.7%	4.1%	850
Renter-Occupied			
White, non-Hispanic	46.2%	24.3%	10,175
Black, non-Hispanic	46.2%	27.4%	1,115
Asian, Non-Hispanic	44.8%	23.2%	7,975
American Indian	34.5%	6.9%	145
Pacific Islander	78.1%	12.5%	160
Hispanic	48.1%	22.6%	4,355
Other	34.1%	16.2%	835

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021.

Figure D-27: (A) Overpaying Owners (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 10:08:50 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Overpayment by Home Owners (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract


- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- > 80%

1:144,448




City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

(B) Overpaying Owners (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

(C) Overpaying Renters (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 10:09:11 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Overpayment by Renters (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract ACS


- < 20%
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- > 80%

1:144,448



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

(D) Overpaying Renters (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Cost Burden

Table D-20 shows the distribution of RHNA units by owner cost burden. About half of the RHNA units are located in census tracts where 20 to 40 percent of homeowners are overpaying for housing. However, nearly 40% of RHNA units in the census tracts where 40 to 60 percent of homeowners are overpaying for housing. No RHNA units are located in census tracts where over 60 percent of owners are cost burdened because no such areas exist within the City.

Table D-20: RHNA Distribution by Owner Cost Burden

Owners Overpaying for Housing		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overpaying Owners in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	10%	10.8%	16.3%	5.5%	5.7%	12.4%
20 - 40%	47%	50.2%	31.6%	41.7%	75.7%	87.6%
40 - 60%	43%	38.9%	52.0%	52.8%	18.7%	0.0%
60 - 80%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
> 80%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Table D-21 shows the distribution of RHNA units by renter cost burden. As shown in the table, most RHNA units (80.8%) are located in census tracts where 40 to 60 percent of renters are overpaying for housing. Similarly, most census tracts in the City have between 40 and 60 percent of renters overpaying for housing. These areas include 74.8% of lower-income RHNA units, 71.7% of moderate-income RHNA units, 92.6% of above-moderate income RHNA units, and 100% of mixed-income RHNA units. No RHNA units are located in areas where over 80 percent of renters are cost burdened because no such areas exist within the City.

Table D-21: RHNA Distribution by Renter Cost Burden

Renters Overpaying for Housing		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overpaying Renters in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20 - 40%	24%	16.8%	20.8%	27.3%	6.4%	0.0%
40 - 60%	73%	80.8%	74.8%	71.7%	92.6%	100.0%
60 - 80%	3%	2.3%	4.5%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%
> 80%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Overcrowding

Table D-22, below, shows that approximately 1.9% of owner-occupied households and 10.7% of renter-occupied households in Torrance are overcrowded. Overcrowding is more common countywide, where 5.7% of owner-occupied households and 16.7% of renter-occupied households are overcrowded. Approximately 0.5% of owner-occupied households and 3.0% of renter-occupied households in Torrance are severely overcrowded.

Figure D-28 shows the concentration of overcrowded households in Torrance by census tract. There are two tracts in the City with a concentration of overcrowded households above 20 percent, but in most of the city the concentration of overcrowded households is less than 5 percent. There are some areas of overcrowded households in the surrounding cities east of Torrance.

Table D-22: Overcrowded Households

Overcrowded	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
Overcrowded (>1 person per room)	1.9%	10.7%	5.7%	16.7%
Severely Overcrowded (>1.5 persons per room)	0.5%	3.0%	1.5%	7.6%
Total Households	30,140	24,765	1,512,365	1,782,835

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021


RHNA Unit Distribution by Percent Overcrowded Households

Table D-23 shows the distribution of RHNA units by percent of overcrowded households. Most census tracts in the City (93%) do not have a higher-than-average percent of overcrowded households, so most RHNA units (90.1%) are located in census tracts with less than the state average of overcrowded households.

Table D-23: RHNA Distribution by Percent Overcrowded Households

Overcrowded Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overcrowded HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
≤ 8.2% (State Average)	93%	90.1%	86.4%	94.2%	93.7%	87.6%
≤ 12%	7%	9.9%	13.6%	5.8%	6.3%	12.4%
≤ 15%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
≤ 20%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
≤ 70%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Units	31	6,473	2,710	1,582	1,479	702

Figure D-28: Concentration of Overcrowded Households



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2013-2017 HUD CHAS Data, 2022.


Substandard Housing Conditions

Incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities can be used to measure substandard housing conditions. There are currently 125 owner-occupied households and 1,079 renter-occupied households in Torrance lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities according to HUD CHAS data, which represents 2.2% of all occupied households in the City. Countywide, 0.4% of households lack complete plumbing facilities and 1.6% of households lack complete kitchen facilities.

Housing age is frequently used as an indicator of housing condition. In general, residential structures over 30 years of age require minor repairs and modernization improvements, while units over 50 years of age are likely to require major rehabilitation such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. Approximately 44.4% of housing is older than 60 years old in Torrance compared to 45.7% countywide. Figure E-29 shows the percentage of homes built before 1959 by housing tract. As shown in Figure E-29, tracts with a higher percentage of old housing are spread throughout the city, without clear clustering of higher and lower percentage tracts.

Overall, the housing stock in the city is generally in very good condition. Presumably, homeowners with higher incomes, such as those in Torrance, make it a priority and can afford to repair and renovate when needed. In the 5 years from 2017 through 2021, the City received a total of 1,762 residential property maintenance complaints, as shown in Table H-32. The annual numbers of complaints were consistently approximately 300; however, that number jumped to 565 in 2021. City staff are of the opinion that the increased number of residential property complaints in 2021 was related to the pandemic, as residents spent more time at home. Likewise, commercial property complaints also rose considerably in 2020 and 2021, again likely attributable to the pandemic and residents spending more time in the community. Abatement of property maintenance issues has been difficult due to material and labor shortages related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Figure D-29: Housing Built Prior to 1959



Homes Stock 2010 Census Tracts
 Percent Built 1959 or sooner (ACS 2019)

- Less than 20%
- 20.1 - 40%
- 40.1 - 60%
- 60.1 - 80%
- More than 80%
- City Boundary

City of Torrance Pre-1960 Housing Stock (2019 5-Year ACS Estimates) by 2010 Census Tract




Homelessness

In January 2020, Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) conducted the annual Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. The count showed that there were 332 people experiencing homelessness in Torrance. The 2021 count was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The 2022 count was held in February 2022, however the results have not yet been released.

The 2020 count shows that people experiencing homelessness are more concentrated in certain parts of the City. Figure D-30 shows the census tracts with higher numbers of people experiencing homelessness, with the highest concentrations in the areas in the north and central part of the City. In particular, the tract with the highest number of people experiencing homelessness is also the tract with the lowest economic, environmental, and education scores, although these areas have better access to high-quality transit and jobs.

Figure D-30: People Experiencing Homelessness




Displacement

HCD defines sensitive communities as “communities [that] currently have populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased development or drastic shifts in housing cost.” The following characteristics define a vulnerable community:

- The share of very low income residents is above 20%; and
- The tract meets two of the following criteria:
 - Share of renters is above 40%,
 - Share of people of color is above 50%,
 - Share of very low-income households (50% AMI or below) that are severely rent burdened households is above the county median,
 - They or areas in close proximity have been experiencing displacement pressures (percent change in rent above county median for rent increases), or
 - Difference between tract median rent and median rent for surrounding tracts above median for all tracts in county (rent gap).


There are several tracts in Torrance that have been identified as vulnerable communities at risk of displacement (Figure D-31). There are significantly more communities east and northeast of the city.

Figure D-31: Sensitive Communities at Risk of Displacement



8/12/2021, 10:12:59 AM

- City/Town Boundaries
- (A) Sensitive Communities (UCB, Urban Displacement Project)
- Vulnerable
- Other



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.


Source: HCD Data Viewer, Urban Displacement Project, 2021.

D.2.6 Other Relevant Factors

A key aspect of fair housing choice is equal access to credit for the purchase or improvement of a home, particularly in light of the recent lending/credit crisis. In the past, credit market distortions and other activities such as “redlining” were prevalent and prevented some groups from having equal access to credit. In addition, informal practices such as real estate agents refusing to show homes in Torrance to non-white buyers or treating non-white buyers disrespectfully effectively preventing anyone besides white buyers from purchasing homes in many parts of the City. Figure D-32 shows the redlining maps for the Torrance. As shown in the maps, some central neighborhoods were “redlined,” making it difficult or impossible for people to gain access to residential financing in these areas.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) in 1977 and the subsequent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) were designed to improve access to credit for all members of the community and hold the lender industry responsible for community lending. Under HMDA, lenders are required to disclose information on the disposition of home loan applications and on the race or national origin, gender, and annual income of loan applicants.

Figure D-32: Home Owners Loan Corporation Redlining Grade



2/7/2022, 12:52:29 PM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Home Owners Loan Corporation Redlining Grade (University of Richmond, 2021)

- A (Best)
- C (Declining)
- D (Hazardous)




Table 24 summarizes home purchase and improvement loan applications in Torrance for 2020. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications along with the income, gender, and race of loan applicants. In 2020, applications for home refinancing were the most common in Torrance. Of the 150,994 applications for refinancing, approximately 63 percent were approved, 20 percent were denied, and 16 percent were withdrawn or closed for incompleteness.

Though less common than loans for home purchase and refinance, there was a noticeable demand for home improvement financing in the City. A total of 34,147 households in Torrance applied for loans to make home improvements and approval rates for this loan type were 47 percent. About 46 percent of home improvement loan applications were denied.

Table D-24: 2020 Home Loan Applications

Table D-8: Summary of Fair Housing Issues Disposition of Home Loan Applications				
Type	Total Applications	Percent Approved*	Percent Denied	Percent Other**
Purchase - Conventional	89,745	79%	9%	12%
Purchase – Government Backed	19,742	83%	7%	10%
Home Improvement	34,147	47%	46%	8%
Refinancing	150,994	63%	20%	16%

*Percent approved includes loans approved by the lenders whether or not they are accepted by the applicants.

**Percent Other includes loan applications that were either withdrawn or closed for incomplete information.

Source: www.ffiec.gov, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data for 2018

Environmental Justice Communities

Disadvantaged communities in California are specifically targeted for investment of proceeds from the State’s cap-and-trade program. Known as California Climate Investments (CCI), these funds are aimed at improving public health, quality of life and economic opportunity in California’s most burdened communities at the same time they’re reducing pollution that causes climate change.


Any jurisdiction can choose to include policies focused on environmental justice (EJ) in their General Plan, but an EJ Element is required under state Law for any city or county that includes disadvantaged communities. For the purposes of environmental justice, a disadvantaged community is defined as, “An area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code or an area that is a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.”

Senate Bill 535 defines disadvantaged communities as the top 25% scoring areas from CalEnviroScreen. As shown below (Figure 33), a portion of Torrance falls within the category of a disadvantage community due to this area being disproportionately affected by environmental pollution. In particular, impacts from ozone pollution affect the majority of the residents in these areas closest to a large refinery and major highways. The only part of Torrance that has a CalEnviroScreen score of 4.0 (the top 25% scoring area) is the area where the Torrance Refining Company, a 750-acre oil refinery, is located. As noted in Program 20, The City will prepare an Environmental Justice Element (EJE) by October 15, 2024. The EJE is intended to confront inequities by addressing the specific environmental

hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy. In accordance with SB 1000, the City will incorporate environmental justice policies into its General Plan to address the following environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives as required by State law:

- Reduction of pollution exposure and improving air quality
- Promoting access to public facilities
- Promoting access to healthy foods
- Promoting safe and sanitary homes
- Promoting physical activity
- Promoting civic engagement

Figure D-33: CalEPA Proposed SB535 Disadvantaged Communities (October 2021)



D.2.7 Sites Inventory

Sites have been identified throughout Torrance to meet the City's RHNA. These sites are shown in Figure D-34, which organizes sites by neighborhoods that include adjacent census tracts. Table D-25 summarizes the number and type of RHNA site in each neighborhood, along with the RHNA variables associated with that part of the City.

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50%) with a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. As discussed in Section D.2.3., according to HCD's 2020 R/ECAP mapping tool based on the 2009-2013 ACS, there are no R/ECAPs in Torrance.

Another indicator of characteristics that have been shown by research (HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children—is the TCAC Opportunity Area Map, also discussed in Section D.2.3. There are no TCAC areas of high segregation and poverty in Torrance—the entire city is identified as an area whose characteristics have been shown to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income households. As shown in Table D-17 (RHNA Distribution by TCAC Opportunity Area Category), 56.7 percent of all census tracts in Torrance are in the Highest Resource Area, 39.6 percent are in the High Resources Area, and 3.7 percent are in the Moderate Resources Area (refinery??).

The scores noted above are an indication that Torrance offers all residents a high quality of life. That being said, the AFFH analysis in Appendix D indicates that there are areas of the city where fair housing issues exist. —see Section D.2.8 (Summary of Fair Housing Issues).

The section below provides an overview of various neighborhoods within Torrance.

North Torrance

North Torrance includes census tracts in the northern part of the City, bounded by the City borders to the north and Del Amo Blvd to the south. This neighborhood currently includes 11,296 households, or about 22 percent of the City's households. Zoning in North Torrance is primarily single family residential in the north part of the neighborhood, with a large industrial area in the south, which includes the 750-acre Torrance Refining Company. Public use, commercial retail, and higher density multi-family residential zones are located along major streets in the neighborhood.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High or Highest Resource, with the exception of Census Tract 6503 (Moderate Resource). Because the North Torrance neighborhood is the only neighborhood in Torrance with a census that has a Moderate Resource score, geographic targeting of AFFH actions should be directed here. North Torrance also has a higher predominance of environmental justice communities. While North Torrance has a relatively average home-owner cost burden compared to the rest of the city, it has a higher renter cost burden than other neighborhoods.

On average, the nonwhite population is slightly higher in this neighborhood than in the rest of the City. This neighborhood includes 1,193 RHNA units, which represents about 18% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower and moderate income. This is due to several factors, such as proximity

to key transit corridors; access to employment, commercial, and open space uses; and the state’s size limits for lower-income units. Another factor is because of the identified trends in both Torrance and surrounding cities that are seeing transition of non-residential uses to residential ones. Note that two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study are located within the North Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory. The City’s program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance.

West Torrance

The West Torrance neighborhood includes census tracts at the western side of the City, north of Sepulveda Blvd and west of Hawthorne Boulevard and Anza Avenue. The bulk of West Torrance is single-family residential and public use, with the exception of the areas between Hawthorne Boulevard and Anza Avenue and along Torrance Boulevard, which include multi-family residential, commercial, industrial, and hospital/medical uses. This neighborhood includes 7,246 households in the City, or about 14% of the current households.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource and the low-moderate income population is generally lower than other neighborhoods. This neighborhood includes 438 RHNA units, which represents about 7% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or mixed income. The location of lower- to moderate-income units in this neighborhood provides lower-income households proximity to the highest resources; proximity to key transit corridors; and access to employment, commercial, and open space uses.

Note that one of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study is located within the West Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory. Several of the sites are located along Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan in place that promotes mixed-use development, a trend that has already been demonstrated in the Housing Element as being very popular and successful. As noted in the Housing Plan, the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) will be modified encourage more housing by reducing the required percentage of commercial use in a mixed-use development and modify development standards to address constraints that were identified by developers during the outreach phase of the Housing Element update. The Sites Inventory identifies many lower, moderate, and mixed income sites in the census tract with the highest level of overcrowding, so construction of addition units should help address that issue.

The City’s program to encourage the production of ADUs, and especially ADUs that are affordable to lower-income households, will increase the opportunity for lower- and moderate income households to live in the West Torrance Neighborhood. Implementation of SB 9 also will expand opportunities for households of all incomes to live in this neighborhood. The City’s program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance, especially in neighborhoods of higher-income households.

Central Torrance

Central Torrance includes the portion of the City located generally south of Del Amo Boulevard, east of Hawthorne Boulevard, west of Crenshaw Boulevard, and north of Sepulveda Boulevard. This

neighborhood includes 8,737 households or about 17% of the current households. Land use in Central Torrance includes a broad mix of single-family and multi-family residential, manufacturing, and planned districts—this neighborhood is also home to the key commercial district in Torrance, which includes Del Amo Fashion Center, which is the sixth largest shopping mall in the United States, with a gross leasable area of approximately 2.52 million square feet. The HBCSP applies to a large portion of this neighborhood, and there is significant developer interest in recycling existing non-residential uses into multi-family residential and mixed-use development.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource. Although Torrance generally does not have many areas with overcrowded housing, West Torrance does have one census tract (6506.02) that is slightly higher than the state-wide average. This neighborhood includes 2,503 RHNA units, which represents about 39% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or above moderate income, although several sites are identified for moderate-income households. The size of many properties in the Central Torrance neighborhood provide an opportunity to facilitate development of lower- and moderate-income units in this neighborhood, as well as adding above-moderate income units. The location of lower- to moderate-income units in this neighborhood provides lower-income households proximity to the highest resources, as well as proximity to key transit corridors and the City’s transit facility; and access to employment and commercial uses, and open space uses. This neighborhood includes the Madrona Marsh Preserve, a 43-acre seasonal wetland with vernal pools, which is one of the few natural areas remaining within an urban landscape in Southern California. Note that two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study are located within the Central Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory.

East Torrance

East Torrance is located along the east boundary of the City, south of Del Amo Boulevard, east of Crenshaw Boulevard, and north of Sepulveda Boulevard. This neighborhood includes single-family and multi-family residential, commercial, manufacturing, and open space, recreational, and public uses. The Old Torrance neighborhood, which is also home to Torrance’s historic downtown (Downtown Torrance), which was discussed in detail in Section 4 of the Housing Element. A former redevelopment area, Old Torrance has seen much development over the past several decades, including new residential developments ranging from market-rate townhomes to moderate-and lower-income multi-family developments, to an SRO—many of these developments received support by the City’s former Redevelopment Agency and currently by the City. This is also an important employment area in Torrance.

There are 8,737 households in this neighborhood, which represents approximately 17% of the City’s households. Both census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High Resource. This neighborhood includes 935 RHNA units, which represents about 14% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are moderate income. As described in Section 4, the City recently adopted a plan for Downtown Torrance that is promoting continued revitalization and facilitation of housing, with an emphasis on affordable housing. Note that East Torrance also includes two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory.

Southwest Torrance

Southwest Torrance includes census tracts on the west side of the City south of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hawthorne Boulevard, as well as a census tract east of Hawthorne Boulevard south of Pacific Coast Highway. Land use in this neighborhood is primarily single-family residential, but includes multi-family residential uses adjacent to the coast, northwest of the intersection of Hawthorne and Pacific Coast Highway, and the Waleria district, which is on and near Hawthorne Boulevard south of Pacific Coast Highway. In addition, public and commercial uses are located along major streets like Hawthorne Boulevard and the Pacific Coast Highway. This neighborhood includes 12,265 households, which is 24% of the City's households.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource. This neighborhood includes 547 RHNA units, which represents about 9% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or above moderate income. Hawthorne Boulevard provides the eastern border of a portion of the Southwest Torrance neighborhood and continues through Waleria to the southern city boundary. The HBCSP applies, which facilitates mixed-use and multi-family residential development in the subdistricts that are located in the Southwest neighborhood. Recycling of non-residential uses into mixed use developments are an ongoing trend in Waleria, as and several developers have expressed interest in continuing to add mixed use and multi-family residential development in the Southwest neighborhood. The City's program to encourage the production of ADUs, and especially ADUs that are affordable to lower-income households, will increase the opportunity for lower- and moderate income households to live in the Southwest Torrance Neighborhood. Implementation of SB 9 also will expand opportunities for households of all incomes to live in this neighborhood. The City's program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance, especially in neighborhoods of higher-income households.

Southeast Torrance

Southeast Torrance includes census tracts on the east side of the City south of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hawthorne Blvd. There are 6,997 households in this neighborhood, which represents about 14% of the City's households. Land use in this neighborhood includes single- and multi-family residential, along with a large portion of commercial and industrial use at and surrounding the Torrance Airport. Several housing corridors identified in the Housing Element are located in the Southeast neighborhood, a portion of the HBCSP is located here, as is one of the HCS areas.

The majority of census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High Resource, with a Highest Resource area located at the northwest corner of neighborhood. Southeast Torrance has a relatively higher rate of both renter and owner cost burden. This neighborhood includes 857 RHNA units, which represents about 13% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower income.

Figure D-34: Sites Inventory by Neighborhood




Table D-25: Residential Sites Inventory by Area and AFFH Variable

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	%	Total	%	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: Central																			
Census Tract 6504.01	2.8%	1,468	10.7%	691	1.8%	116	1.3%	81	3.0%	193	4.7%	301	Highest Resource	60.56% - 64.46%	15% - 38%	No	4.37%	58.60%	31.90%
Census Tract 6506.04	4.7%	2,419	2.5%	161	2.3%	149	0.1%	4	0.1%	8	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	71.73% - 76.93%	61% - 66%	No	8.69%	47.90%	29.40%
Census Tract 6506.05	2.2%	1,120	0.5%	31	0.2%	15	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	69.85%	43%	No	6.74%	43.60%	33.60%
Census Tract 6507.01	1.9%	972	21.9%	1420	5.3%	346	0.0%	0	11.7%	760	4.9%	314	Highest Resource	54.77%	27%	No	1.33%	52.00%	35.80%
Census Tract 6508	5.4%	2,758	3.1%	200	3.1%	200	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.72% - 86.61%	20% - 39%	No	4.58%	49.50%	51.00%
<i>Total</i>	17.0%	8,737	38.7%	2,503	12.8%	826	1.6%	101	14.8%	961	9.5%	615							
Neighborhood: East																			
Census Tract 6509.01	4.5%	2,342	4.6%	299	0.0%	2	4.6%	297	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	High Resource	54.07% - 58.18%	19% - 47%	No	2.60%	49.60%	43.80%
Census Tract 6509.02	5.1%	2,629	9.8%	636	3.9%	251	5.0%	321	1.0%	64	0.0%	0	High Resource	63.71% - 77.95%	28% - 48%	No	6.03%	32.90%	47.30%
<i>Total</i>	9.7%	4,971	14.4%	935	3.9%	253	9.5%	618	1.0%	64	0.0%								

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	%	Total	%	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: North																			
Census Tract 6500.01	4.1%	2,094	9.0%	584	0.3%	21	7.0%	450	1.7%	113	0.0%	0	High Resource	78.10% - 80.31%	14% - 42%	No	1.86%	53.20%	27.00%
Census Tract 6500.03	2.3%	1,163	0.9%	57	0.4%	25	0.2%	16	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	High Resource	73.43% - 77.90%	35% - 60%	No	8.22%	35.00%	47.30%
Census Tract 6500.04	3.0%	1,529	1.6%	104	1.4%	90	0.0%	0	0.2%	14	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	75.84% - 79.88%	47% - 48%	No	5.12%	58.40%	41.30%
Census Tract 6501.01	4.1%	2,095	2.3%	152	1.9%	121	0.2%	16	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	High Resource	77.57% - 86.90%	21% - 49%	No	3.05%	62.40%	18.50%
Census Tract 6502	3.7%	1,895	0.8%	55	0.6%	39	0.0%	0	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	High Resource	58.76% - 69.21%	19% - 33%	No	3.72%	56.90%	39.30%
Census Tract 6503	4.9%	2,520	3.7%	241	3.3%	214	0.4%	23	0.1%	4	0.0%	0	Moderate Resource	65.85% - 67.85%	31% - 48%	No	2.95%	55.00%	41.40%
	21.9%	11,296	18.4%	1,193	7.9%	510	7.8%	505	2.7%	178	0.0%	0							
Neighborhood: Southeast																			
Census Tract 6510.01	3.5%	1,799	0.6%	37	0.2%	12	0.2%	14	0.2%	11	0.0%	0	High Resource	59.80% - 67.82%	21% - 51%	No	2.22%	57.80%	37.20%
Census Tract 6510.02	3.3%	1,703	3.9%	252	2.2%	142	1.5%	95	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	High Resource	61.53% - 65.53%	22% - 35%	No	2.34%	39.10%	28.20%
Census Tract 6511.01	3.6%	1,850	7.6%	491	6.8%	442	0.7%	43	0.1%	6	0.0%	0	High Resource	59.25% - 65.52%	19% - 35%	No	3.26%	46.80%	48.20%
Census Tract 6511.02	3.2%	1,645	1.2%	77	0.9%	60	0.0%	0	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.53%	43%	No	4.04%	47.20%	52.10%

	13.6%	6,997	13.2%	857	10.1%	656	2.3%	152	0.8%	49	0.0%	0							
--	-------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----	------	-----	------	----	------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	%	Total	%	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: Southwest																			
Census Tract 6512.01	3.2%	1,634	0.1%	8	0.1%	8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	36.99%	15%	No	0.91%	29.40%	37.60%
Census Tract 6512.21	2.7%	1,395	2.0%	128	2.0%	128	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.41%	44%	No	2.30%	38.10%	16.60%
Census Tract 6512.22	4.5%	2,329	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	59.67%	41%	No	4.98%	44.90%	45.30%
Census Tract 6513.02	4.4%	2,287	0.2%	15	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	39.61% - 52.60%	7% - 39%	No	2.89%	49.30%	45.40%
Census Tract 6513.04	4.5%	2,327	0.4%	25	0.4%	23	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	25.15% - 26.94%	16% - 36%	No	0.59%	48.40%	57.50%
Census Tract 6514.02	4.5%	2,293	5.5%	354	1.4%	88	1.8%	118	2.3%	148	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	51.44% - 65.72%	7% - 45%	No	6.09%	51.30%	41.90%
	23.8%	12,265	8.5%	547	4.0%	262	2.1%	135	2.3%	150	0.0%	0							
Neighborhood: West																			
Census Tract 6505.02	2.9%	1,478	0.1%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	5	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	48.61%	22%	No	2.33%	41.30%	40.70%
Census Tract 6506.02	5.3%	2,726	6.5%	421	3.0%	194	1.1%	71	1.1%	69	1.3%	87	Highest Resource	65.97% - 81.93%	27% - 51%	No	8.49%	42.40%	12.40%
Census Tract 6506.03	2.9%	1,492	0.1%	9	0.1%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	60.23%	47%	No	1.66%	37.60%	34.90%
Census Tract 6507.02	3.0%	1,550	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	46.15%	25%	No	0.56%	54.50%	31.70%
	14.1%	7,246	6.8%	438	3.1%	203	1.1%	71	1.2%	77	1.3%	87							

D.2.8 Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Table D-25, below, summarizes the fair housing issues identified in this Fair Housing Assessment. As discussed in the previous sections of this analysis, the following conclusions were determined regarding potential fair housing concerns and indicators of certain disadvantaged populations:

- The highest resource areas (environment, education, income, etc.) are in the western portion of the City, while the high resource areas are located on the eastern side of the City,, which is also identified as having a higher percentage of LMI population. The only moderate resource area in the City is located on the north border in the central part of the City. The City’s distribution of resource areas are consistent with cities in areas surrounded by the ocean, hillside, and urban communities.
- Overall, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experience a disproportionately higher percent of housing problems when compared to all other races/ethnicities within the City and may be underserved and in need of additional affordable housing opportunities.
- The southwestern portion of the City that experiences high resources and greater incomes, contains a sizable gap of predominately White residents. Areas outside of the southwestern portion of the City contains a sizable gap of predominately minority concentrations.
- Seniors experience a disproportionate percentage of housing problems compared to other family types within the City.

Overall, this analysis shows that the primary barrier to fair housing in Torrance is high housing cost, which has the effect of limiting access by lower-income households to the high opportunities and resources available in the City. There is no evidence to suggest that discrimination against racial groups or persons with disabilities is a major issue. The Housing Plan includes several programs to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development, as well as the provision of accessory dwelling units, which can expand affordable housing opportunities for lower-income persons such as seniors, female-headed households, and others working in service occupations.

Table D-25: Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Fair Housing Issue	Summary
<i>Enforcement and Outreach</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRC conducts outreach and education throughout Los Angeles County, including Torrance. • Between January 2013 and March 2021, Torrance received 48 fair housing inquiries. • LACDA has committed to complying with the Fair Housing Act and related regulations. • There are 227 units with renters receiving HCVs in the city, primarily in the northwest and southeast areas of the city. • There are no public housing buildings in Torrance.
<i>Integration and Segregation</i>	
Race/Ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a small decrease in overall racial/ethnic minority populations, from 50% in 2010 to 47% in 2019, but an increase in concentration of racial/ethnic minorities within census tracts.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on HUD dissimilarity indices, segregation between non-White and White communities is high and has worsened since 1990. Racial/ethnic minorities are more concentrated in the eastern and central areas of the city.
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.0% of Torrance residents experience a disability, a slight increase from 6.9% in 2012. Populations of persons with disabilities are spread evenly throughout the city.
Familial Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.0% of households have one or more children under age 18; 4.6% of households are single-parent households; 3.9% of households are single-parent female-headed households. Over 60% of children live in married-couple households in the city, with few locations that have a higher concentration of children in female-headed households.
Income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36.1 of households earn less than 80% of the area median family income. Median household income is \$116,447, higher than the countywide average. There are two tracts in the city with at LMI population greater than 51%, one in the center of Torrance and one on the north boundary.
<i>Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty</i>	
Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no R/ECAPs located in Torrance. The R/ECAPs closest to the city are located to the southeast and northeast.
Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Torrance is predominantly White in the area adjacent to the coast, becoming less so farther to the east and north. All areas of the city have at least 20% racial/ethnic minority concentrations. Nearly all block groups in the city have median incomes exceeding the 2020 State median, and there is no clear concentration of higher or lower median incomes.
<i>Access to Opportunities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Urban County, Hispanic residents are most likely to be impacted by poverty, low labor market participation, and poor environmental quality. All tracts in Torrance are considered Moderate to Highest Resource areas.
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All tracts in Torrance have economic scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has an economic score of less than 0.25.
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All parts of Torrance have education scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has a score of less than 0.25.
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About half the tracts in the city have the highest environmental scores between 0.75 and 1.0. Many of the central and northeast tracts in the city have the lowest environmental scores (0.25).
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block groups on in the central areas of the city scored the best in jobs proximity, while areas around the city's boundaries scored increasingly poorer. There are limited HQTAs in Torrance, with HQTAs in the north-central part of the city, as well as along its eastern boundary.
<i>Disproportionate Housing Needs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.8% of owner households and 53.9% of renter households have a housing problem.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-White owner-occupied households have higher rates of housing problems than White owner-occupied households. • In renter-occupied households, more than half of Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experienced a housing problem • Renter-occupied households experience housing problems at a higher rate than owner-occupied households, with the exception of Other and Black households in the city.
Cost Burden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black households have the highest rate of cost burden for owner-occupied units in the city but make up a small overall proportion of households. • Over 25% of Hispanic owner-occupied households, and over 48% of Hispanic renter-occupied households have a cost burden. • Cost burdened households most concentrated in the areas along the north and south boundaries of the city.
Overcrowding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.9% of owner households and 10.7% of renter households are overcrowded. • 0.5% of owner-occupied households and 3.0% of renter-occupied households are severely overcrowded. • There are two tracts in Torrance with a concentration of overcrowded households above 20%, but in most of the city the concentration of overcrowded households is less than 5%.
Substandard Housing Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 125 owner-occupied households and 1,079 renter-occupied households lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities in Torrance, which represents 2.2% of city households. • Tracts with a higher percentage of old housing are spread throughout the city, without clear clusters of higher and lower percentage tracts.
Displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several vulnerable communities at risk of displacement in Torrance, but significantly more to the east and northeast of the city.

D.3 PRIORITIZATION OF CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

The following are contributing factors that affect fair housing choice in Torrance.

D.3.1 Insufficient and Inaccessible Outreach and Enforcement

According to the Fair Housing Survey included in the 2018 Regional AI, 39% of respondents were not aware of their right to request accommodations per Fair Housing, Section 504, and ADA laws. The City currently has limited information regarding fair housing laws, discriminatory practices, and services available to the public. Very few renters in Torrance receive housing choice vouchers despite the concentration of overpaying renters in some Torrance tracts.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of a variety of input media (e.g., meetings, surveys, interviews)
- Lack of fair housing information on the City’s website
- Insufficient local public fair housing enforcement and testing

D.3.2 Lack of Income Diversity

There are fewer low-moderate income households and a higher median household income in Torrance compared to other cities countywide, and the lowest and highest income households are not

concentrated in any particular area of the city. While higher household incomes are generally considered a good thing, the overall lack of lower-income households in Torrance suggests that many people may be priced out of housing in the city entirely.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of private investment in affordable housing
- Development costs
- Land use restrictions

D.3.3 Displacement Risk to Low Income Households Due to Economic Pressures

There are several locations that have been identified as vulnerable communities at risk of displacement according to the Urban Displacement Project, primarily in the east/northeast areas of the city. A higher percentage of Black and Asian owner-occupied households, and Pacific Islander and Hispanic renter-occupied households have a cost burden compared to White households. While the number of overpaying owners and renters has been decreasing over time, there are still a large number of tracts where owners and renters overpay for housing.

Contributing Factors

- Unaffordable rents
- Lack of available affordable housing
- Lack of private investment in new housing construction

D.3.4 Concentration of Environmental Challenges

The TCAC identified a concentration of census tracts in the central/northeast part of the city with poor environmental health scores. Residents in these areas may be subject to environmental hazards that other communities do not face. These include hazards from air and water pollution, traffic, and nearby cleanup sites and waste facilities.

Contributing Factors

- Pollution burden
- Cleanup site locations
- Waste facilities locations

D.3.5 Lack of Affordable Housing

Home values are very high throughout the City, with the city's median home price approximately \$1.05 million in 2021. Home values have risen nearly 20% in the 2020-2021 time period. These prices make homeownership untenable for low- and moderate-income households in the City. Rental availability is limited in the City and is similarly expensive, with a two-bedroom apartment renting for nearly \$2,400 in 2021 and larger apartments and homes renting for even more, rents that are outside the affordability range for low- and moderate-income households in the City. Overall, most housing is not affordable to

even moderate-income families in Torrance, and low- and extremely-low income households face even more challenges finding affordable housing in the City.

Contributing Factors

- High land costs
- Limited housing stock

D.3.6 Historic Patterns That Affect Exclusion

When the city of Torrance incorporated in 1921, it covered approximately 3.8 square miles and had a population of 1,800. It was established by Jared Sidney Torrance (1852- 1921), a Pasadena real estate developer and vice president of Union Oil Company, who envisioned a planned residential and industrial community. Only a few years after the City’s incorporation in 1921, petroleum was discovered in Torrance—the discovery transformed the City from a small town to a major industrial area. Industry in Torrance continued to shape its development as a major employment center in the region.

According to census data, the population (and number of housing units) in Torrance skyrocketed between 1950 and 1960, growing from 22,241 to 100,991 residents in one decade. By 1970, the population had risen to 134,968. The majority of this development occurred in single-family neighborhoods that were developed by both national and local developers. California’s aerospace industry began in Torrance and surrounding communities, and has played an important role in City history as well. The new neighborhoods catered to people working in cutting-edge technologies like the aerospace industry, as a mecca for young, middle class families who were almost exclusively white. Another draw for young families in the high growth era of the 1950’s to 1970’s was the public school district in Torrance, the Torrance Unified School District (TUSD), which serves the entire city, has long been—and continues to be—a desirable location for families due to its public school district. The TUSD was established in 1947 and unified in 1948. It is a highly rated district with a graduation rate of 95% (tUSD.org). According to Niche (niche.com), which ranks nearly 100,000 schools and districts, TUSD ranks #45 of 438 school districts in California.

The population in Torrance leveled off significantly after the development and population boom of the 1950’s to 1970’s, increasing by only 9,462 residents in the past 50 years. This was largely due to Torrance being built out.

In addition to the city’s development history, over the past century, discriminatory lending practices and informal exclusion of non-white buyers prevented many non-white households from purchasing homes in Torrance. Even after these practices were declared unconstitutional, the established patterns of racial and economic segregation remained in place. Existing residents lobbied to retain single-family zoning and ensure high home values in desirable neighborhoods in Torrance. Though the intent of these actions may not have been to directly discriminate, the effect was to exclude certain groups of people, such as lower-income and/or non-white families, from moving into the City. That pattern has been changing over the past several decades—today, Torrance is a majority minority city.

Contributing Factors

- Historic redlining and informal discrimination against non-white buyers
- Land use and zoning rules that promoted housing for higher-income households
- Lack of developable land

D.4 PRIORITIES, GOALS, AND ACTIONS

To adequately meet the housing needs of all segments of the community, the Housing Plan must promote housing opportunities for all people. Table H-45 in Section 5 (Housing Plan) presents a summary of the issues, contributing factors, and the City’s actions in addressing the issues.


**APPENDIX E: SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND
CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS**

Project Identification: A (Entitled Project)
Year: 2021
Project Description: Mixed use development (horizontal) with 32 units & 6,440 ft² of commercial, including restaurant, office, retail. (Previous request for 46-unit project at 38.3 du/ac, developed to R-4 standards, was denied in 2019. This project is a redesign)
 • CUP (CUP20-01023)
Address: 18045 Western Ave. (formerly 1802—18141 Western Ave.)
APN: 4096-018-034, 4096-018-033, 4096-018-032
Size: 52,388 ft² parcel (1.2 acre) (6-lot consolidation)
Existing Use: Combination of undeveloped, former market/parking, and former structure that was razed in 2019
General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)
 • Allowable Density: N/A
 • Expected Density: N/A
 Proposed: No change
Zoning: Existing: C-2 (General Commercial) (Site was approved a ZON from C-R to C-2 in 2019)
 • Allowable density: 43 du/ac (C-2 zone allows R-4 residential uses with a CUP)
 Proposed: No change
Project Density: 26.7 du/ac
 • Percent of maximum allowable Zoning density: 62.1%
 • Percent of expected GP density: N/A
Units: 32 units on 2nd & 3rd floors; parking in garage on ground floor
 • 993 – 1,295 ft²
 • 2-bedroom (all)
Parking: 106 required; 100 provided—7 residential guest spaces are also commercial spaces
Height: 35 – 45 feet
FAR: 1.07:1 (max allowable is 1.0:1, which will be achieved via redesign)

Income Category: Market rate (above moderate)



Rendering of entitled project at 18045 Western Ave.



Project Identification: B (Entitled Project)

Project Description: 24-unit townhouse condominium development

- CUP (CUP20-01016)
- Precise Plan of Development (PRE20-01014)
- Tentative Tract Map for parcel merger & condominiums (DIV20-01007)

Year: Anastasi Development (2021)
Address: 18080 – 18090 Prairie Avenue
APN: 4088-006-CONDO01 (current)
Size: 42,294 ft² (0.97 acre) (2 parcels consolidated)
Existing Use(s): Residence, store, & mixed-use building (1959) and a church (1974)
General Plan: Existing: R-MD (Medium Density Residential)

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac

Zoning: Proposed: No change
 Existing: R3-PP (Restricted Residential – Precise Plan Overlay)
 Proposed: No change

Project Density: 24.7 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 79.7%
- Percent of expected GP density: 106.2%

Units: 24 townhouse units in 4 buildings (two 2-unit buildings, two 10-unit buildings)
 1,086 ft² each
 2-bedroom (all)

Parking: 53 required; 55 proposed

Height: 22 feet

FAR: 0.62:1 (proposed); project conditioned to reduce to maximum allowable 0.6:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: C (Entitled)

Project Description: 3-story Mixed Use Development (9 dwelling units + office area)

- CUP (CUP20-01008)
- Development Permit (DVP20-00001)
- Division of Lot to consolidate 2 parcels (DIV20-01003)

Date: 2020

Address: 24449 Hawthorne Blvd. & 24453 Hawthorne Blvd. (HBCSP-WT)

APN: 7534-021-038, 7534-021-039

Size: 15,132 ft2 combined (0.35 acre) (2 lots, to be consolidated)

Existing Use(s): Commercial building (1963), with storage building and shed (1999)

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed: No change

Zoning (Existing): HBCSP, Walteria Sub-District (H-WT)

- Allowable Density: 27 du/ac max.

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 25.7 du/ac

- Percent of maximum zoning allowable: 95.2%
- Percent of expected GP: N/A

Units: 9 dwelling units (apartments)
 1,028 ft2 (average per unit)
 2-bedroom (all)

Height: 45 feet

FAR: 0.99:1 (C-GEN allows 1:1 FAR for MU)

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: D (Entitled)

Project Description: 15-unit residential condominium development

- CUP (CUP20-01002)
- Zone Change (ZON20-01001)
- Precise Plan of Development (PRE20-01007)
- Tentative Tract Map (DIV20-01001)

Year: 2020

Address: 18419 Western Ave.

APN: 4096-019-055

Lot Size: 28,250 ft² parcel (0.65 acre)

Existing Use(s): Vacant—undeveloped & unpaved

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)
Proposed: No change

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Zoning: Existing: C3-PP (Solely Commercial, Precise Plan Overlay)
Proposed: C2-PP (General Commercial District, Precise Plan Overlay)

Project Density: 23.1 du/ac (zone allows 17 units)


Units: 5-unit building, 7-unit building, & 3-unit building, all 3-story
1,522 to 1,650 ft²
3-bedroom (all)

Height: 32.5 feet (2 stories over ground-floor parking)

FAR: 0.825:1 proposed (0.762:1 being considered to address staff concerns)

Income Category: Market rate





Project Identification: E (Entitled)

Project Description: 48-unit townhouse development (condominiums) with retention of the church sanctuary—demolition of chapel, office, and preschool

- CUP (CUP19-00031)
- Zone Change (ZON19-00002)
- Waiver (WAV19-00002)
- Tentative Tract Map (DIV19-00010) (for condos, merger, and re-subdivision)

Year: 2020

Address: 2706 182nd St.

APN: 4095-020-030

Lot Size: 3.7 ac (original)

Proposed Lot 1 (Existing Church): 40,090 ft² parcel (0.92 acre)

Proposed Lot 2 (Proposed residential development): 121,710 ft² (2.79 ac)

Existing Use: Church sanctuary, chapel, church offices, and preschool (operational)

General Plan: Existing: Medium Density Residential District

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: A1/R2 (Light Agricultural District/Two-Family Residential)

Proposed: R-3 (Limited MFR District)

Project Density: 17.2 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 0.56%
- Percent of expected GP density: 0.74%

Units: 48 three-story townhouse units in 9 buildings


Forty 3-bedroom units (1,725 ft²) and eight 4-bedroom units (2,257 ft²)


Parking: 144 spaces, including 10 guest spaces) (required + provided)

Height: 35 feet

FAR: 0.72:1 (Max allowed is 0.6:1)

Income Category: Above-moderate income





Project Identification: F (Entitled)
Project Description: 6-unit townhouse condominium development

- CUP (CUP19-00006) (for condos & to exceed 0.6 FAR)
- Division of Lot (DIV19-00002)
- Planning Commission Review (PCR19-00001)

Date: 2019
Address: 1750 Manuel Ave. (in the Torrance Tract)
APN: 7359-001-038
Lot Size: 14,678 ft² parcel (0.34 acre)
Existing Use(s): Church building (still operating at the time of the application) (1941)
General Plan: Existing: Medium Density Residential

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25

 Proposed: No change
Zoning: Existing: R-3 (Limited MFR District)
 Proposed: No change
Project Density: 17.8 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable: 57.4%
- Percent of expected: 76.6%

Units: 6 attached & detached townhouse units in 4 buildings
 1,270 to 1,538 ft²
 2-bedroom (all)
Height: 26.33 feet
FAR: 0.537:1
Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: G (Constructed)
Project Description: Mixed Use development (restaurant, office, & retail) with 39 dwelling units, with commercial and parking garage on ground floor (project results in 30 new units, net)

- CUP (CUP18-00013)

- Division of Lot (DIV18-0008)

Date: 2018

Address: 1954 – 1978 Carson St. (Downtown Torrance/Torrance Tract)

APN: 7357-016-001 – 005 (5 parcels to be consolidated into 1)

Lot Size: 38,500 ft² (0.88 acre) (total 5 parcels to be consolidated)

Existing Use: Commercial building (beauty college) (1966), one SFR (1922), 2 detached units (1929), and a MU building with 6 dwelling units (1950); (total 9 dwelling units)

General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

General Plan: Proposed: C-CTR (Commercial Center)

Zoning: Existing: D-T (Downtown Torrance District / Torrance Tract Overlay District)

- Allowable density: 43 du/ac
- Proposed: No change

Project Density: 38.5 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable zoning density: 89.5%
- Percent of expected GP density: N/A


Units: 39 dwelling units (apartments) on the 2nd and 3rd floors
515 to 945 ft²
Mix of 6 studios, 25 one-bedroom units, and 8 two-bedroom units

Parking: 70.4 required; 71 provided

Height: 38.5 feet


FAR: 1.21:1

Income Category: Above moderate



.....

Project Identification:	H (Constructed)					
Project Description:	25-unit residential condominium development					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CUP (CUP16-00005) • Tentative Tract Map • Zone Change • Waiver 					
Year:	2016					
Address:	20411 Earl St. (East Victor Precinct)					
APN:	7524-006-CONDO05 (current)					
Lot Size:	61,184 ft ² parcel (1.4 acre) (1 parcel)					
Existing Use(s):	2 light industrial buildings (1960s), 4 tennis courts (West End Tennis & Racquet Club plus related parking)					
General Plan:	Existing: R-LM (Low-Medium Density Residential)					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowable Density: 9.1 – 18 du/ac • Expected Density: 13.5 du/ac 					
	Proposed: No change					
Zoning:	Existing: ML(M1-PP) Limited Manufacturing (Light Manufacturing w/Precise Plan Overlay)					
	Proposed: R-3 (up to 27 du/ac) (Rezoning required to be consistent with the GP designation and to allow residential)					
Project Density:	17.8 du/ac					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of maximum allowable: 98.9% • Percent of expected: 139.9% 					
Units:	18	duplexes	&	7	stand-alone	units
	1,522		to	1,650		ft ²
	3-bedroom (all)					
Parking:	3 parking spaces/unit + 1 guest space/unit (required + provided)					
Height:	26 feet					
FAR:	0.6:1					
Income Category:	Market rate					



Project Identification: I (Constructed)

- Project Description:** 16-unit residential condominium development
- Conditional Use Permit for condominiums CUP (CUP15-00009)
 - Zone Change (ZON15-00002)
 - Tentative Tract Map for parcel mergers & condominiums (DIV15-00004)
 - Waiver (to exceed the maximum height of the R-P zone)

Year: 2015

Address: 23625-23649 Arlington Ave.

APN: Original not available

Lot Size: 28,635 ft2 parcel (0.66 acre), after consolidation (2 parcels consolidated into 1)

Existing Use(s): Small mixed-use center with a residence, offices, & retail building (1964); and small retail center (1958)

- General Plan:** Existing: R-OF (Residential-Office)
- Allowable Density: 18-31 du/ac
 - Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac
- Proposed: No Change

Zoning: Existing: C-5 (Conditional Commercial)
Proposed: R-P (Residential-Professional) (Rezoning required because residential uses are prohibited in the C-5 zone)



- Project Density:** 25 du/ac
- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 80.7%
 - Percent of expected GP density: 107.5%

Units: Four rows of two 2-unit buildings (total 16 units)
1,073 ft2 (each)
2-bedroom (all)

Parking: 32 spaces in garages, + guest parking (required + provided)

Height: 31.83 feet (R-P zone allows 27' maximum—Waiver required)

FAR: 0.60:1 **Income Category:** Market rate





View of project from Arlington

Project Identification: J (Constructed)

Project Description: Mixed use development (horizontal) with 8 dwelling units + 2,700 ft² commercial office building

- CUP
- DVP (Development Permit)
- DIV (Division of Lot for Condominium purposes)
- Waiver (for setback for residential use)

Year: 2015

Address: 24444 Hawthorne Blvd. (HBCSP, WALTERIA Sub-District, H-WT)

APN: 7534-020-038

Lot Size: 13,696 ft² parcel (0.32 acre)

Existing Use: Recreational swimming school (1958)

General Plan: Existing: General Commercial (allows MU development @ 1.0:1 FAR)

- Maximum Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed): No change

Zoning: Existing: HBCSP, WALTERIA Sub-District, H-WT

- Maximum allowable density: 27 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 25.4 du/ac


- Percent of maximum allowable zoning density: 94.1%
- Percent of expected GP density: N/A

Units: Two 4-unit, 3-story residential buildings
1,062 2-bedroom (all) ft² (all)

Height: 36'-2" feet

FAR: 0.82:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: K (Constructed)
Project Description: Development of a total of 4 detached-style condominium units, 2 per lot

- CUP (CUP14-00001)
- DIV (DIV14-00001)
- ZON (ZON14-00001)
- GPA (GPA14-0001)

Year: 2014
Address: 1008 Sartori Ave.
APN: 7354-019-012, 7354-019-013
Size: Two 4,140 ft² lots (Total of 8,280 ft² or 0.19 acre)
Existing Use: Off-site parking facility (that served a community services facility—the Switzer Center—that ceased operation on the subject property in 2007)

General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)
 Proposed: Medium Density Residential (requested by COT)

- Allowable Density: 18-31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25

Zoning: Existing: P-1 (Open Area, Parking, Planting)
 Proposed: R-3 (Limited MFR District)

- Allowable density: 27 du/ac

Project Density: 21 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 0.78%
- Percent of expected GP density: 90.0%


Units: Four 2-story detached units
 Unit A = 1,338 ft²; Unit B = 1,353 ft²
 3-bedroom (all)

Parking: 8 garages spaces + 2 open guest spaces (required + provided)

Height: 27 feet

FAR: 0.65:1

Income Category: Above-moderate (presumed, since no income category was proposed)





Project Description: L (Constructed)
Date: 2013
Project Description: Mixed use development with 44 dwelling units (workforce housing) and 3,700 ft² of commercial (Cabrillo Family Apartments)
 • CUP (CUP13-00001)
 • Waiver (WAV13-00002) (for front setback)

Address: 1640 Cabrillo Ave. (Downtown Torrance)
APN: 7355-030-905 (City-owned property)
Size: 37,260 ft² parcel (0.86 acre) (4 adjoining parcels consolidated into 1; purchased by the COT Redevelopment Agency in 2009 for workforce housing)
Existing Use(s): Multiple structures housing showroom/office, vehicle maintenance, & storage (1940s – 1950s)
General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)
 • Allowable Density: N/A
 • Expected Density: N/A
Zoning: Proposed: No change
 Existing: Downtown Project Area, Commercial Sector
 • Allowable Density:
 Proposed: No change

Project Density: 51 du/ac
Units: 43 units for low- and very low-income households + 1 manager’s apartment
 560 to 1,087 ft² (density bonus concession for unit size)
 22 one-bedroom units, 8 two-bedroom units, and 14 three-bedroom units
Parking: 79 required; 79 provided (utilizes tandem parking, a density bonus concession)
Height: 35-44 feet
Income Category: Low- and Very Low-Income households (tax credits, density bonus, RDA property)



Project Identification M (Constructed)

Project Description: Planned Development permit to establish development standards for a gated, 104-unit residential condominium development

- Zone Change (ZON03-00003)
- General Plan Amendment (GPA03-00002)
- Planned Development (PD03-00001)
- CUP (CUP03-00013)
- Tentative Tract Map for condominiums (TTM53091)

Year: 2003
Address: 2829 Maricopa Street
Lot Size: 435,746 ft² parcel (10 acres)
Existing Use(s): Industrial building, used for warehousing & distribution and a church (154,000 ft²)
General Plan: Existing: I-LT (Light Industrial)
 Proposed: R-LM (Low-Medium Density Residential)

- Allowable Density: 9.1 – 18 du/ac
- Expected Density: 13.5 du/ac

Zoning: Existing: M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) and P-1 (Planting and Parking)
 Proposed: PD (Planned Development)

Project Density: 10.4 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 57.8%
- Percent of expected GP density: 77.0%

Units: 104 detached to units (patio homes) 2,638 to 3,206 ft²

Height: 4-5 bedrooms 25'-9" to 34'-2"

FAR: 0.68:1

Income Category: Market rate





Project Identification N (Constructed)

Project Description: This project is a proposal to construct a 160-unit condominium development that includes 60 senior units and 100 townhome units.

- Development Permit (DVP02-00002)
- CUP (CUP02-00020 & CUP02-000021)
- Tentative Tract Map for condominiums (TTM53955)
- Waiver (WAV02-00010—front setback)
- Variance (VAR02-00001—parking)

Year: 2002

Address: 3520 Torrance Boulevard

Lot Size: 5.37 acres

Existing Use(s): Secondary oil recovery site

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: HBCSP-DA-1 (Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Del Amo Sub-District 1)

Project Density: 29.8 du/ac

Units: 100 townhouse condominium units:

- 1,591 to 2,143 ft²
- 3 bedrooms

60 senior citizen condominium units:

- 442-613 ft²
- 2 floorplans are studio units; 1 floorplan is 1-bedroom unit

Height: 36.5' (townhouse development)

45.42" (senior citizen development)

FAR: 0.97:1

Income Category: Market rate



CHAPTER 6: Housing Element




Project Identification: O (Entitled Project)
Year: 2020
Project Description: Mixed use development with 53 senior residential condominium units and 1,500 ft² of commercial area.

- CUP (CUP15-00014)
- Division of Lot (DIV15-00006 for condominium purposes)
- Zone Change (ZON15-00003)

Address: East side of Prairie Avenue approximately 100 Feet North Of 176th Street
APN: 4088-002-021
Size: 1.6 acre
Existing Use: Vacant property
General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)
Proposed: No change
Zoning: Existing: C-R (Restricted Commercial)
Proposed: C3-PP (Solely Commercial with Precise Plan Overlay)
Project Density: 33.1 du/ac
Units: 53 units; commercial uses located on the first floor of the western-most building, with residential units on the second floor, and a two-story residential building to the east.

- 16 one-bedroom units
- 37 two-bedroom units

Parking: 72 required; 111 provided (92 spaces provided in a semi-subterranean garage with 19 surface parking spaces)
Height: 24 feet
FAR: 0.9:1 (max allowable is 1.0:1)
Income Category: Market rate (above moderate)



**APPENDIX F: CORRESPONDENCE FROM
PROVIDERS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

**APPENDIX F: CORRESPONDENCE FROM
PROVIDERS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Hi Julia,

Following up on the question from yesterday. Yes we do plan to be affordable for the next 10 years.

Thank you,



Silvia Rangel | Community Manager
Harmony Court Senior Apartment Homes
Western National Property Management
CA DRE LIC#00838846

4502 186th Street | Redondo Beach, CA 90278



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Julia

22520 Ocean houses people with Developmental Disabilities. We do plan to remain for at least the next 10 years.

Thank you,

David Dreben
Director of Property Management

Momentum

6430 Independence Ave

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Office: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.momentum4all.org

The logo for Momentum features the word "momentum" in a lowercase, sans-serif font. The letters are filled with a vibrant, multi-colored gradient that transitions from light blue on the left, through purple and pink, to bright orange and yellow on the right. The background within the letters appears to be a soft-focus image of a sunset or sunrise over a body of water.

Note: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately to arrange for return or destruction of these documents.

APPENDIX G: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX G

6th Cycle 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element – Public Comments and Responses

(Does not include comments/responses concerning associated environmental documents (ISND) or from/to State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD))

Date Comment Received and Commenter	Comment Summary	Draft Responses to be released prior to June 14, 2022, City Council Public Hearing
<p>3.15.2021 Aidan Schwing, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Kari Gallegos, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Prabhu Reddy, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Scarlett Davis, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Sunny Zhou, resident</p> <p>3.16.2021 Ciera Coronado, resident</p> <p>3.16.2021 Margaret Gilbert, resident</p> <p>3.21.2021 Aron Sanchez, resident</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p> <p>Commented concern about the region’s affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of the city.</p> <p>Commented about frustration by homelessness issues, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in neighborhoods.</p> <p>Commented about opinion that exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable housing near transit.</p> <p>Commented about pattern of redlining that divided city’s neighborhoods by race and income.</p> <p>Commented that a new approach is needed to solve city and region’s housing crisis.</p> <p>Suggests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units that can be developed for inventory sites • Using and HCD-recommended “safe Harbor” methodology for forecasting future ADU production • Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well- 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is based on net potential units. The assumed capacity is below actual potential capacity and is supported (in the revised document) by a new evaluation of trends. Programs are provided to facilitate development at or above assumed capacity; this provides a reasonable and conservative estimate of potential units. • The City calculated the average number of ADU permits issued for 2018, 2019, & 2020 to estimate the production of ADUs during the 6th Cycle. The average is 68.7, but the City used 60 ADUs per year as the estimate, which the City believes is a conservative estimate. Note that this is a reduction from the 100 ADU/year assumed in the initial submittal to HCD. The City used the methodology for ADUs as provided by SCAG and approved by HCD for calculating affordability estimates. • One of the City’s strategies is to promote new housing for all income levels on corridors that offer transit and are near or within employment areas and offer other quality-of-life amenities such as parks, schools, and shopping and services that are important for residents. Per the analysis distribution of RHNA units by TCAC • Opportunity Area Category conducted for AFFH evaluation because • most of Torrance is within a “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” category, most RHNA sites are located within one of those two categories. Over 56 percent are located within the Highest Resource category, and nearly 40 percent are located within the High Resource category. Similarly, over 60 percent of census tracts in the City are within the Highest Resource category, and over 30 percent are within the High Resource category. • The Torrance Sites Inventory has a total buffer 31%; when entitled and pipeline projects and estimated ADUs are included, the buffer is

	<p>resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing in order to affirmatively further fair housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the sites inventory to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement. • Adopt policies legalizing more housing, making housing easier to build, funding affordable housing and ending homelessness, and strengthening tenants' rights. 	<p>53.4 percent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding legalizing more housing and making housing easier to build; funding affordable housing, ending homelessness, and strengthening tenants' rights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City's Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. ○ The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. ○ The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at:
--	--	--

		<p>www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City's Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City's recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center. The City established the Social Services Commission to address issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters' (tenants') rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City.
--	--	---

<p>3.29.2021 Morgan Bennyworth</p> <p>3.30.2021 Yazmine Mihojevich, resident</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p> <p>Concerned with policies that ban apartments in much of the city, as this promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in neighborhoods.</p> <p>Expressed concern that apartments are banned on over 80% of residentially-zoned land in LA County. Concerned this had led to undersupply of affordable medium and high-density housing near jobs and transit. Concern this has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities.</p> <p>Concerned that high median home values, scarce affordable apartments and single-family zoning effectively guarantee that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households who tend to be white</p> <p>Would like to see the city legalize apartments citywide.</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <p>Regarding legalizing apartments citywide, the City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. While this does not legalize apartments everywhere, it greatly expands opportunities for apartments throughout Torrance. The corridors were selected to consider adjacent uses to mitigate negative externalities on new residents and to promote use of transit and easy access to goods and services needed by residents. The Housing Element also includes programs to promote affordable housing in neighborhoods that are typically single-family by facilitating construction of ADUs, thereby increasing opportunities for additional housing that is affordable to all income levels.</p>
--	---	---

<p>4.27.2021 From unknown commenter (redacted) Sent in advance of Planning Commission Public Workshop, April 28, 2021</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p>
<p>4.28.21 Aziz Fellague, resident</p>	<p>Expressed concern that Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods.
<p>4.28.21 Name redacted</p>	<p>Stated that the City has added over 9,000 jobs since 2010 and housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City’s Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment. The City’s Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California.
<p>4.28.21 Keiko Thomas</p>	<p>Expressed concern that apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance’s residentially-zoned land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City’s Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to
<p>4.28.21 Name redacted</p>	<p>Stated that just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs.</p>	
	<p>Stated that homelessness has increase nine times since 2013.</p>	
	<p>Urges the city to adopt a transformative housing element that furthers the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legalizes more homes and makes homes easier to build • Funds affordable housing • Addresses and ends homelessness • Strengthens Renters Rights 	

		<p>continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City’s recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center. The City established the Social Services Commission to address issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City. • The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City’s Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City’s recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter at the Civic Center. The City’s Social Services Commission addresses issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.
--	--	--

<p>4.24.21 From Tieira Ryder. Sent in advance of Planning Commission Public Workshop, April 28, 2021</p>	<p>Commented that affordable housing should include both rent and homeownership options for the working class, senior, students and those with low or no income.</p> <p>Stated that it's time to end redline, racist and classist zoning in LA County that has over 60,000 unhoused residents.</p> <p>Expressed that everyone deserves housing that we can afford, rent was not meant to take more than 30% of a resident's income, with some rent taking over 80% of a resident's income, and that's not acceptable.</p> <p>Stated that in the last 10 years in SoCal, rent has increased by over 65%, and during that time period the number unhoused resident increased by over 50%.</p> <p>Expressed support for a variety of housing types, including affordable tiny and small homes, apartments, condos, and townhomes.</p> <p>Stated that the state can capture land from local sub cities that do not meet housing element requirements.</p>	<p>Programs in the City's Housing Element are intended to increase both the number and type of units that will be constructed in Torrance, as well as provide for a wide range of income levels and those with special needs.</p>
--	---	---

<p>4.27.21 Chris Dreike, resident</p>	<p>Encouraged Torrance to join with any legal actions against SCAG, HCD, and the Legislature regarding the false RHNA numbers, to repeal SB828, and SB35.</p> <p>As part of comment, provided a one-page analysis of housing needs for the State of California for the next 10 years. The following are the points made in the commenter's analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated California's population grew by only .2% in 2019, which equates to an increase of 80,000 people. • LA County, including Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan and Carson all lost population. • Commenter stated that we are building more housing than we need, and more apartments than single family homes. Stated that the market is looking for single family homes. • Provided a mathematical analysis for the conclusion that HCD's RHNA calculations are greatly overestimated both Statewide and for the SCAG region. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City filed an appeal to SCAG to challenge its RHNA allocation. Unfortunately, the City was not successful, nor were the majority of cities that filed appeals. • The City carefully considers all state legislation that impacts it and its authority as a charter city and takes action as appropriate.
---	---	---

<p>4.27.21 Prabhu Reddy</p>	<p>Stated the commenter was writing on behalf of Torrance for Everyone and noted that 4 documents were attached to her email:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brutal Facts: Document lays out commenter’s concerns about Torrance’s housing crisis including that more than 45% of Torrance renters are cost-burdened, and a 9-times increase in homelessness since 2013. 2. Our Platform: Document includes 17 policies across 4 key areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Legalize more homes b. Fund affordable housing c. Support unhoused neighbors d. Strengthen renters’ rights 3. Public Outreach: Intent is to remind the City of public outreach obligations. 4. Site Inventory Analysis: Includes letter prepared by Abundant Housing LA summarizing state law, and points to the “affirmatively furthering fair housing” requirement, especially the requirement to distribute low-income housing across the City of Torrance. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. b. The City’s Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment. The City’s Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California.
---------------------------------	--	---

		<p>c. The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City's Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City's recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center.</p> <p>d. The City has utilized a variety of methods for public outreach. They are summarized in Section 1 of the Housing Element, while Appendix A includes documentation of the various efforts.</p> <p>e. The revised Housing Element significantly expands discussion regarding preparation of the Sites Inventory and adds many new sites based on public interest. Refer to the responses to the Abundant Housing LA Letter—they are not repeated here.</p>
--	--	--

<p>11.1.21 Lisa Hirsch Marin, Our Future LA Coalition</p>	<p>Commented that the reason for the letter is multiple concerns about the housing crisis. Provided a considerable amount of background data, summarized here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black and Latino residents feel housing crisis more than most. • Black households have 1.12% the wealth of white households and Latino households have less than 5% • Black people make up 8% of the county population but 33.7% of people experiencing homelessness • Black and Latino neighborhoods face disproportionately higher eviction threats • 25% of AAPI populations are considered severely cost-burdened <p>Stated that decades of racist policies have not been eradicated.</p> <p>The pandemic exacerbated these disproportionate impacts resulting in higher disease and death rates among Black and Latino people.</p> <p>LA County ranks last in counties in the US in housing affordability, overcrowding and unsheltered homelessness. Stated that LA County needs to double the amount of affordable homes built by 2030.</p> <p>Comments specific to the Torrance Housing Element are detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protections: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should expand just-cause eviction protections to cover all tenants and establish a corresponding enforcement program. b. The housing element should implement a local RSO or strengthen/reduce the annual allowable rent increase for the existing RSO program. c. The housing element should codify a tenant’s right to counsel in an eviction proceeding. d. The housing element should create a permanent tenant education program to inform tenants of their rights and how to access eviction defense resources. e. The housing element should create and implement a tenant anti-harassment ordinance combined with enforcement resources. 2. Preservation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element must do more to prioritize rezoning – with value capture – in high-resource neighborhoods which are transit-and job-rich, including single-family zoned areas. This is necessary to expand affordable housing opportunities while 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Protections: b. a.– e.: The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. c. The City does not currently propose to adopt specific ordinances proposed by the commenter, although the City may consider them as part of its ongoing implementation program to enforce fair housing. d. Preservation: e. The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. f. The Sites Inventory does not include parcels containing RSP units. Per Program 16 in the Housing
---	---	---

	<p>minimizing the impact on existing renters in multifamily-zoned areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The housing element should exclude parcels containing RSP housing units in the housing element’s site inventory. c. The housing element should require that no net loss provisions apply to parcels in the site inventory and rezoning program with a monitoring and implementation program. d. The housing element should institute local programs and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing. <p>3. Prioritization of affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should utilize a value capture mechanism, such as inclusionary zoning, to locally fund and/or incentivize affordable housing. b. The housing element should prioritize creation of affordable housing on public land. c. The housing element should streamline affordable housing production. d. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas. e. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas currently zoned R1. 	<p>Element, the City will amend the Zoning Code to require the replacement of units affordable to the same or lower income level as a condition of any development on a nonvacant site consistent with those requirements set forth in State Density Bonus Law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Per Program 1, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis. h. Preserve existing affordable housing i. Prioritization: j. The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element. k. The City has a history of facilitating the construction of affordable housing on City-owned property, especially via the former Redevelopment Agency. The Housing Element already includes a policy to “Prioritize development of housing for moderate- and lower-income households on City-owned property.” (Policy H.2.9) l. The Housing Element includes programs to streamline the production of housing via updates to the Zoning Code. m. & e. The Housing Element includes a program to add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for 100% lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are
--	---	---

4. Site Capacity Assessment

- a. The housing element should estimate and report both the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, both vacant and nonvacant. A table was provided in the letter, showing how the draft housing element will fall short of the RHNA goal, by 5,020 units of realistic capacity. The City must *fairly* estimate the likelihood of development for all parcels on the suitable sites inventory.
- b. The housing element should report the proportion of sites from the previous housing element’s inventory that were developed during the previous planning period, and HCD-recommended methodologies and data sources should be used in order to conduct a thorough “analysis of sites’ realistic development capacity.
- c. The housing element assigns more than 50% of the lower-income RHNA target to nonvacant sites, but should use statistical methods (e.g., surveying a random sample of owners of nonvacant sites) to determine that the sites’ existing uses are likely to be discontinued during the planning period.
- d. A buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity is not included in the housing element site inventory. This capacity buffer is especially necessary in order to accommodate the lower-income RHNA target. (See No Net Loss (NNL) section of 4A.
- e. The housing element should provide a quantitative estimate of the likelihood that in-pipeline projects will be completed, based on historical data, and should adjust the number of in-pipeline units counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA target accordingly.
- f. The housing element should commit to a mid-cycle review to verify the housing element’s assumptions about development probabilities.

located in and near established neighborhoods, including those zoned R-1, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. The City does not propose other overlays that apply to R-1 zoned property.

n. Site Capacity Assessment:

o. The Sites Inventory provides the net number of units that are estimated to be constructed on vacant and non-vacant property. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, a program to codify target densities identified in the Land Use Element will meaningfully increase overall housing production (e.g., disincentivize development of housing at densities below densities in the Land Use Element). Other programs will increase densities; rezone properties to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Also, based on a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as input from local developers and property owners, continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. The City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income

	<p>5. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should meaningfully increase the concentration of lower-income households in areas of the city where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low. b. The housing element should meaningfully reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with significant exposure to noise/pollution and commit to 	<p>category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. The City respectfully disagrees that its RHNA goal falls short by 5,020 units of realistic capacity.</p> <p>p. As part of the Housing Corridor Study, which informs the Housing Element update and provides 33.9% of the sites for the City’s RHNA, a Feasibility Study of potential development prototypes and a pro forma financial feasibility analysis were conducted to determine project feasibility for the development prototypes. The financial factors for the prototypes were generally developed based on the industry-standard cost factors, which reflected a review of site design requirements associated with various zoning districts, and historic property sale data. The analysis was also informed by input from development and design professionals active in the South Bay and comparable southern California markets. The prototypes were evaluated based on the City’s existing parking standards. The fiscal analysis determined that, in many cases, densities could be achieved if the parking standards were reduced. This finding will inform finalization of the development and design standards for the study area so that rezoning of the HCS sites facilitates financial feasibility. This analysis also will inform the revision to other development standards to implement the Zoning Code to facilitate financial feasibility. The City undertook this level of design and fiscal analysis to incentivize development of housing. The Sites Inventory (in the revised document) has been expanded to include information on existing uses, land vs. improvement value, age of the structures, local knowledge regarding underutilization, and interest from the public regarding redevelopment. In addition, a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by</p>
--	---	---

	<p>reducing/addressing noise and pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The housing element should ensure community-serving investment in historically disinvested areas. This includes place-based strategies that create a net gain of affordable housing and stop displacement, prioritize environmental justice, enhance community health, and strengthen equitable community leadership in land use planning. d. The housing element should include a thorough analysis of local patterns in socioeconomic/racial segregation and integration, including patterns of overt racial or ethnic discrimination in the housing and land development market. e. The housing element should adequately prioritize high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities. f. The housing element should adequately identify funding sources, public resources, and density bonus programs to maximize the likelihood that projects with below-market-rate units are built. g. The jurisdiction did not adequately solicit public feedback and commentary on the housing element in a way that accurately reflects the jurisdiction’s socioeconomic makeup. 	<p>input from local developers and property owners indicates that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. Programs to reduce impediments and incentivize development of housing will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing by allowing residential development by- right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> q. See responses to (a) and (b) above. r. The 1st submittal of the Housing Element did include a buffer of over 30% for all income categories. The Sites Inventory in the revised draft Housing Element has a total buffer 31%; when entitled and pipeline projects and estimated ADUs are included, the buffer is 53.4 percent. s. The revised Housing Element added a new section providing information on historical trends to support the capacity estimates. t. Per Program 1, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis rather than waiting until a mid-cycle review. u. v. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: w. The Sites Inventory as proposed will meaningfully increase the concentration of lower income households within the City, including areas where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low throughout the City. Because the City’s residentially designated areas are built out, sites large enough to provide for lower-income housing are challenging to identify. Several used include rezoning
--	--	---

		<p>non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, adding an overlay to allow affordable housing by-right on property owned and operated by religious institutions, which often are in or near neighborhoods of predominantly SFR properties, and facilitating ADUs. The City has adopted an ordinance consistent with SB 9, which also may result in additional affordable units.</p> <p>x. The Torrance Noise Element identifies goals, policies, and programs to mitigate noise impacts. The City has a Noise Ordinance that it actively enforces to mitigate noise violations. Preparation of an Environmental Justice Element is a future action the City will undertake that will address environmental hazards that disproportionately affect lower-income neighborhoods in Torrance.</p> <p>y. Policy H.1.7 commits the City to employ place-based strategies in making neighborhood improvements, where place-based strategies address the physical, social, structural, and economic conditions of a community that affect the well-being of the children, families and individuals who live there. Place-based strategies include any effort to enhance the livability and quality of life in a given community. Implementation of the City's Strategic Plan over the past two decades demonstrates a place-based approach, which is also implemented via the City's budgeting and CIP processes. The City also recently established a Social Services Commission that addresses issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs and advises the City Council.</p> <p>z. The AFFH analysis has been updated to include historic redlining maps, as well as transit, homelessness, and housing loan information, and additional regional information about racial/ethnic minority population, income, disability, and familial</p>
--	--	--

	<p>6. Forecasts of ADU Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element did not use an HCD-recommended safe harbor methodology for forecasting future ADU production. b. The housing element should provide for mid-cycle adjustments if inventory sites are developed at lower rates, or lesser densities, than the housing element anticipated and if ADU production falls short of projections. Mid-cycle adjustments should automatically implement a by-right density bonus on inventory sites, starting mid-cycle, and be large enough to make up for an ADU shortfall. c. The housing element should assess the affordability of forecasted ADUs using city-specific data; it instead uses a regional average. 	<p>status. Contributing factors have been prioritized based on the re-evaluations noted.</p> <p>aa. The Housing Element includes strategies and programs to promote new housing near and along key commercial and transportation corridors. This strategy supports AFFH opportunities because it supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile. Goods and services that residents rely upon are within proximity to housing, which is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation. It also provides greater opportunities to distribute housing for all income levels throughout the city. It has economic benefits as well, as additional residents in proximity to businesses provides an enhanced customer base.</p> <p>bb. The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. See also Policy H.3—"Offer financial and/or regulatory incentives, where feasible, to offset or reduce the costs of developing quality housing affordable to a wide range of Torrance households." The City has a density bonus program in accordance with the state Housing Density Bonus law.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>cc. The City has utilized a variety of methods for public outreach, which are summarized in Section 1 of the Housing Element, while Appendix A includes documentation of the various efforts. In addition, the City’s process for updating its Strategic Plan informed preparation of the Housing Element. The process included considerable public outreach, including two statistically valid surveys (one for residents and one for the business community). For the Residents Survey, 1,336 Torrance residents over the age of 18 were surveyed. The survey was conducted online and by telephone. To ensure the representation of all adult residents, a random sample of those without publicly available email addresses or telephone numbers received a postcard in the mail with an invitation to take the survey online. Results were weighted slightly using figures from the U.S. Census to ensure the sample proportions reflect demographic and geographic proportions within the actual population as a whole. Several of the questions were open-ended. When asked what is the biggest issue of concern facing the residents, 11 percent stated housing costs/affordable housing, and three percent responded “homelessness.” The survey tested eight issues facing the City, and 75 percent cited the number of homeless residents as extremely important/very important, and 59 percent cited affordable housing as extremely important/very important. Residents want to see Torrance as a City that provides a wide-range of affordable housing options, with 73 percent ranking this as very/somewhat important.</p> <p>dd. Forecasts of ADU Development:</p> <p>ee. The City calculated the average number of ADU permits issued for 2018, 2019, & 2020 to estimate the production of ADUs during the 6th Cycle. The average is 68.7, but the City used 60 ADUs per year as the estimate, which the City believes is a conservative estimate. Note that this is a reduction from the 100 ADU/year assumed in the 1st submittal to HCD.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>ff. Per Program 3, to facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, within 6 months of adoption of the Housing Element the City will develop a monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction goal. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU goal, the City will review and revise polices and efforts to increase ADU construction as necessary. (This was already in the 1st submittal of the draft Housing Element.)</p> <p>gg. The City used the methodology for ADUs as provided by SCAG and approved by HCD for calculating affordability estimates.</p> <p>hh.</p> <p>ii.</p>
--	--	--

<p>11.5.21 Letter from Californians for Homeownership, sent by email from Matthew Gelfand</p>	<p>Expressed concern that the sites inventory is legally inadequate, and that the City will not be able to meet its obligation to support the inventory with evidentiary findings as the law requires.</p> <p>Stated these inadequacies may expose the City to the risk of litigation.</p> <p>Stated their letter is intended to assist the City in identifying additional information and facts prior to adopting its Housing Element, so the City can reduce this risk and comply with the law.</p> <p>Discussed state law governing the use of nonvacant sites to satisfy housing element obligations.</p> <p>Outlined where they feel are inadequacies in the City’s Draft Housing Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated the sites inventory does not adequately account for the impediment created by the existing uses on the listed nonvacant sites, including the possibility that a site will be maintained in its current use rather than redeveloped during the planning period. • Inventory appears to assume that every listed nonvacant site will be redeveloped during the planning period. Information about the existing uses only identifies a broad category such as residential, commercial or industrial. • City’s draft housing element appears to rely on nonvacant sites to satisfy over 50% of the City’s lower income RHNA but does not identify evidence that the existing uses on each site will be discontinued during the planning period. • Draft housing element provides a general overview of various possible housing corridors and makes broad statements about sites in these areas. Evidence is not provided that these sites have the potential to recycle, making those sites inappropriate for inclusion. • The letter requests additional information and provides a table listing the nonvacant sites identified for lower income housing in the City’s sites inventory. The letter goes on to request that the City complete the table and return it to the sender within 14 days. The information requested included identifying the percentage of similar sites that were redeveloped in the Fifth Cycle or otherwise explain how its prior experience justifies its assumptions. The table also included a space to identify the site-specific evidence for particular sites. • The letter states that if the City does not respond to the letter, the assumption will be that the City has no further analysis or evidence to provide. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is supported (in the revised document) by a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by input from local developers and property owners, that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. Programs to reduce impediments and incentivize development of housing will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing by allowing residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. • The City has provided a Sites Inventory that demonstrates there are adequate sites in the City to accommodate its RHNA. The City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. • The City is mostly built out and must rely on non-vacant sites. Based on analysis, including age of buildings, land-
---	---	---

		<p>to-improvement value, sites utilization, use, interest expressed by property owners and developers, and development trends, it is reasonable to assume that the identified sites provide adequate opportunities to meet the City's RHNA. As noted above, the City's Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement "no net loss" requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the "no net loss" requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional information has been provided regarding the various corridors. An analysis of recent trends (including examples of new housing being approved and constructed on non-residential property supports the City's strategy of promoting infill residential and mixed-use development on the various corridors. Further, implementation of the City's Housing Corridor Study (discussed in detail in the Housing Element) as well as implementation of the proposed Housing/Mixed-Use Overlay, will incentive production of housing on property that currently does not have a residential land use designation or zoning.• The City has significantly expanded Section 4 and the Sites Inventory Table (Appendix C) to provide additional information and analysis regarding the sites. See also other responses above.
--	--	--

<p>1.4.22 Letter from Abundant Housing LA to Gustavo Velasquez, Director, California Department of Housing and Community Development</p> <p>Commenter attached analysis results provided by MapCraft Inc.</p>	<p>Letter states that Abundant Housing is writing to HCD on behalf of Torrance’s housing element, and concerns about what Abundant Housing sees as major deficiencies in the City’s housing element update.</p> <p>Expresses concern that City hasn’t identified enough parcels in its site inventory and proposed rezoning program to achieve its RHNA target of 4,939 homes by 2029.</p> <p>Expresses concern that the City has not provided the substantial evidence that the current use of the nonvacant sites allocated to meet their lower-income RHNA target is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.</p> <p>States that Abundant Housing LA has partnered with MapCraft Labs to forecast the true realistic capacity of the City’s site inventory and proposed rezoning program.</p> <p>States that the findings of the MapCraft analysis include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the City’s site inventory and rezoning program claimed capacity for about 6,600 housing units, commenter’s analysis suggests the expected housing capacity could fall short by 1,800 to 3,600 units. • On 374 sites where the City has claimed 6,018 housing units, commenter’s analysis found that these sites are unlikely to be redeveloped to the density that the City is claiming, or are unlikely to be redeveloped altogether. Commenter states that this represents 95% of the housing units in the City’s site inventory. <p>Commenter provides the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that HCD urge the City to reassess its site capacity claims, and revise the sites inventory and proposed rezoning program, • Recommend the City add more parcels to the site inventory and expand its proposed rezoning program, particularly for low-density parcels in high-demand neighborhoods like Old Town Torrance and Waltheria. • Recommend the City consider eliminating or reducing on-site parking requirements, which commenter suggests would greatly improve the economic feasibility of denser housing development. <p>Additional recommendations from the MapCraft executive summary include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend introducing new economic incentives to increase the 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is supported (in the revised document) by a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by input from local developers and property owners, that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. There are many programs in the Housing Element that will significantly incentivize opportunities for additional housing. For example, residential development will be allowed by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. Densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. • Based on analysis, including age of buildings, land-to-improvement value, sites utilization, use, interest expressed by property owners and developers, and development trends, it is reasonable to assume that the identified sites are candidates for recycling and provide adequate opportunities to meet the City’s RHNA. As noted above, the City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. The City notes that its evaluation is based on local knowledge, local
---	--	--

	<p>financial feasibility of redevelopment, especially for projects that include below-market-rate units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity. 	<p>trends, and local developer and property owner interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City modified its Sites Inventory after the 1st submittal to eliminate sites that, after further analysis, did not meet its criteria. New sites were added that did meet its criteria and included property owner and/or developer interest. Regarding Old Town Torrance, the draft Housing Element has been revised to directly address and implement the recently approved Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan, which includes many strategies to incentivize housing in and around Downtown Torrance. This is also a location where the City owns several parcels that it may consider for housing (as it has in the past). The Housing Corridor Study also includes rezoning of an area in Old Town to incentivize housing. New mixed-use development is already a trend in the Walteria District of the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP). While other rezoning outside the Walteria District is not currently proposed, there is a possibility that it could be considered in the future. • The Housing Element already includes a program to evaluate and consider reducing certain development standards that may be constraints to residential and mixed-use development, including parking. Other standards that have been expressed by developers as constraints to development also will be considered, including open space requirements, height, FAR, and setbacks, especially identified as a constraints in the HBCSP. • The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element. • The Housing Element already includes an action in Program 1 to adopt an ordinance to revise the minimum
--	---	--

		<p>densities for several existing zones, including all the residential zones, so that the minimum densities are consistent with the “expected” density ranges in the Land Use Element. These are referred to in the Housing Element capacity assessment as “target” densities. Additionally, incentives will be developed to incentivize development at or above the target densities, and disincentives for projects that propose lower than target densities will be developed.</p>
--	--	---

<p>2.28.22 Letter from YIMBY Law Sonja Trauss, Executive Director</p>	<p>Commenter states that findings repeatedly seen are that housing prices are high, segregation exists, and there is a lack of housing for special populations, but the policies and programs of the housing element do not respond to these findings or try to change outcomes.</p> <p>The following is a summary list of YIMBY’s policy recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prioritize rezoning in high resource, historically exclusionary neighborhoods b. Establish a strong tenant protection ordinance so that new housing benefits everyone c. Support homeownership opportunities for historically excluded groups d. Adequately plan for density e. Provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels, including a minimum No Net Loss buffer of 30% f. Use data from the 5th Cycle to calculate the likelihood of development for the 6th Cycle site inventory g. Commit to an automatic mid-cycle adjustment if ADU permitting activity is lower than estimated in the housing element h. Incentivize new ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers. i. Allow residential to be built in areas that are zoned for commercial use. j. All flexibility in inclusionary zoning. k. Ensure that the city has a ministerial process for housing permitting, especially multi-family housing, and remove impact fees for deed-restricted housing. l. Reduce parking standards and eliminate parking minimums. m. Cap fees on all new housing. n. Provide local funding, to possibly include transfer tax, vacancy tax, commercial linkage fee. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Sites Inventory as proposed will meaningfully increase the concentration of lower income households within the City, including areas where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low throughout the City. Because the City’s residentially designated areas are built out, sites large enough to provide for lower-income housing are challenging to identify. Several include rezoning non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, adding an overlay to allow affordable housing by-right on property owned and operated by religious institutions, which often are in or near neighborhoods of predominantly SFR properties, and facilitating ADUs. The City has adopted an ordinance consistent with SB 9, which also may result in additional affordable units. b. The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and
---	--	--

		<p>other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City.</p> <p>c. The Housing Element includes policies and programs to support and encourage homeownership, and the City has a history of promoting ownership via its former Redevelopment Agency via facilitation of condominium development in Downtown Torrance for moderate-income households. The City encourages state and federal programs to increase funding opportunities for homeownership for lower-income households, such as increasing state and federal HUD programs. The City may consider local programs if funding opportunities are available.</p> <p>d. See response to (a) above.</p> <p>e. The Sites Inventory and programs provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels--see response to (a) above. The City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis.</p> <p>f. The updated Housing Element includes an evaluation of previously entitled and constructed housing developments (residential and mixed use) including many from the 5th Cycle, as one of the methods used to inform the Sites Inventory.</p> <p>g. To facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, the Housing Element already includes a program to develop a monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction goal. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU goal, the City will review and revise polices and efforts to increase ADU construction as necessary.</p> <p>h. The Housing Element already has a program to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>incentivize ADUs. While it does not specifically address those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers, it is something the City can consider when preparing the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Housing Element already includes several programs to allow construction of housing and mixed-use development on property that not currently designated for residential uses. Several include rezoning non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, as well as adding a Housing/Mixed Use Overlay to properties along and near other key commercial corridors. j. The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City will look at various options in its evaluation, including methods to promote flexibility. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element k. The Housing Element already includes several programs that will allow housing and mixed-use development to be allowed ministerially. The potential to waive fees is also one of the strategies the Housing Element includes. l. The Housing Element already includes a program to evaluate and consider reducing certain development standards that may be constraints to residential and mixed-use development, including parking. Other standards that have been expressed by developers as constraints to development also will be considered, including open space requirements, height, FAR, and setbacks, especially identified as a constraints in the
--	--	---

		<p>HBCSP.</p> <p>m. Capping fees on all new housing is not currently a program in the Housing Element.</p> <p>n. The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Appendix G (Response to Public Comments) pg. 26 Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. The Housing Element currently does not propose programs proposed by the commentator (transfer tax, vacancy tax, commercial linkage fee), although it's possible such programs could be considered during the City's continued analysis of opportunities for funding for housing.</p>
--	--	---

<p>3.4.22 Letter from Californians for Homeownership, Matthew Gelfand</p>	<p>Commenter states that City has not adopted a sixth cycle housing element, missing two compliance dates of October 15, 2021, and February 12, 2022, and they are currently preparing for litigation against cities like Torrance that have not timely adopted housing elements.</p> <p>Commenter states that they could immediately sue the City and the City could face severe penalties. The letter continues with a list of potential penalties.</p> <p>Commenter enclosed an Acknowledgement of the above-referenced statements, and states that if the City signs and returns the Acknowledgement by March 11, 2022, commenter will not initiate litigation at this time. Commenter states that if no Acknowledgement is received, they may initiate litigation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	---	---------------

<p>3.31.22 Email exchange between Greg Sullivan, CBRE and City staff</p>	<p>Commenter offers to help advise the City regarding “market conditions” in the tailoring of any Zoning Ordinance updates where housing and/or mixed use is concerned.</p> <p>States it is important to create the right balance and flexibility to create win/win developments for the community and to help meet the RHNA goals.</p> <p>States that generally, older ULI concepts of vertically/horizontally integrated missed use have evolved with the onslaught of internet retail, and the necessity for this change can be witnessed by the high vacancy rate of commercial in non-core/downtown areas and mixed-use communities.</p> <p>Suggests a re-visit of commercial standards along the Hawthorn Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP), and states that CBRE believes that 25% gross floor area requirement has prohibited significant residential development on the corridor. Not only has the market shifted from needing this much commercial, but the parking requirements directly affect capabilities to develop meaningful residential. This is especially true in those Districts that allow lesser maximum densities of 27 units/acre.</p> <p>Commenter followed up with another question looking for more details on the 25% gross floor commercial requirements and if visitor parking and community amenities would be allowed within the 100’ setback from Hawthorne for the benefit of the residential component. A subsequent question was if any changes are being proposed to the HBCSP?</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <p>The Housing Element includes a program to review and update the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan to consider reducing the following constraints, at a minimum, based on specific input and feedback from developers who have and propose to construct mixed-use and residential developments in the HBCSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce setback requirements for the residential portions of Mixed-Use developments in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts. • Reduce the minimum percent of commercial uses required for Mixed-Use projects. • Review the maximum FARs for all sub-districts and increase them if necessary to ensure that projects can develop to the allowable densities. • Add objective design standards—tailor them to each district and sub-district as appropriate. • Consider other standards that may be identified during the review process as constraints to development.
--	--	---

<p>4.23.2022</p> <p>Email received from Mark Hansen, resident</p>	<p>The commenter reviewed demographic statistics from the housing element and noted that past population projections were not realized in Torrance.</p> <p>Commenter noted that if the RHNA of 4,939 units is realized, that the population of Torrance will increase by 12,841 residents.</p> <p>Commenter questioned whether the Urban Water Management Plan can accommodate the resulting increase in water demand, if the City’s wastewater infrastructure can accommodate the increased population, and whether the increased demand for electricity can be accommodated without a deterioration in quality of life.</p>	<p>The City Public Works Department provided the following response:</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) utility serves approximately 78% of Torrance, with the remaining portions of the City in West Torrance and the Hollywood Rivera area served by the California Water Service Company. The City of Torrance is a direct member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who wholesales imported potable supplies (drinking water) to its member agencies in Southern California, including Torrance. Currently MWD supplies, approximately 75% of TMW’s potable water demands. However, the City has embarked on local water source diversification program that will increase local supplies to approximately 70% and reduce imported water to 30% or less within the next five years. This will help “drought proof” the community. The City’s North Torrance Wellfield Project (NTWP) project will be operational this summer and will triple our local potable groundwater production and increase of local supplies to 45% more of our potable water requirements.</p> <p>Specifics of Water Inquiry:</p> <p>Based on State guidelines, the Draft Housing Element forecasts that 4,939 new dwelling units will need to be constructed in the City. Assuming 2.6 people per household, this would result in an additional population of 12,841 once all units are built. In 2009, a bill SBx7-7 was passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20% by 2020 (referred to as the 20 by 20 plan). TMW’s 2020 target was set at 142 gallons per day per capita (GPCD), and we actually reduced this demand by 15% below the target to 121 GPCD, as documented in Torrance’s 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Thus, the projected additional housing units would increase water use in the TMW service area over time between 1.554 million gallons per day (mgd) using the actual 121 GPCD number or at 1.838 mgd using the higher 142 GPCD</p>
---	---	---

		<p>target number.</p> <p>Our water demand is generally expressed in acre-feet rather than gallons (1 AF equals approximately 326,000 gallons). Thus, the projected increase in annual potable water use would total between 1,740 AF (at 121 GPCD) to 2,045 AF (at 142 GPCD). In either case, TMW has more than sufficient system capacity and water resources to meet the projected additional demands, without taking into account the demand damping effects of ongoing conservation efforts. Over the last 25 years, TMW's potable water demand has decreased by over 26% from approximately 26,050 AF to 19,200 AF, due to the concerted conservation efforts of our customers. The TWD infrastructure system was sized to meet higher demands of past years, and currently has a total system delivery capacity of more than two and one-half times of our current average demand.</p> <p>Sewer System: The City of Torrance operates and maintains a sewer collection system that conveys sewage from homes and businesses in the City to the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles Joint Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, who provides all treatment. Similar to the water system infrastructure situation, the municipal sewer collection system was sized to meet the higher demands experienced in the 1990s. Reduction in water use has resulted in a corresponding decrease in sewage flows. In 2019, a comprehensive Sewer Master Plan was completed and no major capacity deficiency issues were identified. Based on these findings, the City's sewer system has sufficient infrastructure and pipeline capacity to meet the additional sewage flows for the proposed additional housing units in the Draft Housing Element.</p>
--	--	---

<p>5.18.22</p> <p>Email received from Dennis Piotrowski</p>	<p>The commentor stated he was pleased to see that the Housing Element included a goal to preserve the city's single-family neighborhoods and to retain the character of Torrance as desired by residents. Also concerned about negative impacts from state housing legislation that would negatively impact neighborhoods and homes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	---	---------------


<p>4.28.22</p> <p>Andrew K. Fogg</p>	<p>Commentor writing on behalf of a client stating that the property owner does not want his property included in the Sites Inventory and has no intent of developing it with residential or mixed use development.</p>	<p>City removed property from Sites Inventory.</p>
--------------------------------------	---	--

5.17.22	Commentor is a reporter surveying cities about their Housing Element practices.	Noted.
Manuela Tobia (CAL MATTERS)		

<p>5.18.22</p> <p>Mark Hansen</p>	<p>Commentor followed up regarding questions from an earlier email submitted. Concerned about the state mandating housing based on estimated growth that did not occur. Also concerned about changing the original feel of Torrance by overbuilding.</p>	<p>Previous email was responded to in 2nd submittal—staff directed commentor to where he could view the response.</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--

<p>6.8.22</p> <p>Doug Maupin</p>	<p>Commentor is a developer who has developed over 800 residential units in Torrance. Provided comments on constraints to development, including FAR, parking ratios and guest parking, and open space and how its calculated. Encouraged the City to increase FAR, reduce parking, reduce open space requirements, and increase height limits. Also encouraged City to allow the Senior Development Standards to be used for non-senior housing.</p>	<p>Noted. The Housing Plan includes programs to increase FAR, reduce parking, reduce open space requirements, and increase allowable building height. Revisions to development standards have not occurred yet, and the commentors can participate in the update process to express their support for higher FARs and densities</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

6.14.22	Commentors appreciate the proposed increase in FAR and hope that ultimate updated Zoning Code will increase the FAR to a greater FAR to allow them to construct the same density as they have constructed on other property in another city.	Revisions to development standards have not occurred yet, and the commentors can participate in the update process to express their support for higher FARs and densities.
---------	--	--



HOUSING ELEMENT (2021-2029)

NOTE: Changes for adoption, which were made after April 11, 2022, are shown in track changes with green highlighting (e.g., **additions** and **deletions**)

NOTE: Changes made after after adoption on June 14, 2022, 2022, are shown in track changes with blue highlighting (e.g., **additions** and **deletions**)

ADOPTED

June 14, 2022

Revised August 15, 2022

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-55

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA APPROVING UPDATES TO THE GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT FOR THE 2021 TO 2029 PLANNING PERIOD AND ADOPTION OF THE INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE

WHEREAS, each planning agency shall prepare and legislative body of each city shall adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan for the physical development of the city (Government Code Section 65300); and

WHEREAS, the General Plan shall consist of a statement of policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards and plan proposals. The plan shall include the following elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety (Government Code Section 65302); and

WHEREAS, the State law requires jurisdictions to periodically update their Housing Elements to be in compliance with changes in Housing Element Law, reflect population trends, and demonstrate that the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) allocated by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) can be satisfied; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a draft Housing Element for the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued a letter to the City dated December 14, 2021, with results of their compliance review of the draft Housing Element and provided further revisions to comply with Housing Element Law; and

WHEREAS, the City has incorporated those revisions into the Housing Element update to ensure that the Housing Element substantially complies with Housing Element Law; and

WHEREAS, the City published a joint "Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to Adopt an Initial Study and Negative Declaration" on October 30, 2021 announcing the start of a 30-day public review and comment period on the Initial Study and Negative Declaration from November 1, 2021 through November 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, following the Initial Study and Negative Declaration public review period, a Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration was prepared to address comments received by the City from HCD on the 6th Cycle HEU; and

WHEREAS, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5(c), the updates to the Initial Study and Negative Declaration do not require recirculation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council duly authorizes the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from HCD to support state certification of the 2021-2029 Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2022, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider adoption of the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element Update and the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2022, the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council adoption of the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element and of the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on June 14, 2022, the City Council considered and approved updates to the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021 to 2029 planning period and the Initial Study and Negative Declaration; and

Furthermore, the City Council determines that:

- The 2021-2029 Housing Element facilitates land use planning and policies to accommodate City's RHNA, and comply with State Housing Element Law, which mandates that local governments plan for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community and individuals with special needs.
- The RHNA is essentially non-discretionary for the local jurisdiction. The RHNA is an eight-year planning goal, not a housing production requirement.
- The Housing Element does not grant any development entitlements or authorize construction development.
- No physical development, construction or other ground disturbance is proposed at this time. Therefore, no direct physical impacts to the environment would occur from HEU adoption.

///


///

///

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the updates to the 2021-2029 General Plan Housing Element are hereby APPROVED,


INTRODUCED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 14th day of June, 2022.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
PATRICK Q. SULLIVAN, City Attorney


Tatia Y. Strader, Assistant City Attorney


Mayor Patrick J. Furey

ATTEST:


Rebecca Poirier, MMC, City Clerk


TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2022-55

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss
CITY OF TORRANCE)

I, Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk of the City of Torrance, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, approved, and adopted by the City Council of the City of Torrance at an adjourned regular meeting of said Council held on the 14th day of June, 2022 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS Ashcraft, Chen, Griffiths, Kalani, Walsler, and Mayor Furey.
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS Mattucci.
ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS None.
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS None.

Date: 6/21/2022



Rebecca Poirier, MMC
City Clerk of the City of Torrance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Statutory Framework	1
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Organization	2
1.4 Relationship to Other General Plan Elements	3
1.5 Data Sources	3
1.6 Public Participation	4
1.6.1 Community Workshops	7
1.6.2 Focus Group Sessions	8
1.6.3 Housing Element Webpage	9
1.6.4 1 st Draft Housing Element Review	10
1.6.5 Summary of Public Comments and City Responses	10
1.6.6 2nd Public Review draft	13
1.6.7 Adoption Hearings	13
1.7 Acronyms used	14
1.8 Terms Used	14
2. Community Profile	15
2.1 Population Characteristics	15
2.1.1 Population Growth	16
2.1.2 Age Characteristics	17
2.1.3 Racial and Ethnic Composition	18
2.1.4 Economic characteristics	18
2.2 Household Characteristics	19
2.2.1 Household Type and Size	20
2.2.2 Household Income	20
2.2.3 Households By Income Group	22
2.3 Housing problems	22
2.3.1 Overcrowding	22
2.3.2 Cost Burden	23
2.4 Special Needs Groups	24
2.4.1 Seniors	25
2.4.2 Persons With Disabilities	26
2.4.3 Large Households	28
2.4.4 Single-Parent Households	29
2.4.5 Farmworkers	30

2.4.6	Housing Needs Of Extremely-Low Income (ELI) Households	31
2.4.7	Extremely Low-Income Households	33
2.4.8	Homeless	36
2.5	Housing Stock Characteristics	40
2.5.1	Housing Growth	40
2.5.2	Housing Type	41
2.5.3	Housing Availability And Tenure	41
2.5.4	Housing Age And Condition	42
2.5.5	Housing Cost And Affordability	48
2.6	Affordable Housing In Torrance	51
2.6.1	Public Housing	51
2.6.2	Inventory of At-Risk Housing Units	52
2.6.3	Preservation of At-Risk HOUSING Units	54
3.	Housing Constraints	57
3.1	Introduction	57
3.2	Governmental Constraints	57
3.2.1	Land Use Controls	57
3.2.2	Building Codes and Enforcement	81
3.2.3	On- and Off-Site Improvements	82
3.2.4	Fees and Exactions	83
3.2.5	Processing and Permit Procedures	86
3.2.6	Streamlining programs	88
3.2.7	Transparency in the Development Process	90
3.2.8	Coastal Zone Development	90
3.2.9	Housing for Persons with Disabilities	93
3.2.10	Reasonable Accommodation	93
3.2.11	Dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies in California	94
3.2.12	Other regulatory challenges that present barriers to development include the following:	95
3.2.13	Reductions to Constraints	95
3.3	Non-governmental Constraints	95
3.3.1	Construction Costs	96
3.3.2	Land Costs	96
3.3.3	Home Financing	97
3.4	Environmental Constraints	97
3.4.1	Endangered Species and Sensitive Habitat	98
3.4.2	Seismic Activity	98
3.4.3	Flooding	99
3.4.4	Energy Efficiency	100
3.4.5	Mineral Extraction	101
3.5	Infrastructure Constraints	101
4.	Housing Opportunities and Resources	103
4.1	Future Housing Needs	103
4.1.1	Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	103
4.1.2	Residential Sites Inventory	108

4.1.3 Infrastructure Availability _____ 144~~143~~

4.1.4 Adequacy of Sites Inventory to meet RHNA _____ 144~~143~~

4.2 Financial Resources _____ 146~~144~~

4.2.1 Housing Choice Voucher (SECTION 8) rental assistance program _____ 146~~145~~

4.2.2 Low & Moderate Housing set-aside funds _____ 146~~145~~

4.2.3 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds _____ 147~~145~~

4.2.4 Home Improvement Program _____ 147~~146~~

4.2.5 Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) Grants _____ 147~~146~~

4.2.6 SB2 Grants _____ 147~~146~~

4.2.7 South Bay Regional Housing Trust _____ 148~~146~~

4.3 Administrative Resources _____ 148~~147~~

4.3.1 City of Torrance Community Development Department _____ 148~~147~~

4.3.2 City of Torrance Community Services Department _____ 150~~149~~

4.3.3 City of Torrance Commissions _____ 151~~149~~

4.3.4 Non-Profit Housing Developers _____ 151~~150~~

4.4 Opportunities for resource Conservation _____ 151~~150~~

4.4.1 City Programs _____ 151~~150~~

4.4.2 Utility Provider Programs _____ 152~~151~~

4.4.3 Regional Programs _____ 153~~152~~

5. Housing Plan _____ 154~~153~~

5.1 Housing Goals And Policies _____ 154~~153~~

5.1.1 Housing Opportunities _____ 154~~153~~

5.1.2 Housing to Meet the Needs of All Income Levels _____ 155~~154~~

5.1.3 Removal of Governmental Constraints _____ 156~~155~~

5.1.4 Conserve, Preserve, and Improve the Housing Stock _____ 156~~155~~

5.1.5 Promote Equal Housing Opportunity _____ 157~~156~~

5.2 Housing Programs _____ 158~~157~~

5.3 Summary of Quantified Objectives _____ 188~~187~~

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: OUTREACH EFFORTS
- APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- APPENDIX C: SITES INVENTORY
- APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING
- APPENDIX E: SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS
- APPENDIX F: CORRESPONDENCE FROM PROVIDERS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING
- APPENDIX G: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

TABLES

TABLE H-1: REGIONAL POPULATION GROWTH	16
TABLE H-2: POPULATION AND HOUSING GROWTH 1940-2040	17
TABLE H-3: AGE DISTRIBUTION	17
TABLE H-4: RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS	18
TABLE H-5: EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS 2010 - 2018	19
TABLE H-6: MEAN SALARY BY OCCUPATION – LA, LONG BEACH, GLENDALE REGION (2021)	19
TABLE H-7: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	20
TABLE H-8: TORRANCE HOUSEHOLD INCOME	21
TABLE H-9: MEDIAN INCOME HOUSEHOLD COMPARISON	21
TABLE H-10: HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME GROUPS	22
TABLE H-11: OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS	23
TABLE H-12: COST BURDEN	23
TABLE H-13: SPENDING ON RENT BY INCOME (NUMBER OF RENTER HOUSEHOLDS)	24
TABLE H-14: COSTS FOR MORTGAGE HOLDERS BY INCOME	24
TABLE H-15: SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS	25
TABLE H-16: SENIOR POPULATION	25
TABLE H-17: SENIOR HOUSEHOLD TRENDS	26
TABLE H-18: SENIOR HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME AND TENURE	26
TABLE H-19: DISABILITY STATUS	27 26
TABLE H-20: PERSONS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY BY AGE AND ZIP CODE	28
TABLE H-21: HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE	29
TABLE H-22: HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN	30
TABLE H-23: PERMANENT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS FOR LA COUNTY	31 30
TABLE H-24: EXTREMELY-LOW INCOME HOUSING NEEDS	31
TABLE H-25: RESOURCES FOR SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS	32 31
TABLE H-26. EXTREMELY LOW INCOME HOUSING NEEDS	35
TABLE H-27: INVENTORY OF HOMELESS SERVICES AND FACILITIES	39
TABLE H-28: HOUSING GROWTH	40
TABLE H-29: HOUSING UNIT TYPES	41
TABLE H-30: TENURE COMPARISON	41
TABLE H-31: HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY TENURE (2010-2019)	42
TABLE H-32: SUBSTANDARD HOUSING	43
TABLE H-33: RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE COMPLAINTS	44
TABLE H-34: HOME PRICES	48
TABLE H-35: HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME GROUP	50
TABLE H-36: ASSISTED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS	52
TABLE H-38: LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ZONING DISTRICTS PERMITTING RESIDENTIAL USES	62
TABLE H-39: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ¹	66
TABLE H-40: MINIMUM UNIT SIZE	67
TABLE H-41: PARKING REQUIREMENTS	68
TABLE H-42: PERMITTED USES IN LAND USE CODE	72
TABLE H-43: DENSITY BONUS OPPORTUNITIES	80
TABLE H-44: PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION FEES	84
TABLE H-45: COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT APPLICATION FEES TO SURROUNDING CITIES	84
TABLE H-46: 2021 TORRANCE IMPACT FEES	85
TABLE H-47: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TIME FRAMES	88

TABLE H-48: DISPOSITION OF CONVENTIONAL HOME PURCHASE LOAN APPLICATIONS FOR THE LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH-GLENDALE MSA.....97

TABLE H-49: MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD OF EARTHQUAKE EVENTS BY SIZE AND FAULT IN THE NEXT 30 YEARS.....99

TABLE H-50: RHNA 2021-2029104

TABLE H-51: CREDITS TOWARD RHNA105

TABLE H-52: ADU PERMITS ISSUED FROM 2018-2020106

TABLE H-53: ESTIMATED NUMBER OF ADUS DURING 6TH CYCLE PLANNING PERIOD107

TABLE H-54: REMAINING RHNA OBLIGATION.....108

TABLE H-55: RECYCLING TRENDS—SUMMARY OF SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS IN TORRANCE111

TABLE H-56: RECYCLING TRENDS—SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS IN NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS.....116

TABLE H-57: ASSUMED TARGET DENSITIES FOR CAPACITY ESTIMATES119

TABLE H-58: ADEQUACY OF SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE 2021-2029 RHNA145~~144~~

TABLE H-59: ADEQUACY OF SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE 2021-2029 RHNA BY GENERAL DESCRIPTION145~~144~~

TABLE H-60: AFFH MEANINGFUL ACTIONS MATRIX181~~180~~

TABLE H-61: SUMMARY OF 2021-2029 QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES.....188~~187~~

FIGURES

FIGURE H-1: TORRANCE HOMELESS COUNT 2020.....37

FIGURE H-2: AGE OF TORRANCE HOUSING UNITS.....43

FIGURE H-3: RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY COMPLAINTS.....46

FIGURE H-4: COMMERCIAL PROPERTY COMPLAINTS47

FIGURE H-5: GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICY MAP60

FIGURE H-6: ZONING MAP65

FIGURE H-7: COASTAL ZONE MAP.....92

FIGURE H-8: MAP OF SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND CONSTRUCTED RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE PROJECTS114

FIGURE H-9: HOUSING CORRIDORS STUDY AREAS134

FIGURE H-10: DOWNTOWN TORRANCE STUDY AREA.....139~~138~~

1. INTRODUCTION

The Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

1.1 STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The Housing Element is an integral component of the City's General Plan. It addresses existing and future housing needs of all types for persons of all economic groups in Torrance. The Housing Element is a tool for use by citizens and public officials in understanding and meeting the housing needs in the city.

Recognizing the importance of providing adequate housing in all communities, the state of California (state) mandated a Housing Element within every General Plan since 1969. It is one of the seven required elements. Article 10.6, Section 65580 – 65589.8, Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code sets forth the legal requirements of the Housing Element and encourages the provision of affordable and decent housing in communities to meet statewide goals. Specifically, Section 65580 states the element shall consist of "...an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing." The contents of the element must be consistent with the other elements of the General Plan [Government Code § 65300.5].

Meeting the housing needs established by the state is an important goal for the City of Torrance (the City or City, as the local government). As the population of the state continues to grow and scarce resources decline, it becomes more difficult for local agencies to create adequate housing opportunities while maintaining a high standard of living for all citizens in the community. State law recognizes that housing needs may exceed available resources and, therefore, does not require that the City's quantified objectives be identical to the identified housing needs. This recognition of limitations is critical, especially during this period of financial uncertainties as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic in both the public and private sectors.

Section 65583(b)(2) states, "It is recognized that the total housing needs...may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need within the content of the general plan requirements... Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the total housing needs. The quantified objectives shall establish the maximum number of housing units by income category, including extremely low income, that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved..."

This 2021-2029 City of Torrance Housing Element is prepared in compliance with state law and covers the period of October 15, 2021, through October 15, 2029.

1.2 PURPOSE

The state has declared that “the availability of housing is of vital statewide importance and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order.” In addition, the government and the private sector should make an effort to provide a diversity of housing opportunities and accommodate regional housing needs through a cooperative effort, while maintaining a responsibility toward economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals within the General Plan. Further, state Housing Element law requires “An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs.” The law requires:

- An analysis of population and employment trends;
- An analysis of household characteristics;
- An inventory of suitable land for residential development;
- An identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are permitted by right;
- An analysis of the governmental and non-governmental constraints on the improvement, maintenance and development of housing;
- An analysis of special housing needs;
- An analysis of opportunities for energy conservation;
- An analysis of publicly assisted housing developments that may convert to non-assisted housing developments; and
- An assessment of fair housing practices in order to develop policies and programs designed to affirmatively further fair housing.

The purpose of these requirements is to develop an understanding of the existing and projected housing needs within the community and to set forth policies and schedules, which promote preservation, improvement and development of diverse types and costs of housing throughout Torrance.

1.3 ORGANIZATION

This Housing Element is organized into five primary sections:

- **Introduction:** Provides an overview of the purpose, scope, and organization of the Housing Element.
- **Community Profile:** Provides a summary of the City’s demographic and housing characteristics, and associated housing needs.
- **Housing Constraints:** Provides as assessment of the various constraints to housing development and preservation.
- **Housing Opportunities and Resources:** Provides an inventory of resources available for meeting the City’s existing and projected housing needs.
- **Housing Plan:** Outlines the City’s commitments to providing and preserving housing opportunities in the community.

Additional ~~data and~~ [data and](#) background information are provided in appendices.

1.4 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS

The Torrance General Plan was adopted on April 6, 2010, and consists of the following elements: Land Use, Housing, Circulation and Infrastructure, Community Resources, Safety, and Noise, as well as an Implementation Program. All elements carry equal weight and are designed to be consistent with each other.

State law requires that “... the General Plan and elements and parts thereof comprise an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies...” The purpose of requiring internal consistency is to avoid policy conflict and provide a clear policy guide for the future maintenance, improvement, and development of housing within the City. The Housing Element is being updated at this time in conformance with the 2021-2029 update cycle (6th Cycle) for jurisdictions in the SCAG region. This Housing Element builds upon the other Elements and is consistent with the General Plan’s policies and proposals. The Housing Element draws upon the development capacity levels given in the Land Use Element to determine the appropriate location for affordable housing development. Several programs identified in Chapter 5 (Housing Plan) identify revisions to the Land Use Element to implement the Housing Element to maintain consistency. When any element of the General Plan is amended in the future, the City will review the Housing Element and, if necessary, amend it to ensure continued consistency among elements.

1.5 DATA SOURCES

Publicly Available Data. Data from a variety of resources, including federal, state, and regional data inform the crafting of the Housing Element. One of the most cited sources is the Pre-Certified Local Housing Data for Torrance, developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and pre-certified for use by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for use in 6th cycle housing elements. The source for much of the Pre-Certified Local Housing Data was the 2010 Census and the American Community Survey estimates from 2014-2018 and 2014-2019 (U.S. Census Bureau). California Department of Finance 2020 Population and Housing Estimates supplement the Census data. The source of the current number of mobile homes in the City was updated using information available on HCD’s website. Additional information has been drawn from the 2012-2016 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data. CHAS data are based on special tabulations for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) from sample Census data. Please note that due to the use of different data sources, slight variations in reporting can be expected.

Coordination with Subject Matter Experts. The City coordinated with the California Housing Partnership Corporation to update their inventory of subsidized or assisted affordable units in Torrance and associated risk levels. City staff coordinated with the operators of two affordable housing projects in the City to gain input necessary to complete the Housing Element.

Local Knowledge. The Housing Element also incorporates local data and knowledge where appropriate to capture emerging trends and issues, including utilizing knowledge from City staff, local and regional advocates, the local development community, service providers, and public comments. Throughout this Housing Element, local knowledge is incorporated to complement the federal, state and regional data. As an example, Chapter 3 contains an analysis of constraints to development and input from local developers is included to highlight how local regulations can constrain or enhance

development. Section 2.6.2 identifies whether there is subsidized housing at-risk of converting to market rate housing in the next ten years. Although the data suggested two projects were at-risk of converting, City staff thought differently, so they contacted the operators and received assurances that both intend to continue as is for at least the next ten years. The City's Social Services Commission and City Manager's office provided detailed information on how the City is addressing homelessness, including a project to construct a tiny home village on City property near City Hall specifically for those experiencing homelessness. Local knowledge from City staff and local developers and real estate professionals also provided key information regarding the sites inventory.

1.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation played an important role in the development of the Housing Element. Section 65583(c)(6)(B) of the Government Code states: "The local government shall make diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort." This process not only includes residents of the community, but also coordinates participation among local agencies and housing groups, community organizations, housing sponsors, and organizations serving low-income and special needs groups. All segments of the Torrance community were encouraged by the City to participate in the preparation of the Housing Element.

Torrance Strategic Plan. In Spring of 2021, the City completed a two-year process of updating the **Torrance City's** Strategic Plan. The process included considerable public outreach, including two statistically valid surveys (one for residents and one for the business community) ~~and 29 focus groups totaling over 435 participants. Data that was prepared to inform the update included a Community Profile and Environmental Scan.~~ For the Residents Survey, 1,336 Torrance residents over the age of 18 were surveyed. The survey was conducted online and by telephone. To ensure the representation of all adult residents, a random sample of those without publicly available email addresses or telephone numbers received a postcard in the mail with an invitation to take the survey online. Results were weighted slightly using figures from the U.S. Census to ensure the sample proportions reflect demographic and geographic proportions within the actual population as a whole. Several of the questions were open-ended. When asked what is the biggest issue of concern facing the residents, 11 percent stated housing costs/affordable housing, and three percent responded "homelessness." The survey tested eight issues facing the City, and 75 percent cited the number of homeless residents as extremely important/very important, and 59 percent cited affordable housing as extremely important/very important. Residents want to see Torrance as a City that provides a wide-range of affordable housing options, with 73 percent ranking this as very/somewhat important.

The Business Survey consisted of interviews among 300 Torrance business owners, executives, and middle managers. The survey results showed that businesses support policies that could make the City more business-friendly, e.g., 69 percent in favor of increasing the amount of affordable housing in the City.

The City also conducted 29 Focus Groups totaling over 435 participants. The focus group sessions were held with such diverse groups as the City's Homeowner Associations, Commission on Aging, Cultural Arts Commission, Downtown Association, Faith-based group, residents of senior housing, service organizations, School District, Youth Council, Women's Club, and many more. Lack of affordable housing/high cost of housing and homelessness were some of the major topics listed by participants

when asked what they like least about Torrance. When asked what the City can do to plan for the future, addressing affordable housing and homelessness were two high-ranking topics raised by respondents.

Further, a *Community Profile and Environmental Scan* was prepared to inform the Strategic Plan update, and included a section that discussed housing costs and the resulting impact on the labor force and affordable housing. The study connects housing's impact on business and economic growth, and acknowledges that a major reason businesses are finding it difficult to attract and retain employees is the cost of housing within an acceptable commute distance.

The data, through surveys, focus groups and the *Community Profile and Environmental Scan*, all pointed to community concerns with increasing homelessness, the high price of housing in the area and the need for a broader range of housing prices and products to allow younger generations as well as service workers the ability to purchase or rent near to employment. The data is available on the City's website: <https://www.torranceca.gov/government/city-manager/strategic-plan>.

The update was guided by a Strategic Plan Committee, comprised of residents and business owners with a sincere interest and investment in the future of Torrance. The Strategic Plan Committee reviewed all the input and data and were responsible for updating strategic priorities and goals and sub-goals to reflect the data and community input. The Committee decided that housing was such an important issue for Torrance that they created a new Strategic Priority with associated goals and sub-goals to address housing. The updated Strategic Plan was accepted by the City Council in May of 2021, ~~and~~. As a community-driven plan, the ~~direction~~ input provided by the community and the housing-related goals and sub-goals in the Strategic Plan were considered as part of the development of this Housing Element and provided important direction in its update.

Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan. Beginning in the early part of 2020, the City commenced on a revitalization study for Downtown Torrance. An important component to the effort was examining market feasibility for uses and new development to help define and target development and businesses that could be compatible and practical for the area, including housing opportunities. Considerable efforts were made to include the public.

Between August 27, 2020, and September 10, 2020, a total of seven focus group meetings were held with property owners, business owners, Old Torrance Neighborhood Association members, and Downtown Torrance Business Association members. Housing-related feedback included an interest in additional opportunities for mixed-use housing development in and near Downtown to increase the number of customers and activate the space. Large business owners in the commercial district shared that most of their employees commute to Torrance and patronize downtown businesses at lunchtime. More rental housing opportunities would offer their employees an opportunity to live near work and support the downtown. Most stakeholders were open to high-density, mixed-use housing development in Downtown.

A second set of stakeholder meetings were conducted on December 1, 2020, and December 3, 2020. The meetings were held virtually between the consultant team and property owners, business owners and residents in the area. On December 15, 2020, a workshop was held with the Torrance City Council to review the progress of the plan.

A two-week online community survey was launched in April 2021 to solicit input and feedback on draft goals and priorities for the Downtown Plan study area. The survey was publicized and shared with the community through two pop-up demonstrations at the Torrance Antique Fair and El Prado and Sartori Avenue, and the Torrance Farmers Market at Wilson Park. The demonstration included project information boards that displayed goals, priorities and ideas for downtown, and provided the link to the online survey where community members could provide their feedback. In addition, project flyers publicizing the survey were distributed to businesses to display in storefronts, and the survey link was shared through the City's social media channels and through an email blast. Overall, the responses were supportive of all the goals for the Study Area, and respondents selected specific measures under each goal that were a high priority to them. Many respondents also provided written comments on the suggested goals and priorities, that highlighted the types of improvements and ideas for the Study Area, in particular Downtown Torrance, that were most desired by the community. The key takeaway for housing was that in general, there was support for new mixed-use development in Downtown and the sub-areas, but the respondents supported the combination of housing and retail rather than housing on its own. The study was presented to the City Council on July 13, 2021.

Torrance Housing Corridor Study. At the same time the 6th Cycle Housing Element was being prepared, the City was working on a Housing Corridor Study. The purpose of the Housing Corridor Study is to promote housing development by creating housing corridors. This can be accomplished by rezoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right, which supports the Housing Element by providing additional sites that contribute to the City's RHNA (see Chapter 4, Housing Resources). ~~Although the two plans were on different schedules, with the Housing Element required to be adopted by February 12, 2022, the City acknowledged the important nexus between the two efforts and included the Housing Corridor Study consultants in the community outreach efforts described below, so that the community input would inform both efforts.~~

To better understand the issues or concerns associated with the Housing Corridor Study, the City gathered community feedback through several engagement events, as follows:

- Two stakeholder meetings on May 19th, 2021. Both meetings were an hour long and conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. The City specifically reached out to local developers of market-rate and affordable housing, as well as local housing services providers.
- Two stakeholder meetings on June 29th, 2021. Both meetings were an hour long and conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. A range of participants familiar with the City of Torrance, the development process, and the properties within the study areas attended the meetings, including property owners, residents, and members of the local real estate community.
- Two Housing Element public workshops on April 28th, 2021, and July 28th, 2021. Both workshops were conducted virtually through Zoom conferencing software. City staff presented on the goals and process for the Housing Element effort, provided a brief background on the Housing Corridors Study, and answered questions from Planning Commissioners and attending members of the public. The workshops included poll questions to help identify the needs and desires of the community, as well as gathering feedback on specific strategies to comply with State law.

The community shared important considerations and contextual takeaways with City staff for each study area for the Housing Corridor Study as well as for the general citywide effort to enable housing production. Appendix A contains the full summary of themes and issues as expressed by the stakeholders, and the major concerns are discussed below:

1. **Compatibility of Uses.** Stakeholders repeatedly shared that the interface between industrial and commercial properties with residential properties was something for the City to look out for. They varied on how compatibility issues such as noise, odor, and visual impacts could be addressed; or whether they could be addressed at all. Several participants emphasized that industrial uses should be allowed to continue no matter the results of the Study, and not be labeled “nonconforming”.
2. **Housing Product Types.** Stakeholders expressed their opinions about the possible range of product types and densities new housing in the study areas. There was some concern about higher density multi-family housing, especially in regard to their possible parking and privacy impacts.
3. **Parking.** Stakeholders expressed that new residential development had to establish enough parking to be successful. The Border Avenue study area, due to its proximity to Downtown, was identified as needing particular consideration for parking solutions.
4. **School Impacts.** Stakeholders were concerned about the possible impacts of new residential development on Torrance’s school system. One participant stressed the need to coordinate with school districts to ensure that additional housing does not adversely affect capacity or quality of public schools.
5. **Other Issues.** Stakeholders brought up specific concerns about each study area, such as lot size and zoning inconsistencies. Additionally, stakeholders expressed that property owners should not be required to go along with residential development if they don’t want to and brought up the issue of eminent domain.

1.6.1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

The City held three Community Workshops during the preparation phase of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. ~~Each workshop was~~ Community Workshops 1 and 2 were held in a virtual format due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Community Workshop 3 was held in-person in the City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall. The City provided noticing for the workshops in a number of ways. They published display ads in the Daily Breeze newspaper and on Facebook, Twitter, Digital Sign, and on COVID-19 Today. Notices were posted on the City’s Housing Element Website, and the City Council announced the upcoming workshops/meetings at City Council meetings during orals. The City also distributed workshop flyers using mailing lists of interested residents, stakeholders, developers, community groups, faith-based organizations, housing groups and sponsors, HOA’s, social service agencies, and others, including those who specifically requested to be notified of housing-related meetings. For those who preferred to submit written comment, an email address was provided for that purpose. A copy of the mailing list of the organizations receiving notice of the workshops appear in Appendix A. Workshop summaries are also found in Appendix A.

Community Workshop 1 was held April 28, 2021, at 7 pm, hosted by the City Planning Commission at a special meeting devoted exclusively to the Housing Element. Fifteen members of the public participated via Zoom. City staff and consultants first provided an overview of the Housing Element

update process using a PowerPoint presentation. The Planning Commissioners posed a number of questions to staff and the consultants regarding the timelines involved with the Housing Element, clarification of terms, and a substantial number of questions about the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the potential to impact the City. Public comment is summarized below in Section 1.5.6.

Community Workshop 2 was held July 28, 2021, at 6 pm. Due to technical difficulties, the meeting started at 6:30 pm. Fourteen members of the public participated via Zoom, and eight email comments were received. City staff and consultants first provided a PowerPoint presentation explaining the City's proposed strategy to accommodate the RHNA, and then solicited questions and input from the public. Because of the technical difficulties, the survey questions that were to be part of the presentation did not display and would instead be put online and made available in the coming weeks. See Appendix A for further detail on the survey and responses.

Community Workshop 3 was held at 7 PM October 20, 2021, as part of a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. The Draft Housing Element was previously made available for public review on October 1, 2021, and Community Workshop 3 provided an opportunity for the public and the Planning Commission to have a forum for asking questions and providing further input after having the opportunity to read the draft document. The project team presented a summary of the Draft Housing Element and fielded questions from the Planning Commission and the public. Planning Commission and public comment is summarized below in Section 1.5.6, and Appendix A contains the minutes from Community Workshop 3.

1.6.2 FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

Two Focus Group sessions were held on May 19, 2021, to gather input from housing developers, both those who build market rate housing and those involved with building affordable housing. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, these sessions were held in a virtual format. The sessions are summarized below, and the full meeting summaries are found in Appendix A.

Focus Group Session 1 - Service Providers and Affordable Developers: City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers to better understand the issues and needs of lower income residents and those with special needs, and to identify constraints to development of affordable housing so that programs can be developed to address those needs and constraints. Five service providers, two affordable housing developers, an architect, and a real estate representative participated. Input was received covering a number of important topics. Examples of successful partnerships with religious institutions were provided; and concern with Torrance's rising homeless count, including school district reports of homeless families, were discussed. Much of the input centered on the City's development standards and how changes to certain aspects of the development approval process could improve the feasibility of affordable housing, such as streamlining the entitlement process, relaxing parking standards, and increasing density. The group then discussed how assistance with financing, incentives and concessions are critical for the development of affordable units. Miscellaneous feedback included observations about political will in Torrance, the need for stigma associated with affordable housing to be removed, and the example of an attractive project in nearby Rancho Palos Verdes that is a 100% affordable low-income senior project.

Focus Group Session 2 – Market Rate Developers: City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with market rate developers to understand their issues and concerns regarding development of housing in Torrance, and to identify constraints to development as is required by Housing Element law so that programs can be developed to address those constraints. Four developers attended in person, and one submitted written comments. Valuable input was received concerning the City’s development standards and entitlement process. Participants stated that higher densities are needed as well as relaxed parking standards; open space requirements are high; and the low maximum FAR standards stifle development. Financing, incentives, and concessions were discussed, and participants favored using the density bonus, streamlining the entitlement process, and mitigating challenges associated with acquiring funding to build affordable housing developments. Miscellaneous feedback included comments about property owners often not willing to sell for affordable housing because of neighborhood pushback; sellers having unrealistic expectations about land cost and development timing; and the need for the City to add a substantial residential component around the Del Amo Mall to revive the area.

Focus Group Session 3 - Service Providers and Affordable Developers/Market Rate Developers: Following receipt of HCD’s comments on the first draft of the Housing Element, City staff and the consultant team conducted a third Focus Group session, inviting market rate housing developers, developers of affordable housing, and service providers. Held in a virtual format on February 16, 2022, this session was intended to solicit feedback for the City’s Draft Housing Element prior to completing responses to HCD’s comment letter and resubmitting a second draft for HCD review. Participants were asked to provide feedback regarding the proposed programs and actions, and to provide any other suggestions on programs and/or actions for the 2nd submittal of the Draft Housing Element that would enhance opportunities to provide housing for households across all income categories and those with special needs. Six participants, including two developers of both affordable and market rate housing, one developer of market rate housing, and one representative of a non-profit that provides housing for those with developmental disabilities were in attendance, and two participants remained anonymous. Participants provided a considerable amount of valuable input, including providing a list of what constrains the development of housing in Torrance, and explaining what development standards should be relaxed. The developers in the group explained how important certainty is for the development community, and how the City can help by publishing clear rules, e.g. e.g., for density bonus requirements. Some of the developers have experience with inclusionary housing and described their suggestions for how to make it work better. Suggestions were offered for additional sites for the Sites Inventory. A representative of HOPE housing expressed an interest in partnering with the City to help fill the large need for more housing for those with developmental disabilities, and offered suggestions as to how the City could assist.

1.6.3 HOUSING ELEMENT WEBPAGE

A Housing Element webpage was added to the City’s website at the commencement of the Housing Element planning process, to inform the public and to keep the public apprised of opportunities to be involved and provide input. The webpage provided background information that explained what a Housing Element is, why it must be updated, and what’s included. It also explained what the RHNA is and Torrance’s share of the RHNA. The webpage also explained how interested parties could be involved and provided both notice of upcoming workshops and links to the PPT presentations and workshop summaries.

Following Workshop 2, a survey was made available to the workshop attendees and any other interested parties. The survey was made available for a period of one week. Survey responses are summarized in Section 1.5.6 and presented in Appendix A.

1.6.4 1ST DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT REVIEW

The first Draft City of Torrance 6th Cycle Housing Element was made available for public review on October 1, 2021~~-,~~ and because the City was open to continuing to receive public comment on the Housing Element, the City kept the first review period open through the month of March 2022~~.-~~The second Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element was made available for public review on April 11, 2022. Public review closed on April 29, 2022. During the public review comment period for the second Draft, one item of correspondence was received by the City. A resident sent an email with questions about the potential impact of future residential development planned to meet the RHNA, and the impact on water, wastewater, and electricity in the City. Appendix A includes the text of the email and the response from the City's Public Works Department.

1.6.5 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND CITY RESPONSES

The following paragraphs summarize the public comment and city responses at each of the three Community Workshops. More detailed workshop summaries are found in Appendix A.

WORKSHOP 1: Comments from the public included a participant who favored affordable housing throughout Torrance and was in favor of rent control and the development of high-rise housing. This participant also felt that empty parking lots should be made available for persons who have to live in their cars. Another participant stressed the importance of the City making a diligent effort with outreach, spreading out the affordable housing opportunities throughout the City, and aiding underrepresented individuals in Torrance. This participant also stated that more could be done to ensure the City's outreach is inclusive. Another asked whether neighboring cities can share their RHNA, asked about future opportunities to stay involved in the process. The City responded that there is currently no provision in State law for that, although there was once such a provision and it expired. A participant asked about public review of the Housing Element, and the City responded that all materials would be placed on the City's website when available. The workshop closed with comments from Planning Commissioners. One asked whether the City's standard procedure for notification of opportunities for outreach meets state guidelines, and City staff responded that the City has gone above and beyond the necessary requirements for outreach, and have also reached out to affordable housing developers, social service agencies, HOA, and others. A Planning Commissioner pointed out that the RHNA would house less than 4% of the current population of Torrance, and the City will continue to look for ways to accommodate the RHNA and reduce any adverse effects on existing residents.

As part of the PowerPoint presentation, a live poll was conducted intermittently throughout the presentation. The full poll and results are found in Appendix A and summarized here.

A survey of participants included the following:

- 54% of the attendees reported being a resident of Torrance
- 46% of respondents reported being either a developer of market-rate housing, affordable

housing, or a representative of a service agency serving Torrance residents

- 50% of attendees have lived in Torrance more than 10 years
- 42% did not reside in Torrance

When asked which groups have the highest need for housing and related services in the community (respondents could select up to 3):

- 90% selected young adults
- 70% selected families with children
- Categories of Seniors and Homeless were each selected by 40% of respondents.

Attendees were also asked which housing type is most needed in Torrance and allowed up to 3 selections:

- 70% selected both the Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units, and Rental Housing
- Residential Mixed-use was chosen by 60%

When asked if streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities should be an important consideration:

- 50% replied yes
- 40% replied no or I do not know.

WORKSHOP 2: One participant was concerned about proposed housing legislation at the State level and the impact on quality of life in Torrance and stated the City should continue to oppose their RHNA. This participant was concerned about densification of the City without infrastructure improvements and opposed relaxing parking requirements. City staff responded that one of the goals of this effort is to preserve the City’s single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident’s desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance. That is why the focus is on corridors and underutilized parcels. Staff also explained that the City has also been actively following State housing legislation and responding when concerns arise about proposed legislation. This participant further asked about plans for two specific areas of the City. City staff responded that all plans are in draft form for now, and there will be additional opportunities to provide future input.

Another participant pointed out the housing problems in the City including the rapidly rising homeless crisis and cost burden for renters. This participant asked how the Housing Element would be implemented, and how equal distribution of the sites was being ensured. City staff responded that we are talking to property owners and developers, and looking at land value and vacancies, trying to be as accurate as possible. Further, while the corridors identified for the Corridor Study are in the more centralized part of the City, corridors are located in all Council districts in the City except for one. For the current draft Sites Inventory, the sites are pretty well distributed in all locations in the City.

A student participant referred to making Torrance more walkable, connected the housing crisis to the climate crisis, and encouraged more compact development. Questions were put forward about

potential zoning changes and noticing to affected property owners, and whether the City will use eminent domain or condemnation. City staff responded that the City is using a public process to study the issues and will continue to involve the property owners as the process moves forward. The City will initiate with the required zone changes if the Council decides to do so. The City would create the standards that would streamline development as a part of the rezoning process. There are no plans to use eminent domain or condemnation.

A final participant asked about how the legislation works that allows religious institutions to build housing on their sites. The presenter explained that the legislation is AB 1851. It requires a City to allow religious institutions to build affordable housing on their existing parking lot without requiring them to replace any lost parking, as an incentive. Some cities are placing a “Congregational Overlay” on these properties to encourage and incentivize this type of development. When asked if congregational housing units would pay property taxes, City staff stated they would research the answer to those questions and respond either online or at a future Housing Element workshop.

The online survey that followed Workshop 2 was taken by 59 participants, with 32% of the respondents indicating they had participated in the first Community Workshop in April. The results are summarized below.

When asked to select 2 preferred strategies for ways to accommodate the RHNA in Torrance:

- 68% preferred to change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to mixed-use
- 46% chose to change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to multifamily residential
- 42% selected to change zoning of certain industrial sites to multifamily residential
- 15% chose to actively encourage the production of ADUs

Respondents were given two choices to select their preferred method to increase density to accommodate the 6th cycle RHNA:

- 78% chose to increase the density or establish higher density for residential uses (stand-alone and or mixed-use if allowed) along key commercial corridors
- 22% chose to increase the residential densities throughout Torrance

WORKSHOP 3: The consultant team provided a brief background and overview of the Housing Element project. The topics covered included summaries of the first and second Housing Element workshops, draft Housing Element, explanation of the RHNA, goals and programs, public outreach and the next steps. The Planning Commission was informed the Draft Housing Element had been submitted to HCD on October 15, 2021, after a 14-day public review period.

The Planning Commissioners posed a number of questions. One wondered why the RHNA was so high, and staff explained the process of developing the RHNA in the SCAG region. Another asked about the consequences of not having a certified Housing Element, and the consultant explained some potential consequences that could be imposed such as a moratorium on issuing building permits for up to a year, and the State withholding grant funding. The proposed number of ADU’s used to meet the RHNA was discussed as a strategy for including affordable housing in more affluent neighborhoods, as well as complying with new state law that allows Religious Institutions to build affordable housing on their

sites. Another Commissioner had questions about planning for more than what is required, and staff explained that a buffer is needed in order to accommodate underdevelopment and to show the potential for compliance with the RHNA.

Staff explained the process moving forward, and told the Planning Commission that following HCD review, a letter outlining areas that would need to be revised would be sent from HCD to the City. A revised document would be prepared, and once the revisions are approved by HCD, the document is reviewed by the Commission and recommended for approval to the City Council, who does the final approval. The final document is then sent to HCD.

A member of the public shared concerns about direction to the City coming from an outside agency and about the lack of action on helping the homeless population. The speaker expressed appreciation for the City's efforts.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE – SEE APPENDIX A

1.6.6 2ND PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

The second public review draft of the Housing Element (dated May 9, 2022) was posted on the City's website on May 9, 2022. An email was sent to interested parties, including the website link. It also informed them of the May 18, 2022, Planning Commission hearing to consider the second public review draft (see Section 1.7). The information provided meets the 7-day timeframe specified in AB 215. The submittal date of the second public draft Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development was May 17, 2022. (Noticing is included in Appendix A)

1.6.7 ADOPTION HEARINGS

Planning Commission Consideration: The Planning Commission considered the draft Housing Element (the second public review draft dated May 9, 2022) on May 18, 2022. Notices of the Planning Commission public hearing were mailed to properties identified on the sites inventory and to organizations and individuals who requested such notice, or who have directly submitted correspondence to the City. A notice of public hearing was posted on the Public Notice Board at the City of Torrance, and legal advertisement was published in the local newspaper. Notices were also emailed to interested parties who have submitted an email address during the study. The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element. At the Planning Commission meeting of May 18, 2022, staff and the consultant team presented a summary of the Housing Element Update process, the contents of the document, and a summary of the revisions based on the comments from HCD. The Commission inquired about the hearing process, the notification efforts of the city, the relationship of the Housing Corridor Study to the Housing Element update as well as a clarification of the zoning updates that will be required subsequent to the update of the Housing Element. The hearing was opened for public comment, however no member of the public opted to speak. The City received four comment letters from members of the public, which are provided in Appendix A. A motion to adopt a resolution recommending that the City Council approve the Housing Element Update and Negative Declaration was approved by a vote of 5 to 2. The Community Development Director and the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council

Adopt a Resolution to approve the Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21- 00003).

City Council Adoption: The City Council considered and adopted the draft Housing Element (the second public review draft dated May 9, 2022) on June 3, 2022. Notices of a public hearing scheduled for the City Council meeting of June 14, 2022, were mailed to properties identified on the sites inventory and to organizations and individuals who requested such notice, or who have directly submitted correspondence to the City. A notice of public hearing was posted on the Public Notice Board at the City of Torrance, and legal advertisement was published in the local newspaper. Notices were also emailed to interested parties who have submitted an email address during the study. The City Council Resolution for adoption of the Housing Element duly authorizes the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from HCD to support state certification of the 2021-2029 Housing Element. The City received 3 letters regarding adoption of the Housing Element (see Appendix A). The City Council adopted the Resolution to approve the Housing Element by a vote of 6 to 1.

1.7 ACRONYMS USED

This element includes use of many acronyms to identify agencies, housing programs, funding sources, and planning terms. The most commonly used acronyms are:

ACS	American Community Survey
AMI	Area Median Income
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant
CHPC	California Housing Partnership Corporation
CHAS	Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy
DOF	State of California Department of Finance
HAMFI	HUD Area Median Family Income
HCD	State of California Department of Housing and Community Development
HUD	Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development
MFI	Median Family Income
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments

1.8 TERMS USED

By Right: For the purposes of this Housing Element, the term “by-right” means that the City review is ministerial and therefore must not require conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval.

2. COMMUNITY PROFILE

Introduction

Like many residents of communities throughout the South Bay and Southern California, Torrance residents face significant issues regarding housing availability and affordability. Key concerns are a high demand for housing and limited opportunities for new residential development. Being an older City in the midst of a well-established area, Torrance is virtually built out, with limited land available for future residential development. As a result, Torrance and many built-out communities in California have experienced a tight housing market for several years, with home prices skyrocketing and rents increasing dramatically. The City's reputation for quality schools and neighborhoods has contributed to the high demand and cost for housing in Torrance. Concerns about cost and availability are magnified for special needs groups such as seniors, large families, and disabled residents who face severe limitations in their ability to find decent housing due to physical or economic constraints.

The Community Profile presents information that forms the basis for the objectives, policies, and programs that seek to address housing needs. This section addresses population characteristics, employment patterns, and income levels. The information illustrates how Torrance has grown and changed and identifies patterns and trends that serve as the basis for defining the City's housing policies and programs. Projections are also provided to show how the community is expected to change over the next two decades. To provide a regional context, conditions in Torrance are compared with surrounding communities and Los Angeles County in general.

Data Sources

This section utilizes a variety of sources to compile the most updated data, to the extent feasible. Data sources include: Decennial Census; American Community Surveys (ACS); SCAG projections and forecasts; State Employment Development Department employment and wage data; State Department of Finance estimates; Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data on mortgage financing; and CoreLogic home sales data; among others. (Note: Because multiple sources were used to prepare the Community Profile, at times the data is not completely consistent.)

The ACS, the Census Bureau's annual sample survey, is designed to provide more detailed information about a community. Depending on the size of the community, ACS may collect annual estimates, three-year estimates, or five-year estimates. Given Torrance's population over 20,000, ACS surveys the city at least once every five years. The majority of variables used in this Housing Element are obtained from the 2014 – 2018 and 2014 – 2019 five-year estimates. Sources are denoted below each table.

2.1 POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Torrance's proximity to the coast, location near regional freeways, a desirable school system, and stable residential neighborhoods make the City an attractive destination for homebuyers and renters. As demand for housing grows in this built-out City, housing need must be met through Low/Moderate Housing Funds, infill development, and neighborhood revitalization. To clarify the type of housing that will be needed to meet future demand, Housing Element law requires an assessment of population and employment trends. Characteristics such as age, ethnicity, and employment influence the type

and cost of housing needed or in high demand in the City. Tracking demographic changes can also help the City better respond to or anticipate changing housing demand.

2.1.1 POPULATION GROWTH

Torrance was founded in 1912 and incorporated in 1921 with a population of 1,649. The City’s founders touted Torrance as “a balanced city,” with housing development occurring in tandem with industrial development so that employees could live close to work. Early residential development trends in Torrance generally followed the pattern of the greater Los Angeles regions, with the largest population surge occurring in the post-World War II years. Between 1950 and 1960, the population more than quadrupled and the housing stock grew by eightfold. During that time, housing production rates outpaced population growth because of a significant decrease in household size. In 2020, the California Department of Finance indicated that the City had reached a population of 145,546, with a higher percentage of women (51.2%) than men (48.8%). Between 2010 and 2020, Torrance’s population increased by just 108 persons, a .07 percent increase. This population change was the smallest of the surrounding communities although most of the surrounding communities show very modest growth rates over the past decade. The City of Los Angeles showed the highest growth rate at 5.7 percent, as shown on Table H-1.

Table H-1: Regional Population Growth

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	% Change 2000-2010	% Change 2010-2020
Torrance	137,946	145,438	145,546	5.4%	0.07%
Carson	89,730	91,714	93,108	2.2%	1.5%
Gardena	57,746	58,829	60,937	1.9%	3.6%
Hawthorne	84,112	84,293	86,903	0.2%	3.1%
Hermosa Beach	18,566	19,506	19,614	5.1%	0.6%
Los Angeles	3,694,820	3,792,621	4,010,684	2.6%	5.7%
Lomita	20,046	20,256	20,549	1.0%	1.4%
Manhattan Beach	33,852	35,135	35,250	3.8%	0.3%
Redondo Beach	63,261	66,748	66,994	5.5%	0.4%
Los Angeles County	9,519,338	9,848,605	10,014,009	3.5%	1.7%

Sources: U.S. Census 2000 and 2010. CA Department of Finance, 2020.

A look at historical growth rates demonstrates very slight growth over the past decade. Table H-2 shows the population increase for Torrance between 1980 and 2010 was 12 percent, while the population increase between 2010 and 2020 was just .07%. SCAG estimates that the population of Torrance will top 159,800 by the year 2040, however these estimates were based on a higher forecasted growth estimate for 2020 than what the actual count was from the 2020 Census, as reported below. No 2030 growth estimate is included in the most recent 2016 SCAG RTP forecast. Therefore, the 2040 estimate may be overstated. The COVID 19 pandemic may further affect SCAG’s growth forecast.

Table H-2: Population and Housing Growth 1940-2040

Year	Population		Housing Units	
	Number	% Growth from Previous Decade	Number	% Growth from Previous Decade
1940	9,950	--	2,313	--
1950	22,241	124%	3,457	49%
1960	100,991	354%	28,704	730%
1970	134,584	33%	45,293	58%
1980	129,881	-3%	50,982	13%
1990	133,107	2%	54,957	8%
2000	137,946	4%	55,967	2%
2010	145,138	5%	58,377	4%
2019	145,546	.07%	N/A	--
2040	159,800	N/A	N/A	--

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, 2010, and 2020; 2016 SCAG Adopted RTP Forecast

2.1.2 AGE CHARACTERISTICS

Population age distribution serves as an important indicator of housing needs, as housing needs and preferences change as an individuals or households grow older. Young families tend to focus more on cost and the ability to become first-time homebuyers. Cost and access to services are important to seniors because they may be on fixed incomes and have mobility limitations. Table H-3 shows the age distribution of Torrance residents. Currently, middle age (45-64 years) constitutes the largest age group, at 29 percent, followed by the young adults (25-44 years) group, at 26 percent. These numbers have stayed very consistent over the last decade. The share of the population of Torrance which is under 18 years of age is 20.9%, which is lower than the regional share of 23.4%. Torrance’s seniors (65 and above) make up 16.7% of the population, which is higher than the regional share of 13%. An aging population indicates that in the future, demand will be higher for smaller housing units and housing programs such as housing repair services for seniors.

Table H-3: Age Distribution

	2000		2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age group						
Preschool (0-4 years)	7,834	6%	7,520	5%	8,988	6.1%
School Age (5-17 years)	23,906	17%	24,311	17%	21,543	14.7%
College Age (18-24 years)	9,338	7%	10,875	7%	12,403	8.5%
Young Adult (25-44 years)	44,627	32%	38,296	26%	38,043	26%
Middle Age (45-64 years)	32,814	24%	42,710	29%	42,524	29%
Senior Adults (65+ years)	19,427	14%	21,726	15%	24,488	16.7%
Total	137,946	100%	145,438	100%	146,392	100%
Median Age	38.7		41.3		41.3	

Source: U.S. Census 2000, 2010 and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates

2.1.3 RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Table H-4 shows the racial/ethnic distribution of population in Torrance. The City has become more racially and ethnically diverse since 2000, a trend seen throughout California. In 2019, the most prevalent groups in the City were Whites at 38 percent, and Asian/Pacific Islanders at 37 percent. The third most prevalent group in the City is Hispanic at 18%.

Table H-4: Racial/Ethnic Groups

Racial/Ethnic Groups	2000		2010		2018	
	Torrance	LA County	Torrance	LA County	Torrance	LA County
White	52%	31%	42%	28%	38%	26%
Hispanic	13%	45%	16%	48%	18%	48%
Black	2%	9%	3%	8%	2%	8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	28%	12%	35%	14%	37%	15%
Other	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: ACS 2014 – 2018 5-year estimates

2.1.4 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Employment has an important impact on housing needs. Incomes associated with different jobs and the number of workers in a household determines the type and size of housing a household can afford. In some cases, the types of jobs themselves can affect housing needs and demand (such as in communities with colleges or military installations). Employment growth typically leads to strong housing demand, while the reverse is true when employment contracts.

Between 2010 and 2018, the three largest occupational categories for City residents were Education/Health/Social Services, Professional Services, and Manufacturing (Table H-5). These categories accounted for a large proportion of jobs (48%) held by Torrance residents.

Table H-6 displays mean annual wage data for occupations compiled by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) for the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Glendale Metropolitan Division in 2021. Building and maintenance, farming, fishing and forestry, and healthcare support occupations offer the lowest wages while management, legal, and computer and mathematical occupations offer the highest wages in the area. According to the ACS, between 2014 and 2018, approximately 15% of Torrance’s residents worked in the higher paying Professional Services occupations, and approximately 20% worked in the Education, Health and Social Service occupations which typically generate employment at the moderate income levels.

Close to 23% worked in the manufacturing and retail industries which generally provide jobs at the lower income scales as shown in Table H-6.

Table H-5: Employment characteristics 2010 - 2018

Industry	2006 – 2010 ACS City Employment	2014 – 2018 ACS City Employment
Agriculture, Mining	107	129
Construction	2,688	2,270
Manufacturing	11,566	9,638
Transportation and Warehousing	4,976	4,647
Wholesale Trade	3,661	2,722
Retail Trade	7,479	6,827
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	5,642	5,476
Professional Services	9,175	11,179
Education, Health and Social Services	13,926	14,359
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation	5,287	6,814
Other Services	3,249	3,520
Public Administration	2,470	2,314
Total	72,573	72,573

Sources: ACS 2006-2010, 2014-2018 5-year estimates

Table H-6: Mean Salary by Occupation – LA, Long Beach, Glendale Region (2021)

Occupations	Average Salary
Management	\$140,550
Legal	\$137,750
Computer and Mathematical	\$104,033
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	\$105,055
Architecture and Engineering	\$104,271
Business and Financial Operations	\$87,545
Education, Training, and Library	\$75,433
Construction and Extraction	\$64,680
Protective Service	\$67,082
Community and Social Service	\$64,145
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	\$60,025
Sales	\$51,016
Office and Administrative Support	\$48,540
Production	\$43,266
Transportation and Material Moving	\$45,165
Building, Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	\$40,499
Healthcare Support	\$36,196
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	\$37,535
Food Preparation and Serving Related	\$34,405
All Occupations	\$65,702

Source: California Employment Development Division, Occupational Wage Data, (1st Quarter 2021)

2.2 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

The Census defines a household as “all persons who occupy a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood and unrelated individuals living together.” Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories or other group living

situations are not considered households. Household type and size, income levels, the presence of special needs populations, and other household characteristics determine the type of housing needed by residents, their preferences, and their ability to obtain housing that meets their needs. This section details the various household characteristics affecting housing needs.

2.2.1 HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND SIZE

In 2018, there were 54,991 households in the City. As Table H-7 indicates, Torrance appears to be a stable family-oriented community, with two-thirds of all households classified as families. Regarding the percentage of family households, the City (68.4 percent) has a similar proportion compared to the County (66.7 percent), the State (68.3 percent), and the nation (66.4 percent). This proportion has remained relatively stable since 2000. However, the proportion of families with children has decreased significantly since 2000, whereas families with no children have increased substantially, possibly reflecting the city’s aging population where family members have left to form their own households.

**Table H-7:
Household Characteristics**

Household Type	2000		2010		2018	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Total Households	54,542	100.0%	56,001	100.0%	54,991	100.0%
Families	36,276	66.5%	38,412	68.6%	37,638	68.4%
with children	18,253	33.5%	18,416	32.9%	16,133	29.3%
with no children	18,023	33.0%	19,996	35.7%	21,601	39.1%
Non-Families	18,266	33.5%	17,589	31.4%	17,353	31.6%
Singles	15,005	27.5%	14,472	25.8%	14,771	26.9%
Others	3,261	6.0%	3,117	5.6%	2,582	4.7%
Average Household Size	2.51		2.58		2.61	
Average Family Size	3.10		3.14		3.19	
Renter-Occupied	42.9%		43.5%		44.1%	
Owner-Occupied	54.6%		56.5%		55.9%	

Source: U.S. ~~Census 2000~~Census 2000, 2010, and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates

Household size and composition are often two interrelated factors. Communities with a large proportion of families with children tend to have a large average household size. In Torrance, however, the proportion of families with children has decreased while the average family size has slightly increased since 2000. The modest increase in family size may be correlated to an increase in the proportion of families with extended family members sharing the home and is balanced by the increase in the senior population, who tend to have a smaller average family size.

Since 2000, renter-occupied households have increased. Owner-occupied households increased slightly between 2000 and 2010, and then decreased slightly between 2010 and 2019.

2.2.2 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Household income is an indication of wealth in a community and therefore is directly connected to the ability to afford housing. As household income increases, the more likely that household is a

homeowner. As household income decreases, households tend to pay a disproportionate amount of their income for housing and the number of households occupying unsound and overcrowded housing increases.


The median household income in Torrance is \$94,492 according to ACS 2014-2019 5-year estimates, significantly higher than the median household income for Los Angeles County (\$68,044). Table H-8 shows that overall, 47% of the households in Torrance earn over \$100,000 annually, and approximately 26% of households earn less than \$50,000 per year. When compared to nearby communities, median household income in Torrance is higher than nearby Carson and Gardena, and considerably lower than the adjacent communities of Redondo Beach and Rolling Hills Estates as shown on Table H-9.

Table H-8: Torrance Household Income

Income Range	2019	
	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000	2,141	3.9
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,314	2.4
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2,979	5.5
\$25,000 to \$34,999	2,954	5.4
\$35,000 to \$49,999	5,088	9.3
\$50,000 to \$74,999	7,551	13.9
\$75,000 to \$99,999	6,965	12.8
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11,047	20.3
\$150,000 to \$199,999	5,956	10.9
\$200,000 or more	8,442	15.5
Total	54,437	100.0
Median Income	\$94,492	

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Table H-9: Median Income Household Comparison



Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

2.2.3 HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME GROUP

For purposes of the Housing Element, the State of California has established five income groups based on income limits provided by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The established standard income groups are generally defined as follows:

- Extremely low income: **households earning 0 to 30 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) of the County of Los Angeles;**
- Very low income: **households earning between 30 and 50 percent of the AMI;**
- Low income: **households earning between 50 percent and 80 percent of the AMI;**
- Moderate income: **households earning between 80 percent and 120 percent of the AMI; and**
- Above moderate income: **households earning over 120 percent of the AMI.**

For a household of four in Los Angeles County, the AMI for 2020 was \$77,300. Table H-10 is based on the estimated household income for Torrance for 2013-2017. The proportions of extremely low, very low, and low income groups comprised approximately 50 percent of city households. Approximately 50 percent of households in the city are classified as moderate or above moderate income.

Table H-10: Households by Income Groups

Income Group	% of County Median	Income Range (\$) ¹	% of Households ²
Extremely low	0–30	\$23,700-\$36,550	12%
Very low	30–50	\$39,450-\$60,850	21%
Low	50–80	\$63,100-\$97,350	17%
Moderate	80–120	\$64,900-\$100,150	17%
Above moderate	>120		33%

Notes:

1. Income range based on 1 to 5 person households for 2020.
2. Income distribution is based on SCAG RHNA Methodology (2013-2017 ACS) data.

Sources: SCAG RHNA Methodology, 2020; HCD Income Limits - Los Angeles County, 2020, SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.3 HOUSING PROBLEMS

2.3.1 OVERCROWDING

Overcrowding is defined by state law as having more than one person per room in a single housing unit. Generally, a room is defined as a living room, dining room, bedroom, or finished recreation room; bathrooms and kitchens are not considered. In Torrance, 529 owner-occupied and 2,639 renter-occupied households had more than 1.0 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for overcrowding. Eighty-one owner-occupied households and 712 renter-occupied households had more than 1.5 occupants per room, which meets the ACS definition for severe overcrowding (Table H-11).

Table H-11: Overcrowded Households

Persons per Room	Renter-Households	Owner-Households	Total Households
1.01-1.50	2,639	529	3,136
1.51+	712	81	793
Total Households	3,351	612	3,929

Source: ACS 2014-2018 estimates, SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.3.2 COST BURDEN

Measuring the portion of a household’s gross income that is spent for housing is an indicator of the dynamics of demand and supply. This measurement is often expressed in terms of “overpayers”: households paying an excessive amount of their income for housing, therefore decreasing the amount of disposable income available for other needs. This indicator is an important measurement of local housing market conditions as it reflects the affordability of housing in the community. Federal and state agencies use cost burden/overpayment indicators to determine the extent and level of funding and support that should be allocated to a community.

State and federal programs typically define overpayers as those paying over 30 percent of household income for housing costs. For this evaluation, household income is based on HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI), which is estimated annually for each metropolitan area using data from the American Community Survey (Median Family Income in the Past 12 Months). A household is considered to be experiencing a cost burden if it spends more than 30 percent of its gross income on housing and experiencing a severe cost burden if it spends more than 50 percent of its gross income on housing.

Table H-12 shows that over 20,000 households, (37.5 percent) of Torrance households were overpaying for housing during the period 2012-2016. The number of households overpaying was significantly higher for lower-income households compared to those with higher incomes. Nearly 82 percent of households in the lowest income category (0-30 percent of HAMFI), representing 4,709 households were overpaying for housing, compared to less than 15 percent of households in the highest income category (over 100 percent of HAMFI), or 4,279 households.

Table H-12: Cost Burden

Household Income	Households by Share of Income Spent on Housing Cost:		
	<30%	30-50%	>50%
0-30% HAMFI	995	629	4080
30-50% HAMFI	1,765	1,845	2,985
50-80% HAMFI	3,340	3,360	1,275
80-100% HAMFI	3,290	1,570	399
>100% HAMFI	24,585	3,909	370
Total households	33,975	11,313	9,109

Source: HUD CHAS Data (2012-2016), SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

HAMFI = HUD Area Median Family Income.

Cost Burden = Paying over 30% of HH income in housing costs

While the previous table breaks down cost burden by area-relative income, the ACS also allows for the analysis of Torrance’s 23,049 renter households (for which income data are available) by spending on rent by income bracket (dollar amounts). As one might expect, Table H-13 shows the general trend is that low-income households spend a higher share of income on housing (e.g. e.g., over 50%) while high-income households are more likely to spend under 20% of income on housing.

Table H-13: Spending on Rent by Income (Number of Renter Households)

Income Category	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$100,000 or more
>50%	2,202	1,955	1,099	264	39	9
30-49%	274	771	1,308	2,439	570	392
20-29%	133	84	379	1,408	1,774	2,338
<20%	0	59	9	240	900	4,403

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates, SCAG Pre-certified data, April 2021.

Mortgage-holding households in Torrance can be broken down by income and the percentage of income spent on mortgage costs. As one might expect, the general trend is that lower-income households spend a higher share of income on housing costs, while high-income households may spend a lower share of income on housing. The income category most prevalent amongst Torrance mortgage-holding households is \$75,000 or more (15,888 households) and the most prevalent share of income spent on mortgage costs is over 30% (7439 households), as shown on Table H-14.

Table H-14: Costs for Mortgage Holders by Income

Percent of income spent on mortgage costs	Less than \$20,000	\$20,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 or more
Over 30%	619	668	935	1,310	3,907
20-29%	7	13	58	280	5,722
Under 20%	0	0	20	136	6,259

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

2.4 SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

Certain segments of the population require special needs for housing. These special needs groups include seniors, disabled, female-headed households with children, large households, farmworkers, persons living in poverty (extremely low income households), and people experiencing homelessness. Often, these are low income households who have limited access to housing choices.

The City of Torrance has three City Commissions and Councils comprised of residents dedicated to advising the City Council on issues related to special needs groups in the City. The Commission on Aging deals with the needs and issues confronting senior citizens in the community and provides a voice for senior citizens as a community group. The Social Services Commission addresses issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities, and children with special needs. The Youth Council advises the City Council on matters pertaining to youth in the City.

Table H-15 shows the presence of special needs populations in Torrance. Senior-headed households (28%) were the largest special needs group in the City, followed by persons aged 65 and older (17%) and persons with disabilities (8.5%). The specifics of special needs groups will be explored in the following discussions.

Table H-15: Special Needs Populations

Special Needs Group	# of Persons or Households	# of Owners	# of Renters	% of Total Households or Persons
Persons 65+	24,488	–	–	17
Senior-headed households	15,480	10,900 (70%)	4,580 (30%)	28
Seniors living alone	6,088	4,301 (71%)	1,787 (29%)	11
Persons with Disabilities	12,307	–	–	8.5
Large households (7+)	317	211 (66%)	109 (34%)	.6
Female-headed households with children	2,207	--	--	4
Farmworkers	7	--	--	0
<u>Extremely-low income households</u>	<u>6,390</u>	<u>2250 (7%)</u>	<u>4140 (17%)</u>	<u>11.6</u>
People Experiencing Homelessness experiencing homelessness	225	--	--	.15

Sources: American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates, [SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021](#).

2.4.1- SENIORS

Seniors often age in place, which can result in many seniors living in housing that is too expensive for their fixed incomes or that structurally does not accommodate their specific needs for assistance. Even though seniors may have difficulty living in their own homes, oftentimes they do not have the option or mobility afforded to other segments of the population to relocate to a more suitable housing arrangement. They commonly have to leave their home community and relocate away from family and friends to find a suitable unit. The purpose of this section is to determine the housing needs of the senior community, which is defined as persons aged 65 or over.

As shown in Table H-14¹⁶, 21,726 seniors resided in Torrance in 2010, representing 14.9 percent of the total population. As of 2018, the senior population had risen ~~to 24,488~~ to 24,488 persons or 17 percent of the total population.

Table H-16: Senior Population

Year	Number of Seniors	Change	% Change	Average Annual % Change
2010	21,726			
2019	24,488	2,762	11.3	1.4

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2010 and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Table H-15¹⁷ shows the number of homes within the City that were occupied by seniors. The 2010 Census estimates that 16,490 households in the city were occupied by seniors and that number grew to 18,238 in 2018, almost a 10% change. In 2010, there were 4,871 seniors living alone; by 2018, that number rose to 6,088 seniors. These trends indicate a need for more of a variety of housing options for seniors in the community.

Table H-17: Senior Household Trends

Year	Number of Senior Occupied Homes	Change	% Change
2010	16,490		
2019	18,238	1748	9.6

Sources: 2010 ACS, and ACS 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

Table H-18 relies on federal housing data which define a household type as “elderly family” if it consists of two persons with either or both age 62 and over. As shown in Table H-16, only 4.4% of seniors in the city were renters in 2010. In Los Angeles County, 36 percent of the senior households rented their housing. The number of senior renters in Torrance increased slightly between 2010 and 2019, where approximately 6 percent of the senior households in the city were renters by 2019.

2016. Senior homeowners are considerably more prevalent in Torrance than senior renters. Senior homeowners represented 94.7% percent of all senior households in 2019. Seniors are more inclined Of Torrance’s 15,480 senior households, 20.1% earn less than 30% of the surrounding area income, (compared to be homeowners because they tend to have lived 24.2% in the community for an extended period of time and were able to secure homeownership before the price SCAG region), 38.2% earn less than 50% of housing increased over the past several decades. surrounding area income (compared to 30.9% in the SCAG region).

Table H-18: Senior Households by Income and Tenure

Income Category, relative to surrounding area:	Owner	Renter	Total	Percent of Total Elderly Households
<30% HAMFI	1,832	956	10,900	20.1%
30-50% HAMFI	1,785	1,020	2,805	18.1%
50-80% HAMFI	1,845	590	2,435	15.7%
80-100% HAMFI	1,045	345	1,390	9.0%
Renter 100% HAMFI	854	4,630	5,740	37.1%
Total	10,900	4,580	15,480	100%

Source: HUD CHAS, 2012 – 2016. HAMFI refers to Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income. SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, April 2021.

2.4.2 PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Persons with disabilities include those who are physically, mentally, and/or developmentally disabled. Each type is unique and requires specific attention in terms of access to housing, employment, social services, and medical services. Both physical and mental disabilities can hinder access to traditional housing facilities and the ability to earn adequate income. Disabled individuals have particular housing needs in terms of location and design requirements. For example, physically disabled individuals may require special housing design features, such as wheelchair ramps, holding bars, special bathroom designs, wider rooms, and other features. Similar to older adults, persons with disabilities also have special housing needs in terms of location, and often need to be located near public facilities and alternative transportation services.

The ACS estimates that 27,897 residents (19.2 percent of the population) in Torrance had one or more

disabilities in 2019. The majority of the city’s disabled population is comprised of seniors with hearing, ambulatory and independent living difficulties (Table H-19).

Table H-19: Disability Status

Type of Disability	Population with Disabilities			
	Age 5–17	Age 18–64	Age 65+	Total %
Hearing	33	1,121	3,147	15.4
Vision	96	747	1,156	7.2
Cognitive	598	2,357	1,790	17.0
Ambulatory	111	2,329	4,331	24.3
Self-Care	250	886	1,969	11.1
Independent Living	0	2,224	3,664	21.1
Total Disabled Persons	1,088	10,752	16,057	27,897

Note: A person can have multiple disabilities.
Source: American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Four factors – affordability, design, location, and discrimination – significantly limit the supply of housing available to households of persons with disabilities. The most obvious housing need for persons with disabilities is housing that is adapted to their needs. Most single-family homes are inaccessible to people with mobility and sensory limitations. Housing may not be adaptable to widened doorways and hallways, access ramps, larger bathrooms, lowered countertops, and other features commonly necessary for accessibility. Location of housing is also an important factor for many persons with disabilities, as they often rely upon public transportation to travel to necessary services and shops. “Barrier free” housing, accessibility modifications, proximity to services and transit, and group living opportunities are important in serving this group. Incorporating barrier-free design in new multi-family housing is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for the disabled. Housing that applies universal design principles is considered barrier free and accessible to persons of a wide range of abilities/disabilities.

State and federal legislation mandate that a specified portion of units in new or rehabilitated multi-family apartment complexes be accessible to individuals with limited mobility.¹ The City also allows residential retrofitting to increase the suitability of homes for persons with disabilities in compliance with accessibility requirements. The City works with applicants who need special accommodations in their homes to ensure that application of zoning and building code requirements does not create a constraint. In 2014, the City adopted a formal procedure for review and approval of reasonable accommodation requests (Ordinance 419 § 39). Program 15 in this Housing Element (Chapter 5) would strengthen and codify the City’s Reasonable Accommodation process.

2.4.2.1 Persons with Developmental Disabilities

A recent change in state law requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. As defined by state law, “developmental disability” means a severe, chronic disability of an individual that:

¹The State of California regulates accessibility through Title 24 of the California Building Standards Code and federal Americans with Disabilities Act mandate residential accessibility requirements.

- is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- is likely to continue indefinitely;
- results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: self-care; receptive and expressive language; learning; mobility; self-direction; capacity for independent living; or economic self-sufficiency; and
- reflects the individual’s need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

In Torrance, there are 1,926 people with developmental disabilities according to the California Department of Developmental Services. This represents about 1% of the total population of the City and is about evenly split between adults and children. Table H-20 shows the number of persons with developmental disabilities by age and zip code where they reside within the City.

Table H-20: Persons with Developmental Disability by Age and Zip Code

Zip code	Age		Total all ages
	0-17 years	18+	
90501	284	254	538
90502	97	95	192
90503	239	172	411
90504	200	224	424
90505	208	153	361
Total	1,028	898	1926

Source: CA Department of Developmental Services

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals often require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because many developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person’s living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

2.4.3 LARGE HOUSEHOLDS

Large households are defined as households consisting of five or more persons. Generally speaking, the needs of large households are not targeted in the housing market, especially in the multi-family housing market. As shown in Table H-18²¹, approximately 7 percent or 3,808 households in Torrance met the definition of large households. Homeowners comprised 55 percent of the large households in the city, while 45 percent are renters. The city has a substantial number of large homes which could accommodate the needs of large households, but it is not known if large households occupy these homes. The County had a larger percentage of large households at 14 percent.

Table H-21: Household Size by Tenure

Household Size (Persons)	Owner	Renter	Total	Percentage
1	6,124	7,763	13,887	25.5
2	10,435	6,313	16,748	30.8
3	5,959	4,966	10,925	20.1
4	3,532	5,460	8,992	16.5
5	1,412	1,116	2,528	4.6
6	462	501	963	1.8
7 +	211	106	317	0.6
Total	28,135	26,225	54,360	100.0

Source: American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates.

2.4.4 SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

Single-parent households, particularly female-headed families with children, often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. Female-headed families with children are a particularly vulnerable group because they must balance the needs of their children with work responsibilities, often while earning limited incomes.

As shown in Table H-1922, a significant portion of single-parent households had a female as the head of the household. The 2010 Census counted 17,256 family households with children under 18 years of age in Torrance. Of these households, 3,521 or about 20 percent were headed by a single adult, with the majority being headed by females. In 2019 the number of households with children under 18 years of age decreased slightly to 16,117. Of the households headed by a single adult, the majority continued to be headed by females.

In Torrance, 811 (14%) of the female-headed households were living in poverty. In addition, 437 (19.8%) of the female-headed families with children were living in poverty. The City’s Parks and Recreation Department offers low-cost after-school and before-school childcare at many of the elementary and middle schools.

Table H-22: Households with Children

Household Type	2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Married couple households	29,754	53.1	29,739	54.7
With children under 18 years old	13,735	46.2	13,106	44
With no children	16,019	53.8	16,633	56
Female householder*	6,148	11	5,689	10.5
With children under 18 years old	2,621	42.6	2,207	38.8
With no children	3,527	57.4	3,482	61.2
Male householder*	2,510	4.5	2,543	4.7
With children under 18 years old	900	35.8	804	31.6
With no children	1,610	64.1	1,739	68.4
Non-family households	17,589	31.4	16,389	30.1
Total Households	56,001	100.0	54,360	100.0

*No spouse present

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2018 estimates. SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021.

2.4.5 FARMWORKERS

~~Farmworkers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal (migrant) agricultural labor. Due to the high cost of housing and low wages, a significant number of migrant farm workers have difficulty finding affordable, safe and sanitary housing.~~ Farmworkers are defined by the Census as “agricultural workers and their supervisors” and represent a very small percentage of the City’s total population. ~~This limited income is exacerbated by their tenuous and/or seasonal employment status.~~ According to the SCAG Pre-certified Housing Data, 2021, 149 persons in the City of Torrance were employed in the agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining industry, and 7 persons reported their occupation as farmworker. The Torrance farmworker population accounts for 0.2% of the total employment in the City. The total number of farmworkers for LA County is 3266, according to the 2017 Census of Agriculture, 2017. Farmworkers generally receive much lower wages than other local occupations. According to the State Employment Development Department, farm workers earned an average annual salary of \$37,535 (Table H-5).² ~~Because no land within the City is designated for agricultural use and the City’s farmworker population is small, the housing needs of this group are addressed through its standard affordable housing strategies.~~ These wages severely limit housing options for farmworkers in Southern California’s expensive housing market. Overcrowding and substandard housing conditions are often the only option.

The USDA Census of Agriculture, 2017, documents the labor arrangements between farmworkers and producers, providing insight into their uncertain working conditions. As shown on Table H-23, only 54% of farmworkers reported working over 150 days, or roughly 5 months. Approximately 12% were migrant workers, and 25% were unpaid workers.

² California Employment Development Department, Occupational Wage Data (1st Quarter, 2019).

Table H-23: Permanent and Seasonal Farmworkers for LA County

	Total	Percentage
Farm workers	3266	=
Farm workers by days worked:		
• over 150 days	1749	54%
• less than 150 days	1517	46%
Migrant workers	395	12%
Unpaid workers	822	25%

Source: 2017 Census of Agriculture, USDA.

2.4.6 HOUSING NEEDS OF EXTREMELY-LOW INCOME (ELI) HOUSEHOLDS

Housing the extremely low-income population (below 30% of area median income) can be especially challenging, as this is below the poverty level. HUD’s CHAS dataset provides a wealth of information on such households in Torrance. Table H-24 below provides a breakdown of extremely-low income households by race and ethnicity. The race/ethnicity with the highest share of extremely-low income households in Torrance is Black, non-Hispanic (19.4% compared to 11.6% of total population). In the SCAG region, the highest share of extremely-low income households is Black, non-Hispanic (27.1% compared to 17.7% of total households).

Table H-24: Extremely-low Income Housing Needs

	Total Households	Households below 30% HAMFI	Share below 30% HAMFI
White, non-Hispanic	26,745	3,175	11.9%
Black, non-Hispanic	1,520	295	19.4%
Asian and other, non-Hispanic	19,467	2,090	10.7%
Hispanic	7,375	825	11.2%
TOTAL	55,107	6,385	11.6%
Renter-occupied	24,785	4,140	16.7%
Owner-occupied	30,330	2,250	7.4%
TOTAL	55,115	6,390	11.6%

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

Very few housing units are available to persons and households in the extremely low-income category. Families with incomes below the poverty level, typically with very low and extremely low incomes, are at the greatest risk of becoming homeless and typically require special programs to assist them in meeting their rent and mortgage obligations so as not to become homeless. Table H-24 shows that close to 12%, or 6,390 households in Torrance are living in poverty. These households need assistance with housing subsidies, utility and other living expense subsidies, and other supportive services.

Persons living with incomes below the poverty level can benefit from City programs and services that provide assistance to lower income households in general, such as the Housing Choice Voucher Program, which offers rental assistance to residents. Table H-25 lists various assistance services for households living in poverty.

Table H-25: Resources for Special Needs Groups

Special Needs Group	Program	Description
Female Headed Household and Large Households	Federal Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic
	South Bay Youth Project	Counseling, parenting classes, youth activities
Households in Poverty	Torrance 1st Baptist Church	Hot meal served on the first Saturday of each month from 11am-1pm. (During COVID it is sack lunches to go)
	Torrance YMCA Senior Center	Nutritious lunch M-F, at 12 noon for seniors 60 and older. No membership required for lunch.
	Walteria United Methodist Church	Full hot meals served the 2 nd Saturday for each month from 11am-1pm for the needy and homeless.
	St. Andrews Episcopal Church	Hot meals served the 3 rd Saturday of the month. No charge for meals.
	St. Catherine Laboure Catholic Church	Food distribution for the needy on the last Saturday of the month, 11am-1pm
	Meals on Wheels	One hot meal provided per person.
	First United Methodist Church of Torrance	Hot meals served the 4 th Saturday of the month at 11am.
	Harbor Gateway South Neighborhood Council	Provides food items for families on the 2 nd and 4 th Tuesday of every month at 9:30am or until the food runs out.
	Harbor Gateway/Torrance Outreach	Provides food items for homeless persons over 18 and low-income families on the 2 nd and 4 th Tuesday and the last Saturday of the month at 9:30am.
	Bartlett Senior Citizens Center	Hot lunch (\$2.50) for adults 50 years and older, M-F at 11:30am.
	New Challenge Ministries Torrance	Program to serve the community and those in need. Food offered varies from day-to-day, but usually includes milk, eggs, cheese, bread, vegetables, fruits, and/or juices.
	Coast Christian Fellowship	Partner with the LA Food Bank to give out free groceries to those in need.
Households in Poverty, Disabled Persons and the Elderly	City of Torrance Section 8	Housing assistance payments on behalf of eligible elderly and low income families, and disabled persons
Disabled Persons	Access Services	Transportation service throughout Los Angeles County for individuals with disabilities
	Harbor Regional Center – Torrance	Private, non-profit corporation benefitting individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by providing diagnosis and evaluation, information and referral, individual or family service planning, family support and assistance in finding

		and using community resources.
	Social Vocational Services – Torrance	Adult day programs, supported employment, residential assistance, transportation, and financial management services for adults with developmental disabilities.
	Disabled American Veterans of Los Angeles	A non-profit organization that provides lifetime support for veterans and their families, including transportation to medical appointments, assistance with benefits claims, connection to meaningful employment, and other resources related to veterans and their families.
	Village for Vets	Fills critical gaps in key services for homeless and at-risk veterans in greater Los Angeles. Through programs providing meals, emergency grants, support for basic needs, social support, and links to additional services. Helps ensure Los Angeles’ homeless and at-risk veterans do not fall through the cracks.
Elderly and Disabled Persons	Home Improvement Program (HIP) - Torrance	Free program in which Disabled Individuals and Senior Citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include: Disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, year services, paint and minor repairs.
	Torrance Community Transit Program (TCTP) – Torrance	A transportation assistance program for residents of the City of Torrance. TCTP includes both the Senior and Dial-a-Taxi Swipe Card programs. TCTP enables low-income seniors and those with disabilities to purchase credits for taxi rides at a discounted personal cost.

Source: City of Torrance, 2022

2.4.7 EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

The category “extremely low-income households” is a subset of “very low-income households,” and is defined as 30 percent (or less) of the area median income. The housing element must quantify existing and projected extremely low-income households, analyse their housing needs, and assess the kind of housing available and suitable for extremely low-income households.

Table HE-26 below identifies 5,490 households in Torrance that are considered extremely low-income households, or approximately 10% of all the households in the city. Of the 5,490 ELI households, 3,505 are renter-occupied, and 1,985 are owner-occupied. Table HE-26 provides information on housing problems by income level for various categories of households in Torrance. These problems include:

- Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom);
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room);
- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30 percent of gross income; or
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50 percent of gross income.

The types of problems experienced by different households vary by income level and tenure. Renters generally experience housing problems at a higher rate than owners, with about 53% of all renter households experiencing a housing problem compared to 29% of owner households. Renters also experience a cost burden more than owners (45% compared to 28%).

Although extremely low-income households do have higher rates of housing problems than households in the city overall, both very low income and low-income renter households experience higher rates of housing problems than extremely low-income households. Similarly, the percentage of households with a housing cost burden is higher for very low- and low-income renter households than for extremely low-income renter households. For owner households, the percentage of households with any housing problem, including any housing cost burden, decreases as income level increases.

Table H-26. Extremely Low Income Housing Needs

Household by Tenure, Income, and Housing Problem	Total Renters	Total Owners	Total Households
Extremely Low Income (0-30%AMI)	3,505	1,985	5,490
% with any housing problem	75%	79%	76%
% with cost burden >30%	74%	78%	76%
% with cost burden > 50%	68%	65%	67%
Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)	3,275	2,025	5,300
% with any housing problem	93%	53%	78%
% with cost burden >30%	90%	53%	76%
% with cost burden > 50%	66%	34%	54%
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	4,555	3,130	7,685
% with any housing problem	83%	46%	68%
% with cost burden >30%	76%	45%	64%
% with cost burden > 50%	18%	25%	21%
Moderate/Upper Income (>80% AMI)	12,960	22,925	35,885
% with any housing problem	27%	20%	23%
% with cost burden >30%	14%	19%	17%
% with cost burden > 50%	1%	3%	2%
Total Households	24,295	30,065	54,360
% with any housing problem	53%	29%	40%
% with cost burden >30%	45%	28%	35%
% with cost burden > 50%	22%	12%	17%

Source: CHAS data book (2014-2018)

2.4.8 HOMELESS

Factors contributing to the rise in persons experiencing homelessness include high rates of unemployment and underemployment, a lack of housing affordable to low and moderate income persons, increases in the number of persons whose incomes fall below the poverty level, reductions in public subsidies to the poor, and the de-institutionalization of the mentally ill. Homelessness has long been an issue in Los Angeles County, reflecting high costs of housing in the region. Along with cuts in public funding, lasting impacts of the Great Recession, and recent economic and social impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, local communities are increasingly strained in their limited resources to provide assistance to the persons experiencing homelessness.


Section 65583(1)(7) mandates that municipalities address the special needs of persons experiencing homelessness within their jurisdictional boundaries. “Homelessness” as defined by HUD, describes:

- Individuals/families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, including:
 - Place not meant for human habitation;
 - Living in a shelter; or
 - Exiting an institution.
- Individuals/families who will imminently (within 14 days) lose their primary nighttime residence.
- Unaccompanied youth (under 25 years of age) or families with children/youth.
- Individuals/families fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence.

This definition does not include persons living in substandard housing (unless it has been officially condemned); persons living in overcrowded housing (for example, doubled up with others); persons being discharged from mental health facilities (unless the person was experiencing homelessness when entering and is considered to be homeless at discharge); or persons who may be at risk of experiencing homelessness (for example, living temporarily with family or friends). Torrance Unified School District representatives reported during a Housing Element focus group session they are aware of a number of students experiencing homelessness who live temporarily with family or friends.

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is a Joint Powers Authority established in 1993 as an independent agency by the County and the City of Los Angeles. As the lead agency in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care, LAHSA coordinates and manages federal, state, County, and city funds for homeless services across Los Angeles County. LAHSA also performs policy and planning research and analysis, with the goal of supporting, creating, and sustaining solutions to homelessness. As shown in Figure HEH-1, in January 2020, LAHSA conducted the annual Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. The count showed that there were 332 people experiencing homelessness in Torrance, a 308% increase from the 2015 count of 77. The 2021 count was canceled due to the COVID-19 pandemic, complicating efforts to keep pace with this issue. The 2022 count was held in February 2022, however the results have not yet been released.

Figure H-1: Torrance Homeless Count 2020



The City of Torrance is located in the County of Los Angeles Public Health Department Service Planning Area 8 (SPA-8). While there are many service providers in the Torrance area addressing homeless issues, the City promotes a focused Coordinated Entry System (CES) approach, to help file everyone through the same starting point, so that professionals can link those in need to the appropriate service providers and resources.

Two dedicated outreach staff for those experiencing homelessness are currently working in Torrance. One is a City employee, and the other is funded by a non-profit who provides services for those experiencing homelessness.

In June of 2021, the City approved the first homeless shelter of its own, a temporary community of 40 tiny homes to be placed in the parking lot to the rear of the Torrance Superior Courthouse, according to the Torrance Daily Breeze. This was in response to the rapidly growing population of persons experiencing homelessness in Torrance. The goal of temporary housing is for individuals experiencing homelessness to have housing stability for a short term, while they work with Housing Navigators (professional trained case managers) to attain permanent housing. Stays at the temporary housing units are typically three to six months, and in some cases, can be longer, depending on the needs of the individual. The projected shelter beds are equipped with heating, air conditioning and power. Separate showers and bathrooms will also be located on site. The shelter will be staffed 24 hours per

day by caseworkers and security. The shelter is expected to be constructed when funding becomes available, anticipated in early 2022.

At the same City Council meeting, Torrance also passed a comprehensive homeless plan directive, and an amendment to the City’s anti-camping law that would allow police to write citations and possibly arrest people for camping on city sidewalks and parks if shelter beds in the City were available. The idea behind the anti-camping laws is to encourage a person experiencing homelessness to seek help through an outreach worker, a process that often takes up to 10 encounters before the person is receptive, according to caseworkers.

According to the Torrance Municipal Code, emergency shelters are permitted in the M-2 Heavy Manufacturing Zone. As stated previously, Torrance approved the temporary homeless shelter on public land in the City Hall complex as a critically needed measure; ~~however~~ however, the City plans to continue to search for a site within the M-2 zone where the use is allowed, should such a site become available.

At the January 25, 2022, City Council meeting, the City awarded a product and services agreement to Pallet SPC for the purchase and assembly of the temporary housing units and accessory units at 3290 Civic Center Drive. In July 2022, the City opened the tiny home village to temporarily shelter people experiencing homelessness until they can be connected to a home of their own. Called 3290 Temporary Housing Village at Civic Center Drive, the project is the result of close collaboration among Los Angeles County Supervisor Janice Hahn and the City of Torrance, as well as the Los Angeles County Homeless Initiative, South Bay Cities Council of Governments, and Harbor Interfaith Services. The goal of the Village is to provide housing stability and support services with long-term goals of assisting residents attain permanent housing.

Built by Pallet, the tiny home village includes 40 individual living units, each encompassing 64 square feet of living space, air conditioning, power, and other basic necessities. Residents will also have access to restrooms, laundry facilities and daily meals, along with wraparound services in the form of case management and housing navigation.



Photo Credit: Los Angeles County Newsroom

Harbor Interfaith Services, a nonprofit homeless services provider based in the South Bay, will operate the site. Its professionally trained staff will develop a housing plan for each client with the goal of finding them a more permanent housing solution. Some of the support offered to clients at the tiny home village will range from life and job skills training to substance use disorder treatment and healthcare services, in partnership with the Venice Family Clinic.

Torrance’s Homeless Plan was made available on the City’s website on July 12, 2021. The plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to the community. As the City’s initial homeless response guiding document, it outlines a prudent number of approaches that can be developed and achieved over the next three years, with regular check points to evaluate

effectiveness, to keep the plan fresh in the dynamic environment of homeless services in Los Angeles County.

Program 11 demonstrates the City’s commitment to maintain an emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law. Table H-27 provides an inventory of services and facilities located in the area.

Table H-27: Inventory of Homeless Services and Facilities

Name	Services	Location
Los Angeles Homeless Outreach Portal (LA-HOP)	LA-HOP is designed to assist people experiencing homelessness in LA County with outreach services.	http://la-hop.org
1736 Family Crisis Center	Emergency Youth Shelter, Domestic Violence Shelter Program, and Community Service Center Program offering comprehensive services to community members in crisis.	21707 Hawthorne Blvd., Suite 300, Torrance, CA 90018
City of Torrance Homeless Shelter	New temporary 40-unit tiny home community to include showers, bathrooms, caseworkers, and security. Construction expected in early 2022.	Torrance Superior Court Parking Lot
Torrance Community Service Center	City’s Outreach Coordinator (connected to Harbor Interfaith Shelter) works with unsheltered residents seeking services to determine need and provide referrals.	Torrance City Hall, 3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503
Salvation Army "His House Family Services"	Social service ministry that provides brown bag lunches, homeless meals, groceries, rental assistance, clothing vouchers, and referrals to shelters.	20830 S. Vermont Ave. Torrance, CA 90502
Torrance Unified School District – Foster Youth and Homeless Liaison	Operates McKinney Vento support services that ensure that homeless children and youth have the same access to the same educational experience and resources as all students.	enrollment@tusd.org enrollment@tusd.org
<u>Community’s Child</u>	<u>Social service organization committed to offering women and their infants with healthy alternatives by providing safe living environments, training and education to end poverty, neglect, abuse, additions and hopelessness.</u>	25520 Woodward Ave., Lomita, CA 90717 www.communityschild.org
Harbor Interfaith Shelter	Provides support services including shelter, transitional housing, food, job placement, advocacy, childcare, education, and life skills training to the homeless and working poor.	670 W. 9th St., San Pedro, CA 90731
Operation Healthy Homecoming, MHA of Los Angeles	Serves veteran families who are homeless or at risk of being homeless due to unstable housing situations or severe financial difficulties.	https://www.mhaohh.org/
Habitat for Humanity of Greater Los Angeles	Strives to eliminate substandard housing through advocacy, education and partnership with families and individuals in need to build decent, sustainable, and affordable housing.	18,600 Crenshaw Blvd., Torrance, CA 90504
Doors of Hope Women’s Shelter	Provide services to homeless women in the South Bay providing food, clothing, temporary shelter, and spiritual encouragement.	529 Broad Ave, Wilmington, CA 90744
Beacon Light Mission	Provide services to homeless men in the South Bay providing food, clothing, temporary shelter, and spiritual encouragement.	525 Broad Ave., Wilmington, CA 90744

Catholic Charities:		
1. Elizabeth Ann Seton Residence	Offers emergency shelter to families, pregnant women, the disabled, and the elderly who are homeless.	Long Beach, Pico Rivera, Wilmington
2. Project Achieve		
Gratitude Retreat	Provides funds to qualified applicants for the first few months of residency in sober living for a more permanent solution to homelessness.	Confidential location
Family Promise of the South Bay	Community-based approach to solving homelessness. Families receive resources, support, and training.	2930 El Dorado Street, Torrance, 90503
Source: City of Torrance, CityPlace Planning, the Rainbow Services	Serves individuals and families who are experiencing violence in their homes, or who face homelessness due to domestic violence with transitional shelter, emergency shelter, supportive services, legal services, and counseling.	453 W. 7 th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90731

Source: City of Torrance, CityPlace Planning, Inc., 2021.

2.5 HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

The characteristics of the housing stock, including growth, type, age and condition, tenure, vacancy rates, housing costs, and affordability are important in determining the housing needs for the community. This section details the housing stock characteristics of Torrance to identify how well the current housing stock meets the needs of current and future residents of the city.

2.5.1 HOUSING GROWTH

Torrance experienced very modest housing growth between 2010 and 2021 (Table H-28). The housing stock increased by 231 units, from 58,377 to 58,608, representing an increase of .4 percent. This slight increase in the housing stock was in contrast to the 4.7 percent increase experienced by the County, but was comparable to the other nearby cities of Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach, where the increase in number of units was also 1 percent or less. Carson, Gardena, and Hawthorne each experienced small increases in the number of housing units in the same time period. Torrance has very little remaining vacant land for development, and the majority of vacant parcels are infill parcels to be redeveloped.

Table H-28: Housing Growth

Jurisdiction	2010	2021	2010–2021 Percent Change
Torrance	58,377	58,608	.4
Carson	26,226	26,676	1.7
Gardena	21,472	22,004	2.4
Hawthorne	29,869	30,662	2.6
Hermosa Beach	10,162	10,090	-.7
Los Angeles	1,412,006	1,535,606	8
Manhattan Beach	14,929	15,043	.76
Redondo Beach	30,609	30,928	1
Los Angeles County	3,443,087	3,614,809	4.7

Sources: State Department of Finance, 2010 and 2020.

2.5.2-HOUSING TYPE

Providing for a diverse range of housing types is an important consideration in a community. A diverse range of housing types helps ensure that all households in a community, regardless of income level, size, age, and family type, have the ability to find adequate housing that meets their needs.

Table H-29 shows the composition of Torrance’s housing stock by unit type in 2010 and 2021. The composition of the city’s housing stock has remained virtually unchanged over the timeframe, with single-family detached and attached homes comprising the majority of the housing stock in Torrance (58.7 percent). The remaining share of homes in Torrance consists of multi-family units and mobile homes, which together accounted for approximately 41.3 percent of units.

Table H-29: Housing Unit Types

Housing Type	2010		2021	
	Number of Units	% of Total Units	Number of Units	% of Total Units
Single-Family				
Detached	30,688	52.6	30,744	52.5
Attached	3,638	6.2	3,666	6.3
Subtotal	34,326	58.8	34,410	58.7
Multi-Family				
2-4 units	3,647	6.2	3,680	6.3
5+ Units	19,269	33	19,383	33.1
Subtotal	22,916	39.3	23,063	39.4
Mobile homes	1,135	1.9	1,135	1.9
Total units	58,377	100	58,608	100
Vacancy rate		4.1%		4.7%

Source: State Department of Finance 2013 and 2021. Mobile home unit count was updated to reflect the number reported by HCD, 2022. <https://casas.hcd.ca.gov/casas/cmip/onlineQuery>

2.5.3-HOUSING AVAILABILITY AND TENURE

Household tenure, or the ratio between owner- and renter-occupied households, can be influenced by many factors, such as: housing cost (which is influenced by interest rates, economics, land supply, and development constraints), housing availability, income, employment structure, and consumer preference. As shown below in Table H-30, homeowners in Torrance (56%) outnumber renters (44%). In comparison to Los Angeles County, the percentages are reversed. In 2019, the County homeownership rate (at 45%) is considerably lower and the rental rate (at 55%) is higher than in Torrance.

Table H-30: Tenure Comparison

Occupied Units	2010		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Los Angeles County				
Owner	1,544,749	47.7	1,511,628	45.3
Renter	1,696,455	52.3	1,816,770	54.7
Total	3,241,204	100.0	3,328,398	100.0

Torrance				
Owner	31,599	58.9	30,419	55.9
Renter	22,049	41.1	24,018	44.1
Total	53,648	100.0	54,437	100.0

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

Table H-31 shows the average household size by tenure. In both 2010 and 2019, the average household size for renter-occupied households was slightly lower than that for owner-occupied households, with both average household size for owner-occupied households and renter-occupied households trending upward.

Table H-31: Household Size by Tenure (2010-2019)

Tenure	Average Household Size	
	2010	2019
Owner	2.70	2.75
Renter	2.42	2.52
Total	2.58	2.70

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Community Survey 2014-2019 estimates.

2.5.3.1 Vacancy Rate by Tenure

Vacancy rates are an important housing indicator because they demonstrate the degree of choice available. High vacancy rates usually indicate low demand and/or high supply conditions in the housing market. Too high of a vacancy rate can be difficult for owners trying to sell or rent. Low vacancy rates usually indicate high demand and/or low supply conditions in the housing market. Too low of a vacancy rate can force prices up, making it more difficult for low and moderate income households to find housing. Vacancy rates between two to three percent are usually considered healthy for single-family housing, while a vacancy rate of five to six percent for multi-family housing is considered healthy.


According to the American Community Survey (2014-2019 estimates), the city’s homeowner vacancy rate was 0.7 percent, and the rental vacancy rate was 2.5 percent, although the data does not explain what portion of the rental vacancy rate is for single family or multi-family housing. Both rates indicate housing choice is very limited in Torrance.

2.5.4-HOUSING AGE AND CONDITION

Generally, housing older than 30 years of age will require minor repairs and modernization improvements. Housing units over 50 years of age are more likely to require major rehabilitation, such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. After 70 years of age a unit is generally deemed to have exceeded its useful life without major repairs or renovations.

Figure H-2: Age of Torrance Housing Units

Housing Units by Year Structure Built



American Community Survey 2014-2018 5-year estimates.

The city of Torrance is characterized by older neighborhoods, many dating from the post-World War II era. Homes in Torrance are generally older than those of many communities in Los Angeles County. The time period where the highest share of Torrance’s housing units were built is 1950 – 1959, while in the SCAG region, more units were built during 1970 - 1979 than any other period. As shown in Figure H-2, the largest proportion of Torrance’s housing (37%) was built between 1950 and 1969, making it approximately 52 to 71 years old. Housing units of this age are more likely to require major rehabilitation and repairs. The city has few newer units, as more than 82 percent of the housing stock was built before 1970.

The ACS includes surveys about three factors of what may be considered substandard housing. Table H-32 shows the number of units in Torrance lacking telephone service, lacking plumbing facilities, and lacking complete kitchen facilities, and compares the overall percentages with the SCAG region.

Table H-32: Substandard Housing

	# of units	Torrance Percentage comparison	SCAG Percentage comparison
No Telephone Service Available	1,109	2.04%	1.95%
Lacking Plumbing Facilities	152	0.28%	0.39%
Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	1,075	1.98%	1.29%

Source: SCAG Pre-certified housing data, April 2021.

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Community Services Department (CC). HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department

(HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own. A total of 104 Torrance residents have received assistance between 2019 and 2021, averaging approximately 35 recipients/year. Recipients’ incomes range from approximately \$5,000/year to \$54,000/year with an average annual income of \$23,978.

Overall, the housing stock in the city is generally in very good condition. Presumably, homeowners with higher incomes, such as those in Torrance, make it a priority and can afford to repair and renovate when needed. The city has a strong history of individual homeowners redeveloping their properties, particularly in the Hillside areas, west Torrance, and central and southeast Torrance. Coupled with a history of property owners of both single-family and multi-family housing performing routine maintenance of homes and apartments throughout the city, there tends to be relatively low number of properties considered to be substandard. According to City staff, in 2018 and 2019 there were approximately 1,000 and 1,200 code compliance cases related to property maintenance issues, respectively. In 2020 the number of code compliance cases related to property maintenance issues increased to 1,905, although abatement

In the 5 years from 2017 through 2021, the City received a total of 1,762 residential property maintenance complaints, as shown in Table H-33. The annual numbers of complaints were consistently approximately 300, however that number jumped to 565 in 2021. City staff are of the opinion that the increased number of residential property complaints in 2021 was related to the pandemic, as residents spent more time at home. Likewise, commercial property complaints also rose considerably in 2020 and 2021, again likely attributable to the pandemic and residents spending more time in the community. Abatement of property maintenance issues has been difficult due to material and labor shortages related to the COVID-19 pandemic. As of September 2021, there are approximately 303 open code compliance cases related to property maintenance issues. Figures H-3 and H-4 show the locations of the residential and commercial property complaints spatially in the City.

Table H-33: Residential and Commercial Property Maintenance Complaints

Year	Residential	Commercial
2021	565	164
2020	307	242
2019	314	85
2018	276	104
2017	300	80
Total	1,762	675

Source: City of Torrance, 2022.

The City of Torrance’s Code Enforcement Unit recently audited their code enforcement cases for the last three years as well as conducted a windshield survey on the residential units to determine the percentage of dilapidate housing in need of repair/replacement. Torrance defines a “deteriorated or deteriorating” housing as one in which three or more of the deficiencies below are present.

1. Substandard housing, including illegal garage conversions and illegal additions.
2. Inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities.
3. An aging and obsolete housing unit.
4. Conditions resulting from a defect that normal maintenance cannot correct.

5. Vacant, condemned, or demolished property due to noncompliance with laws, ordinances or regulations.
6. Structures with creaks or holes in ceilings, walls, floors.
7. Broken or cracked plaster, peeling paint.
8. Rodent vermin infestation.
9. Inadequate heat or no heating.
10. Damaged roofing and broken windows.
11. Other equally significant building or environmental deficiencies.

Upon completion of the audit of the code enforcement cases along with the windshield survey, it is Staff's estimate that approximately three to four percent of Torrance housing is dilapidated and in need of some type of repair, while less than one percent is in need of replacement.

DRAFT

Figure H-3: Residential Property Complaints





Figure H-4: Commercial Property Complaints



2.5.5 HOUSING COST AND AFFORDABILITY

Housing costs vary widely from one community to the next, being affected by a range of factors. The type and style of homes, neighborhood characteristics, quality of schools and public services, crime rates, and access to employment opportunities are qualities that many home buyers consider when looking for a new home in a particular community.

Torrance’s attractive neighborhoods, tree-lined streets, low crime rate, and highly ranked school district are all factors that contribute to the high quality of life in the community. According to local realtors, the primary reasons cited by home buyers that relocate to Torrance are the high caliber of the local school district and the quality of homes in the community. These qualities make Torrance a highly desirable location for families with school-aged children.

2.5.5.1 Ownership Housing Costs

The city’s single-family housing prices are higher than several adjacent communities, but not the highest in the vicinity. According to SCAG data, median home prices in Torrance increased 147% between 2000 and 2018, while prices in the SCAG region increased 151 percent. As shown in Table H-43, the city’s median home price was approximately \$1,046,305 in September 2021. This is due to steeply rising home prices in the first half of 2021. This value is seasonally adjusted and only includes the middle price tier of homes. Home values in Torrance have risen approximately 18.5% in the 2020-2021 time period.

Table H-34: Home Prices

City/Community	Median Home Price	Distance from Torrance
Carson	\$703,554	3.7 miles
Redondo Beach	\$1,320,455	3.5 miles
Lomita	\$854,644	4.0 miles
Gardena	\$728,159	5.2 miles
Rolling Hills Estates	\$1,762,395	6.2 miles
Torrance	\$1,046,305	-

Source: Zillow, September 2021

2.5.5.2 Rental Housing Costs

According to the 2013-2019 ACS, the median contract rent was \$1,675 per month in Torrance, compared to \$1,614 for Los Angeles County. Approximately 34 homes/townhomes are available for rent as of September 2021 according to Zillow.com, and 75 apartments are listed for rent. At the same time as housing prices have increased, the price of rental listings has also increased over the ACS estimates, and indicate the following range and average (where several units are available in a single category) of rental rates as of September 2021:

- Studio apartment (2 available): \$1395 - \$1640
- One-bedroom apartment: \$1395 – \$2,150, average \$1,885
- Two-bedroom apartment: \$1,950 - \$3,000, average \$2,375

- Three-bedroom apartment (2 available): \$3,300 - \$3,4000
- Two-bedroom homes/townhomes: \$2,250 - \$3,199, average \$2,767.
- Three-bedroom homes/townhomes: \$2,795 - \$6,500, average \$4,515
- Four-bedroom house (3 available): \$3,750 - \$7,800
- Five-bedroom house (1 available): \$4,500

2.5.5.3 Housing Affordability by Income Level

The ability to afford a home is an important factor affecting the quality of life in a community. Housing affordability in Torrance can be determined by comparing the costs of owning or renting a home with the maximum amount which households with different income levels can afford to pay for housing. This information can reveal what type and size of housing is affordable in the community and what types of households will likely experience overcrowding and overpayment.

HUD conducts annual household income surveys nationwide to determine a household's eligibility for federal housing assistance. Based on this survey, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) developed income limits that can be used to determine the maximum price that could be affordable to households in the upper range of their respective income category. Households in the lower end of each category can afford less by comparison than those at the upper end. According to HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, as of 2017, the income distribution of Torrance's households was as follows (See Table H-410):

- Extremely Low income: 12%
- Very Low income: 21%
- Low income: 17%
- Moderate or Above Moderate income: 50%

The maximum affordable home and rental prices for residents in Los Angeles County are shown in Table H-35. This amount can be compared to current housing asking prices (Table H-34) and market rental rates (Section 2.5.5.2) to determine what types of housing opportunities a household can afford.

Extremely Low Income Households

Extremely low income households earn 30 percent or less of the County AMI, up to \$23,700 for a one-person household and up to \$36,550 for a five-person household in 2020. An extremely low income household can generally afford homes offered at prices between \$61,790 and \$86,953, adjusting for household size. After deductions for utilities, a one-person extremely low income household could afford to pay up to \$442 in rent per month and a five-person low income household could afford to pay as much as \$650. Extremely low income households cannot afford market-rate rental or ownership housing in Torrance without assuming a cost burden.

Very Low Income Households

Very low income households earn between 31 and 50 percent of the County AMI – up to \$39,450 for a one-person household and up to \$60,850 for a five-person household in 2020. A very low income household can generally afford homes offered at prices between \$129,241 and \$191,020, adjusting for

household size. Given the costs of ownership housing in Torrance, very low income households would not be able to afford a home in the city. Very low income renters would not be able to find affordable appropriately-sized market-rate rental units in Torrance without assuming a cost burden.

Low Income Households

Low-income households earn between 51 percent and 80 percent of the County AMI – up to \$63,100 for a one-person household and up to \$97,350 for a five-person household in 2020. The affordable home price for a low income household at the maximum income limit ranges from \$230,534 and \$347,334. Based on the average home sale price of \$1,046,305 in 2021 (Table H-2534), ownership housing would not be affordable to low income households. After deductions of utilities, a one-person low income household could afford to pay up to \$1,427 in rent per month and a five-person low income household could afford to pay as much as \$2,170. Based on current rental listings (Zillow, September 2021) one studio apartment was available in Torrance that would provide housing for a one-person low income household. The vast majority of low income households in Torrance would not be able to find adequately sized affordable apartment units without assuming a cost burden.

Moderate Income Households

Moderate-income households earn between 81 percent and 120 percent of the County AMI – up to \$100,150 depending on household size in 2020. The maximum affordable home price for a moderate income household is \$238,233 for a one-person household and \$359,325 for a five-person family. Moderate income households in Torrance are not able to afford adequately-sized homes for purchase. The maximum affordable rent payment for moderate income households is between \$1,472 and \$2,240 per month. Studio apartments (two available), one-bedroom apartments, and a few two-bedroom apartments would be affordable to moderate income households in this income group. Appropriately-sized market-rate rental apartments would not be affordable to most moderate income households in this income group, and no market-rate homes or townhomes would be affordable in this income group.

Table H-35: Housing Affordability by Income Group

Household (Persons)	Annual Income	Affordable Costs	Utilities	Taxes, Ins., HOA (Ownership)	Affordable Rent	Affordable Home Price
Extremely Low Income (0–30% AMI)						
1	\$23,700	\$593	\$151	\$207	\$442	\$61,790
2	\$27,050	\$676	\$166	\$237	\$510	\$72,096
3	\$30,450	\$761	\$190	\$266	\$571	\$80,244
4	\$33,800	\$845	\$223	\$296	\$622	\$86,069
5	\$36,550	\$914	\$264	\$320	\$650	\$86,953
Very Low Income (31–50% AMI)						
1	\$39,450	\$986	\$151	\$345	\$836	\$129,241
2	\$45,050	\$1,126	\$166	\$394	\$960	\$149,182
3	\$50,700	\$1,268	\$190	\$444	\$1,077	\$166,966
4	\$56,300	\$1,408	\$223	\$493	\$1,185	\$182,427

5	\$60,850	\$1,521	\$264	\$532	\$1,257	\$191,020
Low Income (51–80% AMI)						
1	\$63,100	\$1,578	\$151	\$552	\$1,427	\$230,524
2	\$72,100	\$1,803	\$166	\$631	\$1,637	\$265,026
3	\$81,100	\$2,028	\$190	\$710	\$1,837	\$297,157
4	\$90,100	\$2,253	\$223	\$788	\$2,030	\$327,179
5	\$97,350	\$2,434	\$264	\$852	\$2,170	\$347,334
Moderate Income (81–120% AMI)						
1	\$64,900	\$1,623	\$151	\$568	\$1,472	\$238,233
2	\$74,200	\$1,855	\$166	\$649	\$1,689	\$274,020
3	\$83,500	\$2,088	\$190	\$731	\$1,897	\$307,435
4	\$92,750	\$2,319	\$223	\$812	\$2,096	\$338,527
5	\$100,150	\$2,504	\$264	\$876	\$2,240	\$359,325

Assumptions: 2020 HCD income limits; 30 percent of gross income as affordable housing cost; 35 percent of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance in determining ownership housing affordable price; 10 percent down payment and 3.0 percent interest rate for 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan; utilities based on Los Angeles County Utility Allowance.

Sources:

1. State Department of Housing and Community Development 2020 Income Limits.
2. Veronica Tam and Associates, 2021.

2.6 AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TORRANCE

State law requires the City to identify, analyze and propose programs to preserve existing rental units that are currently restricted to lower income housing use and that will become unrestricted and possibly be lost as lower income housing (i.e., at-risk units). Although the CHPC identified two such rental housing units with expiring affordability covenants in the coming ten years, the Community Development Department at the City of Torrance received assurance from that they do not intend to convert from their current use.

2.6.1 PUBLIC HOUSING

The Torrance Housing Authority is a Section 8 only Housing Authority (HA). It does not own or operate public housing units. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. As of September 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed. The HA maintains a residence preference, which gives priority to households that live or work in the City, and priority is given to families, disabled persons, and seniors.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD’s VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

2.6.2 INVENTORY OF AT-RISK HOUSING UNITS

The City uses various funding sources, including Low/Moderate Housing Funds, HUD funding sources, and Section 8 rental assistance to preserve and increase the supply of affordable housing in Torrance through the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of renter-occupied units and the rehabilitation of owner-occupied units. Financial assistance is provided to both non-profit and for-profit housing developers. Table H-36 presents the inventory of affordable housing developments in Torrance. In 2021, 10 affordable rental housing projects were located in Torrance, providing ~~659~~669 affordable units to lower-income households.

Table H-36: Assisted Housing Developments

	Total Units	# of Affordable Units	Elderly	Non-Elderly	Funding Program	Year Built	Earliest Conversion Date
Federally Assisted Developments							
Golden West Towers 3510 Maricopa Street Torrance, CA 90503 (Senior Housing)	179	178	178	1	HUD Section 236 ; LIHTC; CalHFA	1973	2/28/2025 2058
JCI Gardens Community Housing Management Services 2000 W. 162nd Street Torrance, CA 90504	101	100	--	101	HUD Section 202	1982	7/7/2013— Organization renews annually no plans to convert 7/7/2033
Accessible Apartments 2 United Cerebral Palsy 22520 Ocean Avenue Torrance, CA 90505	13	12	--	13	HUD Section 202	1984	4/22/2013 Organization renews annually no plans to convert 5/1/2024, however the operator assured the City they do not intend to convert (see Appendix E)
Scalabrini House 22410 Evalyn Avenue Torrance, CA 90505	1unit/ 6 beds	1unit/ 6 beds	--	6	HUD PRAC 202/811	n/a	07/31/2012 2045

Table H-36: Assisted Housing Developments

	Total Units	# of Affordable Units	Elderly	Non-Elderly	Funding Program	Year Built	Earliest Conversion Date
Caribou House 4226 W. 231st Street Torrance, CA 90505	1unit/ 6 beds	1unit/ 6 beds	--	6	HUD PRAC 202/844	n/a	02/28/2013 2045
<u>Cabrillo Family Apartments</u> <u>1640 Cabrillo Ave.</u> <u>Torrance, CA 90501</u>	44	43	=	43	LIHTC	2015	2069
State Assisted Development							
Harmony Court Apartments 4494 196th Street 4502 186th Street Redondo Beach, CA 90278 (Senior housing)	187	185	HCD State Tax Credits 185	2	LIHTC	1996	2028 2026, however the _____ operator assured the City in writing that they do not intend to convert _____ (see Appendix F)
Former Redevelopment Agency							
Coleman Court 1421 Cravens Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	79	78	--	79	Housing Set-aside	1987	7/1/2041
Ocean Terrace 3851 W. 226th Street Torrance, CA 90505	36	35	--	36	Housing Set-aside	1988	7/1/2041
El Prado Apartments 1215 El Prado Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	26	26	--	26	Housing Set-aside	1993	7/1/2029
Brisas Del Sol (for sale units) 1201-1211 Cabrillo Avenue Torrance, CA 90501	33	33	--	33	Housing Set-aside	1993	12/31/2029
Total	666 710	659 702	363	346			

Source: City of Torrance, ~~2021~~2022, CHPC.

Several housing developments are age restricted to provide housing for Torrance’s senior population. Golden West Towers is a federally assisted 179-unit senior affordable housing project that was

originally funded with HUD 236 funds and is now financed through the HUD 542(c) program with a contract through ~~2025-2058~~.

Harmony Court Apartments is a state assisted 185-unit senior affordable housing project funded by HCD tax credits with a contract through ~~2028~~.

~~2026, whose operator has provided written assurance to the City that they do not intend to convert in the next 10 years (see Appendix F). JCI Gardens, built in 1982 with a federal Section 202 loan, has a 40-year low-income use restriction. The HUD affordability contract was renewed through July 2013, and the property remains held by a nonprofit organization that annually renews the contract.~~7, 2033.

The nonprofit United Cerebral Palsy Foundation developed the 13-unit Accessible Apartments 2 complex for people with disabilities using Section 202 funding and a 20-year Section 8 contract. ~~The United Cerebral Palsy Foundation renewed its HUD contract in 2013 and annually renews the contract.~~According to the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), this facility has a contract through May 1, 2024, however the operator has assured the City they do not intend to convert within the coming 10-year period (see Appendix F).

Two group homes for the elderly or disabled are included in the HUD Multifamily Assistance and Section 8 Contracts database. Both facilities consist of a single-family home with a six-bed capacity.

2.6.3 PRESERVATION OF AT-RISK HOUSING UNITS

State Housing Element law requires the analysis of government-subsidized multi-family housing that may change from low-income housing to market-rate housing during the next ten years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers the period from October 15, 2021, to October 15, 2031.

Over the next ten years (2021-2031), two subsidized multifamily developments which provide 197 affordable units have expired affordability covenants (Table H-35). Affordability covenants in Torrance include developments that are financed with Low/Moderate Housing set aside funds or federal programs (HUD 202, HUD 811, and HUD 542[c]) or State of California LIHTC's. Accessible Apartments 2 is owned and operated by a nonprofit organization (United Cerebral Palsy), whose operators have informed the City that they do not intend to convert to market rate units in the next 10 years. Harmony Court Apartments is a 187-unit senior affordable housing project offering 185 affordable units. The owners have stated to the City in writing that they do not intend to convert to market rate units during the next 10 years, so there is no risk of conversion for this project.

The El Prado Apartments are owned by the City of Torrance and will not convert when their contract expires in 2029. The contract for Brisas del Sol expires in 2029. Because this is a moderate-income, for-sale condominium complex of 33 units, the likelihood is high of these units converting. Nevertheless, ownership housing is not covered in the at-risk analysis. These ownership units are subject to resale provisions that either ensure the continued affordability of the units or recuperation of the funding for other affordable housing activities.

The City will continue to monitor the status of these at-risk units. Should a Notice of Intent to opt out of the Section 8 program be filed, the City will ensure that tenants are properly notified of their rights under California law.

Preservation and Replacement Options

To maintain the existing affordable housing stock, the City works to preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of units to non-profit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants using other funding sources; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units. Since the only at-risk units are for-sale units, and **HCD state law** does not require analysis of the loss of for-sale units, these options are not discussed in detail.

Transfer of Ownership: Long-term affordability of the units at risk can be secured by transferring ownership of these projects to non-profit housing organizations. However, Accessible Apartments 2 are already nonprofit owned, therefore, transferring ownership to a nonprofit organization applies only to Harmony Apartments. A search on LoopNet shows 14 rental properties for sale in the South Bay region, averaging about \$468,000 per unit. The at-risk units are smaller and older units in a larger complex than those are listed on sale and therefore likely to command lower market prices. Assuming \$400,000 per unit, transferring ownership or purchasing replacement units would require significant resources.³

Purchase of Affordability Covenant: Another option to preserve the affordability of at-risk projects is to provide an incentive package to the owners to maintain the project as low-income housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, and/or supplementing the Section 8 subsidy amount received to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the property is highly leveraged. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable.

Rent Subsidy: Tenant-based rent subsidies could be used to preserve the affordability of housing. Similar to Section 8 vouchers, the City through a variety of potential funding sources could provide assistance to very low income households. The level of the subsidy required to preserve the at-risk affordable housing is estimated to equal the Fair Market Rent for a unit minus the housing cost affordable by a very low income household. Table H-37 shows the rent subsidies required for both of the projects with at-risk units. As shown, subsidizing the very low income at-risk units would require approximately \$1,427,856 annually, an average of \$604 per unit per month.

Unit Size/Household Size	Number of Units	Fair Market Rent¹	Household Annual Income	Affordable Housing Cost³	Monthly per Unit Subsidy⁴	Total Monthly Subsidy
Very Low Income (50% AMI)²						
1 Bedroom/2-person household	197	\$1,604	\$47,650	\$1,000	\$604	\$119,988

³ At \$400,000 per unit, the cost to transfer ownership of Harmony Apartments is estimated at \$75 million. This figure represents a rough estimate for the purpose of illustrating the potential magnitude of costs, and cannot be used to determine the market value of the property.

Source: Veronica Tam and Associates, 2022.

Notes:

1. Fair Market Rent (FMR) is determined by HUD. These calculations use the 2022 HUD FMR for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Area.
2. Rents are restricted to 50% AMI, which puts residents in the Very Low Income Category, set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
3. The affordable housing cost is calculated based on 30% of the AMI, minus utilities for rentals.
4. The monthly subsidy covers the gap between the FMR and the affordable housing cost

Replacement Housing Cost: The cost of developing new housing depends on a variety of factors such as density, size of units, location and related land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average development cost of \$500,000 per unit for multifamily rental housing, replacement of the 197 at-risk units would require approximately \$98.5million.

DRAFT

3. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Governmental, market, infrastructure, and environmental factors may constrain the provision of adequate and affordable housing in a city. State law requires that Housing Elements analyze potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints to the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing for all persons of all income levels and disabilities. Should constraints preclude the achievement of housing goals, state Housing Element law requires jurisdictions to address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. This section addresses these potential constraints that affect the supply of housing in Torrance.

3.2 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Local government housing regulations are necessary to assure: (1) that housing is constructed and maintained in a safe manner, (2) that the density and design of housing is consistent with community standards, and (3) that adequate infrastructure to support new housing is provided. Local policies and regulations can also impact the price and availability of housing and, in particular, the provision of affordable housing. Land use controls, site improvement requirements, fees and exactions, permit processing procedures, and other factors may constrain the maintenance, development, and improvement of housing.

The City of Torrance has not adopted growth control measures or taken measures to reduce potential housing development. The City has acted to preserve existing high-density, multiple-family projects and provided development opportunities for a variety of housing types. Given the age and built-out condition of Torrance, the City has implemented an aggressive capital improvement program to upgrade infrastructure throughout the City.

Consistent with State law (Section 65583) this section addresses five potential constraints to housing development:

- Land use controls
- Building codes and their enforcement
- Site improvements (on and off-site)
- Fees and exactions
- Processing and permit procedures
- Housing for people with disabilities

3.2.1 LAND USE CONTROLS

The Land Use Element (2010) of the Torrance General Plan sets forth the policies which guide development in the city, while the zoning regulations (in Division 9 of the Torrance Municipal Code, or “Zoning Code”) serve to implement these policies. In Torrance, 50.5 percent of the land is designated for residential use in the Land Use Element. The vast majority of housing in the City is low-density,

single-family housing, (averaging approximately seven units per acre) which occupies approximately 4,000 acres, or approximately 38 percent of land area. The Land Use Element and Zoning Code also provide for mixed use development (residential uses in conjunction with commercial) in the three commercial land use designations, and in several commercial districts where appropriate.

The Land Use Element also includes “expected density” (used for residential designations) and “expected intensity” (used for nonresidential designations) for the purpose of estimating future development and population projections as provided for by the Land Use Element. This Housing Element update includes a program (Program 1) to utilize the expected densities as “target densities” to encourage residential development to occur at the expected density of the Land Use Element. The expected densities are included below and are described in greater detail in Sections 4 and 5, where they are proposed as target densities.

As shown in Table H-23 in Section 2 (Community Profile), the housing stock in Torrance has increased by only 231 units over the past decade (Department of Finance); nearly 64 percent of the new units were multi-family residential or part of a mixed use development, which demonstrates the lack of vacant land available for typical single-family residential subdivisions.

3.2.1.1 General Plan Land Use Element

The Land Use Element provides for five residential land use classifications, with allowable densities ranging from up to nine units per acre in low density areas to over 44 units per acre in the higher density multiple family designation, as described below. In addition, one land use category is intended for development of a mix of low intensity offices and residential units. Two commercial land use categories allow residential development in conjunction with office or retail uses. See Figure H-35 for the Land Use Map.

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-LO): The Low-Density Residential designation provides for the development of single-family residences within a density range of up to 9 dwelling units per acre, with an expected density of 6.8 dwelling units per acre. Development is characterized generally by detached single-family dwellings on individual lots forming a cohesive neighborhood.

LOW-MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-LM): The Low-Medium Density Residential designation provides for the development of small-lot single-family homes, duplexes, attached multi-unit developments, and mobile home parks within a density range of 9.1 to 18 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 13.5 dwelling units per acre.

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-MD): The Medium Density Residential designation allows townhouses and low-rise multi-unit buildings within a density range of 18.1 to 31 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 23.25 dwelling units per acre. The City plans to revise the density range by increasing the minimum density to 20 dwelling units per acre (Program 1), although the expected density will remain the same.


MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-MH): Residential development accommodated in the Medium-High Residential designation includes low- and medium-rise multi-unit attached developments. Residential development may occur within a density range of 31.1 to 44 dwelling units per acre, with an expected density of 33 dwelling units per acre. Areas in the City with an R-MH designation are appropriate for subterranean parking.

HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-HI): The High Density Residential designation accommodates multi-family housing, and specifically housing development of a more intensive form, including medium and high-rise apartment buildings with a minimum density of 44.1 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 45 dwelling units per acre. The R-HI designation is appropriate for senior and affordable housing.

RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (R-OF): The Residential Office designation permits the location of office and compatible commercial uses adjacent to residential uses. The designation is intended to accommodate neighborhoods where businesses and residential uses are gradually being combined. Residential-Office will provide opportunities for mixed-use residential and commercial developments as well as live-work arrangements. Professional offices are the most desirable office use in this designation. Housing can include low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots, with a density between 18.1 and 31 dwelling units per acre. The expected density is 23.35 dwelling units per acre. Developments that integrate residential and office or commercial on a single site require approval of a conditional use permit.

DRAFT

Figure H-5: General Plan Land Use Policy Map



3.2.1.2 Correlation Between General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning

Torrance is a charter city and is governed on the basis of a charter that establishes its powers and authorities, as contrasted with a general law city that enjoys only those powers specifically granted to it by the state. While general law cities are required by Section 65860 of the California Government Code to have zoning ordinances that are consistent with the General Plan, zoning ordinances in charter cities like Torrance are not required to be consistent with the General Plan. Nonetheless, the City strives to have a Zoning Code that is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs in the General Plan.

Table H-38 shows the correlation between the land use designations and zoning districts.


DRAFT

Table H-38: Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts Permitting Residential Uses

Land Use Designation/Density		Corresponding Zoning Districts/Densities	Typical Residential Types
R-LO	Low Density (0 - 9 du/acre; Expected density: 6.8 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-1 – Single-Family Residential (0 - 9 du/acre) ▪ A-1 – Light Agricultural District (1 SFR unit per lot) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detached single-family dwellings on individual lots forming a cohesive neighborhood, except as approved in P-D
R-LM	Low-Medium Density (9.1 - 18 du/acre; Expected density: 13.5 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-2 – Two Family District (2 du/lot) ▪ RTH – Residential Townhouse District (0 – 12 du/ac in developments of less than 5 acres; 0 – 15 du/ac in developments of 5 acres or more) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small-lot single-family homes, duplexes, attached multi-unit developments, and mobile home parks
R-MD	Medium Density (18.1 - 31 du/acre; Expected density: 23.5 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-3 – Limited multiple family residential district (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-R-3 – Restricted multiple family residential district (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-3-3 – Three-Unit Multiple-family Residential (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ R-P – Residential Professional (0 - 27 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use only in certain districts; density determined via CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Townhouses and low-rise multi-unit buildings
R-MH	Medium-High Density (31.1 - 44 du/acre; Expected density: 33 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-4 – Unlimited multiple family residence district (0 - 43 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use only in certain districts; density determined via CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low- and medium-rise multi-unit attached developments, often with subterranean parking
R-HI	High Density 44.1+ du/acre (Expected density: 45 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R-5 Highrise residential district ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (mixed use or multi-family in DA-1 & DA-2 districts; minimum density 27 du/ac w/ maximum density determined by CUP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-family housing, and specifically housing development of a more intensive form, including senior housing
R-OF	Residential Office 18.1 - 31 du/acre (Expected density: 23.25 du/ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L-P – Limited professional office district ▪ C-R – Restricted commercial district (Senior housing only) ▪ R-P – Residential Professional (0 - 27 du/ac) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots

Land Use Designation/Density		Corresponding Zoning Districts/Densities	Typical Residential Types
C-GEN	General Commercial (Density for mixed-use development governed by maximum 1.0 FAR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-1 – Retail commercial district (27 du/ac with a CUP) ▪ C-2 – General commercial district ▪ C-3 – Solely commercial district ▪ C-5 – Conditional commercial district ▪ C-R – Restricted commercial district (Senior MFR) ▪ P-D (Planned Development District*) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed-use development consisting of commercial and residential uses is permitted where appropriate
C-CTR	Commercial Center (Density for mixed-use development governed by FAR; maximum 1.0 FAR can be exceeded with CUP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C-4 – Shopping center district ▪ D-RMF – Downtown Residential Multiple Family District (0-43 du/ac) ▪ P-D – Planned Development District* ▪ HBCSP – Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed-use development consisting of commercial and residential uses is permitted where appropriate ▪ D-R District allows higher-density multiple-family residential development in the vicinity of Downtown Torrance

*The Planned Development (PD) District allows densities, unit types, and development standards to be customized as per an approved PD; therefore, densities can range across the residential spectrum.)



3.2.1.3 Zoning

The Planning and Land Use Code (commonly referred to as the Zoning Code) within the Torrance Municipal Code serves as the primary implementation tool for the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Whereas the Land Use Element is a policy document and sets forth direction for development decisions, the Zoning Code is a regulatory document that establishes specific standards for the use and development of all properties in the city, such as heights, parking, setbacks, and open space. The Zoning Map (see Figure H-46) depicts the zones that are referred to in the Zoning Code.

Zoning Districts


Single-family and two-family residences are permitted by right in most residential districts, and single-family residences are also permitted by right in the A-1 (light agricultural) district. The implementation of SB 9 (approved 2021, effective January 1, 2022) allows lot splits and two-unit residential development by right in some locations. The City has complied with SB 9 by adopting language into Section 92.29.34 of its Zoning Code in accordance with state law. Multiple-family residences are permitted by right in many residential districts and are also allowed with a Conditional Use Permit in a number of commercial districts. A conditional use permit is required for projects that exceed established development standards (with a floor-area ratio [FAR] above 0.65 and higher than two stories for the R-2 zone, and for projects with a FAR above 0.60 and higher than two stories for the R-3 zone). Multiple owner-occupied residential structures are subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit, as are multiple family residential developments of more than three stories in height (i.e., in excess of established development standards) or more than 100 units.

Planning Commission review is required of projects in the R-4, Unlimited Multiple Family Residential District, where a maximum density of 43 units per acre is allowed; and in the R-5, High Rise Residential District, for which there is no density limit. Due to the almost built-out nature of the City, a 100-unit development is not common, and the impacts on long-established neighborhoods are a concern to the City. As such, the purpose of a discretionary permit is not to discourage new development, but to ensure that it is well designed and fits into the context of surrounding residential development within the zoning district, and to ensure adequate public review of and input on all land uses which could potentially impact the community, as well as to ensure adequate review.

Staff records indicate that most development (including multiple owner-occupied residential structures and other types of multi-family developments that exceed development standards) have been approved with close City coordination with applicants in the pre-application process. This process ensures that proposed developments fit into the context of surrounding residential development within the zoning district. As further evidence that this requirement is not a constraint to development, the majority of residential units built, approved, or under construction in the City have been multiple -family developments. Demand for residential development remains high in South Bay in general and in Torrance in particular.

The Downtown Residential Multiple-Family District (R-MF) was created to implement the Commercial Center General Plan designation and provide for more housing opportunities, especially multi-family developments, in the Downtown area. The Residential Multiple Family District was created to allow multi-family residential development in the former the Industrial Redevelopment Project Area. A Conditional Use Permit is required for all development within these zones to ensure conformance with these goals.

Figure H-6: Zoning Map



Other zoning districts allow for originality and flexibility in design. The Planned Development (P-D) District allows for development standards to be tailored to individual projects of five acres or more as proposed by the developer, subject to Planning Commission and City Council review. Density is determined by General Plan designation. A significant amount of new residential development in recent years has occurred by planned development, including attached townhouse projects, and detached single-family homes. The Residential Townhouse (RTH) District allows for clustered development at 15 units per acre on properties with a minimum area of five acres or 12 units per acres on less than five acres.

General Residential Development Standards

The City of Torrance regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development in order to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents, as well as implement the policies of the General Plan. The City’s Zoning Code establishes development standards for lot size and area, yards and setbacks, lot coverage, building height, parking, and minimum unit size. Development standards for housing are established by the Zoning Code. The development standards summarized in Table H-39 include the most pertinent development standards development standards outside of the Hawthorne Blvd Corridor specific Plan in Torrance. These regulations can have an effect on the ability of property owners to construct and maintain housing.

Table H-39: Residential Development Standards¹

Development Standards	R-1 1 story	R-1 2 story	R-2	RTH	R-P	R-3	R-R-3	R-3-3	R-4	R-5	RD
Minimum Lot size	6000 sf	6000 sf	6000 sf	none	6000 sf	6000 sf	none	6000 sf	6000 sf	1 acre	15,000 sf
Setbacks											
Front yard	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	none	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft	15 ft
Side yard (interior)	10% of lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% of lot width, and 3-5 ft	Min. 15’ between 1-story buildings and 20’ between 2+ story buildings	3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	10% lot width, and 3-5 ft	30 ft	5 ft
Side Yard (street)	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	none	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	30 ft	10 ft
Rear Yard	15 ft	20 ft	10 ft	none	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	10 ft	30 ft	10 ft
Building Height	18 ft	27 ft	27 ft	35 ft	18/27 ft	35 ft	35 ft	35 ft	50 ft	per Building Code	35 ft
Lot Coverage	50%	40%	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	none
Minimum Lot Depth	80 ft	80 ft	80 ft	none	80 ft	80 ft	none	80 ft	80 ft	200 ft	none
Lot Width (interior)	50 ft	50 ft	50 ft	none	50 ft	50 ft	none	50 ft	50 ft	200 ft	none
Lot Width (exterior)	60 ft	60 ft	60 ft	none	60 ft	60 ft	none	60 ft	60 ft	200 ft	None
Minimum Dwelling Size ²	700-1450	700-1450	none	700 sf - 1350 sf	none	none	1400 SF	none	none	700 sf, 500 sf if studio	none

Table H-39: Residential Development Standards¹

Development Standards	R-1 1 story	R-1 2 story	R-2	RTH	R-P	R-3	R-R-3	R-3-3	R-4	R-5	RD
Maximum Density/floor area ratio	0.6:1	0.6:1	0.65:1	12-15 du/ acre	1 du/ 1600 sf	1 du/ 1600 sf, 0.6:1 FAR, 1.0 FAR for 3-7 units, 1.25 FAR for 8- 10 units	1 du/ 1600 sf	1 du/ 1600 sf, 0.6:1 FAR, & only 3 du/lot	1 du/ 1000 sf	0.13:1 to 3.12:1	1 du/ 1000 sf

Source: City of Torrance Municipal Code

¹ Per Land Use Code Sec. 95.3.28, condominium development can exceed development standards with a CUP.

² The Land Use Code (Sections 92.20.3 and 92.20.4) govern minimum dwelling unit sizes for single-family, two-family (R-2) and multiple-family units

The Zoning Code also regulates minimum unit size for single-family, two-family, and multiple-family residential units. Minimum unit size is based on the number of bedrooms, as per Table H-40. Establishing a minimum unit size can constrain the maximum density allowed, especially for lower and moderate income developments and can limit the flexibility a developer has to respond to a wide variety of resident preferences. Program 3 proposes to examine development standards in the Zoning Code to reduce constraints, including minimum unit size.

Table H-40: Minimum Unit Size

Number of bedrooms	Single-family dwellings	Two-family dwellings	Multiple-family dwellings
Bachelor or single	n/a	n/a	450 sf
One-bedroom	700 sf	700 sf	700 sf
Two-bedroom	900 sf	900 sf	900 sf.
Three-bedroom	1,200 sf	1,200 sf	1,200 sf
Four-bedroom	1,450 sf	n/a	n/a

Parking Standards

City parking standards for residential developments are tailored to the vehicle ownership patterns associated with different residential uses. The Zoning Code requires parking based on the number of units on the property. Parking requirements for residential uses are listed in Table H-41. For single family developments, the Zoning Code requires two parking spaces within an enclosed garage. Multi-family residential requirements vary based on the number of bedrooms in each unit, and also require guest parking.

Table H-41: Parking Requirements

Use	Required Parking Spaces
Single-family home	2 spaces in an enclosed garage
Flag Lot	2 spaces in an enclosed garage + 1 uncovered guest space
Duplex	4 spaces in an enclosed garage per lot
Multiple-family dwelling units	
2 bedrooms or less	2 spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and 1 guest parking space for each 5 dwelling units or portion thereof
3 or more bedrooms	3 spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and 1 guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof
Mobile home park	2 spaces per individual site
Boarding/lodging	2 spaces plus 1 space for each guest room or 1 space for each 150 square feet of sleeping area, whichever is greater, enclosed in garage.
Community residential care facility	1 space per 3 beds
Senior citizens housing	1 space per unit and 1 additional visitor parking space for each 5 dwelling units
ADUs	1 space per unit

Source: Torrance Municipal Code, 2021

Parking requirements for residential uses are closely associated with the actual demand for parking generated by the particular development. Multiple-family units with two or fewer bedrooms require two spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and one guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof. Multiple-family units with three or more bedrooms require three spaces per unit (1.5 in enclosed garage) and one guest parking space for each five dwelling units or portion thereof. To offset the additional parking space in the 3+ bedroom developments, the City allows two of the three spaces to be provided as tandem parking. The guest parking space requirement of one space per five units for all multiple family developments is very low and comparable to other cities in the area.

However, parking space requirements are reduced for uses that have lower parking needs, such as senior housing and special needs housing. To facilitate equal access to housing for special needs groups, such as seniors and the disabled, the Zoning Code provides for a variety of parking space reductions. Parking requirements are more moderate for senior housing, with only one space required per unit and one guest space for every five units. Community residential care facilities require only one space for every three beds. Reduced parking can also be applied to affordable residential developments through the density bonus provisions. At the request of the applicant and pursuant to compliance with state density bonus law, the City can permit an alternative parking ratio and other parking incentives. The City’s density bonus provisions provide for the granting of at least one regulatory concession, including but not limited to, a reduction in setback requirements or reduction in the requirement of parking spaces. For newer mixed-use developments, the City has allowed the required guest parking and commercial parking to overlap, instead of requiring separate parking for each. Several developments in Downtown Torrance (including affordable units) have no on-site parking or reduced parking.

Input received from market-rate and affordable developers as part of the stakeholder outreach conducted for the Housing Element update indicate that the City’s existing parking standards for multiple-family and mixed use projects are a constraint to development, reducing the maximum density that can be realized and negatively impacting development costs. For example, costs

associated with structured parking are significantly higher than surface parking. The City's policy has been to require parking standards at this rate to assure certain quality standards for multiple-family housing and to ensure spillover parking does not negatively impact existing single-family residential neighborhoods. The City offers flexibility in parking such as tandem parking, reduced parking for senior and special needs housing, and parking incentives for affordable developments in order to reduce housing cost. However, in response to developer input, the City will be considering reduced parking standards for new residential and mixed use development along corridors that have been identified for new infill housing in the Sites Inventory (see Section 4), including implementation of the Housing Corridor Study and the Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (Program 3).

Open Space Standards

To improve the living environment of residential neighborhoods, communities typically require housing to have a certain amount of open space, such as yards, common space, and landscaping. In Torrance, open space is reflected in setbacks and lot coverage requirements, as well as open space ratios. For single-family homes in the R-1 and R-2 districts, one third of the lot area must be reserved for open space.

Zones R-P, R-3, R-R-3, and R-3-3 all require half of one square foot to be set aside for every one square foot of dwelling developed, but the open space need not exceed 600 square feet for each dwelling unit. At least 50 percent of this open space must be provided as usable private open space and must therefore be directly accessible from the dwelling unit. Front yards and enclosed areas designated for recreational purposes can contribute to a maximum of 25 percent of the open space requirement.

In the RTH and R-4 zones, a standard amount of open space is required for each dwelling unit—1,000 square feet per dwelling unit and 300 square feet per dwelling unit, respectively. In the RTH zone, both common and private open space must be provided, in proportions to be determined by the applicant. The R-4 zone allows roof decks to contribute up to one-third of the required open space, and enclosed areas for recreation may contribute one-quarter of the required space.

The High Rise Residential District (R-5) requires open space based on the number of stories in the development. For buildings with a small number of stories, the open space requirement is proportionately higher, starting at 6.0 square feet of open space per 1.0 square foot of floor area. A thirteen story building is required to have an open space ratio of 0.40, and a 24 story building requires 0.26 square feet of open space for each square foot of floor area.

In the Downtown Residential Multiple-Family District, open space is required dependent on the size of the dwelling unit. For units less than 900 square feet, 250 square feet of open space are required. For units between 901 and 1449 square feet, 500 square feet of open space are required. For units with a total living area of more than 1450 square feet, 750 square feet of open space is required. There is no minimum requirement for private open space.

Input received from market-rate and affordable developers as part of stakeholder outreach indicates that the City's open space standards for multiple-family and mixed use projects are a constraint to development because they reduce the maximum density that can be realized and negatively impact development costs. The City will be reevaluating its open space standards to reduce constraints (see Program 3).

Overlay Districts

Hillside and Local Coastal Overlay District

The Hillside and Local Coastal Overlay District in the City of Torrance consists of 104 acres of land, which lie west of Palos Verdes Boulevard, north of the City of Palos Verdes Estates and Rolling Hills Estates, and south of the City of Redondo Beach. A portion of the Overlay District in the southwest part of the district, adjacent to the City of Palos Verdes Estates, is within the Coastal Zone. The Coastal Zone area is almost entirely developed with well-established and well-maintained residential properties, both multi-family and single-family dwellings. The balance of the Coastal Zone encompasses 13.3 acres of Public Use (beach and parkland) and 3.5 acres of Commercial Center designated properties.

Development regulations within the Overlay District restrict lot coverage to 50 percent and building heights to one story and 14 feet. Development within the Coastal Zone is subject to further regulations in accordance with the Coastal Act. Within the Overlay District, there is a design review process that is performed either at an administrative level or before the Planning Commission, depending on certain criteria. The overall intent of the design review process is not to preclude new housing development, but to afford protection of views, light, air corridors, and privacy and to address hillside construction and safety issues.

Torrance Tract Overlay District

Within the Torrance Tract Overlay District, Planning Commission review is required for most development, with the exception of minor repairs and maintenance, or low-density residential development. New development must conform with the character of the neighborhood and provide adequate parking and storage. There is a recently adopted historic preservation ordinance that covers the Torrance Tract area.

Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District

Within the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District special development criteria are imposed in the interest of protecting existing homes in an area of small and narrow lots (typically 5,000 square feet and 40 feet wide). In order to address the problem of designing accessible parking on narrow width lots, parking standards are more flexible, allowing the fourth required parking spaces to be uncovered or in tandem configuration with Planning Commission review. Because existing homes are older and relatively small, especially when compared to new homes, they are comparatively less expensive than homes elsewhere in the City.

Commercial/Residential Transition Overlay District

The Commercial/Residential Transition Overlay District applies to properties on the west side of Ashley Avenue between the public alley south of 182nd Street and 186th Street. Underlying zoning is either R-2 Two Family Residential District, or HBCSP Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan District. Parcels of land zoned R-2 remain subject to the provisions of that district, until the Torrance Planning Commission approves a change to a commercial parking lot. At this point, the underlying zoning of the subject parcel will automatically change from R-2 to HBCSP. Parcels of land located east of the alley and zoned HBCSP must be used exclusively as parking lots in support of those parcels of land located on the west and/or north side of the alley.

Providing for a Variety of Housing Types

The Land Use Element and Zoning Code contain the policies and basic standards that allow for the development of a variety of housing types. The Torrance Zoning Code accommodates the widest range of housing, from single-family residential to high-density residential units, as well as special needs housing. Table H-42 lists the allowed location of specific uses. To better facilitate the understanding of housing types permitted in zones in the city, a matrix of approved uses in residential zones will be incorporated into the Land Use Code (Program 11).

DRAFT

Table H-42: Permitted Uses in Land Use Code

Residential Use	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-R-3	R-4	R-P	R-5	L-P	R-3-3	A-1	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-R	M-1	M-2	M-L	P-1	P-U	HMD	R-TH	R-D
Single Family Residence	P	P	P		P	P	C		P	P	C	C											P	P
Multi-family Residential Uses																								
Two Family Residence		P	P	P	P	P			P		C	C												P
Flat building, apartment house, bachelor apartment			P	P	P	P			P		C	C												
Bungalow court or garage apartment			P		P	P					C	C												
Multiple Family Residence							P				C	C	C		C									C
Multiple owner-occupied residential structures		C	C	C	C	C	C		C		C	C	C		C									
Senior Citizen Housing			C	C	C	C	C	C		C	C	C	C	C	C	C						C	C	C
Supplemental Housing for the Elderly	C	C	C	C	C		C		C	C													C	
Trailer Parks	C	C	C	C	C	C					C	C					C	C						
Residential Care Facilities	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*		P*	P*	P*												P*	P*
Rest homes, convalescent homes, guest homes, homes for the aged			C	C	P	P					P	P	P		P							P		
Emergency Shelters																		P						
Long-term facility for the chronic mentally ill, Institutions for the treatment of alcoholics, Mental hygiene home					C	C					C		C	C	C							C		

Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan

The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (Specific Plan), adopted in July 1996, was developed to guide municipal and private actions within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor to spur development, increase the City's retail tax base, and provide for the maintenance and beautification of the City's major commercial corridor. The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also allows residential development on select sites along the corridor. Allowable densities vary, with an unlimited maximum density on certain sites of 40+ units per acre within the H-DA-1 Sub-District.

The Specific Plan provides for seven eight land use sub-districts along Hawthorne Boulevard: the North Torrance Sub-District (H-NT), Promenade Sub-District (H-PR), Del Amo Business Sub-District One (H-DA-1), Del Amo Business Sub-District Two (H-DA-2), Meadow Park Sub-District (H-MP), the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway Intersection Area Sub-District (H/PCH), H/PCH, the Hospital/Medical (H-HMD) Sub-District, and the Walteria Sub-District (WH-WI). Each of these sub-districts has a list of uses that are permitted by right and related development standards. Mixed-use developments that incorporate residential units are conditionally permitted in all sub-districts, excluding the H/PCH sub-district and HMD Sub-Districts. In addition, both stand-alone multi-family residential development (with a density of at least 27 units/acre) and stand-alone senior citizen housing developments are conditionally permitted in the DA-1 and DA-2 zones. The Specific Plan provides opportunities for potential housing along the entire Hawthorne Boulevard corridor, as identified in the Sites Inventory. The City proposes to amend the Specific Plan to further increase opportunities for housing by allowing residential development in the H/PCH and HMD districts Sub-Districts (Program 1).

During a stakeholder meeting, developers and architects noted that existing development standards in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts of the HBCSP were constraints to mixed-use development—they include a 100-foot setback from Hawthorne Boulevard for residential portions of mixed-use projects, and a requirement for at least 30 percent of the floor area of the development be commercial. The lack of development in these three sub-districts, compared with several mixed-use projects that have been constructed and/or proposed in the Walteria Sub-District and a pipeline project in the H-DA-2 Sub-District, indicate that the identified standards may be constraining the development of mixed-use projects in the three identified sub-districts. Both identified standards, as well as others, including FAR, will be reviewed under Program 3.

Mixed-Use Development

Mixed-use development, specifically the integration of residential and commercial uses, is a familiar housing concept in Torrance. Since the City's inception, Downtown Torrance has incorporated mixed-use in the traditional style of residential living area above ground-floor commercial uses.

The General Plan Land Use Element identifies mixed-use development as a viable opportunity in Torrance as "...a way to incorporate a mix of housing on a small scale while enhancing the aesthetic character of commercial areas." The Land Use Element includes an objective and policies to facilitate its development, but currently proposes a case-by-case approach. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, the Sites Inventory includes new opportunities for mixed-use development on a variety of sites. This will require an update to the City's mixed-use policies in the Land Use Element and revisions to the Zoning Code and Zoning Map for implementation.

The General Plan Land Use Policy Map provides opportunity for new mixed-use development in three commercial land use designations while preserving neighborhoods where mixing of uses has already occurred. The General Commercial (C-GEN) designation encourages commercial and office or residential mixed-use developments by allowing a higher intensity of development (1.0 FAR), compared with solely commercial uses.⁴

In neighborhoods where office/business and residential uses are already gradually being combined, the Residential-Office (R-OF) land use designation allows the location of small, less-intense mixed use development adjacent to single-family neighborhoods. Residential-Office housing can include low- to medium-rise apartments or townhouses and condominiums on smaller lots. Developments that integrate residential and office uses within one structure currently require some form of discretionary review, such as a Conditional Use Permit. The Sites Inventory includes many sites that are located in the R-OF land use designation. The Residential Professional District (R-P), which implements the R-OF land use designation, allows various combinations of residential and commercial uses. Mixed use development within one building requires a Conditional Use Permit. The amendment of the R-OF land use designation and R-P zone are proposed (Program 1) to allow stand-alone residential uses in addition to the existing mixed use projects via a ministerial permit, and the Zoning Code will be amended to include new objective design standards and modifications to existing the development standards to facilitate multiple-family and mixed use residential development while mitigating impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

The Commercial Center (C-CTR) designation applies to areas with a concentration of diverse or intense commercial uses. Mixed-use commercial and residential uses are permitted within this designation. Mixed use development is encouraged by allowing the maximum FAR of 1.0 to be exceeded with a Conditional Use Permit for mixed use projects.

In the former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area (DRP), densities are based on unit size. Development with units with living areas less than 700 square feet in size are allowed a density of 43 units per acre. Development with units with living areas between 700 and 1,500 square feet and over 1,500 square feet are allowed densities of 27 and 21 units per acre respectively. Senior Housing is permitted at 58 units per acre. These density parameters are exclusive of density bonuses allowed under State law. Based on development trends in Downtown Torrance, more recent developments have averaged densities of about 52 units per acre.

Also, as noted above, the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also provides for mixed-use development and the City is proposing an expansion of mixed use in other Specific Plan districts.

Accessory Dwelling Units

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is an attached or detached residential unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more people. A Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) is an ADU contained entirely within a single-family residence. Recent state legislation, including AB 68, AB 881, AB 587, AB 671, and SB 13, modified the way local jurisdiction are allowed to regulate ADUs and JADUs. This legislation promotes the construction of new ADUs and JADUs and limits the ways cities can regulate their design. Under current state law, no lot coverage, floor area ratio, open space, or

⁴ Solely commercial developments will be limited to 0.6 FAR.

minimum lot size can preclude the construction of a “statewide exemption ADU,” which is an ADU with an area up to 800 square feet, height up to 16 feet, and 4-foot side and rear yard setbacks. The City recently updated its ADU regulations to comply with these changes.

ADU and JADUs are permitted within Designated Areas and Limited Designated Areas identified in the Municipal Code, on lots located within zones that permit residential uses by right or by conditional use, and that contain an existing or proposed single-family dwelling or accessory structure. Accessory dwelling units are subject to the provisions of the Torrance Municipal Code, except for any provisions that do not allow a statewide exemption ADU. Accessory dwelling units required by state law are allowed on any lots located within a residential or mixed-use zone as provided in Section 65852.2(e) of the Government Code. The City will maintain its ADU ordinance to remain in compliance with state law (Program 6).

Multi-Family Housing

Multi-family housing is permitted by right in most residential zones in Torrance. Two-family units are permitted in the R-2, R-3, R-R-3, R-3-3, R-4, R-5, RTH, and R-P zones. Apartment houses are permitted in all residential zones, with the exception of the R-1 and R-2 zones. In addition, residential uses are conditionally permitted in the C-1 and C-2 zones, allowing convenient access to transportation and commercial activities to persons living in the commercial zones. Larger multi-family structures are allowed in both the R-4 and R-5 zones, permitting buildings up to 50 feet in height in the R-4 zone, and up to 24 stories and an FAR of 3.12 in the R-5 zone.

Senior Citizen Housing

Senior citizen housing (multi-family housing units that are restricted to persons 55 years or older and that meet the state and federal requirements for senior housing) is conditionally permitted in all residential and commercial zones in the City, with the exception of the R-1 and R-2 zones, which do not permit multi-family housing. The Torrance Municipal Code permits senior citizen housing at a density of 58 dwelling units per acre. The City has established development standards for senior citizen housing related to minimum unit size and open space requirements. Two hundred square feet of open space is required for each dwelling unit, which is generally less than the amount required as a standard residential condition. Further, the City encourages ancillary uses such as laundry, recreation, central cooking facilities, and a small pharmacy be provided on site to serve the residents’ needs, especially those with limited mobility. In order to further facilitate housing for this special needs group, the City has reduced parking requirements for senior housing to 1 parking space per dwelling unit.

The Torrance Land Use Code currently includes a provision allowing for conversion of existing detached single-family residences into supplemental housing for the elderly (Section 95.30.40), subject to a conditional use permit. The single family residence to which the supplemental residence unit is added must be owner occupied, and the residence must be occupied by no more than two persons, one of whom is related to the owner occupant of the primary residence, and one of whom must be at least 60 years old. This is a hold-over from the existing Zoning Code that inadvertently was not deleted when the ADU ordinance was updated. The City will delete this provision as part of the update to the Zoning Code that is identified in Program 6.

Residential Care Facilities

The Zoning Code defines residential care facilities as those facilities that are licensed by the state to provide 24-hour residential care to persons in need of personal services, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of the individual, excluding jails and other facilities. Such facilities may provide nursing, dietary and other personal services, but not surgery or other primary medical treatments such as are customarily provided in convalescent facilities or hospitals. This classification includes retirement homes. Consistent with state law, the City facilitates the development of small residential care facilities by treating licensed facilities that serve six or fewer persons as regular residential uses. The City permits large residential care facilities serving more than six persons in all residential zones subject to approval of a large family day care permit. Although a ministerial permit, state law now requires large family day care to be treated the same as small family day care, allowed as a permitted use with no differentiation between it and any other permitted residential use. The City has not adopted a spacing requirement for residential care facilities. The City will revise the Zoning Code to ensure consistency with state law (Program 11).

Emergency Shelters and Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Emergency shelters are defined facilities that provide immediate and short-term housing and supplemental service, such as food, counseling, and access to other social programs, to persons or families experiencing homelessness. According to the 2020 Homeless Count in Los Angeles County, the total unhoused population in Torrance was 332, with 270 of these unsheltered. State law requires emergency shelters to be permitted by right in at least one zone within a city, and that the zone provide sufficient capacity to accommodate this population.

Emergency shelters are permitted by right in the M-2 district. The M-2 zone encompasses 2,273 acres and is comprised of a variety of industrial uses. Specific uses range from refineries to office buildings and accessory commercial uses. The heaviest industrial uses are related to oil refinery operations. However, the majority of land zoned for M-2 is outside of refinery operations. The Torrance Municipal Airport is also located in the M-2 zone. Combined, the refineries and the airport comprise less than half (940 acres) of the M-2 zone. The remaining acreage is defined by lower intensity industrial uses and accessory commercial uses. This area (exclusive of the airport and refineries), approximately 1,333 acres, is substantial in size.

According to the research that was conducted for development of the City’s emergency shelter ordinance, the average lot size in the M-2 zone outside of refinery operations is two to four acres. There are four identified vacant parcels located in the M-2 zone ranging in size from one to 23 acres, with an average size of 9.7 acres. Opportunities for homeless shelter siting also exists in developments that can accommodate tenants in large, ready-to-occupy spaces that would be appropriate for reuse as a homeless shelter. There are no minimum setbacks or maximum lot coverage requirements in the M-2 zone, and building heights are determined based on Building Code requirements.

The area is well served by major regional transportation as the City’s industrial areas are adjacent to or very near major regional corridors. Based on the amount of available industrial land, vacant properties, range of lot sizes available, and opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, the zone has sufficient capacity to accommodate the identified homeless need in at least one year-round shelter, and there are no development standards that constrain the creation of an emergency shelter in the M-2 zone.

Emergency shelters may also be treated as a hotel or motel use based on the character of development, and as such are conditionally permitted in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones.

AB 101 requires jurisdictions to allow a Low Barrier Navigation Center development of up to 50 units by right in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones permitting multi-family uses if the development meets specified requirements. The City may also choose to allow larger Low Barrier Navigation Center developments by right in these zones. A “Low Barrier Navigation Center” is defined 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.” The Housing Plan includes Program 11, to maintain the emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law and to adopt a low barrier navigation center ordinance as required by state law.

Supportive Housing

California Government Code Section 65582 defines supportive housing as housing with no limits on the length of stay that is occupied by a “target population” and links this population with the provision of housing and social services. “Target population” means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.

State law requires supportive housing to be defined as a residential use and subject only to the same regulations as comparable residential uses. Supportive housing is not subject to any regulations beyond what is required for other residential uses in the same zone.

AB 2162 further requires supportive housing projects of 50 units or fewer to be permitted by right in zones where multi-family and mixed-use developments are permitted, when the development meets certain conditions. The City may choose to allow larger supportive housing projects by right in these zones. The bill also prohibits minimum parking requirements for supportive housing within ½ mile of public transit. Program 11 includes an action to update the Zoning Code to explicitly allow supportive housing consistent with state law.

Transitional Housing

Transitional housing provides longer term housing (up to two years), coupled with supportive services such as job training and counseling to individuals and families who are transitioning to permanent housing. State law requires transitional housing to be defined as a residential use and subject only to the same regulations as comparable residential uses.

The Torrance Land Use Code does not currently reference transitional housing directly. Siting for transitional housing is based on the character of development (residential, commercial, etc.), not the population these developments serve. Consistent with State law, small transitional housing serving six or fewer people is considered a single-family residential use and permitted in all zones where residential uses are permitted. Transitional housing for more than seven people and operated as a

residential care facility is permitted in both the R-P and R-4 zones. Transitional housing that functions as a regular multi-family use (such as apartments) is permitted where multi-family uses are permitted. Program 11 includes an action to update the Zoning Code to explicitly allow transitional housing consistent with state law.

Transitional housing may also be treated as a hotel or motel use based on the character of development, and as such are conditionally permitted in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones.

Single Room Occupancy Facilities

Single-room occupancy (SRO) buildings house people in single rooms with tenants often sharing bathrooms and kitchens. SROs are conditionally permitted as hotels or motels in the General Commercial (C-2), Solely Commercial (C-3), and Conditional Commercial (C-5) zones of the City. Several SROs are located within the City including one in Downtown area that is part of a mixed-use development. The private property owners have undertaken several rehabilitation projects to preserve and improve existing SRO units.

Manufactured and Mobile Homes

Manufactured housing is permitted by right on all lots which permit single family houses, pursuant to State law. Mobile homes and mobile home parks developments (termed trailer court and trailer parks in the Torrance Land Use Code) are conditionally permitted in the R-1, R-2, R-3, R-R-3, R-4, R-P, C-1, and C-2 zones. In addition, mobile homes developments can be permitted as a temporary use in the M-1 and M-2 zones.

Farmworker and Employee Housing

As indicated in the Community Profile, there are only 129 Torrance residents that held “Agriculture, Mining” occupations, according to the 2014-2018 U.S. Census American Community Survey estimate. These persons are most likely employed in plant nurseries, landscaping, or gardening companies, as City records indicate that there are no agricultural operations in Torrance. However, the City does permit agricultural uses, including flower and vegetable gardens, orchards, the raising of tree crops, berry or bush crops, for the purpose of propagation, culture, or wholesaling, in many zones, including:

- Light Agricultural (A-1)
- Single Family Residential (R-1)
- Two Family Residential (R-2)
- Limited Multiple Family Residential (R-3)
- Three Unit Multiple Family Residential (R-3-3)
- Unlimited Multiple Family Residential (R-4)
- Residential Professional (R-P)
- Residential Townhome (RTH)

In addition, orchards are permitted to locate within the C-1 and C-2 zones. Very little land in the City is zoned A-1, limited to the Southern California Edison Easement and a portion of vacant land in the southern hillside region. For any agricultural uses in the City, the City will comply with the State Employee Housing Act (Section 17000 of the Health and Safety Code) that allows employee/farmworker housing in zones allowing agricultural uses. [The City will update the zoning](#)

code to clarify that employee and farmworker housing must be allowed in accordance with state law (Program 11)

Density Bonus

Consistent with State law (SB 1818), developers in Torrance can receive density bonuses of 20 to 35 percent, depending on the amount and type of affordable housing provided, and "concessions^{11, 12}" exceptions from normally applicable zoning and other development standards. The State density bonus provisions have not been incorporated into the City’s Land Use Code; however, the City will adopt a density bonus ordinance in compliance with state law (Program 5). Although the City does not have a density bonus ordinance, cities are still required to comply with state law (Table H-43). For example, state density bonus provisions were applied to a 44-unit affordable, mixed-use, workforce housing development in Downtown Torrance. The development provides 43 units affordable to very low and low income households. Additionally, developers Additionally, one pipeline project has been submitted that proposes utilizing the State density bonus to provide units for low-income households. Developers of several potential projects are currently discussing utilization of the density bonus with City staff, although the projects have not yet been submitted.

Table H-43: Density Bonus Opportunities

Group	Minimum % of Units	Bonus Granted	Additional Bonus for Each 1% Increase in Target Units	% Target Units Required for Maximum 35% Bonus
Very Low-Income	5%	20%	2.5%	11%
Low-Income	10%	20%	1.5%	20%
Moderate Income (Condo or PUD Only)	10%	5%	1%	40%
Senior Citizen Housing Development	100%	20%	--	--

Developers may seek a waiver or modification of development standards that have the effect of precluding the construction of a housing development meeting the density bonus criteria. The developer must show that the waiver or modification is necessary to make the housing units economically feasible.

State density bonus regulations also include incentives and concessions. A developer can receive an incentive or concession based on the proportion of affordable units for target groups. Incentives or concessions may include, but are not limited to, a reduction in setback and square footage requirements and a reduction in the ratio of vehicular parking spaces that would otherwise be required that results in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions.

Short term rentals

Short Term Rentals (STRs) are defined as the rental of any residence, or portion thereof within a legally permitted residential structure which is occupied or intended or designed for occupancy, for a period of 30 consecutive calendar days or less. The City adopted a short term rental ordinance in 2019, which allows STRs to be permitted in the vast majority of the City, including the Coastal Zone. In 2020, the

California Coastal Commission approved local regulation of short term rentals in the Coastal Zone, and in May 2021 the City Council adopted amendments to the STR ordinance. The City’s ordinance differentiates between commercial and residential zones, as follows:

- Commercial Zones: STRs are permitted in residences with or without a host living onsite.
- Residential Zones: STRs are permitted in residences solely as a home share with a host living onsite. In STRs located within a multifamily residence, the following standards apply:
 - Only one unit per every 30 residential units within a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental per lot or parcel of land located in a commercial or residential zone.
 - In the Torrance Coastal Overlay, within residential zones all residential units located in a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental, and within commercial zones only one unit per every 30 residential units located in a multifamily residence shall be allowed to operate as a short-term rental per lot or parcel of land.

Requirements include: approval of an STR permit; the limitation of one short term rental period, reservation, booking, or stay by guests per residence; a minimum of one off-street parking space for the STR, in addition to the required parking for the residence; and compliance with a variety of citywide policies, programs, and standards, such the City’s Noise Ordinance, Municipal Collection of Solid Waste Ordinance, and Property Maintenance Ordinance. In the summer of 2021, the City started an enforcement program to bring existing STRs into compliance with City standards and approval procedures.

3.2.2 BUILDING CODES AND ENFORCEMENT

The City of Torrance has adopted the 2019 California Building Code (CBC), which establishes standards and requires inspections at various stages of construction to ensure code compliance. The City’s building code also requires new residential construction to comply with the federal American Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, which specifies that a minimum percentage of dwelling units in new developments must be fully accessible to the physically disabled. Amendments to the CBC have been related to administrative procedures, fire safety requirements, and geological standards. While the incorporation of these measures may raise housing construction costs, these standards are necessary to provide access to homes for people with disabilities and to ensure a safe living environment for the community. Further, the CBC is adopted by many cities throughout California and does not, in general, pose a constraint to residential development.

The City uses a building code and a Land Use (zoning) code enforcement program to help maintain the quality of residential neighborhoods. The Environmental Section of the Community Development Department is responsible for the enforcement of City zoning and land use codes, property maintenance and nuisance codes (both community noise and airport noise codes) and the Building Division is responsible for the enforcement of unpermitted buildings. The program allows residents to report conditions in their neighborhoods. Code enforcement staff will generally respond by making a site inspection to determine if there is a violation and if there is, notice will be given to the resident

that explains what needs to be done to correct the violation. While assessing the complaint, the City will also do a cursory inspection of the immediate area.

The Torrance Municipal Code sets the standards for enforcement, and the Environmental Section uses education, enforcement, and dispute mediation to ensure that these standards are maintained. The Code includes property maintenance, nuisance abatement, and vacant building/lot ordinances (Sections 92.32.1, 92.35.1, and 92.38.1) that establish standards of home and property maintenance practices and provide a legal basis for enforcement of the ordinance by code enforcement staff. The ordinances require property owners to keep their housing units in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

The City had two home rehabilitation programs in place to assist homeowners and property owners. The Low-Interest Home Rehabilitation Loan Program and the No-Interest Home Rehabilitation Deferred Loan Program were available to qualified homeowners and owners of rental property to rehabilitate dwelling units in need of repair. Due to loss of redevelopment funding, these programs are being phased out.

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Workforce Investment Network Partners. HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own.

3.2.3 ON- AND OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Site improvements are a necessary component of the new development process. Improvements include the laying of sewer, water, and streets to serve the new development. Most residential areas in Torrance are served with existing infrastructure due to the built-out nature of the City. For new residential development, additions to existing residences, or residential conversions, the following site improvements are typically required: resident and guest parking, paved vehicular and pedestrian circulation areas, private and common open space, landscaping, trash enclosure, and private storage areas. Required street widths vary depending on the category of street on which the development is located.

Right-of-way standards are consistent with those established by the General Plan:

- Local Residential Street – 34'-40' (street width only, exclusive of sidewalks and parkways)
- Collector Street – 40'-60' (street width only, exclusive of sidewalks and parkways)
- Minor Arterial Street – 66'-74' (street width only, includes median parkway)
- Major Arterial Street – 70'-82' (street width only, includes median parkway)

Site Improvements for Residential Developments:

- Parking
- Open space, private and common
- Trash enclosure
- Landscaping and perimeter walls
- Pedestrian access from sidewalk to entry
- Personal storage areas
- Exterior lighting
- Stormwater drainage facilities
- Fire suppression apparatus and fire exits
- Water pressure apparatus – related to fire safety and water quality
- ADA accessibility requirements
- Service utilities, sidewalk, and property lighting – more common for larger developments
- Necessary Sewer Improvements – staff experience indicates that this is more common for larger developments and due to the infill nature of development in Torrance is not as common.
- Necessary street and traffic enhancements– this is more prevalent in commercial development and very large residential developments.
- Curb, gutter, sidewalk facilities
- Alley and alley drain reconstruction – applies to developments with alleys.

In Torrance, improvements required of new developments are mostly related to basic site function that allow for use/habitation and address health and safety considerations. The City provides flexibility in many cases. In cases where site improvements pose a hardship and or a request is made for a modification, City staff can work with the applicant to identify alternatives to satisfying the improvement requirement in the pre-application or plan check process. The City provides greater flexibility on improvements not directly related to safety and health issues (fire, basic site necessities such as utility connections).

Developments using the State density bonus provisions may benefit from the concession/incentive requirements of SB 1818 that require localities to offer up to three concessions/incentives (including incentive or concession proposed by either party that results in an “identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions”⁵) based on the percentage of targeted units.

3.2.4 FEES AND EXACTIONS

The City of Torrance charges planning and development fees to process and review permits for residential developments. These application and development review fees help offset the cost of processing a particular type of case (see Table H-44). The City’s fees have been calculated to recoup City costs associated with review and approval of proposed projects while not unduly constraining the financial feasibility and development of market rate and affordable housing. Fees charged in Torrance are, in general, comparable to those of surrounding communities in Los Angeles County. A survey of

⁵ Gov. Code § 65915

neighboring jurisdictions (Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Manhattan Beach) indicates that permit fees in Torrance are average for the three neighboring jurisdictions, and slightly higher for General Plan amendments, zone changes, and variances (see Table H-45).

Multiple family developments not requiring any discretionary approval (which do not exceed established development standards) would not be subject to any planning fees and would only be subject to applicable building permit, plan check, and inspection fees which are based on project valuation (approximately \$8,816 in fees for building permit and plan check on a development with a \$400,000 value plus an energy fee and a handicap fee at \$2,112 each), in addition to development impact fees normally associated with residential construction (effective July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021).

Table H-44: Planning Permit Application Fees

Permit Type	Base Fee	Fee for Multiple Filing	Notification Fee	Engineering Mapping Fee
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Tier 1 ¹	\$5,704	\$2,852	\$439	\$78
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Tier 2 ²	\$16,283	\$8,141	\$439	\$78
Development Permit (DVP)	\$5,289	\$2,645	\$439	---
Division of Lot (DIV)	\$3,681	\$1,840	\$439	\$78 per lot
Environmental Assessment (EAS)	\$11,213	---	\$439	---
General Plan Amendment (GPA)	\$10,189	\$7,642	\$439	---
Modification of CUP, PRE, PCR, DVP (MOD)	\$5,801	\$2,901	\$439	---
Planned Development (PD)	\$13,114	\$9,835	\$439	---
Planning Commission Review (PCR)	\$4,631	\$2,316	\$439	\$78
Precise Plan of Development (PRE)	\$5,411	\$2,706	\$439	\$78
Tentative Tract Map (TTM)	\$8,190	\$4,095	\$439	\$78 per lot
Validation Permit (VAL)	\$7,898	---	\$439	---
Variance (VAR)	\$10,871	\$8,153	\$439	---
Waiver (WAV)	\$2,803	\$1,402	---	---
Zone Change (ZON)	\$11,749	\$8,812	\$439	---

Source: City of Torrance, 2021

¹CUP Tier 1: use changes, 7 or fewer residential units, less than 15,000 SF of Commercial or Industrial space

²CUP Tier 2: 8 or more residential units, 15,000 SF or greater Commercial or Industrial space

Table H-45: Comparison of Residential Permit Application Fees to Surrounding Cities

Fee	Torrance	Redondo Beach	Hermosa Beach	Manhattan Beach
Conditional Use Permit (CUP)	\$5,157 (Tier 1 ¹) - \$14,236 (Tier 2 ²)	\$3,055	\$5,070	\$8,393
Variance	\$10,992	\$3,060	\$3,907	\$8,421
Zoning Map Amendment	\$10,411	\$5,7655	\$4,226	\$20,000
Tract or Parcel Map	\$7,408	\$1,530-\$2,370	\$4,879	\$1,301-\$4,074

Table H-45: Comparison of Residential Permit Application Fees to Surrounding Cities

Fee	Torrance	Redondo Beach	Hermosa Beach	Manhattan Beach
-----	----------	---------------	---------------	-----------------

Source: City of Torrance (2019), City of Redondo Beach (2021); City of Hermosa Beach (2020); City of Manhattan Beach (2020)

*Indicates deposit amount

¹CUP Tier 1: use changes, 7 or fewer residential units, less than 15,000 SF of Commercial or Industrial space

²CUP Tier 2: 8 or more residential units, 15,000 SF or greater Commercial or Industrial space

As with most other jurisdictions, the City also charges impact fees to ensure that services and infrastructure are in place to cover the cost of added services required by new residential development. Although impact fees and requirements for offsite improvements add to the cost of housing, these fees and requirements are necessary to maintain the quality of life within a community.

Torrance’s impact fees include (see Table H-46):

- Dwelling Unit Fee (established by the City in 1989 and adjusted periodically according to the Consumer Price Index);
- Parks and Recreation Facilities Fee (established by the City in 1975 for the acquisition, improvement and expansion of public park, playground and/or recreation facilities); and
- Torrance Unified School District Fees.
- Development Impact Fee (adopted in 2005 and updated in 2020 with a phased-in adjustment (70%, 85%, 100%) over next 5 years)

Los Angeles County provides sewer to the City and charges a separate sewer connection fee.

The fees are intended to provide funds to recoup the cost of providing infrastructure and services to the developments, while not unduly constraining the feasibility of both market-rate and affordable housing.

Table H-46: 2021 Torrance Impact Fees

Impact Fees	Single Family (assumes 1,800 sf du)	Multi-Family (assumes 1,000 sf du)
Dwelling Unit Fee	\$1,665	\$1,665
Park & Recreation Fee	\$550	\$550
School Fees	\$7,344	\$4,080
Development Impact Fee (FY 2020/2021)	\$6,224.40	\$5,290.60
Torrance Subtotal:	\$9,559	\$6,295
LA Co. Sewer Connection Fee	\$1,910/unit	\$1,146/unit
Total:	\$11,469	\$7,441

Source: City of Torrance, 2021

Development impact fees charged in Torrance are comparable to, and even less than, those of surrounding communities in Los Angeles County. Due to differences in the types of fees charged in other jurisdictions, an exact comparison can be difficult to make. However, Redondo Beach reports development impact fees of \$15,000 for a typical single-family residence (excluding Quimby fees) and \$18,000 per unit (excluding Quimby fees) for a typical multi-family unit (source: 2021-2029 Redondo Beach Draft Housing Element). The City of Gardena reports development impact fees of \$13,450 for a

typical single-family unit and \$13,650 for a typical multi-family unit (source: 2021-2029 Gardena Draft Housing Element). The reasonable costs of development impact fees in the City are not considered a deterrent to development in Torrance as they are also lower than neighboring cities.

The City Council has the discretion to waive a portion or all of the permit application fees for a project. The Community Development Director also has some discretion in waiving building permit fees and development impact fees. Staff records indicate that the City has deferred developer-responsible improvements to help with project feasibility. As part of Program 3, the City will evaluate reducing permit fees to lower development costs, particularly fees for Tier 2 Conditional Use Permits.

3.2.5 PROCESSING AND PERMIT PROCEDURES

The development review process is an important tool that helps ensure that new housing meets all necessary health and safety codes and is supplied with all necessary utilities and infrastructure. Yet, the development review process can also constrain opportunities for the development of lower income housing, particularly through the indirect cost of time in the process and the direct cost in fees.

The Community Development Department is the lead agency in processing residential development applications, and as appropriate, coordinates the processing of these applications with other City departments and agencies. The City uses various development permits to ensure quality housing while minimizing the costs associated with lengthy reviews and provides a procedural guide to facilitate the submittal process.

SB 330 requires jurisdictions to allow developers to submit a preliminary application for residential development projects in advance of submitting a full application. The preliminary application includes a limited amount of information about the proposed development. If a preliminary application is deemed complete, the City may not modify fees or development standards for the project subsequently, provided there are no significant changes to the proposed project. The developer must submit a full application for the project within 180 days from the date that the preliminary application is deemed complete. The City does not have a preliminary application form available. The City will use HCD's standard Preliminary Application Form for residential development projects, and modify if necessary to address any local requirements (Program 3).

Development processing times for residential projects vary according to the complexity of the proposal but are relatively short and expeditious due to streamlined procedures (see Table H-47 for typical time frames). Single-family homes generally are allowed ministerially (by right) and simply require a building permit. This is true as well for rental duplexes or multiple-family projects that ~~meet specified development standards. For sale multiple-family housing, and two-unit or multiple family housing that exceed certain development thresholds require Planning Commission review.~~ comply with development standards for their zone.

For-sale multiple-family housing, two-unit or multiple-family housing that exceed development thresholds for height and FAR, residential uses within commercial zones, senior citizen housing require a discretionary Conditional Use Permit. Conditional Use Permits are approved by the Planning Commission and may be appealed to the City Council. Most residential uses within the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan require a discretionary Development Permit. Development Permits are

approved by the Planning Commission and may be appealed to the City Council. Minor Development Permits, used for minor expansions and alternations of existing uses are approved by the Planning Director and may be appealed to the Planning Commission. A public hearing is required for Planning Commission approval.

To be approved, the following findings are required for Conditional Use Permits:

1. The proposed use is one conditionally permitted within the subject zoning district, complies with all the applicable provisions of this Division and any applicable Specific Plan or Redevelopment Plan, complies with any conditions imposed on the property on which the use is proposed to be located, and any Code violations are abated. This paragraph shall not be interpreted to impose new requirements on legal nonconforming uses and structures under Article 22 of Chapter 2 of this Division;
2. The proposed use will not impair the integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located;
3. The subject site is physically suitable for the type of land use being proposed;
4. The proposed use is compatible with the land use presently on the subject property if there is more than one (1) land use on the property;
5. The proposed use will be compatible with existing and proposed future land uses within the zoning district and the general area in which the proposed use is to be located;
6. The proposed use will encourage and be consistent with the orderly development of the City as provided for in the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan or Redevelopment Plan;
7. The proposed use will not discourage the appropriate existing or planned future use of surrounding property or tenancies;
8. There will be adequate provisions for water, sanitation, and public utilities and services to ensure that the proposed development is not detrimental to public health and safety;
9. There will be adequate provisions for public access to serve the proposed use;
10. The proposed location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or welfare, or to the property of persons located in the area;
11. The proposed use will not produce any or all of the following results:
 - A) Damage or nuisance from noise, smoke, odor, dust or vibration,
 - B) Hazard from explosion, contamination or fire,
 - C) Hazard occasioned by unusual volume or character of traffic or the congregating of large numbers of people or vehicles;

Guidance on projects that require discretionary ~~review~~ development permits is provided through established development standards and design guidelines in City documents. For example, developers of projects within the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan area that trigger discretionary review can refer to the City’s Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan, which includes clearly written and detailed standards and guidelines. These standards and guidelines provide developers a comprehensive template for designing their projects to ensure maximum compatibility in the design stage, before an

application is formally submitted to the City and subject to further review. Designs of projects within the parameters of established specific plans, standards and other guidelines, help ease the review process and reduce processing time.

From submittal to Planning Commission hearing, a subdivision request (Tract Map or Parcel Map) takes on average 3 months. Other zoning entitlements required for the project are processed concurrently with the subdivision request. A project that requires CEQA review, Variance, Zone Change, or General Plan Amendment generally adds about four to six weeks to the process. Additionally, while Building Permits generally take four to six weeks to process, applicants have the option to pay an expedited plan check fee which can significantly reduce processing time.

Table H-47: Development Review Time Frames

Application	Estimated Processing Time
Conditional Use Permit	3 months
Planning Commission Review	3 months
Waiver	3 months
Variance	3 - 4 months
Parcel Map or Tract Map	3 months
Zoning Map Amendment	4-6 months
General Plan Amendment	4-6 months
Environmental Review	4-6 months
Building Permit	Varies

Source: City of Torrance Staff, 2021

Processing times may be substantially longer if an environmental impact report (EIR) is required for a project. However, processing time relative to environmental review has been reduced substantially in recent years. Combined environmental and project review has shortened the review process on average by two months.

The average length of time between receiving approval of a housing development and submittal of application for the building permit is approximately seven months for projects consisting of six or fewer units and 11 months for projects consisting of more than six units.

3.2.6 STREAMLINING PROGRAMS

The City offers a number of services designed specifically to assist property owners/developers/investors with many key services with the goal of expediting the development of affordable housing units.

- **One Stop Permit Center**

The City offers a single place for property owners/developers/investors to submit and coordinate projects and plan checks to ensure efficient and effective service and support from Building and Safety, Planning, and Engineering personnel.

- **Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Mapping**

The City has created applications for viewing and investigating zoning, land use policy, subdivision activity, aerial imagery, and many other features pertaining to land use within the

City of Torrance. These applications can be found at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/gis-and-mapping> and are a great resource in the planning and development of a project.

- **Preliminary Plan Review**

Torrance is committed to a good start for every project, and that begins with offering preliminary plan review service for projects in early development phase. At no charge, electronic plans are submitted directly to the Planning Division for in-house review and comment by all City Departments.

- **Lower Cost of Doing Business**

Torrance has a longstanding reputation for being business friendly, and that means having the lowest permit fees in the South Bay region. The cost of doing business is less in Torrance, and less means more for business. Torrance has an easy to interpret cost schedule (<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/fee-schedule/-fsiteid-1>), which aids in the planning and budgeting of a project.

- **Permit Streamlining**

Torrance operates a streamlined permit and plan check process that offers quick turnaround times and excellent customer service. Plans are submitted at the one-stop Permit Center through a single point of contact, Building & Safety Division, thus eliminating multiple plan submittals.

Additionally, our public patrons can view live updates at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/building/building-permits> on the current wait time within the Permit Center to find the best time to visit.

- **Expedited Plan Review**

The expedited plan review service is provided at the request of the applicant and approved by an authorized staff member. In order to obtain expedited plan review, the owner or the owner's agent must request expedited review and submit a complete set of plans and documents, required clearances from other agencies, and pay a surcharge of 60% above regular plan review fee upon first submittal. The plans are placed under expedited plan review queue and initial plan review service is 10 working days from first plan submittal date. Expedited plan review is for the Building Division only. Planning and Engineering turnaround times are based on regular turnaround times.

- **Next Day Inspections**

Torrance has an easy to use scheduling system for next day inspections. All inspections are scheduled through a single point of contact, Building & Safety Division, thus avoiding schedule conflicts and unnecessary delays.

- **Online Citizen Portal**

Torrance has developed a Building and Safety Division Records Search Portal that allows our public patrons to search for the following:

- [Active Building Permits- provides information regarding active Building and Safety permits.](#)
- [Permit Records- grants access to scanned Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Grading, Sign, and Engineering permit records.](#)
- [Property Information- provides information regarding parcel profile attributes such as zoning, special overlay areas \(Hillside, Expansive Soils, etc\), assessor parcel number, year built, legal description, and more.](#)

[The Building and Safety Division Records Search Portal can be found at https://www.torranceca.gov/services/community-development/properties-permits-and-records-search#!/](https://www.torranceca.gov/services/community-development/properties-permits-and-records-search#!/)

[The City will continue to offer these programs and, as noted in various programs in the Housing Plan, will seek input from homeowners and developers as to how streamlining can be improved and will update and/or add new programs as appropriate.](#)

3.2.7 TRANSPARENCY IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

[To increase transparency and certainty in the development application process as required by law, the City has links to its zoning and development standards and fee schedule posted on its website. Links to the zoning maps can be found here:](#)

- <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/gis-and-mapping/map-gallery>

[Links to development standards and allowed uses can be found here:](#)

- <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Torrance/>

[Fee schedules can be found here:](#)

- <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/fee-schedule>

3.2.8 COASTAL ZONE DEVELOPMENT

Torrance has approximately 123 acres of property that is within the Coastal Zone and is subject to oversight by the California Coastal Commission (see Figure H-57). The City has not completed a Local Coastal Plan; as a result, for properties located in the Coastal Zone, projects must first go through the local planning process at the city (such as Minor Hillside Exemptions, Precise Plans, and CUPs if needed). Once acted on at the City, the applicant then has to apply at the Coastal Commission for any process the project may be subject to. Once approved by the Coastal Commission, applicants can go through plan check at the City and obtain building permits.

California Government Code Section 65588(c) requires each periodic revision of the Housing Element to include the following information relating to housing in the Coastal Zone: a) the number of new housing units approved for construction within the Coastal Zone since January 1, 1982; b) the number of housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income required to be provided in new housing developments either within the Coastal Zone or within three miles of the Coastal Zone as a replacement for the conversion or demolition of existing coastal units occupied by low or moderate income persons; c) the number of existing residential units occupied by persons and families of low or moderate income that have been authorized to be demolished or converted since January 1, 1982 in the coastal zone; and d) the number of residential units for persons and families of low or moderate income that have been required for replacement units.

The majority of residential areas in the coastal zone are single family in nature and very stable (limited development activity). Since 1982, 58 new residential units have been constructed in the Coastal Zone. Since 2013, no new units have been constructed. An existing 12-unit multiple-family unit was approved to be replaced with a new 8-unit building; however, building permits have yet to be issued. None of the units involved were affordable to low- and moderate-income households and are not subject to the replacement requirements. Program 16 ensures compliance with the Coastal Zone as it relates to replacement housing of units occupied by low- and moderate- income households. The City has no formal inclusionary housing policy for the coastal area. However, as part of the City's Housing Plan for this 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will be adding a Religious Institution Overlay to various properties throughout the City to facilitate (but not require) development of affordable housing on properties owned by religious institutions, including several properties within the R-H Overlay Zone (Program 7).

Figure H-7: Coastal Zone Map



3.2.9 HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Pursuant to State law, Torrance permits state-licensed residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons in all of its residential zoning districts by right. Currently the City requires a Large Family Day Care Permit in all its residential zones, which is not consistent with SB 234, which became effective on January 1, 2020. The City will revise the Zoning Code to permit large family day care uses in all residential zones as required by state law (Program 11).

Several housing types for persons with various disabilities require a CUP in certain residential and commercial zones. Many of the existing uses that are permitted either ministerially or with discretionary review via a CUP are outdated and do not reflect all the types of uses that provide appropriate housing for persons with disabilities. Although the CUP requirement is no more stringent than for other conditional uses, the City will review its current uses and permit requirements to include and reflect a broader range of uses and to facilitate housing for persons with disabilities (Program 11).

The City has adopted the 2019 California Building Code. Standards within the Code include provisions to ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities. These standards are consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act. No local amendments that would constrain accessibility or increase the cost of housing for persons with disabilities have been adopted. To accommodate disabled persons in public facilities, the City defers to Title 24 of the California Handicap Accessibility Code.

The redefinition of “family” may limit access to housing for persons with disabilities when municipalities narrowly define the word, illegally limiting the development of group homes for persons with disabilities, but not for housing similar sized and situated families. The definition of “Family” was removed from the Torrance Municipal Code to eliminate any potential limitations on development, to implement Program 12 of the 5th Cycle Housing Element.

3.2.10 REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

The Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, requires that cities and counties provide reasonable accommodation to rules, policies, practices, and procedures where such accommodation may be necessary to afford individuals with disabilities equal housing opportunities. While fair housing laws intend that all people have equal access to housing, the law also recognizes that people with disabilities may need extra tools to achieve equality. Reasonable accommodation is one of the tools intended to further housing opportunities for people with disabilities. For developers and providers of housing for people with disabilities who are often confronted with siting or use restrictions, reasonable accommodation provides a means of requesting from the local government flexibility in the application of land use and zoning regulations or, in some instances, even a waiver of certain restrictions or requirements because it is necessary to achieve equal access to housing. Cities and counties are required to consider requests for accommodations related to housing for people with disabilities and provide the accommodation when it is determined to be “reasonable” based on fair housing laws and the case law interpreting the statutes.

State law allows for a statutorily based four-part analysis to be used in evaluating requests for reasonable accommodation related to land use and zoning matters and can be incorporated into reasonable accommodation procedures. This analysis gives great weight to furthering the housing

needs of people with disabilities and also considers the impact or effect of providing the requested accommodation on the City and its overall zoning scheme. Developers and providers of housing for people with disabilities must be ready to address each element of the following four-part analysis:

- The housing that is the subject of the request for reasonable accommodation is for people with disabilities as defined in federal or state fair housing laws;
- The reasonable accommodation requested is necessary to make specific housing available to people with disabilities who are protected under fair housing laws;
- The requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the local government; and
- The requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the local zoning code.

The City has adopted a procedure to allow requests for reasonable accommodation using a simple form available at the public counter or by request. Requests for reasonable accommodation may not be appealed by residents of adjacent properties. During the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will adopt an ordinance in the Zoning Code to formalize the City’s existing procedure (Program 15).

3.2.11 DISSOLUTION OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN CALIFORNIA

The City of Torrance had a Redevelopment Agency with a total of four redevelopment project areas, including Meadow Park Project Area, Skypark Project Area, the Downtown Project Area, and the Industrial Project Area. As a result of passage of ABX1 26 (known as the “Dissolution Act”) in 2011 as a part of the state budget, all Redevelopment Agencies in the state were dissolved. As part of this dissolution, Redevelopment Agencies were required to establish Successor Agencies, which would be charged with handling any outstanding debts and winding down the activities of the former Redevelopment Agencies, under the direction of the Oversight Board. The City of Torrance has been established as the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Torrance.

Redevelopment was a tax increment financing tool that allowed cities and counties to retain a higher share of the growth in property taxes in designated “blighted” areas to invest in those areas to remediate blight. Over 400 cities and counties in the state used this tool before 1979. Since 1994, Redevelopment projects were required to allocate 20 percent of all tax increment (known as housing set-aside funds) for affordable housing in the community. The Torrance Redevelopment Agency used its set-aside funds to produce a total of 702 affordable units. The state’s dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies has had a profound effect on the quantity and complexity of affordable housing development in the State. On a statewide level, over two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) was lost annually for affordable housing due to this change in state law. Despite state legislative efforts to replace Redevelopment with Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and Community Revitalization and Investment Areas, these financing tools generate a tiny fraction of the local funding that Redevelopment did previously, which is the reason that only a few Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and no Community Revitalization and Investment Areas have been adopted over the last 10 years.

The state has not provided an adequate replacement for affordable housing funding available under Redevelopment and the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment has resulted in a significant loss of funding that the Torrance Redevelopment Agency previously used to construct and rehabilitate affordable housing in the city.

3.2.12 OTHER REGULATORY CHALLENGES THAT PRESENT BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Complying with State regulations and energy standards, greenhouse gas reduction requirements, and other environmental conditions help to preserve the environment—however, they add to development costs.
- Prevailing wages, a federal and state legal requirement for publicly funded projects, can add 13–20 percent to hard construction costs. These additional costs are added to already-high construction and materials costs and can push an affordable housing project to be financially infeasible.

3.2.13 REDUCTIONS TO CONSTRAINTS

Land use and development standards, fees, and permitting schedules can constrain residential development in Torrance. In particular, required minimum unit sizes, the number and type of required off-street parking spaces, the amount of required open space, the mix and density of allowed uses, restrictions on accessory dwellings and housing for populations with special needs, setbacks, density bonuses, and permit fees will be evaluated and modified to encourage residential development as identified in Section 5.2 (Housing Program). Section 5.2 also identifies revisions that will be made to the Zoning Code to implement state-mandated residential development processes and procures, such as SB 330, AB 1397, and others.

The City also provides a comprehensive streamlining program to facilitate the development process—see Section 3.2.6 for an overview—see also see Program 3.10. Additionally, many programs identified in Section 5 include methods to provide information and technical assistance to property owners and developers to help them navigate the City’s development process, with the intent to reduce constraints to development.

3.3 NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Many factors that relate to housing costs are related to the larger housing market in general. Land costs, construction costs, and labor costs all contribute to the cost of housing and can hinder the production of affordable housing. Additionally, the availability of financing can limit access to homeownership for some low-income households. Market-related constraints are part of regional and national trends related to housing, over which local jurisdictions have little to no control.

3.3.1 CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Construction costs for housing can vary significantly, depending on the type of housing, such as single-family, townhomes, and apartments. However, even within a particular building type, construction costs vary by unit size and amenities. ~~One factor~~ One indicator of construction costs is Building Valuation Data compiled by the International Code Council (ICC). The unit costs compiled by the ICC include structural, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical work, in addition to interior finish and normal site preparation. The data are national and do not take into account regional differences, nor include the price of the land upon which the building is built. In 2021, according to the latest Building Valuation Data release, the national average for development costs per square foot for apartments and single-family homes in 2021 are as follows:

- Type I or II, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$157.74 to \$179.04 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$120.47 to \$125.18 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-3 Residential One and Two Family Dwelling: \$130.58 to \$138.79 per sq. ft.
- R-4 Residential Care/Assisted Living Facilities generally range between \$152.25 to \$211.58 per sq. ft.

Other factors related to construction costs is the number of units in a development—as the number of dwelling units increases, overall costs generally decrease as builders can benefit from the economies of scale. The difficulty of developing awkward infill sites can also add to costs. Furthermore, neighborhood resistance to some developments can lengthen development time, driving up the holding costs for developers.

Construction costs are relatively constant throughout Los Angeles County, and therefore high construction costs are a regional constraint on housing development rather than a local constraint. The City's ability to mitigate high construction costs is limited without direct subsidies.

3.3.2 LAND COSTS

Land is perhaps the major variable cost component in producing new housing. The high cost of land is a contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing in all of Southern California, but especially in coastal areas such as Torrance. The impact of land costs is exacerbated in Torrance due to the fact that there is very limited amount of vacant land available in mostly built-out Torrance. Land costs may vary depending on whether the site is vacant or has existing structures that must be removed. Similarly, site constraints, such as environmental conditions, including steep slopes, soil stability, seismic hazards, or flooding, can also be factored into the cost of land. The cost of land in Torrance and surrounding cities has risen substantially due to a decrease in the availability of vacant or otherwise developable land in the South Bay area. A survey of listings on realtor.com in September 2021 found only one vacant parcel for sale, a 0.35-acre site, with a land use designation of C-GEN and zoning of ML, priced at \$1,390,000 or approximately 4.6 million per acre. This site was still available as of March 2022 and is included in the Sites Inventory.

3.3.3 HOME FINANCING

The availability of financing for a home greatly affects a person’s ability to purchase a home or invest in repairs and improvements. The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) requires lending institutions to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by income, gender, and race/ethnicity of applicants. Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates.

Table H-48 presents the disposition of home purchase loan applications in 2020 by income of the applicants. The data is for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), of which Torrance is a part. The data includes purchases of 1 to 4 unit homes as well as manufactured homes. Approximately 65.5 percent of the loan applications were received from above moderate-income households (earning greater than 120 percent of Median Family Income [MFI]), which is 3.5 percent higher than 2011 (as reported in the 5th Cycle Housing Element). Moderate-income households (80 to 120 percent of MFI) accounted for 20.3 percent of total loan applications, which is 1.3 percent higher than in 2011. Lower-income households (less than 80 percent MFI) accounted for 14.1 percent of total loan applications, which is 1.1 percent lower than in 2011. Origination refers to loans approved by the lender and accepted by the applicant. The overall loan origination rate in 2020 was approximately 69.2 percent, which is 7.3 percent higher than in 2011; as in 2011, this rate decreased as income decreased. However, in 2020 the percent of loans denied increased for lower income applicants as compared to 2011, while they decreased for moderate and above-moderate income applicants. This may reflect a tightening of lending standards as a result of the Great Recession, which impacts lower income applicants more than those with moderate and above-moderate incomes.

Table H-48: Disposition of Conventional Home Purchase Loan Applications for the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale MSA

Applicant Income	Total Apps.	Percent of Total	% Orig.	% Denied
Lower Income (<80% MFI)	71,478	14.1%	49.9%	23.9%
Moderate Income (80 to 120% MFI)	103,071	20.3%	61.5%	13.5%
Above Moderate Income (>120% MFI)	331,968	65.5%	75.9%	12.1%
All	506,517	100%	69.2%	14.1%

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), 2020.

*Totals may not add up due to rounding.

3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Torrance has several environmental constraints that affect potential development. These constraints are due to endangered species and sensitive habitat, heightened seismic activity, noise levels in excess of City standards, potential mineral extraction facilities, and other constraints which preclude or restrict the development of housing. This section briefly outlines these constraints.

As part of the Housing Element update, a Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) in compliance with CEQA Guidelines, was prepared to identify and analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, and the ways in which any potential significant effects could be avoided or mitigated. The IS/ND was made available for public review from November 1, 2021,

through November 30, 2021. Based on the initial evaluation presented in the IS, it was concluded that the Draft 6th Cycle Housing Element would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts, which is the rationale for the preparation of the ND.

Attachment B of the IS/ND presents a comprehensive list of standard Mitigation Measures, Conditions and Requirements that are generally applicable to ground disturbing land development projects in the City. These mitigation measures include those in the City’s adopted 2010 General Plan EIR and 2013 Addendum to the FEIR or are the standard, current Mitigation Measures generally applicable to land development projects in the City.

As determined to be applicable by the City, these measures are to be implemented before, during and after construction and can be incorporated as Conditions of Approval for any future or subsequent ground disturbing land development projects in the City to ensue all potential impacts are avoided, minimized or reduced to less than significant levels.

3.4.1 ENDANGERED SPECIES AND SENSITIVE HABITAT

Torrance contains few areas where native habitat hosts endangered or sensitive species, as most of the City’s open space is developed as programmed urban parks. Torrance has one significant resource to the natural habitat of Southern California, the Madrona Marsh, which was established as a permanent ecological preserve in 1986. The Marsh is a remnant of a natural vernal wetland sustained by a historic drainage basin that no longer exists. The Marsh covers approximately 11 acres within a larger open space preserve area; the balance of the area is sandy upland and wetland, all of which has been designated by Los Angeles County as a Significant Ecological Area. Vernal marshes are distinct in that they flood during the rainy season and dry out after the rainy season has passed. This wetland regime produces a unique ecosystem, and its significance is evidenced by the diversity of life that resides there. This 42-plus acre site is home to over 110 species of plants, over 65 families of insects, two amphibian species, three species of reptiles, about 160 types of birds, and at least four mammal species. The Marsh, dedicated as an ecological preserve, cannot be developed for urban uses.

3.4.2 SEISMIC ACTIVITY

The potential for seismic activity and ground shaking in Torrance depends on the proximity to the affected fault and the intensity of the seismic event along the fault. Currently no active or potentially active faults are known to exist within Torrance. However, the city lies in a seismically active region where numerous faults are capable of generating moderate to large earthquakes that could impact structures and infrastructure. Since Torrance is close to multiple fault zones, movement along any of the zones has the potential of adversely affecting the City. As indicated by nearly two centuries of earthquake records, the impacts of ground shaking related to seismic activity are expected to remain a risk in Torrance and have the potential to be severe.

The City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies the maximum likelihood of earthquake events on the most likely faults by size and fault over the next 30 years. Table H-49 below identifies these faults and the percent of likelihood of an earthquake, measured using the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale, according to seismic forecasts conducted by the US Geological Survey (USGS).

Table H-49: Maximum Likelihood of Earthquake Events by Size and Fault in the Next 30 Years

Fault	6.7 M _w	7.0 M _w	7.5 M _w	8.0 M _w
Palos Verdes	3.17%	2.84%	0.1%	---
Puente Hills	0.78%	0.58%	0.19%	---
Puente Hills (Coyote segment)	0.95%	0.65%	0.19%	---
Puente Hills (Los Angeles Segment)	1.01%	0.51%	0.15%	---
Puente Hills (Santa Fe Springs segment)	0.96%	0.76%	0.29%	<0.01%
Newport-Inglewood (onshore only)	0.99%	0.88%	0.43%	---
Elysian Park	0.06%	0.05%	0.02%	---
Santa Monica	1.19%	1.02%	0.29%	<0.01%
Malibu Coast	0.75%	0.65%	0.37%	<0.01%
Hollywood	1.59%	1.18%	0.29%	<0.01%
Upper Elysian Park	1.26%	0.78%	0.07%	---
Anacapa-Dume	0.90%	0.66%	0.25%	<0.01%
Whittier	1.58%	1.43%	0.80%	<0.01%
Raymond	1.70%	1.18%	0.35%	<0.01%
Verdugo	0.51%	0.45%	0.32%	<0.01%
San Andreas*	22.34%	19.68%	18.74%	6.91%

* Only fault sections in the greater Los Angeles region are included. This does not represent the risk of future events on the entire San Andreas fault.

Note: The magnitude of the events shown in this table are for the site of the earthquake. Depending on the locations of the earthquake, the magnitude may be less severe within Torrance itself.

Source: City of Torrance Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2017-2022 – USGS 2015a

The City has a mandatory retrofit seismic ordinance that was adopted in 1987, applicable to the most susceptible building type to earthquake damage, unreinforced masonry. The City used subsidies to bring almost all of the older buildings into compliance with the City’s mandatory strengthening requirements.

3.4.3 FLOODING

According to the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2017-2022), the main area at risk of flooding in Torrance is the western half of the Madrona Marsh nature preserve, which lies partly in the 100-year floodplain and partly in the 500-year floodplain. Some land north of the nature preserve across Plaza del Amo is within the 500-year floodplain, and a block of land northeast of the preserve (bordered by Plaza del Amo, Del Amo Circle East, West Carson Boulevard, and Madrona Avenue) is within the 100-year floodplain. Elsewhere in the city, the areas around the intersections of California Street and Alaska Avenue and of Amsler Street and Dormont Avenue are both in the 100-year floodplain, as is part of an undeveloped area near the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte. Some land west of Crenshaw Boulevard between 235th and 237th Streets is within the 500-year floodplain, as are parts of the St. Lawrence Martyr School along the city’s border with Redondo Beach. Torrance’s beaches also are at risk of coastal flooding, but beachside development is outside of both the 100-year and 500-year floodplains.

Torrance has largely been free of significant flood events. Localized flooding has occurred occasionally, particularly prior to the construction of modern storm drains and water retention basins.

Localized flooding is likely to continue to occur in the future, especially during significant storm events. Major storms in California are frequently the result of meteorological phenomena called atmospheric rivers, which are narrow bands of very moist air which in effect act as pathways for heavy precipitation. Although these storms make up a relatively small number of weather systems that affect the western United States, they typically cause 30 to 50 percent of all precipitation in the area (NOAA 2015d). Another type of event, the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO, or El Niño), can cause more intense storms and higher levels of precipitation in the western United States, especially in Southern California. Although Torrance does not have a history of significant flooding, a particularly severe storm or series of intense storms may cause more widespread flooding emergencies.

Torrance is also at risk of flooding from infrastructure failure. The Walteria and Ben Haggot Reservoirs, both owned by the City, are two buried water storage facilities with a combined capacity of 28.7 million gallons located along Crenshaw Boulevard near the city's border with Rolling Hills Estates. The failure of one or both facilities could create flooding in the area below the reservoirs. The prime risk of infrastructure failure to either reservoir is a significant earthquake, although the most likely outcome is cracks in the reservoirs that cause leaks and some localized flooding. However, a significantly strong earthquake could cause catastrophic failure of the reservoir walls. This "worst-case" scenario would drain the reservoirs in as little as 18 minutes and could inundate 215 acres. The inundation zone includes numerous residential and commercial properties, as well as the southeast portion of Torrance Municipal Airport.

In 2015 the City adopted an ordinance to require Low Impact Development (LID) strategies to manage the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff by setting standards and practices to maintain or restore the natural hydrologic character of a development site, reduce off-site runoff, improve water quality, and provide groundwater recharge. The ordinance applies to new and redevelopment projects that require building permits.

In accordance with Government Code Section 65302, as part of the current Housing Element Plan update process, the City is required to review and revise the Safety Element to identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to flood hazard zones, National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA, information about flood hazards, designated floodway maps, dam failure inundation maps, areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of levees or floodwalls, etc. as listed in Section 65302(9)(2) and establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding. This will reduce potential constraints related to flooding (see Program 19 in Section 5).

3.4.4 ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The City promotes energy conservation through the implementation of State of California Title 24 building code energy performance requirements. Title 24 measures require, for example, minimum ceiling, wall, and raised floor insulation, and minimum heating, ventilating, air conditioning and water heating equipment efficiencies.

In 2017, the City of Torrance, in cooperation with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The purpose of the CAP is to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions within the city. The City's CAP serves as a guide for action by setting GHG emission reduction

goals and establishing strategies and policies to achieve desired outcomes over the next 20 years. The City’s website includes an overview of the City’s targets outlined in the CAP, includes updates regarding the status, and includes links to the City’s CAP and specific energy generation and storage measures and methodology.

The City also recognizes the role of sustainable building practices in achieving energy efficiency and is home to one of the largest and most publicized examples of green building, the Toyota headquarters building. The City will undertake a phased approach to adopting green building practices through public education and recognition as the key to implementing green building design and construction on a wide scale. Multiple sustainability and energy conservation measures are identified in General Plan Appendix A: Implementation Programs.

3.4.5 MINERAL EXTRACTION

According to the State Mining and Geology Board, the majority of land within Torrance is classified as MRZ-1 (no significant mineral deposits are likely) and MRZ-3 (significance of mineral deposits cannot be determined). A small strip of land within the City is designated as MRZ-2, indicating that significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present. The area is located south of Pacific Coast Highway, and roughly east of Hawthorne Boulevard.

The classification system is intended to ensure consideration of statewide or regionally significant mineral deposits by the City in planning and development administration. These mineral resource designations are intended to prevent incompatible land use development on areas determined to have significant mineral resource deposits.

3.5 INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS

Another factor adding to the cost of new construction is the provision of adequate infrastructure: major and local streets; curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; water and sewer lines; storm drains; and street lighting. All of these improvements are required to be provided—either as upgrades or new infrastructure—in conjunction with new development. In most cases, these improvements are dedicated to the City, which is then responsible for their maintenance. The cost of these facilities is borne by developers, added to the cost of new housing units, and eventually passed on to the homebuyer or property owner. ~~Given the fully urbanized character of Torrance, public infrastructure and services are available at all the sites included in the inventory.~~

The City of Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) utility serves approximately 78 percent of Torrance, with the remaining portions of the City in West Torrance and the Hollywood Rivera area served by the California Water Service Company. The City of Torrance is a direct member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who wholesales imported potable supplies (drinking water) to its member agencies in Southern California, including Torrance. Currently MWD supplies, approximately 75 percent of TMW’s potable water demands. However, the City has embarked on local water source diversification program that will increase local supplies to approximately 70 percent and reduce imported water to 30 percent or less within the next five years. This will help “drought proof” the community. The City’s North Torrance Wellfield Project (NTWP) project will be operational this summer and will triple our local potable groundwater production and increase of local supplies to 45%

~~more of our potable water requirements. Potable water is provided to the majority of the City by the Torrance Municipal Water Department (TMWD), with two smaller areas served by the Rancho Dominguez and Hermosa-Redondo Districts of the California Water Service Company (CWS). TMWD forecasts indicate that sufficient existing and projected water supplies are available to meet the demands of the development levels projected in the General Plan.~~

Based on the City's RHNA for the 2021-2029 cycle, the Draft Housing Element forecasts that 4,939 new dwelling units will need to be constructed in the City. Assuming 2.6 people per household, this would result in an additional population of 12,841 if all units are built. In 2009, a bill (SBx7-7) was passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20 percent by 2020 (referred to as the "20 by 20" plan). TMW's 2020 target was set at 142 gallons per day per capita (GPCD); the City actually reduced this demand by 15 percent below the target to 121 GPCD, as documented in Torrance's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Thus, the projected additional housing units would increase water use in the TMW service area over time between 1.554 million gallons per day (mgd) using the actual 121 GPCD number or at 1.838 mgd using the higher 142 GPCD target number.

TMW water demand is generally expressed in acre-feet rather than gallons (1 AF equals approximately 326,000 gallons). Thus, the projected increase in annual potable water use would total between 1,740 AF (at 121 GPCD) to 2,045 AF (at 142 GPCD). In either case, TMW has more than sufficient system capacity and water resources to meet the projected additional demands, without taking into account the demand-damping effects of ongoing conservation efforts. Over the last 25 years, TMW's potable water demand has decreased by over 26 percent from approximately 26,050 AF to 19,200 AF, due to the concerted conservation efforts of the City's customers. The TWD infrastructure system was sized to meet higher demands of past years, and currently has a total system delivery capacity of more than two and one-half times of our current average demand.

The City of Torrance Public Works Department maintains local sewer and storm drainage systems. The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) is the regional agency responsible for the collection and treatment of wastewater. The nearest wastewater treatment facility to Torrance is the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson. The design capacity of the JWPCP is greater than the facility's current wastewater flows. There is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity for the increase in wastewater that projected development levels on the General Plan would generate. With utility and services system providers coordinating their planning and construction consistent with General Plan land use policy, future needs, including the 2021-2029 RHNA, can be met.

While utility and service connections would be needed to accommodate the new housing units, and some utilities and service system would need to be extended or enlarged to and from the new housing opportunity sites (e.g., sewer, storm water runoff, electrical, etc.), these new connections would not result in a need to modify the larger off-site infrastructure. Future housing in the City is anticipated to be on urban infill development/redevelopment sites surrounded by existing development on all sides. All wet and dry public utilities, facilities and infrastructure are in place and available to serve the new housing opportunity sites identified in the HEU for the eight-year planning period and infrastructure is not a constraint to development of housing.

4. HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES

The resources available for the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing in Torrance are addressed in this section of the Housing Element. This section provides an overview of available land resources and residential sites for future housing development and demonstrates the City’s ability to satisfy its share of the region’s future housing need. Also discussed are the financial and administrative resources available to support affordable housing and energy conservation opportunities.

4.1 FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS

4.1.1 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)

State law requires that a community provide an adequate number of sites to allow for and facilitate production of the regional share of housing. To determine whether a jurisdiction has sufficient land to accommodate its share of regional housing needs for all income groups, that jurisdiction must identify “adequate sites.” Under State law (California Government Code section 65583[c][1]), adequate sites are those with appropriate zoning and development standards, with services and facilities, needed to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing for all income levels. Torrance’s RHNA (developed and adopted by SCAG) covers the 6th Cycle planning period, which is from June 30, 2021, through October 15, 2029. The RHNA assigns a housing production to each jurisdiction in the region. Torrance must identify adequate land with appropriate zoning and development standards to accommodate its allocation of the regional housing need.

According to the RHNA, Torrance’s share of regional future housing need for the 2021-2029 planning period has been determined by SCAG to be a total of 4,939 housing units. This allocation is distributed into five income categories, as shown below in Table H-50. The RHNA includes a fair share adjustment that allocates future housing need by each income category in a way that meets the state mandate to reduce over-concentration of lower income households in historically lower income communities or areas within the region (analyzed in Appendix D—Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing).

Table H-50: RHNA 2021-2029

Income Group	% of County AMI	Total Housing Units Allocated	Percentage of Units
Extremely Low*	30% or less	584	12%
Very Low*	31-50% AMI	1,037	21%
Low	51-80% AMI	846	17%
Moderate	81-120% AMI	853	17%
Above Moderate	120%+ AMI	1,619	33%
Total		4,939	100%

Source: Final RHNA, SCAG (March 2021)

AMI = Area Median Income, which is based on the HCD 2020 State Income Limits for Los Angeles County of \$77,300 for a 4-person household

*Note: *The City has a RHNA allocation of 1,621 very low-income units (inclusive of extremely low-income units). Pursuant to state law (AB 2634), the City must project the number of extremely low-income housing needs based on Census income distribution or assume 50 percent of the very low-income units as extremely low. According to the CHAS data developed by HUD (Table H-10) 12 percent of the City households were extremely low income and 21 percent were very low income.

4.1.1.1 Credits Toward RHNA—Entitled & Pipeline Projects

The 6th cycle RHNA covers a planning period that is approximately 8.3 years, starting on June 30, 2021. Housing units ~~built, under construction, or entitled~~ (approved) ~~or under review~~ (in the pipeline) but ~~that were not expected to be issued building permits~~ as of June 30, 2021, ~~onward~~ can be credited toward meeting the City’s RHNA for the 6th Cycle. These units can be subtracted from the City’s share of regional housing needs. The City must demonstrate in this Housing Element its ability to meet ~~the~~ its remaining housing needs through the provision of sites, after subtracting units ~~under construction~~ that ~~have been entitled or are in the pipeline and are anticipated~~. ~~After accounting for units to be approved and pending approval (see Table H-51), a remaining need of 4,705 units exists.~~ 49 summarizes the ~~entitled and pipeline projects that are credited toward meeting the City’s RHNA.~~

Table H-51: Credits Toward RHNA

	Project Description	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
RHNA		1,621	846	853	1,619	4,939
Net Units Entitled/Pending Permits as of 7/1/22:						
175 th and -Prairie Ave.	Mixed-use: senior condos + 3 commercial condos	---	---	---	6 53	6 53
1750 Manuel Ave.	Detached townhouse condo development	---	---	---	6	6
2706 182 nd St.	Townhouse development + church use	---	---	---	48	48
18419 Western Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	15	15
24449 Hawthorne Blvd.	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	10	10
18080-18090 Prairie Ave.	Townhouse condo project	---	---	---	25	25
18045 Western Ave.	Mixed use: apartments + commercial space	---	---	---	32	32
22422 Ocean Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
22424 Ocean Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
2463 Torrance Blvd.	Apartments (conversion of retail space into residential)	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
18522 Grevillea Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
18530 Amie Ave.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
1621 Crenshaw Blvd.	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	1 (net)
<u>Entitled Subtotal:</u>		---	---	---	195	195
Net Units Pending Approval or In Process as of 7/1/2021 (Not Entitled/Pipeline):						
No address (7 parcels, East side of Hawthorne Blvd.) Boulevard, 210 feet north of Rolling Hills Road APNs 7547-004-040 to 046	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	18	18
24601 Hawthorne Blvd. (APNs: 7534-028-005, -006, -021, -022, -024, -027)	Mixed use: apartments + office space	---	---	---	11	11
22501 Hawthorne Boulevard APN 7368-001-015	Mixed use: apartments + commercial use	17*	---	---	201	218
4111 Pacific Coast Highway APN 7529-019-003	Residential: Convert existing 92-room hotel to 108 senior apartments	11*	---	---	97	108
4100 Spencer Street (APN 7524-008-12)	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	2 (1 net)
22600 Crenshaw Bld. (APN 7370-001-018)	Mixed use apartments + commercial space	---	---	---	72	72

Table H-51: Credits Toward RHNA

	Project Description	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
812 Crenshaw Blvd. (APN 7354-011-041)	Condo development	---	---	---	2 (1 net)	2 (1 net)
Not Entitled/Pipeline Subtotal:		28	---	---	401	429
All Total:		28	---	---	596	624
Remaining RHNA:		1,593	846	853	1,023 (net)	4,315 (net)

* These two projects include a density bonus request. Conditions of approval have been incorporated to require that the developer and City enter into a Density Bonus Agreement. The Agreement will require that the designated affordable units remain affordable for at least 55 years and reports substantiating that the affordable units are being rented to qualified households be submitted to the City periodically.

4.1.1.2 Credits Toward RHNA—Anticipated Accessory Dwelling Units

The City allows and regulates accessory dwelling units (ADUs), including junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs), in compliance with California Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22, with the most recent ADU/JADU ordinance amended in April 2021. In Torrance, ADUs and JADUs can provide smaller and less expensive housing in a way that disperses new housing throughout the community and blends in well with existing community character. ADUs can be a valuable addition to Torrance’s housing stock, serving as a resource for seniors aging out of their homes and for multi-generational accommodations—issues that have been raised by the community for both the 5th and 6th Cycle Housing Elements. As indicated in the Constraints section of this Housing Element, Torrance permits ADUs consistent with state law.

New state laws passed since 2017 have substantially relaxed the development standards and procedures for the construction of ADUs. As a result, the City has seen significant increases in ADUs in the community, increasing from just three ADU permits issued in 2017 to 9687 permits issued in 2021. Table H-50 below summarizes this trend, based on amended Annual Progress Reports (APRs) submitted to HCD by the City on January 7, 2022 and again on June 23, 2022, and building permits issued for 2021 (see Table H-52). The average number of permits issued for ADUs over the three-year period of 2019–2021 is 55.3 ADUs per year. However, as of August 1, 2022, the City has already issued permits for 94 ADUs, which demonstrates the continuation of this trend.

Table H-52 ADU Permits Issued from 2018-2020

Year	Number of ADU Permits Issued*
2018	33
2019	7739
2020	9640
2021	87
Average:	68,755.3

*These numbers are based on amended APRs submitted to HCD on January 7, 2022

Based on this steeply upward trend and the City’s plans to incentivize the production of ADUs (see Program 6), the City assumes 60 ADUs annually for a total of 480 ADUs over the eight-year planning period of the Housing Element for the purpose of RHNA credits.

The SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis (for LA County I), which has been reviewed and approved by HCD, provides local governments in the SCAG region with assumptions for ADU affordability that can be used to assign ADUs to income categories for the purposes of 6th Cycle Housing Elements. According to the SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis, the following percentages of units may be applied to the required income categories:

- 15 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to extremely low-income households;
- 2 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to very low-income households;
- 43 percent of ADUs are considered affordable to low-income households;
- 6 percent to moderate income households; and
- 34 percent to above-moderate income households.

The Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis that was prepared by SCAG and approved by HCD is the estimate the City of Torrance uses to estimate the income distribution of ADUs for the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Torrance’s estimated number of ADUs is provided in Table HE-53.

Table H-53: Estimated Number of ADUs During 6th Cycle Planning Period

Income Category	Percent of Units Per Income Category	Number of Units Per Income Category
Extremely Low	15%	72
Very Low	2%	10
Low	43%	206
Moderate	6%	29
Above Moderate	34%	163
Total:	100%	480

4.1.1.3 Remaining RHNA

After accounting for the credits discussed in Section 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.2 (units approved and pending approval and the anticipated ADUs for the 6th Cycle planning period) (see Table H-54), a remaining need of 3,835 units exists to accommodate the RHNA. However, pursuant to SB 166 (No Net Loss Law, Government Code Section 65863), all jurisdictions must maintain adequate sites in their Housing Elements to accommodate their remaining unmet RHNA by each income category at all times throughout the entire planning period. If, at any time during the planning period, a jurisdiction finds that there is a shortfall of sites to accommodate its remaining RHNA, the jurisdiction must take immediate action to correct the shortfall by amending its Housing Element sites inventory to either include sites previously unidentified with capacity to accommodate the shortfall, or sites that have been rezoned to correct for the shortfall. Failure to do so constitutes a violation of the No Net Loss law. **The State recommends a buffer of 15-30 percent to provide for the No Net Loss requirements.**

Table H-54: Remaining RHNA Obligation

	Very Low*	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Official RHNA	1,621	846	853	1,619	4,939
Credits toward RHNA (per Table H-49)	28	---	---	596	624
ADUs credited toward RHNA (per Table H-51)	82	206	29	163	480
Remaining RHNA Obligations	1,511	640	824	860	3,835

*Inclusive of Extremely Low

4.1.2 RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY

4.1.2.1 Overview of Sites Inventory Requirements and Strategy

Overview: State law requires that jurisdictions demonstrate in the Housing Element that their land (sites) inventory is adequate to accommodate that jurisdiction’s share of the region’s projected growth during the planning period. The purpose of the Housing Element’s Sites Inventory is to identify and analyze specific sites that are available and suitable for residential development to determine the jurisdiction’s capacity to accommodate residential development and reconcile that capacity with the jurisdiction’s RHNA. The available and suitable sites are referred to as “adequate sites.” The Sites Inventory enables the jurisdiction to determine whether there are sufficient adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA by income category. A Sites Inventory and analysis determines whether program actions must be adopted to “make sites available” with appropriate zoning, development standards, and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the new development need. Sites are considered suitable for residential development if they are zoned appropriately and are available for residential use during the planning period. If the inventory demonstrates that there are insufficient sites to accommodate the RHNA for each income category, the inventory must identify sites for rezoning to be included in a Housing Element program to identify and make available additional sites to accommodate those housing needs early within the planning period.

As shown in Section 4.1.1.2, the City has a remaining RHNA of 3,835, after accounting for units entitled (approved) and in the pipeline. Torrance does not currently have enough residentially zoned available sites to accommodate its required RHNA or the No Net Loss buffer. Therefore, the City of Torrance has identified sites that could accommodate its future housing needs in accordance with the 6th Cycle RHNA as required by state Housing Element law. Appendix C (Sites Inventory) provides a list of the vacant and underutilized properties in the City that have been identified to accommodate the RHNA.

Strategy: There has been a significant trend within Torrance over the past 10-15 years to construct residential and mixed-use development on non-residentially zoned property. New standalone commercial, office, and industrial development has been declining, consistent with the trend throughout the region, which is discussed throughout Section 4. With very little vacant land left in Torrance—and much of that topographically constrained—the City has taken a multi-pronged strategy to accommodate its 6th-Cycle RHNA:

1. **ADUs:** Encourage and facilitate ADUs.

2. **Facilitate Conversion of Non-Residential Sites on Housing Corridors to Mixed Use and Multi-Family Residential Uses:** Identify vacant properties and underutilized sites along and near key transportation corridors that have a likelihood of transitioning from non-residential to residential and mixed-use development during the planning period, with an emphasis on facilitating “housing corridors.” This strategy includes promoting both stand-alone residential and mixed-use development. The sites will be rezoned and redesignated as necessary.
3. **Facilitate Residential Infill:** Identify sites that offer opportunities to increase infill residential density. The City’s Housing Corridor Study (HCS), discussed later in this section, identifies sites that will be rezoned to provide additional residential infill opportunities. The HCS also supports the Housing Corridors strategy.
4. **Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay:** Facilitate affordable housing on sites owned and operated by religious institutions by adding an overlay to identified properties to facilitate construction of housing that is affordable to lower- and moderate-income households.

4.1.2.2 Development Trends Substantiating City’s Sites Inventory Strategy of Conversion of Non-Residential Sites on Housing Corridors to Mixed Use and Multi-Family Residential Uses

Torrance has no vacant sites designated and zoned for higher density residential development.—the remaining vacant residentially zoned properties are currently designated and zoned for low density single-family residential development (23 sites) and low-medium residential development (3 sites). In fact, much of the residential development that has been constructed over the past several decades has occurred via redesignation and rezoning of non-residential sites to allow for higher density residential infill for single-family and multiple-family housing types. Mixed use development has increased considerably as well during the past decade, especially in recent years (as demonstrated in Tables H-49 and H54), as demand for housing in Torrance remains high but vacant residentially designated and zoned land is not available. These trends support the City’s strategy, which is described in the sections that follow.

Torrance has a long history of the conversion of non-residential sites to residential uses. As a built out city, there is very little vacant land available. As such, a majority of development in Torrance occurs from the recycling of property from one use to another. Mixed use (residential with commercial) development has been occurring in areas where constructing mixed use provides a benefit to the applicant, such as a higher FAR or greater density, or in when standalone housing is not allowed per code.

In many instances, developers have indicated to City Staff that they would prefer to propose projects which are 100 percent residential. Fully residential developments are typically easier to design, construct, and to finance. Often, developers report that buyers tend to prefer fully residential projects over a mixed use situation. Many of the smaller developers we work with only develop standalone residential.

A trend City Staff are also seeing is that the commercial portion of mixed use projects can take a great deal of time to be leased out. Some mixed use projects can take several years before the commercial component is occupied. Recently, a mixed use project was constructed near the Downtown area.

While the leasing activity of the residential portion has been robust, the retail portion has been slow. As a result, the developer has recently requested that the City consider the potential to convert a majority of the ground floor commercial space to Live-Work residential space. The City has provided initial comments and City Staff expect to see a revised plan in the near future.

The City has additionally been approached by several over developers interested in the Live-Work concept. Due to the increased desire of telecommuting, which was facilitated significantly due to the COVID pandemic, as well as the entrepreneurial spirit of workers, the City is aware of this new trend. As a result, the City is currently reviewing its Zoning Code to enable and regulate Live-Work uses within designated areas of the community.

Another factor that influenced the City's housing strategy is the City's desire to retain and support its long-standing goal of remaining a "balanced city," which includes retaining its commercial, service, industrial, and other establishments to preserve the employment and tax base and provide for the goods and services upon which the community depends. The City also has a long-standing goal of increasing the amount of active and passive recreational facilities and open space, which is a key factor in continuing to preserve the high quality of life in Torrance. for existing and future residents of all income levels. These two goals were reiterated by the community in the recently updated Torrance Strategic Plan.

Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Torrance: As noted previously, with the lack of vacant land in Torrance, and especially residentially designated and zoned land, the City's strategy of encouraging and implementing residential development on underutilized non-residential land is supportable based on local trends. Table H-47 summarizes a sampling of 15 (seven entitled and eight constructed) projects, including seven of the 10 entitled projects from Table H-42 and eight constructed projects from the 5th Cycle. While not inclusive of all residential and mixed-use projects that have been entitled or constructed over the past 20 years, they demonstrate that the approach the City has taken for the Sites Inventory regarding types and locations of residential and mixed-use projects with densities greater than single-family residential is valid and supportable. Two projects from earlier cycles (Project IDs M and N) are included because they illustrate the continuation of this trend in Torrance over the recent past. Table H-55 summarizes all 15 projects and Figure H-6 identifies their locations. Each project is described in more detail in Appendix E.

Table H-55: Recycling Trends—Summary of Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Torrance

ID	Address	Status Year Approved	Type of Project	Land Use Designation		Density (du/ac)		Number of Units	Vacant	Lot Consolidation	Lot Size (acres, (consolidated))
				Existing	Proposed	Target	Actual				
A	18045 Western Ave.	Entitled (2021)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	26.7	32	Part vacant	Yes (6 lots)	1.2
B	18080-18090 Prairie Ave.	Entitled (2021)	Residential	R-MD	No change	23.25	24.7	24	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.97
C	24449 & 24453 Hawthorne Blvd.	Entitled (2020)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	25.7	9	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.35
D	18419 Western Ave.	Entitled (2020)	Residential	C-GEN	No change	36	23.1	15	Yes	No	0.65
E	2706 182nd St.	Entitled (2020)	Townhouse + church	R-MD	No change	23.25	17.2	48	No	Yes (2 lots)	3.7
F	1750 Manuel Ave.	Entitled (2019)	Residential	R-MD	No change	23.25	18.8	6	No	No	0.34
G	1954-1978 Carson St.	Constructed (2018)	Mixed Use	C-CTR	No change	36	38.5	39	No	Yes (5 lots)	0.88
H	20411 Earl St.	Constructed (2016)	Residential	R-LM	No change	13.5	17.8	25	No	No	1.4
I	23625-23649 Arlington Ave.	Constructed (2015)	Residential	R-OF	No change	23.25	25	16	No	Yes (2 lots)	0.66
J	24444 Hawthorne Blvd.	Constructed (2015)	Mixed Use	C-GEN	No change	33	25.4	8	No	No	0.32
K	1008 Sartori Ave.	Constructed (2014)	Residential	C-CTR	R-MD	36	21 du	4	Parking lot	Yes (2 lots)	0.19
L	1640 Cabrillo Ave.	Constructed (2013)	Mixed Use (100% lower-income)	C-CTR	No change	36	51.2*	44	No	Yes (4 lots)	0.86
M	2829 Maricopa St.	Constructed (2003)	Residential	I-LT	R-LM	13.5	10.4	104	No	No	10.0
N	3520 Torrance Blvd.	Constructed (2003)	Residential (37.5% senior)	C-GEN	C-GEN	33	29.8	160	No	No	5.37
O	East side of Prairie Ave., approx. 100 feet north of 176th St.	Entitled (2020)	Mixed Use (100% senior)	C-GEN	C-GEN	33	33.1	53	Yes	No	1.6

*Project received approval of a density bonus for 100% low and very low-income households

A summary of the information in Table 54 is provided below.

- Five of the 15 (33.3 percent) projects meet or exceed the newly proposed target density (the expected density of the land use designation, as identified in the Land Use Element). With the implementation of Program 1, Action 4, which is intended to incentivize projects to be constructed at or above target densities, as well as modifications to development standards to reduce constraints (Programs 3 and 8), it is realistic to assume that actual densities of future projects will achieve the densities assumed in the Sites Inventory.



*Rendering of recently entitled mixed use project at 18045 Western Ave. (formerly 1802—18141 Western Ave).
(See Project A in Table H-47 above and a summary of the project in Appendix E)*


- Six of the 15 projects (40 percent) are mixed use developments.
- Two-thirds (10 out of the 15 projects) were developed on property that was designated for non-residential land uses. This is a trend that provides evidence to support the City’s Sites Inventory strategy of using underutilized sites that are currently designated with non-residential land use designations in the Land Use Element.
- One project is a 100% affordable development, constructed on City-owned property in Downtown Torrance (see Project ID “L”).
- Eight of the 15 projects (53.3 percent) required lot consolidation (from two to six lots), which demonstrates that lot consolidation is not a constraint to development in Torrance; however, implementation of Program 4, Action 9 will further facilitate lot consolidation.
- One project (Project ID “E”) took an existing church property, retained the sanctuary, and added 48 units on the remainder of the site. This example demonstrates the validity of adding the Religious Institution Overlay as provided in Program 7 and discussed in greater detail in Section 4.1.3.5.
- The projects range in size from a 4-unit condominium to a 160-unit project with townhouses and stacked flats. Lot sizes range from 0.19 to 10 acres.
- The projects are distributed throughout Torrance. Many are located along key transportation corridors that have been identified in the City’s Sites Inventory strategy,

including Hawthorne Boulevard, Western Avenue, and Torrance Boulevard. Many others are located in or near the study areas (from the Land Use Element) that are being addressed in the Housing Corridor Study (see Section 4.1.3.5).

- Two projects include senior citizen housing—Project ID “O” is a 100 percent senior development, while Project ID “N” has 37.5% of its units set aside for senior citizens.

DRAFT

Figure H-8: Map of Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Residential and Mixed-Use Projects



Recycling Trends—Sites on the Torrance Sites Inventory with Public Interest Expressed for Residential Development: The trend in Torrance for developing residential projects on non-residentially designated/zoned property is further evidenced by the number of sites on the Housing Element Sites Inventory with expressed public (property owner or developer or both) interest in developing housing.

Recycling Trend—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions: The trend for developing residential and mixed use projects on non-residentially designated/zoned property that has been observed and demonstrated in Torrance in the previous section is also a trend in neighboring jurisdictions. Table H-56 shows 11 recent projects in Redondo Beach and Gardena that have been developed with residential on formerly non-residential sites. Like Torrance, both cities are built out and must rely on non-residentially zoned properties to accommodate their respective RHNA's.

DRAFT

Table H-56: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions

ID	Jurisdiction	Address or Location	GP/Zone	Description	Previous Use(s)	Units	Acres	Density (du/ac)	Approval
AA	Gardena	16958 S. Western Ave.	Specific Plan	Residential Townhomes	Vacant, recreational vehicle storage	46	2.31	20	2017
BB	Gardena	12850 Crenshaw Blvd.	Specific Plan	Apartment rental units	Warehouse use	265	1.33	199	2021
CC	Gardena	16831-16911 S. Normandie Ave.	Specific Plan	Apartment rental units/Residential townhomes	Warehouse use	349	5.3	66	Pending
DD	Gardena	14504 S Normandie Ave.	Specific Plan	Residential Townhomes	Plant nursery	96	4.69	20	2015
EE	Gardena	14321 S. Van Ness Ave.	General Commercial- Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	35 Residential Townhomes; 5 Live/Work Units	Vacant lot, previous auto dealership	40	2.04	20	2018
FF	Gardena	16819 S. Normandie Ave.	Industrial/M-1	Residential (SROs)	Plant nursery	63	0.69	91	2018
HH	Gardena	2101/2129 Rosecrans Ave.	General Commercial- Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	Residential	Warehouse use	113	5.47	21	2020
II	Gardena	2500 Rosecrans Ave.	General Commercial- Mixed Use/C-3 - MUO	49 Residential Townhomes; 3 Live/Work Units	Stand-alone restaurant, vacant	52	2.35	22	2020
JJ	Gardena	13126 S. Western Ave	Industrial/M-1	100% Residential & Density Bonus (SROs)	Stand-alone auto repair	121	1.01	120	Pending
KK	Redondo Beach	1700 South Pacific Coast Highway	Mixed Use 3/MU-3A	Mixed use—115 units, 22,000 sq. ft. of retail and restaurant	Hotel & retail space including Bristol Farm grocery store, massage parlor, salon, & guitar school	115	4.28	27	2018
LL	Redondo Beach	1815 Hawthorne Blvd.	Commercial Regional/Commercial Regional	300 residential units (including 20% lower-income or 10% very-low income units)	Redevelopment of South Bay Galleria (existing mall) into a mixed use project	300	29.85	N/A	2019

MM	Lomita	2457 Lomita Blvd.	/Specific Plan	220 luxury studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom apartments	Equipment rental yard	220	2.7	81	Under construction
NN	Lomita	24805 Narbonne Ave.		Mixed-use project medical office, 5 live-work units with ground floor commercial space & 10- townhome residential units					Under construction
OO	Lomita	24830-24838 Narbonne Ave.		Mixed-use project ground floor commercial and 11 residential units with one two-bedroom unit for a very-low-income household					Approved
PP	Lomita	26109 Narbonne Ave.		8 Townhome-Unit Project					Under construction
QQ	Lomita	26016 Oak Street							

4.1.2.3 Realistic Capacity Assumptions For Sites Inventory

The capacity assumptions used in the 6th Cycle Housing Element are shown below in Table H-53 and described in more detail in this section. As discussed earlier, the City’s Sites Inventory is required to accommodate SB 166 (No Net Loss Law). There are several strategies cities can take to ensure that sufficient capacity exists in the Housing Element to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period in accordance with the No Net Loss Law. HCD prepared a memorandum identifying various strategies jurisdictions can take to implement SB 166 in their Housing Elements. Due to the lack of production of units for lower- and moderate-income households in Torrance during the last planning period, the City’s Housing Element is applying two key strategies, as described below.

Reduced Density Assumption Strategy: The first strategy jurisdictions can take is to create a buffer by projecting capacity less than what is allowed from the maximum density to allow for some reductions in density. For the purpose of estimating future population and development assumptions as a result of theoretical build-out under the Torrance Land Use Element, the Land Use Element identified “development assumptions” based on *density* (expressed as du/ac) for residential land use designations and *intensity* (expressed as FAR) for non-residential land use designations. These development assumptions are referred to as “*expected density*” and “*expected intensity*” in the Land Use Element (see Table LU-2 in the Land Use Element).

Expected densities for the land use categories in the Land Use Element are based on 75 percent of maximum allowable density. There is no maximum density provided for the Commercial City Center (C-CTR) land use designation, so the City is assuming a density of 36 dwelling units per acre, which is just three dwelling units per acre above the expected density for the Commercial General (C-GEN) land use designation—the City considers this to be a conservative estimate.

Target Density for Capacity Estimates: Since these assumptions are already being used in the Land Use Element, the City chose to use the “*expected density*” from the Land Use Element as the “**target density**” for production of future housing in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. This is consistent with the reduced density strategy suggested by HCD—see Table H-57.

Table H-57: Assumed Target Densities for Capacity Estimates

General Plan Land Use Designation	Existing Density (du/ac)	Target Density (du/ac)	Density Factor	Percent Assumed to be Developed Residential
R-LO (Res. Low)	0-9	6.8	1	100
R-LM (Res. Low-Medium)	9.1-18	13.5	1	100
R-MD (Res. Medium)	18-31	23.25	1	100
R-MH (Res. Medium-High)	31.1-44	33	1	100
R-HI (Res. High)	44.1+	45	1	100
R-OF (Res. Office)	18.1-31	23.25	1	100
C-GEN (Comm. General)	Up to 44	33	1	100
C-CTR (Comm. City Center)	No maximum	36	1	100
C-GEN w/proposed Housing Overlay	Up to 44	33	1	100
C-GEN in HBSPC (mixed use only) ¹	Up to 44	33	1	75
C-CTR in DA-1 & DA-2 (HBCSP) ²	No maximum	36	1	100
All sites with Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ), with any underlying GP land use designation	As per site	23.25 du/ac	1	25

¹ Excludes DA-1 & DA-2 districts of the HBCSP

² Assumes development in the DA-1 and DA-2 districts of the HBCSP will be developed 100% residential as 80% market-rate and 20% lower income

Surplus Sites Strategy: The second strategy identified by HCD is to create a buffer in the Housing Element Sites Inventory of at least 15 to 30 percent more capacity than required, especially for capacity to accommodate the lower-income and moderate-income RHNA. While technically not a capacity “estimate” for the Sites Inventory, the City also is utilizing HCD’s second strategy to maintain consistency with the No Net Loss Law. The Sites Inventory provides a 25-415.6 percent surplus for the lower-income category and a 41-979.1 percent surplus for the moderate-income category. When estimated ADUs are included, the surplus rises to 38-228.3 percent for the lower-income category and an 45-382.5 percent surplus for the moderate-income category. (See Table H-55 for the summary of the adequacy of sites to accommodate the RHNA.)

The remainder of this section describes the considerations used to develop these realistic capacity assumptions. Because the City is relying on both residential and non-residential designated sites and a new Religious Institution Housing Overlay, the discussions of the various capacity assumptions are organized accordingly.

Capacity Assumptions For Residentially Designated Sites

As noted previously, the capacity assumptions for residentially designated sites (Table H-53) are 75 percent of the maximum allowable density for the associated land use designations. The residential land use designations in the Land Use Element include Residential Low (R-L), Residential Low-Medium (R-LM), Residential Medium (R-M), Residential Medium-High (R-MH), and Residential High (R-H). These designations range from a maximum of nine dwelling units per acre for the R-L land use designation to a maximum of 44 dwelling units per acre for the R-H land use designation.

However, as noted in Section 3 and discussed in this section, the Torrance Zoning Code currently allows lower residential housing types and densities in higher density zones—for example, R-3 allows R-1 and R-2 uses/densities, and R-4 allows any use permitted in R-3, which allows R-1 and R-2 uses. In

other words, the minimum density for R-3 and R-4 allows single-family residential development as a permitted use. The R-P (Residential-Professional) zone has a maximum density consistent with R-3, and it, too, allows single-family residential, although Planning Commission approval is required via a discretionary permit. The advantage of this approach is that it provides a wide degree of flexibility for developers, especially those who specialize in market-rate, lower density single-family housing products; ~~the, including low-medium density “patio home” housing types, which are very popular in Torrance.~~ The disadvantage is that it can make it difficult for the City to promote development at the higher densities by not having a minimum density that ensures a development that is consistent with expected densities in the Land Use and Housing Elements. ~~The Housing Plan includes several actions to address this situation and to promote a wider range of housing types and affordability levels in Torrance.~~

As shown in Table 54, two of the 15 identified projects were residential projects in existing residential land use designations; two others applied for and received approval to redesignate and rezone the lots from non-residential designations (one was industrially designated while the other was commercially designated). However, only one of the projects achieved the target density for the land use designation. As shown in Table H-49, five of the entitled projects and two of the pipeline projects are two-unit condominiums. Due to the built-out nature of the residential neighborhoods and the scarcity of residentially designated sites in the city, two-unit infill condominiums, which typically result in only one new net unit, are the most typical types of residential infill projects in Torrance. The implementation of SB 9 (which was approved in 2021 and became effective on January 1, 2022) may result in additional infill development in existing neighborhoods. The City has complied with SB 9 by adopting a new ordinance (SECTION 92.29.34 TWO-UNIT PROJECTS AND URBAN LOT SPLITS IN THE R-1 ZONE) in its Zoning Code. Due to the timing of SB 9, jurisdictions cannot allocate units that may be constructed in accordance with SB 9 to their Sites Inventory; however, if SB 9 is effective, it is reasonable to assume that additional infill housing will occur in Torrance.

To promote the development of multi-family housing on residentially designated sites at or above the target density in the 6th Cycle, the Housing Plan includes several actions to incentivize development at or above the capacity assumptions and to promote a wider range of housing types and affordability levels on Torrance. Implementation of the actions summarized below, in addition to many other programs and associated actions, demonstrate that the capacity used for residentially designated sites is reasonable for the Sites Inventory.

- Implementation of the results of the Housing Corridor Study (described later in this section) will result in adding a new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay (R/MU-OZ) to 69.9 acres of property across 132 parcels to accommodate a potential of 1,677 new residential units (at target capacity, not maximum allowable capacity) across all income categories. The Housing Corridor Study also will streamline development of housing in the identified areas of Torrance (see Figure H-6 and Program 3) and facilitate development at the maximum allowable densities. The sites will be rezoned to implement the results of the study.
- Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate the RHNA and No Net Loss) includes an action to incentivize development of housing (whether stand-alone residential or mixed use) in the R-3, R-4, mixed use, and other sites at or above the expected densities, by adopting an ordinance that will establish the expected density as the “target” density for production of future housing. -The ordinance will consider various options to incentivize housing

production at the target density and/or will include disincentives if the project proposes housing below the target density.

- Program 1 also includes an action to revise the minimum densities for several existing zones ~~and set~~, including all the residential zones, so that the minimum densities ~~for new~~ are consistent with the density ranges in the Land Use Element. New overlay zones also will be zoned to comply with the densities necessary for sites to be considered able to accommodate moderate- and lower-income developments. Additionally, incentives will be developed to incentivize development at or above the target densities, and disincentives for projects that propose lower than target densities will be developed.

- Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) will reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce constraints to development of housing to enable developers to achieve maximum allowable densities, which will support achievement of the capacity assumptions expressed as target densities. Standards that have been identified as constraints by developers include parking, open space, FAR, building height, and minimum unit size. These standards (as well as others that may be determined to be constraints to achieving target densities) will be revised.

With implementation of these Programs, the assumed capacity assumption for residentially designated property in the Sites Inventory is reasonable and realistic.

Capacity Assumptions For Commercially Designated Sites

Torrance has three commercial land use designations—General Commercial (C-GEN), Commercial Center (C-CTR), and Residential Office (R-OF).

Residential Development on Commercially Designated Sites: For the purposes of the Housing Element, the City has identified target densities of 33 dwelling units per acre for the C-GEN land use designation (75 percent of the maximum) and 36 dwelling units per acre for the C-CTR land use designation, which does not have a maximum density. The R-OF land use designation allows 18.1 to 31 du/ac for residential development.

The Zoning Code currently allows stand-alone residential development in the C1 and C2 zones at a maximum density of 27 dwelling units per acre. The development standards for Downtown Torrance allow up to 58 dwelling units per acre depending on the size of the dwelling unit.

As demonstrated in Table 54, several recent residential projects have been developed on commercially designated property. One pipeline project proposes to convert an existing motel to a 100 percent residential use for seniors, including a density bonus. This demonstrates the viability of the City’s strategy of identifying non-residential sites for residential development in its Sites Inventory.

Program 1, Objective 3 creates a residential/mixed use housing overlay zone (R/MU-OZ) for certain commercially designated properties to facilitate residential development. This program, coupled with Program 1, Objectives 1 and 2, demonstrates the City’s capacity assumption for residential development in commercially designated zones.

Mixed Use Development on Commercially Designated Sites: The Land Use Element also allows mixed-use development in these commercial land use designations; however, rather than providing an

“expected density” (expressed as dwelling units per acre), “expected intensity” is provided for each non-residential land use designation, where “intensity” is expressed as floor area ratio (FAR). The C-GEN land use designation allows a maximum FAR of 0.6 for commercial uses and a maximum 1.0 FAR for mixed use development, while the C-CTR land use designation allows a maximum FAR of 1.0 for all development, but it can be exceeded for mixed-use projects with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

Because requests for mixed-use developments in the C-GEN and C-CTR land use designations are not limited by a maximum density, but instead are limited by the FAR, actual density of mixed-use projects is determined by the size of the residential units and the amount of commercial floor area proposed. However, for the purposes of the Housing Element, the City is using 33 dwelling units per acre to estimate capacity for mixed-use projects in the C-GEN land use designation and 36 dwelling units per acre in the C-CTR land use designation. Mixed-use development in the R-OF land use designation is 23.25, which is 75 percent of the maximum allowable density.

As noted previously, mixed-use developments have become prevalent in Torrance. Six of the 15 projects (40 percent) identified in Table H-54 are mixed-use developments, and four of the seven pipeline projects are mixed-use developments. All have a commercial land use designation. Of the six mixed use projects shown in Table H-54, three are below the target density for the land use designation, one is at the target density, and two exceed the target density.

Programs:

- The Land Use Element will be revised to incorporate these target densities via Program 1, Objective 1.
- Based on review of many previously approved mixed-use projects, it appears that FAR can be a constraint to achieving target and higher densities. Program 1, Objective 1 will increase the maximum FARs in the C-GEN and C-CTR land use designations to allow densities for mixed use developments to reach or exceed the target densities.
- The City has added a new Program (Program 3, Objective 4) that will revise the Zoning Code to increase the maximum allowable FAR to be consistent with the revisions to the Land Use Element described in Program 1, Objective 1 (above).
- Currently, the Zoning Code allows mixed use projects to exceed densities of stand-alone residential densities in commercial zones, because mixed use is regulated by FAR rather than density. The City has included a Program (Program 1, Objective 2) that revises the Zoning Code to allow stand-alone residential to be developed at the new target densities in commercial zones.

The capacity assumptions for sites located in non-residential land use designations assume that any site that is proposed as either a mixed use or stand-alone residential project will develop at 100 percent of the target density, with two exceptions that are discussed below. This assumption is based on the Programs identified in the Housing Plan that are intended to incentive development at or above the target capacity. As demonstrated in Table 54, several recent mixed-use projects have developed or are proposed to develop at or above the target density without benefit of the proposed Programs; therefore, this trend, coupled with the implementation Programs, justify this capacity approach as realistic and supportable.

One of the exceptions to the 100 percent assumption noted above is regarding certain properties within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HSCSP). The properties in the HBCSP that are not within the DA-1 and DA-2 sub-districts assume that 75 percent of the floor area of the proposed development will develop with residential uses based on the requirements of the HBCSP. However, the capacity assumption is that 100 percent of the portion of the mix-use development that is developed with residential uses will develop at 100 percent of the target density. The other exception is described below in the capacity assumption for the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone.

Capacity Assumptions for Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ)

The Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OOZ) is a proposed program (Program 7) to facilitate affordable multi-family residential throughout Torrance; the strategy is described in Section 4.1.3.5. The City has used a capacity assumption that 25 percent of a site could be developed with housing, which could occur on undeveloped portions of a property such as portions of parking lots and open areas. Based on trends identified in Section X, it also may be possible that existing structures that are no longer being utilized could be replaced with housing. Since the potential sites are varied, the 25 percent assumption is an average—some sites could add less than 25 percent, while others, such as the example described in the following paragraph, involved 75 percent of the site.

This is a new overlay zone that will be implemented after the 6th Cycle Housing Element has been adopted, and therefore the City has not processed any applications to demonstrate the capacity assumption under the new RIH-OZ program. However, in 2020 an application was submitted (and eventually approved) for a 48-unit townhouse (condominium) development on a church property in Torrance that included retention of the church sanctuary and demolition of the existing chapel, office, and preschool. The existing land use designation of R-MD was retained and a rezoning from A-1/R-2 to R-3 was approved. Approximately 75 percent of the total project site was developed with townhouses. Although the project was not processed under the proposed RIH-OZ, it demonstrates that the City’s capacity assumption of 25 percent is reasonable. During stakeholder meetings the City had with non-profit and market-rate developers, religious institution sites were identified as viable and promising candidates for new housing.

4.1.2.4 Criteria Used to Identify Suitable Sites in the Sites Inventory

Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, nonvacant sites comprise more than half of Torrance’s Sites Inventory. Because of this, Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(2) requires the City to analyze the extent to which existing uses may constitute an impediment to additional residential development. In addition to describing past experience in converting non-residential uses to residential development, market trends and conditions (described in Section XXX), and regulatory or other incentives to encourage recycling/redevelopment (as provided in the Housing Plan), the City must identify the criteria used to select sites to meet its RHNA. Based on the trends described previously and the criteria described below, the City has determined that the criteria demonstrate that the sites are not an impediment to development with housing during the Planning Period. Following are the criteria the City used to select sites for the Sites Inventory.

1. **Developer or property owner interest to develop/redevelop the site.** Properties with expressed interest in development are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.

2. Vacant lot, parking lot, or open storage that includes only minor existing improvements on site. Vacant properties, parking lots, or those with limited improvements are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.

3. Sites that meet a minimum of 2 of the following criteria:

- a. Site is included in the Housing Corridor Study. As described in the Housing Element, the detailed evaluations of the properties have been conducted for the Housing Corridor Study, including feasibility analysis and economic analyses to verify development feasibility. Sites in the HCS also will have the benefit of having CEQA review already prepared for sites in the study area, which offer an incentive to development by streamlining the development process.
- b. City-owned site. The Sites Inventory includes multiple sites owned by the City that are available for housing within the 6th Cycle Planning Period.
- c. Land value is greater than improvement value (LV>IV), when adjusted for current assessment values. According to the methodology developed by the University of California at Berkeley for the State of California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, the ratio of land improvements to land value can facilitate identification of underutilized sites with potential for infill or redevelopment with higher density residential and/or mixed use developments. An improved site may be considered underutilized if it is located in a non-single-family area (e.g., commercial, industrial, multi-family, etc.) and the total value of improvements on the site is less than the total value of the underlying land (i.e., LV<IV). *(Please note that due to the age of structures, lack of improvements that would trigger a new assessment, and/or lack of transfer of ownership in many years, many sites have not been reassessed in decades—some in as many as 48 years. The land value of these sites does not reflect what the current assessed value would be based on recent reassessments of similar properties in Torrance, which we reviewed and can be confirmed based on our analysis. Therefore, wherever the criteria for land value is indicated to be higher than improvement value, either it is higher or would be higher if it had been reassessed within the past several years to reflect recent market value. We also note that some sites that have been identified as having developer interest do not have a current LV>IV, which supports this approach.)*
- d. Structure was built before 1992 (and therefore over 30 years old). An improved site may be considered as having the potential for redevelopment if it is older than 30 years. Analysis indicates that several sites that have been redeveloped or approved in recent years or are or in the pipeline in Torrance have been less than 30 years old.
- e. Site is in disrepair and/or has had ongoing Code violations, as identified by City Staff.
- f. Presence of low-intensity or low-value uses, such as small structures surrounded by large parking lots.

- g. If residential, the site can accommodate an increase in the number of dwelling units (based on allowable or proposed density).
- h. If a religious institution with the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ), the site has parking areas and/or other open space that could accommodate the addition of housing to the site, which means existing structures would not be an impediment to development. (Please note that for the purposes of the capacity assumption for the RIH-OZ, the Housing Element assumes an average of only 25 percent of a site would be developed with housing based on availability of parking lots/open space. The capacity assumption does not include potential demolition of existing buildings that may no longer be used. The discussion and examples in the RIH-OZ section also substantiate the assumptions the City has made regarding potential availability of the site for added residential use.)
- i. There is or has been an ongoing presence of vacancies.

Property owners in the Sites Inventory (excluding the Housing Corridor Sites) were contacted to inform them of their inclusion in the Sites inventory and what it would mean to them, and were asked to contact the City if they wanted to be excluded from the Sites Inventory. A representative of one property owner responded to ask to be removed because he is pursuing a non-residential project; his site was removed. The City also received many calls for property owners to confirm that their sites were included. Outreach to the property owners in the Housing Corridor Study is described below.

ADEQUACY OF SITES INVENTORY CONCLUSION: The City considers that the sites in the Sites Inventory do not pose an impediment to recycling from non-residential to residential or mixed use developments due to the following factors: (1) the documented development trends of non-residentially used and zoned properties to mixed use and residential in both Torrance and nearby cities; (2) the significant interest Staff receives regularly by developers and property owners who want to recycle non-residentially used and zoned property to residential and mixed use; (3) the local, regional, and national trends of diminishing need for stand-alone retail and office uses due to e-commerce and more people and working from home due to the COVID pandemic; (4) the ability of developers who want to retain or construct commercial uses in addition to residential, which is being facilitated by programs in Section 5 (Housing Plan); (5) the outreach the City conducted to property owners on the Sites Inventory; (6) the capacity assumptions discussed in Section 4.1.2.3 and the City's programs incentivize densities at or above the target density are not only realistic but conservative; and (7) the City has a 31.1 percent buffer built into the sites inventory, not including ADUs, pipeline, or approved projects.

4.1.2.5 Lot Consolidation

The residential sites inventory includes many small sites that are clustered and offer excellent opportunity for consolidation in order to facilitate high-quality and well-designed developments. The Sites Inventory includes the assumption of lot consolidation for certain identified sites. As demonstrated in Table H-44 (residentially designated) and Table H-45 (non-residentially designated projects), many mixed use and stand-alone residential developments include lot consolidation. While consolidating lots is not as easy or convenient as having only one parcel to develop, lot consolidation occurs frequently in Torrance and does not appear to be a significant constraint to development. The Sites Inventory includes properties that more than likely will have to rely on lot consolidation to be

.....

viable; therefore, To encourage lot consolidation, Program 3 includes existing and proposed actions to facilitate future lot consolidation.

4.1.2.6 Additional Information Regarding Sites Inventory Strategies

Create Housing (Residential/Mixed Use) Corridors

The City's housing strategy builds on the direction provided in the City's General Plan Land Use Element and Strategic Plan to identify recyclable land along and in proximity to major commercial and transportation corridors and in Downtown Torrance as an opportunity to facilitate new housing (multiple-family and mixed use). This strategy helps the City meet the local housing demand while encouraging the recycling of older and underutilized buildings and uses and, vacant buildings and sites, and problem properties, while creating tax generation opportunities. The Land Use Element noted that in Torrance, future residential and mixed-use developments will most likely be located in Downtown Torrance, along major commercial corridors, and at key activity nodes such as major commercial intersections where development is compatible with surrounding land uses. Consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element, residential and mixed-use developments should be located in areas where services and transportation are most available and do not interfere with established residential neighborhoods. In several areas, stand-alone residential is also proposed, as many housing developers either are not familiar with or choose not to develop mixed use developments.

There are several benefits to introducing and encouraging housing near and along key commercial and transportation corridors, including benefits to further affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities. It supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile, which is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation. It also provides greater opportunities to distribute housing for all income levels throughout the city. It has economic benefits as well, as additional residents in proximity to businesses provides an enhanced customer base.

This strategy also implements input from the community that influenced several sub-goals in the City's recently updated Strategic Plan (May 2021). Mixed use development (~~a mix of residential and compatible non-residential uses in the same building or on the same site~~) is encouraged in both the Economic Development and Housing Strategic Priorities. The Economic Development Strategic Priority encourages flexible, creative, and innovative land uses and development types, including mixed-use development. The Housing Strategic Priority proposes to address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential -infill housing in locations that are close to local-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.

Another factor that is making mixed use and residential development more viable along predominantly commercial corridors more viable is the impact of e-commerce on local and national retail shopping. The last decade has brought a significant increase in online sales, with e-commerce sales rising steadily from 6.4 percent in 2010 to 21.3 percent in 2020.⁶ This national trend, which was exacerbated by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic (which started in 2019 and is still ongoing as of the date of adoption of this Housing Element), is not expected to decline. The economic

6 US Ecommerce Grows 44.0% in 2020 (<https://www.digitalcommerce360.com/article/us-e-commerce-sales/#:~:text=Online's%20share%20of%20total%20retail,2019%20and%2014.3%25%20in%202018.>) Accessed 4.22.21

impact of the COVID-19 lockdown is the number of businesses that have permanently closed, with small businesses especially hard hit. Many services also are moving to an online platform, such as banking and insurance. The impact of the pandemic also has resulted in more people working remotely (usually from home); although many will return to their places of employment after the pandemic, estimates are that as many as 25-30% of the workforce will continue to work at home on a multiple-days-a-week basis.⁷

As a result of these and other factors, cities across the country are recognizing the need to provide flexibility in land uses in traditionally commercial areas by allowing a greater mix of uses, including mixed use development, as well as stand-alone residential uses in traditionally commercial areas to create mixed use “nodes” and mixed use “corridors.”

Torrance is experiencing the impacts of this trend as well. Additionally, due to the City’s history (incorporation in 1921) and its most rapid period of development between 1950 and 1969, there are many buildings in Torrance that are at least 50 years old. Many of these underutilized and older properties exhibit similar characteristics in terms of conditions and existing operations as other properties that have been redeveloped within the recent past. In fact, prior to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies by the state in 2012, Torrance had four redevelopment project areas that experienced significant recycling of older and underutilized property.

A significant number of sites have been chosen with the criteria of underutilization and age in mind. Due to the scarcity of developable vacant land in the city, these properties offer an economic incentive to the property owner to develop higher density residential and mixed-use products, as evidenced by the increasing number of applications and developer interest to recycle existing non-residential properties to residential uses. As described in Section 3, Torrance provides the opportunity for mixed use development in several commercial land use designations on a case-by-case basis and in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. The Housing Plan includes several programs and actions to facilitate mixed use and stand-alone residential development in traditionally non-residential land use designations, including allowing them by-right in certain designations and providing a new housing overlay in other areas.

The City also acknowledges that development on small lots may be more difficult; thus, the City has included only those smaller properties that have the potential for sufficient added capacity to make recycling of land economically feasible. However, recently approved projects, new applications, and developer interest indicate that lot consolidation can make development projects economically viable. Table H-54 shows that six out of 10 mixed use development or residential projects on non-residentially designated properties include lot consolidation, ranging from two to six parcels. To support and encourage continued assembly of smaller properties into larger sites, the City has a program (Program 3, Objective 10) to facilitate lot consolidation.

The Housing Plan (Section 5) includes several programs and objectives to facilitate multi-family and mixed-use development along key corridors. Program 1, Objective 3 will add one or more new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays (R/MU-OZ), tailored to the specific target density, to identified sites on Redondo Beach Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, as well as other scattered sites on other key transportation corridors, such as Western Avenue, Torrance Boulevard (not in the HBCSP),

⁷ <https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/work-at-home-after-covid-19-our-forecast>. Accessed 4.23.21

Pacific Coast Highway, and other locations. Other programs include adding residential and mixed-use as allowable uses to certain districts in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and increasing the density and allowing stand-alone residential along Crenshaw Boulevard.

The key areas included in the sites inventory with the potential and reasonable likelihood to develop with higher density residential and mixed-use development are summarized below. Together, these sites are able to can accommodate a full range of income levels, including lower income housing as defined by State law⁸.

Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan: The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) is the only specific plan in Torrance. Adopted in 1996, it introduced the concept of mixed-use development on underutilized sites along the length of Hawthorne Boulevard, with higher density stand-alone residential and senior housing developments also allowed in the two Del Amo districts to support a walkable, dynamic city center. During the 5th Cycle Housing Element, this vision began to take shape, as a market-rate townhouse style development and a senior apartment development were constructed in the Del Amo 1 Sub-District directly north of Del Amo Fashion Center, and three new mixed-use projects were constructed in the Walteria district (see Table H-54).

Continued and increasing developer interest in the HBCSP and the changing nature of retail indicate the growing economic feasibility of redeveloping a variety of sites along Hawthorne Boulevard with residential uses. For example, the disappearance of national department store chains has impacted the Del Amo Fashion Center—the mall’s southern end, which used to be home to Sears and presents a significant opportunity for revitalization, including the introduction of residential uses, which is a national trend that is stimulating reinvestment in malls across the country.

This trend is reflected in plans to add residential development to the South Bay Galleria, which is a mall located on Hawthorne Boulevard in Redondo Beach that shares a boundary with Torrance (see Project LL in Table H-55: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions), which



Examples of new mixed-use developments in the Walteria District in the HBCSP

⁸ California Government Code Section 65583.2: if a local government has adopted density standards consistent with the population based criteria set by 65583.2 (at least 30 du/ac for Torrance), the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is obligated to accept sites with those density standards (30 units per acre or higher) as appropriate for accommodating the jurisdictions share of regional housing need for lower-income households.

proposes 300 residential units including 20% lower-income or 10% very-low income units on the South Bay Galleria site.

The Sites Inventory identifies a wide range of opportunities for housing throughout the corridor at a variety of scales and housing types, from smaller mixed-use projects in WALTERIA to larger-scale residential opportunities within the Del Amo districts, to medium-scale mixed use projects in other districts. The sites range from under-utilized properties with existing buildings to parking lots directly adjacent to the Del Amo Fashion Center, which has undergone significant redevelopment and expansion over the past decade or more, including the addition of several residential developments as noted above. The sites identified and proposed programs also encourage opportunities for developments to have a mix of income levels, including mixed income within individual developments. The mixed-income sites assume that 80 percent of the units will be available to above-moderate households with the remaining 20 percent available to lower-income households. The intent is to recognize the demand for above-moderate units in Torrance while encouraging a mixed of income levels on larger sites consistent with the goal of affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Density and use are not proposed to change in the HBCSP; however, Program 1, Objective 5 would add mixed use as an allowable use in the HMD and H/PCH districts of the Specific Plan, increasing the HBCSP's ability to provide additional housing opportunities. Program 1, Objective 5 also proposes to




*Mixed Townhouse/Senior Stacked Flat (Podium) Development
in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Del Amo Sub-District 1*

consider allowing stand-alone residential in the districts that currently are limited to mixed use development. Program 3, Objective 5 will evaluate and remove governmental constraints to development standards in the HBCSP, such as reconsidering the 100' setback requirement for residential portions of mixed-use developments in the NT, PR, and MP Districts, and modifications to other development standards that have been identified by local developers as constraints to development. A total of 76 sites are identified along the entire length of Hawthorne Boulevard corridor, providing the opportunity for 3,305,301 units, including above-moderate, moderate, and lower-income households as well as mixed-income developments.

The City has received developer interest regarding many of the sites identified in the Sites Inventory, including several in the Del Amo DA-1 and DA-2 Sub-Districts. There are two mixed use developments that are in the pipeline in the WALTERIA district, both of which are processing applications for lot consolidation, further demonstrating the trend toward recycling existing buildings into residential uses via lot consolidation. There is also a pipeline project in the Del Amo DA-2 Sub-District, which includes units available for low-income households. The trend of developing multi-family residential and mixed use development on non-residential sites has already occurred in the HBCSP and continues to increase. The interest is so high that the City expects requests to add residential units to sites in the HBCSP that are not already included to continue through the Housing Element Planning Period.

Crenshaw Boulevard (south of Sepulveda Boulevard): A significant stretch of Crenshaw Boulevard between Sepulveda and Pacific Coast Highway is currently designated R-OF (Residential-Professional-Office), with a Residential-Professional (RP) zone. Many of these properties were developed in the 1950s and 1960s as office and service uses but have seen declining tenancy over the years as demand for Class A offices caused office uses to move to other areas of Torrance. The shift toward working remotely is exacerbating this trend, and many tenant spaces along this corridor area have experienced high vacancy rates and continue to do so. Due to the age and location of this area, many of these sites are smaller and do not meet state criteria for lower income housing.



Examples of Sites on Crenshaw Boulevard

The R-OF land use designation currently allows 18.1-31 dwelling units per acre. The allowable densities for R-OF properties will be increased to 31.1-44 dwelling units per acre and the R-P zone will be revised accordingly to facilitate and encourage mixed-use and stand-alone residential uses on the Crenshaw corridor, as well as for other R-OF designated and R-P zoned sites (pursuant to Program 1, Objectives 1 and 2).

There are also several properties on the Crenshaw Boulevard corridor directly south of the R-OF designated properties that are designated and zoned commercial, which also provide opportunities to introduce housing along the corridor; these two sites also are candidates for the new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(R/MU-OZ) identified above. During the rezoning process, additional sites may be added if appropriate. Objectives in Program 3 will reduce government constraints to development. The trend of redeveloping non-residentially zoned properties to residential uses is demonstrated along the Crenshaw corridor as evidenced by the new residential development that is under construction on Crenshaw Boulevard in Lomita, directly adjacent to and south of the City’s sites on Crenshaw Boulevard south of Sepulveda Boulevard—see project MM in Table H-XX: Recycling Trends—Sampling of Entitled and Constructed Projects in Neighboring Jurisdictions). The City fully expects this trend to continue in Torrance along the Crenshaw corridor.

A total of 21 sites providing an estimated capacity of 495214 units identified for moderate- and lower-income are identified on Crenshaw Boulevard south of Sepulveda Boulevard (note that there are additional sites on Crenshaw Boulevard in the Housing Corridor Sites Study Area, discussed below).

Redondo Beach Boulevard: During the General Plan update process, Redondo Beach Boulevard was an area that was identified as a transition area experiencing land use changes, and where properties are underutilized and/or undervalued. The 6th Cycle Sites Inventory expands the number of properties on Redondo Beach Boulevard appropriate for residential development, as identified in the Sites Inventory. Located at the northern boundary of the City along a major thoroughfare, the sites are adjacent to goods, services, and the El Camino College on the north side of Redondo Beach Boulevard

in Los Angeles county. Another benefit is that they are easily accessible to regional transit since the majority of Redondo Beach Boulevard in Torrance is identified as a High-Quality Transit Area (HQTA) as part of SCAG’s Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Availability of efficient, affordable transportation can be used to measure fair housing and access to opportunities; therefore, facilitating housing along Redondo Beach Boulevard promotes additional affordable housing opportunities. This trend to add residential units to non-residentially zoned sites along Redondo Beach Boulevard is reflected in plans to add 300 market-rate and low-income residential units to the South Bay Galleria, located in Redondo Beach at the intersection of Hathorne and Redondo Beach Boulevards (discussed previously and shown in Table H-56).

Unlike Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan that allows residential and mixed-use development, or the portion of Crenshaw Boulevard that is designated R-OF and zoned RP, mixed use development is allowed on Redondo Beach Boulevard on a case-by-case basis via a Conditional Use Permit. However, to facilitate and incentivize mixed use and multi-family housing along Redondo Beach Boulevard, the City will add a new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay (R/MU-OZ) to the identified sites (Program 1, Objective 3), similar to what is being proposed via the Housing Corridors Study (HCS) discussed later in this section. During the rezoning process, additional sites along this corridor may be added if appropriate.

Sepulveda Boulevard: Portions of Sepulveda Boulevard also provide opportunities to introduce mixed use development due to underutilization of retail and service buildings. Sepulveda Boulevard is also a key transportation corridor and is located in proximity to goods and services, employment, and open space (Madrona Marsh). Unlike Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan that allows residential and mixed-use development, or the portion of Crenshaw Boulevard that is designated R-OF and zoned RP, mixed use development is allowed on Sepulveda Boulevard on a case-by-case basis via a conditional use permit. To facilitate mixed use and multi-family residential development on this section of Sepulveda Boulevard, the Housing Element proposes to adopt and apply the proposed Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(R/MU-OZ) to properties identified for the Sites Inventory. Not only will the overlay facilitate residential uses along in this area, but it will also take into consideration the need to mitigate impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Increase Residential Infill Via Housing Corridors Study (HCS)

The Land Use Element identifies seven land use study areas, representing areas in transition that may be experiencing land use changes, physical blight, stagnation, vacancies, or underutilization, and/or otherwise may not be functioning at their full potential. The City initiated a Housing Corridors Study in 2020 to evaluate these and other potential study areas as possibilities to aid in providing new opportunities for housing and attractive placemaking. Each study area was selected based on direction provided in the General Plan, proximity to primary commercial corridors, and adjacency to public transit lines, which are all key factors in providing housing that affirmatively furthers fair housing and housing choice. ~~The preliminary study areas are shown in Figure H-6.~~

The study areas that are being evaluated in the Housing Corridors Study are shown in Figure H-9 and discussed in greater detail below.

1. **Gramercy Place:** The Gramercy Place Study Area includes 12 parcels (6.85 acres). All properties are designated R-LM, although they are all zoned M1 (Light Manufacturing), with the majority currently developed with small-scale industrial uses. All the parcels are proposed to retain their

R-LM land use designation and an overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the allowable density for the R-LM land use designation of 9.1-18 dwelling units per acre. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 100.

6. **Spencer Street:** The Spencer Street Study Area includes 10 parcels (approximately three acres). All properties are designated R-LM and zoned ML(M1-PP) (Limited Manufacturing with a Light Manufacturing-Precise Plan overlay) and are developed with small-scale light manufacturing uses. All parcels are proposed to be redesignated to the R-MD land use designation, which allows 18.1-31 dwelling units per acre. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the R-MD density. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 62. A similar property in the vicinity (on Earl St.) that was also designated R-LM and zoned industrial was recycled to a residential development in 2016 (see Project ID “H” in Table H-54).
7. **Maricopa Street:** The Maricopa Street Study Area includes nine parcels (28.2 acres). Eight of the nine parcels are designated I-LT (Light Industrial); the remaining parcel is designated I-HVY (Heavy Industrial). The parcels are zoned either M2 or M2/P1, which is Heavy Manufacturing (P1 is a Planting/Parking zone). Existing uses include light manufacturing, a church, and the City-owned property adjacent to the Torrance Transit Center. Proposed land use designations range from R-LM to R-HI. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density ranges. Based on the assumed target capacities, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 640. An industrially designated and zoned property on Maricopa Street adjacent to this study area was recycled to a residential development in 2003—see Project ID “M” in Table H-54.
8. **Border Avenue:** The Border Avenue Study Area is an area that was identified in the *Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan* as a location for recycling to residential development, in accordance with the strategies to incentivize mixed use and residential development on infill sites in Downtown and in the surrounding corridors and to ensure new housing includes affordable units. Eighty-nine of the 136 original parcels included in the Border Avenue Study Area have been included in the Sites Inventory. The current land use designations for the parcels are R-OF, R-MD, and C-CTR; the current zoning varies and includes M1 (Light Manufacturing), C1 (Retail Commercial), R3 (Limited Multiple Family Residential), and DRP (Downtown Redevelopment Plan). A determination has not yet been made as to how to designate and ultimately apply an overlay zone to these properties; therefore, for the purposes of estimating potential capacity in the Housing Element, the target densities for the existing land use designations were used. Applying those target densities, a potential of 442 dwelling units could be achieved. In 2013, a 44-unit, 100 percent affordable mixed-use development was constructed directly west of several of the properties identified in the Border Avenue Study Area (see Project ID “L” in Table H-54). Public interest has been expressed to develop housing on at least five parcels in the Border Avenue Study Area in recent months. See also the discussion regarding Downtown Torrance later in this section.
9. **Western Avenue:** The Western Avenue Study Area includes nine parcels (5.6 acres). The parcels are designated I-BP (Business Park) and zoned M1 (Light Manufacturing). Existing uses include small-scale manufacturing, light industrial, and a vacant property. The parcels north of Lincoln Avenue are proposed to be designated R-MH (Residential Medium-High), while those south of Lincoln Avenue are proposed to be designated R-MD (Residential Medium Density). An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density ranges. Based on the assumed target capacities, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 152.

There have been two recently entitled projects on Western Avenue in 2020—one a mixed-use development and the other a residential project; both were developed on property designated C-GEN.

10. **Lomita & Madison:** The Lomita And Madison Study Area consists of one parcel that is 8.3 acres. The existing land use designation is I-BP and the zoning is M1-PP. Existing uses include light industrial, places of worship, and office. The parcel is proposed to be redesignated to R-MH (Residential Medium-High). An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the R-MH density. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 274.
11. **Prairie Avenue:** The Prairie Avenue Study Area includes two parcels (0.7 acres). The existing land use designation is C-GEN and the zoning is C5. The property is proposed to be redesignated to R-LM. An overlay zone will be applied to accommodate the assumed density range. Based on the assumed target capacity, the potential number of units identified in the Sites Inventory is 7. There have been two entitled projects in Prairie Avenue—one in 2020 and one in 2021 (see Project IDs “B” and “O.”)

Outreach was conducted with property owners for each of the study areas to inform them of the project and receive input.






Figure H-9: Housing Corridors Study Areas




The Torrance Housing Corridors Study was funded by a SB 2 grant from the state of California. Specific goals related to SB 2 grant funding are provided below:

- Make funding available to all local governments in California for the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans that streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production.
- Facilitate planning activities that will foster an adequate supply of homes affordable to Californians at all income levels. It is designed to help local governments meet the challenges of preparing and adopting land use plans and integrating strategies to promote housing development.
- SB 2 funded activities are intended to achieve the following program objectives:
 - Accelerate housing production
 - Streamline the approval of housing development affordable to owner and renter households at all income levels
 - Facilitate housing affordability for all income groups
 - Promote development consistent with State Planning Priorities (Government Code Section 65041.1)
 - Ensure geographic equity in the distribution and expenditure of allocated funds



Prototype/Concept Analyzed—Townhouse



Prototype/Concept Analyzed—Walk-Up (Podium Alternative)

Although not yet complete, the Torrance Housing Corridors Study is being prepared concurrently with the Housing Element update to position the City to better address the increases in RHNA allocations for the 6th Cycle planning period and implement the City’s housing goals, policies, and objectives consistent with state law. ~~The sites that are included in the Housing Corridors Study are also included in the Housing Element Sites Inventory. Results from the Housing Corridors Study will support the implementing actions in the Housing Plan of the 6th Cycle Housing Element, including preparation of regulatory recommendations and preliminary design concepts that will provide the foundation for amendments to the Land Use Element, Zoning Code and Zoning Map to implement the Housing Corridors Plan.~~ The Housing Corridor Study is supplying 132 parcels in the Sites Inventory, or approximately 30.6 percent of the total number of parcels in the Sites Inventory (434431 parcels) and approximately 34 percent of required units (based on a RHNA of 4,934). Note that not all parcels in the Housing Corridor Study have been included in the Sites Inventory due to lack of ability to meet key criteria or a property owner’s desire not to redevelop their property at this time.

All seven study areas are undergoing analysis and preparation of context-appropriate standards for future residential development. This includes the preparation of a Feasibility Study of four building concepts (prototypes) that could be used in the various study areas, depending on the applicable density. The intent is to determine if the proposed densities can be achieved by applying specified development standards. The building prototypes range from a townhouse development at 23.5 dwelling units per acre, a podium apartment development at 32.5 dwelling units per acre, a walk-up apartment at 30.2 dwelling units per acre, and a “split” project that includes both townhouses and

apartments, for an average density of 40.5 dwelling units per acre. A financial pro forma fiscal analysis was then performed for five prototypes (the “split” townhouse/apartment was evaluated as two prototypes—the townhouse and the apartment component) to determine project feasibility. The financial factors for the prototypes were generally developed based on the industry-standard cost factors, which reflected a review of site design requirements associated with various zoning districts, and historic property sale data. The analysis was also informed by input from development/design professionals active in the South Bay and comparable southern California markets. The prototypes were evaluated based on the City’s existing parking standards. The fiscal analysis determined that, in many cases, densities could be achieved if the parking standards were reduced. This finding will inform finalization of the development and design standards for the study area. The fiscal analysis did not consider impacts of other development standards that have been identified as constraints to development, such as height, open space, and FARs.

The results of the Housing Corridor Study will culminate in the preparation of specified zones (and/or overlay zones) for the various Study Areas, each with development and design standards tailored to the particular area. The Housing Corridor Study is being implemented via Program 8. The detailed prototype and fiscal evaluations and analyses conducted for the HCS and the resulting development and design standards also will provide direction for other amendments to the Zoning Code to implement the Housing Element programs, such as preparation of the Residential/Mixed Use Overlay Zone and modifications to existing development standards to reduce development constraints.

Downtown Torrance

In Downtown Torrance, commercial properties with potential to redevelop to mixed-use are also identified on the sites Inventory. These areas offer the opportunity for development on contiguous sites at the appropriate densities to accommodate housing opportunities. The former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area (DRP) encompasses 88.5 acres and contained the original commercial core of the city when it was founded in 1912. Historically, the pattern of redevelopment in the Downtown area has not been limited to construction of projects dedicated solely for commercial uses. The Redevelopment Agency was instrumental in providing funds for new development and property maintenance and rehabilitation prior to the demise of redevelopment agencies in 2012.

Trends indicate that the Downtown area has been consistently redeveloped with mixed-use developments that integrate a residential component. In Downtown Torrance, mixed-use development has revitalized older buildings and added to the charm and character of the area. It has been common practice for projects in Downtown to consist of ground-floor commercial uses and an above-ground-floor residential use, and stand-alone residential development also has occurred, including a townhouse-style development and a senior apartment project. Examples of mixed-use developments in the DRP within the last 30 years include Brisas del Sol (at 96 du/ac) and Brisas del Prado (at 84 du/ac), which were made possible through the former Torrance Redevelopment Agency.

The General Plan identifies intensification of uses as a means to revitalize the area. Currently, the area is experiencing a renaissance with the development of and reinvestment in the Downtown commercial




Cabrillo Family Apartments, a 44-unit, 100% affordable development in Downtown Torrance

area. In early 2013, the City approved an affordable, mixed-use, workforce housing development consisting of 44 dwelling units and approximately 3,700 square feet of commercial space in Downtown Torrance. The development utilized a density bonus and provided 43 units affordable to very low- and low-income households, plus a manager’s unit. The project was developed on City-owned property.

To continue and support the momentum in Downtown Torrance, the City recently approved a *Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (Downtown Plan)* in July of 2021. The Downtown Plan includes the commercial core of Downtown Torrance, also referred to as Old Torrance, as well as portions of four surrounding corridors that constitute the balance of the “greater” Downtown Torrance area (-see Figure H-7-10). Note that the *Border Avenue study area in the HCS* is also one of the identified corridors in the Downtown Plan.

Figure H-10: Downtown Torrance Study Area



The Downtown Plan evaluated current regulations pertaining to the Downtown Commercial District, and reviewed the market feasibility for uses and new development to help define and target businesses or development that could be compatible and practical for the area. Utilizing the background information and considerable public input, the Plan provides a detailed vision concept for the Downtown, and goals, strategies, and actions to implement the vision. In particular, Goal 5 proposes to support infill development of underutilized retail and commercial sites with mixed use and stand-alone housing. The key strategies and supporting future recommended actions in the Downtown Plan regarding the incentivization of mixed use and residential development are highlighted below.

Strategy M: Incentivize mixed use housing development on infill sites in Downtown and in the surrounding corridors.

- **M.1. Modify internal processes for approving mixed-use projects.** Front load the environmental use design considerations and reduce discretionary actions to attract investment interest and increase speed of project approvals. Develop a streamlined development process to incentivize mixed use housing projects in Downtown and corridors.
- **M.2. Remove parking barriers to development by evaluating right-sizing parking ratios to 1.5 spaces for residential units over 700 square feet to encourage mixed-use housing development.** The cost of developing subterranean parking in downtown is a barrier to financial feasibility. With reduced parking ratios, developers can generate higher profit margins and are more likely to pursue projects in Downtown Torrance. Permitting lower

parking ratios as part of the municipal code will also streamline the development process and reduce the need for developers to request a variance from development standards.

- **M.3. Relax open space requirement for residential projects, especially apartments with inclusionary units.** This existing open space requirement for multi-family housing is onerous and restricts the opportunity for more residential density and units. See Appendix A for suggested modifications to the existing requirements within Downtown and in the Corridor Study Areas.
- **M.4. Develop incentives to encourage market rate and affordable housing development near Downtown.** Consider fee waivers for affordable and inclusionary housing projects in Downtown and the surrounding corridors.



Examples of potential types of infill housing provided in the Downtown Plan

Strategy N: Incentivize mixed-use redevelopment in the Commercial Study Area so it can become an extension of Downtown Torrance.

- **N.1. Create a zoning overlay or rezone the area to permit mixed-use development.** Developers are most likely to pursue a wrap typology, which is conducive for the larger sites in the commercial area.
- **N.2. Consider expedited site plan review.** This would be for new construction and adaptive reuse projects located in the overlay/area. Expediting the development review process reduces developer holding costs and incentivizes development.

Strategy O: Ensure new housing includes affordable units.

- **O.1. Explore adoption of an inclusionary zoning (IZ) ordinance for properties in the Study Area.** Any IZ requirements should be calibrated to current market conditions and parallel density bonus requirements for implementation effectiveness.
- **O.2. Prioritize bids to develop on City-owned land that include affordable housing.** There are several City-owned parcels in the Study Area, including parking lots in Downtown Torrance. Under a request for bids, the City can prioritize affordable housing be part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.
- **O.3. Consider offering zoning incentives to mixed-use and residential projects that provide affordable housing.** Incentives could apply to many areas including open space and parking requirements. For instance, the recommended parking ratio of 1.5 spaces for residential units over 700 square feet could be further reduced to 1.0 spaces per unit.

As can be seen from the strategies and implementing actions above, the City is planning many ways to incentivize mixed-use and residential development within the Downtown area and associated corridors. All sites that fall within these areas can benefit from these proposed implementation efforts. (Please note that not all sites that fall within these areas are identified in the Sites Inventory as in the “Downtown,” even though they fall within the Downtown Plan are therefore subject to the strategies and actions listed above). “Downtown Torrance” is commonly known as the area on the map that is identified as such. As noted in the Sites Inventory, there are many sites that fall within these areas that already have public interest for development of housing. Implementation of the strategies and actions will only serve to enhance interest and continue the long-standing trend in the area.

The Sites Inventory identifies a number of properties within the Downtown Torrance study area where the conditions of existing uses are conducive to private redevelopment in the future. Such conditions include expressed developer interest, City ownership, large parking areas, older buildings, marginally operating businesses, and significant capacity for additional units. Strategy O under Goal 5 in the Downtown Plan is to “ensure new housing includes affordable units.”

There are several City-owned parcels in the Study Area that are included in the Sites Inventory, including parking lots in Downtown Torrance and the Border Avenue Housing Corridor Study, which also is included in the Downtown Plan. A recommended action (Strategy O.2. noted above) in the Downtown Plan states the following: “Under a request for bids, the City can prioritize affordable housing be part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.” The City-owned sites in the Downtown area are located in an area which is zoned to allow residential densities as envisioned in the Housing Element. To the City’s knowledge there are no known conditions that preclude residential development of City-owned properties. As noted in Strategy O.2. above, and as evidenced by the City’s history of utilizing City-owned property in Downtown Torrance for affordable housing, the City intends to continue to consider City-owned sites for affordable development. For example, the City is in current discussions with a developer for the construction of a maximum 20-unit affordable housing complex on a parcel owned by the City located at 1956 Torrance Boulevard (Site 499). The site is currently being used as a parking lot. It is the City’s intention to expand the number of affordable units within the City with the development of this site, in accordance with the strategies in the Downtown Plan (described above).

Religious Institution Overlay Zone

Throughout California, the development of affordable housing on religious properties has become an increasing trend. Nonprofit organizations such as Many Mansions and National CORE have assisted many religious facilities to incorporate housing on site. AB 1851 (Religious Facility Housing, 2020) incentivizes religious institutions to construct housing on their properties by allowing religious facilities to partner with nonprofit developers to provide affordable housing on-site and receive parking relief to facilitate development—a local agency is prohibited from requiring the replacement of religious-use parking spaces that a developer of a religious institution affiliated housing development project proposes to eliminate as part of that project. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, religious institutions in the city provide the potential to accommodate housing on their sites to assist the City in meeting the RHNA.

The City proposes to facilitate housing on religious institution properties by establishing an affordable housing overlay (Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone [RIH-OZ], Program 7). The Sites Inventory includes 2426 properties owned by and operated as religious institutions that have been identified as potential candidates for the addition of housing. These properties would be appropriate for the

addition of multifamily housing, as many are located near transit, services, businesses, and other resident-serving uses. These sites also are scattered throughout the city, which supports the City's goals, policies, and programs to affirmatively further fair housing.

Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, this is a valuable strategy to provide additional housing opportunities for lower income households. Utilizing church land for affordable housing also provides an attractive opportunity for affordable housing developers by minimizing their cost for land, risk, and time to process development applications. This approach also helps congregations further their missions to support lower-income populations while providing enhanced financial stability for religious institutions, many of which have been impacted by declining attendance, which has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Not all religious institutions in the city are proposed for the RIH-OZ due to a variety of factors, including the built-out nature of their properties. It is not the City's intent to limit potential RIH-OZ sites; additional properties may be identified via the rezoning process and could be included at that time or in the future. The RIH-OZ is a tool that could be utilized by any religious institution as conditions change. During the first focus group session with service providers and affordable developers, examples of successful partnerships with religious institutions were provided and the proposed concept for the RIH-OZ was supported. During the second focus group with service providers and affordable and market-rate developers, support for the RIH-OZ was again supported and one of the attendees noted that a 48-unit townhouse development has been entitled recently for the Christ the King Lutheran Church site in Torrance. This is a project for above-moderate income housing that would retain the existing church sanctuary and demolish the chapel, office, and preschool. Forty 3-bedroom units and eight 4-bedroom units are proposed on a 2.79-acre site. Although the RIH-OZ will only be applicable for affordable housing, the recently entitled project demonstrates that identifying religious institution properties for residential development is a reasonable strategy.

There has been significant expressed interest from church operations throughout Southern California to partner with nonprofit developers such as National CORE and Many Mansions to provide affordable housing onsite. Typical development model involves the church to provide a ground lease of the surplus or parking areas for affordable housing in exchange for lease payments, new facility, and/or affordable units for staff. An action is included in the Housing Plan for the City to actively pursue such opportunities. Following are three examples of an affordable housing developer adding housing to existing religious institution sites as proposed by the City's RIH-OZ.

1. The Southern California affordable housing developer National Community Renaissance (National CORE) has worked with several religious institutions to construct infill housing on sites they own. One example is Santa Angelina Senior Apartments in Placentia, California. National CORE is redeveloping an existing church site, retaining the church building, and constructing 65 units of senior affordable housing, new community garden, a new parish hall (to replace the existing parish hall), and a new memorial garden for the church.
- 4.2. A second example is Orchard View Apartments in the City of Buena Park, California. This is an existing church with a vacant portion of the site on which National CORE is building 66 units affordable to seniors. The church building will remain, and because of the passage of AB 1851, the remaining parking on the site is adequate. Amenities include a community center, outdoor seating areas, and BBQ picnic area.

3. A third example in the Los Angeles region is Legacy Square in the city of Santa Ana. This site was made available because a local church wanted to consolidate two campuses located in proximity to each other, and they wanted to further the church’s legacy in the neighborhood. One of the two sites retains the church buildings, and on the other, National CORE is constructing 93 affordable housing units for families on a 1.74-acre site (53.4 du/ac). These units are 100 percent affordable. The project includes amenities such as a tot lot playground, community center, landscaped outdoor courtyards, and BBQ areas.

Because of the recently entitled project in Torrance for construction of a residential development on the site of a religious institution in Torrance, and the three other examples of affordable housing on religious sites elsewhere in Southern California, this constitutes an important trend that likely will gain in popularity over the next eight years, assisting the City of Torrance in meet its affordable housing goals.

While the actual size and/or development potential of any religious institution for multifamily housing would vary from site to site, the City has made an assumption for the purposes of the Sites Inventory that approximately 25 percent of a site could be developed with residential uses. Development could occur on vacant or underutilized portions of the property and/or may include redeveloping portions or all of existing buildings into residential units. The City is proposing a density of 20-31 dwelling units per acre for the proposed RIH-OZ, with a target density of 23.25 dwelling units per acre. Given the fact that most affordable housing requires density bonuses, and because only affordable housing would qualify for the parking relief, the City assumes residential development proposed for these sites will be on the higher sides of the density range and therefore considers the assumed density factor to be not only reasonable, but conservative.

4.1.32.7 Other Recyclable Residential Land

As noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the land designated for residential use in Torrance has been essentially built out for years. However, analysis conducted for the Sites Inventory reveals that there are still underutilized residential properties in Torrance—that is, properties that are designated for higher residential density but are currently developed at less than the maximum permitted density, most commonly with single-family dwellings. Given the scarcity of developable land in Torrance, infill development on underutilized properties has been an ongoing trend for many years. Table H-42 identifies six properties that are zoned R-2 that either have received approval of or are in the application process to redevelop with two units per site. While this is only a net increase of 6 units, it represents the continuation of a trend.

Another opportunity for increased density on existing residentially designated property includes the potential to subdivide properties into flag lots. For example, if a single lot were to be subdivided into three lots through a flag lot subdivision, each one of the new lots also could accommodate an ADU and a JADU. If one existing lot with one single-family unit were to be subdivided into three lots, the potential net increase could be up to eight dwelling units, counting the ability to add an ADU and JADU to each site. Community input received during public outreach for the Housing Element update indicates a continued interest in creating flag lots.

These ongoing trends demonstrate that the City facilitates and encourages recycling and that there is a demand and market for recycling of residentially designated land to higher densities. The Sites Inventory identifies many of these sites—general descriptions include Apple Avenue, Santa Fe

Avenue, Gramercy Avenue (separate from the Housing Corridors Study sites on Gramercy Avenue), and flag lots.

4.1.23.8 Scattered Sites

A review of the City's records indicates that there are other opportunities for infill development at scattered sites throughout the City that have not already been discussed in previous sections. These scattered sites represent recyclable properties that contain existing non-residential uses that are likely candidates for conversion to residential uses. These properties are located in areas where the pattern of development has demonstrated a trend of conversion of existing underutilized and non-residential uses into multi-family uses. Also, many of these properties contain parcel sizes and configurations that make these sites conducive for recycling to multi-family uses. As has been noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the age of the structures on the scattered sites also will encourage redevelopment, as many are over 50 years old.

The scattered sites include a wide range of types of properties, from existing single-family units that are currently designated and zoned to allow more units and/or become flag-lot subdivisions, to larger industrial sites along key transportation corridors that will benefit from proposed redesignation and rezoning, and everything in between. Eleven sites have been identified as having public interest for development of housing. The various programs and actions identified in the Housing Plan will further incentivize the recycling of these sites into mixed-use and residential units.

4.1.34 INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABILITY

Torrance is a built-out community with existing infrastructure throughout. As discussed on Section 3.5 and in the Initial Study/Negative Declaration prepared for this project, no significant public service or infrastructure constraints have been identified. Public infrastructure improvements required of new developments, impact fees, and planned City improvements of facilities help to ensure that services are available to both current and future residents. Parks, schools, emergency facilities, and other public facilities area also extended in this manner. Ongoing development and maintenance of an efficiently functioning infrastructure is an ongoing priority for the City. It is one of the 10 strategic priorities in the City's Strategic Plan. The City has implemented an aggressive capital improvement program to upgrade infrastructure throughout the City.

4.1.54 ADEQUACY OF SITES INVENTORY TO MEET RHNA

Identified properties in the sites inventory have the combined capacity to accommodate 5,940 a total of 6,6436,471 income-targeted housing units on underutilized and vacant residential (Table H-58) and meetsites, which exceeds the City's total RHNA for the 2021-2029 planning period by 35.531 percent (see Table H-57). When anticipated ADUs and entitled and pipeline projects are included, the RHNA is exceeded by 57.053.4 percent.

Table H-58: Adequacy of Sites to Accommodate the 2021-2029 RHNA

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	---	28	288	3,094 ₂ 2,850	3,410 ₂ 3,166	38.2 ₃ %
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		---	---	29	1,210 ₅ 1,528	1,239 ₅ 1,557	45.3 ₅ %
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,167 ₂ 2,041 ²	2,926 ₂ 2,800	80.7 ₃ %
Total	4,939		304 195	429	480	6,471 6,473	7,575 7,577	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among; and added to, their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

Table H-59 summarizes the sites as identified by General Description in the Sites Inventory and as described in Section 4. The sites identified in the “Other” category are a compilation of the categories that are otherwise not specified in the table.

Table H-59: Adequacy of Sites to Accommodate the 2021-2029 RHNA by General Description

General Descriptions	Affordability Category			Total Units
	Lower Income ^{1,2}	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income ²	
Housing/Mixed Use Corridor Study (HCS)s:				
▪ HCS-Border	---	442	---	442
▪ HCS-Gramercy	---	---	100	100
▪ HCS-Lomita-Madison	274	---	---	274
▪ HCS-Maricopa	125	81	434	640
▪ HCS-Prairie Ave.	---	7	---	7
▪ HCS-Spencer	---	29	33	62
▪ HCS-Western	126	26	---	152
Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan	849 ₇₅	213 ₂₀₉	1,243 _{1,117}	2,301
Crenshaw Blvd. south of Sepulveda Blvd.	119	95	---	214
Redondo Beach Blvd. (not in HBCSP)	561 ₁₁₁	450	9	570
Sepulveda Blvd. east of Maple Ave.	851 ₆₃	143	15	221
Downtown Torrance (not otherwise accounted for)	---	126 ₁₂₈	---	126 ₁₂₈
Religious Housing Institution Overlay Zone	270	---	---	270
All Other Sites	687	72	333	1,092
Total	3,261 2,850	1,214 1,582	2,167 2,041	6,471 6,473

Note: All capacity assumptions based on Table H-53.

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among, and added to, their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

4.2 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Torrance has access to a variety of funding sources for affordable housing activities. These include programs from local, state, federal, and private resources. The City uses various funding sources, including Low/Moderate Housing Funds, HUD funding sources, and Section 8 rental assistance to preserve and increase the supply of affordable housing in Torrance through the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of renter-occupied units and the rehabilitation of owner-occupied units. Financial assistance is provided to both non-profit and for-profit housing developers. With the elimination of redevelopment, Torrance has limited funding for affordable housing activities. As noted previously the former Downtown Redevelopment Project Area was responsible for assisting with the development of several hundred units in Downtown Torrance over the years, including mixed use, residential, and SRO developments.

During the course of the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will pursue funding opportunities as provided for in the Housing Plan (Section 5). Financial incentives, such as fee waivers, are another strategy that can incentivize housing.

4.2.1 HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER (SECTION 8) RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The federal Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program provides rental assistance to very low-income households overpaying for housing. In general, the HCV program assists a very low-income household by paying the difference between 30 percent of the gross household income and the cost of rent. The Torrance Housing Authority is a Section 8 only Housing Authority (HA). It does not own or operate public housing units. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. As of September 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed. The City is constrained in the number of households it can assist by this program based on the way the federal government funds the program; the City go assist up to 650 households if federal funding was more appropriate. The HA maintains a residence preference, which gives priority to households that live or work in the City, and priority is given to families, disabled persons, and seniors.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD's VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

4.2.2 LOW & MODERATE HOUSING SET-ASIDE FUNDS

The City annually receives low- and moderate-income housing funds for the purpose of creating new affordable housing and maintaining existing affordable housing. The funds also assist with the monitoring of affordability restrictions and administering housing activities. Currently, the City has \$1.9 million in low- and moderate-income funds.

4.2.3 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FUNDS

Through the CDBG program, HUD provides funds to local governments for funding a wide range of community development activities for low-income persons. Since 2011, the City has received approximately \$7.2 million dollars in total of CDBG funds with another \$754,897 of CDBG funds to be received in Fiscal Year 2020-2021. In recent years, the City has used CDBG funds to successfully complete projects throughout the City by providing accessibility and mobility through the improvement of sidewalks. The City identifies areas where the sidewalk is either damaged or displaced, causing a non-continuous path of travel to anyone, including senior citizens and those with disabilities. The City then uses CDBG grant fund to address the accessibility issues by removing the barriers via the removal/replacement of damaged sidewalk.

4.2.4 HOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The City has a Home Improvement Program (HIP) that is administered by the Community Services Department. HIP is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided through HIP include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs. Qualifications include being a senior aged 50 or older or a disabled owner or occupant of a single-family residence within Torrance, and the applicant must meet the financial criteria as set out by the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD). City code enforcement staff works closely to refer residents that may not be able to complete needed repairs on their own.

4.2.5 LOCAL EARLY ACTION PLANNING (LEAP) GRANTS

In the 2019-20 Budget Act, Governor Gavin Newsom allocated \$250 million for all regions, cities, and counties to do their part by prioritizing planning activities that accelerate housing production to meet identified needs of every community. With this allocation, HCD established the Local Early Action Planning Grant Program (LEAP) with \$119 million for cities and counties. LEAP provides one-time grant funding to cities and counties to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that will facilitate the acceleration of housing production and help local governments prepare for their 6th cycle RHNA much like the SB2 Planning Grants. The City of Torrance was awarded \$155,000, which was used to fund the Housing Element update.

4.2.6 SB2 GRANTS

In 2017, Governor Brown signed a 15-bill housing package aimed at addressing the State's housing shortage and high housing costs. Specifically, it included the Building Homes and Jobs Act (SB 2, 2017), which establishes a \$75 recording fee on real estate documents in order to increase the supply of affordable homes in California. Because the number of real estate transactions recorded in each county will vary from year to year, the revenues collected will fluctuate.

The first year of SB 2 funds are available as planning grants to local jurisdictions. The City of Torrance received \$310,000 for planning efforts to facilitate housing production. The City allocated \$50k50,000 to develop a program to promote ADU production and \$260k260,000 to fund the Housing Corridor Study.

For the second year and onward, 70 percent of the funding will be allocated to local governments for affordable housing purposes. A large portion of year two allocations will be distributed using the same formula used to allocate federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

4.2.7 SOUTH BAY REGIONAL HOUSING TRUST

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) is currently in the process of trying to create a Regional Housing Trust (RHT), specific to South Bay cities, through a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to fund and finance the planning and construction of homeless housing, and extremely low, very low, and low-income housing projects. The South Bay Regional Housing Trust (SBRHT) funding would make the construction of affordable housing more appealing to developers. The City has already provided a Letter of Support for SB 1444 (Allen), which would create the SBRHT. It is the City's intent to continue to work with the SBCCOG as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance.

4.3 ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

The following agencies and organizations are important components of the City's housing services delivery system. These agencies and entities have administrative capacity to implement programs contained in the Housing Element to help construct, preserve, and improve housing in Torrance, including preserving affordable housing that is at risk of converting to market-rate housing. They include the City of Torrance, other public agencies, and local and national non-profit private developers.

4.3.1 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The City of Torrance Community Development Department is the lead department implementing a number of the programs outlined in this Housing Element. The Community Development Director is responsible for the management of all City building and planning activities including building permits, environmental/code enforcement, engineering permits and records, GIS and mapping -and housing activities. Responsibilities of the Community Development Department include:

- Advanced Planning
- Building Permits & On-Line Permitting
- Construction Plan Check and Inspections
- Development Review
- Engineering Permits
- Engineering Records
- Environmental/Code Enforcement
- Housing Programs (including Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8)
- Transportation Planning
- GIS and Mapping

As noted above, the Community Development Department runs the City of Torrance Public Housing Authority (PHA), which is located at Torrance City Hall.

According to the draft 2022 Annual PHA Plan Executive Summary, the City of Torrance PHA has been allocated 690 Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV), 25 Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers (VASH), and 33 Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV). The PHA is currently assisting approximately 500 families, including 12 transfer families whose current agencies are billing Torrance for the families' housing assistance payments.

The main changes from the 2021 Annual PHA Plan to the 2022 Annual PHA Plan are due to the increased voucher programs, to maximize lease-up, that the PHA is administering. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA applied for and received an additional allocation of 15 VASH vouchers. These vouchers are administered in partnership with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of supportive services. The PHA now has 25 VASH vouchers. On May 20, 2021, the PHA accepted a U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allocation of 33 EHV's. These vouchers are targeted to assist the following populations: homeless; at risk of homelessness; fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking or human trafficking; recently homeless and for whom providing rental assistance will prevent the family's homelessness or having high risk of housing instability. These new voucher programs changed the PHA's expected financial resources and have assisted the PHA in meeting the 5-Year Plan goal of expanding the supply of assisted housing. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA increased the voucher payment standards in an effort to compete with the increasing market rate rents in the area and thus increase the assisted housing choices for voucher holders. In January 2022, the PHA applied for an expedited HUD regulatory waiver to establish payment standards between 111% and 120% of Fair Market Rent (FMR). The PHA has continued to issue replacement vouchers and provide voucher mobility information to program participants. The PHA will continue to evaluate budget, per unit cost, and fair market rents to determine if the payment standards for all voucher types can be increased in Plan Year 2022.

In addition to maximizing lease-up, there are 10 major initiatives in the 2021 Annual Plan, which the PHA intends to continue the following efforts in the 2022 Annual Plan:

1. Continue quality control inspections.
2. Continue the review of 100% of case files by supervision.
3. Continue working with social service agencies in the community including those serving the homeless, seniors and handicapped/disabled households.
4. Continue working with HUD's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and local law enforcement to follow up on fraud reports and collect any money owed to the Housing Authority as a result of such fraud.
5. Review the operations and procedures of the program in order to serve clients in a more efficient manner.
6. Utilize the Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) to electronically verify the accuracy of tenant reported data to ensure that program participants pay their fair share of the rent.
7. Require families who fail to report income in a timely manner to the PHA to reimburse overpayments on the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) made on their behalf by the

agency. In Plan Year 2021, the PHA entered into three repayment agreements for overpaid HAP.

8. Maintain and update the database for the rent reasonableness system.
9. Follow up on Social Security number discrepancies that have occurred since HUD began matching the records of program participants with the Social Security Administration records. PHA staff are also monitoring the Megan’s Law and Los Angeles County Sheriff’s website in an effort to monitor applicants and participants for criminal activity.
10. Continue to comply with the HUD submission requirements using the Multi-Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) during the next fiscal year. Information about program participants is electronically transmitted to HUD using MTCS. HUD requires that at least 95% of the records for program participants be successfully submitted to MTCS.

The City of Torrance is proposing a project for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) funding, which identifies projected use of funds for submission for fiscal years 2020-22 for to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). CDBG CARES funds must be used to benefit primarily low and moderate-income persons who have been adversely affected by COVID-19. There is one project submitted for consideration for Community Development Block Grants CARES, which is for the purchase of non-congregate shelter units for individuals experiencing homelessness (\$39,310). The temporary housing program will include case management and housing navigation, which will provide critical support services essential for transitioning people experiencing homelessness into permanent housing.

The Community Development Department is also responsible for tracking the number and affordability of new housing units that will be built during this planning period and administering the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program. The Environmental Division is responsible for responding to code violations for substandard housing issues.

4.3.2 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The City of Torrance Community Services Department offers Torrance residents the unique opportunity to help achieve a sense of purpose, identity, self-worth, and improved self-esteem within the specialized areas of Cultural Arts, Library, and Parks and Recreation. The Community Services Department is responsible for administering the Home Improvement Program (HIP), which is a free program in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed, provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Services provided include disability upgrades for the home, light plumbing, yard services, paint, and minor repairs.

The City of Torrance Community Services Department is also responsible for coordinating homeless services. Torrance is located in Service Provider Area (SPA) 8 of Los Angeles County. The Community Services Department has local resources available to assist the community’s residents in their greatest times of need. While there are many service providers in the area, the Department promises to promote a focused ‘Coordinated Entry System’ or CES, to help escort everyone through the same starting point, so that professionals can link those in need to the appropriate service providers and resources. The Community Services Department also prepares and administers the Permanent Local Housing Allocation Five-Year Plan (2019-2023).

4.3.3 CITY OF TORRANCE COMMISSIONS

The City of Torrance has several commissions that are directly or indirectly responsible for supporting the City's efforts to improve housing and the quality of life for its residents.

The City's seven-member **Planning Commission** works with the Community Development Department to prepare updates to the Torrance General Plan, including the Housing Element and the Land Use Element, which plays a key role in implementing the Housing Element. The Planning Commission also assists the Community Development Department in updating the City's Zoning Code and other zoning-related plans, which also implement the Housing Element.

The City has a seven-member **Social Services Commission**, which addresses issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.

The City also has a seven-member **Commission on Aging**, which deals with the needs and issues confronting senior citizens in the community and provides a voice for senior citizens as a community group.

4.3.4 NON-PROFIT HOUSING DEVELOPERS

Due to the high cost of housing development in Los Angeles County, many communities have found that partnerships with non-profit housing developers are an effective tool for creating affordable housing units. Nonprofit housing developers active in Southern California include:

- Habitat for Humanity
- National CORE
- Bridge Housing
- Meta Housing
- Jamboree Housing
- Linc Housing
- Many Mansions

4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR **ENERGY**RESOURCE CONSERVATION

4.4.1 CITY PROGRAMS

Energy-related housing costs can directly impact the affordability of housing. Although sometimes energy efficient measures can increase initial construction costs, over time providing energy conservation features reduces costs by lowering energy consumption. The City promotes energy conservation through the implementation of State of California Title 24 building code energy performance requirements. Title 24 requires energy efficient design measures, such as minimum

ceiling, wall, and raised floor insulation, and minimum heating, ventilating, air conditioning and water heating equipment efficiencies.

In 2017, the City of Torrance, in cooperation with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, developed a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP sets greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals, and outlines strategies to achieve those goals. These include strategies such as promoting solar panel installation, grid modernization, encouraging electric vehicle use, and land use changes. The targets are consistent with state goals for emission reduction and include an overall goal to reduce emissions by 49 percent from 2005 levels by 2035.

The City of Torrance has also created an Interdepartmental Sustainability Team to further the City's Sustainability Goals and create a Sustainability Plan to guide the City's sustainable programs and policies. The Team includes representatives from several departments or divisions working on sustainable initiatives. Its mission is to work together to expand ongoing sustainable initiatives into a more effective movement towards a more sustainable city. Some specific projects and programs that can help encourage energy efficient housing and reduce energy costs include:

- The Torrance “1 Mile, 1 Charger” Project, which provides publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Participation in the Tree City USA program
- Streamlined solar permitting and inspections

4.4.2 UTILITY PROVIDER PROGRAMS

Utility providers also offer assistance to encourage and facilitate energy conservation and to help residents minimize energy-related expenses.

Southern California Edison (SCE) offers a variety of energy conservation and assistance programs. The Energy Savings Assistance Program helps income-qualified households conserve energy and reduce their electricity costs. The program pays all costs of purchasing and installing energy-efficient appliances and equipment, which are free to eligible customers. In addition, SCE offers ongoing and one-time bill assistance, including reduced bills for qualified households through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA) programs.

The Southern California Gas Company offers various rebates, incentives, and assistance programs for customers. These include programs such as the Energy Savings Assistance Program, which provides no-cost energy-saving home improvements and furnace repair or replacement services, the Medical Baseline Allowance Program, which offers assistance to customers with major health concerns, and the Residential Advance Clean Energy Program, which provide eligible customers a complimentary walkthrough energy assessment and the installation of energy technologies.

A Direct Assistance Program (DAP) is available for qualified low-income customers. DAP provides no-cost weatherization and furnace repair or replacement services. The Gas Company also operates the Gas Assistance Fund (GAF), which helps low-income households pay their gas bills. Southern California Gas participates in the state’s CARE program, which provides a 20 percent discount on the monthly gas bills of income-eligible households. In addition, the Gas Company participates in the Medical Baseline Allowance Program. Customers with a qualifying medical condition are eligible for a free

medical baseline allowance 0.822 therms per day. Under this program additional gas usage is billed at the baseline rate, which is the lowest rate for residential customers.

In addition to the assistance programs, residents may qualify for assistance through the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP is a federally funded energy assistance program that may help residents pay the utility bill if they are income-qualified. Funds pledged to assist customers of SoCalGas are distributed through local community-based organizations, assistance agencies and certain government agencies.

4.4.3 REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The South Bay Environmental Services Center (SBESC) is the South Bay's local clearinghouse for energy efficiency, water conservation and environmental information, training, materials, and outreach. SBESC assists public agencies including cities, schools, and special districts as well as businesses and residents of the South Bay to best utilize the many resources available to them through a wide variety of statewide and local energy efficiency and water conservation programs.

SBESC has expanded its services through its Energy Efficiency Plus (EE+) program to deliver significant and measurable energy savings by working directly with public agencies on joint procurement of energy efficient equipment as well as providing information on more energy efficient practices.

5. HOUSING PLAN

This Housing Plan sets forth the City’s overall housing objectives in the form of Goals, Policies, and Programs that guide housing policy for the City for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period. The goals, policies, and programs are consistent with the direction of the other General Plan elements, specifically the Land Use Element, and also reflect the direction provided by the City’s recently updated Strategic Plan (May 2021). While many of the programs have been carried forward from the previous (5th Cycle) Housing Element, many others have been revised or added to reflect the community’s needs and constraints as identified in previous sections of the Housing Element, input from the community (see Section 1—Introduction and Appendix A), and to respond to new circumstances and significant changes in Housing Element law over the past four+ years.

The Housing Element goals, policies, and programs aim to:

- Provide adequate sites to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA;
- Assist in the development of housing to meet the needs of lower income households;
- Address and where appropriate, and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to housing development;
- Conserve, preserve, and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; and
- Promote equal housing opportunity (affirmatively furthering fair housing).

These objectives are required by and delineated in State Law (California Code Section 65583 [c][1]).

Torrance is a built-out community with a long-standing goal of maintaining a balance of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. The extremely limited amount of remaining vacant land creates a significant challenge for the City to promote a variety of individual choices regarding tenure, type, location, and affordability of housing throughout the community that accommodates the 6th Cycle RHNA, while maintaining the balance of land uses that is important to maintain a desirable quality of life for existing and future residents, and a healthy economy. This section presents the City’s eight-year Housing Plan for the 2021-2029 planning cycle, which is intended to mitigate these challenges, address the identified housing needs of the community, accommodate the City’s allocated RHNA, and promote equal opportunity for all residents to reside in decent, safe, affordable housing.

5.1 HOUSING GOALS AND POLICIES

5.1.1 HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Meeting the housing needs of all residents of the community requires the identification of adequate sites for all types of housing.

GOAL H.1:	Enhance housing opportunities for all existing and future Torrance residents.
Policy H.1.1:	Provide a range of different housing types and unit sizes for varying income ranges and lifestyles, including low density single-family homes, duplexes, bungalow courts, cottage/courtyard housing, accessory dwelling units, apartments and condominiums, and mixed-use residential development, to accommodate the City’s RHNA.
Policy H.1.2:	Continue to provide appropriate land use designations and zones to facilitate residential development and maintain an inventory of suitable sites for residential development.
Policy H.1.3:	Address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential infill housing in locations that are close to resident-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.
Policy H.1.4:	Encourage higher-density housing development along transit corridors and smart growth focus areas in order to encourage preservation of natural resources; reduce energy consumption and emissions of greenhouse gasses and other air pollutants; and promote active transportation with its associated health benefits.
Policy H.1.5:	Encourage housing for seniors and persons with disabilities near public transportation, shopping, medical, and other essential support services and facilities.
Policy H.1.6:	Encourage developers to employ innovative solutions to meet housing needs, including adaptive reuse of existing non-residential buildings.
Policy H.1.7:	Employ place-based strategies ⁹ in making neighborhood improvements.

5.1.2 HOUSING TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL INCOME LEVELS

Torrance encourages the development of housing units affordable to all segments of the population. The Low- and Moderate-Income funds facilitate the production of affordable for-sale and rental housing through the provision of both financial and regulatory incentives.

GOAL H.2:	Assist in the provision of safe, decent, affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents of Torrance of all income levels, including persons with low and moderate incomes.
Policy H.2.1:	Explore approaches to residential development that decrease the cost of housing and increase the opportunity for homeownership.

⁹ Place-based strategies address the physical, social, structural, and economic conditions of a community that affect the well-being of the children, families and individuals who live there. Place-based strategies include any effort to enhance the livability and quality of life in a given community. From <https://www.ddcf.org/globalassets/17-0118-nga-place-based-strategies-to-address-poverty-issue-brief.pdf>

Policy H.2.2:	Continue to utilize federal and state subsidies to the fullest extent in order to meet the needs of lower income residents.
Policy H.2.3:	Use the City’s regulatory powers to promote affordable housing.
Policy H.2.4:	Work with large employers to facilitate the development of workforce housing.
Policy H.2.5:	Provide incentives and/or support to nonprofit development corporations for the development of affordable housing.
Policy H.2.6:	<u>Provide incentives for market-rate developers to include units that are available to moderate- and lower-income households.</u>
Policy H.2.67:	Encourage the development of housing for low- and moderate-income households in areas with adequate access to employment opportunities, community facilities, and public services.
Policy H.2.78:	Encourage the distribution of low- and moderate-income housing opportunities throughout all areas of the City.
Policy H.2.9	<u>Prioritize development of housing for moderate- and lower-income households on City-owned property.</u>
Policy H.2.810:	<u>Continue the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program to the full extent of the availability of funding from the federal government.</u>

5.1.3 REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Factors that pose constraints to the provision of housing include the costs of developing both ownership and rental housing, which are ultimately passed to the consumers; the availability and cost of mortgage and rehabilitation financing; and restrictive zoning or other development regulations. These factors tend to disproportionately impact lower- and moderate-income households due to their limited resources for absorbing the costs. The City of Torrance will, where legally possible, remove governmental constraints affecting the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

GOAL H.3:	Mitigate potential governmental constraints to housing production and affordability.
Policy H.3.1:	Review and revise City regulations, ordinances, permitting processes, development fees, and impact fees to ensure that they do not constrain housing development and are consistent with state law.
Policy H.3.2:	Continue to allow multiple-family legally non-conforming units to rebuild to existing densities.
Policy H.3.3:	Offer financial and/or regulatory incentives, where feasible, to offset or reduce the costs of developing quality housing affordable to a wide range of Torrance households.
Policy H.3.4:	Accommodate housing needs for extremely low-income households and special needs persons in the City’s development regulations.

5.1.4 CONSERVE, PRESERVE, AND IMPROVE THE HOUSING STOCK

Preserving the existing housing stock in Torrance is a high City priority. Continued maintenance of the existing housing stock ensures high-quality neighborhoods. Housing activities that help achieve these

goals include rehabilitation of single- and multi-family housing units and preservation of assisted housing units that may be at risk of converting to market-rate housing.

GOAL H.4:	Maintain and improve the quality of existing housing and residential neighborhoods in Torrance.
Policy H.4.1:	Encourage the maintenance and enhancement of the existing housing stock.
Policy H.4.2:	Promote increased awareness among property owners and residents of the importance of property maintenance.
Policy H.4.3:	Support preservation of existing affordable low-income housing that is considered at risk of converting to market level rents.
Policy H.4.4:	Encourage the rehabilitation of residential properties by homeowners and property owners.
Policy H.4.5:	Continue to enforce the City’s Short Term Rental ordinance to ensure dwelling units remains available as housing for Torrance residents.
Policy H.4.6:	Continue to utilize the City’s code enforcement program to bring substandard units into compliance with City codes and to improve overall housing quality and conditions in Torrance.

5.1.5 PROMOTE EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY

In 2018, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) into California state law. AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. Specifically, these meaningful actions must aim to accomplish the following:

- Address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity;
- Replace segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns;
- Transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity; and
- Foster and maintain compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.

AB 686 creates new requirements that apply to all Housing Elements due for revision on or after January 1, 2021, which includes the 6th Cycle Housing Element update for the SCAG region. Each jurisdictions’ Housing Element must include an assessment of fair housing (AFH) in each of five analysis areas:

1. Fair housing enforcement and outreach;
2. Segregation and integration;
3. Disparities in access to opportunity;
4. Disproportionate needs/displacement; and
5. Racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty.

Per HCD, the Sites Inventory required for the Housing Element also “...must assess whether the identified sites serve the purpose of replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns. Analysis should not be limited to the identification of sites for lower income households but should incorporate the jurisdiction’s projected housing development at all income levels. It should assess the extent to which it either further entrenches or ameliorates existing patterns of segregation and/or exclusion of protected class members.”

In order to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all segments of the community, the City must ensure equal and fair housing opportunities are available to all residents. This means that through its goals, policies, and programs, the City must identify meaningful actions to expand the range of housing opportunities provided in Torrance, including extremely low, lower, and moderate-income households, housing for seniors on fixed incomes, the disabled, large families, female-headed households with children, and people experiencing homelessness.

GOAL H.5:	Promote equal housing opportunity for all residents, regardless of race, religion, family status, age, or physical disability.
Policy H.5.1:	Continue to enforce state and federal fair housing laws prohibiting discrimination in the building, financing, selling, or renting of housing on the basis of race, ethnicity, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, marital status, familial status, source of income, sexual orientation, or any other arbitrary factor.
Policy H.5.2:	Promote housing along with supportive services to meet the special housing and service needs of seniors, homeless individuals and families, large households, single parents, and persons with disabilities.
Policy H.5.3:	Assist in the enforcement of fair housing laws by cooperating with local fair housing agencies to promote fair housing practices, and monitor, investigate, and enforce violations of fair housing laws.
Policy H.5.4:	<u>Facilitate and incentivize the construction of housing for moderate- and lower-income households and special needs populations in a manner that mitigates segregation and concentration of poverty and increases access to opportunities.</u>
Policy H.5.45:	Refer individuals concerned with possible violations of applicable fair housing laws to the fair housing service provider to ensure timely and effective response to such concerns.
Policy H.5.56:	Provide increased outreach and education for the broader community of residents, residential property owners, and property managers regarding fair housing practices and requirements.

5.2 HOUSING PROGRAMS

The programs contained in this section of the Housing Element describe specific actions the City of Torrance will carry out over the 2021-2029 Housing Element cycle to implement the City’s housing goals and policies, satisfy the community’s housing needs, and meet the requirements of state law. The City’s quantified objectives for the 2021-2029 Housing Element follow the program descriptions. Most programs include specific objectives/actions to implement them. Where a time frame is not specifically

identified, the objective is considered ongoing—something the City is already doing—and which the City commits to continue doing throughout the course of the Planning Period.

PROGRAM 1: ADEQUATE SITES TO ACCOMMODATE THE RHNA AND NO NET LOSS

The City of Torrance has a RHNA of 4,939 units for the 2021-2029 RHNA period. The residential sites inventory consists of 292.7 acres of vacant and underutilized land with capacity to yield at least 6,473 new units. These sites can accommodate the City's RHNA for all income levels through year 2029. Since the City's existing Land Use Element, Zoning Code, and Zoning Map do not provide adequate sites, the actions identified below will be taken during the planning period to redesignate and rezone sites in accordance with the Sites Inventory.

To ensure that the City monitor its compliance with SB 166 (No Net Loss), the City will develop a procedure [\(see Objective 8, below\)](#) to track:

- Unit count and income/affordability assumed on parcels included in the sites inventory.
- Actual units constructed and income/affordability when parcels are developed.
- Net change in capacity and summary of remaining capacity in meeting remaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Revise Density Ranges in the Land Use Element:** [By October 15, 2024](#), the City will revise the Land Use Element to implement the density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA. [The FARs for the commercially designated land uses also will be increased in the Land Use Element to accommodate the assumed densities in the Housing Element.](#)
2. **Revise Density Ranges in the Zoning Code:** [By October 15, 2024](#), the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to implement the “target” density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA, [including adding minimum density standards for the zones identified in the Sites Inventory to accommodate the City’s allocated RHNA and to implement the “expected” density ranges in the Land Use Element.](#)
3. **Add Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays (R/MU-OZ):** [By October 15, 2024](#), the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to add [one or more new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlays \(R/MU-OZ\)](#) on properties designated in the Sites Inventory, [to implement the density ranges assumed for the Sites Inventory to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA and to allow stand-alone multi-family residential and mixed-use without discretionary action and incentivize its development. Consideration may be given to tailoring the requirements of the R/MU-OZ to incentivize construction of moderate- and lower-income units on property identified for this overlay. \(Note: more than one R/MU-OZ may be necessary to ensure the identified sites can be developed to the target densities while considering impacts on adjacent properties. For example, some sites in the Sites Inventory that are designated with the R/MU-OZ are adjacent to non-residential uses, while others are adjacent to low-density residential uses. Tailoring the R/MU-OZs based on location can facilitate construction of higher-density development in a manner that protects adjacent uses from impacts.\)](#)

4. **Incentivize the Target Density:** By October 15, 2024, the City will establish an ordinance to incentivize the production of housing at or above the expected density that is identified in the Land Use Element (existing Table LU-2, and as updated pursuant to the subsequent amendment of the Land Use Element to implement Program 1/Objective 1). The ordinance will establish the expected density as the “target” density for production of future housing, in accordance with the Housing Element. The ordinance will consider various options to incentivize housing production at the target density and/or will include disincentives if the project proposes housing below the target density. The City may decide that a separate ordinance is required or may incorporate the incentives and disincentives into existing and new ordinances as proposed in this Housing Plan.
5. **Revise Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP):** By October 15, 2024, the City will review and update the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan to consider the following actions, at a minimum:
 - a. Add mixed-use as an allowable use to H/PCH sub-district.
 - ~~a~~.b. Add mixed-use and stand-alone residential as allowable uses to the HMD and H/PCH sub-districts.
 - ~~b~~.c. Consider allowing stand-alone residential uses in districts where only mixed-use is currently allowed, either as a non-discretionary use or via a Conditional Use Permit.
- ~~5~~.6. **Implement Housing Corridor Study (HCS):** By October 15, 2024, implement results of the Housing Corridor Study, which is an SB 2 grant-funded plan to promote housing development in identified areas of the city via zones and/or overlay zones with tailored development and design standards. (See also Program 8)
7. **Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to add a new Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential and mixed-use without discretionary action. Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards.
8. **Develop “No Net Loss” Sites Inventory Monitoring Procedure:** No later than April 1, 2023, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available throughout the 6th Cycle Planning Period to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis. The procedure will monitor:
 - a. Unit count and income/affordability assumed on parcels included in the sites inventory.
 - b. Actual units constructed and income/affordability when parcels are developed.
 - ~~a~~.c. Net change in capacity and income/affordability and a summary of remaining capacity and income/affordability in meeting the City’s remaining RHNA.
- ~~6~~.9. **Publicize Inventory of Available Sites:** Ongoing. By the end of 2022, The the City will prepare continue to maintain an inventory of available sites for residential development and will make it available on the City’s website, as well as provide it to prospective residential developers upon request. The City will update and publicize the inventory no less than annually.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 2: BY-RIGHT APPROVAL FOR PROJECTS WITH 20 PERCENT AFFORDABLE UNITS AND THAT REQUIRE REZONING

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **AB 1397 Implementation:** Pursuant to AB 1397 passed in 2017, by October 15, 2024, the City will amend the Zoning Code to require by-right approval of housing developments that include 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower income households, applicable to sites being used to meet the 6th cycle RHNA that meet the following:

a. A “reuse” of sites previously identified in the 5th cycle Housing Element. This applies to units developed for both rental and ownership. The “reuse” sites are specifically identified in the inventory (see Appendix C).

b. Rezoning of sites where the rezoning occurs past the October 15, 2021, statutory deadline

(Note: “By-right” means that the City review is ministerial and therefore must not require conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval.)

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 3: REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT CONSTRAINTS

The City periodically reviews its development standards to ensure they are not unduly constraining to residential development. As identified through preparation of Section 3 and public input from market-rate and affordable housing developers received through this Housing Element update process, there are constraints to development of affordable housing that can be mitigated via actions the City can take. The City will review and amend the Zoning Ordinance to mitigate the potential constraints or to identify alternative mechanisms to mitigate constraints and ensure compliance with state law, as identified below.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **SB 35 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a streamlined, ministerial review process for qualifying multi-family residential projects consistent with SB 35.

2. **SB 330 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a preliminary application for residential development projects consistent with SB 330.

3. **SB 1087 Implementation:** By October 15, 2023, the City will establish a written procedure to provide affordable housing with priority for water and sewer services consistent with SB 1087.

4. **Revise Development Standards in Zoning Code to Reduce Constraints:** By October 15, 2024, the City will reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce identified constraints to development of housing. Standards the City will reassess include the following:

- a. Parking standards for multi-family and mixed-use development. May consider developing a sliding scale that is location-based (e.g., lower standards for housing that is near or on transit corridors, in mixed-use developments, etc.).
 - b. Open space requirements for multi-family and mixed-use developments.
 - c. FARs for multi-family and mixed-use developments.
 - d. Maximum building heights for multi-family and mixed-use developments.
 - e. ~~and~~ Modify evaluation of the method by which the City measures building height.
5. **Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards:** The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households.
6. **Mitigate Impacts to Existing Single-Family Development:** Concurrent with the revisions to the Zoning Code to mitigate constraints to development, but no later than October 15, 2024, the City will ensure that the new residential and mixed-use development mitigates impacts on adjacent single-family neighborhoods to the extent feasible. Actions the City will take include the following:
- a. Review and potentially revise setbacks and other development standards to protect existing single-family development.
 - b. Prepare objective design standards for multi-family and mixed-use development to ensure quality development that considers impacts on adjacent single-family neighborhoods without unduly constraining development of affordable housing.
6. **Revise the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) to Reduce Constraints:** By October 15, 2024, review and update the HBCSP to consider reducing the following constraints, at a minimum, based on specific input and feedback from developers who have and propose to construct mixed-use and residential developments in the HBCSP:
- a. Reduce setback requirements for the residential portions of Mixed-Use developments in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts.
 - b. Reduce the minimum percent of commercial uses required for Mixed-Use projects.
 - c. Review the maximum FARs for all sub-districts and increase them if necessary to ensure that projects can develop to the allowable densities.
 - d. Add objective design standards—tailor them to each district and sub-district as appropriate.
 - e. Consider reducing parking standards for the HBCSP, including developing a sliding scale that is location-based (e.g., lower standards for housing that is near or on transit corridors, in mixed-use developments, etc.).
 - f. Reduce open space requirements.
 - g. Revise maximum building heights (in association with modification of the method by which the City measures building height, which would apply to all development within the City, including the HBCSP—see Objective 4.e. above).

- h. Consider modifying other development standards that may be identified during the review process as constraints to development to eliminate potential constraints.
- 7. **Revise Method of Calculating Density:** By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code to allow fractional units to be rounded up to the next whole number when calculating density based on the number of dwelling units per acre. This is consistent with the state density bonus law.
- 6.8. **Assess Development Fees:** By October 15, 2024, the City will reassess development fees to ensure they do not unduly constrain development. The City will consider reducing permit fees to lower development costs if they are found to be a constraint, particularly fees for Tier 2 Conditional Use Permits. The City will consider fee waivers for affordable and inclusionary housing projects.
- 9. **Technical Assistance:** Continue to provide technical development assistance to developers to promote construction of new housing in Torrance. By October 15, 2023, survey developers to identify methods that would best assist them to promote construction of new housing in Torrance and implement those measures as appropriate.
- 7.10. **Streamlining Program:** The City currently offers a number of services designed specifically to assist property owners/developers/investors with many key services with the goal of expediting the development of affordable housing units, which are discussed in Section XXX of the Housing Element. No less than every two years, the City will conduct periodic, informal surveys with local developers to monitor the success the City's streamlining efforts and will revise or develop new streamlining programs as appropriate and as funding allows.
- 8.11. **Facilitate Lot Consolidation:** The residential sites inventory includes many small sites that are clustered and offer excellent opportunity for consolidation in order to facilitate high-quality and well-designed developments. The City will continue to encourage and facilitate lot consolidation as a means of maximizing development and redevelopment potential. As funding permits, use the City will develop lot consolidation incentives to help achieve full use of limited land resources and promote larger residential developments that can facilitate a wide range of housing types and affordability levels. Lot consolidation incentives may include but are not limited to:
 - a. Financial assistance: At the discretion of the City and contingent upon available funding as determined by the City of Torrance, fee assistance and other financial incentives may be made available to encourage lot consolidation activities.
 - b. Technical assistance: The City will assist applicants with development counseling on the lot consolidation process. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will prepare and provide literature to applicants or interested developers regarding the lot consolidation process and list assistance available, if any, from the City for lot consolidation activities.
 - c. Processing of lot consolidation requests: Process lot consolidation applications concurrently with other applications for development.
 - b.d. Sites inventory with lot consolidation potential: At least annually and on an ongoing basis, provide the sites inventory to interested developers and assist in identifying sites with lot consolidation potential. At least annually and on an ongoing basis, the City also will identify vacant and underutilized parcels that become available and were not included in the Sites Inventory for potential lot consolidation.

- e. Evaluate trends and requests for lot consolidation: By October 15, 2023, and annually after that, re-evaluate the trend of lot consolidation and make modifications as necessary to promote housing and mixed use development on smaller sites.
- f. Surveys: No less than every two years, beginning by October 15, 2023, the City will conduct periodic, informal surveys with local developers to monitor the success of lot consolidation efforts. Revise or develop new lot consolidation incentives as appropriate. This objective may be combined with other outreach and information-gathering objectives identified in this Housing Element.
- g. Incentives: Based on information received via Objectives 11.e. and 11.f. of this Program, evaluate the City’s lot consolidation activities and adopt appropriate incentives. Incentives to be considered include, but are not limit to: waiver or subsidy of development fees, reduction in parking standards, allowance for shared parking, and reduction in commercial FARs for projects in mixed use zones. Consider enhanced incentives for projects that include lower- and/or moderate-income units.
- h. Information regarding lot consolidation: By October 15, 2023, the information and actions (including assistance, incentives, and all other actions) identified in this Lot Consolidation objective will be made available to interested parties on a new Lot Consolidation webpage. The Lot Consolidation webpage will be updated at least annually and on an ongoing basis as new information and/or incentives occur. ~~Developer incentives and technical assistance to occur on a case-by-case basis and in pre-application conferences.~~

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 4: INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

An Inclusionary Housing Program is a program that requires developers of new market-rate residential developments to provide affordable units as well. According to “Inclusionary Housing—Creating and Maintaining Equitable Communities,” prepared by the Lincoln Institute (available at: https://www.lincolninst.edu/sites/default/files/pubfiles/inclusionary-housing-full_o.pdf):

Research into the very real benefits and limitations of mixed-income development suggests that the creation and preservation of affordable homes in asset-rich neighborhoods is one of the few successful strategies for overcoming economic segregation. It also demonstrates that integration within each new market-rate development does not always make sense. Successful economic integration requires careful attention to a number of policy design choices.

The City does not currently have an Inclusionary Housing Program. In order to determine if an inclusionary housing program/ordinance would be appropriate for Torrance to help implement the City’s housing objectives and policies, analysis is necessary.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. By October 15, 2024, the City will study the option of preparing an Inclusionary Housing Program and determine whether to proceed with a program/ordinance. This action is citywide and includes the action identified in the Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (2021).

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 5: DENSITY BONUS

The City does not have a density bonus ordinance in the Zoning Code. However, as required by state law, the City applies the state density bonus to applicable projects as requested.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Adopt Density Bonus Ordinance:** By October 15, 2023, the City will revise the Zoning Code to adopt a density bonus ordinance in compliance with state law.
2. **Monitor State Density Bonus Legislation:** The City will monitor changes in state density bonus law annually and will revise its density bonus ordinance within six months of revisions to the state density bonus law to remain in compliance with state law.
- 2-3. **Density Bonus Information:** The City will promote the use of density bonus incentives to developers and provide technical assistance to developers in utilizing density bonus for maximized feasibility and to meet local housing needs. This will be done by posting information and the ordinance on the City’s website as soon as the ordinance is adopted, and discussing it with developers who express interest in developing housing and in pre-application meetings.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund

PROGRAM 6: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) units represent a viable means of dispersing lower cost rental housing in and throughout the community, while providing homeowners an opportunity to obtain rental income to assist them with their own mortgage payments.

The City has an ADU ordinance that was amended in April 2021. The City has seen a significant increase in the number of ADUs that have been constructed in Torrance in recent years as many property owners have developed accessory dwelling units pursuant to the City’s ADU ordinance to use for guests, family members, domestic workers, and as independent rental units. The City’s goal is to encourage continued development of ADUs and JADUs to provide opportunities for rental housing to low- and moderate-income households and to increase the number, type, and affordability levels of housing in Torrance.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Develop ADU Monitoring Program:** To facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, within 6 months of adoption of the Housing Element by April 1, 2023, the City will develop a data collection and monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction and income goals. Develop a monitoring metric that evaluates locations of affordable ADUs. The City will evaluate the production and income data annually thereafter. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU construction and income/affordability goals, the City will review and revise polices and efforts to increase ADU construction and meet its income/affordability goals as necessary. Additionally, if monitoring results indicate limited ADUs in higher resource areas, develop incentives to encourage ADU production in those areas.

2. **Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs:** The City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental. The City will begin investigating funding sources within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and will reevaluate funding options annually.
- 2.3. **Zoning Code Clean-Up:** ~~Within one year of adoption the statutory deadline of the Housing Element~~ By October 15, 2024, the City will delete Section 95.3.40 (Supplemental Housing for the Elderly), because it has been replaced by the City’s adopted ADU ordinance, consistent with state law. It was inadvertently left in the Zoning Code when the ADU ordinance was adopted.
4. **Monitor Changes to State ADU Laws:** The City will continue to monitor changes in state law regarding ADUs on an annual basis. Within six months of revisions to state law regarding ADUs, the City will update the Zoning Code regularly to remain consistent with state law.
5. **Expedited Application for Affordable ADUs:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, staff will create a program whereby if the property owner is willing to commit to developing an affordable ADU (i.e., very low, low, or moderate-income), then their entitlement application would be expedited and reviewed within 15 working days.
6. **Promote Housing Voucher Program for ADUs:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, staff will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household.
- 3.7. **ADU Amnesty Program:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will adopt an amnesty program to allow conversion of unpermitted, existing, accessory structures into accessory dwelling units without penalty, provided that all other applicable Code requirements are met.
- 4.8. **Outreach and Information to Promote ADU Construction:** The City will maintain and distribute literature on funding opportunities and programs promoting construction of affordable rental ADUs. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, the City will create and maintain an ADU Webpage to promote the construction of ADUs, with particular emphasis on development of affordable ADUs. The ADU Webpage will provide information to the public regarding ADUs, including their benefits, procedures for approval, and any new program(s) the City develops when they are completed, including the existing and new objectives included in this ADU Program. As part of this effort, staff also will develop a checklist to help to simplify the application process for homeowners by identifying the materials required for submittal. The City will continue to utilize the City’s newsletters, promotional brochures, Torrance CitiCABLE, utilizing social media, and other means to provide information and education.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 7: RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION HOUSING OVERLAY ZONE

Encouraging religious institutions to build housing on property owned by religious institutions (also known as “congregational land”) would provide sites that otherwise would not be available for affordable housing. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, this is a valuable strategy to provide additional housing opportunities for lower income households. Adopting a religious institution housing overlay zone (RIH-OZ) would enable religious institutions to build or partner with others to

build affordable housing by-right. This is a significant opportunity in built-out cities such as Torrance that have so few vacant sites. Utilizing congregational land for affordable housing also provides an attractive opportunity for affordable housing developers by minimizing their cost for land, risk, and time to process development applications. This approach also helps congregations further their missions to support lower-income populations while providing them with enhanced financial stability, as many have been impacted by declining attendance that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Preparing an RIH-OZ is a program that builds on the provisions of AB 1851, adopted in 2020, which facilitates housing on religious institution properties. Pursuant to AB 1851, a local agency is prohibited from requiring the replacement of more than 50 percent of religious-use parking spaces that a developer proposes to eliminate as part of that housing development project.

During the Housing Element stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers (See Appendix A), partnering with religious institutions was cited as an effective way to provide affordable housing, and several examples were identified.

Objectives and Timeframe:

1. **Add RIH-OZ to Zoning Code:** ~~Within two years of one year of the statutory deadline for adoption of the 6th Cycle Housing Element~~ By October 15, 2024, the City will revise the Zoning Code and Zoning Map to establish a Religious Institution Housing Overlay (RIH-OZ) that can apply to all properties owned by and operated by religious institutions in the city. In order to qualify for the RIH-OZ, the units must be affordable to lower (below 80% AMI) households. Outreach to religious institutions and affordable housing developers that are known to partner with religious institutions to develop affordable housing on their sites will be conducted as part of this revision to the Zoning Code.
2. **Update Parking Requirements for RIH-OZ:** Concurrently with the establishment of the RIH-OZ, the City will update parking requirements in the Zoning Code to provide flexibility in accommodating housing on religious institutions' property.
- 2.3. **RIH-OZ Information and Outreach:** Concurrently with the establishment of the RIH-OZ, the City will develop a program to inform religious institutions of the new RIH-OZ and to assist them through the newly established process. The outreach program would outline the ins and outs of development timelines, construction, housing options and regulations, and provide information regarding potential partnerships with affordable housing developers.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Source: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 8: INCENTIVIZE INFILL ON RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE CORRIDORS

As noted, Torrance has ~~very little remaining~~ no vacant and/or greenfield land available for development that is currently designated for multi-family residential development; therefore, the 6th Cycle RHNA cannot be accommodated by existing ~~land use~~ residentially designated and ~~zoning~~ zoned land. One of the City's key RHNA strategies is to identify remaining vacant properties and underutilized sites, primarily focusing along key urbanized corridors in Torrance, that can accommodate growth through stand-alone and mixed-use residential infill and redevelopment. Due to a variety of factors, cities

across the country are recognizing the need to provide flexibility in land uses in traditionally commercial areas by allowing mixed use development and stand-alone residential uses in traditionally commercial areas to create mixed use areas and corridors. These factors include the rapidly increasing trend to online sales and services, local and national “brick and mortar” businesses closing, and more people working remotely. Adding housing in these areas has the benefit of adding potential customers to support local businesses and services. In Torrance, many buildings are 30 to 50 years old with eight on the Sites Inventory 100 or more years old. The average age of the buildings in the Sites Inventory is 1958, which is 64 years old. This provides ~~an additional~~ a key opportunity for recycling or major reinvestment.

In addition to offering availability for additional housing, promoting housing in mixed use areas via mixed use and stand-alone residential development also supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile. This is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation, including lower-income households and residents with special needs. This strategy also promotes sustainable development and reduced GHG emissions by: ~~directing~~

- Directing traffic from new development directly onto the City’s existing key transportation corridors;
- Supporting the use of the City’s transit system;
- Providing easier access to employment centers and the businesses and services which households need; and
- Locating new housing in areas that already have infrastructure to accommodate increased development capacity.

The City’s General Plan already provides for opportunities for housing integrated with commercial uses. The Commercial Center, General Commercial, and Residential-Office General Plan designations allows multi-family residential units as part of a mixed-use project, or as separate projects integrated into the larger commercial center site plan via pedestrian or transit connections. The Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also currently allows mixed use development in the majority of the districts, and also allows stand-alone residential in the two Del Amo districts.

The City is already in the process of implementing this Residential/Mixed ~~Mixed~~-Use Corridors strategy through the following two programs, which are intended to complement and support the Housing Element efforts to develop additional housing capacity in a manner that supports the City’s goals and strategic priorities.

- **Housing Corridor Study:** Using grant funding from SB 2 to streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production, the City is undertaking a Housing Corridor Study to explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. Seven areas have been identified and are undergoing analysis and preparation of context-appropriate standards for future residential development, as described in Section 4.1.3.5. All these areas are included in the Sites Inventory. The Housing Corridor Study includes accompanying CEQA documentation that will enable compliant development to be built if consistent with the City’s environmental policies

and state CEQA law. This approach may be applied to in the future, depending on the availability of funding.

- **Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan:** The City prepared a Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan (Downtown Plan) that was adopted by City Council in July 2021. Three strategies in the Downtown Plan ~~is to incentivize~~ focus on incentivizing mixed use housing and residential development, including affordable units, on infill sites in Downtown and in surrounding corridors that were identified in the Downtown Plan. An overview of the strategies and recommended actions are provided in Section 4.1.3.5. One corridor in the Downtown Plan—the Border/Cabrillo corridor—is being implemented via the Housing Corridor Study, described above.
- **Other Mixed Use/Housing Corridors:** The results of the HCS will be used to incentivize mixed use and multi-family development on other corridors of the City already discussed, including Redondo Beach Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, Crenshaw Boulevard, other sites on Western Avenue that are not already included in the HCS, and on and near other corridors for which the proposed Residential/Mixed Use Overlay Zones(s) (already discussed in Section 4 and throughout the Housing Plan) will be applied.

The City is and will continue to identify and implement additional opportunities for residential and mixed-use development through along corridors throughout the following City. Many programs and associated objectives identified throughout this Housing Plan are designed specifically to facilitate and incentivize the production of housing along key corridors in Torrance. Many programs and objectives have already been discussed, but this section provides a summary of several of which are also identified in Program 1 programs.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Implement Housing Corridor Study:** By October 15, 2024, implement the Housing Corridor Study. This strategy may be applied to other areas corridors of the City in the future, as part of implementation of the Housing Plan, as described elsewhere.
2. **Implement Downtown Torrance Revitalization Plan:** By October 15, 2024, implement Downtown Torrance Revitalization and Connectivity Plan as it relates to incentivizing the production of housing and mixed-use development.
3. **Implement R/MU-OZ:** By October 15, 2024, implement the Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(s) (R/MU-OZ) along the mixed-use/housing corridors identified in Sections 4 and 5 and on the Sites Inventory. Consider expanding the overlay to additional appropriate sites/corridors, as time and funding permit.
- 3.4. Ongoing. Continue to allow residential development either as a component of a mixed-use development or as a separate development in appropriate areas designated as Commercial Center in the Land Use Element.
- 4.5. Ongoing. Continue to allow mixed-use residential and commercial uses in the City’s designated commercial areas.
6. **Revise Zoning Code:** By October 15, 2024, revise the Zoning code to allow stand-alone multi-family residential uses in addition to mixed-use residential uses in the Residential-Office (R-OF) land use designation and the Residential-Professional (RP) zone along key commercial corridors, as described in the Housing Element.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 9: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

For-profit and non-profit developers can play a significant role in providing affordable housing in Torrance. The City provides land, regulatory incentives, and in limited cases, financial assistance to developers to complete both ownership and rental housing for extremely low-income, lower-income, and special needs households such as lower-income renters, seniors, and persons with disabilities, including developmental. Many programs and associated objectives identified throughout this Housing Plan are designed specifically to facilitate and incentivize the production of housing that is affordable to moderate- and lower-income households. While they are not all repeated here, their implementation will contribute significantly to the production of housing in Torrance to accommodate the 6th Cycle RHNA and implementation of key goals and sub-goals in the City’s Strategic Plan. In addition to the identified programs and objectives, on a case-by-case basis, the City will assess other/additional incentives it may be able to provide to facilitate the development of affordable housing.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Outreach to Affordable Housing Developers:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and at least every other year thereafter, conduct an affordable housing meeting with affordable housing developers. If the City has City-owned land that is available and ready for development, invite proposals from interested developers.
2. **Outreach Regarding RIH-OZ:** As part of implementation of the Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone, coordinate discussions between affordable housing developers and church properties to promote affordable housing onsite. Ensure that religious institutions are aware of and understand the benefits of the overlay. (See Program 7, Objective 3).
- ~~3.~~ **Support Applications for Developers of Affordable Housing:** Support funding applications for projects that include a portion of the units as housing affordable to extremely low-income households, especially those with special housing needs (such as seniors and persons with disabilities, including those with developmental disabilities), provided that the proposed projects are consistent with the City’s General Plan and applicable specific plans.
4. **Pursue Funding:** Pursue additional State (e.g., State funds for transit-oriented development and infrastructure improvements) and federal funding for affordable development. No less than annually check the websites of HUD, State HCD, and Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) for potential funding sources and apply for eligible programs.
- ~~2-~~5. **Regional Housing Trust:** Continue to work with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance.
- ~~3-~~6. **Facilitate RHNA for Lower Income Units:** Facilitate the development of ~~3003, 166~~ housing units affordable to lower income households through incentives, project conditions, development agreements, and/or other mechanisms identified in this Housing Plan.
- ~~4-~~7. **Inclusionary Ordinance:** Consider adoption of an inclusionary ordinance as per Program 4.
- ~~5-~~8. **Affordable Housing Production Monitoring:** Per Program 1/Objective 8, monitor the production of affordable housing in Torrance and evaluate the degree to which the sites that

have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments (at least 20 percent of the units assumed to be available to lower-income households), have been or are being developed in those income categories. As part of monitoring program, develop a metric to evaluate success in adding affordable housing (including new residential or MU developments, ADUs, and housing in RIH-OZs) in areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas

- 6-9. **Prioritize Water and Sewer Service for Affordable Housing:** Establish procedures for granting priority water and sewer service to developments with lower-income units in compliance with Government Code Section 65589.7.
- 10. **City Prioritization for Infrastructure for Affordable Housing:** Prioritize areas with sites designated for low-income developments for needed infrastructure. This could be accomplished via the CIP program, annual budgeting, and/or pursuing infrastructure-related grants to be used for specific projects/areas.
- 11. **Incentives:** Provide regulatory incentives to private developers to increase the supply of affordable housing, including reduced parking where feasible and appropriate as identified in the Programs of this Housing Element. Offer local non-profit developers and agencies technical assistance and information on City funding sources.
- 7-12. **Prioritization of City-Owned Sites for Affordable Housing:** The Sites Inventory includes multiple sites owned by the City that are available for housing within the 6th Cycle Planning Period. By October 15, 2024, the City will develop a process, consistent with the State Land Use Act, under a request for bids to prioritize affordable housing as part of a scoring system, with more points going to bids that included a minimum number of affordable units.
- 8-13. Ongoing. Encourage the development of rental projects that meet the needs of lower-income renters, seniors, and persons with disabilities, including developmental disabilities.
- 9-14. Ongoing. Encourage use of the Density Bonus provisions through technical assistance and information dissemination.
- 10-15. Ongoing. Alert housing developers with known interest in developing affordable housing within Torrance when opportunities are available (e.g., sites, partnerships, prioritization of City-owned sites per the Downtown Plan, etc.).
- 11-16. Ongoing. Continue to conduct pre-application conferences with developers interested in building affordable housing.
- 17. Ongoing. Utilize Low and Moderate Housing funds for affordable housing on a case-by-case basis.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and other departments, such as Public Works, as appropriate

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 10: RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Housing Choice Voucher Program extends rental subsidies to very low-income households, as well as seniors and disabled persons. The subsidy represents the difference between 30 percent of the monthly income and the allowable rent determined by program guidelines. Vouchers permit tenants to locate their own housing and rental units beyond the federally determined fair market rent in an

area. In 2021, the Torrance HA provided Section 8 rental assistance to 600 households. In 2021, there were approximately 10,000 active applicants on the waiting list, which is now closed.

In 2021, the City was able to provide rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD’s VASH voucher program which enable homeless veterans and their families to access affordable housing with an array of services. The City has applied for an additional 10 VASH vouchers as of September 2021. Also in 2021, the City was able to secure 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness.

The Torrance Senior Citizen Rental Assistance Program provides rental assistance to residents at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments. As of February 2021, 2 households were receiving assistance, down from 11 in 2013. This reduction is due to the elimination of the redevelopment agency, which provided funding for this program. Due to the loss of funding, this program is being phased out.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Housing Choice Voucher Program:** Support efforts to maintain, and possibly to increase, the current number of Housing Choice Vouchers, and direct eligible households to the program.
2. **Housing Choice Voucher Program Information:** Provide information and referrals to landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. **Advise property owners of ADUs of the City’s Section 8 Voucher Program.**
3. **Rental Assistance:** Continue to provide rental assistance to senior households at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments as feasible based on financial resources.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department; Housing Authority

Funding Sources: HUD; General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM11: SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Persons and households with special needs have limited housing options. Housing types appropriate for these groups include emergency shelters, low barrier navigation centers, transitional housing, supportive housing, and single-room occupancy (SRO) units. Special needs persons may also find housing opportunities in residential care facilities and group homes.

As part of the Governmental Constraints analysis, the following revisions to the Torrance Land Use Code, as required by State law, are identified as appropriate to better facilitate the provision of a variety of housing types:

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Amend the Zoning Code for Special Needs Housing:** Within one year of the statutory deadline for adoption of the 6th Cycle Housing Element, amend the Zoning Code in conformance with state law to accomplish the following:
 - a. **Emergency Shelters:** Revise existing parking standards for shelters based solely on staffing level. Maintain an emergency shelter ordinance consistent with state law.
 - b. **Low Barrier Navigation Centers:** Revise the Zoning Code to allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones that permit multi-family uses.

- c. **Transitional and Supportive Housing:** Explicitly allow transitional and supportive housing as a residential use to be permitted as similar uses in the same zone and to ensure compliance with AB 2162.
 - d. **Large Group Homes:** Review and revise the provisions for permitting large group homes to be similarly permitted as small group homes or develop other mitigating strategies to remove constraints to the development of group homes for more than six persons.
 - e. **Residential Facilities/Group Homes:** Evaluate provisions regarding development of residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development. If substantial constraints are identified, revise the Land Use Code accordingly. Update uses by deleting outdated uses and adding uses that more accurately reflect contemporary facilities and uses.
 - f. **Employee & Farmworker Housing:** Update the Zoning Code to clarify that employee and farmworker housing must be allowed in accordance with state law.
2. **Matrix of Residential Uses:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, a matrix of approved uses in residential zones will be incorporated into the Land Use Code to clearly identify and facilitate the understanding of all housing types permitted in zones in the City, including special needs uses. The table will reflect the permitted and conditionally permitted residential uses in the City.
 3. **City of Torrance Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness:** Ongoing. Continue to implement the City’s three-year *“Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness,”* which was adopted in July 2021. Due to the comprehensiveness of the Plan, the details are not repeated here. Refer to the City of Torrance *“Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness,”* which is available at: <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67099/637617075561400000>.
By June 2024, update the plan to extend it a minimum of another three years.
 4. **Temporary Housing Units for Persons Experiencing Homelessness:** Ongoing. The City will continue to develop and implement its program to establish and secure an operator for its temporary housing program for persons experiencing homelessness, located on City-owned property at 3290 Civic Center Drive. Community outreach sessions will be conducted so that the community can understand site design and operations.
 - 4.5. **Social Services Commission Workplan:** Ongoing. Continue to implement the City’s Social Services Commission workplan, which includes strategies for addressing homelessness in the City of Torrance.
 - 5.6. **Senior Citizen Development Standards.** Ongoing. Continue to implement the Senior Citizen Housing Development Standards. Monitor their effectiveness in continuing to produce housing for senior citizens and revise them if constraints to development are identified.
 - 6.7. **Special Housing Needs of Seniors:** Ongoing. Continue to monitor and assess the special housing needs of senior citizens, in collaboration with the Torrance Commission on Aging.
 - 7.8. **Technical Assistance & Information:** Ongoing. Provide technical assistance and information on available City-owned parcels for lower-income developments to private or non-profit housing providers. Prioritize bids to develop on City-owned land that include affordable housing.

9. **Torrance Community Transit Program (TCTP):** Continue to implement the TCTP, a transportation assistance program for residents of the City of Torrance that enables low-income seniors and those with disabilities to purchase credits for taxi rides at a discounted personal cost.
10. **Discount Program for Water Bills:** Continue the Torrance Municipal Water program that offers low income senior or disabled customers a discount on their water bills. (Note that approximately 400 customers are currently enrolled.)

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department, Community Services Department, Public Works Department, Social Services Commission, Torrance Commission on Aging.

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 12: HOME REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The Home Improvement Program, administered by the Workforce Investment Network Partners, provides home repairs for low-income seniors and disabled residents. The repairs are completed by persons in need of employment who have been trained. Most participants are Torrance youths who face barriers to employment. The Home Improvement Program assists in the City’s housing preservation objectives and in the enhancement of employment opportunities. The number of home improvement projects anticipated is approximately 250~~35~~ per year, or approximately 2,000 for the planning period, which is more than double the anticipated rehabs estimated for the 5th Cycle.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Home Improvement Program (HIP):** Ongoing. Continue to provide home improvement assistance through the Home Improvement Program, in which disabled individuals and senior citizens can have a variety of home improvement services completed provided they meet certain criteria and are Torrance residents. Assist in 250~~at least 35~~ home improvement projects annually.
2. **HIP Annual Reporting:** Ongoing. Continue to conduct annual reporting throughout the planning period.

Responsible Agency: Community Services Department

Funding Sources: Low and Moderate Housing Funds

PROGRAM 13: PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING

Over the next ten years (2021-2031), two ~~federally-assisted~~ subsidized multifamily developments ~~and two group homes that altogether,~~ which provide ~~112~~ a total of 197 affordable units, will have ~~expiring~~ expired affordability covenants. ~~Both JCI Gardens and~~ (Table H-35). Affordability covenants in Torrance include developments that are financed with Low/Moderate Housing set aside funds or federal programs (HUD 202, HUD 811, and HUD 542[c]) or State of California LIHTC’s.

- Accessible Apartments 2 ~~are~~ is owned and operated by a nonprofit organizations and as such, are considered to be at low risk of conversion to market rate. Long term affordability is fairly secure for these projects, as this is consistent with the nonprofits’ missions to provide affordable housing for the elderly, disabled, and low income families. Both property owners indicated organization (United Cerebral Palsy), whose operators have informed the City in writing that they ~~renew~~ do not intend to convert their HUD contracts annually and plan to do

~~so in the future. As such, no changes in ownership are anticipated.~~ 12 units to market rate units in the next 10 years. (See Appendix F)

~~Golden West Towers~~ Harmony Court Apartments is a ~~179~~187-unit senior affordable housing project with a ~~contract expiring in February 2025. Although technically this places the project at risk of converting to market rate units, Golden West Towers were recently remodeled, and in discussion with the owners, they intend to continue as a senior affordable housing development. Furthermore, HUD offers funding priority for extending Section 8 assistance to housing for seniors and persons with disabilities.~~

- ~~Harmony Court Apartments is a offering 185-unit senior affordable housing project with a contract through 2028~~ units. The owners have stated to the City in writing that they do not intend to convert to market rate units, during the next 10 years, so there is no risk of conversion for this project either. (See Appendix F)
- ~~The El Prado Apartments are owned by the City of Torrance and will not convert when their contract expires in 2029. The contract for Brisas del Sol expires in 2029. Because this is a moderate income, for sale condominium complex of 33 units, the likelihood is high of these units converting. HCD does not require analysis of the loss of for sale units.~~

Recognizing the two affordable complexes discussed above are not expected to change in the next ten years, the City still understands the importance of continuing to monitor their status. See Section 2.6.3 for a more detailed explanation.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Existing Affordable Housing Units:** Ongoing. Support in the preservation of 112~~197~~ affordable units at risk of converting to market rents by:
 - a. ~~Consulting~~ The City will consult annually with property owners of affordable housing in the City to gauge the likelihood of conversion of affordable units and discuss opportunities for the preservation of affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rents.
 - b. ~~Offering~~ The City will offer technical assistance to affordable housing owners with at-risk units such as providing information on transfer of ownership opportunities and funding opportunities (federal, state, or local).
2. **Existing Affordable Housing Units-Noticing:** Ongoing. Within 60 days of notice of intent by any property owners of affordable developments of plan to convert to market rate, the City will contact qualified entities to inform them of opportunities to acquire and continue affordability of at-risk units and will work with residents to provide tenant education in regard to affordable housing options, including the potential availability and priority for Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. The City will work with potential purchasers using HCD’s current list of Qualified Entities. (<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/tech/presrv/>).

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund, HUD, Low/Mod Housing Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 14: COMMUNITY PRESERVATION

The Environmental Division of the Community Development Department provides a number of services that preserve the appearance, character and quality of the city’s neighborhoods and the larger community. These efforts promote and maintain the high standards that make Torrance such a desirable place to live and do business. The services include code enforcement, which is intended to ensure the safety of residents and prevent structures and properties from falling into substandard condition. Code Enforcement’s goal is to gain compliance, as quickly as possible, by working with Torrance residents and businesses. In some cases, however, Enforcement staff may also issue citations, hold administrative or abatement hearings or use other legal means to achieve compliance.

The City allows short-term rentals (as described in Section 9.3) in compliance with a STR Ordinance in place. In order to ensure that STRs do not generate problems and retain dwelling units as housing (via the home-share requirement in single-family neighborhoods), the City has an enforcement program that was initiated in 2021.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Property Maintenance Standards:** Ongoing. Continue to enforce property maintenance standards to preserve existing units, maintain property values, and support a high quality of life for residents. Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, review the City’s Code Enforcement Program to ensure that it:
 - a. Identifies any areas of concentrated rehabilitation needs.
 - b. Assists in the repairs and mitigate potential costs associated with rehabilitation to the extent feasible utilizing existing, expanded, and/or new programs.
 - c. Reduces the displacement of residents through support of rehabilitation.
2. **Funding for Rehabilitation Assistance:** At least annually, pursue funding at the State level to expand housing rehabilitation assistance.
- ~~2~~3. **Property Maintenance Assistance for Low-Income Seniors and Disabled Residents:** Low-income seniors and disabled residents with property maintenance violations will be referred to the City’s Home Improvement Program for assistance with bringing their properties into compliance.
- ~~3~~4. **Short-Term Rental Ordinance:** Ongoing. Continue to enforce the City’s short-term rentals (STR) ordinance to bring existing STRs into compliance with City standards and approval procedures, and to retain dwelling units as housing.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department (Environmental Division)

Funding Sources: General Fund, Home Improvement Program (funded through Workforce Investment Network Partners), Low/Mod Housing Fund, and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 15: REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

The Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, requires that cities and counties provide reasonable accommodation to rules, policies, practices, and procedures where such accommodation may be necessary to afford individuals with disabilities equal housing opportunities. While fair housing laws intend for all people to have equal access to housing, the law also recognizes that people with disabilities may need extra tools to achieve equality. Reasonable accommodation is one of the tools

intended to further housing opportunities for people with disabilities. Reasonable accommodation provides a means of requesting from the local government flexibility in the application of land use and zoning regulations or, in some instances, even a waiver of certain restrictions or requirements because it is necessary to achieve equal access to housing, recognizing that sometimes the request is urgent. Cities and counties are required to consider requests for accommodations related to housing for people with disabilities and provide the accommodation when it is determined to be “reasonable” based on fair housing laws and case law interpreting the statutes.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Reasonable Accommodations Regulations:** Although the City developed a process for making requests for reasonable accommodation to land use and zoning decisions and procedures regulating the siting, funding, development, and use of housing for people with disabilities during the 5th Cycle Housing Element, by October 15, 2024, the City will codify the process by updating the Zoning Code and will provide expedited processing for urgent requests.
2. **Reasonable Accommodations Information:** Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element and on an ongoing basis thereafter, the City will provide information to residents on reasonable accommodation procedures via public counters and the City website. The City will investigate and implement additional methods to provide information.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 16: REPLACEMENT HOUSING

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **AB 1397 Implementation:** Development on nonvacant sites with existing residential units is subject to replacement requirement, pursuant to AB 1397. The City will amend the Zoning Code to require the replacement of units affordable to the same or lower income level as a condition of any development on a nonvacant site consistent with those requirements set forth in State Density Bonus Law.
- ~~2.~~ **Coastal Zone Replacement Housing:** Approximately 123 acres of Torrance is within the Coastal Zone (see Figure H-5). This requires the City to ensure the replacement of any units occupied by low- and moderate-income households lost through demolition. On an ongoing basis, the City will:
 - a. ~~Ongoing-~~ Maintain records of existing housing units serving lower and moderate-income households in the Coastal Zone and continue to monitor development activities within the Coastal Zone, including new construction, conversion, and demolition of affordable housing.
 - b. ~~Ongoing-~~ Ensure compliance with the replacement requirements. The emphasis of this program will be on retention of affordable units with replacement (Government Code 65590) on a unit-by-unit basis when removal cannot be avoided.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 17: WATER AND SEWER SERVICE PROVIDERS

In accordance with Government Code Section 65589.7 as revised in 2005, immediately following City Council adoption, the City must deliver to all public agencies or private entities that provide water or sewer services to properties within Torrance a copy of the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. Within 30 days of adoption of the Housing Element, deliver the Torrance Housing Element to all providers of sewer and water service within the City of Torrance.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 18: ENFORCE FAIR HOUSING LAWS

To assist in education and understanding of fair housing rights and protections, the City's Housing Office provides information packets about fair housing laws to all participants of the rental assistance programs and maintains a website with information and resources regarding fair housing. The City will continue to distribute information on fair housing and refer fair housing questions and housing discrimination claims to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (www.hud.gov). Appendix D summarizes the fair housing issues and concerns in Torrance based on findings of the research conducted as part of this Housing Element update.

Objectives and Time Frame:

1. **Fair Housing Laws:** Ongoing. Continue to abide by and enforce fair housing laws.
2. **Fair Housing Information:** Ongoing. Continue to provide information to help increase awareness of fair housing protections. **Hold at least one outreach event annually.**
3. **Fair Housing Referral and Assistance:** Ongoing. Provide referral and assistance to people who claim to be victims of housing discrimination.
4. **Fair Housing Advertising:** Ongoing. Advertise the availability of fair housing services through flyers at public counters. Posting of available fair housing services will also be made available on the City's website and other community locations. **Additional methods to advertise the availability of fair housing services will be assessed and implemented to reach the broadest possible cross-section of the community. Provide all outreach and fair housing information in the three languages most spoken by City residents.**
5. **Fair Housing Outreach Plan for Landlords:** **Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element,** create an outreach plan to educate local landlords. Hold at least one outreach event annually.
- ~~4-6.~~ **Survey Residents:** **Within one year of adoption of the Housing Element, survey residents for feedback on effective communication procedures and what is most beneficial for residents when it comes to outreach activities and accessing information.**

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 19: FLOOD MANAGEMENT

In accordance with Government Code Section 65302, as part of the current Housing Element Plan update process, the City shall review and revise the Safety Element to identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to flood hazard zones, National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA, information about flood hazards, designated floodway maps, dam failure inundation maps, areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of levees or floodwalls, etc. as listed in Section 65302(9)(2) and establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding.

Objectives and Time Frame: Ensure that flood risks are considered and mitigated when making land use decisions by updating and adopting the Safety Element of the General Plan by 2025.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Public Works Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 20: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Environmental justice is the movement to recognize and improve the disproportionate burden of environmental pollution and other toxins faced by low-income communities and communities of color. Senate Bill 1000 (SB 1000) was signed into law in 2016 which requires local jurisdictions that have disadvantaged communities to incorporate environmental justice policies into their general plans. For the purpose of general plan requirements, environmental justice is defined as: “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of people of all races, cultures, incomes, and national origins, with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies” (California Government Code §65040.12). Residents living in or near neighborhoods with high levels of pollution are at an increased risk for developing respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Pregnant women living in highly polluted neighborhoods are also at an increased risk for experiencing poor birth outcomes, such as preterm birth. The environmental justice element is intended to confront these types of inequities by addressing the specific environmental hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy.

In accordance with SB 1000, the City will incorporate environmental justice policies into its General Plan to address the following environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives as required by State law:

- Reduction of pollution exposure and improving air quality
- Promoting access to public facilities
- Promoting access to healthy foods
- Promoting safe and sanitary homes
- Promoting physical activity
- Promoting civic engagement

Objectives and Time Frame: Adopt Environmental Justice Element by 2025 to ensure that there is fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department and Public Works Department

Funding Sources: General Fund and pursue grant funding opportunities

PROGRAM 22: REMOVAL OF RACIAL COVENANTS

Although racial covenants and similar race-based deed restrictions have long been illegal and unenforceable, this language has not always been removed entirely from home titles. In order to confirm its commitment to making housing available to people of all races and ethnicities, the City will provide homeowners with instructions detailing how to remove these types of restrictions from their property titles. Information will be provided via public bulletins at the planning counter, as well as on the City's website.

Quantified Objectives and Timeframe:

1. By October 15, 2023, the City will develop detailed instructions for removing race-based restrictions from residential property titles, and provide as public information online and at the planning counter.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department

PROGRAM 21: AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

Appendix D (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) provides the City's assessment of fair housing issues in Torrance. Section D.2.7 provides a summary of fair housing issues identified in the Fair Housing Assessment. According to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas composite map, the majority of Torrance is considered to be in the "highest resource" and "high resource" areas. One small area is located in the "moderate resource" area, while the only area identified as a "high segregation and poverty area" is the area where the Torrance Refining Company and other industrial uses are located, which is not a residential area (see Figure D-19). As seen on Figure D-19, the majority of the RHNA sites are located in "highest" and "moderate" resources areas.

Overall, the Fair Housing Assessment analysis shows that the primary (priority) barrier to fair housing in Torrance is high housing cost, which has the effect of limiting access by lower- and moderate-income households to the high opportunities and resources available in the City. The Housing Plan includes many programs and objectives to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development, as well as the provision of accessory dwelling units, which can expand affordable housing opportunities for lower-income persons such as seniors, female-headed households, and others working in service occupations

There is no evidence to suggest that discrimination against racial groups or persons with disabilities is a significant issue. However, the City will continue to enforce Fair Housing requirements and will enhance its outreach efforts.

The City's Housing Plan includes programs and objectives that address all the issues identified in the Housing Element, including those to mitigate AFFH issues identified in Appendix D. As required, Table H-60 below highlights meaningful actions to address the priority issues identified in Appendix D, including the programs/objectives, specific commitments, timeline, geographic targeting, and metrics.

Table H-6o: AFFH Meaningful Actions Matrix

HE Programs or Other Activities	Specific Commitment	Timeline	Geographic Targeting	2021-2029 Metrics
Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach				
Program 18 (Enforce Fair Housing Laws)	Continue to provide information to help increase awareness of fair housing protections. Hold at least one outreach event annually.	Ongoing, with annual event	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Outreach to 1,000 residents, landlords, and housing professionals
	Create an outreach plan to educate local landlords. Hold at least one outreach event annually.	By June 2023, with annual event	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
	Advertise the availability of fair housing services using diverse methods.	Ongoing	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
Income Diversity				
Program 6 (ADUs) / Objective 1 (ADU Monitoring)	Evaluate production of ADUs, including income distribution. Develop a monitoring metric that evaluates locations of affordable ADUs. If monitoring results indicate limited ADUs in higher resource areas, develop incentives to encourage ADU production in those neighborhoods	April 1, 2023	Target West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Achieve 75% of ADUs affordable to lower and moderate income in higher resource neighborhoods
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objectives 12 (Pursue/Prioritize Funding)	Pursue additional State and federal funding for affordable development. Prioritize use of City grant funds to incentivize/partner with developers to pursue affordable housing in the City	No less than annually check the websites of HUD, State HCD, and Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) for potential funding sources and		Facilitate the development of 250 affordable housing units through additional funding/grants

		apply for eligible programs.		
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 1 (Housing Choice Voucher Program)	Support efforts to maintain, and possibly to increase, the current number of Housing Choice Vouchers, and direct eligible households to the program Evaluate the distribution of HCVs in North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods and endeavor to promote equitable distribution	Evaluate annually	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 2 (Housing Choice Voucher Program Information)	Provide information and referrals to landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program	Ongoing, at least annually	Target North, West, Central, East, and Southeast neighborhoods	
Program 10 (Rental Assistance Program) / Objective 3 (Rental Assistance)	Continue to provide rental assistance to senior households at the Coleman Court and Ocean Terrace developments as feasible based on financial resources.	Ongoing	N/A	
Displacement				
Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA) / Multiple Objectives	Rezone per identified objectives in Program 1 to implement additional and affordable housing opportunities in areas of city with populations vulnerable to displacement (Figure D-31)	By October 15, 2024	Target North, Central, Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 1.7: Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA (Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone or RIH-OZ)	Add a new RIH-OZ on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential & mixed-use without discretionary action. (Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards and would be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, if adopted)	By October 15, 2024	Citywide ordinance, but creates new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate development of 268 affordable housing units in RIH-OZ


<p><u>Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 5 (Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards)</u></p>	<p>The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households</p>	<p>By October 15, 2024</p>	<p>Citywide opportunity, as expanded use of Senior Housing Standards would facilitate more affordable housing for renters and owners</p>	<p>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</p>
<p><u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)</u></p>	<p>City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.</p>	<p>By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.</p>	<p>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</p>	<p>Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs</p>
<p><u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)</u></p>	<p>City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household</p>	<p>By June 14, 2023, and ongoing</p>	<p>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</p>	<p>Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs</p>
<p><u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)</u></p>	<p>City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.</p>	<p>By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.</p>	<p>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</p>	<p>Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent</p>
<p><u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)</u></p>	<p>City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household</p>	<p>By June 14, 2023, and ongoing</p>	<p>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</p>	<p>Increase the use of HCVs by 10 percent</p>
<p>Environmental Health</p>				
<p><u>Program 20: Environmental Justice</u></p>	<p>Adopt and implement an Environmental Justice Element (EJE) to reduce inequities by addressing specific environmental hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy and action</p> <p>When preparing the EJE, ensure that the North, East, and Central neighborhoods receive targeted attention. Conduct focused</p>	<p>By October 15, 2024</p>	<p>Target North, East, Central neighborhoods</p>	<p>As part of development of the new EJE, establish metrics that are related to the identified issues and track them not less than every 2 years</p>

	<p>outreach to residents in those neighborhoods to ensure their issues are understood and they are involved in developing policies and actions.</p>			
<p>Lack of Affordable Housing</p>				
<p>Program 1.7: Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA (Add Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone or RIH-OZ)</p>	<p>Add a new RIH-OZ on properties designated in the Sites Inventory to allow lower- income stand-alone multi-family residential & mixed-use without discretionary action. (Housing that is proposed for any of the sites that is not lower-income must develop to the existing base zone and comply with associated development and design standards and would be subject to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, if adopted)</p>	<p>By October 15, 2024</p>	<p>Citywide ordinance, but creates new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods</p>	<p>Facilitate development of 268 affordable housing units in RIH-OZ</p>
<p>Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 5 (Expand Use of Senior Housing Standards)</p>	<p>The City will consider expanding the use of the existing Senior Housing Standards (which are more lenient than typical multi-family development standards) to allow developers to use the Senior Housing Standards for non-senior projects if the units are restricted to lower- or moderate-income households</p>	<p>By October 15, 2024</p>	<p>Citywide opportunity, as expanded use of Senior Housing Standards would facilitate more affordable housing for renters and owners</p>	<p>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</p>
<p>Program 4: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance</p>	<p>Study the option of preparing an Inclusionary Housing Program and determine whether to proceed with an inclusionary ordinance.</p>	<p>By October 15, 2024</p>	<p>Citywide ordinance, but would create new affordable housing opportunities in highest and high resources areas, including West, Central, and Southwest neighborhoods. Also, would benefit neighborhoods with a higher renter cost</p>	<p>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</p>

			burden, such as North Torrance.	
<u>Program 5: Density Bonus</u>	<u>Promote use of density bonus incentives to developers and provide technical assistance to developers in utilizing density bonus for maximized feasibility and to meet local housing needs.</u>	<u>By October 15, 2023</u>	<u>Citywide ordinance. Promote use of density bonus to developers who propose to develop in LMI neighborhoods</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</u>
<u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 2 (Financial Assistance for Affordable ADUs)</u>	<u>City will work with federal, state, and local agencies to try to identify and secure funding for homeowners who are interested in building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and are willing to offer it as an affordable rental.</u>	<u>By June 14, 2023 & will reevaluate funding options annually.</u>	<u>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs</u>
<u>Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 6 (Promote Housing Voucher Programs for ADUs)</u>	<u>City will promote the Housing Choice Voucher Program to homeowners for rental of their ADU to an affordable household</u>	<u>By June 14, 2023, and ongoing</u>	<u>Encourage ADUs in high and highest resource areas</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs</u>
<u>Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 1 (Outreach to Affordable Housing Developers)</u>	<u>Conduct an affordable housing meeting with affordable housing developers. If the City has City-owned land that is available and ready for development, invite proposals from interested developers.</u>	<u>By June 14, 2023, & at least every other year thereafter</u>	<u>Citywide</u>	<u>Minimum of 4 outreach events</u>
<u>Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 4 (Pursue Funding)</u>	<u>Pursue additional state and federal funding for affordable housing development.</u>	<u>No less than annually, beginning in 2023</u>	<u>Citywide</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</u>
<u>Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 5 (Regional Housing Trust)</u>	<u>Continue to work with South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) as it explores the feasibility of a Regional Housing Trust that could facilitate the development of affordable housing in participating South Bay cities including Torrance</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>	<u>Citywide</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</u>
<u>Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 8 (Affordable Housing Production Monitoring)</u>	<u>Monitor production of affordable housing in Torrance and evaluate the degree to which sites that have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments have been or</u>	<u>By April 1, 2023, and ongoing.</u>	<u>Citywide</u>	<u>Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units</u>

	are being developed in those income categories. If not, reevaluate programs and objectives accordingly.			
Program 13 (Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing)	Support the preservation of affordable units at risk of converting to market rents	Ongoing	N/A	Preserve 197 affordable housing units
Historic Patterns that Affect Exclusion				
Program 1 (Adequate Sites to Accommodate RHNA) / Multiple Objectives	<p>Revise Land Use Element and Zoning Code to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase density ranges as per programs; • add new Residential/Mixed Use Housing Overlay(s) (R/MU-OZ); • incentivize new target densities; • revise the HBCSP to add MU to more districts and consider allowing stand-alone residential in more districts; • implement the Housing Corridor Study areas; and • add the RIH-OZ. 	By October 15, 2024	Target highest and high resources areas	Monitor development of affordable housing units to facilitate 53% in highest resources areas and 39% in high resources areas.
Program 3 (Removal of Government Constraints) / Objective 4 (Revise Development Standards to Remove Government Constraints)	Reevaluate the Zoning Code to address and reduce identified constraints to development of housing, including parking, height, open space FARs, etc.	By October 15, 2024		Facilitate the development of 3,166 affordable units
Program 6 (Accessory Dwelling Units) / Objective 8 (Outreach and Information to Promote ADU Construction)	Maintain and distribute literature on funding opportunities and programs promoting construction of affordable rental ADUs.	By June 14, 2023, and ongoing throughout the Planning Period	Although a citywide objective, focus on highest resource areas and Central and Southwest neighborhoods	Facilitate the development of 288 affordable ADUs
Program 9 (Affordable Housing Development) / Objective 8 (Housing Production Monitoring)	Monitor production of affordable housing and evaluate the degree to which the sites that have been identified in the Sites Inventory as affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, including mixed-income developments have been or are being developed in those income categories.	By April 1, 2023, and annually thereafter	Although a citywide objective, evaluate areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas (per data in Appendix D)	Monitor development of affordable housing units to facilitate 53% in highest resources areas and 39% in high resources areas.

	As part of monitoring program, develop a metric to evaluate success in adding affordable housing (including new residential or MU developments, ADUs, and housing in RIH-OZs) in areas that are predominantly white and highest income areas			
Program 22 (Removal of Racial Covenants)	Develop detailed instructions for removing race-based restrictions from residential property titles, and provide as public information online and at the planning counter.	By October 15, 2022; advertise and make available on an ongoing basis	Although a citywide objective, focus on areas that are predominantly white	Reduce dissimilarity index by 10 percent



5.3 SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Table H-4661 summarizes the City’s quantified objectives for the 2021-2029 planning period by income group.

- The Construction Objective represents the City’s RHNA of 810 units for extremely low-income households, 811 units for very low-income households, 846 units for low-income households, 853 units for moderate-income households, and 1,619 units for above-moderate-income.
- The Rehabilitation objective represents home improvement repairs for an average of approximately 250 low-income seniors and disabled residents per year through the City’s Home Improvement Program.
- The Conservation objective represents the conservation of the ~~112 units at risk of converting to market rate~~ 197 units in two subsidized multifamily developments, which will have expired affordability covenants during the planning period. Although both owners have stated in writing to the City that they do not intend to convert their units to market rate units during the next 10 years, the City will monitor the status of these units.

**Table H-4661
Summary of 2021-2029 Quantified Objectives**

	Income Level					Total
	Extremely Low ¹⁰	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Construction Objective (RHNA)	810	811	846	853	1,619	4,939
Rehabilitated Objective	1,000		1,000	--	--	2,000
Conservation Objective	197			--	--	197

Appendices

¹⁰ State law allows local jurisdictions to use 50% of the very low income category to represent households of extremely low-income (less than 30 percent of the MFI).

APPENDIX A: OUTREACH EFFORTS

DRAFT

APPENDIX A: OUTREACH EFFORTS

DRAFT

Appendix A: Outreach Efforts

Appendix A comprehensively presents the outreach efforts for the Torrance Housing Element. It is organized as follows:

Section 1: Presents the noticing for public meetings that provide the public the opportunity for involvement in the preparation of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Includes comment letters received from the public. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the 1st Draft Housing Element for public review, including invitation to participate in Community Workshop 3 during the public review period. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the second submittal to HCD for the public's review, and includes a comment letter received from a member of the public. Includes the City's noticing for the Planning Commission's hearing set for May 18, 2022.

Section 2: Presents the results of the online polling from **Community Workshop 1**, and the survey from **Community Workshop 2**.

Section 3: Presents the full Workshop Summaries for the **3 Community Workshops**.

Section 4: Presents the full **Focus Group** summaries for the sessions with the Service Providers and Affordable Developers, and the Market Rate Developers.

Section 5: Presents the Mailing Lists used to invite participants to the **Community Workshops** and **Focus Group** sessions, as well as to promote the City's website as a way to keep informed of progress of the Housing Element and the ways to submit written input.

Note: New information was added to each of the above sections in April 2022 and May 6, 2022, in preparation for the 2nd HCD review period anticipated to begin May 2022. The new information is preceded by a cover sheet in each section, titled "New Information, added April 2022 and May 6, 2022."

Section 1

Section 1: Presents the noticing for public meetings that provide the public the opportunity for involvement in the preparation of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Includes comment letters received from the public. Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the 1st Draft Housing Element for public review, including invitation to participate in Community Workshop 3 during the public review period.

Presents the City's noticing of the availability of the second submittal to HCD for the public's review, and includes a comment letter received from a member of the public. Includes the City's noticing for the Planning Commission's hearing set for May 18, 2022.

New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled "New information"

CITY OF TORRANCE
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

Refer to: **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

Tel: **(310) 618-5990**

Fax: **(310) 618-5829**

Date: April 16, 2021

Legal Desk
Daily Breeze
400 Continental Boulevard Suite 600
El Segundo, CA 90245
Phone: (310) 543-6635
FAX: (310) 316-6827

Attached herewith for publication at our contracted rate for legal advertising is notice described as follows:

(LEGAL AD)

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs.....

Please publish 1 time on the date indicated below.

Tuesday – April 20, 2021

Thank you!

Special Instructions to Publisher:

- Advance Proofs required
Important: please email Ad Proof to BeatrizPerez@TorranceCA.Gov
- Proofs of Publication required
- Tear Sheets required

Attachment

Betty Perez
Administrative Assistant
Community Development Department

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 7:00 P.M., APRIL 28, 2021 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Orange Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued April 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means in our continuing effort to practice social distancing to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:

Webinar ID: 924 1869 4169

Password: 859371

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: April 20, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Community Development Director

Screenshot of Workshop 1 notice on City's website

EVENT	DATE/TIME	AGENDA	MINUTES
Commissioners Aging	05/11/2021 9:30 AM - 11:30 AM	May 11, 2021	Not Included
City Services Commission	05/10/2021 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM	May 10, 2021	Not Included
Environmental Quality Commission	05/06/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 6, 2021	Not Included
License Review Board	05/04/2021 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM	May 4, 2021	Not Included
Wash Council	05/05/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 5, 2021	Not Included
Planning Commission	05/05/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 5, 2021 - CANCELLED	Not Included
City Council Meeting	05/04/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	Not Included	Not Included
Traffic Commission	05/03/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	May 3, 2021	Not Included
Planning Commission Workshop for Housing Element Update	04/28/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	April 28, 2021 Workshop	Not Included
Water Commission	04/28/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	April 28, 2021	Not Included
City Council Meeting	04/27/2021 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM	Not Included	Not Included
Civil Service Commission	04/26/2021 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM	April 26, 2021	Not Included

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Orange Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued April 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means in our continuing effort to practice social distancing to reduce the spread of COVID-19.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:

Webinar ID: 924 1869 4169

Password: 859371

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.



PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission meets the first and third Wednesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. All meetings are open to the public via teleconference. No new items will be discussed after 11:00 p.m. If there are items remaining, they will be heard at the next regular meeting.

General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes and Variances require a public hearing before the Planning Commission and the City Council. They will automatically be submitted to City Council for hearing approximately 45 days after the Planning Commission hearing.

Actions of the Community Development Director or Planning Commission may be appealed by the applicant, City Council, City Manager, or other interested parties by filing a written notice of appeal along with the required appeal fee with the City Clerk within 15 days of the action.

Staff reports are available for review at the Community Development Department, Civic Center Main Library and the City Clerk's Office. Questions or concerns may be directed to Planning & Environmental Manager, Oscar Martinez, at 310.618.5990. Agendas and Minutes are posted on the City of Torrance Home Page www.TorranceCA.Gov.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if special assistance is needed to participate in this meeting, please call 310.618.5990. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR 35.102-104 ADA Title II]

**PUBLIC COUNTER
HOURS OF OPERATION
Monday through Friday from
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

**Offices are closed alternate Fridays.
City Hall will be closed:
Friday, May 7, 2021**

CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION

VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

"There's no place like home."

~Dorothy Gale

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM LISTED ON THE AGENDA

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **FLAG SALUTE**
3. **ROLL CALL / MOTIONS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCE**
4. **REPORT ON POSTING OF AGENDA**
The agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard on April 22, 2021.
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
6. **REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS**
7. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC #1
(Limited to a 30 minute period)**

This portion of the meeting is reserved for comment on items not on the agenda. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Planning Commission cannot act on items raised during public comment, but may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed; request clarification; or refer the item to staff. Speakers under Orals are limited to either Oral Communications #1 or Oral Communication #2 and no longer than 3 minutes per speaker. To participate, please use the Zoom credentials provided at the top of the page at <https://zoom.us> and use the "Raise Your Hand" feature when prompted. Your comments to the Planning Commission meeting will be recorded as part of the Planning Commission meeting. By staying online and making public comment during the Planning Commission meeting, you are agreeing to have your audio recorded.

8. TIME EXTENSIONS

9. SIGN HEARINGS

10. CONTINUED HEARINGS

11. WAIVERS

12. FORMAL HEARINGS

13. RESOLUTIONS

14. PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS

A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

15. MISCELLANEOUS

16. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS

17. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES

18. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC #2

19. ADJOURNMENT

A. Future meetings (subject to change):

1. May 5, 2021
2. May 19, 2021
3. June 2, 2021

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14A

TO: Members of the Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Division
SUBJECT: Land Use Study LUS21-00002/City of Torrance (Housing Element Update)
LOCATION: Citywide

The purpose of this workshop is to provide information on the City of Torrance General Plan Housing Element update addressing the Sixth Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle covering 2021 through 2029.

BACKGROUND

The City of Torrance is currently updating its Sixth Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State’s overall housing need. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying, the State’s overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State’s housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process by attending workshops, which will be held virtually. Concurrently with the update of the Housing Element, the City is conducting a Housing Corridor Study to identify locations to facilitate streamlined housing review.

Purpose and Requirements of the Housing Element

Since 1969, California has required that all local governments adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community. The Housing Element is a State-mandated policy document within the General Plan that guides the implementation of various programs to meet future housing needs for residents and households of all income levels. The housing needs are determined through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. The Housing Element identifies available land that is suitable for housing development, as well goals, policies, and programs to accommodate the City’s housing need, provide opportunities for new housing, and preserve the existing housing stock.

California Housing Element law requires that local jurisdictions update the Housing Element every eight years. These frequent updates are required because housing is critical to ensure economic prosperity and quality of life throughout the State. The update also helps to ensure that jurisdictions are responding to their residents’ changing needs. The revised Housing Element must be adopted by the Torrance City Council and submitted to HCD by October 15, 2021, although there is a 120-day grace period. Housing Elements must be certified (approved) by HCD as complying with State law. Jurisdictions that are not in compliance with Housing Element law could lose eligibility for significant sources of funding currently provided by the State and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Noncomplying jurisdictions also run the risk of being sued by the State Attorney General.

Key components of the Housing Element include:

- A demographic profile and analysis of population growth and trends in the community;
- Identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community;
- Identification of adequate sites that are zoned and available within the 8-year housing cycle to meet the city's fair share of regional housing needs at all income levels, as prescribed by the RHNA;
- An evaluation of local constraints or barriers to housing development as well as opportunities to develop housing; and
- Housing goals, policies, quantified objectives and scheduled programs to preserve, improve and develop housing within the City.

Because the Housing Element is updated every eight years, the current 5th Cycle (2013–2021) Housing Element provides a foundation for this update. Please refer to the City's current 5th Cycle (2013–2021) Housing Element for more information on existing goals, policies, and programs. It can be accessed on the City's website: (<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showdocument?id=2740>).

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

RHNA stands for Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Every eight years, "housing need"—both the total number of units and the distribution of those units by affordability levels—is determined by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the entire State. HCD then distributes this housing needs assessment to each regional planning body in California; this housing needs assessment is the amount of housing that must be planned for by each region. Torrance is located in the six-county regions (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura and Imperial) administered by SCAG, which is the regional planning body for our area. SCAG takes the number of housing units it receives from the State housing needs assessment and allocates it to all jurisdictions in its planning area, including Torrance. This allocation is the RHNA. On September 11, 2020, for the 6th Cycle period, Torrance was allocated at total of 4,939 units, compared to 1,450 units for the 5th Cycle period. On October 14, 2020, on behalf of the residents of Torrance, the City Council submitted a letter appealing the Final Draft RHNA Allocation and methodology used, which was based on local planning factors, land use constraints and available land and density constraints. The appeal was denied in January of 2021. The appeal letter is available on the City's website: (<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument?id=62867>).

To comply with State law, each jurisdiction's Housing Element must be updated to ensure its policies and programs can accommodate its share of the number of housing units identified by the State. For the upcoming Sixth Cycle (2021-2029) Housing Element update, the City's share of the RHNA is 4,939 units, divided among a range of income or affordability levels (based on Area Median Income, or AMI), as shown in the following table.

6 th Cycle RHNA for Torrance		
Income Category/Affordability Level*	Number of Units	Percent of Total Units
Very Low Income (0-50% of AMI)	1,621	33%
Low Income (50-80% of AMI)	846	17%
Moderate Income (80-120% of AMI)	853	17%
Above Moderate Income (More than 120% of AMI)	1,619	33%
Total Units	4,939	100%

*Income/affordability categories are grouped into the four categories shown in the table above; average median income (AMI) is the average household income for each Metropolitan Statistical Area. The AMI for Los Angeles County is currently \$77,300 for a four-person household.

Through the Housing Element update process, the City must show that it has the regulatory and land use policies to accommodate its assigned RHNA. Local governments are not required to build the housing—the actual development of housing is typically done by for-profit and non-profit developers. However, the Housing Element is required to demonstrate potential sites where housing can be accommodated to meet all the income levels of a jurisdiction’s RHNA. Identification of a site’s capacity does not guarantee that construction will occur on that site. If there are insufficient sites and capacity to meet the RHNA allocation, the Housing Element is required to identify a rezoning program to accommodate the required capacity. As previously noted, if the City does not identify capacity for its RHNA allocation, the City could be deemed out of compliance and risk losing important sources of funding currently provided by the State as well as facing legal challenges.

Housing Element implementation

The Housing Element sets goals, objectives, policies, and programs that are implemented after the plan is adopted. When a new housing program, project, or idea is considered, the Housing Element provides guidance for decision-makers to evaluate the proposal. The Housing Element must remain consistent with the other elements of the General Plan. This may require amendments to certain elements, most often the Land Use Element.

Strategies for Accommodating RHNA:

- To ensure the City has adequate sites zoned appropriately to accommodate the total number of units with the RHNA, and the following steps are being taken:
 - Identify entitled projects (not expected to issue permit until July 1, 2021)
 - Identify “pipeline projects” (in application/review/approval stages)
 - Estimate of future permits for Accessory Dwelling Units (based on recent trends from 2018, 2019 and 2020)
 - Sites Inventory (available vacant and underutilized properties):
 - That already permit residential development
 - That need to be redesigned and rezoned to permit residential development
 - For lower income housing – must meet certain requirements to be deemed adequate sites:
 - At least 10 dwelling units per acre allowed density
 - Between 0.5-10 acres.

The City will be holding additional outreach efforts to obtain input from residents and stakeholders. Additional community workshops are tentatively scheduled for May through July and formal public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council will occur before the Housing Element updates can be adopted. Public notification of both the workshops and the formal public hearings will occur. The workshops will be in a virtual public format to provide information on the Housing Element update and receive public comments.

Following the review by the Planning Commission, the Draft Housing Element will be submitted to the HCD for a 60-day review period, during which the Draft Housing Element will remain available for public review. Copies will be made available at the City Clerk's Office, Planning Counter at City Hall, all six Torrance Libraries and on the Community Development website. (<https://www.torranceca.gov/services/community-development>). Following the 60-day review period, the Housing Element will be brought before the Planning Commission for a second review before being presented before the City Council for adoption.

Housing Identification Corridor Study

The Housing Corridor Study is a grant funded Planning effort aimed at facilitating streamlined housing production in the city. The purpose of the project is to promote the development of housing by identifying and analyzing presently non-residentially zoned areas in the City that may be re-zoned to multifamily residential. Utilizing the current Torrance Housing Element and data showing inconsistently zoned properties in the City, staff identified six preliminary study areas that may be strong candidates for this purpose. The consultant will prioritize these areas based on best use of grant funding, and most efficient yield of housing units, taking into consideration surroundings, scale, services and access. Staff will work with the consultant to draft potential re-zoning of the studied areas as a result of the completed Housing Identification Corridor Study. Staff notes that any future rezoning would require consideration by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

RECOMMENDATION

The Community Development Director recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public workshop, provide feedback and take public comment on the 2021-2029 Housing Element update.

Prepared by,



Carolyn Chun
Senior Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg D. Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachments:

1. Correspondences

From: Aidan Schwing <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 11:14:41 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Aidan Schwing using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Aidan Schwing



From: Aron Sanchez <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 21, 2021 at 11:39:40 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Aron Sanchez using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Aron Sanchez

[REDACTED]

From: Ciera Coronado <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 16, 2021 at 1:00:38 AM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Ciera Coronado using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Ciera Coronado



-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Chen, George <GChen@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member George K. Chen,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Kari Gallegos using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Kari Gallegos
[REDACTED]

From: Margaret Gilbert <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 16, 2021 at 1:00:15 AM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Margaret Gilbert using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Margaret Gilbert

[REDACTED]

From: Morgan Bennyworth <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 29, 2021 at 12:49:15 PM PDT
To: "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>
Subject: End Exclusionary Zoning
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Sharon Kalani,

I'm a local constituent writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. In particular, I'm writing to express my opposition to policies that ban apartments in much of our city. This misguided policy promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in our neighborhoods.

Apartments are banned on over 80% of the residentially-zoned land in Los Angeles County; this share is often even higher in high-income cities and neighborhoods. This form of exclusionary zoning, which mandates single-family detached homes as the only legal housing option in most of the county, has led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities. With the County's median home value over \$750,000, and with affordable rental apartments scarce, single-family zoning effectively guarantees that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households, who tend to be white.

Fortunately, cities across California are recognizing that ending exclusionary zoning and legalizing apartments will help make our neighborhoods more affordable, diverse, and environmentally sustainable. Sacramento recently voted to allow up to four homes on any residential parcel, and Berkeley is poised to do the same. Oakland's city council is exploring a similar policy. Portland and Minneapolis legalized small apartment buildings citywide several years ago. However, no cities in Los Angeles County have yet adopted these reforms.

As a city with positive values, we must emulate the example of our Bay Area neighbors and also legalize apartments citywide. I urge you to support an end to exclusionary zoning and apartment bans in our city. This bold reform will help us fix our city's housing affordability crisis, creating a city where everyone is welcome and everyone can thrive.

Personally sent by Morgan Bennyworth using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool.
Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Morgan Bennyworth
[REDACTED]

From: Prabhu Reddy <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 5:17:22 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Prabhu Reddy using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Prabhu Reddy

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on
behalf of Scarlett Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:07 PM
To: Chen, George
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member George K. Chen,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Scarlett Davis using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Scarlett Davis



From: Sunny Zhou <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 15, 2021 at 8:49:03 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: Support for a Transformative Housing Element
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a constituent in your district writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. I'm frustrated by increasing homelessness, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on our neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in our neighborhoods.

Exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and have perpetuated segregated living patterns and the exclusion of historically disadvantaged communities. The racist practice of redlining, which divided our city's neighborhoods by race and income, strongly influenced zoning laws that remain on the books today, defining where affordable housing may and may not be built. The housing and homelessness crisis, together with this year's COVID-19 pandemic, severe wildfires, and civil unrest, illustrate the need for a totally new approach to solving our city and region's housing crisis.

Fortunately, our city has a valuable opportunity to address the need for more housing in a way that furthers equity, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery. Under California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment, our city is required to update the housing element in a way that encourages historically high housing growth, while affirmatively furthering fair housing opportunities and undoing patterns of discrimination in housing. We can't miss this opportunity to fix our city's housing crisis.

That's why I urge you to ensure that our city creates a transformative, high-quality housing element that fully accords with state law and expert recommendations, by doing the following:

- Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, which will provide a realistic estimate of future housing production on parcels where redevelopment is likely to occur
- Using an HCD-recommended "safe harbor" methodology for forecasting future ADU production
- Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities, in order to affirmatively further fair housing
- Including the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the site inventory, in order to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement

Furthermore, I urge you and your colleagues to adopt supplemental policies alongside the housing element this year, in order to further the following crucial goals:

- Legalizing more housing
- Making housing easier to build
- Funding affordable housing and ending homelessness
- Strengthening tenants' rights

Our city needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Personally sent by Sunny Zhou using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Sincerely,
Sunny Zhou

[REDACTED]

From: Yazmine Mihojevich <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 30, 2021 at 2:21:25 PM PDT
To: "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>
Subject: End Exclusionary Zoning
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

WARNING: External e-mail
Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Council Member Heidi Ann Ashcraft,

I'm a local constituent writing to express my concern about our region's affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of our city. In particular, I'm writing to express my opposition to policies that ban apartments in much of our city. This misguided policy promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in our neighborhoods.

Apartments are banned on over 80% of the residentially-zoned land in Los Angeles County; this share is often even higher in high-income cities and neighborhoods. This form of exclusionary zoning, which mandates single-family detached homes as the only legal housing option in most of the county, has led to an undersupply of affordable medium- and high-density housing near jobs and transit, and has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities. With the County's median home value over \$750,000, and with affordable rental apartments scarce, single-family zoning effectively guarantees that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households, who tend to be white.

Fortunately, cities across California are recognizing that ending exclusionary zoning and legalizing apartments will help make our neighborhoods more affordable, diverse, and environmentally sustainable. Sacramento recently voted to allow up to four homes on any residential parcel, and Berkeley is poised to do the same. Oakland's city council is exploring a similar policy. Portland and Minneapolis legalized small apartment buildings citywide several years ago. However, no cities in Los Angeles County have yet adopted these reforms.

As a city with positive values, we must emulate the example of our Bay Area neighbors and also legalize apartments citywide. I urge you to support an end to exclusionary zoning and apartment bans in our city. This bold reform will help us fix our city's housing affordability crisis, creating a city where everyone is welcome and everyone can thrive.

Personally sent by Yazmine Mihojevich using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool.
Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.


Sincerely,
Yazmine Mihojevich
[REDACTED]

Supplemental #1 to Agenda Item No. 14A

To: Members of the Planning Commission
From: Community Development Department
Date: April 28, 2021
Subject: LUS21-00002, Housing Element Update

Correspondence was received after the item was published and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Carolyn Chun
Senior Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 11:09 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

<https://torranceforeveryone.com/#platform>

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

From: T <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Public Comment

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Regarding item # 14

PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

Hello,

When it comes to affordable housing it should include both rent and homeownership options for the working class, seniors, students, those with low or no income, and any other residents in need of such housing! *It's time to end REDLINE, racist & classist zoning that is ruining the lives of so many residents in LA County that currently has over 60,000+ unhoused residents!* We ALL deserve housing that we can afford, rent was never meant to take more than 30% of a residents income and it is currently taking over 80% of some residents income and that is NOT acceptable!

Within the last 10 years in SoCal, rent has increased by over 65% and during that time period the number of unhoused residents increased by over 50%! That large increase in rent has nearly WIPED OUT the working class that may not exist in the state of CA anymore! That has to change, it's time to return affordable housing, both rent and homeownership, for residents in need!




The housing types that we support include *affordable tiny & small homes, apartments, condos, and townhomes!* As a friendly reminder, *the state can capture land from local sub cities that do not meet housing element requirements!* Thank You for your time regarding this urgent matter.

--

Best,
Tieira
www.HTWWS.org

--

Best,
Tieira Ryder
<https://www.youtube.com/c/BlackRavenCinema>



From: "c.dreike" [REDACTED]

Date: April 27, 2021 at 8:18:20 PM PDT

To: "Furey, Pat" <PFurey@torranceca.gov>, "Goodrich, Tim" <TGoodrich@torranceca.gov>, "Chen, George" <GChen@torranceca.gov>, "Griffiths, Mike" <MGriffiths@torranceca.gov>, "Ashcraft, Heidi" <HAshcraft@torranceca.gov>, "Mattucci, Aurelio" <AMattucci@torranceca.gov>, "Kalani, Sharon" <SKalani@torranceca.gov>

Subject: RHNA

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Mayor, Council, City Manager, City Clerk

First, I am so sorry that you all have to endure the abuse from BLM under orals.

Please have a look at my attached 1 page analysis of the housing needs for the State of California for the next 10 years.

I hope that it will provide you with some insight about the what is really needed to provide housing going forward.

Possibly this will encourage Torrance to join with any legal actions against SCAG, HCD and the Legislature regarding the false RHNA numbers.

While my analysis is very a simple view, HCD used a complicated and convoluted process dictated by the legislature to calculate their false and misleading number. Generally a simple explanation is the most correct one. Generally a complicated explanation is the least correct. In this case our legislature was fooled into believing that we have a housing problem.

As you will understand after reading my analysis, we do not need HCD ordering cities to build.

Will Torrance join in lawsuits against the state to correct this problem?

Would Torrance join with other cities to repeal SB828 which is one root of the RHNA problem and SB35 which would punish cities if the RHNA ordered housing is not built?

Thanks,
Chris Dreike
[REDACTED]

--

Scientists seek to understand what is, while engineers seek to create what never was. As the "Bad Astronomer" Phil Plait says, "Teach a man to reason, and he can think for a lifetime."

4/27/2021

Thank you Senator Allen for meeting with us today. I will provide some population growth perspective on why the current raft of housing bills are unnecessary. I have found this information in a May 1, 2020 report by the California Department of Finance (1) and also from Dept. of Housing and Community Development (2) and SCAG (3). I also use a current report from the Public Policy Institute (4).

In 2019 California's population grew by only 0.2 percent, continuing an historically slow growth trend since the Great Recession. 0.2% equates to an increase of 80,000 people per year. According to the charts, the population growth rate has been declining consistently since 1991 and there is no indication that the growth rate will increase. The current growth estimate is now between .05% and .06%. It has fallen dramatically since May 2020.

Los Angeles County, the state's most populous county, has now lost population the last two years, dropping 0.3 percent in 2018 and 0.1 percent in 2019. Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan, Carson all lost population.

2019 is the first time the state has added more housing units than people. We are now building more housing than we need. Continuing an 8 year trend, we are now building more apartments than single family homes by about 8600 units. California continues to add housing faster than we are growing. The wrong types of housing may be getting built. The market is looking for single family homes judging from the rapid increase in pricing.

In looking at Housing and Community Development RHNA calculations, HCD is projecting a need for over 1.3 million housing units by October 2029 ONLY in the SCAG region. Further, SCAG has objected (3) to this large number and countered with a total need of 800-900,000. Juxtapose both of these estimates with a constant 0.2% population growth driven need for housing of approximately 400-600,000 units for the entire state over this period.

Now using the NEW high side growth estimate of .06%, growth is only 24,000 a year for the entire state. Extrapolating that out to the end of the RHNA cycle in 2031 that is a total statewide increase over the next 10 years of only 240,000 new residents. Using census data of 2.93 residents per dwelling in California, we only need 81,911 housing units over the next 10 years. That's only 8,191 per year for the entire state!

And the questions arise, "Why is the legislature creating all of these housing bills?" and "Why have the RHNA estimates not been reduced to match the data?"

Thank you for your time and please consider a NO vote on the housing measures.

If you like I can provide a pdf copy of this write up which includes links to the reports.

1) http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/e-1/documents/E-1_2020PressRelease.pdf

2) https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/southern_california_association_of_governments_regional_housing_need_determination_for_the_sixth_housing_element_update_1.pdf

3) <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/scag-objection-letter-rhna-regional-determination.pdf?1602190274>

4) [https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-population/#:~:text=According%20to%20estimates%20by%20the,halt%20\(0.05%25%20gain\).](https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-population/#:~:text=According%20to%20estimates%20by%20the,halt%20(0.05%25%20gain).)

-----Original Message-----

From: Aziz Fellague [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 10:50 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,5ZRAyDGjIjGL_SJOqpBUWmYJoXoCGy-3jIDYGR3JHhcRxVZTgeZO4OYjavwi5X89wGQYVoNO0muHt3Uzz3slBzx3LQr1oGUsRsukJIJUTnb1x1cll7XWHsO2Rpc,&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

I want to be able to live in Torrance just like my parents did, so the Housing Element would be a bold step to ensure this.

Aziz

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,Byil3e7r3CpWKDbEqUWVbS7esu3Jt7J4Glr-4lVqyPTsqFXHqFCpjVR992ydUtDsL0JW903rGxnY7XjR-KM5AshNp7s31U0l-luV51U962milHE,&typo=1>

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

April 27, 2021

Members of the Planning Commission
City Hall
Torrance, CA

PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov,
Via Email

Re: Housing Element Update

Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing on behalf of Torrance For Everyone to provide input on the Housing Element Update. To that end, I have attached 4 documents:

1. Brutal Facts: This document lays out some of our greatest concerns with respect to Torrance's housing crisis including (a) more than 45% of Torrance renters are cost-burdened, and (b) 9x increase in homelessness since 2013.

2. Our Platform: This document includes 17 policies across 4 key areas: (i) legalize more homes, (ii) fund affordable housing, (iii) support our unhoused neighbors, and (iv) strengthen renters rights.

3. Public Outreach: This letter is a reminder of Government Code § 65583(c)(9), which requires the City of Torrance to make "a diligent effort...to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort." The state routinely rejects draft housing elements from cities for not doing sufficient public outreach.

4. Site Inventory Analysis: This letter prepared by Abundant Housing LA summarizes state law. I'd like to draw your attention to Component #3 of the letter which summarizes AB 686 (2018) which requires the housing element update to "affirmatively further fair housing". This means that zoned capacity, especially sites identified for lower income housing, should be distributed across the City of Torrance.

Sincerely,

Prabhu Reddy
email@torranceforeveryone.com
<https://linktr.ee/torranceforeveryone>



-----Original Message-----

From: Keiko Thomas <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 12:45 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,Hx403ZNbpLg31fCeR3WM-YTwCycGAiPiSZ_Z2v9AauictUj56lvBW6uSa0VPU8db3TOC7NvRkrJ6fJrRcz3cUjA00mKVKN2tAmRQcQB77CusFyE,&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: Yahoo <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 11:43 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: 14A. LUS21-00002: CITY OF TORRANCE (HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis. We must confront the brutal facts. Our city's boom in new employment (over 9,000 jobs added since 2010) has not been matched by housing growth (the housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period). Apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance's residentially-zoned land, making it difficult to add housing. As a result, just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs and homelessness has increased 9x since 2013.

We can't wait any longer to fix the housing crisis. I urge you to adopt a transformative housing element this year that furthers the following goals:

- Legalizes More Homes & Makes Homes Easier To Build
- Funds Affordable Housing
- Addresses & Ends Homelessness
- Strengthens Renters Rights

Specific policy proposals for each of these goals can be found here:

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftorranceforeveryone.com%2f%23platform&c=E,1,IgOillOG0I5xT_5jrHYgUcs8131DHD7yW9uCRrIZVanQWKN7Mhek4kqEaszLZY3PaS0U7FGgsuweJ88XjhnaSaC6wcs64KFDaycV4Vp7rl95&typo=1

Torrance needs a transformative housing element to solve its housing affordability crisis, and to create a city where everyone can thrive. The time for action on housing is now.

Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE AT **6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is approximately 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Yellow Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued May 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: June 24, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

Workshop #2 Notice: Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government

July 23 · 🌐

The Community Development Department will be hosting a virtual community outreach meeting on the Housing Element update at a special Workshop on Wednesday, July 28th at 6 P.M. This virtual workshop will provide information on the Housing Element Update and Housing Corridor Study process. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process


For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate . If you have any questions, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov.



Workshop 2 Notice: City Calendar

			Planning Commission 7:00 PM Youth Council - DARK			
<p>25 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>8:00 AM Torrance Antique Street Fair</p>	<p>26 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>Magic Color Scratch Butterfly Ornaments</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p> <p>6:00 PM Civil Service Commission</p>	<p>27 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM Free COVID-19 Testing at the YMCA</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p> <p>6:30 PM City Council Meeting</p>	<p>28 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>9:30 AM California Competes Tax Credit Webinar</p> <p>10:00 AM Babytime</p> <p>12:00 PM Carcenter Wagon</p> <p>6:00 PM Housing Element Update Workshop</p> <p>7:00 PM Water Commission</p>	<p>29 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM UCLA Blood Drive</p> <p>12:00 PM Park Craft Grab and Go</p>	<p>30 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>Camo Torrance</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p> <p>8:00 AM "Take and Make" Craft Kits for Adults</p> <p>10:00 AM Toddler Time</p>	<p>31 8:00 AM Youth Flag Football Registration</p> <p>Torrance Football & Cheer</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>All Ages Summer Reading Program - READING COLORS YOUR WORLD</p> <p>Torrance-South Bay YMCA Summer Camps</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>11:00 AM Torrance Art Museum's Ultra! Public Art Tour & Summer Exhibitions</p> <p>2021 School Supply Donation Drive</p> <p>6:00 AM Commission on Aging Meeting</p>

Workshop #2 Promotion: COVID-19 TODAY
COVID-19 TODAY <https://youtu.be/yHQ2mduTBgA?t=766>




COVID-19 TODAY
CORONAVIRUS NEWS UPDATE
ROSE PARADE FLOAT
HOUSING OUTREACH MEETING
ULTRA! ART EXHIBITION

12:46 / 16:21 • HOUSING OUTREACH MEETING >





COVID-19 [LEARN MORE](#)

Get the latest information from the CDC about COVID-19.

 See more resources on Google [↗](#)

COVID-19 TODAY - JULY 26, 2021 - City of Torrance

85 views • Jul 26, 2021

 0  0  SHARE  SAVE ...

Community Development Department

**Virtual community outreach
meeting on the Housing Element
update.**

Wed., July 28th | 6 P.M.

TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate

Advertising Order Confirmation

AdTaxi | Press-Telegram • The Beach Reporter
Daily Breeze • Palos Verdes Peninsula News

07/22/21 12:42:12PM

Page 1

<u>Ad Order Number</u> 0011477197	<u>Customer</u> CITY OF TORRANCE	<u>Payor Customer</u> CITY OF TORRANCE	<u>PO Number</u>		
<u>Sales Representative</u> Pauline Fernandez	<u>Customer Account</u> 5007865	<u>Payor Account</u> 5007865	<u>Ordered By</u> BeatrizPerez@torranceca.gov		
<u>Order Taker</u> Pauline Fernandez	<u>Customer Address</u> FINANCE DEPT.ACCOUNTS PAYABLE 3031 TORRANCE BLVD TORRANCE, CA 90503	<u>Payor Address</u> FINANCE DEPT.ACCOUNTS PAYABLE 3031 TORRANCE BLVD TORRANCE, CA 90503	<u>Customer Fax</u>		
<u>Order Source</u> Select Source	<u>Customer Phone</u> 310-618-2870	<u>Payor Phone</u> 310-618-2870	<u>Customer EMail</u>		
<u>Current Queue</u> Ready	<u>Invoice Text</u> BeatrizPerez@torranceca.gov				
<u>Tear Sheets</u> 0	<u>Affidavits</u> 0	<u>Blind Box</u> _____	<u>Materials</u> _____	<u>Promo Type</u> _____	<u>Special Pricing</u> _____

Advertising Order Confirmation

AdTaxi | Press-Telegram • The Beach Reporter
Daily Breeze • Palos Verdes Peninsula News

07/22/21 12:42:12PM

Page 2

Ad Number 0011477197-01 Ad Size 4 X 94 Li Color Production Color Ad Attributes Production Method AdBooker Production Notes

External Ad Number Pick Up Ad Type Legal Liner Released for Publication

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD AT 6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 (as extended by Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-08-21), which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's A Safer Return Together At Work And In The Community - Beyond The Blueprint For A Safer Economy - Encouraging COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage With Limited Risk Reduction Measures (issued June 15, 2021), staff and the city consultants will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

Pub July 24, 2021 (1t)DB(11477197)

Advertising Order Confirmation

AdTaxi | Press-Telegram • The Beach Reporter
Daily Breeze • Palos Verdes Peninsula News

07/22/21 12:42:12PM

Page 3

<u>Product</u>	<u>Requested Placement</u>	<u>Requested Position</u>	<u>Run Dates</u>	<u># Inserts</u>
Daily Breeze	Legals CLS	General - 1076~	07/24/21	1

Order Charges:

<u>Net Amount</u>	<u>Tax Amount</u>	<u>Total Amount</u>	<u>Payment Amount</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
637.88	0.00	637.88	0.00	\$637.88

If this confirmation includes an advertising proof, please check your proof carefully for errors, spelling, and/or typos. Errors not marked on the returned proof are not subject to credit or refunds.

Please note: To meet our printer's deadline, we must have your proof returned by the published deadline, and as indicated by your sales rep.

Please note: If you pay by bank card, your card statement will show the merchant as "SoCal Newspaper Group".

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, the undersigned, am a resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. I am employed by the City of Torrance, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance California 90503.

On July 23, 2021, I caused to be mailed 303 copies of the within notification for the General Plan Housing Element Workshop on July 28, 2021 to the interested parties in said action by causing true copies thereof to be placed in the United States mail at Torrance California.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed July 23, 2021 at Torrance, California.



(signature)

NOTICE OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A COMMUNITY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE AT **6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2021** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTER:

The City of Torrance is in the process of updating the General Plan Housing Element for the 2021-2029 (6th Cycle) planning period and wants to hear from the community.

The Housing Element, mandated by State law to be updated every eight years, considers the City's needs for housing access, inventory, affordability, and quality. It provides a policy framework intended to guide housing capacity citywide, reduce constraints to development of housing, and identify actions to help meet housing goals.

The City must plan for meeting its share of the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) as determined by the State of California. The City's assigned RHNA for the 6th cycle of the Housing Element is approximately 4,939 new housing units, which is distributed across all income groups. The City invites you to participate in the second Housing Element Community Workshop, which will focus on strategies for identifying potential sites that can accommodate the City's RHNA.

The City is also developing a Grant Funded Housing Corridor Study to facilitate planning activities to promote housing development and explore the creation of housing corridors by re-zoning properties and amending the Land Use Code to allow such development by right. The City is gathering data for the study and will eventually develop strategies and recommendations and prepare a draft Housing Corridor Study. The workshop will share additional information on the Corridor Study efforts.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to CDDINFO@TORRANCECA.GOV.

In compliance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended portions of the Brown Act, Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-33-20 (Stay At Home Order issued March 19, 2020), and the County of Los Angeles Public Health Officer's Reopening Safer at Work and in the Community for Control of COVID-19 Blueprint for a Safer Economy – Yellow Tier Risk Reduction Measures (issued May 14, 2021), members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP via Zoom at <https://zoom.us> or (669) 900-9128 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 872 3760 1481
Passcode: 133502

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE WORKSHOP by emailing CDDinfo@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment Housing Element Update" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the "Housing Element Update" with your comments.

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: June 24, 2021

DANNY E. SANTANA
Assistant City Manager

New Information

Added: April 2022, May 6, 2022

Language for the “Seasons” publication

The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State’s overall housing need by updating their General Plan’s Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Sample of Seasons publication

TORRANCE
SEASONS
FALL 2021

TORRANCE THEATRE COMPANY
PRESENTS

Nursesense
THE MEGA-MUSICAL

August 13-21, 2021
James Armstrong Theatre

FOR MORE INFORMATION SEE PAGE 25.

Check out the Fall Season Programs and Classes
Registration Information is on Page 6.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE SURVEY

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The Draft Housing Element Update is available for review on the City's Website and will be presented to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 7:00 pm. This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd. The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Posted flyers at the California Welcome center, located at the Del Amo Mall

The City has a special section for all Torrance Related Activities and Events

**The City of Torrance
Housing Element Update
RHNA Allocation -
6th Planning Cycle (2021-2029)**

The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:
<https://bit.ly/3mui3yK>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990.

Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

The Draft Housing Element Update is scheduled to be presented to the **Planning Commission at 7 p.m. Wednesday, October 20, 2021.**

This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd.

Thank you!





[Read about the coalition here](#)



DISABILITY COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER



DOWNTOWN
WOMEN'S
CENTER





John Jackson



November 1, 2021

Torrance City Council
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503

Dear Councilmembers:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the process of updating the housing element of Torrance's general plan. We are writing on behalf of the **Our Future LA Coalition** regarding the 6th Cycle housing element update.

Why does this matter? Because we face a cascade of housing crises in our region. And while nearly everyone in Los Angeles County feels the crush of our housing crisis, Black and Latino residents feel it more than most:

- Black households have 1.12% the wealth of white households, and Latino households less than 5% (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco)

- Black people make up 8% of the county population, but 33.7% of people experiencing homelessness (LAHSA)
- Even under COVID-related eviction moratoriums, Black and Latino neighborhoods face disproportionately higher eviction threats (Los Angeles Times, UCLA)
- One in four AAPIs pay more than half of their income toward housing costs compared to whites (16 percent), putting many on the edge of financial vulnerability. This segment of the population is considered severely cost-burdened (Crisis to Impact Report, A joint publication of the National Coalition of Asian Pacific American Community Development and the University of California, Los Angeles)

These are the effects of decades of racist policies that we have not eradicated: Restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning, and redlining made it impossible for Black families to build wealth through homeownership, and result in lower homeownership and higher rents today. The California Constitution's Article 34 and local "crime-free housing" policies put roadblocks in the way of addressing racial divisions in Californians' housing affordability and security.

This impact was felt devastatingly during the pandemic, when essential workers living in overcrowded housing were exposed to COVID at work and had no choice but to expose their families at home, leading to disproportionate deaths among Black and Latino people. Neighborhoods in South and Southeast LA, where nearly 20% of homes are overcrowded (defined as more than one person per room) had COVID rates of roughly 14,000 cases per 100,000 people. Neighborhoods on the Westside, where less than 5% of homes are overcrowded, had rates well under 5,000 cases per 100,000 people.¹ Death rates were similarly disproportionate -- at a time (January 2021) when the city of Beverly Hills was reporting 21 COVID deaths, and the neighborhood of Brentwood 9, the city of Compton reported 147, and the neighborhood of Westlake 202.² In all, COVID-19 mortality rates in LA County were roughly twice as high for Black people (31 deaths/100,000 individuals) and Latinos (29/100K) as for whites (15/100K) (from CGLA).

Of the 3,007 counties in the United States, L.A. County ranks last in housing affordability, overcrowding, and unsheltered homelessness. We are not doing enough to preserve and create homes for working class and lower-income people. The affordable housing crisis, rampant speculation, lack of tenant protections and rent control, and affordable housing shortage have gotten so bad that lower-income Black, Latino and AAPI families are being pushed out of their homes and communities at an alarming rate. At the rate we're going, next generations won't be able to live in Los Angeles County.

Los Angeles County is legally required to build 341,000 affordable homes by 2030. [To truly address our needs, we need more than double that.](#) At the rate we're going today, we might build 25,000. That's 7% of what's needed. That kind of failure will fall hardest on Black and Latino families, who disproportionately face eviction, homelessness and having to choose between rent and food. Our Future LA demands we not let that happen.

¹ ["When coronavirus invaded their tiny apartment, children desperately tried to protect dad". LA Times. 1/29/21](#)

² ["We Are Forced to Live in These Conditions': In Los Angeles, Virus Ravages Overcrowded Homes". NY Times. 1/23/21](#)

In order to create a better housing future, we must make every neighborhood resource-rich so people can live where they want to live and don't have to leave their community to find opportunity. The Housing Element must also consider the intersection between housing, public health, and environmental justice. The very communities facing the highest rent burden are often the same communities who bear the brunt of the negative impacts brought on by environmental contamination and exposure to the worst air and soil qualities. For example, in LA County, 75% of active oil wells are located within 2,500 feet of homes, the vast majority of which are occupied by low-income people of color. We must also achieve equitable land use and zoning so that historically exclusionary communities build at greater densities, with value capture, while also ensuring that areas already zoned for density are protected from environmental and spatial racism and displacement pressures. As the region plans for growth, there must be no conversion of wildlife habitat to housing or further development in wildfire hazard areas, as identified by CalFire. We understand that the City cares deeply about these issues, and we hope to offer assistance in addressing them.

As it stands right now, the draft housing element will not meet the City's goals around equity and affordability. We submit these comments in the spirit of collaboration in order to partner and provide research, grounded data to help in meeting housing needs. We are interested in having a meeting to discuss these comments more.

Our Future LA Housing Element Comments

1. Protections

- A. The housing element should expand just-cause eviction protections to cover all tenants and establish a corresponding enforcement program.
- B. The housing element should implement a local RSO or strengthen/reduce the annual allowable rent increase for the existing RSO program.
- C. The housing element should codify a tenant's right to counsel in an eviction proceeding.
- D. The housing element should create a permanent tenant education program to inform tenants of their rights and how to access eviction defense resources.
- E. The housing element should create and implement a tenant anti-harassment ordinance combined with enforcement resources.

2. Preservation

- A. The housing element must do more to prioritize rezoning - with value capture - in high-resource neighborhoods which are transit- and job-rich, including single-family zoned

areas. This is necessary to expand affordable housing opportunities while minimizing the impact on existing renters in multifamily-zoned areas.

B. The housing element should exclude parcels containing RSO housing units in the housing element’s site inventory.

C. The housing element should require that no net loss provisions apply to parcels in the site inventory and rezoning program with a monitoring and implementation program.

D. The housing element should institute local programs and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing.

3. Prioritization of affordable housing

A. The housing element should utilize a value capture mechanism, such as inclusionary zoning, to locally fund and/or incentivize affordable housing.

B. The housing element should prioritize creation of affordable housing on public land.

C. The housing element should streamline affordable housing production.

D. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas.

E. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas currently zoned R1.

4. Site Capacity Assessment

A. The housing element should estimate and report both the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, both vacant and nonvacant.

Comparison of claimed capacity vs. estimated realistic capacity

Income Category	Claimed Capacity in			Estimated Add'n Dev Potential in Draft HE (13% dev likelihood)	Recommended Add'n Dev Potential w/20% NNL	Gap in Add'n Dev Potential
	RHNA Target	Draft HE	NNL Buffer			
VLI + LI	2,467	3,135	27%	408	2,960	-2,553
MI	853	936	10%	122	1,024	-902
AMI	1,619	2,902	79%	377	1,943	-1,566
Total	4,939	6,973	41%	906	5,927	-5,020

We estimate that the draft housing element will fall short of the RHNA goal, by 5,020 units of realistic capacity. The City must *fairly* estimate the likelihood of development for all parcels on the suitable sites inventory.

B. The housing element should report the proportion of sites from the previous housing element's inventory that were developed during the previous planning period, and HCD-recommended methodologies and data sources should be used in order to conduct a thorough "factors" analysis of sites' realistic development capacity.

C. The housing element assigns more than 50% of the lower-income RHNA target to nonvacant sites, but should use statistical methods (e.g. surveying a random sample of owners of nonvacant sites) to determine that the sites' existing uses are likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

D. A buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity is not included in the housing element site inventory. This capacity buffer is especially necessary in order to accommodate the lower-income RHNA target.

See No Net Loss (NNL) section of 4A.

E. The housing element should provide a quantitative estimate of the likelihood that in-pipeline projects will be completed, based on historical data, and should adjust the number of in-pipeline units counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA target accordingly.

F. The housing element should commit to a mid-cycle review to verify the housing element's assumptions about development probabilities.

5. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

A. The housing element should meaningfully increase the concentration of lower-income households in areas of the city where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low.

B. The housing element should meaningfully reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with significant exposure to noise/pollution, and commit to reducing/addressing noise and pollution.

C. The housing element should ensure community-serving investment in historically disinvested areas. This includes place-based strategies that create a net gain of affordable housing and stop displacement, prioritize environmental justice, enhance community health and strengthen equitable community leadership in land use planning.

D. The housing element should include a thorough analysis of local patterns in socioeconomic/racial segregation and integration, including patterns of overt racial or ethnic discrimination in the housing and land development market.

E. The housing element should adequately prioritize high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities.

F. The housing element should adequately identify funding sources, public resources, and density bonus programs to maximize the likelihood that projects with below-market-rate units are built.

G. The jurisdiction did not adequately solicit public feedback and commentary on the housing element in a way that accurately reflects the jurisdiction's socioeconomic makeup.

6. Forecasts of ADU Development

A. The housing element did not use an HCD-recommended safe harbor methodology for forecasting future ADU production.

B. The housing element should provide for mid-cycle adjustments if inventory sites are developed at lower rates, or lesser densities, than the housing element anticipated and if ADU production falls short of projections. Mid-cycle adjustments should automatically implement a by-right density bonus on inventory sites, starting mid-cycle, and be large enough to make up for an ADU shortfall.

C. The housing element should assess the affordability of forecasted ADUs using city-specific data; it instead uses a regional average.

We request the opportunity to meet with you and your colleagues to address the concerns raised in this letter. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hirsch Marin
COO, Wellnest, Emotional Health & Wellness
[Our Future LA Steering Committee Member](#)

CC: Jason Elliott, Senior Counselor to Governor Gavin Newsom
Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director, Housing Policy Development, HCD

Melinda Coy, Land Use and Planning Manager, HCD
Tyrone Buckley, Assistant Deputy Director of Fair Housing, HCD
Paul McDougall, Housing Policy Development Manager, HCD



November 5, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Michelle Ramirez
Director of Community Development
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503
Email: community_development_dept@torranceca.gov; cddinfo@torranceca.gov

RE: Request for additional analysis and evidence regarding treatment of nonvacant sites in the City's Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

Dear Ms. Ramirez:

Californians for Homeownership is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization devoted to using legal tools to address California's housing crisis. Our organization is monitoring local compliance with the law governing housing elements.

As you know, housing element law places strict requirements on the sites inventory that the City must include with its Sixth Cycle Housing Element. We have reviewed the inventory provided with the City's draft Housing Element submitted to the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Based on this review, we are concerned that the inventory is legally inadequate, and that the City will not be able to meet its obligation to support the inventory with evidentiary findings as the law requires.

These inadequacies may expose the City to the risk of litigation. This letter is intended to assist the City in identifying additional information and facts now, before it has adopted its Housing Element, so that the City can reduce this risk and comply with the law.

State Law Governing the Use of Nonvacant Sites to Satisfy Housing Element Obligations

Under Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(1), for each nonvacant site, a city must "specify the additional development potential . . . within the planning period," and it must explain how the developmental potential for each site was measured. The methodology must consider the extent to which the existing use may impede development.

Additionally, if a city intends to rely on nonvacant sites to make up more than fifty percent of its lower income housing need, it is also subject to Government Code Section 65583.2(g)(2). This provision requires the city to make an affirmative factual showing that the existing use is not an impediment to development. More specifically, the city must present "findings based on



substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.” Without these findings, the existing use is “presumed to impede additional residential development.”

Inadequacy of the City’s Draft Housing Element

The sites inventory in the City’s draft Housing Element does not meet these requirements. The inventory does not adequately account for the impediment created by the existing uses on the listed nonvacant sites, including the possibility that a site will be maintained in its current use rather than redeveloped during the planning period. Indeed, the inventory appears to assume that every listed nonvacant site will be redeveloped during the planning period. Also, the information about the existing uses is woefully underspecified as it simply identifies a broad category such as industrial, residential, or commercial.

What’s more, the City’s draft housing element appears to rely on nonvacant sites to satisfy over 50% of the City’s lower income RHNA. But the inventory does not identify evidence that the existing uses on each of these sites will be discontinued during the planning period. Instead, the draft housing element provides a general overview of various possible housing corridors and makes the following broad statements regarding sites in these areas:

[T]here are many buildings in Torrance that are at least 50 years old. Many of these underutilized and older properties exhibit similar characteristics in terms of conditions and existing operations as other properties that have been redeveloped within the recent past A significant number of sites have been chosen with the criteria of underutilization and age in mind. Due to the scarcity of developable vacant land in the city, these properties offer an economic incentive to the property owner to develop higher density residential and mixed use products, as evidenced by the increasing number of applications and developer interest to recycle existing non-residential properties to residential uses.

The draft also contains the following broad statements regarding scattered sites:

These scattered sites represent recyclable properties that contain existing non-residential uses that are likely candidates for conversion to residential uses. These properties are located in areas where the pattern of development has demonstrated a trend of conversion of existing underutilized and non-residential uses into multi-family uses. Also, many of these properties contain parcel sizes and configurations that make these sites conducive for recycling to multi-family uses. As has been noted in other sections of this Housing Element, the age of the structures on the scattered sites also will encourage redevelopment, as many are over 50 years old.

This comes nowhere near meeting the City’s obligations under Section 65583.2(g)(2). Indeed, the City’s repeated (and unsupported) reference to the claim that “many” of the listed sites have features that could result in a discontinuation of the existing use seems to betray the fact that, for other sites, the City has no such evidence. Accordingly, as it stands, the existing uses of the non-vacant sites listed in the City’s inventory would be presumed to impede additional residential development, making those sites inappropriate for inclusion.

November 5, 2021

Page 3

Request for Additional Information

Because the City's draft Housing Element does not meet the requirements in subdivisions (g)(1) and (g)(2) of Government Code Section 65583.2, the City may face the significant risk of litigation if it adopts the Housing Element in its current form. Accordingly, we have prepared a table (below) to offer the City an opportunity to provide the additional analysis and evidence that the law requires. We ask that you complete this table and return it to us within 14 days, so that we can review it with sufficient time to make informed comments on the City's draft Housing Element.

In the table, we have listed the nonvacant sites identified for lower income housing in the City's sites inventory. The table includes a space to describe the analysis the City undertook under Section 65583.2(g)(1); as part of this analysis, the City should identify the percentage of similar sites that were redeveloped in the Fifth Cycle or otherwise explain how its prior experience justifies its assumptions. It also includes a space to identify the site-specific evidence required by Section 65583.2(g)(2).

If the City does not respond to this letter, we will assume that it does not have further analysis or evidence to provide. We or another organization may use the City's failure to respond as evidence for inadequacy of the City's analysis and evidence under Section 65583.2. And we may argue that the City's failure to timely provide this information hindered our right to make informed public comments regarding the City's draft Housing Element. For these reasons, we urge you to comply with our request.

* * *

Time is of the essence, so please respond to this letter within 14 days of receipt. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of this with me, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (213) 739-8206.

Sincerely,



Matthew Gelfand

cc: City of Torrance
Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager (by email to glodan@torranceca.gov)
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate (by email to cchun@torranceca.gov)
Patrick Sullivan, Esq., City Attorney (by email to psullivan@torranceca.gov)

California Department of Housing and Community Development
Dulce Ochoa-Hernandez (by email to dulce.ochoa-hernandez@hcd.ca.gov)

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7371-009-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7374-006-037	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-007-032	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-006-050	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-006-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-019-053	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-019-020	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-022-903	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7355-022-902	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-027-144	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-021	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-022-017	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-026	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-024-025	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-026-900	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7355-026-016	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
7378-003-121	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-039	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-044	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7368-001-015	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-183	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-001-002	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-048	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-182	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
7534-012-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7534-019-021	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-015-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7366-019-133	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-008-028	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-048	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-047	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-025	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7524-020-024	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-023	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-020-022	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7368-021-043	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7377-004-051	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-011-019	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7352-002-911	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-030-003	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7357-030-005	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-030-018	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-037-019	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7357-037-013	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4067-013-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4067-012-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4092-001-904	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7519-025-049	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7370-002-002	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4088-007-026	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-010-012	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7514-023-030	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-016	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4087-016-033	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7370-010-009	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-015-104	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
7547-003-015	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7528-005-009	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-032	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7534-006-012	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7511-021-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4088-006-027	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4085-032-008	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-023-038	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

APN	Nonvacant?	Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)	Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)
7524-006-001	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4096-009-067	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7519-026-040	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-007-035	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7514-005-005	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7362-014-011	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7371-020-041	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4095-020-030	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____

<u>APN</u>	<u>Nonvacant?</u>	<u>Method Under § 65583.2(g)(1)</u>	<u>Evidence Under § 65583.2(g)(2)</u>
4096-001-053	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-009-017	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7524-013-064	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
4096-001-054	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-039-006	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7529-019-003	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7359-012-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____
7379-001-004	Yes	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____	Draft HE: None listed. Response: _____ _____ _____



January 4, 2022

Gustavo Velasquez, Director
California Department of Housing & Community Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

Dear Director Velasquez:

We are writing on behalf of **Abundant Housing LA** regarding Torrance's 6th Cycle housing element update. As you know, we have shared several comment letters with HCD describing our concerns about major deficiencies in the City's housing element update. Among our concerns is the City's failure to identify enough parcels in its site inventory and proposed rezoning program to achieve its RHNA target of 4,939 homes by 2029.

Assembly Bill 1397 (2017) requires cities to provide an accurate assessment of realistic site capacity, including "the city's or City's past experience with converting existing uses to higher density residential development, the current demand for the existing use, and an analysis of existing leases or other contracts that would perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment."

When cities allocate over 50% of their lower-income RHNA targets to nonvacant sites, they must demonstrate through *substantial evidence* that the current use of these sites is likely to be discontinued during the planning period. This is necessary in order to ensure that enough parcels for affordable housing production are identified, and that the lower-income RHNA targets are ultimately achieved. **To date, the City has not yet adequately provided this substantial evidence.**

Abundant Housing LA has partnered with [MapCraft Labs](#), an economic and policy analysis firm with expertise in housing elements and quantitative real estate analysis, to forecast the true realistic capacity of the City's site inventory and proposed rezoning program. The analysis considers the likely impact of housing element updates on housing production and proposes alternative rezoning scenarios that are more likely to achieve the RHNA target. In particular, MapCraft analyzed the market feasibility of the unit capacity claims made on parcels included in jurisdictions' site inventories.

This analysis calls into question the City's conclusion that its housing element creates the conditions for achieving the RHNA target. Among our core findings:

- While the City's site inventory and rezoning program claimed capacity for about 6,600 housing units, **our analysis suggests that expected housing capacity could fall short by 1,800 to 3,600 housing units.**

- On 374 sites where the City has claimed 6,018 housing units, our analysis found that these sites are either unlikely to be redeveloped to the density that the City is claiming, or are unlikely to be redeveloped altogether. **This represents 95% of the housing units in the City's site inventory.**

In light of this information, we respectfully recommend that HCD urge the City to reassess its site capacity claims, and revise its site inventory and proposed rezoning program. The City should add more parcels to its site inventory and expand its proposed rezoning program, particularly for low-density parcels in high-demand neighborhoods like Old Town Torrance and WALTERIA. The City should also consider eliminating or reducing on-site parking requirements, which would greatly improve the economic feasibility of denser housing development.

We encourage you to review Abundant Housing LA and MapCraft's full report describing how these conclusions were reached. We would be happy to discuss our findings with you and your colleagues. Thank you for your team's continued hard work and dedication to solving California's housing shortage and affordability crisis.

Sincerely,

Leonora Camner
Executive Director
Abundant Housing LA

Anthony Dedousis
Director of Policy and Research
Abundant Housing LA

MAPCRAFT

Abundant Housing LA Feedback on Torrance Housing Element

Date: December 22, 2021
To: Abundant Housing LA
From: MapCraft Inc
Subject: Housing Element Feedback Analysis Results

Executive Summary

Based on an analysis of the sites found in Torrance's site inventory, which claimed total capacity for nearly 6,600 total units across roughly 460 sites, our analysis suggests that Torrance's expected housing capacity could fall short by between 1,800 and 3,600 units.

Torrance could consider the following actions to meet RHNA goals:

- Right-sizing claimed capacity on sites in the current site inventory, both reducing expectations on many sites and being more ambitious in upzoning other sites. The City could revisit additional opportunities to rezone more parcels in the inventory, particularly in areas like Old Town Torrance and Waltheria.
- Adding more sites to the site inventory and evaluating rezoning of those sites. The inventory includes 10% of the City's 4,622 parcels, so there are many places that could be explored further to address this potential shortfall.
- Reducing or eliminating parking requirements and promoting automobile alternatives to reduce households' demand for parking. If developers could meet household demand with fewer on-site parking stalls, it could make multifamily development in many parts of the City more economically feasible.
- Introducing new economic incentives to increase the financial feasibility of redevelopment, especially for projects that include below-market-rate units.
- Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity.

Purpose of this Analysis

The State of California requires local jurisdictions to periodically update their housing elements to address housing needs, as identified by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Cities in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region are in the process of developing updates to their housing elements, as part of the 6th cycle of the RHNA Allocation Plan, which will cover the planning period October 2021 through October 2029.

In March 2021, California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) approved SCAG's adopted RHNA Allocation Plan, apportioning the region's housing growth target to its jurisdictions. City governments in SCAG are responsible for updating their Housing Elements and

MAPCRAFT

submitting them to HCD by October 2021. The Housing Elements must include an inventory of parcels suitable and available for residential development. The total capacity of the sites must be sufficient to accommodate the total housing need, by income level, allocated throughout the planning period.

Abundant Housing LA (AHLA) is a pro-housing, nonprofit advocacy organization working to help solve Southern California's housing crisis. AHLA is providing feedback on housing elements to jurisdictions during the public comment period, and communicating to HCD staff its assessment of the housing elements. AHLA's review of housing elements is intended to ensure that jurisdictions develop high-quality housing element updates, and fully comply with state housing element law.

To that end, AHLA partnered with MapCraft to assess the site inventories shared by jurisdictions as part of their housing element updates. The analysis considers the likely impact of the draft housing elements on housing production and suggests alternative rezoning scenarios that are more likely to achieve cities' RHNA goals. MapCraft worked with a team to determine the likelihood that new housing production would be possible at the scale assumed by draft housing elements. In particular, MapCraft analyzed the market feasibility of the unit capacity claims made on sites included in jurisdictions' site inventories. This memorandum serves as the documentation for the results of various analyses completed by MapCraft for assessing Torrance's Housing Element.

Categorizing Site Inventory Claims

We conducted multiple tests of Torrance's proposed site inventory. For each site for which data was available, we assessed the following:

1. How historic development patterns compared with the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory
2. How physical zoned capacity, taking into account major zoning constraints, beyond just the allowed units per acre, compared with the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory
3. How the scale of pipeline developments identified in the site inventory compare to the unit capacity claims made on similar sites in the site inventory
4. How financially feasible scales of development compared to the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory

Based on the tests on each site, we classified the housing capacity claimed on each site in the site inventory as one of three categories: reasonable, questionable, or unreasonable. Although the tests were nuanced, in general these categories meant:

- Capacity estimates were categorized as "reasonable" when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity on the site was greater than what the jurisdiction claimed in the inventory
- Capacity estimates were categorized as "questionable" when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity was roughly similar to, though lower than, the claim in the inventory

MAPCRAFT

- Capacity estimates were categorized as “unreasonable” when a MapCraft test found that viable capacity was deemed substantially less than what was claimed

Multiple feasibility tests were performed for each site. If the number of claimed units on a site was found to be unreasonable according to multiple tests, we are confident that a reevaluation of the site is warranted.

- More specifically, if the site’s claimed capacity resulted in “unreasonable” for more than one third of the applicable tests, we concluded the site’s claim was unreasonable.
- If none of the tests resulted in an “unreasonable” finding, and more than one third of the applicable tests resulted in “reasonable”, then we concluded the site’s claim was reasonable.
- The rest of the sites, which fall between our thresholds for “reasonable” and “unreasonable,” were defined as “questionable.”

We analyzed 464 sites in Torrance’s site inventory, with a total claimed capacity of 6,561 units.¹ Of that number, Torrance’s draft housing element claimed 2,061 units on sites where rezoning was not proposed. This includes 233 units that are projects that are already pending, entitled, or pipeline projects; however, we were only able to match six of those projects (using addresses and APN numbers) to sites in the inventory which accounted for 98 units, which we assumed to be reasonable capacity claims. We therefore assume that the remaining pending, entitled, or pipeline projects were among the rest of the sites we analyzed where rezoning was not proposed - a total of 176 sites with 1,968 units - which we analyzed further. We also analyzed 277 site inventory parcels that are part of the Housing Corridor Study in Torrance and might be rezoned. These sites claim an additional 4,483 units of capacity.

Our analysis suggests that on 374 sites where Torrance has claimed 6,018 units, the capacity claims we analyzed were “unreasonable” or “questionable”. This represents 95% of the total capacity claimed in the site inventory.

Table 1: Results of Site Inventory Categorization

	Number of Sites	Claimed Units	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	79	335	17%	5%
Questionable	332	4,834	73%	76%
Unreasonable	42	1,184	9%	19%
Subtotal	453	6,353	100%	100%
Incomplete Data*	5	110	N/A	N/A
Total	458	6,463	100%	100%

*Sites with Incomplete data needed for our tests. These Sites were not included in our Analysis

¹ Torrance’s site inventory had net units. For the majority of our tests we needed total capacity. To arrive at total capacity we joined the APNs of the sites in the inventory to the Los Angeles County assessor data and added the existing total units to the net units estimated in the site inventory. Any mention of units in this memo refers to the total capacity instead of net capacity.

MAPCRAFT

Exhibit 1: Sites Inventory Categorization – Percent of Sites





Exhibit 2: Sites Inventory Categorization – Percent of Units



Additionally, we estimated the scale of development that might reasonably be expected on parcels in the site inventory. Our analysis suggests that Torrance’s **expected capacity could fall short by anywhere between 1,801 units and 3,601 units, as compared to the 6,353 units claimed** in the site inventory.

To arrive at a range of unit assumptions, we applied two different sets of assumptions about the viability of units being developed on sites deemed reasonable, questionable, or unreasonable. For a more conservative estimate, we assumed 100% viability for reasonable, 50% viability for questionable, and 0% viability for unreasonable, whereas for a more lenient estimate, we assumed 100%, 75%, and 50% respectively and subtracted those units from the total.

MAPCRAFT

Table 2: Expected Capacity Shortfall

Site Classifications	Claimed Units on Sites	Conservative Estimates		Lenient Estimates	
		<i>Expected viability of Units on Site</i>	<i>Claimed units that are not viable</i>	<i>Expected viability of units on sites</i>	<i>Claimed units that are not viable</i>
Reasonable	335	100% Viable	-	100% Viable	-
Questionable	4,834	50% Viable	2,417	75% Viable	1,209
Unreasonable	1,184	0% Viable	1,184	50% Viable	592
Total	6,353		3,601 (57% Not Viable)		1,801 (28% Not Viable)

The the City has multiple potential policy actions available to increase the viability of redevelopment on the site inventory parcels, such as:

- Add more market-feasible sites to the site inventory
- Upzone sites more ambitiously to enable more intense market-feasible housing development opportunities on sites already in the inventory and any sites added to the inventory
- Consider introducing new incentives and other “carrots” to encourage housing production, such as fee waivers or direct subsidies, a faster permitting process, and greater flexibility on setback size or maximum lot coverage
- Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity

Test Results

The following tests were conducted on sites in the Torrance site inventory to assess whether the claimed development density in the housing element was reasonable. This was based on a comparison of the inventory claims to historic development patterns, sites’ zoned capacity, similar projects under development, and the current financial feasibility of projects of a similar scale.

1. Analysis of Historic Development Patterns (Utilization of Zoned Capacity)

MapCraft evaluated projects built in the last ten years, using Torrance tax assessor data, to estimate whether the claimed development density of a site inventory parcel was comparable with Torrance’s recent record of housing production.

Test 1a – Historic Development Scale

As a first test, we searched for projects built anywhere in unincorporated Torrance over the last 10 years that were on sites whose size was within 20% of the site size identified in the inventory and with development densities (units per acre) that were within 20% of the density claimed in the inventory (units divided by site size).

MAPCRAFT

If recent developments matched the claimed density of a site inventory parcel, we categorized the parcel as “Reasonable.” If no similar historical developments existed, we assumed that zoning had prohibited such developments or other factors precluded such developments from being built in Torrance, and categorized the parcel as “Questionable.” Given that **Torrance recognizes the need to rezone 283 parcels (or approximately 62% of the sites we analyzed) to arrive at 4,483 units (or 71% of the units we analyzed)**, restrictive zoning may contribute to the lack of recent development projects at certain scales. We refrained from categorizing any site inventory parcel as “unreasonable” based on the historic development scale test.

Table 3: Analysis of Historic Development Scale Results (Test 1a)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	9%	1%
Questionable	91%	99%

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Test 1b – Historic Development in Zones

For site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed in the housing element, we conducted two other tests comparing the historic development patterns to the number of units claimed on sites in the site inventory.

Test 1b determined whether development occurred in the last 10 years on parcels whose zoning matches the zoning of the site in the inventory. Sites were categorized as “reasonable” if there was development in that zoning category in the last 10 years, or “unreasonable” if there was not.

Table 4: Analysis of Historic Development in Zones Results (Test 1b)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	79%	39%
Unreasonable	21%	61%

*This test was applicable on 38% of the sites we analyzed

Test 1c – Historic Development Scale in Zones

Test 1c compared the observed density of historic developments in a given zoning category to the claimed density of sites in the inventory in the same zoning category. This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the density of recent projects in the same zoning category, “questionable” if the parcel’s proposed density for redevelopment was within 10% of the maximum historic development density in the same zoning category, or “unreasonable” if the parcel’s proposed density for redevelopment exceeded 10% of the maximum historic development density in the same zoning category.

MAPCRAFT

Table 5: Analysis of Historic Development Scale in Zones Results (Test 1c)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	21%	15%
Questionable	54%	35%
Unreasonable	23%	49%

*This test was applicable on 30% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- Only 9% of the sites in the inventory have claimed densities that match recent developments in Torrance, which corresponds to a reasonable claim for just 1% of the units.
- Of sites where rezoning is not proposed, the vast majority (79%) of sites are in zones that have seen some scale of development in the last 10 years. However, these are typically zoned for low-density development. As a result, these sites contain less than two-fifths (39%) of the total claimed units on sites that will not be rezoned. Thus, just 21% of sites where rezoning is not proposed account for 61% of the related units.
- For sites in zones that have experienced development, less than one-quarter of the sites (21%) have claimed densities that are reasonable (i.e. less than the average density observed in those zones in the last 10 years). This accounts for 15% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- For sites in zones that have seen development, a little less than one-quarter of the sites (21%) have claimed densities that are unreasonable and greater than the average density observed in those zones in the last 10 years. However, this accounts for about half (49%) of the claimed units for this subset of sites.

2. Evaluation of Zoned Capacity

For site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed, MapCraft conducted tests based on the physical capacity of the zoning code, acknowledging that various zoning parameters might result in a lower effective capacity than the units per acre allowed in a zone. We collected several zoning attributes for each zone listed in the inventory, including maximum height limits, maximum FAR, maximum impervious coverage, minimum lot area per unit, maximum dwelling units per lot, and maximum dwelling units per acre. Using the zoning category noted for each site in Torrance’s site inventory, we estimated how many units could be accommodated on the site under the relevant zoning limits and compared the result to what was claimed in the site inventory.

This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the density resulting from any of the zoning attributes, “questionable” if the claimed density was less than the maximum density resulting from the majority of zoning attributes (e.g. based on height, based on FAR, etc.) but the claimed density was up to 10% greater than what one or more zoning attributes would accommodate, or “unreasonable” if the claimed density was greater than what a majority of zoning attributes would accommodate.

MAPCRAFT

Table 6: Evaluation of Zoned Capacity Results (Test 2)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	61%	79%
Questionable	2%	1%
Unreasonable	37%	19%

*This test was applicable on 38% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- A majority of the sites in the inventory that are not expected to be rezoned (61% of these sites), have density claims that are reasonable. This corresponds to 79% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- About 37% of the sites in the inventory that are not expected to be rezoned, have density claims that are unreasonable, but these sites account for just one fifth (19%) of the claimed units for this subset of sites.
- These DUA limitations would impact both market-rate and 100% affordable projects.

3. Analysis of Site Inventory Pipeline

To understand the current conditions for housing development on site inventory parcels where rezoning is not proposed, MapCraft used the pipeline project data in Torrance’s site inventory as another way of determining what scales of development could be expected on other sites in the inventory. The scale of the pipeline projects planned on sites in a given zone provided a sample of real-world development densities for other developments in those Torrance zones. Our sample was limited to those sites in the inventory that could be matched to APNs through an address search, which represents just over two-fifths (42%) of the pipeline units. The limited samples were used to compare the development density (units per acre) of upcoming projects to the claimed density on each site in the inventory that was not expected to be rezoned.

This test categorized sites as “reasonable” if the claimed density for the site was less than the pipeline patterns in the zone, “questionable” if it was within 10% of the maximum pipeline development density, or “unreasonable” if it exceeded 10% of the maximum pipeline development density.

Table 7: Analysis of Site Inventory Pipeline Results (Test 3)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	67%	45%
Questionable	0%	0%
Unreasonable	33%	55%

*This test was applicable on 11% of the sites we analyzed

MAPCRAFT

Key Takeaways:

- This test was applicable for only 11% of the sites in the inventory, meaning that most of the sites (89%) are in zones that currently do not have any pending or approved projects listed among pipeline sites.
- The substantial majority of the sites (67%) that could be compared to pipeline projects in the same zone had claimed densities that are reasonable. This corresponds to 45% of the claimed units for this subset of sites.

4. Financial Feasibility Analysis (Market-Driven Development Expectations)

MapCraft assessed the financial viability of the claims made in the site inventory by evaluating the financial feasibility of developing housing at a scale similar to the densities claimed on each site in the inventory.

MapCraft used real estate pro formas to analyze the financial feasibility of a variety of housing development types. To determine whether the unit capacity claimed on each site in the inventory might be financially feasible, MapCraft evaluated the financial feasibility of development types that had densities that were within 10% of the claimed density on each site.

Pro forma analyses can help identify market feasible development types by determining whether the value of a potential development is greater than the project's construction costs, land costs, and other costs. MapCraft estimated the land cost for each site in the inventory, using the market values provided by the Torrance tax assessor. This comparison also helps to demonstrate that the existing use of a parcel is likely to be discontinued. Costs also included parking provision, which was tested in two ways: 1) based on current parking provision in the Torrance submarket and 2) assuming an aggressive reduction in mandated parking ratios and parking demand. To ensure the results reflected the market conditions applicable to each site in the inventory, the pro forma for each development type was run with the corresponding neighborhood-level market inputs.

Test 4a – Feasibility with Historic Parking Provision

For the first test, which considered parking provided at rates observed in existing development in the submarket, MapCraft categorized sites as “reasonable” if there were feasible development types that matched the scale of development claimed on each site. Sites were categorized as “questionable” if there were not feasible prototypes with similar densities. We did not include the option for an “unreasonable” result because this tested the feasibility of development using current observed parking provision, which may be higher than what is possible in new development today.

Table 8: Feasibility Analysis Results - historic parking provision (Test 4a)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	1%	2%
Questionable	99%	98%
Unreasonable	N/A	N/A

*This test was applicable on 96% of the sites we analyzed

MAPCRAFT

Test 4b – Feasibility with Reduced Parking Provision

The second test considered more lenient parking provision, which can contribute to development feasibility by reducing cost and saving space. MapCraft categorized sites as “questionable” if there were feasible development types that matched the scale of development claimed on each site. Sites were classified as “unreasonable” if the most financially feasible of the prototypes with similar densities could not pay for land based on the assessor’s estimate of total value. We did not include the option for a “reasonable” result for this test, given the more lenient parking assumptions may not be viable in all submarkets.

Table 9: Feasibility Analysis Results - reduced parking provision (Test 4b)

	Percent of Sites	Percent of Units
Reasonable	N/A	N/A
Questionable	100%	100%
Unreasonable	0%	0%

*This test was applicable on 96% of the sites we analyzed

Key Takeaways:

- We found that today’s housing market does not support the scales of development claimed on most sites in the inventory.
- We found that today’s housing market could support the scales of development claimed on many sites in the inventory if less parking were demanded and required than what has historically been provided. The City could reduce or eliminate parking requirements and promote automobile alternatives to reduce households’ demand for parking, thereby making it economically feasible to develop multifamily housing in many areas.

Test Results of Alternative Rezoning Scenarios

We analyzed 453 sites to assess whether there was market potential to exceed the capacity claimed in the site inventory should Torrance upzone site inventory parcels more ambitiously than what’s proposed in the housing element. For this analysis, we considered all sites in the inventory, both the sites that Torrance is already planning to rezone and sites where the existing zoning is expected to persist.

We conducted two different tests, using MapCraft pro forma feasibility assessments (for more details, see approach outlined in Test 4) to estimate the market potential on the sites in the inventory. By comparing MapCraft’s market feasible unit estimates to the unit capacity claimed in the site inventory, we were able to identify sites where upzoning may yield more capacity than currently tabulated.

Test 5a – Maximum density of potential upzoned sites

As a first test, we considered the most intense housing options that could be feasibly built on each site. We first identified the array of feasible housing development prototypes on each site, which may include both high- and low-density housing options. In this case, financial feasibility was based

MAPCRAFT

on a development project’s prospects of paying more for the site than the current property value. We compared the housing capacity of the densest of those feasible prototypes to the capacity claimed in the site inventory to determine if further upzoning could yield more capacity.


Across all of the 453 sites that we analyzed, only 289 could be financially feasible for redevelopment at a capacity that exceeded the capacity proposed for the parcel in the site inventory. Of those sites, 126 were sites slated to be rezoned and 163 were sites that were not slated to be rezoned. The table and charts below show the resulting estimated units, based on the greatest density of development types that had market potential to displace the existing use, and how that estimate compares to the total claimed units in the inventory.

Table 10: Estimated Units from Max Density of Potential Upzones (Test 5a)

	Number of sites where feasible development exceeded claimed capacity (% of all inventoried sites in that category)	Potential Incremental Units Identified by Test 5a (Claimed Units)
Site planned for rezone in site inventory	126 (28%)	10,395 (1,566)
Site NOT planned for rezone in site inventory	163 (36%)	6,240 (918)

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Exhibit 3: Estimated Units from Max Density of Potential Upzones (Test 5a)



MAPCRAFT

Test 5b – Maximum feasibility of potential upzoning

We conducted a second test that considered the most financially feasible options that could be built on each site. As in Test 5a, we considered the array of feasible housing development prototypes on each site. For Test 5b, we compared the housing capacity of the most feasible prototype to the capacity claimed in the site inventory to determine if further upzoning could yield more capacity. Because the most feasible prototype could be lower density than other feasible prototypes, this approach produced more conservative outcomes than Test 5a.


Accordingly, there were 287 sites that had feasible development options with capacity that exceeded what was claimed in the site inventory. Of those sites, 126 were sites slated to be rezoned and 161 were sites that were not slated to be rezoned. The table and charts below show the resulting estimated units, based on the greatest density of development types that had market potential to displace the existing use, and how that estimate compares to the total claimed units in the inventory.

Table 11: Results of Test 5b

	Number of sites where feasible development exceeded claimed capacity (% of all inventoried sites in that category)	Potential Incremental Units Identified by Test 5a (Claimed Units)
Site planned for rezone in site inventory	126 (28%)	5,446 (1,566)
Site NOT planned for rezone in site inventory	161 (36%)	3,526 (895)

*This test was applicable on 100% of the sites we analyzed

Exhibit 4: Estimated Units from Max Feasibility of Potential Upzones (Test 5b)




MAPCRAFT

Given these results, we believe that there is substantial capacity “left on the table” for sites currently in the site inventory - for both sites already planned to be rezoned as well as sites not expected to be rezoned. But there are opportunities to identify additional parcels where market feasible capacity exists and add those sites to the proposed site inventory.

Viable upzoning opportunities exist in many parts of the City, and we observed concentrations of sites with greater market feasible housing capacity in the Old Town Torrance and Waltheria neighborhoods. These locations may be areas where Torrance could effectively add more market-feasible sites to the inventory by rezoning these sites to allow for denser development.

Exhibit 5: Map of Concentrations of Potential Upzoning Opportunities



MAPCRAFT

Key Takeaways:

- Additional capacity could be achieved on the majority of sites in the inventory where market-feasible opportunities to upzone exist. Inclusion of additional parcels in the site inventory, and potentially rezoning those parcels to allow denser development, will be needed in order to reasonably achieve the RHNA target.
- Comparing results from Test 5a to 5b, it appears that the most financially feasible development options may be less intense than other feasible development options in some cases. For example, for-sale townhomes may be more profitable than small rental apartment buildings with more housing units. For that reason, the city may consider establishing site utilization minimums so that sites redevelop at higher intensities.



February 28, 2022

Policy Recommendations for 6th Cycle Housing Element

Dear Planning staff:

YIMBY Law submits this letter to share our policy goals and recommendations for the Policies and Programs section of your Housing Element. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Housing Element process.

The Policies and Programs section of the city's Housing Element must respond to data, analysis and findings presented in the Housing Needs section. We repeatedly see findings that housing prices are high, segregation exists, and there is a lack of housing for special populations, but the Policies and Programs don't respond to these findings or try to change outcomes. The overview of the city's housing environment should set the scene, and the policies and programs should explain what the city is going to do to fix it.

Our policy goals are as follows:

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

1. Prioritize rezoning in high resource, historically exclusionary neighborhoods.

Many of the highest resource neighborhoods with the best access to jobs, good schools, and other amenities have histories of exclusion which are still reflected in their zoning. Cities should rezone to allow more housing opportunities in those neighborhoods, particularly those with low Vehicle Miles Traveled, as part of their

Housing Elements.

- 2. Establish a strong tenant protection ordinance so that new housing benefits everyone.** Development should not permanently displace current residents. Housing replacement programs, temporary housing vouchers, right of return, and demolition controls will create stability for renters while allowing new homes to be built for new households and to accommodate the growth associated with RHNA. In your sites inventory and rezoning programs, you should prioritize development on sites with owner-occupied housing & commercial uses over those with existing rent-controlled apartments or other rental housing with lower income residents.

- 3. Support homeownership opportunities for historically excluded groups.** Homeownership continues to be a path to building financial security and inter-generational wealth, which has been systematically denied to many Americans. As a society, we need to make this right by intentionally offering opportunities to communities who have been excluded. The housing element should identify opportunities to create a variety of for-sale housing types and create programs to facilitate property ownership among excluded groups.

Site Capacity

- 4. Adequately plan for density.** Ensure that a site's density will accommodate the number of homes that are projected to be built. In addition, make sure height limits, setback requirements, FAR, and other controls allow for adequate density and the ability to achieve a site's realistic capacity. Housing will not be feasible if you have a high density paired with low height limits. This density should be emphasized around jobs and transit and should go beyond the Mullin density in those areas.

- 5. Provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels, including a minimum No Net Loss buffer of 30%.** Not every site will be developed at maximum density during the eight-year planning period. Identify an ample amount of opportunity sites and zone the sites to accommodate lower-income housing types (usually a statutory minimum of 30 dwelling units per acre) to give the city the best chance at meeting its RHNA.

- 6. Use data from the 5th Cycle to calculate the likelihood of development for your 6th Cycle site inventory.** Likelihood of development is a measure of the probability of an inventory site being developed during the planning period. The median likelihood of development across the state is 25%, meaning only one of every four sites will likely be developed during the planning period for the median city. Incorporating the likelihood of development into the zoned capacity will set the city up to successfully achieve their RHNA, making the housing element less of a paper exercise and more of an actionable, functional document.

Accessory Dwelling Units

- 7. Commit to an automatic mid-cycle adjustment if ADU permitting activity is lower than estimated in the housing element.** We highly recommend complying with HCD's standards of using one of its "safe harbor" methodologies to anticipate future ADU production. However, if the city is optimistic about ADU growth, then creating an automatic mid-cycle adjustment will automatically facilitate alternative housing options (i.e., a rezoning program, removing development constraints, ADU incentives, etc.) if the city falls behind the estimated ADU production.
- 8. Incentivize new ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers.** Consider offering low- or no-interest loans, forgivable loans, impact fee waivers for ADUs that are 750 square feet or larger, allowances to facilitate two-story and second-story ADU construction, etc.

Zoning

- 9. Allow residential to be built in areas that are zoned for commercial use.** There are a myriad of ways to do this, but a housing overlay is one common policy. Additionally, consider eliminating new commercial space in mixed-use developments where there is not a strong demand or there is otherwise a glut of commercial space that is unused or frequently vacant.
- 10. Allow flexibility in inclusionary zoning.** Cities should require different percentages for different AMI levels. Additionally, we urge cities to incentivize land

dedication to affordable developers in order for market-rate developers to meet their inclusionary requirements. Avoid getting trapped into thinking that the affordable units must be “sprinkled throughout” the market-rate units, or require the market-rate units to look exactly the same as the affordable ones. This should be balanced against not locating all of the affordable units in one place and ghettoizing neighborhoods by creating or perpetuating racially concentrated areas of poverty.

Better Entitlement Process & Reducing Barriers to Development

- 11. Ensure that the city has a ministerial process for housing permitting, especially multi-family housing, and remove impact fees for deed-restricted housing.** A discretionary process for housing development creates uncertainty and adds to the cost of construction. For example, multi-family housing should not require a conditional use permit or city council approval unless the builder is asking for unique and extraordinary concessions. Right-sizing governmental constraints, entitlement processes, and impact fees will help the city successfully meet its RHNA.
- 12. Reduce parking standards and eliminate parking minimums.** Minimum parking requirements are a major constraint on housing, especially for lower cost housing types. They can cost in excess of \$30,000 per spot and can raise rents by as much as 17%, and eliminating them is particularly important for smaller & other spatially constrained sites. Consider adopting a parking maximum.
- 13. Cap fees on all new housing.** Most construction costs are outside the City’s control, but reducing impact fees can demonstrate that a city is serious about building new housing. At a minimum, cities should delay the collection of impact fees until the issuance of the certificate of occupancy to reduce financial impacts on new housing and make the units cheaper by not asking the developer to carry impact fee charges or debt throughout the construction phase.
- 14. Provide local funding.** One of the largest barriers to building new affordable homes is the lack of city/county funds available to assemble sites, provide gap funding, and to pay for dedicated staff. Without new funding, especially at the local level, we will not be able to build more affordable homes. There are three

new revenue streams that should be considered: 1) **Transfer tax**, a one-time payment levied by a jurisdiction on the sale of a home, may be utilized to raise much needed revenue to fund affordable homes; 2) **Vacancy tax** may be collected on vacant land to convince landowners to sell their underutilized properties and be used to fund the construction of affordable homes; 3) **Commercial linkage** fees should be adopted or revisited for increases on new commercial developments.

We urge you to include these policies in your 6th cycle Housing Element.

Best regards,

Sonja Trauss

Executive Director

YIMBY Law

sonja@yimbylaw.org



March 4, 2022

Michelle Ramirez
City of Torrance
Email: mramirez@torranceca.gov

RE: Torrance's failure to timely adopt a Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

Dear Ms. Ramirez:

Californians for Homeownership is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization that uses impact litigation to address California's housing crisis. We are monitoring local compliance with the law governing housing elements. Our understanding is that the City has not adopted a sixth cycle housing element, which it was required to do by October 15, 2021.¹ It also missed the second compliance deadline of February 12, 2022, subjecting it to additional penalties.² We are currently preparing for litigation against cities that have not timely adopted housing elements, like yours.

In light of the City's failure to timely adopt its housing element, our organization could immediately sue the City under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 to compel it to adopt a compliant housing element.³ As a result of this litigation, in addition to being ordered to adopt a housing element on a short timeline,⁴ the City could also face a number of serious penalties. For example, the court could suspend all non-residential permitting,⁵ or could judicially approve housing development projects within the City.⁶ And the court could impose these penalties while the litigation is pending, even before reaching a final decision.⁷ Housing element litigation is given priority in the court system,⁸ and a successful plaintiff can obtain attorneys' fees under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5. Indeed, in a recent case involving the City of Huntington Beach's housing element, a court awarded another non-profit organization over \$3.5 million in fees.⁹

The purpose of this letter is to offer the City a pathway to avoid immediate litigation by our organization. Enclosed is an Acknowledgment that sets forth some of the penalties to which the City is currently subject in light of the City's failure to adopt a housing element. If the City signs and returns the Acknowledgment, we will not initiate litigation against the City at this time.

¹ Gov. Code § 65588(e)(3).

² Gov. Code §§ 65583(c)(1)(A), 65583.2(c), and 65588(e)(4)(C).

³ Gov. Code §§ 65587, 65751.

⁴ Gov. Code § 65754.

⁵ Gov. Code § 65755(a)(1).

⁶ Gov. Code § 65755(a)(4).

⁷ Gov. Code § 65757.

⁸ Gov. Code § 65752.

⁹ <https://www.communitylegalsocal.org/kennedy-commission-awarded-3-5-million-in-attorneys-fees-for-advocacy-in-huntington-beach-low-income-housing-case/>



March 4, 2022

Page 2

We ask that you return the Acknowledgement by March 11, 2022. If you decline to do so, understand that we may initiate litigation against the City, using the City's refusal to acknowledge these basic requirements of state housing law to demonstrate the existence of a dispute necessitating judicial intervention. As part of the litigation, we would likely seek a judicial declaration that the City is subject to the same penalties described in the Acknowledgment, among other remedies. We have dedicated in-house resources sufficient to maintain at least 10 simultaneous housing element lawsuits as part of our commitment to enforcing this important aspect of state housing law.

We look forward to receiving the signed Acknowledgment. If you would like to discuss any of this with me, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (213) 739-8206.

Sincerely,



Matthew Gelfand

cc: Patrick Sullivan, Esq., City Attorney (by email to psullivan@torranceca.gov)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The City of Torrance hereby acknowledges that it has not timely adopted a sixth cycle revised housing element of its general plan within the deadline set forth in Government Code Section 65588, and that its housing element is therefore not in substantial compliance with Article 10.6 of the Government Code. As a result, the City is subject to the following:

1. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 65583(c)(1)(A), 65583.2(c), and 65588(e)(4)(C), the City will be required to complete any rezoning required under housing element law in connection with the City’s sixth cycle housing element by October 15, 2022.

2. The City is currently prohibited from rejecting housing development projects based on subdivisions (d)(1) and (d)(5) of the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), Government Code Section 65589.5. The City acknowledges that this means that, unless another exception within subdivision (d) applies, the City is prohibited from using its general plan and zoning standards to reject a proposal that meets the affordability requirements described in subdivision (h)(3) of the HAA.

The public, including without limitation any applicant to develop any project involving residential units, may rely on this Acknowledgment as the City’s binding commitment to comply with the provisions of state law described above.

DATED: _____, 2022 CITY OF TORRANCE

By: _____
[Signature]

[Name]

Its: _____
[Title]

Leo,

Thank you for the detailed voicemail.

Carolyn,

Thank you as well for all of your time on the phone. As discussed, please let us know what we can do to help advise the City of Torrance regarding "market conditions" in your tailoring of any Zoning Ordinance updates where housing and/or mixed use is concerned. It is important to create the right balance and flexibility to create win/win developments for the community and to help meet your RHNA goals. Generally, older ULI concepts of vertically/horizontally integrated mixed use have evolved with the onslaught of internet retail. The necessity for this change can be witnessed by the high vacancy rate of commercial in non-core/downtown areas and mixed use communities.

Of particular focus, we'd suggest a re-visit of commercial standards along the **Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan**. We believe that the 25% gross floor area requirement has prohibited significant residential development on the corridor. Not only has the market shifted from needing this much commercial, but the parking requirements directly affect capabilities to develop meaningful residential. This is especially true in those Districts that allow lesser maximum densities of 27 units/acre.

Our division has been involved with over 10,000 units of residential development in Southern California and we have included some case studies for your reference.

Please let us know how we can be of service and we wish you all the best in your General Plan and Zoning Updates.

Sincerely,

Greg Sullivan | First Vice President | Lic. 00920305
CBRE | Infill Land
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 100 | Newport Beach, CA 92660

[REDACTED] www.cbre.com/greg.sullivan

Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message.

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 3:41 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: HBCSP (Promenade District)

External

Hi Greg,

Per my voicemail, if you have any questions I can be reached directly at [REDACTED]

For questions related to the Housing Element Update, please contact Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate, copied with this email. Ms. Chun can also be reached by telephone at [REDACTED]

LEO OORTS

Senior Planning Associate – Community Development Department
City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia | www.TorranceCA.Gov/COVID19

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 10:02 AM

To: [REDACTED] >

Subject: HBCSP (Promenade District)

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Hi,

Just looking for more details on the 25% gross floor commercial requirements and if visitor parking and community amenities would be allowed within the 100' setback from Hawthorne for the benefit of the residential component. Also, interested if any changes being proposed to the SP in the current Housing Element Update?

Thanks,
Greg

Greg Sullivan | First Vice President | Lic. 00920305
[CBRE | Infill Land](#)
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 100 | Newport Beach, CA 92660

[REDACTED] www.cbre.com/greg.sullivan

Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message and any attachments may be privileged, confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or believe that you have received this correspondence in error, please contact the sender through the information provided above and permanently delete this message.

5. Committee Meetings and Announcements

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by the State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The revised Draft Housing Element Update was made available for public review on the City's Website until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the City, but not necessarily directly addressed.

The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include “Housing Element Update” in the subject line of any correspondence.



Explore

⚙ Settings



Tweet



9:36 AM · Apr 14, 2022 · Twitter Web App

🔍 Search Twitter

By signing up, you agree to the [Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), including [Cookie Use](#).

Relevant people



City of Torrance ✓
@TorranceCA

Follow

This is the official Twitter page for the City of Torrance, California.

What's happening


NHL · LIVE

Hurricanes at Bruins



Input · Earlier today


"A complete, colossal failure":
The story of VENN, the TV network that vanished



USA TODAY · This morning



Search Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government
April 14 at 9:26 AM · 🌐

The revised Housing Element Update document has been posted on the City's website, Monday April 11. The revised Draft Housing Element Update is available for public review at www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022.

👍👍👍 7

1 Comment 11 Shares



Like



Comment



Share

Most relevant ▾



Sandra Goetz

so 50% of the mandated RHINA number is roughly 2500 units of low income housing.

Like Reply 3w



Write a comment...



Subject: Notice of Public Hearing - Housing Element Update

Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 at 5:09:55 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Chun, Carolyn

To: Lodan, Gregg

CC: Joe, Kevin

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:

Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969

Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Subject: FW: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 at 10:44:46 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Chun, Carolyn
To: Patricia Bluman, Claudia Tedford
CC: Lodan, Gregg, Joe, Kevin

Fyi

This was sent out to the Old Torrance Neighborhood Association

From: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Subject: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good morning, OTNA Members! The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State's overall housing need.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying the State's overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State's housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The Revised Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link: <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the city, but not necessarily directly addressed.

Debbie Hays 😊

Community Relations, OTNA

www.OldTorranceNeighbors.org

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Comment received from mark hansen

From: Yahoo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2022 9:55 AM
To: Chun, Carolyn [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: REVISED DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed for the City of Torrance bases on a 7% when in reality it was only 0.07% or 1% of the prediction of 7%.

Per the recent Los Angeles County Census there are 2.6 people per household. Housing Element # 6 requires that 4939 households with 2.6 people be constructed during that time frame. That will increase the population of Torrance by 12,841.

The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Torrance section 4.7 Projected Water Demand states " Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD." Those numbers assume we do not experience a serious drought .

2020
URBAN WATER
MANAGEMENT PLAN
CITY OF TORRANCE

4.7 PROJECTED WATER DEMAND

Future water use projections must consider significant factors on water demand, such as development and/or redevelopment, and climate patterns, among other less significant factors that affect water demand. Although redevelopment is expected to be an ongoing process, it is not expected to significantly impact water use since the City is already in a "built-out" condition. Rainfall, however, will continue to be a major influence on demand as drought conditions will increase demand at a time when these supplies are limited, and may therefore result in water use restrictions in accordance with the City's Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 3717 and Ordinance 3782). As the City's population continues to grow incrementally over time and as water conservation measures continue to be implemented, the City should experience only minor increases in its water consumption over the long term, due mostly to overall population increases along with limited redevelopment. Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD.

So an increase in Torrance population of 12,841 people at a water demand of around 142 GPCD will require an increase of water usage of 1,823,422 gallons per day. Because Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of water on the City of Torrance with no help from the state where is this additional water reserve going to come from?

Also, Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of sewage on the City of Torrance and again there is no help from the state to address the additional impact this will have on the City's limited waste water system infrastructure .

The States Electrical Grid is already at its breaking point and now with the push to stop the sale of gas powered vehicles by 2035 by Governor Newsome and go electric where is this additional electrical power going to come from and how is this electricity going to be transmitted on a limited and antiquated electrical grid?

In conclusion, the State is requiring the City of Torrance to implement a policy that is not attainable because of limited resources in the form of water, electrical, and infrastructure which will lead to a deterioration of our quality of life. Its unfair for the state to mandate this type of policy without first identifying if there are the basic resources that can support their lofty endeavors.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

5. Committee Meetings and Announcements

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by the State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The revised Draft Housing Element Update was made available for public review on the City's Website until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the City, but not necessarily directly addressed.

The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include “Housing Element Update” in the subject line of any correspondence.



Explore

⚙ Settings



Tweet



9:36 AM · Apr 14, 2022 · Twitter Web App



Search Twitter

By signing up, you agree to the [Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), including [Cookie Use](#).

Relevant people



City of Torrance ✓
@TorranceCA


Follow

This is the official Twitter page for the City of Torrance, California.

What's happening

NHL · LIVE

Hurricanes at Bruins




Input · Earlier today

"A complete, colossal failure":
The story of VENN, the TV network that vanished




USA TODAY · This morning





Search Facebook



City of Torrance CA Government
April 14 at 9:26 AM · 🌐


The revised Housing Element Update document has been posted on the City's website, Monday April 11. The revised Draft Housing Element Update is available for public review at www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate.

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022.

👍👎🗨️ 7 1 Comment 11 Shares

Like Comment Share

Most relevant ▾

Sandra Goetz 
so 50% of the mandated RHINA number is roughly 2500 units of low income housing.

Like Reply 3w

Write a comment...  

Subject: Notice of Public Hearing - Housing Element Update
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 at 5:09:55 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Chun, Carolyn
To: Lodan, Gregg
CC: Joe, Kevin

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Subject: FW: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited
Date: Monday, April 25, 2022 at 10:44:46 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Chun, Carolyn
To: Patricia Bluman, Claudia Tedford
CC: Lodan, Gregg, Joe, Kevin

Fyi

This was sent out to the Old Torrance Neighborhood Association

From: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Debbie Simpson <debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com>
Subject: OTNA - Revised Housing Element Drat - Input Invited

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good morning, OTNA Members! The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan, which will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 – October 2029. Local governments across California are required by State Housing Element law to adequately plan to meet their share of the State's overall housing need.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is the State Agency that is responsible for administering Housing Element Law and for identifying the State's overall housing need. To adequately plan for their share of the State's housing need, local governments adopt Housing Elements as part of their General Plans. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development. The community is invited and encouraged to participate in the planning process.

The City's initial Draft Housing Element was available for public review on November 1, 2021 thru November 30, 2021. The Document was also submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. Based on their comments, a Revised Draft Housing Element has been prepared.

The Revised Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link: <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The public review period for the Revised Draft Housing Element runs until April 29, 2022. Any comments received prior to 5:00 PM April 29, 2022 will be addressed in the Final Document. Comments received after this date will be reviewed by the city, but not necessarily directly addressed.

Debbie Hays 😊

Community Relations, OTNA

www.OldTorranceNeighbors.org

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., **MAY 18, 2022** VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Comment received from mark hansen

From: Yahoo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2022 9:55 AM
To: Chun, Carolyn [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: REVISED DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed for the City of Torrance bases on a 7% when in reality it was only 0.07% or 1% of the prediction of 7%.

Per the recent Los Angeles County Census there are 2.6 people per household. Housing Element # 6 requires that 4939 households with 2.6 people be constructed during that time frame. That will increase the population of Torrance by 12,841.

The 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Torrance section 4.7 Projected Water Demand states " Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD." Those numbers assume we do not experience a serious drought .

2020
URBAN WATER
MANAGEMENT PLAN
CITY OF TORRANCE

4.7 PROJECTED WATER DEMAND

Future water use projections must consider significant factors on water demand, such as development and/or redevelopment, and climate patterns, among other less significant factors that affect water demand. Although redevelopment is expected to be an ongoing process, it is not expected to significantly impact water use since the City is already in a "built-out" condition. Rainfall, however, will continue to be a major influence on demand as drought conditions will increase demand at a time when these supplies are limited, and may therefore result in water use restrictions in accordance with the City's Water Conservation Plan (Ordinance No. 3717 and Ordinance 3782). As the City's population continues to grow incrementally over time and as water conservation measures continue to be implemented, the City should experience only minor increases in its water consumption over the long term, due mostly to overall population increases along with limited redevelopment. Per capita consumption rates should be expected to remain under 142 GPCD, in accordance with SBx7-7, and trend further below the 2020 target of 142 GPCD.

So an increase in Torrance population of 12,841 people at a water demand of around 142 GPCD will require an increase of water usage of 1,823,422 gallons per day. Because Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of water on the City of Torrance with no help from the state where is this additional water reserve going to come from?

Also, Housing Element #6 places the responsibility of sewage on the City of Torrance and again there is no help from the state to address the additional impact this will have on the City's limited waste water system infrastructure .

The States Electrical Grid is already at its breaking point and now with the push to stop the sale of gas powered vehicles by 2035 by Governor Newsome and go electric where is this additional electrical power going to come from and how is this electricity going to be transmitted on a limited and antiquated electrical grid?

In conclusion, the State is requiring the City of Torrance to implement a policy that is not attainable because of limited resources in the form of water, electrical, and infrastructure which will lead to a deterioration of our quality of life. Its unfair for the state to mandate this type of policy without first identifying if there are the basic resources that can support their lofty endeavors.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

Section 2

[Presents the results of the online polling from Community Workshop 1, and the survey from Community Workshop 2.](#)

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”](#)

Deleted: Workshop Notices and full Workshop Summaries for the 3 Community Workshops.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE SURVEY

Good Evening. The City of Torrance is currently updating its 6th Cycle Housing Element of the General Plan. Local governments across California are required by State law to adequately plan to meet their allocated share of the State's overall housing need by updating their General Plan's Housing Element. Housing Elements provide goals, policies, and programs to create opportunities for housing development where local governments deem appropriate.

The Draft Housing Element Update is available for review on the City's Website and will be presented to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 7:00 pm. This will be an 'in-person' meeting held in the City of Torrance Council Chambers at 3031 Torrance Blvd. The community is invited and encouraged to participate. Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

For further information, please visit the Community Development Department Webpage at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/HousingElementUpdate. If you have any questions or would like to be added to the email distribution list, please email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Workshop 1 Live Poll and Results
April 28, 2021

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
1. Are you a _____:		
a. Torrance resident	7/13	54%
b. Torrance landlord	1/13	8%
c. Torrance business owner	0/13	0%
d. Developer of market-rate housing	3/13	23%
e. Developer of affordable housing	1/13	8%
f. Representative of service agency serving Torrance residents	2/13	15%
g. None of the above	2/13	15%



Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
2. How long have you lived in Torrance?		
a. Less than 5 years	1	8%
b. 5-10 years	0	0%
c. More than 10 years	6	50%
d. None of the above	5	42%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
3. Which group do you think has the highest need for housing and related services in the community? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Seniors	4/10	40%
b. Persons with disabilities	0/10	0%
c. Young adults	9/10	90%
d. Families with children	7/10	70%
e. Homeless	4/10	40%
f. Veterans	1/10	10%
g. Others	1/10	10%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
4. Which housing type is most needed in the City of Torrance? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Single-family homes (detached)	1/10	10%
b. Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units	7/10	70%
c. Residential Mixed-use (residential use with commercial or office components)	6/10	60%
d. Transitional or Supportive Housing (affordable or special needs housing linked to supportive services, particularly for persons experiencing homelessness or with disabilities)	4/10	40%
e. Rental	7/10	70%
f. Senior (age restricted)	0/10	0%
g. Assisted Living Facilities	1/10	10%
h. Affordable Housing (restricted by deed or special agreement)	2/10	20%
i. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU or second unit/granny flat)	2/10	20%
j. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless	3/10	30%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
5. Is streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities an important consideration for the City?		
a. Yes	5	50%
b. No	2	20%
c. No preference	1	10%
d. I do not know	2	20%

Screenshot of Housing Element Workshop Survey on Facebook

City of Torrance CA Government  August 18 · 

We want to hear from you! The Community Development Department is looking for feedback on the Housing Element Update and/or Housing Corridor Study. Please take our brief survey; <https://bit.ly/3stu3CW> Your input is important to the City and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

The survey will be available for about one week.

For more information about the Housing Element Update visit <https://www.torranceca.gov/.../com.../housing-element-update...> **See More**



Workshop 2
Survey Questions and Results
August 2021

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
1. Did you participate in the first Housing Element Workshop in April of 2021?		
a. Yes	19	32%
b. No	40	68%

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
2. Please select 2 preferred strategies for ways to accommodate the RHNA in Torrance.		
a. Actively encourage production of ADUs	9	15%
b. Change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to mixed-use	40	68%
c. Change zoning of certain commercial corridors/sites to multifamily residential	27	46%
d. Change zoning of certain industrial sites to multifamily residential	25	42%
e. Other	17	29%

Survey Question	Results	
	Number	Percentage
3. What is your preferred method to increase density to accommodate the 6 th cycle RHNA?		
a. Increase the density for most or all residential uses (stand-alone and/or mixed-use if allowed) throughout Torrance	13	22%
b. Increase the density or establish higher density for residential uses (stand-alone and/or mixed-use) along key commercial corridors	46	78%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
4. Which housing type is most needed in the City of Torrance? (Please choose up to 3 choices)		
a. Single-family homes (detached)	1/10	10%
b. Condos or Townhomes, Duplex, Triplex or Fourplex Units	7/10	70%
c. Residential Mixed-use (residential use with commercial or office components)	6/10	60%
d. Transitional or Supportive Housing (affordable or special needs housing linked to supportive services, particularly for persons experiencing homelessness or with disabilities)	4/10	40%
e. Rental	7/10	70%
f. Senior (age restricted)	0/10	0%
g. Assisted Living Facilities	1/10	10%
h. Affordable Housing (restricted by deed or special agreement)	2/10	20%
i. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU or second unit/granny flat)	2/10	20%
j. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless	3/10	30%

Poll Question	Real-time Results	
	Number	Percentage
5. Is streamlining the permit process to allow for new housing opportunities an important consideration for the City?		
a. Yes	5	50%
b. No	2	20%
c. No preference	1	10%
d. I do not know	2	20%

Section 3

Presents the full Workshop Summaries for the 3 Community Workshops.

New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”

Deleted: Online polling results from **Community Workshop 1**, and **¶** survey results from **Community Workshop 2**

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP #1

Special Planning Commission Workshop

April 28, 2021

MEETING SUMMARY

The City of Torrance held its first community workshop regarding the update of the 6th Cycle Housing Element (2021-2029). Staff from the Community Development Department introduced the workshop and answered questions. A PowerPoint presentation was provided by members of the consultant team, who also answered questions. The PowerPoint presentation provided at the workshop can be viewed at

<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67532/637631623241100000>.

Below is a summary of the discussion, questions, and input from the workshop. The minutes from the workshop are available at <https://www.torranceca.gov/government/city-clerk/commissions-and-advisory-boards/planning-commission/agendas-and-minutes/-folder-5015/-npage-3>.

Opening Questions from Planning Commission Members:

- What does “Housing for All” mean?
 - A. It is about access to fair housing, not actually providing housing for everyone that requires it.
- Would City have to come up with laws for rent control?
 - A. It would not be necessary. There are already measures in place that can accommodate fair housing requirements. Rent control is not required.
- What do the timelines look like?
 - A. The City is mandated to prepare a draft Housing Element and send it to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) first to get comments. HCD has up to 60 days for their review. The City then tries to resolve the comments within 60 days. Once the comments are resolved, the plan can be adopted. The City can utilize the grace period of 120 days beyond the official deadline of October 15, 2021, so the City has until February 12, 2022, to adopt the Housing Element.
- Does the General Plan have to be amended?
 - A. The current Housing Element expires on October 15, 2021, so there needs to be a replacement, which is considered an amendment of the General Plan.
- How does this affect the Hawthorne Corridor?
 - A. Another project team is working on the Housing Corridor study so this question would have to go to the other consulting team. The Hawthorne

Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan is separate from the Housing Element and the Housing Corridor Study, although both may provide sites for the Housing Element.

Planning Commission Questions about the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA):

- What is the RHNA appeal process and who does it go through? What if the Planning Commission doesn't agree with the rejection (of the City's appeal)?
 - A. SCAG officially adopted the RHNA and there is no avenue to change it once it is adopted. State law limits the appeal process.
- What if we don't agree with the RHNA?
 - A. Consultant and City staff both explained that the City is moving forward with the numbers it was assigned. If there are further actions the Council wishes to take, that would be a parallel process. 54 jurisdictions appealed the RHNA and only 2 were approved, one due to a math error in calculation.
- What qualifies for low income tier, senior living facilities, hospital zones?
 - A. Some independent senior living facilities and the Cabrillo Family Apartments, and perhaps some older units in the City qualify as low to moderate income units.
- Concern expressed about traffic with increased densities.
 - A. One strategy is to look for housing near transit.
- Question about how ADU numbers impact the RHNA? Can they be counted?
 - A. Explanation provided about making assumptions of future accessory dwelling units (ADUs) based on averaging the past 3 year's trends. SCAG's affordability review determines how many can be counted toward the low income RHNA numbers.
- What factors accounted for the 250% increase in RHNA for Torrance?
 - A. Two main reasons: One is that the last cycle (5th cycle housing element) was done in a recession, so the projection was substantially lower. The current 6th cycle is at the peak of the housing market, which accounts for the inflation. The other main reason is new legislation that requires the RHNA to not just project future need but make up for housing that was not built in previous decades, and also requiring the RHNA consider the cost burden of paying for housing on households.
- What is the purpose of public input if the City cannot challenge the RHNA?
 - A. Public input is needed regarding where to accommodate the units and other policies and programs. Numbers, sites, and strategies will all be discussed in future workshops.

- Since California's population has decreased as shown by the recent census, could the RHNA be changed?
 - A. Nothing will affect the current RHNA, but there might be future legislation that could reflect the change.
- A few additional questions were asked, specifically relating to State law and how the RHNA could be amended.
 - A. The RHNA process is complete, and the City must plan for the allocated units.
- Would a standard development without a low income component still count toward the RHNA?
 - A. Yes, it would count toward the RHNA category of moderate and above.
- Would the RHNA be affected in any way if people living in cars in parking lots were allowed to do so?
 - A. The RHNA is related to housing units, so the answer is no.
- Do mobile homes count for the RHNA?
 - A. Yes, if they are parked, but not when they are being towed around.
- How can we build 2400 low and very low income units in just 8 years?
 - A. It is in those 8 years that Torrance should be trying to accommodate those units, plus plan for a buffer of additional units in case some of the units are lost to a different use.
- Question about understanding non-profit builder activity, and if units must be rented for a certain cost?
 - A. City staff responded with an example: For the Cabrillo Family Housing development, the City bought the land with the intention of a non-profit builder constructing in the range of 39 to 44 affordable rental units. Regulations are in place for what the rents can be. Most affordable housing requires multiple layers of assistance or subsidies. They also sometimes use low income tax credits which makes rent affordable.
- Statement that City would need to rezone ½ to ¼ of industrial land to residential to accommodate the new density requirements.
 - A. Since there is very little vacant land in the City, redevelopment of existing land will be needed.
- Comment: How will we call ourselves a balanced City? If we meet all the State's requirements, we have no ability to change that imbalance.
- How do we motivate people to actually build these units?
 - A. The density bonus (state-mandated) can help. With a density bonus, a developer can increase the number of units in exchange for a lower parking ratio, or lower open space requirements, as examples.

Miscellaneous Questions from the Planning Commission:

- Is there any plan to use the Del Amo Mall or the Toyota property for housing, such as condominiums?
 - A. Malls around the country are incorporating housing in close proximity, and mall owners seem very receptive to the idea.
- What is the connection between the CEQA process and the Housing Element? Does CEQA have an effect on the RHNA?
 - A. They are on a parallel track, and CEQA has no effect on the RHNA.

Public Comment from Meeting Participants:

Participant #1: Renter – likes the idea of affordable housing everywhere in Torrance. City should establish rent control. Use empty lots. People should have a place to park if they have to live in cars. Affordable units shouldn't be segregated. High rise development is good.

Participant #2: Shared four points –

1. Submitted printed material for the public record.
2. Public Outreach – City must do diligent outreach, to include renters, minorities and underrepresented persons. Needs to be across all income levels.
3. AFFH (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) – City cannot put all affordable housing in one place. It should be spread out and near high opportunity areas.
4. The policies and programs section of the Housing Element should be comprised of aiding underrepresented individuals in Torrance.
5. Question from a Planning Commissioner for the Participant – Do you have a concern about outreach?
 - A. Participant: I think more can be done to be more inclusive.

Participant #3:

- Question – can two adjacent cities share their response to the RHNA if they combined them?
 - A. There is no state provision to allow for that currently. There was once such a provision that is now expired.
- Question - Can the public review the draft Housing Element prior to the 2nd Housing Element Workshop?
 - A. If there are materials to provide the public in advance of the second workshop, they will be put on the City's website. The Housing Element will not be ready for public review at that time. (*Subsequent note:* the Draft Housing Element will be put on the City's website prior to the 3rd public workshop, before the draft Housing Element is submitted to HCD.)



Closing Comments from Planning Commissioners:

- Question regarding whether the City's standard procedure for notification of opportunities for outreach meets state guidelines?
 - A. City has gone above and beyond the necessary requirements for outreach, and have also reached out to affordable housing developers, social service agencies, HOAs, and others.
- Comment: Torrance has approximately 150,000 residents, so the RHNA requirement is less than 4% of the population. RHNA requirements may not be so detrimental as led to believe at first.
 - A. City is looking for ways to accommodate the number and reduce the negative effect on the existing residents.
- Comment: The strategies put forward will help with this endeavor.

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP #2

Community Workshop

July 28, 2021

MEETING SUMMARY

The City of Torrance held its second community workshop regarding the update of the 6th Cycle Housing Element (2021-2029). Due to technical difficulties, the workshop started nearly 30 minutes late. Twenty-one members of the public participated via Zoom. Staff from the Community Development Department introduced the workshop and answered questions. A PowerPoint presentation was provided by members of the consultant teams who are preparing the Housing Element and the Housing Corridor Study; they also answered questions. The PowerPoint presentation provided at the workshop can be viewed at <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/67530/637631557256430000>. Below is a summary of the discussion, questions, and input from the workshop. There were no formal minutes taken.

Public Comment from Meeting Participants:

Early in the presentation a participant asked if the presenter was using her own words or the State's Housing Element and legislation language. The presenter replied she was summarizing State Housing Element guidance.

Participant #1: Comment – **Participant has spent the better part of three years fighting the State's efforts to take away local control, including zoning control from local governments.** Expressed concern over proposed State changes to zoning that would affect single-family neighborhoods and urged the other participants to contact their legislators to tell them to vote no on this proposed legislation. Personal preference is to have the City continue to fight the RHNA numbers. Concerns include possible densification of existing neighborhoods with no required upgrades to infrastructure. Also expressed disagreement with relaxing parking requirements and used an example of a senior development in the City where visitors have considerable difficulty finding parking. Expressed concern about the proposed Butcher Solano project, and said it is proposed on the site of a toxic waste dump.

City staff responded that one of the goals of this effort is to try to preserve the City's single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident's desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance. That is why the focus is on corridors and underutilized parcels. Staff also explained that the City has also been actively following State housing legislation and responding when concerns arise about proposed legislation.

Participant #1: Questions

- Q. How do the Border Avenue renderings compliment Old Torrance?
 - A. The Housing Corridor Study is in the initial phases and the renderings provided this evening are just examples of possible building types and styles. There will be more opportunity for community input as the project progresses.
- Q. Where are the sites specifically in the Riviera neighborhood?
 - A. The City will post **the list of the draft Sites Inventory and Map on the City's website** so that all interested parties can view them. The power point presentation and meeting summary will be posted as well. The presenter explained that some of the sites in the Riviera area are religious institution properties and provided additional detail regarding new State legislation that allows religious facilities to build affordable housing on 50% of their parking lots. Further clarification was provided that this is not an effort to get rid of religious institutions, rather responding to the fact that some religious institutions find that they have excess parking and are expressing interest in looking further into this possibility.

Participant #2: Comment – South Torrance homeowner – Noted that he had submitted written comments. Stated that this Housing Element work will put a dent in the housing crisis in the City. Provided statistics about how homelessness in the City has grown by nine times over the past 10 years, increasing from approximately 30 persons to over 300, and 45% of renters in the City experience a cost burden which means they must pay over 30% of their income for housing.

Participant #2: Questions

- Q. How are you estimating development potential in terms of realistic capacity, so we actually see growth in our housing stock?
 - A. Staff responded that we are talking to property owners and developers, and looking at land value and vacancies, trying to be as accurate as possible.
- Q. How are the sites being distributed and how are you ensuring equal distribution?
 - A. While the corridors identified for the Corridor Study are in the more centralized part of the City, corridors are located in all Council districts in the City except for one. For the current draft Sites Inventory, the sites are pretty well distributed in all locations in the City.

Participant #3: Comment – Student – Stated appreciation for efforts to make Torrance more walkable. Referred to climate crisis as well as housing crisis, so likes the idea of locating new residential development on or near transit to support fewer cars. Favors mixed-use developments spread equitably throughout the City, which also encourages people to shop locally. Encourages revitalization of the City and neighborhoods by getting rid of large parking lots of which the City has too many.

Participant #4 – Questions

- Q. For the parcels the City has identified as needing changed from being zoned Light Industrial to Residential (referring to the Housing Corridor Study), how does that get accomplished? Does the City propose to use eminent domain or condemnation?
 - A. City staff responded that the City is using a public process to study the issues and will continue to involve the property owners as the process moves forward. The City

will initiate the required zone changes if the Council decides to do so. The City would create the standards that would streamline development as a part of the rezoning process. There are no plans to use eminent domain or condemnation.

- Q. How do we express how we feel about the proposed changes?
 - A. Staff encouraged the participant to write letters and continue to attend the workshops for both the Housing Element update and the Housing Corridor Study. The City will post a poll online to replace the polling questions that were to be used before the City experienced technical difficulties with the workshop this evening. Also, please **continue to monitor the City's Housing Element website** and the Housing Corridor Study website. Provide written comments to cddinfo@Torrance.gov.

Participant #5 – Comment - Thanked the City and consultants for the presentation. Urged City staff and team to reach out to affected homeowners. Stated that the participant is a leader of a religious institution.

Participant #5 Question


- Q. Asked for additional information about the ability of religious institutions to build housing on their parking lots; unfamiliar with this legislation?
 - A. Presenter explained that the legislation is AB 1851. It requires a City to allow religious institutions to build affordable housing on their existing parking lot without requiring them to replace any lost parking, as an incentive. Some cities are placing what is often referred to as a “**Congregational Overlay**” on these properties to encourage and incentivize this type of development and mentioned Pasadena as a recent example. In response to a follow-up question by another participant, the presenter clarified that parking can be reduced up to 50% for religious institutions if used for affordable housing, without have to replace the parking; the legislation does not require that institutions be allowed to reduce parking to zero.

Miscellaneous Participant Questions and Staff/Consultant Responses:

- Q. Will congregational housing units be paying property taxes?
 - A. **City staff will research the answer to that question and respond either online or at a future Housing Element workshop.**

New Information

Added: April 2022



City of Torrance

Housing Element Update: Workshop #3

Planning Commission

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

7:00 p.m.

Meet the Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager

Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate

Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



Agenda

Housing Element Update

- Summary of HE Workshops 1 and 2
- Draft Housing Element
- Accommodating the RHNA, Goals and Programs
- Public Outreach
- Next Steps
- Comments, Questions, & Discussion

Next Steps

Workshop 1: Overview

What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for meeting the City's share of regional housing needs as determined by the State
- Provides an assessment of the City's housing needs and how best to accommodate the housing needs
- The City "plans for" housing so that developers can build projects consistent with the City's General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other planning documents

Housing Element Requirements:

- Accommodate projected housing demand, as mandated by the State
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet this demand
- Improve the safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate the development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all

Workshop 1: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

State (HCD):

Assesses total number of housing units needed statewide; assigns each region their share

SCAG Region:

1,341,827 units

SCAG then allocates units to each jurisdiction in the region

Los Angeles County:

813,082 units

City of Torrance:

4,939 units

Workshop 1: Torrance RHNA (by Income Category)


Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 – 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes “Extremely Low,” which is up to 30% of AMI

Workshop 1: RHNA Comparison with Nearby Cities



Workshop 1: Housing Element Strategies and CEQA

- Discussed initial strategies to accommodate the RHNA, such as:
 - Use leftover vacant/underutilized sites from 5th Cycle Housing Element; identify entitled projects and pipeline projects; estimate potential ADUs
 - Facilitate housing on religious institution properties
 - Housing Corridor Study
 - Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan
 - Encourage ADU production
- CEQA:
 - Process
 - Topics evaluated



Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Workshop 2:

Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- General community concerns re: housing (based on statistically valid survey and focus groups):
 - High price of housing
 - Need for broader range of housing products and prices to allow younger generations and service workers the ability to purchase or rent near employment
 - Increasing homelessness

Workshop 2:

Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.1: Evaluate ways to encourage and accommodate more housing choices at various price points and housing types to meet the diverse needs of Torrance residents.

Sub-goal 1.2: Address the scarcity of vacant land for housing in Torrance by exploring creative options to allow for commercial and residential infill housing in locations that are close to local-serving uses and employment, and that support alternative modes of transportation while maintaining green space considerations.

Workshop 2:

Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.3: Explore ways to work with/encourage (e.g., development standards, zoning) developers, community partners, and stakeholders to provide housing that meets the needs of the community, both in terms of housing type, such as bungalow housing, duplexes, cottage/courtyard housing, etc., and affordability.

Sub-goal 1.4: Encourage the rezoning of underused and unused commercial zoned property into residential zoning.

Workshop 2: Torrance Strategic Plan 2021

- **Housing Goal:** Promote a diversity of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of a wide range of Torrance citizens.

Sub-goal 1.5: Encourage additional implementation of mixed-use office and residential space through creative collaboration and exploration of partnerships with community stakeholders, including employers.



Workshop 2:

Approach to Accommodate RHNA

Since Torrance is mostly built out and does not have much vacant land, a creative approach is needed to accommodate the RHNA while retaining the city's character and quality of life:

- Minimize impact on existing single-family neighborhoods to extent feasible
- Allow new/increased residential density along identified corridors and areas:
 - Identify locations along major corridors in Torrance that are near services, employment, transit and bicycle facilities, and parks and recreation
 - Identify areas and corridors that could benefit from opportunities for revitalization by repurposing existing underutilized or vacant commercial space
- Establish “target densities” to incentivize development
- Encourage production of ADUs

Workshop 2: Sites Inventory Discussion

- Reviewed Proposed Sites Inventory and Rationale:
 - Housing Corridors (Mixed Use & Stand-Alone Residential)
 - Residential Infill
 - Religious Institution Housing Overlay
 - Must ensure that sites that are feasible for affordable units are distributed throughout City and are located in “high resource” areas
- Presentation provided on Housing Corridor Study

Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**
- **Chapter 2: Community Profile**
 - Population Characteristics
 - Household Characteristics
 - Housing Problems
 - Special Needs Groups
 - Housing Stock Characteristics
 - Affordable Housing in Torrance



Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents (cont.)

■ Chapter 3: Housing Constraints

- Governmental Constraints
- Non-governmental Constraints
- Environmental Constraints
- Infrastructure Constraints

■ Chapter 4: Housing Opportunities and Resources

- Future Housing Needs
- Financial Resources
- Administrative Resources
- Opportunities for Energy Conservation

Torrance Draft Housing Element (6th Cycle) Format/Contents (cont.)

■ Chapter 5: Housing Plan

- Housing Goals and Policies
- Housing Program
- Summary of Quantified Objectives

■ Appendices

- Appendix A: Outreach Efforts
- Appendix B: Review of Past Accomplishments
- Appendix C: Sites Inventory
- Appendix D: Assessment of Fair Housing

Accommodating the RHNA via the Sites Inventory (6th Cycle)

- City's RHNA for the 6th cycle is 4,939 units, assigned as follows:
 - 2,467 Very Low Income/Low Income
 - 853 Moderate Income
 - 1,619 Above Moderate Income

- City identified 5,940 sites with capacities to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation in all income categories, as follows:
 - 2,655 Very Low Income/Low Income
 - 888 Moderate Income
 - 2,397 Above Moderate Income

- **Conclusion:**
 - Identified properties in the sites inventory have the combined capacity to accommodate the City's 4,939 income-targeted housing units and meet the RHNA for the 2021-2029 planning period.
 - Provides adequate sites to accommodate the "no net loss" requirements

Housing Goals (6th Cycle)

- Section V of the HEU contains Goals, Policies, and Programs that address the identified housing needs in Torrance for the 2021-2029 cycle. The Programs are described in detail in the HEU.
- **Overall Goals:**
 1. Enhance housing opportunities for all existing and future Torrance residents.
 2. Assist in the provision of safe, decent, affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents of Torrance of all income levels, including persons with low and moderate incomes.
 3. Mitigate potential governmental constraints to housing production and affordability.
 4. Maintain and improve the quality of existing housing and residential neighborhoods in Torrance.
 5. Promote equal housing opportunity for all residents, regardless of race, religion, family status, age, or physical disability.

Outline of Housing Programs (6th Cycle):

1. Adequate Sites
2. By-Right Approval (certain cases)
3. Removal of Government Constraints
4. Inclusionary Housing
5. Density Bonus
6. Accessory Dwelling Units
7. Religious Institution Housing Overlay
8. Residential and Mixed-use Corridors
9. Affordable Housing Development
10. Rental Assistance Programs
11. Special Needs Housing
12. Home Rehabilitation & Improvement
13. Preservation of Affordable Housing
14. Community Preservation
15. Reasonable Accommodation
16. Coastal Zone Replacement Housing
17. Water & Sewer Service Providers
18. Enforce Fair Housing Laws
19. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any comments or questions on material covered so far?



Public Outreach (Appendix A)



- 3 Community Workshops, including Online Polling and Survey; Results
- Project Website
- 2 Focus Group sessions with Affordable Developers and Service Providers, and Market-rate Developers; Meeting Summaries Posted on Website
- Legal Notices, City Website Notices, Posted Notices in Downtown Torrance and Del Amo Mall, and on City's Digital Sign
- Email Blast, Facebook and COVID Today Workshop Promotion
- Mailing List for Workshop Notices

Next Steps:

- Public Review of Draft Housing Element: October 1 to December 15, 2021
- HCD Review of Draft Housing Element (60 days): Started October 15, 2021
- Public Review of Draft CEQA Document (30 days): Starts November 3, 2021
- Respond to HCD comments: Prior to December 15, 2021
- Finalize Housing Element and CEQA Document: Prior to December 15, 2021
- Planning Commission Review/Recommendation to City Council:
December 15, 2021
- City Council adoption of Housing Element & certification of CEQA Document:
January 2021

Public Comment Period



Commission Check-in

- Does the Planning Commission have any final comments or questions?



Thank you for Participating!

- If you have any questions or comments, please email them to the web address below and include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence:

CDDinfo@torranceca.gov

- Please check the City's website for additional information at:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/HousingElementUpdate>

INDEX
TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION – OCTOBER 20, 2021

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>OPENING CEREMONIES</u>	
1. Call to Order/Roll Call	1
2. Flag Salute	1
3. Posting of the Agenda	
4. Withdrawn, Deferred, and/or Supplemental Items	1
5. <u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS</u>	1
6. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>	
6A. Approval of Minutes	1
7. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u>	
7A. LUS21-00002: Housing Element Update: City of Torrance	3-6
7B. EXT21-00018: Continental Development Corporation <i>Res. 21-061</i>	2
8. <u>HEARINGS</u>	6
9. <u>RESOLUTIONS</u>	6
10. <u>COMMISSION AND STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS</u>	6
11. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	7

At 9:31 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, November 3, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, in the Council Chamber at Torrance City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Anunson, Choi, Kartsonis, Pino, and Chairperson Sheikh.

Absent: Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao.

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez, Senior Planning Associate Chun, Planning Associate Joe, Community Development Director Ramirez, and Assistant City Attorney Strader.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to grant Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao an excused absence for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Choi and passed by a 5-0 roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Community Development Director Ramirez.

3. POSTING OF THE AGENDA

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez reported that the agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and on the City's website on October 15, 2021.

4. WITHDRAWN, DEFERRED, AND/OR SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS

Supplemental material was available for item 7A.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez suggested moving Item 7B out of order to ensure sufficient time for Item 7A.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to take Item 7B before Item 7A. Commissioner Kartsonis seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 5-0 roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

*

Chairperson Sheikh reviewed the policies and procedures of the Planning Commission, including the right to appeal decisions to the City Council.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None.

7. **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Agenda Item 7B was considered out of order at this time.

7B. **EXT21-00018: CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Time Extension of a previously approved Division of Lot (DIV19-00007) to allow the subdivision of one lot into two lots on property located in the H-MP Zone at 23420 Hawthorne Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15315 – Minor Land Divisions. (Res. No. 21-061)

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Associate Joe introduced the request.

Toni Reina, representative of Continental Development Corporation, provided a brief overview of the proposal. She conveyed that the COVID-19 pandemic was one of the reasons for the time extension request.

In response to Commissioner Choi's inquiry, Ms. Reina explained that they did not submit the application due to various challenges created by the economic impact of the pandemic such as trying to attract tenants. She specified that the division of lot map on the Staff Report was submitted and approved by the City. She confirmed that the map must be approved by Los Angeles County for the map check process.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez revealed that the applicant would have to file a new division of lot if the time extension was denied.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the frequency of approvals for similar situations. Mr. Martinez reported that requests for time extensions were common due to similar hardships relating to the pandemic. He detailed that the original approval was good for a maximum of a 2-year extension.

Assistant City Attorney Strader informed the Commission that denial of the extension is up to the discretion of the Commission, but not advisable due to the current economic state.

Chairperson Sheikh invited public comment, and no members of the public spoke.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kartsonis and passed with a unanimous vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to concur with staff recommendation and approve EXT21-00018. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino with a 5-0 roll call vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Anunson moved to adopt Resolution No. 21-061. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino and passed with a unanimous vote.

7A. LUS21-00002 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE

Planning Commission will conduct a public workshop to receive input on the Public Review Draft of the Housing Element from the Planning Commission, residents, and other stakeholders regarding the 6th Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Cycle Housing Element Update. An Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the Housing Element Update and returned with the next Draft Housing Element for review and consideration.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Associate Joe introduced the request.

Planning Manager Lodan distributed copies of the presentation and opened the presentation on the Housing Element Update Workshop.

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate at CityPlace Planning, Inc., provided a brief background and overview of the project. The topics covered included summaries of the first and second Housing Element workshops, draft housing element, accommodation of the (RHNA) Regional Housing Needs Allocation, Goals and Programs, Public Outreach, and the Next Steps.

In reference to the first workshop, Ms. Bluman presented visuals on the number of units that Los Angeles County and the City of Torrance must satisfy based off State and SCAG Region requirements. Torrance must demonstrate potential satisfaction of needs for 4,939 units out of the total 813,082 units in Los Angeles County. She noted that the 6th cycle of RHNA requirements were almost 3 ½ times the amount required than the 5th cycle, which was 1,450 units. She communicated that all cities have experienced an increase.

Commissioner Anunson inquired about the magnitude difference from the State level. Ms. Bluman responded that each city had about a 2 to 4 times increased amount than the 5th cycle.

Commissioner Choi questioned the entire process. Ms. Bluman explained that evaluations are completed by cities to develop conclusions on demographics such as income and estimated cost of living. She emphasized the focus on density and density proxy, which is 30 dwelling units. Ms. Bluman summarized that even if not actually built, the city must demonstrate the potential to provide and accommodate affordable housing on qualifying sites, which fulfill the (HCD) California's Department of Housing and Community Development requirements and the specified percentages of each income category. These potential sites were labeled by income on the Housing Element map.

Ms. Bluman explained that there are some developers who specialize in low income to obtain tax credit. She added that Torrance must make sure that no net loss requirement is maintained to ensure that certain number of sites are available for certain income brackets.

Commissioners Anunson and Choi asked about the consequences of not meeting state requirements. Ms. Bluman answered that the state could penalize the City by providing disincentives like prohibition of issuing both commercial and residential building permits. She advised on compliance as it could lead to a lawsuit against the City by the state attorney general, housing advocates, or individuals. Planning Manager Lodan emphasized that although there is no strict penalty or law, grant funding is often tied to being compliant and having a certified housing element.

In response to Commissioner Kartsonis' inquiry about religious institutions, Planning Manager Lodan addressed that these sites were market rate developments, and the item of topic is focused on affordable housing.

Chairperson Sheikh asked whether Torrance met the 5th RHNA cycle requirements. Planning Manager Lodan answered that as of 2020, the City has built 234 of the required units, but has fallen short of the goal. Commissioner Anunson reminded the Commission that the City only had to show potential to construct, which Planning Manager Lodan affirmed. Planning Manager Lodan stressed the state's aggression to meeting the requirements and suggested preparing the necessary documents to maintain local control and make decisions accordingly.

Planning Manager Lodan stated that the 4,939-unit requirements are for the next cycle and not additive to the 5th cycle, in response to Chairperson Sheikh's inquiry.

Commissioner Pino inquired about the inclusion of (ADUs) accessory dwelling units in the requirements and Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that it would be a contributing factor to meeting the requirements.

Commissioner Choi learned that ADUs alone would only cover a portion of the requirements. Planning Manager Lodan reported that the City allocated 800-units in the strategy based of the number of units tracked on applications.

Planning Manager Lodan disclosed a new law that allows religious institutions to construct affordable housing on their lot. Ms. Bluman noted that some institutions across Los Angeles and California have started to pursue this route to retain the property from the effects of COVID-19 and declining church attendance. When asked by Commissioner Choi if Torrance pursued this, Planning Manager Lodan stated that exact numbers were undetermined since it depends on multiple factors and only the potential capacity is calculated. Ms. Bluman added that conservative assumptions were made because HCD will be observing them.

In reference to the second workshop, Commissioner Pino challenged the method of providing affordable housing in expensive neighborhoods such as the Hillside Overlay District. Planning Manager Lodan suggested some strategies to create these opportunities were by building through churches, ADUs, or junior ADUs.

Commissioner Pino inquired about ADUs categorization as affordable housing, but not as property for sale. Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that ADUs are traditionally rentals and that affordable ADUs require covenants with the property owner. He predicted that junior ADUs were more affordable than larger ones due to their smaller and simplified structure. He suggested that the City could encourage these developments in the Hillside Overlay area to limit square footage.

Commissioner Pino requested clarification on the new legislation allowing homeowners to sell ADUs. Planning Manager Lodan disclosed that the City is working on an ordinance that would impact the ability to divide lots and sell off new units on traditional single-family households.

In response to Commissioner Kartsonis' inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan announced that target density would encourage higher density to help meet the RHNA numbers. He concluded that the City has prepared a 20% buffer of affordable units to accommodate underdevelopment.

Chairperson Sheikh and Planning Manager Lodan examined that the main idea was to strategize ways to meet the requirements. Planning Manager Lodan elaborated on the reason for the document. Staff identify the merits of a particular development and explain how those properties comply with the Housing Element to make an educated decision on a project, which would create opportunities to make development easier or more affordable.

Commissioner Choi wondered if any employers in Torrance provide affordable housing. Planning Manager Lodan was uncertain and reported that unanswered questions will be addressed in the future.

In response to Commissioner Choi's inquiry about the housing element approval process, Planning Manager Lodan detailed that staff will present a draft to the Commission and Environmental Study, then the recommendations of staff and the Commission will be presented to Council before the deadline.

In response to Commissioner Choi's concerns, Community Development Director Ramirez elaborated on the process that once the document is submitted to HCD, it is returned with comments to staff. Once the revisions are approved by HCD, the document is reviewed by the Commission for approval to the City Council, who does the final approval. The final document is then sent to HCD. Assistant City Attorney Strader communicated that this process is the state of the law.

Assistant City Attorney Strader disclosed that public opinion workshops and polls have been completed and taken into consideration by experts, in response to the concerns of the Commission.

Ms. Bluman summarized each section of the 6th cycle Housing Element.

Planning Manager Lodan recounted that the document was reviewed and finalized by staff in the last 2 months.

Commissioners Choi and Kartsonis inquired about the itemized list of all the properties. Commissioner Kartsonis asked if zoning changes happened once the final version of the document is approved. Planning Manager Lodan responded that an approval would not create a zoning change and that future zone changes will have to be individually processed. He indicated that the document is for the purpose of identifying sites.

In response to Chairperson Sheikh's inquiry about state and city funding on low to moderate income funds, Planning Manager Lodan explained how the programs are funded through tax increments. The City purchased properties to develop affordable housing. Planning Manager Lodan informed the Commission that these properties are individually managed, and tenants must continuously meet eligibility requirements.

Commissioner Kartsonis requested eligibility clarification of property types that count towards the RHNA. Ms. Bluman stated that housing must be permanent to qualify.

Ms. Bluman announced that state law requires an update to zoning codes to allow ordinances in accommodation of certain housing facilities such as supportive housing, transitional housing, single-room occupancies, and emergency shelters.

Community Development Director Ramirez expressed that the 20% buffer will help the City prepare for the unknown numbers of meeting the capacity. In response to Commissioner Choi, she emphasized that the City must only show potential to meet the requirements. She and Assistant City Attorney Strader concluded that the purpose was to demonstrate willingness to meet the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Bluman continued presenting the public outreach efforts. She concluded with the announcement of deadlines and next steps.

Planning Manager Lodan revealed that the CEQA document will be presented to the Commission in a future commission meeting.

Chairperson Sheikh invited public comment.

Mark Hansen, 823 Beech Ave, shared his concerns about direction coming from an outside agency and about the lack of action on helping the homeless population. He appreciated the City's efforts. Planning Manager Lodan listed some efforts that were affiliated with such concerns.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the letters of correspondence listed on the supplemental material.

Commissioner Kartsonis, Commissioner Anunson, and Chairperson Sheikh commended staff for their hard work. Commissioner Anunson and Chairperson Sheikh applauded the staff's process on developing the document.

Chairperson Sheikh wondered if staff intend to reach out to and incentivize homeowners with older properties. Planning Manager Lodan relayed programs will be put into place to prepare for a smoother development process in accordance with the City's budget.

8. HEARINGS – None.

9. RESOLUTIONS – None.

10. COMMISSION AND STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Kartsonis recounted a previous item that was reviewed and denied by the Commission but approved by the City Council. He thanked the staff for their hard work.

Assistant City Attorney Strader indicated that the Commission would not have to be informed of an item's substantial change unless it directly affected them. Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez noted that it was not a common occurrence.

Planning and Environmental Manager Martinez announced that in their next meeting, the City Council will hear an item that the Commission approved.

Planning Manager Lodan thanked the Commission for a thorough review of the materials and for asking questions. He informed that public comments should be directed to cddinfo@torranceca.gov or to visit the website at torranceca.gov/housingelementupdate.

Planning Manager Lodan and Chairperson Sheikh appreciated Patricia Bluman and Claudia Tedford from CityPlace Planning, Inc.'s efforts. Chairperson Sheikh also gave thanks to the public for attending the meeting.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: At 9:31 p.m., Commissioner Kartsonis moved to adjourn this meeting to November 3, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pino with a unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioners Rudolph and Tsao absent.

###

Approved as submitted December 1, 2021 s/ Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk

Section 4

Focus Group summaries for the Service Providers and Affordable Developers, and the Market Rate Developers.

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled “New information”](#)

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: Service Providers and Affordable Developers

May 19, 2021

As a part of the Housing Element update process, City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with service providers and affordable developers to better understand the issues and needs of lower income residents and those with special needs, and to identify constraints to development of affordable housing so that programs can be developed to address those needs and constraints. Five service providers, two affordable housing developers, an architect, and a real estate representative participated. Below is a summary of the input received.

Partnering with Religious Institutions

- Example of large project in San Jose: 250 units of affordable housing constructed on church parking lot, partner with Palo Alto Housing Authority.
- San Pedro UMC is another example: 48 units in church parking lot, including mixed-income, singles and families. Used 10/10 development, tax credits, additional investments

Homeless

- Torrance's homeless count in 2020 was 322 people, up 42%.
- More and more seniors falling into homelessness.
- Families are also suffering during the pandemic.
- Rental vacancy market is in crisis.
- Torrance Unified representative reported that homeless families are not new to Torrance. Currently have 130 homeless children that have been in Torrance 4 years or more. If children are doubled up, meaning they are currently living with others, like perhaps family members, they are not eligible for funding, and this is happening.

Development Standards in General/Entitlement Process

- Torrance development rules are set up for for-sale housing.
- Tough open space and parking standards.
- City needs to be more flexible with standards.
- Streamlining the entitlement process helps considerably.
- Get rid of CEQA or look for CEQA exemptions.
- For affordable housing to work, the development approval process must be cost-effective and efficient.

- Staff explained that the goal of the Housing Corridor Study, currently in the beginning stages, is to facilitate development and allow developers to go straight to pulling building permits, effectively eliminating the entitlement process, including CEQA.

Parking

- Developers need concessions for parking – they get that in the City of Los Angeles.
- Parking is very expensive to build, brings up the price of development overall.
- Bureaucracy demands excessive parking.
- Senior parking requirements should be max of ½ space/unit.
- Seniors often give up their cars after moving into senior housing – because they are too expensive.
- Affordable developers looking to locate next to transit.

Density

- If developer can't achieve a certain density, it's very hard to make affordable housing work.
- City needs to be more flexible with standards.
- Density – “sweet spot” for affordable housing is 1 level of podium parking, 4-5 levels of residential above: 100 du/acre at 4 stories is Type 5 construction, and at least 5 stories is type 3 construction.

Financing/Incentives/Concessions

- Torrance has historically not had subsidies for affordable housing.
- Must have close to 100 units for tax credits to apply.
- Projects need to be a little smaller, rental or mixed-income for affordable to be feasible in City.
- Question: Does Torrance have a Consolidated Plan? Affordable developers who use HUD financing weren't allowed to build in Torrance because the City didn't have a Consolidated Plan. Answer: Yes, Torrance is currently part of a regional Consolidated Plan.
- Example of City of Los Angeles, TOC program – tier system established near transit that allows for greater density, and higher density bonus concessions, including reduced parking, increased building height and additional stories, the closer a project is to transit
- One developer stated they are doing the first density bonus project in Manhattan Beach.
- The City of Carson has done several density bonus projects.
- The City of Los Angeles has special rules for 100% affordable projects.
- 100% affordable is different than mixed-income projects.
- Mixed-income has been very successful. Despite early community opposition, projects are not problematic once open and operating.

- Concessions are very important for making a project work with affordable units.
- Redevelopment used to help but is no longer available.
- City helping with installing public improvements can help make an affordable project financing work.
- City can waive or defer fees to assist.
- Fee transparency is needed so developers know what to expect up front.
- City can help facilitate affordable housing by looking at their own excess property for potential housing sites and offering it free or at reduced prices.
- When using a Housing Trust Fund, non-profits score higher if cities can offer some type of assistance, such as city land and city funds. Helps with getting tax credits.

Miscellaneous Feedback

- Political will in Torrance is tough.
- City needs to change its mindset and get on board with helping solve the housing crisis.
- 100% low-income senior project in Rancho Palos Verdes is nice project. No one would be able to tell by looking at the project that it is affordable.
- Stigma associated with low income housing needs removed.
- Some developers are keeping an eye on vacant commercial properties that might have potential to transform into residential development. Would like to see them change to mixed-use or residential only.
- Question about Torrance opposing inclusionary housing ordinance. City staff provided more explanation on the City's position.
- Affordable family housing is a severe need.
- Pet ownership should be allowed in all affordable housing and is required if the pet is an emotional support animal.

City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

HOUSING ELEMENT STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS: Market Rate Developers

May 19, 2021

As a part of the Housing Element update process, City staff and the consultant team conducted a stakeholder interview with market rate developers to understand their issues and concerns regarding development of housing in Torrance, and to identify constraints to development as is required by Housing Element law so that programs can be developed to address those constraints. Four developers attended in person, and one submitted written comments. Below is a summary of the input received.

Development Standards in General / Entitlement Process

- The recently initiated Housing Corridor Study will help with process and timing. No entitlement risk will help with financing.
- The more density the City allows, the better.
- Streamlining the process helps, as does reduced parking requirements.
- Torrance is very easy to work with. Example of project – had a good planner that moved the project through the process and helped come up with workable solutions.
- Torrance has the strictest parking requirements compared to other cities. Couldn't reach the allowed density because of parking requirements. Three spaces per unit is too much.
- Open space requirements are high.
- Example of project in Torrance that was zoned for 39 du/ac. Ended up with 13 du/ac because of parking and open space requirements.
- Tandem parking should be considered.
- Example provided of a project where bike parking fulfilled part of the parking requirement.
- Hard to make projects of under 20 du/ac work.
- The faster a project makes it through approvals, the less risk for the developer.
- The existing maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.6:1 is stifling developers' ability to build. All the 0.6 FAR does is make developers build less units on their sites. Look at Carson and how great they have done lately. Their FAR is 1.5.
- Torrance need to zone a lot of properties to R-4 with no FAR.

Financing / Incentives / Concessions

- Affordable housing projects present a challenge for acquiring funding. Example – tax credit projects.
- Density bonus is helpful.
- When you change zoning to allow certain types of housing, the sellers raise their prices.
- Challenge is seller's expectation of land value and what a developer can pay, and with building costs so high right now, it raises the cost for building affordable housing too high to make it pencil out.
- Incentives from the City can include relief on fees, relief on parking requirements, higher density.
- Developers need certainty without so many variables, such as cost of raw land, cost to complete projects in a timely manner.
- Developers also have to get a property owner to continue to work with them through the process. Can be hard to do with a long entitlement process.

Miscellaneous Feedback

- 100% affordable not looked on favorably by neighbors.
- Staff provided the example of some developers building ADUs as part of single-family residential developments.
- Sellers not usually willing to sell for affordable housing.
- Religious institution example is 2 acres carved out of existing church site of 4 acres for housing, too large for what church campus needs in Torrance.
- When City Council is on the same page as Planning, process is easier.
- Sellers often have unrealistic expectations about land cost and development timing.
- The City needs to add a substantial residential component around the Del Amo mall to revive the area.

New Information

Added: April 2022

Focus Group Meeting Summary
Torrance 6th Cycle Housing Element
February 16, 2022
2:30 pm

The virtual session started at 2:30 pm with a total of 12 participants, representing market rate developers, developers of mixed-income and affordable housing, and service providers. City staff introduced themselves, and the consultant team. A short presentation was provided that summarized the key Housing Element Programs and Actions in the Draft Housing Element. Participants were asked to provide feedback regarding the proposed programs and actions, and to provide any other suggestions on programs and/or actions for the 2nd submittal of the Draft Housing Element that would enhance opportunities to provide housing for households across all income categories and those with special needs. The following is a summary of the input received:

Certainty for the development community is key

- Updating the General Plan, Land Use Map and Zoning helps developers reduce risk.
- Clear density bonus rules in the Zoning Ordinance are very helpful. Used example of the City of Los Angeles published density bonus rules.

What constrains the development of housing?

- CEQA is a constraint. CEQA takes time and money, both of which are deterrents to the development of housing.
- Bureaucracy is a constraint to development. When a city's development review/permitting process is slow, it can cost a developer to lose funding, such as low-income tax credit (LIHTC) financing. Time and money again.
- Requiring retail as part of mixed-use development is tough, especially in today's economic climate. Too much commercial is a constraint.
- Rules imposed by the Fire Department can be a constraint. Sometimes rules are imposed that are stricter than what the code requires and/or are not identified early in the process.
- FAR rules reduce density that can be achieved.
- Senior projects that are designed in accordance with the City's senior citizen housing development standards, with smaller units and reduced parking standards, can only be used for seniors. There is a strong demand for the same type of development by young singles and couples, but with current restrictions, developers cannot build them for the younger demographic.

Development standards need to be relaxed

- FAR
- Setbacks along busy corridors should be allowed to be closer to the roadway. Makes the corridor more to scale, and creates a more vibrant and walkable cityscape. For example, the HBCSP requires a 100' setback from the Hawthorne Boulevard ROW, which is a significant constraint.
- Reduced parking standards
- Reduced open space requirements
- Flexibility is key

- Look at sliding scale for concessions for development of housing, e.g., smaller units with reduced parking if in walkable area/neighborhood, near transit, etc.

If the City pursues Inclusionary Housing

- Many cities require developers to provide the identical size housing product for someone paying considerably less than full market rate.
- Would like to be able to reduce the square footage somewhat for those paying less to make it more attractive for developers.
- If requirements are reduced, developers could build more mixed-income housing.
- Developers cannot afford to build housing for the extremely low-income group because the income is so low, persons are almost homeless.

Housing for those with developmental disabilities

- Representative from Hope Housing ,who assists with providing housing for those with developmental disabilities, explained there is a large need for this type of housing.
- Suggested the City could help them with: the purchase of homes, rehab assistance, providing HOME HUD funding, and/or Mainstream vouchers.
- Expressed an interest in partnering with the City to help meet need.

Suggestions for additional sites for the Housing Element

- Suggested the City include sites developers are looking at for housing projects in the Sites Inventory of the Draft Housing Element. They were encouraged to provide potential sites to City staff.
- Suggested including all the religious institutions in the City. His firm is currently building 3 projects on church sites. Said the proposed Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) is a good program.
- Suggested building housing along busy commercial corridors that are walkable and near jobs
- Suggested using parking lots of hotels
- Suggested looking at underutilized sites in Industrial zones, empty school sites, Sears at Del Amo Mall, vacant and unused retail spaces. Due to the built-out nature of Torrance, the majority of new development has to go on already developed sites. The age of properties in Torrance, declining retail, and general underutilization make many developed sites appropriate for residential and mixed-use development.

Section 5

Mailing Lists

[New attachments added for the 2nd submittal to HCD are found following the cover sheet titled "New information"](#)

organization	address	city
Salvation Army "His House Family Services"	20830 S. Vermont Avenue	Torrance, CA 90502
Rebuilding Together South Bay Los Angeles	P.O. Box 6367	Torrance, CA 90504
Kenny Nickelson Memorial Foundation for Homeless Veterans and Children Inc.	P.O. Box 3098	Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
LA County Deptment of Children and Family Services	2325 Crenshaw Boulevard	Torrance, CA 90501
Social Vocational Services (SVS)	2441 W. 205th St, Ste C-100	Torrance, CA 90501
Catholic Charities LA	1530 James M Wood Blvd #1112,	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Catholic Charities	123 E. 14th Street	Long Beach, CA 90803
Disabled Resource Center	2750 E. Spring Street, Ste #100	Long Beach, CA 90806
Focal Point on Aging	1339 Post Avenue	Torrance, CA 9501
The Arc -- South Bay	1735 W Rosecrans Ave,	Gardena, CA 90249-3023
South Bay Senior	2510 W. 237 th Street, Suite 204	Torrance, CA 90505
Torrance Unified School District --Foster Youth and Homeless Liaison	2335 Plaza Del Amo	Torrance, CA 90501
Harbor Regional Center	21231 Hawthorne Blvd.	Torrance, CA 90503
Access Community Housing, inc	222 N Sepulveda Blvd #2000,	El Segundo, CA 90245
Episodes International	3480 Torrance Blvd., Suite 100	Torrance, CA 90503
Home Instead Senior Care Veterans Salute Program	3625 Del Amo Blvd UNIT 105,	Torrance, CA 90503
Walteria Senior Citizens Center	3855 W. 242nd Street,	Torrance, CA 90505
Tillim Senior Citizens Center	3612 W. Artesia Boulevard,	Torrance, CA 90504
Bartlett Senior Citizen's Center	1318 Cravens avenue	Torrance, CA 90501
Shelter Partnership	520 S. Grand Avenue #695	Los Angeles CA 90071
Harbor Interfaith Shelter	670 W. 9th St.	San Pedro, CA 90731
House of Yahweh	4046 Marine Avenue,	Lawndale, CA 90260
Mission Beacon Light	525 Broad Ave,	Wilmington, CA 90744
Pacific Gateway Workforce investment network	<u>3447 Atlantic Ave.</u>	Long Beach CA 90807
home ownership for personal empowerment (HOPE, Inc)	21231 Hawthorne Blvd,	Torrance, CA 90503
habitat for humanity of greater los angeles	18600 Crenshaw Blvd.	Torrance CA 90504
easter seals torrance	1740 W. Carson Street	Torrance, CA 90505
gratitude retreat foundation	3535 Lomita Blvd	Torrance, CA 90505
gratitude retreat foundation	18411 Crenshaw Blvd #350	Torrance CA 90504
South Bay Family Promise	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance CA 90503
LINC Housing	3590 Elm Ave,	Long Beach, CA 90807
META Housing	11150 W Olympic Blvd Suite #620	Los Angeles, CA 90064
MAR ventures	721 N Douglas St,	El Segundo, CA 90245
AMCAL Housing	30141 Agoura Road, Suite 100,	Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Abode Communities	1149 S. Hill Street, Ste 700	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Amercian Communities		
national Community Renaissance	9421 Haven Ave,	Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Related California	333 South Grand Avenue Suite 4450	Los Angeles, CA 90071
witheemalcolm	2251 W 190th St,	Torrance, CA 90504
Board of realtors	22833 Arlington Avenue	Torrance, CA 90501
Hart Community Homes	208 n lemon st	fullerton CA 92832
Century Housing Corporation	1000 Corporate Pointe	Culver City, CA 90230
Adobe Communities	1149 S. Hill Street, Ste 700	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Jamboree Housing Corporation	17701 Cowan Ave, Suite 200	Irvine, CA 92614
Housing Corporation of America	6330 Variel Avenue Suite 201	Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Doty-Burton Associates	3787 Worsham Avenue	Long Beach, CA 90808
A Community of Friends	3701 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700	Los Angeles, CA 90010
Century Pacific Equity Corporation	10100 Santa Monica Blvd Ste 300	Los Angeles, CA, 90067-4107
CitiHousing Real Estate Services	11432 South Street #244,	Cerritos, CA 90703-6611
Coalition for Economic Survival	14320 Ventura Blvd. - PMB 537	Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
FAME Housing Corporation	1968 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90018	
Hope - Net	760 S. Westmoreland Ave.	Los Angeles, CA 90005
Korean Youth & Community Center, Inc.. (KYCC)	680 S. Wilton Place	Los Angeles, CA 90005
LINC Community Development Corporation	same as Linc Housing- see above	
Menorah Housing Foundation	10991 W. Pico Blvd.	Los Angeles, CA 90064
Poker Flats II LLC	not found (KJ)	
Winnetka King, LLC	not found (KJ)	
Foundation for Quality	not found (KJ)	
Community Rehabilitation Services, Inc	not found (KJ)	
Veteran Aid.org	none	
Home and Community	not found	
BROOKS + SCARPA California	3929 W. 139th Street	Hawthorne, CA 90250
Flyaway Homes	2116 Arlington Avenue, Suite 100	Los Angeles, CA 90018
LifeArk	831 Meridian St.	Duarte, CA 91010
United Dwelling	150 E. 57th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90011

RNLA (Restore Neighborhoods LA, Inc.)	315 West 9th St #503	Los Angeles, CA 90015
Skidrow Housing Trust	1317 E. 7th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90021
Brilliant Corners	527 W 7th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90014
La Mas	2806 Clearwater Street,	Los Angeles, CA 90039
Venice Community Housing	200 Lincoln Blvd.	Venice, CA 90291
Volunteers of America LA	3600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1500	Los Angeles CA 90010
Community Corporation of Santa Monica	1423 2ND ST. SUITE B	SANTA MONICA, CA 90401
Coalition for Responsible Community Development	3101 S. Grand Ave.	Los Angeles, CA 90007
Clifford Beers Housing	11739 Victory Blvd	Los Angeles, CA 91606
PATHVentures		
Weingart Center	501 E 6th Street	Los Angeles, CA 90021
GenesisLA	801 S. GRAND AVE., STE. 775	LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
Daylight Community Development		

RMG Housing	<i>329 Pacific Coast Highway</i>	Hermosa Beach CA 90254
RxLA		
Many Mansions	1259 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.	Thousand Oaks, CA 9

CONTACT	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	
Pastor Dean Mayeda	Nova Community Church	4345 Emerald Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Dr. William (Bill) Hurst	First Lutheran Church and School	2900 West Carson Street	Torrance CA 90503
Vicar Erin Armstrong	First Lutheran Church and School	2900 West Carson Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Milton Herring	Living Word Christian Church	18119 S. Prairie Avenue	Torrance CA 90504
Pastor Cinda Herring	Living Word Christian Church	18119 S. Prairie Avenue	Torrance CA 90504
Minister Jhonny Saavedra (+5)	Cristo Para Las Naciones	700 Maple Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Sang Boo	Good Community Church of Torrance	19950 Mariner Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Sr. Pastor Paul Kim	Good Community Church of Torrance	19950 Mariner Avenue	Torrance CA 90503
Eric Anderson	First Baptist Church of Walteria	3711 Newton Street	Torrance CA 90505
Sr. Warden Thomas Winfrey	Christ Our Savior Anglican Church	1108 Sartori Avenue, #220	Torrance CA 90501
Daniel Park	Blessed South Bay Church	24817 Western Avenue	Lomita CA 90717
Kevin Leathers	Crenshaw Baptist Church	18749 Crenshaw Boulevard	Torrance CA 90504
Nick Rasmussen	Family Promise of the South Bay	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance CA 90503
Pastor Ken Johnson	Resurrection Lutheran Church & School	330 Palos Verdes Boulevard	Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Monsignor Mike Meyers	St. James Parish	124 N Pacific Coast Highway	Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Rev. Mark Ger	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Rev. Daniel Low	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Rev. Wilson Lee	Bread of Life Church	2780 Lomita Boulevard	Torrance CA 90505
Pastor Glen Moore	Torrance New Life Church	2300 Sepulveda Boulevard	Torrance CA 90501
Senior Pastor Bill Schwartz	South Bay Christian Community	2549 W. 190th Street	Torrance CA 90504
Pastor Gary Shiohana	South Bay Community Church	2549 W 190th Street	Torrance CA 90504
Rabbi Didi Thomas	Temple Emet	2051 W. 236th Street	Torrance CA 90501
Manuel Lares	Behavioral Health Services, Inc.	2510 W 237th Street, #204	Torrance CA 90505
Dr. Rogers Govender	Behavioral Health Services, Inc.	2510 W 237th Street, #204	Torrance CA 90505
Reverend Hùng Tran	Nativity Catholic Church	1447 Engracia Avenue	Torrance CA 90501
Keeley Gilmore	Department of Mental Health- LAC	1000 W Carson St,	Torrance, CA 90502
Dr. Tim Morey	Life Covenant Church	2390 Crenshaw Blvd. #213	Torrance CA 90501
Pastor Bill MacPhee	The River Church of the South Bay	3525 Lomita Blvd.	Torrance CA 90505
Opal Booth	United Evangelist Association	2008 W Carson St # 207	Torrance CA 90501
Linda Cruz	United Evangelist Association	2008 W Carson St # 207	Torrance CA 90501
Josh Wicker	Torrance Church of Nazarene	700 Maple Ave,	Torrance, CA 90503
Pastor Julian Birkenstock	Karros Ministries		
Steven Fietz	Fire Christian Church of Torrance	2930 El Dorado Street	Torrance, CA 90503
Pastor Joel V. Petermann	Zion Lutheran Church	1001 W 223rd St	Torrance, CA 90502

Beacon Light Mission & Doors of Hope Women's Shelter

Tiffany Rashel	(guest of Dr. Rogers)		
Lionel Pieterse	(guest of Dr. Rogers)		

New Information

Added: April 2022

company	Address 1	City
lennar homes	12103 Summer Ln,	Whittier, CA 90602
don wilson builders	23705 Crenshaw Blvd STE 200	Torrance, CA 90510
anastasi development company	511 Torrance Blvd 2nd Floor	Redondo Beach, CA 9027
The olson company	3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100	Seal Beach, CA 90740-2751
withee malcolm	2251 W 190th St	Torrance, CA 90504
cambridge Pacific Ventures		
mark vasey	1983 190 th street	Torrance CA 90504
tony ashai	9744 Wilshire Boulevard #305	Beverly Hills CA 90212
doug maupin	23505 Crenshaw Blvd #208	Torrance CA 90505
Derek Empey, ReyLenn Properties LLC	444 S. Cedros Ave. #180	Solana Beach, CA 92075
city ventures	2000 Avenue of the Stars 9th floor South	Los Angeles, CA 90067
Cyrus Paykan	11444 Acacia Avenue	Hawthorne, CA 90250
MAR ventures	721 N Douglas St,	El Segundo, CA 90245
Diana Coronado Building Industry Association BIA		
Watt Companies	2716 Ocean Park Boulevard Suite 2025	Santa Monica, CA 90405
INTRACORP SW, LLC Christopher Piers	895 Dove St, Suite 400	Newport Beach CA 92660
Storm Bird Storm Properties	23223 Normandie Ave	Torrance, CA 90501
Derek Reylenn Reylenn Properties L	444 S. Cedros Avenue, Suite 180	Solana Beach, CA 92075

Mailing List **Affordable Housing Advocates**

Organization

Salvation Army "His House Family Services"

Rebuilding Together South Bay Los Angeles

Kenny Nickelson Memorial Foundation for
Homeless Veterans and Children Inc.

LA County Deptment of Children and Family
Services

Social Vocational Services (SVS)

Catholic Charities LA

Catholic Charities

Disabled Resource Center

Focal Point on Aging

The Arc -- South Bay

South Bay Senior

Torrance Unified School District --Foster Youth
and Homeless Liaison

Harbor Regional Center

Access Community Housing, inc

Episodes International

Home Instead Senior Care Veterans Salute
Program

Walteria Senior Citizens Center

Tillim Senior Citizens Center

Bartlett Senior Citizen's Center

Shelter Partnership

Harbor Interfaith Shelter

House of Yahweh

Mission Beacon Light

Pacific Gateway Workforce investment network

Home Ownership for Personal Empowerment
(HOPE, Inc)

Habitat for Humanity of Greater Los Angeles

Easter Seals Torrance

Gratitude Retreat Foundation
South Bay Family Promise
LINC Housing
META Housing
MAR ventures
AMCAL Housing
Abode Communities
Americian Communities
National Community Renaissance
Related California
Withee Malcolm
Board of Realtors
Hart Community Homes
Century Housing Corporation
Adobe Communities
Jamboree Housing Corporation
Housing Corporation of America
Doty-Burton Associates
A Community of Friends
Century Pacific Equity Corporation
CitiHousing Real Estate Services
Coalition for Economic Survival
FAME Housing Corporation
Hope - Net
Korean Youth & Community Center, Inc..
(KYCC)
LINC Community Development Corporation
Menorah Housing Foundation
Poker Flats II LLC
Winnetka King, LLC
Foundation for Quality
Community Rehabilitation Services, Inc
Veteran Aid.org

Veteran Aid.org
Home and Community
BROOKS + SCARPA California
Flyaway Homes
LifeArk
United Dwelling
RNLA (Restore Neighborhoods LA, Inc.)
Skidrow Housing Trust
Brilliant Corners
La Mas
Venice Community Housing
Volunteers of America LA
Community Corporation of Santa Monica
Coalition for Responsible Community
Development
Clifford Beers Housing
PATHVentures
Weingart Center
GenesisLA
Daylight Community Development
RMG Housing
RxLA
Many Mansions

Mailing List – Market Rate Housing Developers

Company

Lennar Homes
Don Wilson Builders
Anastasi Development Company
The Olson Company
Withee Malcolm
Cambridge Pacific Ventures
Mark Vasey
Tony Ashai
Doug Maupin
Derek Empey, ReyLenn Properties LLC
City Ventures
Cyrus Paykan
MAR Ventures
Diana Coronado Building Industry Association BIA
Watt Companies
INTRACORP SW, LLC Christopher Pierson | VP, Acquisitions
Storm Bird Storm Properties
Derek Reylenn, Reylenn Properties LLC
Related California

Mailing List
Churches and Faith-based Organizations

ORGANIZATION
Nova Community Church
First Lutheran Church and School
Living Word Christian Church
Cristo Para Las Naciones
Good Community Church of Torrance
First Baptist Church of Walteria
Christ Our Savior Anglican Church
Blessed South Bay Church
Crenshaw Baptist Church
Family Promise of the South Bay
Resurrection Lutheran Church & School
St. James Parish
Bread of Life Church
Torrance New Life Church
South Bay Christian Community
South Bay Community Church
Temple Emet
Behavioral Health Services, Inc.
Nativity Catholic Church
Department of Mental Health- LAC
Life Covenant Church
The River Church of the South Bay
United Evangelist Association
Torrance Church of Nazarene
Karros Ministries
Fire Christian Church of Torrance

Zion Lutheran Church

ADDITIONS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

ADOPTION HEARING

May 18, 2022

CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Wednesday, May 18, 2022
Via Teleconference or Other Electronic Means



CHAIR: CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Tonight, the Planning Commission is conducting this Planning Commission Meeting under a National, State and City – State of Emergency.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361 members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

AGENDA



1. Call Meeting To Order
- Roll Call
2. Flag Salute

CHAIR: CAN I GET A ROLL CALL PLEASE

STAFF: ROLL CALL

CHAIR: Commissioner _____,
would you lead us in the flag salute?

FLAG SALUTE



AGENDA



3. Report on Posting of Agenda
- May 13, 2022

4. Announcement of Withdrawn, Deferred, and/or
Supplemental Items

CHAIR: CAN I HAVE THE REPORT OF THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA?

STAFF: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED ON THE PUBLIC NOTICE BOARD AT 3031 TORRANCE BLVD ON May 13, 2022.

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY WIDTHRAWN, DEFERRED AND/OR SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS?

STAFF: (Will respond and request item 8A to be continued to a date certain of 5/4/22)

AGENDA



5. Oral Communications from the Public #1

- Limited to a 15 Minute Period;
- Use “Raise your Hand” feature if you would like to speak.
Press *9 if you are using a phone.

CHAIR: This portion of the meeting is reserved for comment on items not on the agenda. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Planning Commission cannot act on items raised during public comment, but may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed; request clarification; or refer the item to staff. Speakers under Orals are limited to Oral Communications #1 and no longer than 3 minutes per speaker. To participate, please use the “Raise Your Hand” feature when prompted. If you are using a touchtone phone, please press *9 (star 9) to raise your hand. Your comments to the Planning Commission meeting will be recorded as part of the Planning Commission meeting. By staying online and making public comment during the Planning Commission meeting, you are agreeing to have your audio recorded.

IS THERE ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WISHES TO SPEAK?

STAFF: WILL RESPOND AND/OR STATE: “(NAME) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTED” IF ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WISHES TO SPEAK
(STAFF WILL TIME SPEAKERS AND MUTE THEM AT 3-MINUTES)



Announcement by Chairman Sheikh

Before the meeting begins, there are a few matters of general information I would like to explain:

1. The meeting will be conducted in an informal manner:

- Formal rules of evidence, such as those used in a court of law, will not apply
- Everyone with an interest in the matter will be heard
- Our decision will be based on the evidence presented; including, the staff report, any pictures or drawings presented by staff, oral testimony heard tonight, any written or graphic material presented during the meeting, and each Commissioner's personal observations upon viewing the site.

2. If you wish to address an item before the Commission, you are asked to keep your remarks pertinent to the case before us, refrain from making personal remarks about the other people involved, and refrain from

repeating comments or observations already made. Repetition of evidence usually is neither necessary nor helpful to the matter.

Tonight's proceedings are being recorded. The minute secretary will prepare minutes based upon notes taken during the meeting and the contents of the recording. Therefore, when you speak to the Commission you are asked to:

- Use the "Raise your Hand" feature;
- Although not required, you may provide your name and address for the record;

3. Zone Changes, Variances and General Plan Amendments go to the City Council automatically for a decision. Everything else is final with this Commission unless appealed to the City Council.

Appeals may be filed any time within 15 calendar days after our decision is made by going to the City Clerk's office, filling out the application, and paying the necessary fee. Matters appealed to the City Council generally are heard by the Council within 45 days.

4. The matters to be considered by the Commission tonight will be heard in the following manner:

- Staff will present the matter by reading a short description of the case and will respond to questions posed by Commissioners.
- The applicant, or proponent, will then be asked to come forward and make any presentation he or she may wish to make and to respond to Commission inquiries.
- Anyone interested in the matter will be asked to raise your hand and when instructed present his or her remarks and respond to any questions the Commission may have.
- The proponent will be invited to make any closing comments and respond to further questions by the Commission.
- At the conclusion of the presentation of evidence, the Commission will discuss the matter publicly and will vote upon their decision.

STAFF MEMBERS FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUILDING & SAFETY DIVISION AND ENGINEERING DIVISION AS WELL AS THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE ARE ON HAND TO RESPOND TO QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION REGARDING TONIGHT'S CASES.

THAT CONCLUDES MY COMMENTS. MAY WE HAVE THE NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

AGENDA

- 6. Consent Calendar
 - A. None
- 7. Administrative Matters
 - None
- 8. Hearings
 - 8A

CHAIR: ARE THERE MINUTES FOR APPROVAL?

STAFF: None

CHAIR: Administrative Matters?

STAFF: NONE

CHAIR: HEARINGS?

STAFF: Yes,

THEY HAVE BEEN CONTINUED/POSTPONED??

CHAIR: CAN I HAVE THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA PLEASE?

AGENDA



8. Hearings

B. Consideration of LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003, HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE

Planning Commission consideration of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

CHAIR: IS THE APPLICANT PRESENT?

STAFF: YES CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE A PRESENTATION PREPARED

~~(APPLICANT NAME) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTTED, WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. THE APPLICANT~~

~~CHAIR: (APPLICANT NAME) PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROJECT~~

~~APPLICANT: (TURN TO SPEAK)~~

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(YES/NO)

CHAIR: IS THERE ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON THIS ITEM?

PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND

STAFF: (STAFF WILL RESPOND, IF ANYONE WISHES TO SPEAK AND WILL UNMUTE THE MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC) YOU ARE NOW UNMUTTED, WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD?

CHAIR: (ALLOW MEMBER OF PUBLIC TO SPEAK, IF NO SPEAKERS REQUEST A MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING)



City of Torrance

Housing Element Update

Planning Commission

Wednesday, May 18, 2022

6:30 p.m.

STAFF: Good Evening, I am Gregg Lodan with the Community Development Department. Tonight we will be initiating the process for updating the City of Torrance Housing Element. Briefly, the Housing Element allows a city to plan for housing related needs in the city. As part of our presentation tonight we will be going into more detail later.
Next Slide Please

The Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director
Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate
Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal
Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



10

STAFF:

The Team working on this update includes both city staff and our consultants:

City Staff

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager
Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate
Kevin Joe, Planning Associate

CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal
Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate

Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal

Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal

At this point I will turn the meeting over to Veronica Tam to discuss the agenda and begin the presentation

What is the Housing Element?

- One of the 7 mandated elements of the General Plan
- Subject to detailed statutory requirements rather than guidelines—most regulated element of the General Plan
- Must be updated every 8 years per State law
- Reviewed for compliance by State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)



11

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for meeting each jurisdiction's share of regional housing needs (Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA) as determined by State law
- Provides an assessment of the City's housing needs and how best to accommodate the housing needs
- The City "plans for" housing so that developers can build projects consistent with the City's General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other plans and programs



12

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Housing Element Requirements

- Demonstrate that the jurisdiction can accommodate its RHNA as mandated by State law
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet demand
- Improve the safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate the development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all (AFFH)



13


STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

RHNA for 6th Cycle



14

CONSULTANT:

Sites Inventory Overview

- Each jurisdiction must identify available vacant and/or underutilized properties to accommodate its RHNA by income category
- For lower income housing, site must meet certain requirements to be deemed adequate
- Allowable "credits" toward RHNA:
 - Already entitled and pipeline projects
 - Accessory dwelling units



15

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Torrance Required RHNA by Income Category

Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 - 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes "Extremely Low," which is up to 30% of AMI

CONSULTANT:

Adequacy of Sites to Meet RHNA by Income Category

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	—	28	288	3,094 ^{2,3}	3,410 ²	38.2%
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		—	—	29	1,210 ⁴	1,239	45.3%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,167 ²	2,926 ²	80.7%
Total	4,939		195	429	480	6,471	7,575	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among and added to their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

³ 32.2% of lower-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

⁴ Approximately 45% of moderate-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

CONSULTANT:

Process to Date

- 3 Planning Commission Workshops
(April 28, 2020, July 28, 2021, & October 20, 2021)
- 1st Submittal to HCD October 15, 2021 (Housing Element dated October 1, 2021)
- HCD Response December 14, 2021
- Revised version made available to public on April 11, 2022
- 2nd Submittal version made available to public on May 9, 2022
- 2nd Submittal to HCD on May 17, 2022



18

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 1: Introduction**
 - Background information, data sources
 - Includes summary of public outreach
- **Section 2: Community Profile**
 - Population characteristics
 - Special needs groups
 - Housing problems, housing stock characteristics
 - Affordable housing



19

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 3: Housing Constraints**

- Governmental
- Non-governmental
- Environmental
- Infrastructure

- **Section 4: Housing Opportunities & Resources**

- Future Housing Needs (Entitled/pipeline, ADUs, sites)
- Financial & administrative resources
- Opportunities for energy conservation



20

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Contents of Housing Element

- **Section 5: Housing Plan**
 - Goals and policies
 - Housing programs, including actions and timeframes
- **Appendices**



21

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- Updates were made to address HCD and public comments
- **Section 1: Introduction**
 - Outreach methods used were updated and expanded. Review process updated.



22

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ **Section 2: Community Profile**

- Data and evaluation of housing needs expanded
- Inventory of at-risk units clarified

■ **Section 3: Housing Constraints**

- Various constraints were added, clarified, and expanded per HCD comments
- Impact of dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies and other State constraints were added



23

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ Section 4: Housing Opportunities and Resources

- Number of estimated ADUs to be constructed was reduced from 600 to 480 (per HCD comments)
- Realistic capacity assumptions for Sites Inventory were clarified and expanded; examples were provided
- Sampling of 15 entitled and constructed projects was prepared (details in a new Appendix E)
- Conclusions from Feasibility Study of building prototypes and pro forma fiscal analysis for the Housing Corridor Study were provided
- Sites Inventory was updated to reflect deletions & additions & figures were revised
- Outreach to property owners on Sites Inventory was discussed



24

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ Section 5: Housing Plan

- Several policies were added to address HCD and/or public input
- Many programs and objectives were expanded or added to address HCD and/or public input
- Time frames for objectives were revised consistent with AB 1398, which took effect January 1, 2022



25

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix A: Outreach Efforts**
 - All new noticing the City did, comment letters received, and summaries of additional outreach were added
- **Appendix B: Review of Past Accomplishments**
 - No change



26

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

■ **Appendix C: Sites Inventory**

- Expanded to include additional information for each site, including criteria for selection
- Sites were deleted that did not meet criteria or per property owner request
- Sites were added based on public interest and identification of additional opportunities based on HCD criteria
- Revised figures were provided



27

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix D: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)**
 - Expanded evaluation of AFFH data per direction from HCD
 - Provided additional information regarding actions to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH)
 - Summary of fair housing issues was added
 - Data and figures were revised to reflect revisions to Sites Inventory



28

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix E: Sampling of Entitled & Constructed Projects (NEW)**
 - Provides details of projects discussed earlier
- **Appendix F: Correspondence from Providers of Affordable Housing (NEW)**
 - Letters received from providers of affordable housing in Torrance stating that they plan to remain affordable for the next 10 years



29

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Summary of Revisions between 1st and 2nd Submittal to HCD

- **Appendix G: Response to Public Comments (NEW)**

- All public comments that were received were summarized in a table and each was responded to



30

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Environmental compliance to support Housing Element Update
- Not a project-specific or construction-level CEQA review
- Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared by City
- 30-Day public review conducted Nov. 1 – Nov. 30, 2021
- Housing Element adoption would not create significant impacts
- Additional CEQA for future proposed construction projects



31

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Next Steps

- City Council adoption of Housing Element & certification of CEQA Document on June 14, 2022
- HCD responds to 2nd Submittal mid-July
- City Manager authorized to make minor revisions to address HCD comments for certification



32

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.

Recommendation:

- The Community Development Department recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing to receive comments from the public, provide staff their comments on the draft Housing Element and adopt a RESOLUTION recommending that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element Update and a Negative Declaration.



33

STAFF: ARE THERE ANY FINAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

CHAIRMAN: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?

(QUESTIONS)

CHAIRMAN: THIS CONCLUDES COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, STAFF PLEASE CONTINUE.



Planning Commission Discussion and Voting Period for Agenda Item:

8B. LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Staff Recommendation:

The Community Development Department recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a RESOLUTION recommending that the City Council adopt the draft Housing Element Update and a Negative Declaration.

31

- DISCUSSION
- WAIT FOR MOTION – FIRST AND SECOND

CHAIR: ROLL CALL

STAFF: (ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE)

CHAIR: IS THERE A RESOLUTION?

STAFF: YES, (ALLOW STAFF TO INTRODUCE RESO)

- WAIT FOR MOTION – FIRST AND SECOND

CHAIR: ROLL CALL

STAFF: (ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE)

CHAIR: STAFF, CAN I HAVE THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA PLEASE

AGENDA



9. Resolutions

- None

10. Commission and Staff Oral Communications

11. Adjournment

A. Adjournment of Planning Commission Meeting to Wednesday,
June 1, 2022, at 6:30pm

35

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY RESOLUTIONS?

STAFF: NONE

CHAIR: ARE THERE ANY COMMISSIONER OR STAFF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS? IF SO,
PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND AND I WILL CALL ON YOU.

CHAIR: MOTION TO ADJOURN TO JUNE 1, 2022

STAFF: ROLL CALL AND ANNOUNCE VOTE

On May 5, 2022, at 5:10 PM, Chun, Carolyn <CChun@torranceca.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

Should you have comments or questions on the Draft feel free to email staff at CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov or you may call 310-618-5990. Please include "Housing Element Update" in the subject line of any correspondence.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager

LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD BEFORE THE CITY OF TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION AT 6:30 P.M., MAY 18, 2022 VIA TELECONFERENCE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC MEANS, ON THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:

LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE: CITY OF TORRANCE: Conduct a Public Hearing to make recommendations to the City Council regarding the adoption of the 6th Cycle (2021-2029) City of Torrance Housing Element Update and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

Material can be reviewed in person at the Permit Center in the Community Development Department at 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503. The agenda will be posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard and online at <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. All persons interested in any of the above matters are requested to submit their comments to the Community Development Department, City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503 or via e-mail to PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, members of the Planning Commission and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at: <https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials:
Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by emailing PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email, include the item number "12A" and/or title of this item with your comments. All comments emailed by 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be included as a "Supplemental" and uploaded to <https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/planning-/planning-commission/notice-of-public-hearing>. Comments received after 2:00 p.m. will be uploaded the following day to the previously noted web address.

If you challenge any of the above matters in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department or the office of the City Clerk, prior to the public hearing and further, by the terms of Resolution No. 88-19, you may be limited to ninety (90) days in which to commence such legal action pursuant to Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 310.618.2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]

For further information, contact the PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at 310.618.5990.

Published: May 6, 2022

MICHELLE G. RAMIREZ
Community Development Director

Chun, Carolyn

Contact Group Name: Housing Element interest list

Members:

56oreo@gmail.com
agill@intracorphomes.com
aidanrschwing@gmail.com
alex@charingcp.com
amsanc9@gmail.com
amy@josefekassoc.com
andreareilly6@aol.com
anelson@redoakinv.com
anthony@abundanthousingla.org
arwheat@gmail.com
birvin@provincegroup.com
bluewejustgotaletter@gmail.com
Bob.Patterson
brandon@mitchtsailaw.com
brent stoll
brett@buchmann-design.com
brian_huang7757@elcamino.edu
briannajoice@gmail.com
briggs@cityventures.com
cannulli@yahoo.com
mark capellino
'carlsgoode@earthlink.net'
cgomez@landadvisors.com
chrishall@prodigy.net
Claudia Tedford
contact@caforhomes.org
david@abundanthousingla.org
dcoronado@bialav.org
debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com
derek.caldwell@marcusmillichap.com
dominic mazza - intracorphomes
donleefarmers@gmail.com
Santana, Danny
dtsmith90505@gmail.com
dwithie@witheemalcolm.com
efa4402@ucla.edu
email@torranceforeveryone.com
Beacon Light mission
gnoble@verizon.net
hamiddari@yahoo.com
hema gujjari (heu)
honeybobaboba@yahoo.com
mitch tsai law
james tu (housing element)
'james@trustee.pro'
Janet Payne
jd@jdholdings.com
jeremymiddleton@gmail.com
jimgallagher@cox.net
jminer831@gmail.com
Nulty, Jennifer

56oreo@gmail.com
agill@intracorphomes.com
aidanrschwing@gmail.com
alex@charingcp.com
amsanc9@gmail.com
amy@josefekassoc.com
andreareilly6@aol.com
anelson@redoakinv.com
anthony@abundanthousingla.org
arwheat@gmail.com
birvin@provincegroup.com
bluewejustgotaletter@gmail.com
Bob.Patterson@socalmultihousing.com
brandon@mitchtsailaw.com
brent_stoll@yahoo.com
brett@buchmann-design.com
brian_huang7757@elcamino.edu
briannajoice@gmail.com
briggs@cityventures.com
cannulli@yahoo.com
capellinos@yahoo.com
'carlsgoode@earthlink.net'
cgomez@landadvisors.com
chrishall@prodigy.net
claudia.tedford@cityplaceplanning.com
contact@caforhomes.org
david@abundanthousingla.org
dcoronado@bialav.org
debbie.simpson@acssoftware.com
derek.caldwell@marcusmillichap.com
dmazza@intracorphomes.com
donleefarmers@gmail.com
DSantana@TorranceCA.gov
dtsmith90505@gmail.com
dwithie@witheemalcolm.com
efa4402@ucla.edu
email@torranceforeveryone.com
gfigueroa@blmission.org
gnoble@verizon.net
hamiddari@yahoo.com
hgujjari@gmail.com
honeybobaboba@yahoo.com
info@mitchtsailaw.com
james@2-bit-toys.com
'james@trustee.pro'
janhpayne@sbcglobal.net
jd@jdholdings.com
jeremymiddleton@gmail.com
jimgallagher@cox.net
jminer831@gmail.com
JNulty@TorranceCA.gov

joel.calplanningconsultants@gmail.com

'Jon Wizard' <jon@yimbylaw.org>
jperry@theolsonco.com
keelyinla@gmail.com
kgalvin@socal.rr.com
Joe, Kevin
adrian young
lare98@aol.com
lauralohnes@yahoo.com
laurie love
leon@mitchtsailaw.com
leonora camner
Leora Tanjuatco Ross <leora@yimbyaction.org

llcraig543@gmail.com
llopez912@sbcglobal.net
lmdryer@earthlink.net
management@c7properties.com
Manuela Tobias (cal matters)
marc@danziger.org
marianne hamada
mariselaalonzo1956@yahoo.com
mark hansen
matt gelfand (californians for homeownership)

matt@caforhomes.org
matthew.doyle@marcusmillichap.com
mbennyworth@gmail.com
Ottoson, Matthew B.
mcerletti@aol.com
melanie dreike
city ventures
mike@inland-west.net
missd628@yahoo.com
mitch@mitchtsailaw.com
moogtorran@att.net
najme.rezaee@yahoo.com
news@layimby.com
NHCivicAffairs@gmail.com
norally (norally@horizonmgmt.com)
office.drilpro@sbcglobal.net
onorio.marsella@gmail.com
pampop1@verizon.net
Patricia Bluman
'Phil Lam'
powersoft_4@msn.com
prabhu.r.reddy@gmail.com
ray prayer
Couto, Rachel
'Rfragapane@mullerco.com'
'richardk@paragonlabsusa.com
robert (interested in HEU)

joel.calplanningconsultants@gmail.com

jon@yimbylaw.org
jperry@theolsonco.com
keelyinla@gmail.com
kgalvin@socal.rr.com
KJoe@TorranceCA.gov
ladeea49@aol.com
lare98@aol.com
lauralohnes@yahoo.com
laurieLove@socal.rr.com
leon@mitchtsailaw.com
leonora@abundanthousingla.org

LeoraTanjuatcoRoss <leora@yimbyaction.org
llcraig543@gmail.com
llopez912@sbcglobal.net
lmdryer@earthlink.net
management@c7properties.com
manuela@calmatters.org
marc@danziger.org
marianne.ntha@att.net
mariselaalonzo1956@yahoo.com
mark.hansen37@yahoo.com

matt@caforhomes.org
matt@caforhomes.org
matthew.doyle@marcusmillichap.com
mbennyworth@gmail.com
mbootton@rrmdesign.com
mcerletti@aol.com
melaniedreike@gmail.com
michellet@cityventures.com
mike@inland-west.net
missd628@yahoo.com
mitch@mitchtsailaw.com
moogtorran@att.net
najme.rezaee@yahoo.com
news@layimby.com
NHCivicAffairs@gmail.com
norally@horizonmgmt.com
office.drilpro@sbcglobal.net
onorio.marsella@gmail.com
pampop1@verizon.net
patricia.bluman@cityplaceplanning.com
plam@theolsonco.com
powersoft_4@msn.com
prabhu.r.reddy@gmail.com
ray584prayer@yahoo.com
rcouto@torranceca.gov
'Rfragapane@mullerco.com'
richardk@paragonlabsusa.com
robert@networkerservices.net

samuelgallegoswas@everyactionadvocacy.com

sandimonda1239@gmail.com
sasha.burik@gmail.com
sbird@storm-properties.com
scarlettrosedavis@gmail.com
sedwards@cityventures.com
sheablanco@gmail.com
slacanfora@yahoo.com
sliversun2009@yahoo.com
smc@camm-inc.com
Southwood.homeowners@gmail.com
Stacy Metcalfe <stacymetcalfe@yahoo.com>

'stanlwong@yahoo.com'
steve.martin (housing element)
'steve@surfmanagement.com'
Julie Randall
therealaziz@icloud.com
tie.ryder@gmail.com
'timsymington@gmail.com'
'tony@huntermason.com'
usscowell@yahoo.com
yhawkstar28@icloud.com
ymihojevich@gmail.com

samuelgallegoswas@everyactionadvocacy.com

sandimonda1239@gmail.com
sasha.burik@gmail.com
sbird@storm-properties.com
scarlettrosedavis@gmail.com
sedwards@cityventures.com
sheablanco@gmail.com
slacanfora@yahoo.com
sliversun2009@yahoo.com
smc@camm-inc.com
Southwood.homeowners@gmail.com

stacymetcalfe@yahoo.com
'stanlwong@yahoo.com'
steve.martin@greystar.com
'steve@surfmanagement.com'
streetfaire@gmail.com
therealaziz@icloud.com
tie.ryder@gmail.com
'timsymington@gmail.com'
'tony@huntermason.com'
usscowell@yahoo.com
yhawkstar28@icloud.com
ymihojevich@gmail.com

Supplemental #1 to Agenda Item No. 8A

To: Members of the Planning Commission

From: Long Range Planning Division

Date: May 18, 2022

Subject: LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Correspondence was received after the staff report for this item was prepared and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Kevin Joe, AICP
Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: Dennis Piotrowski <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 10:22 AM
To: CDD Info <cddinfo@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Housing Element Update, public comment

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Dear Torrance City Staff, City Council, and Planning Commission,

I'm writing in response to the "Public Review Draft Housing element 5/9/22."

As a long-term Torrance resident, I am pleased that City staff responded in this draft that "one of the goals of this effort is to preserve the City's single-family neighborhoods and follow what the City understands to be resident's desires to retain the character of the City of Torrance."

Please do all that you can to challenge (and mitigate the impacts of) harmful state legislation that is and will negatively impact our single-family home neighborhoods, homes that we have worked hard for all of our lives.

Thank you,
Dennis Piotrowski
Torrance resident

ATTACHMENT 1



Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP

Andrew K. Fogg

File No. 088988

April 28, 2022

VIA E-MAIL

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
City of Torrance
Planning Department
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503
CDDInfo@TorranceCA.Gov

Re: Torrance General Plan Housing Element Update - 21515 Western Avenue

Dear Ms. Chun and Messrs. Lodan and Joe:

We write on behalf of our client, Rexford Industrial Realty (“Rexford”) to object to the potential rezoning of the property commonly known as 21515 Western Avenue, APN 7355-031-054 (the “Property”) discussed for the first time in the City’s Housing Element (2021-2029) Public Review Draft dated April 11, 2022. As explained below, the Property is not appropriate as a potential housing site, and Rexford requests that the City remove this site from the Sites Inventory Appendix in the draft Housing Element.

As an initial matter, we would like to express Rexford’s disappointment with the process relating to the City’s proposal to add the Property to the City’s draft Housing Element Sites Inventory Appendix. This change was made without any consultation with or notice to Rexford, the Property owner. This is surprising because Rexford has been engaged in detailed conversations with the City for nearly a year regarding the potential redevelopment of the site consistent with the existing zoning. For your reference, enclosed is a detailed chronology of Rexford’s conversations with the City leading up to, and immediately following, Rexford’s acquisition of the Property. The potential for including the Property as a potential housing site was never raised by the City during any of these meetings. As described in the attached, these activities included the submission of a Preliminary Site Plan Review, meetings with City staff regarding the Preliminary Site Plan Review, and the filing of a current pending application for the proposed redevelopment project.

Additionally, the draft Housing Element Sites Inventory Appendix mischaracterizes the status of the use of the Property by stating that the Property is a potential opportunity site because it is a “vacant grocery store.” This ignores the fact that the Property was leased, at significantly below-market rental rates, from August 2021 through April 2022 (and may in the near future be leased again) to a warehouse user for the purpose of assembling and warehousing

COVID test kits, as well as a drive through COVID testing site, which provided a tremendous benefit to the community at large during a difficult time that presented serious logistical challenges across the region.

Further, the identification of the Property as a potential housing site makes no sense given its context. The Property is located in the eastern portion of the City, west of Western Avenue, south of 213th Street, north of West Carson Street, and east of Mullin Avenue. The Property is located in the City's I-BP General Plan land use category and is zoned M2 – Heavy Manufacturing.¹ The Property is completely surrounded on all sides within the City with lands that have identical I-BP and M2 zoning. There are no other properties located in the City proximate to the Property that are zoned for residential uses – the nearest residential use in the City is more than 1000 feet from the Property. Introducing new residential uses in an existing industrial zone has the potential to create use conflicts that are confusing and inefficient, at best, and are detrimental and contrary to public policy, at worst. By contrast, the pending development redevelopment project application would facilitate the Property being redeveloped with uses that complement, rather than conflict with, surrounding development in the City.

Finally, we would like to bring to your attention that the Property is part of a larger development plan known as the Torrance Center II Project. The Torrance Center II Project is a 36-acre planned industrial business park that was approved originally in the mid to late 1980s. The entire Torrance Center II Project area is subject to recorded CC&Rs, which were approved by the City's Redevelopment Agency and recorded against all properties within the project area on July 15, 1988 as Document Number 88-1116926 and, as amended and restated, on August 2, 1989 as Document Number 89-1238617. The CC&Rs include a comprehensive set of Design Guidelines that limit and control all development within the project area. The Design Guidelines describe the Torrance Center II Project as follows:

Torrance Center is a 36-acre, mixed-use business park located in the City of Torrance Industrial Redevelopment Project. The site is bounded by Western Avenue, Carson Street, 213th Street and Border and Bow Avenue. Proposed uses for the site are office, light industrial, research and development, and commercial. Commercial uses include a retail center, hotel and restaurants.

(Design Guidelines, P.1). Notably, residential uses are not permitted under the Design Guidelines or the CC&Rs. There is no process for developing a residential development on the Property without securing the approval of all of the industrial users located in the Torrance Center II Project development. As such, it would likely be impossible to develop any project if the City were to change the zoning as contemplated because any residential use would be precluded under the CC&Rs and any non-residential use would be inconsistent with the proposed

¹ The Housing Element incorrectly identifies the Property's existing zoning as M1 when it is, in fact, M2.

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
April 28, 2022
Page 3

zoning. Eliminating all ability to use the Property could constitute a taking and has the potential to create significant exposure for the City.

For all of these reasons, we respectfully ask that the Property be removed from the Sites Inventory and that the existing General Plan and zoning classification be maintained. We are available to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Andrew K. Fogg.

Andrew K. Fogg

AKF

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Aram Chaparyan, City Manager
Mr. Danny Santana, Assistant City Manager
Ms. Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director
David Lanzer Esq., Rexford General Counsel

Attachment 1

**Chronology of Events Regarding
Proposed Redevelopment of Property**

- Seller Offering Memo dated April 2021
- Purchase Agreement signed 6/23/21 – for Rexford purchase of site from seller for industrial development
- Meeting with City 6/23/21 – City: Danny Santana, Director of Community Development (prior to promotion to Assistant City Manager) and Oscar Martinez, Planning Manager with Rexford: (Patrick Schlehuber, Steve Masura, Felix Vollrath, Daniel Murphy); Discussed proposed industrial/warehouse project; In summary, Danny Santana relayed the following information in regard to the proposed project, which he believed to be feasible given the subject's M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning with the following suggestions:
 - Building needs to be high image, with a large office component
 - Building loading must be protected from the street and neighboring residential by architectural features or landscaping
 - Parking requirements have been relaxed in the I-BP (Industrial Business Park) General Plan designation to encourage developments similar to this project
 - At a high level, they do not see any major issues related to the CC&Rs that would prevent our development plans
 - Exterior aesthetics will be a key feature they will look for in site-plan review
 - It was also discussed that the City's Downtown Torrance plan document refers to the subject site to be considered in a potential "Gateway Mixed Use District", and that since Rexford would be only developing the site for industrial use per the existing zoning that the City would not recommend including this site in any housing opportunity inventory.
- Close of Escrow 10/12/21
- Preliminary Site Plan Review application submittal to City 12/2/21 for new industrial development
- Preliminary Site Plan Review meeting held with City to review City comments 12/20/21; the City's comments included some minor recommended changes to the design and included fairly typical comments from the Public Works Department and Police Department, and there was reference to some standards from the CC&Rs.
- Meeting with City 1/24/22 – City: Danny Santana, Assistant City Manager; Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director; Oscar Martinez, Planning Manager; Fran

Mr. Gregg Lodan, Ms. Carolyn Chun & Mr. Kevin Joe
April 28, 2022
Page 5

Fulton, Economic Development Manager; Kevin Joe, Assistant Planner - Rexford (Patrick Schlehber , Steve Masura, Felix Vollrath, Daniel Murphy, Ben Martin, Erin Thrash, Bruce Herbkersman, Nicole Morse (Rexford's Land Use Consultant)); Discussed proposed project and Preliminary Site Plan submitted to City. Danny Santana and staff again generally indicated support of the project reiterating the comments from the 6/23/21 meeting.

- Full application for entitlements for Site Plan Review and CUP submittal to City 4/20/22 - the final plans submitted were modified to address the City's concerns for high quality design and architectural treatment, options in parking layouts to allow for tenant flexibility for additional office and/or manufacturing space, and maintaining existing large setbacks and mature trees.

088988\14868692v3

From: Manuela Tobias [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 2:03 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: CalMatters question: Housing Element

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Hi,

My name is Manuela Tobias, I'm a reporter writing about California housing for CalMatters. I'm based in Sacramento and mainly cover the Capitol. I'm working on a story about the Housing Element/RHNA and am surveying a few cities about their practices. Was wondering if you could help me answer a few questions about Torrance's process for a potential statewide story?

Did your city contract out preparation of the Housing Element?
Who is the contractor?
Who else bid for the job?

Thanks so much for your help.

Best,
Manuela

--
Manuela Tobias
Housing Reporter

CAL MATTERS

www.calmatters.org

[REDACTED]

Supplemental #2 to Agenda Item No. 8A

To: Members of the Planning Commission


From: Long Range Planning Division

Date: May 18, 2022

Subject: LUS21-00002, EAS21-00003

Additional correspondence was received after the staff report for this item was prepared and is attached herewith for your consideration.

Prepared by,



Kevin Joe, AICP
Planning Associate

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg Lodan, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachment:

1. Correspondence

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 3:22 PM
To: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Re: Housing Element #6

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.
Good Day Carolyn,

Thank you for taking the time and directing me to where my comments.

In the original letter I tried to point out that the actual population growth of Torrance is sufficiently less than the predicted growth rate as stated in Housing Element #6. The growth rate is the driving force behind Housing Element #6 to justify additional growth. The inaccuracy of Housing Element #6 population predicts should be taken in consideration when attempting to determine how many units should be constructed. Building 617 units a year to accommodate a population growth rate of 163 people per year does not compute. I agree with Chris Drieke that RHNA estimates are greatly overestimated.

From Original Email

The City of Torrance Population and Housing Growth from 1940-2030 Table H-2 predicted that the period of 2010 would see a 5% increase in growth and the period of 2020 would see a 7% increase in growth. The actual data for the from 2010-2020 was 0.07% not even close to the predicted 7%. Yet, the state is mandating through Housing Element #6 that 4939 households need to be constructed.

The TMW statement was very informative. In 2009 a bill SBx7-7 passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20% by 2020. TMW 2020 target was 142 GPCD and we achieved a potable water demand of 121 GPCD which was 15% less than required. While I think we still have more work to conserve the City of Torrance should take a lot of pride in hitting those types of numbers.

Torrance Municipal Water did a good job in their draft response in explaining where cities potable water supply will be coming from and time will tell.

Likewise, the Sewer System draft response showed that the department has used foresight and taken the necessary steps to make sure the system works flawlessly.

I agree with the analysis that the wet and dry public utilities and infrastructure are in place and available for housing opportunities. I just wonder how much you are going to change the original feel of Torrance by over building. To many households casing to few people.

Thank You
Mark Hansen

Is Dan Walker behind Housing Element #6?

On Tuesday, May 17, 2022, 11:28:27 AM PDT, Chun, Carolyn <cchun@torranceca.gov> wrote:

Hi Mark,

Your comments, in the Housing Element document, start on page 549 (page 29 of appendix G) here's the link. <https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/74100/637877125086170000>

ATTACHMENT 1

The Planning Commission meeting will be held Virtually on Wednesday, May 18.

Here's a link to the PC agenda with the Zoom and telephonic meeting info.

<https://www.torranceca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/74274/637880486226730000>

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW AND PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARING via Zoom at:
<https://zoom.us> or (720) 707-2699 and using the following credentials: Meeting ID: 899 6580 1969
Passcode: 873491

CAROLYN CHUN
Senior Planning Associate --Office of the Community Development Department

City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | 310 618 5869 | 310 618 5829 fax |
CChun@TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia |
www.TorranceCA.Gov/COVID19 |

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>
Subject: Housing Element #6

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Good Day Carolyn,

Could you please direct me to where my concerns about Housing Element #6 are recorded?

I checked the workshop and others meeting notes were individuals made comments and stated concerns, but I could not locate my points.

Is the Planning Commission meeting this coming week open to in person attendance?

Thank You

Mark Hansen

ADDITIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL

ADOPTION HEARING

June 14, 2022

Good Afternoon!

The City of Torrance is reaching out to you today due to your interest in the City's Housing Element Update. The Draft Housing Element has been posted on the City's Housing Element webpage at the following link:

<https://www.torranceca.gov/our-city/community-development/housing-element-update>

The Draft Housing Element Update will be reviewed by the City Council on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, Please see the notice below for more information.

Thank you
Gregg Lodan
Planning Manager



CITY OF TORRANCE
Community Development Department
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council appoints the day of **June 14, 2022** at the hour of **6:30 p.m.**, for a public hearing regarding **the Housing Element Update**: Conduct Public Hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002 and Adopt RESOLUTION Approving Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003) that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (310) 618-5880. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's office at (310) 618-2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title ii]

Direct questions or concerns to the City Council at (310) 618-2801, the City Manager at (310) 618-5880, or an individual department head prior to submission to the City Council. Parties will be notified if the complaint will be included on a subsequent agenda.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, the City Council and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means. **The Council Chamber is closed to the public in the interest of maintaining appropriate social**

distancing and in order to reduce the risk of spreading COVID-19. The public can view the meeting and participate in the meeting as outlined below.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW THE MEETING via CitiCABLE Channel 3 (Spectrum) and Channel 31 (Frontier), streaming online at www.TorranceCA.Gov, Facebook @ City of Torrance CA Government, and YouTube Channel TorranceCitiCABLE.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by email to CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email include the title of this item "HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE". All comments received by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2022 will be included as "Supplemental" on the City's website prior to the meeting. Comments received after 2:00 p.m., but prior to the end of the meeting, will be added to the record and will be available on the City webpage the following day.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE DURING THE HEARING by telephone at (310) 618-2404.

For further information, contact the COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at (310) 618-5990.

Published: June 3, 2022

**REBECCA POIRIER
CITY CLERK**



CITY OF TORRANCE
Community Development Department
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council appoints the day of **June 14, 2022** at the hour of **6:30 p.m.**, for a public hearing regarding **the Housing Element Update**: Conduct Public Hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002 and Adopt RESOLUTION Approving Housing Element Update for the 6th RHNA Cycle (2021-2029) and Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003) **that was prepared for the document, which determines that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts and that a Negative Declaration should be adopted. The City's General Plan Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community.**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (310) 618-5880. If you need a special hearing device to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's office at (310) 618-2870. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28CFR35.102-35.104 ADA Title ii]

Direct questions or concerns to the City Council at (310) 618-2801, the City Manager at (310) 618-5880, or an individual department head prior to submission to the City Council. Parties will be notified if the complaint will be included on a subsequent agenda.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, the City Council and staff will participate in this meeting via teleconference or other electronic means. **The Council Chamber is closed to the public in the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing and in order to reduce the risk of spreading COVID-19.** The public can view the meeting and participate in the meeting as outlined below.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY VIEW THE MEETING via CitiCABLE Channel 3 (Spectrum) and Channel 31 (Frontier), streaming online at www.TorranceCA.Gov, Facebook @ City of Torrance CA Government, and YouTube Channel TorranceCitiCABLE.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE BEFORE THE HEARING by email to CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.Gov and write "Public Comment" in the subject line. In the body of the email include the title of this item "HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE". All comments received by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 14, 2022 will be included as "Supplemental" on the City's website prior to the meeting. Comments received after 2:00 p.m., but prior to the end of the meeting, will be added to the record and will be available on the City webpage the following day.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE DURING THE HEARING by telephone at (310) 618-2404.

For further information, contact the COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING DIVISION of the Community Development Department at (310) 618-5990.

Published: **June 3, 2022**

**REBECCA POIRIER
CITY CLERK**

CAROLYN CHUN

Senior Planning Associate –Office of the Community Development Department
City of Torrance | 3031 Torrance Boulevard | Torrance CA 90503 | 310.618.5869 | 310.618.5829 Fax
| CChun@TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov | www.TorranceCA.Gov/SocialMedia | www.TorranceCA.Gov/COV1019 |

Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 3:39 PM

To: Council Meeting Public Comment <CouncilMeetingPublicComment@TorranceCA.gov>

Cc: Chun, Carolyn <CChun@TorranceCA.gov>; Lodan, Gregg <GLODAN@TorranceCA.gov>

Subject: Public Comment From Doug Maupin, Developer

WARNING: External e-mail

Please verify sender before opening attachments or clicking on links.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

To The Torrance City Council

Ms / Sirs I have been a developer in The South Bay and specifically in the City of Torrance for over 30 years.

I have, through many partnerships bought land, entitled land, and either built and or sold entitled projects to Public Development companies.

My projects have totaled over 800 residential units, built-in Torrance.

I'm happy the city is considering the changes to the General Plan and updating the Housing element.

In the past, the hardest impediments to a successful development have been the following.

1. The FAR
2. The parking ratios and Gust parking
- 3 The open space and how it's calculated

Another impediment to housing was the No Growth Era where almost 0 housing was allowed.

FAR R-3 Land was supposedly zone 1 unit per 1600 sq ft of land. But 1600 sq ft X .06 FAR = 960 sq ft of living area Not enough to be practical

So almost every r-3 development in the last 25 years was built to about a 65% density. Which Made these units VERY Expensive.

Parking The Zoning imposed 3 cars for a 3 bedroom unit + one guest for every 4 units Also Very expensive for the Builder and the eventual Home Buyer.

Open space was also a Hard Number to reach, as some had to be on Grade and directly accessible for each unit.

I With the Watt Companies built a 45 unit Senior housing development on Torrance Blvd and Amie next to 100 Unit condo we entitled
We had dozens and dozens of single people and young couples who wanted to buy. But we had to turn them down because they needed to be 55 years old to occupy what was designated senior housing.

Promote the density bonus now available for senior housing to allow non-age restricted projects to take place in the appropriate locations.

I believe you should eliminate the FAR to make it 1.5 to one in the R-3 zone and cut back parking to a max of 2 cars per unit and less for one-bedroom units Reduce open space requirements and increase height limits.

Il believe about 1000 seniors a year Graduate from Torrance High schools and when they return from college, get into other Careers, and try to move back to Torrance there are VERY FEW good options for them.

Fewer Rules More density are the Key success in creating the needed housing for this City,

Best Regards Doug Maupin

June 14, 2022

Dear City Council members,

We have been informed by the City's Community Development Department that Torrance's Housing Element is in the process of being updated.

As long-time stake holders in the City of Torrance, we welcome the opportunity to participate in this discussion by providing feedback that will assist future development in addressing the City's long term housing needs.

We (Old Town Redlands, LLC) purchased a property at 20505-20555 Hawthorne Blvd in 2008. Two years later we acquired an adjoining parcel of vacant land. The combined site is approximately 4 1/2 acres in size and is located on the South-West corner of Hawthorne Blvd. & Spencer Avenue. The property has the "Promenade" designation in the Hawthorne Blvd Corridor Specific Plan. Other than the car wash and a small sales office for Hertz, the site is undeveloped.

Our objective when we purchased these properties was to wait for the long-term leases to expire which would then allow us the opportunity to develop a new project on this rather large (and essentially undeveloped) property located in the Hawthorne Blvd. corridor. That opportunity will finally present itself in approximately 2 years' time.

As you are considering changes to the existing zoning, we would like to share with you how the changes proposed in the draft Housing Element compare to other properties we own in the region, specifically, as it relates to residential development. We believe you will find this very informative.

The manner in which the draft Housing Element has been crafted essentially dictates density based on the permissible FAR, which (in this case) currently stands at 0.6. The proposed changes would bump the FAR to 1.0 - provided the new development had a mixed-use component. While this is a welcome and much needed boost to the FAR, it falls woefully short of what would be required to make a residential development financially feasible on this property.

To put this into context, if the proposed 1.0 FAR is adopted (as currently proposed in the draft Housing Element), that would translate to a residential project with a maximum density of approximately 105 residential units.

By way of comparison, we also own a 14,000 sq ft commercial property on Melrose Ave., in the City of Los Angeles. Current zoning would permit a 53-unit apartment project on that parcel. If the Torrance site had the same zoning, that would enable us to bring 742 residential units to the community.

While we understand that level of density may not be the best fit for Torrance, we thought it helpful to illustrate just how constraining the proposed zoning is towards any meaningful redevelopment. To get to the point, we strongly believe a compromise somewhere in-between the two zoning densities described above, would be required to have any consequential impact in addressing Torrance's housing needs.

We therefore would like to suggest that the City considers allowing greater density of housing in larger projects along the Hawthorne corridor, as this area has excellent transport hubs and a residential component would be a great addition to the commercial activities along the Boulevard. Not to do so would be short sighted, and squandering what we should all agree, is a very limited resource.

Further, this would give the city of Torrance an opportunity to provide new market rate, moderate & low-income housing and address the state requirements for these product types.


We are available to discuss this further and would be happy to provide some preliminary conceptual ideas to illustrate how the density can be designed to accommodate the City's housing goals, whilst maintaining the character that is Torrance.

Regards,


John Rohan
Manager
Old Town Redlands, LLC



Keith Hagaman
Manager
Old Town Redlands, LLC

City of Torrance

6th Cycle Housing
Element Update

City Council

Tuesday, June 14, 2022
6:30 p.m.

The Team

City Staff

Michelle Ramirez, Community Development Director

Gregg Lodan, Planning Manager

Carolyn Chun, Senior Planning Associate

Kevin Joe, Planning Associate



CityPlace Planning, Inc.

Claudia Tedford, Principal

Patricia Bluman, Senior Associate



Veronica Tam and Associates, Inc.

Veronica Tam, Principal



Summit Environmental Group, Inc.

Leslea Meyerhoff, Principal



What is the Housing Element?

- One of 7 mandated elements of the General Plan
- Subject to detailed State statutory requirements rather than guidelines—most regulated element of the General Plan
- Must be updated every 8 years per State law
- Reviewed for compliance by State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)



What is the Housing Element?

- Plan for each jurisdiction to meet its share of regional housing needs (Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA), as determined by State law
- **Provides an assessment of each jurisdiction's** housing needs and how best to accommodate them
- **Jurisdictions “plan for” housing so that developers** can build projects consistent the General Plan, zoning ordinance, and other plans and programs



Housing Element Requirements

- Demonstrate that each jurisdiction can accommodate its RHNA as mandated by State law
- Facilitate increased housing production to meet demand
- Improve safety, quality, and condition of existing housing
- Facilitate development of housing for all income levels and household types
- Promote fair housing choice for all (AFFH)



Contents of Housing Element

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Community Profile
- Section 3: Housing Constraints
- Section 4: Housing Opportunities & Resources
- Section 5: Housing Plan
- Appendices



RHNA for 6th Cycle

State (HCD):
Assesses total
number of
housing units
needed
statewide;
assigns each
region their
share

SCAG Region:
1,341,827 units

SCAG then
allocates units to
each jurisdiction
in the region

Los Angeles
County:
813,082 units

City of
Torrance:
4,939 units

Torrance Required RHNA by Income Category

Income Category	% of Area Median Income (AMI) ¹	Income Range	6 th Cycle RHNA ² (2021-2029)	
			# of Units	% of Total
Very Low ³	Up to 50%	Up to \$38,650	1,621	33%
Low	51 - 80%	\$38,651 - \$61,840	846	17%
Moderate	81 – 120%	\$61,841 - \$92,760	853	17%
Above Moderate	Above 120%	Above \$92,760	1,619	33%
Total:			4,939	100%

¹AMI = Area Median Income, based on the HCD 2020 State income limits for Los Angeles County: \$77,300 for a 4-person household

²SCAG Final RHNA Allocation Plan (adopted by SCAG Regional Council on March 4, 2021)

³Includes “Extremely Low,” which is up to 30% of AMI

Requirements to Accommodate RHNA

- Sites Inventory – each jurisdiction must identify available vacant and underutilized properties to accommodate RHNA for each income category
- **“No Net Loss” Law** – Requires sufficient adequate sites to be available at all times throughout entire RHNA planning period
- Fair Housing Requirements – Sites feasible for affordable units must distributed throughout City and **must be located in “high resource” areas**



Approach to Accommodate RHNA

- Meet community needs and reflect public input
- Minimize impact on existing neighborhoods to the extent feasible
- Identify locations along/near major transportation corridors that are near services, employment, transit/bicycle facilities, and parks and recreation
- Identify non-residential areas and corridors that could benefit from opportunities for revitalization via housing



Strategy to Accommodate RHNA

1. Start with leftover vacant/underutilized sites from 5th Cycle Housing Element that still meet new criteria
2. Identify entitled **and “pipeline” projects**
3. Estimate potential accessory dwelling units (ADUs) based on recent trends and incentives (2018, 2019, & 2020)



Strategy to Accommodate RHNA

4. Identify additional opportunities, such as:
 - A. Housing Corridor Study (underway)
 - B. Downtown Revitalization & Connectivity Plan
 - C. Facilitate housing on religious institution properties (builds on AB 1851 for affordable housing or other housing)
 - D. Other Sites / Corridors / Areas



Adequacy of Sites to Meet RHNA by Income Category

Income	RHNA		Entitled/ Pending Permits	Pipeline Projects	ADUs	Sites Inventory Capacity	Total	% Surplus
Very Low ¹ (<50% AMI)	1,621	2,467	---	28	288	3,094 ^{2,3}	3,410 ²	38.2%
Low (51-80% AMI)	846							
Moderate (81%-120% AMI)	853		---	---	29	1,210 ⁴	1,239	45.3%
Above Moderate (>120% AMI)	1,619		195	401	163	2,167 ²	2,926 ²	80.7%
Total	4,939		195	429	480	6,471	7,575	53.4%

¹ Includes Extremely Low and Very Low.

² Mixed Income is assumed at 80% above moderate income and 20% lower income; the mixed income total has been divided among and added to their respective above-moderate & lower income categories.

³ 32.2% of lower-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

⁴ Approximately 45% of moderate-income RHNA is provided by the Sites Inventory

Process to Date

- 3 Planning Commission Workshops
(April 28, 2020, July 28, 2021, & October 20, 2021)
- 1st Submittal to HCD October 15, 2021 (Housing Element dated October 1, 2021)
- HCD Response December 14, 2021
- Revised Housing Element for 2nd submittal to HCD; made it available to public on April 11, 2022



Key Changes for 2nd Submittal

- Expanded population and housing data and evaluation of housing needs
- Updated housing constraints and clarified processing and permit procedures
- Updated list of entitled and pipeline projects
- Revised estimated number of ADUs per input from HCD
- Expanded discussion of Sites inventory, including rationale for sites and realistic capacity assumptions



Key Changes for 2nd Submittal

- Revised Sites Inventory to delete certain sites and add new sites based on public interest and identification of additional opportunities
- Provided additional information regarding actions to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) and expanded evaluation of AFFH data
- Expanded list of objectives/actions to implement programs in Housing Plan



Process to Date, continued

- Revised the April 11, 2022 version of draft Housing Element; made it available to public on May 9, 2022
- Planning Commission considered and made recommendation for City Council to adopt 6th Cycle Housing Element at public hearing on May 17, 2022
- 2nd Submittal made to HCD on May 18, 2022



California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Environmental compliance to support Housing Element Update
- Not a project-specific or construction-level CEQA review
- Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared by City
- 30-Day public review conducted Nov. 1 – Nov. 30, 2021



California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- Finding that adoption of 6th Cycle Housing Element would not create significant impacts
- Additional CEQA for future proposed construction projects



Next Steps

- HCD responds to 2nd Submittal mid-July
- Resolution authorizes the City Manager to make minor revisions to address HCD comments for certification



Recommendation of Community Development Director and Planning Commission:

1. Conduct a public hearing on Land Use Study 21-00002; and
2. Adopt a RESOLUTION to approve the Housing Element Update for the 6th Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) Cycle (2021-2029); and
3. Adopt a Negative Declaration (EAS21-00003); and
4. Authorize the City Manager to make iterative changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element in response to comments from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, if any comments are received.

**APPENDIX B:
REVIEW OF PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

DRAFT

APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Government Code Section 65588(a) requires each jurisdiction to review its Housing Element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate:

- The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal;
- The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community’s housing goals and objectives; and
- The progress of the city, county or city and county in implementation of the housing element.

This section documents the City’s achievements under the 2013-2021 (5th Cycle) Housing Element with respect to the actions and objectives contained therein. This section describes the relative success of the City’s efforts to implement the 5th Cycle programs, and contains recommendations for program retention, revision, deletion or addition to address current and projected needs and state requirements for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Table B-1 summarizes the City’s progress regarding the 5th Cycle RHNA for new construction, rehabilitation, and conservation/preservation. Table B-2 provides a review of the Program accomplishments for the 5th Cycle Housing Element.

Table B-1: Objectives and Accomplishments

Income Category	RHNA Objective	New Construction		Rehabilitation		Conservation/Preservation	
		Objective	Accomplishment	Objective	Accomplishment	Objective	Accomplishment
Extremely Low	190	190	0	262	43	28	0
Very Low	190	190	0		31	29	0
Low	227	227	0	263	106	57	0
Moderate	243	243	5	--	--	--	--
Above Moderate	600	600	229 297	--	--	--	--
Total	1,450	1,450	234302	525	180	114	0

B.1 EFFECTIVENESS IN ADDRESSING SPECIAL NEEDS

The City of Torrance continues to provide technical assistance and information to both housing developers that serve populations with special needs, as well as individuals and households within those populations. The City provides financial assistance via various rental assistance programs, and also distributes information about available funding via its website and public counter.

The City also adopted an emergency shelter ordinance in 2013, to bring its zoning code into compliance with state law. ~~The City approved its first temporary emergency shelter in June 2021. A location near Torrance City Hall was selected for the 40-unit tiny home community.~~ This ordinance permitted in the M-2 Heavy Manufacturing Zone. In June of 2021, the City approved the first homeless

shelter of its own, a temporary community of 40 tiny homes to be placed in the parking lot to the rear of the Torrance Superior Courthouse. At the January 25, 2022, City Council meeting, the City awarded a product and services agreement to Pallet SPC for the purchase and assembly of the temporary housing units and accessory units. The City plans to continue to search for a site within the M-2 zone where the use is allowed, should such a site become available.

The City also has a Homeless Plan, which was made available on the City’s website in July 2021. As the City’s initial homeless response guiding document, it outlines several approaches that can be developed and achieved over the next three years, with regular check points to evaluate effectiveness.

DRAFT

Table B-2: Review of Past Program Accomplishments

Goal and Associated Programs	Accomplishments
Providing New Housing Opportunities	
Program 1: Adequate Sites	<p>Continue to provide appropriate land use designations and maintain an inventory of suitable sites for residential development. Provide technical assistance and information on available City-owned parcels for lower-income developments housing providers. Encourage and facilitate lot consolidation, and as funding permits, use lot consolidation incentives to help achieve full use of limited land resources. Promote larger residential developments that can facilitate a wide range of housing types and affordability levels.</p> <p>Ongoing: The City implements the Land Use Element of General Plan & maintains an inventory of sites available for higher density and mixed-use development. An inventory of vacant residential land is available. The City also works with developers on lot consolidation and parcel assembly to facilitate residential development.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Housing to Meet the Needs of All Income Levels	
Program 2: Mixed Use Development	<p>Continue to allow residential development either as a component of a mixed-use development or as a separate development in appropriate areas.</p> <p>Ongoing: The City continues to encourage multi-family residential units as part of mixed-use development where appropriate. Several mixed-use developments have been approved within Torrance during the 5th Cycle.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. New mixed-use overlays and other revisions to facilitate mixed-use are proposed.</p>
Program 3: Affordable Housing Development	<p>Continue to provide regulatory incentives to private developers to increase the supply of affordable housing, including reduced parking where feasible and appropriate. Offer local non-profit developers and agencies technical assistance and information on City funding sources, incentives, and development opportunities. Facilitate rental projects for lower-income renters, seniors, and persons with disabilities.</p> <p>Ongoing: The City will continue to provide technical assistance and information to developers. The City has approved developments for senior housing during the 5th Cycle.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued and updated in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. Development standards are proposed to be revised and land use designations and revisions to the Zoning Code and Map are proposed to facilitate the accommodation of the City's RHNA.</p>
Program 4: Rental Assistance Programs	<p>Support efforts to maintain, and possibly to increase, the current number of Housing Choice Vouchers, and direct eligible households to the program by providing information and referrals to landlords regarding participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Continue to provide rental assistance to senior as feasible.</p> <p>Ongoing: The City provided assistance to 600 households and distributed 100% of rental assistance funds during 2021. Provided rental assistance to 10 veterans through HUD's VASH voucher program and applied for 10 additional vouchers. City secured 33 emergency housing vouchers, targeted to those experiencing or at-risk for homelessness. City provides pamphlets at public counter for first-time home</p>

		<p>buyers. City also has a dedicated webpage regarding its Section 8 Rental Housing Program.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Removal of Government Constraints		
Program 5: Land Use Code Housing Types	Update land use code to accurately reflect residential uses that are permitted & conditionally permitted in all zones.	<p>Ongoing: This program was proposed to be conducted as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update. Due to budgetary constraints, the comprehensive Zoning Code update has been postponed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. If the comprehensive Zoning Code update is not able to be funded during the 6th Cycle, the City will prepare a focused update to implement this program.</p>
Program 6: Extremely Low Income and Special Needs Housing	Amend the Land Use Code to facilitate housing opportunities for extremely low-income persons by addressing provisions for transitional housing, supportive housing, SRO housing, and emergency shelters. Evaluate provisions regarding development of residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development.	<p>Ongoing: The City adopted an emergency shelter ordinance in 2013. City's first temporary emergency shelter was approved in June 2021. Construction is expected in early 2022.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element to adopt ordinances for transitional housing, supportive housing, and SRO housing, and to implement provisions residential care facilities and licensed and unlicensed group homes in the City to ensure that specific conditions and restrictions do not unduly constrain development.</p>
Program 7: Water and Sewer Service Providers	Deliver the Torrance Housing Element to all providers of sewer and water service within the City of Torrance.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element in compliance with state law.</p>
Program 8: Multi-Family Provisions	Identify modifications to development standards and permit requirements to remove constraints on multi-family development.	<p>Ongoing: This program was proposed to be conducted as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update. Due to budgetary constraints, the comprehensive Zoning Code update has been postponed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element. If the comprehensive Zoning Code update is not able to be funded during the 6th</p>

		Cycle, the City will prepare a focused update to implement this program.
Conserve, Preserve, and Improve the Housing Stock		
Program 9: Home Rehabilitation and Improvement Programs	Provide low or no interest loans to qualified households to rehabilitate housing units and home repairs for senior & disabled residents.	<p>Ongoing: The City will continue to administer these programs as funding allows.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Program 10: Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing	Preserve affordable units at risk of converting to market rents by consulting annually with property owners of affordable housing, offering technical assistance to affordable housing owners with at-risk units and contacting qualified entities to inform them of opportunities to acquire and continue affordability of at-risk units.	<p>Ongoing: The City continues to consult with the property owners of these at-risk units to gauge the likelihood of conversion & seek to find a qualified entity to acquire properties to maintain affordability. None of the affordable rental units are considered at-risk for the period between 2021 and 2031.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>
Promote Equal Housing Opportunity		
Program 11: Reasonable Accommodation	Create a process for making requests for reasonable accommodation and provide information to residents on reasonable accommodation procedures via public counters and the City website.	<p>Ongoing: The City has adopted a procedure to allow requests for reasonable accommodations using a simple form available at the public counter or by request. Requests for reasonable accommodations may not be appealed by residents of adjacent properties.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: During the 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City will adopt an ordinance in the Zoning Code to formalize the City's existing procedure.</p>
Program 12: Land Use Code Definitions	Revise the definition of family to be flexible for a variety of household types consistent with State and Federal Law.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program is completed and is no longer necessary to be continued.</p>
Program 13: Enforce Fair Housing Laws	Educate and promote fair housing protections to participants of the rental assistance program.	<p>Ongoing: The City will continue to enforce and abide by fair housing laws, increase awareness of fair housing protections & provide assistance to victims of housing discrimination.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be continued in the 6th Cycle Housing Element.</p>

APPENDIX C
Table C-1—SITES INVENTORY
3RD Submittal

CRITERIA LEGEND (Please see Section 4.1.2.4 for details)

1. **Developer or property owner interest to develop/redevelop the site.** Properties with expressed interest in development are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.
2. **Vacant lot, parking lot, or open storage that includes only minor existing improvements on site.** Vacant properties, parking lots, or those with limited improvements are assumed not to have impediments to development. No further criteria are necessary.
3. **Sites that meet a minimum of 2 of the following criteria:**
 - a. Site is included in the Housing Corridor Study
 - b. City-owned site
 - c. Land value is greater than improvement value (LV>IV), when adjusted for current assessment values
 - d. Structure was built before 1992 (and therefore over 30 years old)
 - e. Site is in disrepair and/or has had ongoing Code violations
 - f. Presence of low-intensity or low-value uses, such as small structures surrounded by large parking lots
 - g. If residential, the site can accommodate an increase in the number of dwelling units (based on allowable or proposed density)
 - h. Identified for new Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ)
 - i. There is or has been an ongoing presence of vacancies

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situation Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria	
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning								Criteria per Criteria Legend	Additional Information/Comments
Apple Avenue	7	7359-016-005	2401 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.20	23.25	1	yes		SFR 3 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	17	7359-016-002	2409 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	54	7359-015-011	2623 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.11	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	80	7359-016-006	2325 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.20	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	108	7359-015-010	2617 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	132	7359-015-005	2611 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.18	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	235	7359-016-004	2103 Lincoln Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	301	7359-016-001	2405 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Apple Avenue	402	7359-016-003	2413 Apple Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	yes	LV<IV; new construction, little chance of build-out to allowable density	---	---	---
Crenshaw MU-1	450	7371-009-051	23804 Crenshaw Blvd	C-GEN	C-5	C-GEN	C-5 (R/MU-OZMU Overlay)	Lower	0.88	33	29	no		Commercial building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Crenshaw MU-1	451	7374-006-037	23900 Crenshaw Blvd	C-GEN	C-5	C-GEN	C-5 (R/MU-OZMU Overlay)	LowerModerate	0.40	33	13	no	Lot size	Commercial building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential Site is directly north of a new residential development in the City of Lomita being constructed on property formerly zoned and used for light industrial and general commercial
Crenshaw RP	8	7370-007-032	22930 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Crenshaw RP	11	7370-020-022	23210 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	21	7370-007-062	22910 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	58	7370-020-058	23150 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.21	33	6	no		Medical office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	62	7370-006-050	22850 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	152	7370-006-051	22700 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	194	7371-001-011	23314 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.23	33	7	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	276	7370-019-053	23000 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	278	7370-007-061	22920 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office building (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	344	7370-020-059	23110 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.34	33	11	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	397	7370-019-020	23026 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Lower	0.55	33	18	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	412	7370-020-021	23224 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	422	7370-007-060	22924 Crenshaw Blvd.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office building (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	444	7371-005-100	2480 236th St	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	445	7371-005-099	2481 236th Pl	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	446	7371-006-108	2480 236th Pl	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	447	7371-006-107	23632 Crenshaw Blvd	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.12	33	3	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	448	7371-008-045	23730 Crenshaw Blvd	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no		Office in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Crenshaw RP	449	7371-008-072	2481 238th St	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.13	33	4	no		Hair studio in converted SFR unit	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Downtown	37	7355-022-903	Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.14	36	5	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2, 3.b., 3.c.	City-owned parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	43	7355-022-902	Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.16	36	5	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2, 3.b., 3.c.	City-owned parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Downtown	165	7355-027-144	1256 Sartori Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.35	36	12	yes	Lot size	Parking lot	2, 3.c.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	175	7355-024-047	1610 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Above ModerateMode rate	0.33	36	11	yes		Commercial/L-I building - unoccupied, and parking area	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	211	7355-024-021	1614 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.09	36	3	yes	Lot size	Small commercial bldg. 1/2 unoccupied	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	244	7355-022-017	1529 Cravens Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.29	36	10	yes	Lot size	Small commercial office/parking area	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	295	7355-024-026	1424 Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.10	36	3	yes	Lot size	Small commercial/office building	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	393	7355-024-025	1430 Marcelina Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.29	36	10	yes	Lot size	Large parking lot	3.c., 3.d.	Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	406	7355-026-900	Post Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.21	36	7	yes	Lot size	City-owned parking lot	2, 3.b., 3.d.	City-owned parking lot Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	425	7355-026-016	1324 Post Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	LowerModerate	0.32	36	11	yes	Lot size	Parking lot	2, 3.b., 3.d.	Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	465	7355-023-030	1925 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.27	36	7	no		Restaurant	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	466	7355-023-031	1951 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.14	36	5	no		Dance studio	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	467	7355-023-029	1931 CARSON ST	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.25	36	9	no		surface parking lot	1, 2, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	468	7355-023-027	S. OF GRAMERCY AVE/CRAVENS AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.14	36	5	no		surface parking	1, 2, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Downtown Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	469	7355-028-014	1831 213TH st	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.21	36	7	no		Car wash	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Car wash; adjacent to parcel owned by same owner (Site 470); directly south of residential condo development
Downtown	470	7355-028-008	N of CORNER OF 213 TH/BORDER	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.11	36	3	no		Car wash	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Car wash; adjacent to parcel owned by same owner (Site 446); directly south of residential condo development
Downtown	472	7355-024-009	1639 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.12	36	4	no		Commercial on ground floor and hotel on upper floors	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	473	7355-003-015	1646 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.2	36	6	no		Mixed use/commercial ground floor; hotel on upper floor	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	474	7355-003-016	1644 CABRILLO AVE	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no		Parking	1, 2, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Parking lot. Revitalization Plan identifies need for housing
Downtown	499	7355-027-91	1956 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DRP	Lower	0.06	36	2	no		City-owned parking lot		Even though this site is less than ½ acre, the City is in discussion with an affordable housing developer to construct up to 20 affordable units on this site.
Flag Lots	85	7374-009-041	2354 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.27	6.8	0	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	240	7371-027-049	2265 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.45	6.8	2	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	271	7374-009-040	2356 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.30	6.8	1	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	289	7374-009-096	2332 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.27	6.8	0	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situation Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5 th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Flag Lots	357	7374-009-101	2322 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.33	6.8	1	no		SFR	3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Flag Lots	415	7371-027-038	2279 239th St.	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above Moderate	0.45	6.8	2	no		SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Potential flag lot subdivision like others in area
Gramercy Avenue	44	7357-005-010	2439 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	66	7357-012-023	2404 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	124	7357-005-008	2431 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	130	7357-005-011	2443 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.23	23.25	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	143	7357-012-016	2432 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	1	yes		SFR 2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	188	7357-012-022	2408 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	207	7357-012-017	2428 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	315	7357-012-014	2440 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.27	23.25	5	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	386	7357-012-021	2412 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	408	7357-005-009	2435 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.11	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Gramercy Avenue	433	7357-012-015	2436 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Moderate	0.15	23.25	1	yes		SFR 2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
HBCSP	6	4085-015-049	4234 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Moderate	0.33	33	8	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	10	7534-012-018	3760 242nd St.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	29	7534-020-028	24474 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	31	7534-012-013	24211 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	46	7534-013-017	24218 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	51	7534-013-020	24212 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial - Waleria Liquor (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	56	7534-019-012	24418 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.24	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	57	7534-013-025	24222 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	73	7534-014-029	24238 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.13	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.*	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	76	4085-015-050	4232 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Moderate	0.33	33	8	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	89	7378-003-121	3655 Lomita Blvd	C-GEN	H-MP	C-GEN	H-MP	Lower	2.45	33	60	yes		Office Building	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	109	7534-014-021	24242 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	113	7534-013-012	24230 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	118	7534-020-018	24454 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	119	7534-012-002	24245 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-Gen	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.29	33	7	no		Commercial (1- & 2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	126	7534-012-033	24217 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	145	4085-015-039	4240 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	0.65	33	16	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HBCSP	148	7534-019-016	24430 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.20	33	4	no		Commercial office (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	153	7534-019-015	24428 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	174	4085-015-044	4310 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	0.98	33	24	no		Commercial (1-story) (1963)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	187	7534-021-001	24401 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.31	33	7	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	206	7534-012-012	24213 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	208	7368-001-015	22501 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2	Mixed	3.82	36	137	no	Pipeline Project		3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	210	7534-014-019	24250 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	218	7534-021-038	24449 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	2	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit) (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	225	7534-019-013	24424 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	0	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	232	7534-021-016	24423 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story front & 2-story rear) Vacant building and parking lot	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	242	7366-019-183	S/W Corner-Fashion Way/Madrona	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	6.64	36	238 (190 above/48 lower)	no			1., 2., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	266	7534-012-034	24413 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.09	33	1	no	Entitled project		2	
HBCSP	274	7534-012-035	No Address (Parking Lot)	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.11	33	2	no		Parking lot	2, 3.d.	Identified trend in WT for MU
HBCSP	279	7352-001-002	19040 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	1.73	33	42	no		Auto service use	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	282	7534-014-033	24262 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.44	33	10	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	283	7534-012-019	3768 242nd St.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	287	7534-020-016	24448 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	291	7534-013-028	24214 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story) (1984)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	292	4085-015-048	17490 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	5.92	33	146	no		Commercial shopping center	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	294	7534-020-027	24460 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no		Commercial 1- and 2-story	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	296	7534-013-024	24222 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Parking lot	2, 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	302	7534-012-009	24221 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	309	7534-019-014	No Address (Parking Lot)	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	0	no		Mixed use (commercial + 1 unit (1-story)	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	316	7534-013-027	24216 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (2-story) (1962)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	322	7534-013-026	24202 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.25	33	6	no		Commercial - Hawthorne Market (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	323	7534-014-020	24244 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	333	7534-021-019	24411 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5 th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HBCSP	338	7366-019-182	21515 Madrona Ave	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	7.32	36	263 (210 above/53 lower)	no		Parking lot @ Del Amo Mall	1., 2., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	340	7534-012-034	24207 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	354	7534-012-043	24239 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Lower	0.65	33	16	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	356	7534-020-017	24450 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	372	7534-013-023	24226 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.17	33	4	no		Commercial (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	373	7534-019-021	24400 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Lower	0.59	33	14	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	374	7534-013-011	24232 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.07	33	1	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	378	7534-012-017	24203 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	2	no		Commercial hair salon (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	382	7534-012-016	24205 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.08	33	1	no		Commercial hair salon (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	392	7534-021-017	24421 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.14	33	1	no		Mixed use (Commercial plus 2 units) (2-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	411	7534-020-011	Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.20	33	4	no		Parking lot for adjacent office building	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	413	7534-021-042	24415 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	419	4085-015-043	4212 Artesia Blvd.	C-GEN	H-NT	C-GEN	H-NT	Lower	1.00	33	24	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce setback an incentive for MU
HBCSP	423	7534-020-025	3735 Newton St./Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	435	7366-019-133	22100 Hawthorne Blvd.	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed	21.11	36	760	no		Sears property	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	452	7524-008-028	20555 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	3.53	33 (26 above/7 lower)	87	no		Car rental (Hertz)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	453	7524-020-048	Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.25	33	6	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	454	7524-020-047	20617 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.20	33	4	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	455	7524-020-025	20625 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.23	33	5	no		Car rental (Enterprise)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	456	7524-020-024	20627 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.34	33	8	no		Body shop	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for and existing interest for MU in the PR District Lack of site amenities. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	457	7524-020-023	20703 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.34	33	8	no		Auto collision	3.c., 3.d.	Lack of site amenities. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	458	7524-020-022	20705 Hawthorne Blvd	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	MixedModerate	0.48	33	11	no		Industrially assessed use, minimal improvements	3.c., 3.d.	Poor site condition, underutilized. Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5 th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HBCSP	462	7368-021-043	3735 Newton St./Hawthorne Blvd.	C-GEN	H-WT	C-GEN	H-WT	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	4.48	33	110 (88 above/22 lower)	no		Commercial (1-story)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for MU in WT District
HBCSP	463	7378-009-072	3825 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	H-P/PCH	C-GEN	H-P/PCH	Moderate	0.72	33	17	no		Vacant lot	1., 2., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Vacant. Program to add MU to H-P/PCH an incentive
HBCSP	477	7524-014-110	3475 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2	Lower	1.23	36	33	no		Office building	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	482	7524-010-021	3730 SPENCER ST	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.46	33	11	no		Vacant auto repair	1., 3.c., 3.d., 3.f.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district
HBCSP	483	7524-010-023	20502 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Moderate	0.21	33	5	no		Commercial (CA Home Fitness)	3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	484	7524-010-020	20522 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	0.61	33	15	no		Commercial (Budget Car Rental)	3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district
HBCSP	489	7366-019-101	3610 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Lower	4.03	36	108	no		Retail building	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HBCSP	490	7524-014-117	3535 TORRANCE BLVD	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTR	H-DA2	Lower	1.14	33	28	no		Commercial center	3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	491	7366-019-123	3405 CARSON ST	C-CTR	H-DA1	C-CTR	H-DA1	Mixed (assumes 85% above-moderate/20% lower-income)	1.92	36	51 (41 above/10 lower)	no		Restaurant	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in Del Amo districts
HBCSP	493	7524-015-081	20901 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Above Moderate	1.48	33	36	no		Commercial-retail	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Identified trend for & existing interest for housing in PR district
HBCSP	494	7524-015-082	20821 HAWTHORNE BLVD	C-GEN	H-PR	C-GEN	H-PR	Lower	0.88	33	21	no		Commercial-medical	1., 3.c., 3.d.	Program to reduce development standards an incentive for MU
HCS Border	1	7357-022-027	2034 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23-25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	9	7357-024-006	1741 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	13	7357-022-011	2121 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	19	7355-029-018	1511 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	20	7357-021-014	2224 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.19	23-25	1	no	Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	22	7357-023-021	1806 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.19	23-25	4	no	Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Border	24	7357-022-005	2023 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	30	7357-023-018	1820 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Existing apartment building; limited net new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	32	7357-023-025	1914 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Net negative number of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	34	7357-022-024	2028 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Net negative number of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	35	7357-022-020	2012 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	3	no	Added new overlay zone	parking lot for religious institution	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	36	7355-029-901	1316 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned building	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	39	7357-023-020	1810 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	-1	no	Net negative number of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	41	7355-029-027	1420 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	49	7357-023-008	1913 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	52	7357-024-008	Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot for industrial building	1, 2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	53	7357-024-004	1731 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	60	7355-029-013	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.11	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	surface parking for auto paint and body shop	2., 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	61	7355-030-021	1612 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	65	7355-029-012	1415 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.12	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	67	7357-023-007	1907 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.32	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	70	7357-022-021	2006 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.35	23.25	8	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	71	7357-023-005	1823 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial+1 du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	72	7357-022-028	2020 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	82	7357-023-010	1923 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing+ 1du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	83	7357-023-002	1809 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	86	7355-030-006	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	3.a., 3.c., 3.i.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	87	7355-029-038	1503 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.35	36	12	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	91	7357-023-015	1904 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	92	7357-022-026	2032 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	95	7357-022-002	1800 220th St	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	96	7357-021-017	2208 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	0	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	98	7357-021-021	1865 Plaza Del Amo	R-OF	R3	R-OF	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.52	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situation Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Border	99	7357-022-012	2118 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	0	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	101	7357-022-001	SW Corner Of W220th/Border	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Added new overlay zone	vacant land	2, 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	104	7357-024-023	1870 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.64	36	22	no	Added new overlay zone	shopping center	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	105	7355-030-005	1619 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking/outdoor storage	2, 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	107	7357-022-000002		R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.10	23.25	2	no	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	111	7355-030-015	1646 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	mixed-use commercial, hotel above	1, 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	114	7357-022-009	2113 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	116	7357-022-003	2013 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR-1 du	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	117	7357-022-008	2107 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	120	7357-023-001	1801 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	122	7357-021-026	2218 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	125	7355-030-003	1611 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	128	7357-023-026	1916 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	129	7355-030-012	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land	2, 3.a., 3.c.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	133	7357-022-004	2019 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
HCS Border	135	7357-022-030	2020 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	141	7357-021-027	2220 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	147	7355-029-019	1513 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	149	7355-029-044	1408 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.32	36	11	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-auto service	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	150	7355-029-041	1424 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	158	7357-022-007	2029 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	160	7357-023-028	1918 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 3-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	161	7357-023-017	1824 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	163	7355-030-022	1610 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	166	7357-023-006	1829 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	168	7355-030-007	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2, 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	172	7357-022-031	2020 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Border	173	7357-021-023	2305 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.48	33	15	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	176	7357-021-024	2326 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.91	23.25	20	no	Added new overlay zone	Masonic Temple	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	181	7357-023-CONDO02		R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.10	23.25	2	no	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	189	7357-021-029	2212 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 6-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	190	7357-022-010	2117 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	192	7357-024-009	1870 218th St	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.22	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR-2 units	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	196	7357-024-013	1742 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.14	23.25	0	no	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	203	7355-029-042	1518 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.37	36	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	205	7357-024-024	1724 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.43	23.25	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Motel	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	209	7357-024-012	1746 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	219	7357-023-023	1910 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	220	7357-022-012	2122 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.19	23.25	3	no	Part of 4-unit condo	---	---	---
HCS Border	221	7355-030-008	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	230	7357-021-CONDO01		R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.21	23.25	4	no	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	233	7355-030-010	1635 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	234	7355-029-020	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	245	7355-029-039	1328 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.23	36	8	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	247	7357-021-012	2308 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.32	23.25	-8	no	15-unit apartment building—net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	248	7357-024-022	1880 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.44	36	15	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	250	7355-029-023	1508 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	-1	no	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	257	7357-023-011	1924 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	258	7355-029-900	1312 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	2. 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	259	7357-024-007	1745 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	260	7357-021-901	2223 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	City-owned water tank	---	---	---
HCS Border	262	7357-021-900	2223 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	City-owned water tank	---	---	---
HCS Border	264	7357-021-028	2222 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-1	no	Net loss of units	---	---	---

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5 th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Border	268	7357-024-014	1734 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.14	23-25	1	ne	LV>IV (reassessed in 2020)	---	---	---
HCS Border	269	7357-021-010	2323 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.28	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	1. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	281	7355-029-902	1320 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.08	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	2. 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	293	7355-029-003	1405 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.13	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	299	7355-030-009	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	300	7357-023-003	1813 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	304	7355-030-905	Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	TBD	Moderate	0.84	36	-14	ne	Affordable MU project developed during 5 th cycle	---	---	---
HCS Border	307	7357-021-030	2214 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23-25	-1	ne	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	310	7357-022-CONDO01		R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.11	23-25	2	ne	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	312	7355-030-004	1617 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	313	7357-021-020	2207 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.32	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	317	7355-030-011	1641 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	318	7355-030-024	1600 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant industrial Property	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	324	7357-023-019	1814 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23-25	0	ne	---	---	---	---
HCS Border	326	7355-029-002	1401 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	TBD	Moderate	0.05	36	0	ne	---	---	---	---
HCS Border	331	7355-029-028	1420 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	City-owned lot	3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	336	7357-024-020	1725 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.29	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	auto paint and body shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	337	7357-022-025	2030 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23-25	-1	ne	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	339	7357-022-016	2100 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	341	7357-023-029	1918 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23-25	-1	ne	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	342	7357-023-030	1918 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23-25	-1	ne	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	345	7357-024-010	1754 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	Mixed use	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	346	7357-021-031	2216 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23-25	-1	ne	Net Loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	347	7355-030-016	Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.09	36	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	349	7355-030-002	1609 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	355	7357-023-016	1830 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	358	7355-030-001	1603 Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.21	36	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-service shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situation Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Border	365	7357-023-CONDO01		R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.09	23.25	2	no	Part of condo development	---	---	---
HCS Border	370	7355-030-025	1875 Carson St	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.21	36	7	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-service shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	371	7357-024-015	1732 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	C1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	375	7357-022-014	2114 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	0	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	388	7355-029-010	1324 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.10	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-service shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	389	7357-023-024	1912 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.02	23.25	-2	no	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	396	7357-021-004	2217 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	398	7355-029-014	Border Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.08	36	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	399	7357-024-005	1737 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.14	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	401	7357-022-029	2020 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.01	23.25	-1	no	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Border	403	7357-021-003	2213 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	404	7357-021-013	2230 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.25	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	407	7357-023-014	1908 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	409	7357-021-018	2204 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	0	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	417	7357-021-009	2317 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	424	7357-022-018	2022 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	1	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	426	7357-023-004	Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	427	7357-024-011	1750 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	C1	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.14	23.25	0	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Border	434	7357-022-006	2027 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	439	7357-023-009	1917 Border Ave	R-OF	M1	R-OF	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.16	33	2	no	Added new overlay zone	MFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	441	7355-029-024	1504 Cabrillo Ave	C-CTR	DRP	C-CTR	DPR(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.19	36	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-store	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Border	442	7357-022-015	2108 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	TBD	Moderate	0.16	23.25	-1	no	Net loss of units	---	---	---
HCS Gramercy	4	4094-009-039	2008 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.13	13.5	1	no	Added new overlay zone	SFR	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	23	4094-009-012	16809 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.72	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	38	4094-009-062	2016 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.60	13.5	8	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	47	4094-009-015	16709 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.72	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	93	4094-009-045	2044 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.37	13.5	3	no	Added new overlay zone	Commercial-office building	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	123	4094-009-037	Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.41	13.5	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-parking lot	2. 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Gramercy	127	4094-009-016	16659 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.69	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	186	4094-009-040	2012 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	TBD	Above moderate	0.13	13.5	9	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Gramercy	191	4094-009-007	16639 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.93	13.5	12	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	239	4094-009-067	16619 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.40	23.25	8	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	261	4094-009-014	16719 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-LM	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.71	13.5	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	306	4094-019-037	16933 Gramercy Pl	R-LO	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.48	23.25	11	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Gramercy	334	4094-009-038	2004 166th St	R-LM	M1	R-LM	TBD	Above moderate	0.13	13.5	9	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Gramercy	364	4094-009-068	16649 Gramercy Pl	R-LM	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	0.71	23.25	16	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Lomita-Madison	183	7377-004-051	3521 Lomita Blvd	I-BP	M1-PP	R-MH	M1-PP(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Lower	8.32	33	274	no	Added new overlay zone	light industrial business park	1., 3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	14	7352-010-002	612 Maple Ave	I-LT	M2	R-MD	M2(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	2.26	23.25	52	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	75	7352-011-020	2515 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-MD	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	1.27	23.25	29	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-public storage/mini-warehouse	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	180	7352-011-021	2645 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	2.71	13.5	36	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	184	7352-010-001	700 Maple Ave	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	2.08	13.5	28	no	Added new overlay zone	religious institution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	238	7352-011-143	625 Alaska Ave	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	2.97	13.5	38	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	328	7352-011-019	2535 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-MH	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Mixed	9.14	33	301	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	381	7352-011-003	2727 Maricopa St	I-LT	M2/P1	R-LM	M2/P1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	4.29	13.5	57	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	440	7352-010-003	615 Hawaii Ave	I-LT	M2	R-MD	M2(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above moderate	1.50	23.25	34	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Trend for previous residential development on Maricopa. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Maricopa	459	7352-002-911	Crenshaw Blvd	I-HVY	M2	R-MH	M2(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Lower	1.99	33	65	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant land, City owned, next to transit	2., 3.a., 3.b., 3.c., 3.d.	Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Prairie Area	185	4084-008-018	18129 Prairie Ave	C-GEN	C5	R-LM	C5(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.39	13.5	2	no	Added new overlay zone	Vacant restaurant & 2 dwelling units	3.a., 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Identified trend for housing on Prairie. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Prairie Area	405	4084-008-019	4015 182nd St	C-GEN	C5	R-LM	C5(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.33	13.5	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Liquor store, vape/smoke shop, bicycle shop	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing on Prairie. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	26	7524-006-039	4215 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	27	7524-006-057	4227 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.60	23.25	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	121	7524-006-064	4209 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	159	7524-006-042	4203 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	162	7524-006-029	20433 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	179	7524-006-038	4221 Spencer St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.20	23.25	4	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	182	7524-006-025	20433 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	215	7524-006-904	Finy Sliver Behind-088	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	TBD	Above Moderate	0.01	23.25	9	no	No new units	---	---	---
HCS Spencer	305	7524-006-058	20441 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	379	7524-006-046	20445 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above Moderate	0.27	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Spencer	395	7524-006-088	20427 Earl St	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	ML(M1-PP)(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Above Moderate	0.45	23.25	10	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western N	40	7357-030-003	22501 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Lower	0.68	33	22	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western N	97	7357-030-005	22597 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Lower	0.52	33	17	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western N	102	7357-030-018	22501 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Lower	1.04	33	34	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western N	367	7357-030-004	22593 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MH	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.27	33	9	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western S	84	7357-037-021	22717 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ)TBD	Moderate	0.26	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
HCS Western S	136	7357-037-016	22707 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ) FBD	Moderate	0.26	23.25	6	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western S	164	7357-037-019	22701 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ) FBD	Lower	0.58	23.25	13	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western S	265	7357-037-013	22625 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ) FBD	Lower	1.76	23.25	40	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
HCS Western S	376	7357-037-020	22771 Western Ave	I-BP	M1	R-MD	M1(R/MU-OZ) FBD	Moderate	0.22	23.25	5	no	Added new overlay zone	Industrial-Light manufacturing/machine shop/printing	3.a., 3.c., 3.d.	Identified trend for housing in East Victor. Implementation of HCS an incentive for recycling
Other RP	137	7371-021-003	23536 Arlington Ave.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.15	33	3	no		Industrial-warehouse/distribution	3.c., 3.d.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other RP	138	7371-021-072	2175 236th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.12	33	3	no		Commercial-office building w/1 SFR	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other RP	199	7371-018-073	2173 237th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.20	33	5	no		SFR (1 unit existing)	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Other RP	255	7371-018-074	2165 237th St.	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Moderate	0.14	33	3	no		SFR (1 unit existing)	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to increase in density & allowing stand-alone residential provides incentives
Redondo Beach Blvd	290	4067-013-001	2500 Redondo Beach Blvd	C-GEN	C-3PP	C-GEN	C-3PP(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	13.64	33	450	yes	Corrections to land use designations and zoning (clean-up) Correction	Old drive in/open air swap meet	2., 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	380	4067-012-001	2700 Redondo Beach Blvd	R-OF	C-2PP	R-OF	C-2PP (R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.64	33	21	yes	Correction	parking lot	2., 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	431	4067-012-014	Redondo Beach Blvd	C-GEN	C-3PP	C-GEN	C-3PP (R/MU-OZ)	Above moderate	0.30	33	9	yes	Correction	Old drive in/open air swap meet	2., 3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Redondo Beach Blvd	460	4092-001-904	Redondo Beach Blvd	PBLC		PBLC/R-HI	R4 or R5 or PBLC/R/MU-OZ MU OVERLAY	Lower	2.00	45	90	no	Correction	El Camino College parking lot	2., 3.c., 3.d.	Program to redesignate/rezone provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Religious Institution	33	7519-025-049	21100 Victor St.	R-MH	R3	R-MHRL-OVR	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.44	23.25	14	no	Correction	Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	63	7370-002-002	2300 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3/P1	C-GENRL-OVR	C3/P1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.46	23.25	2	no	Correction	Torrance New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	78	4088-002-024	15090 Prairie Ave	R-MD	R3-DR	RL-OVR	RL-OVR	Lower	0.64	23.25	1	no				
Religious Institution	88	7359-010-012	1900 Crenshaw Blvd.	C-GEN	M2	C-GENRL-OVR	M2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.88	23.25	16	no	Correction	Torrance First Presbyterian	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	94	7514-023-030	330 Palos Verdes Blvd	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay)	R-MDRL-OVR	R3 (Hillside Overlay) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.87	23.25	10	no	Correction	Resurrection Lutheran Church & Riviera Hall Lutheran School	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	106	7371-020-016	2051 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LORL-OVR	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.40	23.25	2	no	Correction	Temple Emet	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	131	4087-016-033	16831 Ainsworth Ave.	PBLC	R3/C2	PBLCRL-OVR	R3/C2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.34	23.25	25	no	Correction	St. Catherine Laboure	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	146	7370-010-009	2150 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GENRL-OVR	C3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.92	23.25	5	no	Correction	South Bay Christian Community	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	177	7524-015-104	3611 Torrance Blvd	C-CTR	H-DA2	C-CTRRL-OVR	H-DA2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.60	23.25	9	no	Correction	St. Abraam Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	193	7547-003-015	3646 Newton St.	R-MD	R3	R-MDRL-OVR	R-MD (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.88	23.25	5	no	Correction	Walteria United Methodist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Religious Institution	216	7528-005-009	22605 Kent Ave.	R-MD	R3	R-MDRL-OVR	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.17	23.25	18	no	Correction	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	231	7371-020-032	2059 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LORL-OVR	R-1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.21	23.25	0	no	Correction	South Bay New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	241	7534-006-012	4000 Pacific Coast Highway	C-GEN	C2	C-GENRL-OVR	C2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	2.62	23.25	15	no	Correction	Calvary Church of Torrance	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	254	7511-021-004	375 Palos Verdes Blvd	R-MD	R3 (Hillside Overlay)	R-MDRL-OVR	R3 (Hillside Overlay) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.63	23.25	9	yes	Correction	Riviera United Methodist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	311	4088-006-027	17910 Prairie Ave.	PBLC	R3	PBLCRL-OVR	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.68	23.25	21	no	Correction	Ascension Lutheran Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	314	4085-032-008	18015 Prairie Ave.	R-LO	A1	R-LORL-OVR	A1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.84	23.25	4	no	Correction	Faith Christian Assembly	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	332	7359-023-038	2900 Carson St.	R-LM	R2	R-LMRL-OVR	R2 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	3.38	23.25	19	no	Correction	First Evangelical Lutheran Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	353	7524-006-001	4527 Spencer St	R-MH	R3	R-MHRL-OVR	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.44	23.25	2	no	Correction	Anza Baptist Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	361	4096-009-067	2115 182nd St	C-GEN	C3/P1	C-GENRL-OVR	C3/P1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.33	23.25	7	no	Correction	Faith United Methodist	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	366	7519-026-040	4915 Emerald St./20730 Victor St.	R-LO	R1	R-LORL-OVR	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.58	23.25	9	no	Correction	Baycities South Bay Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	369	7524-007-035	4345 Emerald Ave.	R-LM	ML(M1-PP)2	R-LMRL-OVR	ML(M1-PP) (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.33	23.25	25	no	Correction	Nova Community Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	391	7514-005-005	6122 Pacific Coast Highway	R-MD	R3	R-MDRL-OVR	R3 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.73	23.25	4	no	Correction	Redondo Beach Church of Christ	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	400	7362-014-011	2930 El Dorado St.	R-LO	R1	R-LORL-OVR	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.70	23.25	9	no	Correction	First Christian Church of Torrance	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	420	7371-020-041	2077 236th St	R-LO	R1	R-LORL-OVR	R1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	0.80	23.25	4	no	Correction	South Bay New Life Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	492	7527-021-006	4565 SHARYNNE LN	R-LO	A-1	R-LO	A-1 (RIH-OZ)	Lower	1.67	23.25	8	No		Evangelical Formosan Church	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Religious Institution	495	7377-013-001	2701 237TH ST	I-LT	M1-PP	I-LT	I-LT (RIH-OZ)	Lower	4.38	23.25	25	no		The 103 Saints Korean Catholic Center	3.c., 3.d., 3.h.	opportunity to add MFR to religious site
Santa Fe Avenue	3	7359-013-031	2116 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	42	7359-013-033	2124 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	154	7359-013-051	2130 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Santa Fe Avenue	167	7359-013-032	2120 Santa Fe Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	15	7357-011-011	2424 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	16	7524-014-017	21027 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	33	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	18	7357-011-023	2435 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	45	7378-003-091	3630 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	48	7357-007-008	2757 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	55	4087-013-021	3606 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	59	7357-011-008	2412 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	64	4092-005-014	3535 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	77	4089-024-012	3615 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	81	4089-020-001	3511 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	90	7357-011-022	2431 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	128	4089-020-024	182nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Lower	0.13	23.25	2	yes	Entitled Project			
Scattered Sites	103	4089-020-002	18923 Cerise Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	139	4092-005-016	3547 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	140	7514-006-001	100 Vista Del Parque	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	142	4092-019-014	17022 Yukon Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above moderate	0.12	33	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	144	7357-010-011	2420 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	155	4092-005-070	3553 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	156	4095-020-027	2700 182nd St	R-MD	RP	R-MD	RP	Above moderate	0.18	23.25	4	yes		Office Building		Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	157	7378-003-093	3616 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	169	7357-011-020	2423 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	170	4089-025-014	18919 Cranbrook Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	200	7357-011-012	2428 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	201	4096-001-053	18655 Western Ave	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)C2	Lower	1.31	33	43	yes	Correction	Vacant industrial building	3.c., 3.d., 3.i., 3.j.*	*Trend for residential on Western. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	204	4087-013-022	3602 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	212	4089-020-018	3519 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	213	7357-011-021	2427 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	214	7524-014-018	21101 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	33	4	yes		MFR-2 units	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	
Scattered Sites	223	7359-009-017	2255 Jefferson St.	I-BP	M2	R-MD	R3	Lower	2.38	23.25	55	no		Industrial-warehouse/distribution		GP/rezoning program an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	228	4089-018-013	18924 Cerise Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	249	7357-011-018	2415 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	253	4087-012-022	3616 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	256	4087-013-020	3610 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	270	7378-003-120	3640 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	272	7378-003-096	23012 Samuel St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.18	23.25	3	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	273	4092-005-018	3559 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program to reconsider/revise development standards an incentive
Scattered Sites	275	7524-013-064	3520 Emerald St	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3R4	Lower	2.41	33	79	yes	Correction	Religious institution	3.c., 3.d.	Program to rezone consistent with GP an incentive

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	277	4087-012-023	3610 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit		
Scattered Sites	280	4092-019-013	17016 Yukon Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3R-4	Above moderate	0.12	33	2	yes		SFR 1 unit		Program to rezone consistent with GP an incentive
Scattered Sites	284	4096-001-054	18715 Western Ave	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)C2	Lower	2.15	33	71	yes	Correction	Small scale nursery	3.c., 3.d., 3.f., 3.l.*	*Trend for residential on Western. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	308	7378-003-090	3634 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	319	4089-025-012	3635 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	320	4087-012-021	3622 171st St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	325	4089-025-011	18918 Kornblum Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	327	7378-003-095	3604 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.16	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	329	7357-011-024	2439 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	330	4089-024-011	18918 Cranbrook Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	335	4089-020-017	18924 Patronella Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	348	7378-003-092	3624 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	350	7524-014-019	21105 Madrona Ave	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Moderate	0.16	33	4	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	360	4089-018-014	3445 190th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.13	23.25	1	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	362	7357-011-042	2443 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	363	7357-007-009	2765 Gramercy Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.30	23.25	6	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	368	7357-010-010	2416 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	377	4089-024-013	18923 Yukon Ave	R-MD	C2	R-MD	(R/MU-OZ)C2	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes	Correction	SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	394	7357-011-019	2419 Cabrillo Ave	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	416	4092-005-015	3541 168th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	418	7378-003-094	3610 230th St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.17	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	421	7357-011-009	2416 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	428	4087-007-022	3638 168th St	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Above moderate	0.20	33	5	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	432	7357-011-007	2408 Andreo Ave	R-MD	R-3-3	R-MD	R-3-3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	436	7359-039-006	1780 Oak St.	R-MD	PD	R-MD	PD	Lower	1.12	23.25	26	no		Commercial gym/event rental	3.c., 3.d.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	437	4087-012-002	3605 172nd St	R-MD	R3	R-MD	R3	Above Moderate	0.14	23.25	2	yes		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density
Scattered Sites	443	4089-024-014	18919 Yukon Ave	R-MD	C2	R-MD	C2(R/MU-OZ)C2	Above Moderate	0.12	23.25	1	yes	Correction	SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	461	4094-017-037	17010 Van Ness Ave	R-LO	R-1	R-LO	R-1	Above Moderate	0.71	6.8	5	no		SFR 1 unit	3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Site underutilized based on allowable density. Potential for lot subdivision potential, portion of lot contains vacant dairy building

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Scattered Sites	464	7529-019-002	4111 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	C-2PP	C-GEN	H-P/PCH	Mixed	1.67	22		no	Pipeline Project	---	---	---
Scattered Sites	471	7535-004-004	3110 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.63	33	53	no		shopping center	1, 3.c., 3.d., 3.g.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	475	7554-024-004	21515 WESTERN AVE	C-GEN	M2	R-MD	R3	Lower	1.04	23-25	43	no	Owner requested removal	vacant grocery store	1	Public interest in residential. Program to revise GP/zoning an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	476	7359-028-233	2325 CRENSHAW BLVD	C-GEN	PD	C-GEN	PD(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	5.5	33	181	No		Office building (Park Del Amo PD)	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	478	4089-028-025	3709 190th ST	C-GEN	R1/C1-PP	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.56	33	18	No		Commercial/store	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	479	4087-021-017	3977 171st St	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	480	4087-021-018	3977 171st ST	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.12	33	3	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	481	4087-021-016	3977 171ST ST	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.23	33	7	No		Commercial (auto repair)	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive
Scattered Sites	485	7524-003-041	4011 SPENCER ST	BP	ML(M1-PP)	R-MD	R3	Lower	2.26	23.25	52	no		RV storage yard	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential. Program for GP/zoning an incentive for residential
Scattered Sites	486	7373-019-064	2427 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.42	33	13	No		Preschool	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	487	7373-019-063	2439 Pacific Coast Hwy	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.5	33	16	No		Restaurant	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	488	7524-027-028	4501 TORRANCE BLVD	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	1.07	33	35	No		Shopping center	1, 3.c., 3.d.	Public interest in residential.
Scattered Sites	497	4096-016-027	17905 S WESTERN AVE	C-GEN	ML	C-GEN	C2(R/MU-OZ)	Moderate	0.18	33	5	No		Restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	12	7379-001-015	2780 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.22	33	7	no	Correction	Commercial-service	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	28	7379-001-012	2732 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial-store (part of shopping center)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	134	7379-001-010	2720 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	217	7359-012-004	2407 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	M2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Lower	0.85	33	28	no	Correction	Building supply	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	222	7379-001-039	2770 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Shopping center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	224	7379-001-004	2606 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Lower	0.78	33	25	no	Correction	Furniture store	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	263	7379-001-040	2738 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.76	33	25	no	Correction	Shopping center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	267	7370-002-019	2340 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN MU-1	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-3 (MU OVERLAY)	Above Moderate	0.28	33	9	no	Correction	Office building	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Sepulveda East of Maple	285	7379-001-001	2630 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Above Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial building	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	303	7379-001-011	2724 Sepulveda Blvd	C-Gen	C2	C-Gen MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	343	7379-001-013	2734 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Commercial-restaurant	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	387	7379-001-037	2700 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.97	33	32	no	Correction	Commercial-store (Ethan Allen Furniture)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	390	7370-002-018	2350 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN MU-1	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-3 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.66	33	21	no	Correction	Shopping center	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	410	7379-001-002	2722 Sepulveda Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN MU-1	C-2 (R/MU OVERLAY) C-2 (MU OVERLAY)	Moderate	0.19	33	6	no	Correction	Small commercial center (portion)	3.c., 3.d.	R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Sepulveda East of Maple	496	4096-016-028	2880 Sepulveda Blvd.	C-GEN	C3-PP	C-GEN	C3-PP(R/MU-OZ)	Lower	0.99	33	32	no		Vacant restaurant	3.c., 3.d., 3.i.	Vacant building. R/MU-OZ program provides incentive for recycling to MU &/or residential
Vacant Sites	2	7547-002-011	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	1.70	6.8	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	5	7532-011-904	4730 Via Corona	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.32	6.8	2	yes	City-owned; removed because of hillside & terrain	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	25	7547-002-007	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.03	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	50	7531-016-049	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.10	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	68	7519-023-026	4605 Torrance Blvd	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C-3 (R/MU OVERLAY) C3	Lower	0.52	33	17	yes	Correction	vacant (parking for commercial center)	2., 3.c., 3.d.	Vacant. Program for R/MU-OZ an incentive for residential
Vacant Sites	69	7547-001-009	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.28	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	74	7524-008-063	Spencer St	R-LM	ML(C4)	C-GEN+HBCSP-MU	H-PR	Mixed (Assumes 80% above-moderate/20% below moderate)	0.85	13.5 33	11	yes		vacant (portion of adjacent auto lot)	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	79	7547-002-010	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.07	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	110	7547-001-019	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.32	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	112	7532-034-905	Via Corona	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.22	6.8	1	yes	City-owned site. Removed because of hillside & terrain	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	115	7547-001-024	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.23	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	151	7352-007-900	Del Amo & Crenshaw	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2	Above Moderate	0.42	33	13	yes	City-owned. Removed	---	---	---

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situs Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Vacant Sites	171	7517-038-900	Sepulveda Blvd	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.16	6.8	1	yes	Owned by Water Replenishment District	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	178	7547-001-021	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.31	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	195	7547-001-014	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.09	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	197	4096-018-004	N/A	C-GEN	CR	C-GEN	CR	Lower	0.13	33	4	yes	Parcel deleted by assessor	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	198	4096-018-008	Parcel Deleted By Assessor	C-GEN	CR	C-GEN	CR	Lower	0.13	33	4	yes	Parcel deleted by assessor	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	202	7531-016-047	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.05	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	226	7547-001-008	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.28	6.8	1	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	227	7547-002-006	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.01	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	229	7368-002-013	226th St & Hawthorne	R-MH	R3	R-MH	R3	Lower	0.45	33	14	yes	Land-locked parcel	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	236	7516-001-007	Torrance Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2	Above Moderate	0.10	33	3	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	237	7547-001-015	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.06	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	243	7547-002-005	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	18.07	6.8	122	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	246	7547-001-025	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.14	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	251	7547-001-018	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.69	6.8	4	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	252	4096-002-027	2150 Artesia Blvd	C-GEN	C2	C-GEN	C2	Above Moderate	0.35	33	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	286	7547-001-026	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.12	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	288	4084-008-058	Hickman Dr	R-LM	R2	R-LM	R2	Above moderate	0.21	13.5	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	297	4096-018-005		C-GEN	CR	C-GEN	CR	Lower	0.13	33	4	yes		---	---	---
Vacant Sites	298	7547-002-008	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.05	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	321	7547-001-020	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.32	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	351	7517-038-901	Sepulveda Blvd	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.14	6.8	0	yes	Owned by Water Replenishment District	---	---	---
Vacant Sites	352	7520-001-008	Beryl St	C-GEN	C3	C-GEN	C3	Lower Above moderate	0.18	33	5	yes	Lot size	vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	359	7547-001-028	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.04	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	383	7532-009-901	Vista Largo	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.59	6.8	4	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	384	4084-008-059	Hickman Dr	R-LM	R2	R-LM	R2	Above moderate	0.21	13.5	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	385	4096-018-006	N/A	C-GEN	CR	C-GEN	CR	Lower	0.13	33	4	yes	Parcel Deleted By Assessor	---	---	---

General Description	Site Number	Assessor Parcel Number (APN)	Situation Address	Current		6 th Cycle Proposed		Assumed Income Level	Acres	6 th Cycle Target Density	Net Realistic Capacity	Carry-over from 5th Cycle	Reason for Change (deletion, revision, etc.)	Existing Use	Criteria per Criteria Legend	Criteria Additional Information/Comments
				Land Use Designation	Zoning	Land Use Designation	Zoning									
Vacant Sites	414	7371-021-022	Arlington	R-OF	RP	R-OF	RP	Above Moderate	0.34	33	11	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	429	7547-001-007	Via Valmonte	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.40	6.8	2	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	430	7531-016-048	Via El Chico	R-LO	R1	R-LO	R1	Above moderate	0.07	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant
Vacant Sites	438	7547-002-009	Hawthorne Blvd	R-LO	A1	R-LO	A1	Above moderate	0.06	6.8	0	yes		vacant	2., 3.c., 3.d.	vacant

APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

APPENDIX D. ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

D.1 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF AB 686

In 2017, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) into California state law. AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. The Bill added an assessment of fair housing to the Housing Element which includes the following components:

- A summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the jurisdiction’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity;
- An analysis of segregation patterns, racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunities and disproportionate housing needs;
- An assessment of contributing factors; and
- An identification of fair housing goals and actions.

The AFFH rule was originally a federal requirement applicable to entitlement jurisdictions (with population over 50,000) that can receive U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds directly from HUD. Before the 2016 federal rule was repealed in 2019, entitlement jurisdictions were required to prepare an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) or Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI). AB 686 states that jurisdictions can incorporate findings from either report into the Housing Element.

For the purpose of HUD CPD funds (CDBG, HOME, and ESG), the County of Los Angeles (county) functions as the lead agency to receive these funds on behalf of 47 small cities (with population less than 50,000), including Torrance, and the unincorporated county areas. Collectively, this geography is known as the Urban County. Some of the data provided by HUD for the purpose of housing and community development and AFFH analysis is based on this collective Urban County geography.

D.2 Fair Housing Assessment

D.2.1 Enforcement and Outreach

Regional Trends

Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. In FY 2019-2020, HRC received 2,038 calls for general housing inquiries and 356 calls related to fair housing inquiries. Among the 356 inquires, fair housing issues relating to disabilities (physical and mental) represented the majority (82%) of the protected classifications. Trailing behind was source of income at 5% of the inquiries.

During the FY 2019-2020, 83 fair cases were opened, with the majority being reconciled or withdrawn. Two cases were referred to litigation and three cases were referred to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). Among the 83 cases opened, physical disability (47%), mental disability (22%), and source of income (19%) represented the majority of the protected classes.

Annually, HRC conducts outreach and education throughout the Los Angeles Urban County. Typical activities include Public Service Announcements/media/advertisements; community presentations; literature distribution; and management trainings.

The Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) policy prohibits discrimination in any aspect of housing on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status, or sex. Furthermore, the HRC, under contract with LACDA, monitors fair housing compliance for both state and federal fair housing laws.

Local Trends

Housing Element Outreach

To assist in the development of fair housing programs and recommendations within the Housing Element, the City gathered input from local service providers and affordable housing developers during two focus group sessions, as well as more general input from community members at three public workshops. The City reached out to HOAs, City Commissions, and others who work developing both affordable and market-rate housing to encourage their participation in the development of the Housing Element, as well as other agencies that assist low-income residents. The City also conducted a Housing Corridor Study, provided information about the Housing Element on its webpage, provided updates about the process at Planning Commission and City Council meetings, and promoted the Housing Element via social media and notices posted at the City information kiosk at the mall, library and Downtown information kiosk. The City Cable Station also broadcast virtual meetings related to the development and review of the Housing Element. The City also met with representatives of Abundant Housing over a Zoom session on November 15, 2021.

In addition to in-person meetings, the City has received comment letters and written communication from multiple groups and individuals focused on promoting fair and affordable housing within the City. A summary of this outreach is included in Section 1 of the Housing Element, and copies of written communication received during the development of the Housing Element are included in Appendix A.

Fair Housing Outreach

According to HUD's fair housing records, Torrance received 48 fair housing inquiries from January 2013 to March 2021, an average of approximately 5.3 inquiries per year.


~~Typical activities include Public Service Announcements/media/ advertisements; community presentations; literature distribution; and management trainings.~~ Torrance also provides information about Fair Housing and Homeless resources on its website, along with information about local housing programs. The City has a Housing Assistance Office that facilitates its Section 8 Rental Assistance Program, as well as a Home Improvement Program that provides services for disabled and senior homeowners that meet income qualifications.

Torrance has a Social Services Commission whose roles include helping to address the needs of Veterans, people experiencing homelessness, adults with developmental disabilities, and children with special needs within the city. In addition to monthly meetings, the Social Services Commission webpages include links to resources for these populations. Fair housing resources, including links to rental assistance resources and housing discrimination forms, are also located on the City's website.

For federally funded Urban County programs, Torrance has committed to complying with the Fair Housing Act, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq., by ensuring that housing is available to all persons without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status (having children under age 18), or sex. ~~The Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) policy prohibits discrimination in any aspect of housing on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status, or sex. Furthermore, the HRC, under contract with LACDA, monitors fair housing compliance for both state and federal fair housing laws.~~

As shown in ~~Figure D-1~~, ~~Figure D-1~~, there is no data for housing choice vouchers in the majority of Torrance tracts. To protect the confidentiality of those receiving Housing Choice Voucher Program assistance, tracts containing 10 or fewer voucher holders have been omitted. The tracts with the highest percentage of renters receiving vouchers are located in the northwest and southeast areas of the city. These tracts include 227 units where renters receive vouchers, representing 5-15% of renters in these tracts. There are no public housing buildings located in Torrance.


Figure D-4-1: Housing Choice Vouchers, Public Housing Buildings, and FHEO Inquiries



8/12/2021, 9:29:11 AM

1:144,448

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Housing Choice Vouchers - Tract > 0 – 5%
- No Data
- > 5% – 15%
- > 15% – 30%
- > 30% – 60%
- > 60% – 100%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

D.2.2 Integration and Segregation

Race/Ethnicity

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it can demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences, and mobility. ~~According to the 2015-2019 ACS, 47% of the Torrance population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group, a small decrease from 50% during the 2006-2010 ACS. In comparison, 74% of Los Angeles County residents belong to a racial or ethnic minority group.~~

Regional Trends

HUD tracks racial or ethnic dissimilarity trends for the Los Angeles Urban County, which includes Torrance, and the Los Angeles County region.¹¹ Dissimilarity indices show the extent of distribution between two groups, in this case racial/ethnic groups, across census tracts. The following shows how HUD views various levels of the index:

- <40: Low Segregation
- 40-54: Moderate Segregation
- >55: High Segregation

The indices for the Urban County and Los Angeles County from 1990 to 2020 are shown in ~~Table D-4~~ [Table D-1](#). Dissimilarity between non-White and White communities in the Urban County and countywide has worsened since 1990. In the Urban County and countywide, dissimilarity between Hispanic/White and Asian or Pacific Islander/White communities has worsened, while dissimilarity between Black and White communities has improved. Based on HUD's definition of the various levels of the index, segregation between Asian or Pacific Islander and White communities is moderate, while Non-White/White, Black/White, and Hispanic/White communities are highly segregated.

¹¹ Index of dissimilarity is a demographic measure of the evenness with which two groups are distributed across a geographic area. It is the most commonly used and accepted method of measuring segregation.

Table D-4-1: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index

	1990	2000	2010	2020
Los Angeles Urban County				
Non-White/White	53.33	53.62	53.85	55.87
Black/White	68.29	63.51	60.24	64.21
Hispanic/White	62.81	64.99	64.38	65.12
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	41.58	48.57	49.62	52.79
Los Angeles County				
Non-White/White	56.66	56.72	56.55	58.53
Black/White	73.04	67.4	64.99	68.24
Hispanic/White	60.88	63.03	63.35	64.33
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	46.13	48.19	47.62	51.59

Sources: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Database, 2020.

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences, and mobility. [Figure D-2 and Figure D-3](#) Tables D-2 and D-3 show the racial/ethnic makeup of Los Angeles County, Torrance, and several surrounding cities in 2010 and 2020. As show in these tables, the majority of Los Angeles County residents belong to a racial or ethnic minority group. Between 2010 and 2020, the number of residents belonging to a racial or ethnic minority group increased slightly from 72 percent to 74 percent.

Table D-2: 2010 Regional Race/Ethnic Groups

Race	Los Angeles County		Gardena		Hermosa Beach		Lomita		Palos Verdes Estates		Rancho Palos Verdes		Redondo Beach		Rolling Hills Estates		Torrance	
	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Total	9,818,605	100%	58,829	100%	19,506	100%	20,256	100%	13,438	100%	41,643	100%	66,748	100%	8,067	100%	145,438	100%
Hispanic or Latino	4,687,889	48%	22,151	38%	1,632	8%	6,652	33%	631	5%	3,556	9%	10,142	15%	499	6%	23,440	16%
White	2,728,321	28%	5,484	9%	15,780	81%	8,797	43%	9,868	73%	23,323	56%	43,531	65%	5,134	64%	61,591	42%
Black	815,086	8%	14,034	24%	216	1%	964	5%	156	1%	988	2%	1,772	3%	107	1%	3,740	3%
American Indian & Alaska Native	18,886	0%	100	0%	28	0%	76	0%	14	0%	54	0%	163	0%	12	0%	304	0%
Asian	1,325,671	14%	15,149	26%	1,097	6%	2,850	14%	2,306	17%	11,998	29%	7,858	12%	1,995	25%	49,707	34%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	22,464	0%	382	1%	43	0%	112	1%	8	0%	39	0%	177	0%	8	0%	473	0%
Other	25,367	0%	174	0%	52	0%	60	0%	22	0%	92	0%	287	0%	19	0%	505	0%
Two or more races	194,921	2%	1,355	2%	658	3%	745	4%	433	3%	1,593	4%	2,818	4%	293	4%	5,678	4%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census

Table D-3: 2020 Regional Race/Ethnic Groups

Race	Los Angeles County		Gardena		Hermosa Beach		Lomita		Palos Verdes Estates		Rancho Palos Verdes		Redondo Beach		Rolling Hills Estates		Torrance	
	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Total	10,014,009	100%	61,027	100%	19,728	100%	20,921	100%	13,347	100%	42,287	100%	71,576	100%	8,280	100%	147,067	100%
Hispanic or Latino	4,804,763	48%	24,503	40%	2,064	10%	7,691	37%	1,003	8%	4,535	11%	12,497	17%	640	8%	28,080	19%
White	2,563,609	26%	4,819	8%	14,563	74%	7,269	35%	8,544	64%	20,480	48%	40,796	57%	4,492	54%	51,913	35%
Black	760,689	8%	13,006	21%	195	1%	1,129	5%	166	1%	1,086	3%	2,103	3%	90	1%	4,781	3%
American Indian & Alaska Native	18,453	0%	106	0%	31	0%	57	0%	16	0%	38	0%	187	0%	13	0%	235	0%
Asian	1,474,237	15%	15,813	26%	1,371	7%	3,436	16%	2,713	20%	13,424	32%	10,085	14%	2,492	30%	51,857	35%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	20,522	0%	356	1%	20	0%	128	1%	4	0%	32	0%	183	0%	7	0%	523	0%
Other	58,683	1%	364	1%	152	1%	133	1%	85	1%	301	1%	532	1%	71	1%	980	1%
Two or more races	313,053	3%	2,060	3%	1,332	7%	1,078	5%	816	6%	2,391	6%	5,193	7%	475	6%	8,698	6%

Source: 2020 Decennial Census

The racial composition of Torrance in 2020 differs from many other nearby cities. The percentage of the population in Torrance that is White is smaller than several of the nearby coastal cities, such as Palos Verdes Estates (73% White) and Hermosa Beach (81% White), while the percentage of the population that is Asian is larger than other cities in the vicinity. Like most other cities in the area, the percentage of the population that is Black or Hispanic or Latino is lower than in Los Angeles County overall. Figures D-2 and D-3 show the racial composition in the vicinity of Torrance in 2010 and 2018.

Local Trends

In Torrance, the racial composition has not changed significantly between 2010 and 2020. Whites continue to make up the largest percentage of the population, but the Asian population in Torrance is also large (35% in 2020) and as of 2020 is nearly the same as the White population. Hispanics or Latinos are the only other significant racial or ethnic minority group in Torrance (19% in 2020), with all other groups making up less than 10 percent of the population in 2010 and 2020.

Figure D-4 and Figure D-5 compare racial or ethnic minority concentrations in 2010 and 2018. There has been an increase in racial/ethnic minority populations since 2010, particularly in the central and north parts of the city. The only part of Torrance where racial/ethnic minorities make up less than 40% of the population is in the southwest area, at the coast.

Figure D-3 Distribution of RHNA Units by Percent Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration


Figure D-5 also shows the sites inventory used to meet the City’s 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). ~~Most~~Table D-4 shows how RHNA sites units are ~~located where racial/ethnic minorities make up at least 41% of the~~ distributed across block groups by non-white population.

As shown in Table D-4, the majority (60.07%) of sites are located in census block groups where the non-white population is between 61 and 80 percent. This includes 7765.2% of lower income units, 54.468.1% of moderate income units, 9044.2% of above moderate units, and 27.555.3% of mixed-income units (mixed-income is assumed to be 80 percent above-moderate and 20 percent lower income). Areas where 41-60 percent of the population is non-white also have a high percentage of RHNA units (32.132.7%), including 72.553.4% of mixed-income above moderate income units. This roughly corresponds to the distribution of the non-white population throughout the City, where block groups with a non-white population between 61 and 80 percent make up 50 percent of the City, and block groups with a non-white population between 41 and 60 percent make up 30 percent of the City.







Table D-4: RHNA Distribution by Percent Racial/Ethnic Minority Population


Block Group by Non-White Population		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Non-White Population in Block Group	% of Total Block Groups	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
≤ 20%	0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
21 - 40%	15%	0.5%0.5%	1.1%1.2%	0.0%0.0%	0.1%0.4%	0.0%0.0%
41 - 60%	30%	32.7%32.1%	19.9%7.8%	30.0%43.3%	53.4%5.4%	44.7%72.5%
61 - 80%	50%	60.0%60.7%	65.2%77.2%	68.1%54.4%	44.2%90.0%	55.3%27.5%
> 81%	5%	6.7%6.6%	13.8%13.8%	1.8%2.3%	2.2%4.3%	0.0%0.0%
Total	99	6,4736,604	27102,705	15821,286	1479800	7021,810

Figure D-2-2: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2010)




2/1/2022, 10:36:59 AM

-  City/Town Boundaries
- (A) Racial Demographics (2010) - Block Group
-  ≤20%
-  21 - 40%
-  41 - 60%
-  61 - 80%
-  > 81%










City of Carson, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-3: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2018)




2/1/2022, 10:42:10 AM

-  City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group
-  ≤ 20%
-  21 - 40%
-  41 - 60%
-  61 - 80%
-  > 81%



City of Carson, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-3-4: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2010)




8/12/2021, 9:36:50 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Racial Demographics (2010) - Block Group


- ≤20%
- 21 - 40%
- 41 - 60%
- 61 - 80%
- > 81%

1:144,448



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Figure D-5: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2018) – April 11 Version
 Figure D-5: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations (2018)



Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Data Viewer, 2024.

Disability

Regional Trends

Like most cities in the vicinity, the percentage of the population of Torrance with a disability is no more than 20 percent, with many areas having a lower percentage of the population with a disability. According to 2019 ACS 5-year estimates, disabilities are very low in the younger population, but increase as the population ages. Older people in Torrance (65 or older) are far more likely to have a disability than the rest of the population, with nearly 2/3 of the population having at least one type of disability.

Overall, the percent of the population in Torrance with disabilities is similar to other regional cities, with the exception of Gardena, which has a higher percentage of people with disabilities than others in the area. Torrance's disabled population is notably lower than Los Angeles County overall, particularly people 65 years or older. In Los Angeles County generally nearly 75 percent of people 65 years or older have at least one disability, while in Torrance only about 60 percent of people 65 years or older are disabled in some way. Table D-5 shows the 2019 population with a disability in Torrance and the surrounding cities.

Regionally there are higher concentrations of people with disabilities away from the coast, particularly in central Los Angeles. Many of the locations with higher concentrations of people with disabilities also have higher percentages of racial and ethnic minority populations. Figure D-6 shows the 2019 percentage of the population with a disability in the region.

Local Trends

According to the 2015-2019 ACS, approximately 9.0% of Torrance residents experience a disability, compared to 9.9% countywide. ~~Since the 2008-2012 ACS, the disabled population in Torrance has increased slightly from 8.9%. Figure D-4 and Figure D-5~~ The overall percentage of people with a disability has decreased since 2010, as compared to Los Angeles County, which had a slight increase in the percentage of people with a disability. However, the percentage of people 65 years or older with a disability has nearly doubled since 2010, and there has been an increase in the number of people over 18 with a disability as well. Table D-6 compares the 2010 and 2019 population with a disability in Los Angeles County and Torrance.

Figure D-7 and Figure D-8 compare the disabled population during the 2010-2014 ACS and 2015-2019 ACS. The disabled population is spread fairly evenly across tracts in the city, with no major concentration of people with disabilities. ~~There has been a decrease in the concentration of the population with disabilities between 2014 and 2019.~~

Torrance has a Social Services Commission whose roles include helping to address the needs of adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs within the city. In addition to monthly meetings, the Social Services Commission webpages include links to resources for these populations. ~~Figure D-5~~ Figure D-8 includes the City's sites inventory used to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA. While some sites are located in areas with higher concentration of people with disabilities, given the low concentration of people with disabilities in Torrance, most RHNA sites are in areas where less than 10 percent of the population has a disability.

Table D-5: 2019 Population with a Disability

	LOS ANGELES COUNTY		GARDENA		HERMOSA BEACH		LOMITA		PALOS VERDES ESTATES		RANCHO PALOS VERDES		REDONDO BEACH		ROLLING HILLS ESTATES		TORRANCE	
	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct
Population	992,719	9.9%	7,621	12.9%	1,295	6.7%	2,198	10.8%	1,131	8.4%	4,098	9.8%	4,369	6.5%	789	9.7%	12,994	9.0%
Under 5 years	3,554	0.6%	21	0.6%	78	7.0%	13	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%
With a hearing difficulty	2,474	0.4%	0	0.0%	78	7.0%	13	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%
With a vision difficulty	2,242	0.4%	21	0.6%	78	7.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5 to 17 years	62,051	3.9%	321	3.9%	51	2.2%	53	1.9%	64	2.7%	130	1.8%	169	1.6%	65	4.3%	779	3.7%
With a hearing difficulty	7,430	0.5%	76	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	1.2%	28	0.4%	76	0.7%	0	0.0%	33	0.2%
With a vision difficulty	10,493	0.7%	78	0.9%	13	0.5%	0	0.0%	15	0.6%	10	0.1%	47	0.5%	20	1.3%	96	0.5%
18 to 64 years	466,385	13.4%	3,546	16.8%	459	6.3%	1,191	16.8%	236	8.4%	864	8.8%	2,214	9.4%	229	13.8%	5,159	10.4%
With a hearing difficulty	80,715	1.2%	697	1.8%	99	0.7%	125	1.0%	42	0.6%	161	0.7%	619	1.4%	22	0.5%	1,121	1.2%
With a vision difficulty	95,218	1.5%	1,002	2.7%	148	1.1%	173	1.4%	31	0.4%	184	0.8%	499	1.1%	62	1.5%	747	0.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	198,645	3.1%	1,275	3.4%	222	1.6%	499	4.0%	91	1.3%	325	1.4%	911	2.1%	77	1.8%	2,357	2.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	219,273	3.4%	1,838	4.9%	122	0.9%	653	5.2%	54	0.8%	285	1.3%	1,020	2.3%	109	2.6%	2,329	2.6%
With a self-care difficulty	101,174	1.6%	683	1.8%	46	0.3%	166	1.3%	70	1.0%	151	0.7%	412	0.9%	61	1.4%	886	1.0%
With an independent living difficulty	179,055	2.8%	1,181	3.1%	95	0.7%	419	3.3%	121	1.7%	326	1.5%	858	2.0%	76	1.8%	2,244	2.5%
65 years and over	460,729	74.5%	3,733	79.7%	707	69.1%	941	61.0%	831	46.1%	3,104	56.2%	1,966	51.4%	495	45.5%	7,045	59.5%
With a hearing difficulty	162,288	12.4%	1,499	15.6%	330	13.7%	358	10.3%	388	10.7%	1,393	13.0%	878	9.9%	184	8.9%	3,147	13.0%
With a vision difficulty	88,130	6.7%	1,138	11.8%	120	5.0%	149	4.3%	92	2.5%	508	4.8%	325	3.7%	35	1.7%	1,156	4.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	138,704	10.6%	1,069	11.1%	209	8.7%	332	9.6%	177	4.9%	986	9.2%	430	4.9%	88	4.3%	1,790	7.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	310,046	23.7%	2,128	22.1%	343	14.2%	581	16.7%	427	11.8%	1,624	15.2%	1,215	13.7%	331	16.1%	4,331	17.9%
With a self-care difficulty	152,154	11.6%	1,056	11.0%	169	7.0%	315	9.1%	104	2.9%	876	8.2%	273	3.1%	134	6.5%	1,969	8.2%
With an independent living difficulty	245,624	18.8%	1,984	20.6%	370	15.3%	385	11.1%	328	9.0%	1,372	12.8%	698	7.9%	260	12.6%	3,664	15.2%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-4-6: Percentage of the Population with a Disability (2019)





Table D-6: 2010 and 2019 Population with a Disability

	2010						2019					
	Los Angeles County			Torrance			Los Angeles County			Torrance		
	Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability		Total	With a disability	
	Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct	
	9,755,188	904,804	9.3%	144,819	14,991	10.4%	10,012,895	992,719	9.9%	144,652	12,994	9.0%
Under 5 years	644,843	3,512	0.5%	8,044	0	0.0%	611,448	3,554	0.6%	8,792	11	0.1%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	2,779	0.4%	NA	0	0.0%	NA	2,474	0.4%	NA	11	0.1%
With a vision difficulty	NA	2,225	0.3%	NA	0	0.0%	NA	2,242	0.4%	NA	0	0.0%
5 to 17 years	1,753,870	63,017	3.6%	24,713	1,137	4.6%	1,599,642	62,051	3.9%	21,156	779	3.7%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	9,815	0.6%	NA	135	0.5%	NA	7,430	0.5%	NA	33	0.2%
With a vision difficulty	NA	12,051	0.7%	NA	68	0.3%	NA	10,493	0.7%	NA	96	0.5%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	44,820	2.6%	NA	1,003	4.1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	9,567	0.5%	NA	69	0.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
With a self-care difficulty	NA	13,841	0.8%	NA	69	0.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
18 to 64 years	6,315,320	441,188	7.0%	88,151	6,379	7.2%	6,493,258	466,385	13.4%	90,574	5,159	10.4%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	74,623	1.2%	NA	1,693	1.9%	NA	80,715	1.2%	NA	1,121	1.2%
With a vision difficulty	NA	83,337	1.3%	NA	576	0.7%	NA	95,218	1.5%	NA	747	0.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	182,865	2.9%	NA	2,171	2.5%	NA	198,645	3.1%	NA	2,357	2.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	221,761	3.5%	NA	3,558	4.0%	NA	219,273	3.4%	NA	2,329	2.6%
With a self-care difficulty	NA	100,280	1.6%	NA	861	1.0%	NA	101,174	1.6%	NA	886	1.0%
With an independent living difficulty	NA	175,028	2.8%	NA	2,271	2.6%	NA	179,055	2.8%	NA	2,244	2.5%
65 years and over	1,041,155	397,087	38.1%	23,911	7,475	31.3%	1,308,547	460,729	74.5%	24,130	7,045	59.5%
With a hearing difficulty	NA	141,295	13.6%	NA	3,187	13.3%	NA	162,288	12.4%	NA	3,147	13.0%
With a vision difficulty	NA	80,236	7.7%	NA	1,267	5.3%	NA	88,130	6.7%	NA	1,156	4.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	NA	122,172	11.7%	NA	1,870	7.8%	NA	138,704	10.6%	NA	1,790	7.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	NA	272,766	26.2%	NA	5,175	21.6%	NA	310,046	23.7%	NA	4,331	17.9%
With a self-care difficulty	NA	136,069	13.1%	NA	2,181	9.1%	NA	152,154	11.6%	NA	1,969	8.2%
With an independent living difficulty	NA	221,140	21.2%	NA	3,940	16.5%	NA	245,624	18.8%	NA	3,664	15.2%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-7: Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 9:40:22 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Population with a Disability (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract


- < 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS), 2021.

Figure D-5-8: Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2015-2019) – April 11 Version
 Figure D-8: Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2024.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Disability

As shown in Figure D-8, the overall percentage of the population with a disability is relatively low, so most RHNA units are located within census tracts that have few people with disabilities. Table D-7 shows the how RHNA units are distributed across census tracts by the percentage of the population with a disability. Overall, 89.9% of RHNA units are located in places where the population with a disability is between 10 and 20 percent, while all remaining units are located in areas with less than 10 percent of the population that has a disability. Throughout the City, 32 percent of tracts have a disabled population over 10 percent, while only 98.9 percent of RHNA units are located within these tracts.

Table D-7: RHNA Distribution by Disability

Tract by Disability		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Disabled Population in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 10%	68%	91.1% 90.1%	83.7% 80.9%	95.6% 95.4%	95.7% 90.1%	100.0% 100.0%
10 - 20%	32%	8.9% 9.9%	16.3% 19.0%	4.4% 4.6%	4.3% 9.9%	0.0% 0.0%
20 - 30%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
30 - 40%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
> 40%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	702 1,810

Familial Status

Familial status ~~refers~~ is used to indicate the presence of children under the age of 18, within a household, whether or not the child is biologically related to the head of household, and regardless of the marital status of the head of households. Families ~~with children~~ may face housing discrimination by landlords who fear that children will cause property damage. Some landlords may have cultural biases against children of the opposite sex sharing a bedroom. Differential treatments such as limiting the number of children in a complex or confining children to a specific location are also fair housing concerns.

Regional Trends

Table D-8 shows the number of families with children in Torrance and surrounding cities, including the percent of children in married-couple families, male-headed families, and female-headed families. In 2019, approximately 29% of Torrance households ~~have had~~ one or more child under the age of 18. ~~The City's share~~, which is about the same as the percentage of households with ~~children is~~ one or more children in Los Angeles County overall (28%). While the exact percentage of children living in married-couple households has changed slightly ~~lower~~ throughout the region between 2010 and 2019, children living in married-couple households continue to make up the majority of families in Torrance and the surroundings cities.

Single-parent families are more likely to be female-headed, rather than ~~the county (33.0%) and the neighboring city of Rolling Hills Estates (33.8%), and slightly higher than the neighboring cities of Lomita (29.6%), Gardena (29.6%),~~ male-headed. In Los Angeles County overall in 2010, 24 percent of families were female-headed, compared to only 8 percent male-headed. This split remains nearly the same in 2019. However, in several of the coastal cities surrounding Torrance, the percentage of single-

parent households (male-headed or female-headed) is significantly lower. For instance, in 2019 Palos Verdes Estates (28%), Hermosa Beach (20.5%), Redondo Beach (29.4%), and Rancho had only 11 percent single-parent households, and Ranchos Palos Verdes (30.5%) had even fewer (8 percent). In contrast, in 2019 over one-quarter of the families in Gardena and Lomita were headed by a single parent. Torrance falls in between these extremes, with about 20 percent of families headed by a single male (5 percent) or female (14 percent).

Local Trends

Single parent households are also protected by fair housing law. ~~There are~~ In 2019 there were 2,497,984 single-parent households in the city representing 4.619% of all family households. Female-headed households with children require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. ~~Only 3.9%~~ In Torrance, 14% of family households ~~in Torrance~~ are single female-headed households ~~with children~~, which represents about 4.1% of total households in the City.

As shown in ~~Figure D-6~~, ~~Figure D-9~~, the percent of children in married-couple households are spread fairly evenly in the city, with at least 60 percent of children living in married-couple households throughout Torrance. Conversely, in most city tracts, less than 20% of children live in single female-headed households (~~Figure D-7~~), (~~Figure D-10~~). There are areas, particularly in the central and northeast parts of the city, where there is a higher concentration of both single female-headed households and racial/ethnic minority populations (~~Figure D-11~~).


Table D-8: Families with Children (2010 and 2019)

Household Type	2010								2019							
	Total	Married-couple		Male-headed		Female-headed		Total	Married-couple		Male-headed		Female-headed			
		Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct		Total	Pct	Total	Pct	Total	Pct		
Los Angeles County																
Total households	3,217,889	1,465,486	NA	213,313	NA	491,428	NA	3,316,795	1,495,658	NA	226,505	NA	488,776	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,087,704	735,852	68%	90,266	8%	261,586	24%	937,890	639,936	68%	86,362	9%	211,592	23%		
Gardena																
Total households	21,043	8,424	NA	1,481	NA	3,726	NA	20,612	9,263	NA	1,086	NA	3,438	NA		
With own children under 18 years	6,351	3,906	62%	627	10%	1,818	29%	5,101	3,535	69%	295	6%	1,271	25%		
Hermosa Beach																
Total households	9,389	3,185	NA	320	NA	302	NA	8,956	3,570	NA	286	NA	363	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,542	1,314	85%	113	7%	115	7%	1,751	1,390	79%	118	7%	243	14%		
Lomita																
Total households	7,791	3,819	NA	410	NA	876	NA	8,062	3,615	NA	326	NA	1,097	NA		
With own children under 18 years	2,485	1,876	75%	126	5%	483	19%	2,111	1,519	72%	117	6%	475	23%		
Palos Verdes Estates																
Total households	4,916	3,700	NA	64	NA	294	NA	4,909	3,579	NA	244	NA	247	NA		
With own children under 18 years	1,686	1,535	91%	12	1%	139	8%	1,373	1,215	88%	75	5%	83	6%		
Rancho Palos Verdes																
Total households	15,044	10,556	NA	495	NA	1,063	NA	15,488	10,557	NA	264	NA	836	NA		
With own children under 18 years	5,258	4,525	86%	101	2%	632	12%	4,372	4,025	92%	92	2%	255	6%		
Redondo Beach																
Total households	28,540	12,334	NA	1,200	NA	2,480	NA	27,663	13,596	NA	1,173	NA	1,915	NA		
With own children under 18 years	7,549	5,850	77%	503	7%	1,196	16%	7,916	6,347	80%	663	8%	906	11%		
Rolling Hills Estates																
Total households	2,926	1,987	NA	86	NA	230	NA	2,920	2,185	NA	58	NA	72	NA		
With own children under 18 years	952	799	84%	50	5%	103	11%	955	920	96%	14	1%	21	2%		
Torrance																
Total households	55,576	29,194	NA	2,516	NA	5,900	NA	54,437	29,626	NA	2,428	NA	5,748	NA		
With own children under 18 years	17,557	13,637	78%	1,012	6%	2,908	17%	15,752	12,768	81%	717	5%	2,267	14%		

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Figure D-6-9: Percent of Children in Married Couple Households—April 11 Version


Figure D-9: Percent of Children in Married Couple Households



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021


Figure D-7-10: Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households – April 14 Version

Figure D-10: Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2024²


Figure D-11: Female-headed Households and Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration



2/4/2022, 1:13:19 PM

1:72,224

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group - Graduated Dots
 - 0 - 20%
 - 20% - 40%
 - 40% - 60%
 - 60% - 80%
 - 80% - 100%
- (F) Percent of Children in Female Household, No Spouse/Partner Present Households (ACS, 2015-2019) - Tract
 - ≤ 20%
 - 20% - 40%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Familial Status

Tables D-9 and D-10 show the distribution of RHNA units by familial status, including the percent of children in married-couple households and the percent of children in single female-headed households. Throughout the City, most children live in married-couple households, so RHNA units are located in census tracts with higher concentrations of children in married-couple households. Over 65% of RHNA units are located in census tracts with more than 80% of children in married-couple households, including 76.660.5% of lower-income RHNA units, 55.937.6% of moderate-income RHNA units, 46.573.3% of above-moderate income RHNA units, and 95.287.6% of mixed-income RHNA units.

Table D-9: RHNA Distribution by Children in Married-Couple Households

Tract by Children in Married-Couple Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Children in Married-Couple HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
20 - 40%	0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
40 - 60%	0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
60 -80%	40%	32.5%32.6%	23.4%39.5%	62.4%44.1%	26.7%53.5%	12.4%4.8%
> 80%	60%	67.5%67.4%	76.6%60.5%	37.6%55.9%	73.3%46.5%	87.6%95.2%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	702 1,840

Most RHNA units are located in census tracts with a low concentration of children in single female-headed households, as most children do not live in these types of households. Nearly three quarters (73.5%) of RHNA units are located in census tracts with less than 20 percent of children living in single female-headed households. Over 75 percent of tracts in the City have less than 20 percent of children living in single female-headed households.

Table D-10: RHNA Distribution by Children in Single Female-Headed Households

Tract by Children in Single Female-Headed Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Children in Single Female-headed HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	77%	72%73.5%	83.9%71.3%	39.8%59.0%	75.7%55.4%	87.6%95.2%
20 -40%	23%	28%26.5%	16.1%28.7%	60.2%41.0%	24.3%44.6%	12.4%4.8%
40 - 60%	0%	0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
60 -80%	0%	0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
> 80%	0%	0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%	0.0%0.0%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	702 1,840

Income

Identifying areas of poverty and low-or-moderate-income (LMI) geographies and individuals is important to overcome patterns of segregation. These locations often correlate with other factors such as race/ethnicity and disability status.

Regional Trends

In the Los Angeles region, households with lower incomes are concentrated in the central parts of the region, while coastal areas are wealthier. Figure D-12 shows the percentage of households experiencing poverty in the central Los Angeles region. As shown in the figure, coastal cities such as Torrance have generally few households experiencing poverty.

Table D-11 shows the 2019 poverty status for Los Angeles County, Torrance, and the surrounding cities. Overall, 15 percent of Los Angeles County residents have incomes below the poverty level. Children are more likely to experience poverty, while older people are slightly less likely to experience poverty. Poverty rates are higher among the Black, Other, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian/Alaska Native populations, while the White population experiences poverty at a lower-than-typical rate.

Many of the coastal cities in the vicinity of Torrance have poverty rates significantly lower than the County generally. In Ranchos Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills Estates, and Hermosa Beach, only 5 percent of the population or less has an income level below the poverty level. Torrance has a slightly higher percentage of the population with incomes below the poverty level, but overall poverty levels are still lower in Torrance than in the County overall. As can be seen on Figure D-12, the majority of the city has a poverty rate below 10 percent, with a few areas have a poverty rate of 10-20 percent; no area of Torrance has a poverty rate that exceeds 20 percent.

Table D-11: Regional Poverty Status (2019)

	Population	AGE		SEX		RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN							
		Under 18	65+	Male	Female	Black	American Indian & Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	Other	Two or more races	Hispanic or Latino	White
<u>Los Angeles County</u>	<u>9,928,773</u>	<u>2,184,080</u>	<u>1,308,509</u>	<u>4,888,596</u>	<u>5,040,177</u>	<u>799,551</u>	<u>71,877</u>	<u>1,449,582</u>	<u>27,126</u>	<u>2,097,544</u>	<u>393,536</u>	<u>4,835,446</u>	<u>2,593,271</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>1,480,446</u>	<u>454,064</u>	<u>172,458</u>	<u>670,676</u>	<u>809,770</u>	<u>166,068</u>	<u>13,014</u>	<u>160,890</u>	<u>3,115</u>	<u>402,176</u>	<u>45,999</u>	<u>876,303</u>	<u>249,492</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>21%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>21%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>10%</u>
<u>Gardena</u>	<u>58,886</u>	<u>11,429</u>	<u>9,631</u>	<u>28,265</u>	<u>30,621</u>	<u>13,156</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>14,749</u>	<u>706</u>	<u>12,626</u>	<u>2,848</u>	<u>23,322</u>	<u>5,392</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>8,071</u>	<u>2,188</u>	<u>1,261</u>	<u>3,792</u>	<u>4,279</u>	<u>1,813</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>1,475</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,349</u>	<u>334</u>	<u>3,778</u>	<u>770</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>14%</u>
<u>Hermosa Beach</u>	<u>19,523</u>	<u>3,474</u>	<u>2,414</u>	<u>10,485</u>	<u>9,038</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>1,002</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>328</u>	<u>1,360</u>	<u>1,829</u>	<u>15,235</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>877</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>776</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>5%</u>
<u>Lomita</u>	<u>20,344</u>	<u>4,297</u>	<u>3,470</u>	<u>9,982</u>	<u>10,362</u>	<u>1,258</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>3,305</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>2,538</u>	<u>1,463</u>	<u>6,792</u>	<u>8,039</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>2,137</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>453</u>	<u>953</u>	<u>1,184</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>549</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>714</u>	<u>524</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>23%</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>7%</u>
<u>Palos Verdes Estates</u>	<u>13,434</u>	<u>2,871</u>	<u>3,633</u>	<u>6,466</u>	<u>6,968</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3,083</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>1,045</u>	<u>8,782</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>796</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>391</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>333</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>333</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>4%</u>
<u>Ranchos Palos Verdes</u>	<u>41,796</u>	<u>8,788</u>	<u>10,692</u>	<u>20,059</u>	<u>21,737</u>	<u>770</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>13,112</u>	<u>367</u>	<u>1,419</u>	<u>2,570</u>	<u>4,330</u>	<u>21,030</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>1,719</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>647</u>	<u>588</u>	<u>1,131</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>397</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>963</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>
<u>Redondo Beach</u>	<u>67,208</u>	<u>14,663</u>	<u>8,842</u>	<u>33,971</u>	<u>33,237</u>	<u>2,318</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>9,112</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>2,652</u>	<u>5,085</u>	<u>10,646</u>	<u>40,632</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>2,633</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>1,209</u>	<u>1,424</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>458</u>	<u>1,567</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>
<u>Rolling Hills Estates</u>	<u>8,158</u>	<u>1,892</u>	<u>2,057</u>	<u>4,017</u>	<u>4,141</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2,359</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>253</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>831</u>	<u>4,471</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>115</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>3%</u>
<u>Torrance</u>	<u>144,593</u>	<u>29,825</u>	<u>24,130</u>	<u>69,899</u>	<u>74,694</u>	<u>4,099</u>	<u>1,031</u>	<u>52,308</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>9,006</u>	<u>10,056</u>	<u>26,786</u>	<u>54,089</u>
<u>Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>9,939</u>	<u>2,059</u>	<u>1,906</u>	<u>3,945</u>	<u>5,994</u>	<u>453</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>3,878</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>720</u>	<u>717</u>	<u>2,048</u>	<u>3,256</u>
<u>% Below Poverty Level</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>6%</u>

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Local Trends

The total number of people with income below poverty level in Torrance has remained relatively consistent between 2010 and 2019, with a slight decrease from 8 percent to 7 percent of the population with income below poverty level. Generally, poverty in Torrance is less than in Los Angeles County overall, but certain groups within the City experience more poverty than others. For example, the block group in the northeast corner of the city, as well as the block group north of Torrance Blvd between Hawthorne Blvd and Anza Ave both have higher concentrations of people below poverty level and children living in single female-headed households (see figures D-11 and D-13). In addition, the Black, American Indian, and Alaska Native populations have a higher percentage of people below the poverty level, while the White population is lower than the citywide average. While a slightly higher percentage of people 65 years are below the poverty level, overall the percentage of older people in poverty in Torrance is less than in Los Angeles County overall. Table D-12 shows the poverty status in Los Angeles County and Torrance in 2010 and 2019.


Table D-12: Poverty Status (2010 and 2019)

	2010						2019					
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY			TORRANCE			LOS ANGELES COUNTY			TORRANCE		
	Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level		Total Population	Below Poverty Level	
		Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct		Total	Pct
POPULATION	9,678,817	1,697,465	18%	144,823	11,745	8%	9,928,773	1,480,446	15%	144,593	9,939	7%
AGE												
Under 18 years	2,367,269	579,151	25%	32,692	3,920	12%	2,184,080	454,064	21%	29,825	2,059	7%
65 years and over	1,041,155	135,654	13%	23,911	1,675	7%	1,308,509	172,458	13%	24,130	1,906	8%
SEX												
Male	4,764,325	772,821	16%	71,311	6,473	9%	4,888,596	670,676	14%	69,899	3,945	6%
Female	4,914,492	924,644	19%	73,512	5,272	7%	5,040,177	809,770	16%	74,694	5,994	8%
RACE												
Black	809,080	183,691	23%	NA	NA	NA	799,551	166,068	21%	4,099	453	11%
American Indian & Alaska Native	40,644	10,939	27%	NA	NA	NA	71,877	13,014	18%	1,031	93	9%
Asian	1,340,907	172,752	13%	48,383	5,044	10%	1,449,582	160,890	11%	52,308	3,878	7%
Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander	23,215	3,498	15%	NA	NA	NA	27,126	3,115	12%	710	18	3%
Other	1,999,996	497,306	25%	NA	NA	NA	2,097,544	402,176	19%	9,006	720	8%
Two or more races	359,352	48,476	14%	NA	NA	NA	393,536	45,999	12%	10,056	717	7%
Hispanic or Latino	4,654,635	1,049,860	23%	22,163	2,874	13%	4,835,446	876,303	18%	26,786	2,048	8%
White	2,663,753	267,523	10%	62,887	3,046	5%	2,593,271	249,492	10%	54,089	3,256	6%

Source: 2010 Decennial Census, 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates

As shown in Figure D-12, most of the areas within Torrance that have the highest percentages of people in poverty also have higher concentrations of racial and ethnic minorities. These areas are generally located in the eastern and central parts of the city, away from the coastal neighborhoods.

Figure D-13: Race and Poverty Status



2/4/2022, 1:11:40 PM

1:72,224


City/Town Boundaries

(R) Racial Demographics (2018) - Block Group - Graduated Dots

- 0 - 20%
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- 80% - 100%

(R) Poverty Status (ACS, 2015 - 2019) - Tract

- < 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021

HUD’s 2013-2017 CHAS data (Table D-13) shows that 36.1 percent of Torrance residents earn 80% or less than the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) and are considered lower income, compared to 51.6 percent countywide. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the median household income in Torrance is \$116,447, higher than \$68,044 for the county.

Table D-13: Income Level Distribution

Income Category	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
<30% HAMFI	6,080	11.1%	641,055	19.5%
31-50% HAMFI	6,085	11.1%	482,070	14.6%
51-80% HAMFI	7,630	13.9%	578,285	17.5%
81-100% HAMFI	4,835	8.8%	312,595	9.5%
>100% HAMFI	30,285	55.2%	1,281,195	38.9%
Total	54,905	100.0%	3,295,200	100.0%

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data (based on 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS)), 2020.


Figure D-14 shows the Lower and Moderate Income (LMI) areas in the city by census tract/block group. HUD defines a LMI area as a census tract or block group where over 51% of the population is LMI. There are two tracts/nine block groups in Torrance with LMI populations over 51%, one in the center of the city and one on the north boundary mostly located in the central, east, and north parts of the city. In general, LMI concentration increases farther from the coastline. Overall, Torrance has a lower concentration of LMI populations compared to surrounding cities to the north and east, but a higher concentration of LMI populations than cities to the west and southwest (adjacent to the coast).

Table D-14 shows the distribution of RHNA units based on the concentration of low and moderate income population throughout the City. As shown in Table 14, most RHNA units (over 96%) are located within census tracts that have a low and moderate income population below 50 percent. This is expected, since most of the City’s population (93 percent of census tracts) has higher-than-average household incomes. Just over 66% Nearly 65% of the RHNA units are located within census tracts that have a low and moderate income population between 25 and 50 percent, with 59.571.9% of lower-income RHNA units, 69.649.6% of moderate-income RHNA units, 43.471.3% of above-moderate income RHNA units, and 83.457.1% mixed-income RHNA units located within these areas.

Table D-14: RHNA Distribution by Percent Low and Moderate Income Population

Low and Moderate Income Population		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Low and Moderate Income HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 25%	19%	31.7% 30.2%	21.2% 33.6%	49.3% 28.6%	26.6% 51.8%	42.9% 16.6%
25% - 50%	74%	64.7% 66.1%	71.9% 59.5%	49.6% 69.6%	71.3% 43.4%	57.1% 83.4%
50% - 75%	6%	3.6% 3.8%	6.9% 6.9%	1.1% 1.8%	2.0% 4.9%	0.0% 0.0%
< 75 – 100%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	702 810

Figure D-8-14: Concentration of LMI Households—April 11 Version
 Figure D-14: Concentration of LMI Households




Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD LMI Database, 2021.

D.2.3 Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50%) with a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. According to HCD's 2020 R/ECAP mapping tool based on the 2009-2013 ACS, there are no R/ECAPs in Torrance. The R/ECAPs closest to the city are located to the southeast and northeast (Figure D-9). (Figure D-15).

Figure D-9-15: Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) – April 11 Version
Figure D-15: Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)




Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD R/ECAP Database, 2022.

Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas

In February 2017, HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened a group of independent organizations and research centers that worked together to with create an opportunity map to identify areas in every region of the state whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children. The TCAC opportunity areas of high segregation and poverty in the region are shown outlined in red in Figure D-16. As shown in the figure, there are no TCAC areas of high segregation and poverty in the City—the entire city is identified as an area whose characteristics have been shown to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income households. The nearest TCAC opportunity areas of high segregation and poverty are located to the east and southeast of the City.

Figure D-16: Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Opportunity Areas



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD R/ECAP Database, 2021.

Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs)


While racially concentrated areas of poverty and segregation (R/ECAPs) have long been the focus of fair housing policies, racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) must also be analyzed to ensure housing is integrated, a key to fair housing choice. A HUD Policy Paper defines racially concentrated areas of affluence as affluent, White communities.¹² According to this report, Whites are the most racially segregated group in the United States and “in the same way neighborhood disadvantage is associated with concentrated poverty and high concentrations of people of color, conversely, distinct advantages are associated with residence in affluent, White communities.” Based on their research, HCD defines RCAAs as census tracts where 1) 80% or more of the population is White, and 2) the median household income is \$125,000 or greater (slightly more than double the national median household income in 2016).

As shown in [Figure D-10](#), [Figure D-17](#), all of Torrance is predominantly White in the area adjacent to the coast, becoming less White farther to the east and north. This is consistent with demographics in nearby cities, where the White population is also concentrated along the coastline. However, as shown in [Figure D-3](#), [Figure D-17](#), there are no areas in Torrance with racial/ethnic minority concentrations below 20%. While nearly all block groups in the city have a median income greater than the state median of \$87,100, median income varies throughout the city, with no clear concentration of higher or lower median incomes—([Figure D-18](#)).

The sites used to meet the City’s 2021-2029 RHNA are shown in [Figure D-3 above Figure D-17](#). Sites are generally spread throughout the city, but only three sites are located in the southwest part of Torrance near the coastline, where more of the population is White.

¹² Goetz, Edward G., Damiano, A., & Williams, R. A. (2019) Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation.’ Published by the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research (21,1, 99-124).

Figure D-10-17: White Predominant Areas



8/12/2021, 9:54:48 AM

1:144,448


City/Town Boundaries

(R) Predominant Population - White Majority Tracts

Slim (gap < 10%)

Sizeable (gap 10% - 50%)


Predominant (gap > 50%)



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure D-18: Median Income by Block Group



8/12/2021, 9:56:09 AM

- City/Town Boundaries
- (R) Median Income (ACS, 2015-2019) - Block Group
- < \$30,000
- < \$55,000
- < \$87,100 (HCD 2020 State Median Income)
- < \$125,000
- Greater than \$125,000



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2014 ACS, 2021.

D.2.4 Access to Opportunities

HUD developed an index for assessing fair housing by informing communities about disparities in access to opportunity based on race/ethnicity and poverty status. ~~Table D-3~~Table D-15 shows index scores for the following opportunity indicator indices (values range from 0 to 100):

- **Low Poverty Index:** The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.
- **School Proficiency Index:** The higher the score, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.
- **Labor Market Engagement Index:** The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood.
- **Transit Trips Index:** The higher the trips transit index, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.
- **Low Transportation Cost Index:** The higher the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.
- **Jobs Proximity Index:** The higher the index value, the better access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.
- **Environmental Health Index:** The higher the value, the better environmental quality of a neighborhood.

In the Urban County, Hispanic residents are most likely to be impacted by poverty, low labor market participation, and poor environmental quality. White residents in the Urban County and countywide are least likely to be exposed to poverty and have the highest exposure to better environmental quality. White residents also have the best access to high quality school systems and employment opportunities and have the highest labor market participation rates in both the Urban County jurisdictions and county.

Urban County residents, regardless of race or ethnicity, have less access to public transit and pay more for transportation. However, Los Angeles County residents as a whole are more exposed to poor environmental quality compared to Urban County jurisdictions.

Table D-3-15: HUD Opportunity Indicators

	Low Poverty	School Proficiency	Labor Market	Transit	Low Transportation Cost	Jobs Proximity	Environmental Health
Los Angeles Urban County							
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	70.12	72.18	68.22	76.66	67.60	55.10	22.89
Black, Non-Hispanic	46.29	41.09	42.82	84.10	73.91	41.10	14.44
Hispanic	40.70	43.31	34.05	84.98	73.75	44.48	11.98
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	68.38	72.86	66.73	82.22	68.98	51.22	13.86
Native American, Non-Hispanic	54.75	55.06	48.03	77.80	69.62	45.65	20.02
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	61.23	66.91	61.96	79.48	71.75	55.51	20.59
Black, Non-Hispanic	29.03	29.31	27.29	85.47	76.25	30.59	12.84
Hispanic	28.75	35.77	26.10	87.23	76.67	41.99	10.38
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	61.63	70.67	62.58	83.88	72.41	51.16	13.30
Native American, Non-Hispanic	41.92	47.90	41.36	84.81	73.95	51.00	12.82
Los Angeles County							
Total Population							
White, Non-Hispanic	62.59	65.09	65.41	82.63	74.09	55.80	18.99
Black, Non-Hispanic	34.95	32.37	34.00	87.70	79.18	40.13	11.66
Hispanic	33.91	38.38	33.18	87.19	77.74	41.53	11.91
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	53.57	59.34	55.94	86.52	76.45	51.82	12.16
Native American, Non-Hispanic	45.04	46.90	44.50	83.17	75.65	44.24	16.74
Population below federal poverty line							
White, Non-Hispanic	50.68	58.06	57.49	86.42	79.48	57.52	16.66
Black, Non-Hispanic	23.45	27.16	25.52	88.65	81.18	36.59	11.62
Hispanic	23.66	32.87	27.66	89.45	81.02	42.84	10.30
Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	42.97	54.52	50.06	89.62	81.49	54.19	9.84
Native American, Non-Hispanic	29.85	35.12	32.02	85.23	78.70	46.35	16.01

Sources: HUD AFFH Database, 2020.

To assist in this analysis, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task Force (Task Force) to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD).” The Task force has created Opportunity Maps to identify resource levels across the state “to accompany new policies aimed at increasing access to high opportunity areas for

families with children in housing financed with 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)”. These opportunity maps are made from composite scores of three different domains made up of a set of indicators. Based on these domain scores, tracts are categorized as Highest Resource, High Resource, Moderate Resource, Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing), Low Resource, or areas of High Segregation and Poverty. [Table D-4](#) [Table D-16](#) shows the full list of indicators.

Table D-4-16: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps

Domain	Indicator
Economic	Poverty Adult education Employment Job proximity Median home value
Environmental	CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values
Education	Math proficiency Reading proficiency High School graduation rates Student poverty rates
Poverty and Racial Segregation	Poverty: tracts with at least 30% of population under federal poverty line Racial Segregation: Tracts with location quotient higher than 1.25 for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, or all people of color in comparison to the county

Sources: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, 2020.

Opportunity map scores for Torrance census tracts are presented in [Figure D-19](#). All tracts in the city are categorized as Moderate to Highest Resource, with [the exception of one area that is identified as an area of high segregation and poverty—however, the entire area has industrial uses, including a 750-acre refinery and industrial and business park uses](#). Resource levels are higher in the west half of the city and lower in the east half. Regionally, [the surrounding areas along the coastline are generally classified as Highest Resource areas, with Low Resource areas located east of the city](#). The economic, environmental, and education scores for Torrance are further detailed below.


[Table D-17 shows the distribution of RHNA units by TCAC Opportunity Area Category. As most of the City is within a Highest or High Resource category, most RHNA sites are located within one of those two categories. Nearly Over 56 percent of the RHNA are located within the Highest Resource category, and over nearly 40 percent are located within the High Resource category. Similarly, over 60 percent of census tracts in the City are within the Highest Resource category, and over 30 percent are within the High Resource category.](#)

[The City’s Sites Inventory distributes lower-income units equitably and does not concentrate them in lower-resource areas. As discussed previously and shown in Table D-16, 53.2 percent of lower-income units are located in the Highest Resources areas in Torrance and 38.9 percent are located in High Resources Areas. Only 7.9 are located in Moderate Resource Areas, and none are located in Low Resource Areas or High Segregation & Poverty areas, because none exist in Torrance.](#)

Table D-17: RHNA Distribution by TCAC Opportunity Area Category

TCAC Opportunity Area Category		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Category	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
Highest Resource	61%	56.7% 55.8	53.2% 39.8	19.4% 24.7%	82.4% 60.0	100.0% 100.0
High Resource	33%	39.6% 40.5	38.9% 52.3	79.1% 73.4%	17.3% 39.5	0.0% 0.0%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	3%	3.7% 3.7%	7.9% 7.9%	1.5% 1.9%	0.3% 0.5%	0.0% 0.0%
Low Resource (None in Torrance)	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
High Segregation & Poverty (None in Torrance)	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Missing/Insufficient Data	3%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total Units	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	7021 810

Figure D-12-19: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Composite Scores - April 11 Version
Figure D-19: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Composite Scores



Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021¹²

Economic

As described previously, the Fair Housing Task Force calculates economic scores based on poverty, adult education, employment, job proximity, and median home values. According to the 2021 Task Force maps presented in [Figure D-13](#), [Figure D-20](#), all tracts in Torrance have economic scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has an economic score of less than 0.25—however, this tract is primarily industrial uses with no residents. [Figure D-20 shows a correlation between race and economic scores, with areas of the City with higher concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities having slightly lower economic scores.](#)

Education

As described above, the Fair Housing Task Force determines education scores based on math and reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and student poverty rates. As shown in [Figure D-14](#), [Figure D-21](#), all parts of Torrance have education scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has a score of less than 0.25—however, this tract is primarily industrial uses with no residents.

Environmental

Environmental health scores are determined by the Fair Housing Task Force based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values. [Figure D-15](#), [Figure D-22](#) shows that about half of the tracts in Torrance have the highest environmental scores, between 0.75 and 1.0. However, many of the central and northeast tracts in the city have the lowest environmental scores (under 0.25). Environmental scores are generally better in the surrounding areas to the southwest, with areas to the east and north having low scores.

[Figure D-23 shows more recent environmental data from CalEnviroScreen 4.0. As shown in the figure, environmental quality is best closer to coastal areas, while further to the east environmental quality becomes progressively worse. In Torrance, environmental quality does not reach worst \(highest\) scores, but there are several areas of the east and central City above the 50th percentile for poor environmental quality.](#)


Transportation

HUD's Job Proximity Index, described previously, can be used to show transportation needs geographically. Block groups with lower jobs proximity indices are located farther from employment opportunities and have a higher need for transportation. As shown in [Figure D-16](#), [Figure D-24](#), the central parts of the city have the best access to employment opportunities, while areas around the city's boundaries score increasingly poorer. All sites used to meet the City's 2021-2029 RHNA are in block groups with job proximity scores of 40 or above, and about half of the sites are in locations with the highest job proximity.

Availability of efficient, affordable transportation can be used to measure fair housing and access to opportunities. SCAG developed a mapping tool for High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) as part of the Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). SCAG defines HQTAs as areas within one-half mile from a major transit stop and a high-quality transit corridor. [Figure D-17](#), [Figure D-25](#) shows that there are limited HQTAs in Torrance, with HQTAs in the north-central part of Torrance, as well as along its eastern boundary.



Figure D-13-26 shows the AllTransit Performance Score for Torrance, which rates the City at 6.1 (moderate) overall for transit access, with better transit scores within the central part of the City.

Figure D-20: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Economic Scores



2/7/2022, 10:13:05 AM


1:72,224



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, GeoTechnologies, Inc., USGS, EPA, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021


Figure D-14-21: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Education Scores



8/12/2021, 9:58:44 AM

1:144,448

City/Town Boundaries



(R) TCAC Opportunity Areas (2021) - Education Score -Tract

< 0.25 (Less Positive Education Outcomes)

0.25 - 0.50

0.50 - 0.75


> 0.75 (More Positive Education Outcomes)

No Data

City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021

Figure D-45-22: TCAC Opportunity Areas - Environmental Scores



8/12/2021, 9:59:00 AM

City/Town Boundaries


(R) TCAC Opportunity Areas (2021) - Environmental Score -Tract

< .25 (Less Positive Environmental Outcomes)

.25 - .50

.50 - .75

.75 - 1 (More Positive Environmental Outcomes)



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, TCAC Opportunity Maps, 2021

Figure D-23: CalEnviroScreen 4.0






Figure D-46: 24: Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group



8/12/2021, 10:00:29 AM

1:144,448

City/Town Boundaries




(A) Jobs Proximity Index (HUD, 2014 - 2017) - Block Group

- < 20 (Furthest Proximity)
- 20 - 40
- 40 - 60
- 60 - 80
- > 80 (Closest Proximity)

City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD Opportunity Indices, 2021.

Figure D-47-25: High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA)



Source: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), 2021.

Figure D-26: All-Transit Performance Score



AllTransit™ Performance Score

6.1

City: Torrance, CA
 Moderate combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible enabling moderate number of people to take transit to work

On Average Households have:

1,260	Transit Trips per Week within ½ Mile
7	Transit Routes within ½ Mile
224,996	Jobs Accessible in 30-minute trip
2.28%	Commuters Who Use Transit

D.2.5 Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing problems for Torrance were calculated using HUD’s 2020 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data based on the 2013-2017 ACS. ~~Table D-5~~ [Table D-18](#) breaks down households by race and ethnicity and presence of housing problems for Torrance and Los Angeles County households. The following conditions are considered housing problems:

- Substandard Housing (incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities)
- Overcrowding (more than 1 person per room)
- Cost burden (housing costs greater than 30%)

In Torrance, 29.8% of owner-occupied households and 53.9% of renter-occupied households have one or more housing problem. The city had a slightly lower proportion of households with a housing problem compared to the county, where 39.9% of owner-occupied households and 62.3% of renter-occupied households experience a housing problem. In Torrance, non-White owner-occupied households generally experience higher rates of housing problems than White owner-occupied households. In renter-occupied households, more than half of Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experienced a housing problem. In both Torrance and the county, renter-occupied households tend to experience housing problems at a higher rate, with the exception of “Other” households in Torrance.

Table D-5-18: Housing Problems by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
White	29.0%	50.2%	32.1%	52.6%
Black	69.0%	49.3%	41.5%	63.7%
Asian	30.4%	56.8%	38.3%	56.3%
American Indian	17.6%	34.5%	39.7%	56.4%
Pacific Islander	--	78.1%	39.7%	55.5%
Hispanic	28.8%	60.0%	48.2%	71.1%
Other	35.3%	3.0%	36.5%	55.7%
All	29.8%	53.9%	38.9%	62.3%

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021.

Cost Burden

Cost burden by tenure based on HUD CHAS data is shown in ~~Table D-6~~ [Table D-19](#). For owner-occupied households, a higher percentage of Black households (over 60 percent) are cost burdened. However, Black households make up a small portion of the total owner-occupied households in the city. While a smaller percentage of Asian owner-occupied households are cost burdened (27 percent) compared to Black households, these make up a much larger portion of the owner-occupied households in Torrance.

For renter-occupied households, a higher percentage (78 percent) of Pacific Islander households are cost burden. However, these also make up a minor portion of the overall renter-occupied households

in the city. While a lower percent of Asian (45 percent) and Hispanic (48 percent) renter-occupied households have a cost burden, these populations make up a much larger portion of renter-occupied households in Torrance.


Figures D-18 and Figures D-27 (A) through (D) compare overpayment by tenure over time using the 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS. The proportion of overpaying homeowners has lowered somewhat over these time periods. Currently, 20% to 60% of owners in most tracts in the City are cost burdened, with more overpaying owners generally in the north and south boundaries of the city. Overpayment by renters has decreased overall, but in most of the city 40-60 percent of renters overpay.

Table D-6-19: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Cost Burden (>30%)	Severe Cost Burden (>50%)	Total Households
Owner-Occupied			
White, non-Hispanic	28.4%	12.1%	15,895
Black, non-Hispanic	61.9%	26.2%	210
Asian, Non-Hispanic	27.1%	12.0%	10,080
American Indian	16.5%	11.8%	85
Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	35
Hispanic	25.1%	11.9%	2,985
Other	34.7%	4.1%	850
Renter-Occupied			
White, non-Hispanic	46.2%	24.3%	10,175
Black, non-Hispanic	46.2%	27.4%	1,115
Asian, Non-Hispanic	44.8%	23.2%	7,975
American Indian	34.5%	6.9%	145
Pacific Islander	78.1%	12.5%	160
Hispanic	48.1%	22.6%	4,355
Other	34.1%	16.2%	835

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021.

Figure D-48-27: (A) Overpaying Owners (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 10:08:50 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Overpayment by Home Owners (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract


- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- > 80%
- > 80%



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community


(B) Overpaying Owners (2015-2019) – April 11 Version

(B) Overpaying Owners (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

(C) Overpaying Renters (2010-2014)




8/12/2021, 10:09:11 AM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Overpayment by Renters (ACS, 2010 - 2014) - Tract ACS

- < 20%
- 20% - 40%
- 40% - 60%
- 60% - 80%
- > 80%


1:144,448



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

(D) Overpaying Renters (2015-2019) – April 14 Version

(D) Overpaying Renters (2015-2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS, 2022.

RHNA Unit Distribution by Cost Burden

Table D-20 shows the distribution of RHNA units by owner cost burden. **Most** About half of the RHNA units are located in census tracts where 20 to 40 percent of homeowners are overpaying for housing. However, **nearly 40%** ~~there is also a higher percentage (47.8%)~~ of **lower income** RHNA units in the census tracts where 40 to 60 percent of homeowners are overpaying for housing. No RHNA units are located in census tracts where over **68%** percent of owners are cost burdened because no such areas exist within the City.

Table D-20: RHNA Distribution by Owner Cost Burden

Owners Overpaying for Housing		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overpaying Owners in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	10%	10.8% 11.2%	16.3% 14.3%	5.5% 5.5%	5.7% 10.6%	12.4% 10.9%
20 - 40%	47%	50.2% 49.1%	31.6% 37.8%	41.7% 17.3%	75.7% 48.0%	87.6% 89.1%
40 - 60%	43%	38.9% 39.6%	52.0% 47.8%	52.8% 77.1%	18.7% 41.4%	0.0% 0.0%
60 - 80%	0%	0.0% 3.2%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
> 80%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	7024 810

Table D-21 shows the distribution of RHNA units by renter cost burden. As shown in the table, most RHNA units **79.2%** ~~80.8%~~ are located in census tracts where 40 to 60 percent of renters are overpaying for housing. Similarly, most census tracts in the City have between 40 and 60 percent of renters overpaying for housing. These areas include **77.9%** ~~74.8%~~ of lower-income RHNA units, **60.1%** ~~71.7%~~ of moderate-income RHNA units, **92.8%** ~~80.6%~~ of above-moderate income RHNA units, and **93.9%** ~~100%~~ of mixed-income RHNA units. No RHNA units are located in areas where over 80 percent of renters are cost burdened because no such areas exist within the City.

Table D-21: RHNA Distribution by Renter Cost Burden

Renters Overpaying for Housing		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overpaying Renters in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
< 20%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
20 -40%	24%	16.8% 17.7%	20.8% 14.9%	27.3% 39.9%	6.4% 17.5%	0.0% 6.1%
40 - 60%	73%	80.8% 79.2%	74.8% 77.9%	71.7% 60.1%	92.6% 80.6%	100.0% 93.9%
60 - 80%	3%	2.3% 3.2%	4.5% 7.1%	1.0% 0.0%	1.0% 1.9%	0.0% 0.0%
> 80%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total	31	6,473 6,604	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	7024 810

Overcrowding

Table D-7, Table D-22, below, shows that approximately 1.9% of owner-occupied households and 10.7% of renter-occupied households in Torrance are overcrowded. Overcrowding is more common countywide, where 5.7% of owner-occupied households and 16.7% of renter-occupied households are

overcrowded. Approximately 0.5% of owner-occupied households and 3.0% of renter-occupied households in Torrance are severely overcrowded.

Figure D-28 shows the concentration of overcrowded households in Torrance by census tract. There are two tracts in the City with a concentration of overcrowded households above 20 percent, but in most of the city the concentration of overcrowded households is less than 5 percent. There are some areas of overcrowded households in the surrounding cities east of Torrance.

Table D-22: Overcrowded Households

Overcrowded	Torrance		Los Angeles County	
	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
Overcrowded (>1 person per room)	1.9%	10.7%	5.7%	16.7%
Severely Overcrowded (>1.5 persons per room)	0.5%	3.0%	1.5%	7.6%
Total Households	30,140	24,765	1,512,365	1,782,835

Sources: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2021

RHNA Unit Distribution by Percent Overcrowded Households


Table D-23 shows the distribution of RHNA units by percent of overcrowded households. Most census tracts in the City (93%) do not have a higher-than-average percent of overcrowded households, so most RHNA units (91.14%) are located in census tracts with less than the state average of overcrowded households.

Table D-23: RHNA Distribution by Percent Overcrowded Households

Overcrowded Households		RHNA Units by Income Level				
Overcrowded HH in Tract	% of Total Tracts	Total	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Mixed
≤ 8.2% (State Average)	93%	90.1% 91.4%	86.4% 87.9%	94.2% 94.1%	93.7% 90.0%	87.6% 95.2%
≤ 12%	7%	9.9% 8.6%	13.6% 12.1%	5.8% 5.9%	6.3% 10.0%	12.4% 4.8%
≤ 15%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
≤ 20%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
≤ 70%	0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%
Total Units	31	6,473 6,601	2,710 2,705	1,582 1,286	1,479 800	702 1,810

Figure D-19-28: Concentration of Overcrowded Households — April 11 Version

Figure D-28: Concentration of Overcrowded Households



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2013-2017 HUD CHAS Data, 2024.

Substandard Housing Conditions

Incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities can be used to measure substandard housing conditions. There are currently 125 owner-occupied households and 1,079 renter-occupied households in Torrance lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities according to HUD CHAS data, which represents 2.2% of all occupied households in the City. Countywide, 0.4% of households lack complete plumbing facilities and 1.6% of households lack complete kitchen facilities.

Housing age is frequently used as an indicator of housing condition. In general, residential structures over 30 years of age require minor repairs and modernization improvements, while units over 50 years of age are likely to require major rehabilitation such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. Approximately 44.4% of housing is older than 60 years old in Torrance compared to 45.7% countywide. Figure E-2029 shows the percentage of homes built before 1959 by housing tract. As shown in Figure E-2029, tracts with a higher percentage of old housing are spread throughout the city, without clear clustering of higher and lower percentage tracts.


Overall, the housing stock in the city is generally in very good condition. Presumably, homeowners with higher incomes, such as those in Torrance, make it a priority and can afford to repair and renovate when needed. In the 5 years from 2017 through 2021, the City received a total of 1,762 residential property maintenance complaints, as shown in Table H-32. The annual numbers of complaints were consistently approximately 300; however, that number jumped to 565 in 2021. City staff are of the opinion that the increased number of residential property complaints in 2021 was related to the pandemic, as residents spent more time at home. Likewise, commercial property complaints also rose considerably in 2020 and 2021, again likely attributable to the pandemic and residents spending more time in the community. Abatement of property maintenance issues has been difficult due to material and labor shortages related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Homelessness

In January 2020, Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) conducted the annual Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. The count showed that there were 332 people experiencing homelessness in Torrance. The 2021 count was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The 2022 count was held in February 2022, however the results have not yet been released.

The 2020 count shows that people experiencing homelessness are more concentrated in certain parts of the City. Figure D-30 shows the census tracts with higher numbers of people experiencing homelessness, with the highest concentrations in the areas in the north and central part of the City. In particular, the tract with the highest number of people experiencing homelessness is also the tract with the lowest economic, environmental, and education scores, although these areas have better access to high-quality transit and jobs.

Figure D-30: People Experiencing Homelessness




Displacement

HCD defines sensitive communities as “communities [that] currently have populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased development or drastic shifts in housing cost.” The following characteristics define a vulnerable community:

- The share of very low income residents is above 20%; and
- The tract meets two of the following criteria:
 - Share of renters is above 40%,
 - Share of people of color is above 50%,
 - Share of very low-income households (50% AMI or below) that are severely rent burdened households is above the county median,
 - They or areas in close proximity have been experiencing displacement pressures (percent change in rent above county median for rent increases), or
 - Difference between tract median rent and median rent for surrounding tracts above median for all tracts in county (rent gap).


There are several tracts in Torrance that have been identified as vulnerable communities at risk of displacement (~~Figure D-21~~)(~~Figure D-31~~). There are significantly more communities east and northeast of the city.

Figure D-21-31: Sensitive Communities at Risk of Displacement



8/12/2021, 10:12:59 AM

-  City/Town Boundaries
- (A) Sensitive Communities (UCB, Urban Displacement Project)
-  Vulnerable
-  Other



City of Torrance, County of Los Angeles, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Source: HCD Data Viewer, Urban Displacement Project, 2021.


D.2.6 Other Relevant Factors

A key aspect of ~~Fair Housing Issues~~ fair housing choice is equal access to credit for the purchase or improvement of a home, particularly in light of the recent lending/credit crisis. In the past, credit market distortions and other activities such as “redlining” were prevalent and prevented some groups from having equal access to credit. In addition, informal practices such as real estate agents refusing to show homes in Torrance to non-white buyers or treating non-white buyers disrespectfully effectively preventing anyone besides white buyers from purchasing homes in many parts of the City. Figure D-32 shows the redlining maps for the Torrance. As shown in the maps, some central neighborhoods were “redlined,” making it difficult or impossible for people to gain access to residential financing in these areas.

~~Table D-8, below, summarizes the fair housing issues identified in this Fair Housing Assessment. Fair housing issues are generally spread throughout the city, although some specific issues are more prevalent in the east and central parts of the city. For instance, racial and ethnic minorities are more concentrated in these areas, and these areas generally have lower economic, education, and environmental scores. There are several vulnerable communities at risk of displacement in the central and north-central parts of Torrance. In general, racial/ethnic minority households are more likely to have housing problems and are more cost-burdened than White households.~~

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) in 1977 and the subsequent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) were designed to improve access to credit for all members of the community and hold the lender industry responsible for community lending. Under HMDA, lenders are required to disclose information on the disposition of home loan applications and on the race or national origin, gender, and annual income of loan applicants.

Figure D-32: Home Owners Loan Corporation Redlining Grade



2/7/2022, 12:52:29 PM

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Home Owners Loan Corporation Redlining Grade (University of Richmond, 2021)

- A (Best)
- C (Declining)
- D (Hazardous)




Table 24 summarizes home purchase and improvement loan applications in Torrance for 2020. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications along with the income, gender, and race of loan applicants. In 2020, applications for home refinancing were the most common in Torrance. Of the 150,994 applications for refinancing, approximately 63 percent were approved, 20 percent were denied, and 16 percent were withdrawn or closed for incompleteness.

Though less common than loans for home purchase and refinance, there was a noticeable demand for home improvement financing in the City. A total of 34,147 households in Torrance applied for loans to make home improvements and approval rates for this loan type were 47 percent. About 46 percent of home improvement loan applications were denied.

Table D-24: 2020 Home Loan Applications

Table D-8: Summary of Fair Housing Issues Disposition of Home Loan Applications				
Type	Total Applications	Percent Approved*	Percent Denied	Percent Other**
Purchase - Conventional	89,745	79%	9%	12%
Purchase – Government Backed	19,742	83%	7%	10%
Home Improvement	34,147	47%	46%	8%
Refinancing	150,994	63%	20%	16%

*Percent approved includes loans approved by the lenders whether or not they are accepted by the applicants.

**Percent Other includes loan applications that were either withdrawn or closed for incomplete information.

Source: www.ffiec.gov, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data for 2018

Environmental Justice Communities

Disadvantaged communities in California are specifically targeted for investment of proceeds from the State’s cap-and-trade program. Known as California Climate Investments (CCI), these funds are aimed at improving public health, quality of life and economic opportunity in California’s most burdened communities at the same time they’re reducing pollution that causes climate change.

Any jurisdiction can choose to include policies focused on environmental justice (EJ) in their General Plan, but an EJ Element is required under state Law for any city or county that includes disadvantaged communities. For the purposes of environmental justice, a disadvantaged community is defined as, “An area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code or an area that is a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.”


Senate Bill 535 defines disadvantaged communities as the top 25% scoring areas from CalEnviroScreen. As shown below (Figure 33), a portion of Torrance falls within the category of a disadvantage community due to this area being disproportionately affected by environmental pollution. In particular, impacts from ozone pollution affect the majority of the residents in these areas closest to a large refinery and major highways. The only part of Torrance that has a CalEnviroScreen score of 4.0 (the top 25% scoring area) is the area where the Torrance Refining Company, a 750-acre oil refinery, is located. As noted in Program 20, The City will prepare an Environmental Justice Element (EJE) by October 15, 2024. The EJE is intended to confront inequities by addressing the specific environmental

.....

hazards faced by disadvantaged communities in meaningful policy. In accordance with SB 1000, the City will incorporate environmental justice policies into its General Plan to address the following environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives as required by State law:

- Reduction of pollution exposure and improving air quality
- Promoting access to public facilities
- Promoting access to healthy foods
- Promoting safe and sanitary homes
- Promoting physical activity
- Promoting civic engagement

Figure D-33: CalEPA Proposed SB535 Disadvantaged Communities (October 2021)



D.2.7 Sites Inventory

Sites have been identified throughout Torrance to meet the City's RHNA. These sites are shown in Figure D-34, which organizes sites by neighborhoods that include adjacent census tracts. Table D-25 summarizes the number and type of RHNA site in each neighborhood, along with the RHNA variables associated with that part of the City.

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50%) with a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. As discussed in Section D.2.3., according to HCD's 2020 R/ECAP mapping tool based on the 2009-2013 ACS, there are no R/ECAPs in Torrance.

Another indicator of characteristics that have been shown by research (HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children—is the TCAC Opportunity Area Map, also discussed in Section D.2.3. There are no TCAC areas of high segregation and poverty in Torrance—the entire city is identified as an area whose characteristics have been shown to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income households. As shown in Table D-17 (RHNA Distribution by TCAC Opportunity Area Category), 56.7 percent of all census tracts in Torrance are in the Highest Resource Area, 39.6 percent are in the High Resources Area, and 3.7 percent are in the Moderate Resources Area (refinery??).

The scores noted above are an indication that Torrance offers all residents a high quality of life. That being said, the AFFH analysis in Appendix D indicates that there are areas of the city where fair housing issues exist. —see Section D.2.8 (Summary of Fair Housing Issues).

The section below provides an overview of various neighborhoods within Torrance.

North Torrance

North Torrance includes census tracts in the northern part of the City, bounded by the City borders to the north and Del Amo Blvd to the south. This neighborhood currently includes 11,296 households, or about 22 percent of the City's households. Zoning in North Torrance is primarily single family residential in the north part of the neighborhood, with a large industrial area in the south, which includes the 750-acre Torrance Refining Company. Public use, commercial retail, and higher density multi-family residential zones are located along major streets in the neighborhood.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High or Highest Resource, with the exception of Census Tract 6503 (Moderate Resource). Because the North Torrance neighborhood is the only neighborhood in Torrance with a census that has a Moderate Resource score, geographic targeting of AFFH actions should be directed here. North Torrance also has a higher predominance of environmental justice communities. While North Torrance has a relatively average home-owner cost burden compared to the rest of the city, it has a higher renter cost burden than other neighborhoods.

On average, the nonwhite population is slightly higher in this neighborhood than in the rest of the City. This neighborhood includes 1,193 RHNA units, which represents about 18% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower and moderate income. This is due to several factors, such as proximity

to key transit corridors; access to employment, commercial, and open space uses; and the state's size limits for lower-income units. Another factor is because of the identified trends in both Torrance and surrounding cities that are seeing transition of non-residential uses to residential ones. Note that two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study are located within the North Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory. The City's program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance.

West Torrance

The West Torrance neighborhood includes census tracts at the western side of the City, north of Sepulveda Blvd and west of Hawthorne Boulevard and Anza Avenue. The bulk of West Torrance is single-family residential and public use, with the exception of the areas between Hawthorne Boulevard and Anza Avenue and along Torrance Boulevard, which include multi-family residential, commercial, industrial, and hospital/medical uses. This neighborhood includes 7,246 households in the City, or about 14% of the current households.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource and the low-moderate income population is generally lower than other neighborhoods. This neighborhood includes 438 RHNA units, which represents about 7% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or mixed income. The location of lower- to moderate-income units in this neighborhood provides lower-income households proximity to the highest resources; proximity to key transit corridors; and access to employment, commercial, and open space uses.

Note that one of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study is located within the West Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory. Several of the sites are located along Hawthorne Boulevard, which already has a specific plan in place that promotes mixed-use development, a trend that has already been demonstrated in the Housing Element as being very popular and successful. As noted in the Housing Plan, the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP) will be modified encourage more housing by reducing the required percentage of commercial use in a mixed-use development and modify development standards to address constraints that were identified by developers during the outreach phase of the Housing Element update. The Sites Inventory identifies many lower, moderate, and mixed income sites in the census tract with the highest level of overcrowding, so construction of addition units should help address that issue.

The City's program to encourage the production of ADUs, and especially ADUs that are affordable to lower-income households, will increase the opportunity for lower- and moderate income households to live in the West Torrance Neighborhood. Implementation of SB 9 also will expand opportunities for households of all incomes to live in this neighborhood. The City's program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance, especially in neighborhoods of higher-income households.

Central Torrance

Central Torrance includes the portion of the City located generally south of Del Amo Boulevard, east of Hawthorne Boulevard, west of Crenshaw Boulevard, and north of Sepulveda Boulevard. This

neighborhood includes 8,737 households or about 17% of the current households. Land use in Central Torrance includes a broad mix of single-family and multi-family residential, manufacturing, and planned districts—this neighborhood is also home to the key commercial district in Torrance, which includes Del Amo Fashion Center, which is the sixth largest shopping mall in the United States, with a gross leasable area of approximately 2.52 million square feet. The HBCSP applies to a large portion of this neighborhood, and there is significant developer interest in recycling existing non-residential uses into multi-family residential and mixed-use development.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource. Although Torrance generally does not have many areas with overcrowded housing, West Torrance does have one census tract (6506.02) that is slightly higher than the state-wide average. This neighborhood includes 2,503 RHNA units, which represents about 39% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or above moderate income, although several sites are identified for moderate-income households. The size of many properties in the Central Torrance neighborhood provide an opportunity to facilitate development of lower- and moderate-income units in this neighborhood, as well as adding above-moderate income units. The location of lower- to moderate-income units in this neighborhood provides lower-income households proximity to the highest resources, as well as proximity to key transit corridors and the City's transit facility; and access to employment and commercial uses, and open space uses. This neighborhood includes the Madrona Marsh Preserve, a 43-acre seasonal wetland with vernal pools, which is one of the few natural areas remaining within an urban landscape in Southern California. Note that two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study are located within the Central Torrance neighborhood, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory.

East Torrance

East Torrance is located along the east boundary of the City, south of Del Amo Boulevard, east of Crenshaw Boulevard, and north of Sepulveda Boulevard. This neighborhood includes single-family and multi-family residential, commercial, manufacturing, and open space, recreational, and public uses. The Old Torrance neighborhood, which is also home to Torrance's historic downtown (Downtown Torrance), which was discussed in detail in Section 4 of the Housing Element. A former redevelopment area, Old Torrance has seen much development over the past several decades, including new residential developments ranging from market-rate townhomes to moderate- and lower-income multi-family developments, to an SRO—many of these developments received support by the City's former Redevelopment Agency and currently by the City. This is also an important employment area in Torrance.

There are 8,737 households in this neighborhood, which represents approximately 17% of the City's households. Both census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High Resource. This neighborhood includes 935 RHNA units, which represents about 14% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are moderate income. As described in Section 4, the City recently adopted a plan for Downtown Torrance that is promoting continued revitalization and facilitation of housing, with an emphasis on affordable housing. Note that East Torrance also includes two of the seven areas identified in the Housing Corridor Study, which will promote development of sites in the Sites Inventory.

Southwest Torrance

Southwest Torrance includes census tracts on the west side of the City south of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hawthorne Boulevard, as well as a census tract east of Hawthorne Boulevard south of Pacific Coast Highway. Land use in this neighborhood is primarily single-family residential, but includes multi-family residential uses adjacent to the coast, northwest of the intersection of Hawthorne and Pacific Coast Highway, and the WALTERIA district, which is on and near Hawthorne Boulevard south of Pacific Coast Highway. In addition, public and commercial uses are located along major streets like Hawthorne Boulevard and the Pacific Coast Highway. This neighborhood includes 12,265 households, which is 24% of the City's households.

All census tracts in this neighborhood are designated Highest Resource. This neighborhood includes 547 RHNA units, which represents about 9% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower or above moderate income. Hawthorne Boulevard provides the eastern border of a portion of the Southwest Torrance neighborhood and continues through WALTERIA to the southern city boundary. The HBCSP applies, which facilitates mixed-use and multi-family residential development in the subdistricts that are located in the Southwest neighborhood. Recycling of non-residential uses into mixed use developments are an ongoing trend in WALTERIA, as and several developers have expressed interest in continuing to add mixed use and multi-family residential development in the Southwest neighborhood. The City's program to encourage the production of ADUs, and especially ADUs that are affordable to lower-income households, will increase the opportunity for lower- and moderate income households to live in the Southwest Torrance Neighborhood. Implementation of SB 9 also will expand opportunities for households of all incomes to live in this neighborhood. The City's program to adopt a Religious Institution Housing Overlay Zone (RIH-OZ) for affordable Housing will provide additional opportunities for lower-income households to locate throughout Torrance, especially in neighborhoods of higher-income households.

Southwest Torrance

Southwest Torrance includes census tracts on the east side of the City south of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hawthorne Blvd. There are 6,997 households in this neighborhood, which represents about 14% of the City's households. Land use in this neighborhood includes single- and multi-family residential, along with a large portion of commercial and industrial use at and surrounding the Torrance Airport. Several housing corridors identified in the Housing Element are located in the Southwest neighborhood, a portion of the HBCSP is located here, as is one of the HCS areas.

The majority of census tracts in this neighborhood are designated High Resource, ~~of~~ with a Highest Resource area located at the northwest corner of neighborhood. Southwest Torrance has a relatively higher rate of both renter and owner cost burden. This neighborhood includes 857 RHNA units, which represents about 13% of the total units within the City. Of these, most are lower income.

Figure D-34: Sites Inventory by Neighborhood




Table D-25: Residential Sites Inventory by Area and AFFH Variable

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	%	Total	%	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: Central																			
Census Tract 6504.01	2.8%	1,468	10.7%	691	1.8%	116	1.3%	81	3.0%	193	4.7%	301	Highest Resource	60.56% - 64.46%	15% - 38%	No	4.37%	58.60%	31.90%
Census Tract 6506.04	4.7%	2,419	2.5%	161	2.3%	149	0.1%	4	0.1%	8	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	71.73% - 76.93%	61% - 66%	No	8.69%	47.90%	29.40%
Census Tract 6506.05	2.2%	1,120	0.5%	31	0.2%	15	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	69.85%	43%	No	6.74%	43.60%	33.60%
Census Tract 6507.01	1.9%	972	21.9%	1420	5.3%	346	0.0%	0	11.7%	760	4.9%	314	Highest Resource	54.77%	27%	No	1.33%	52.00%	35.80%
Census Tract 6508	5.4%	2,758	3.1%	200	3.1%	200	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.72% - 86.61%	20% - 39%	No	4.58%	49.50%	51.00%
Total	17.0%	8,737	38.7%	2,503	12.8%	826	1.6%	101	14.8%	961	9.5%	615							
Neighborhood: East																			
Census Tract 6509.01	4.5%	2,342	4.6%	299	0.0%	2	4.6%	297	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	High Resource	54.07% - 58.18%	19% - 47%	No	2.60%	49.60%	43.80%
Census Tract 6509.02	5.1%	2,629	9.8%	636	3.9%	251	5.0%	321	1.0%	64	0.0%	0	High Resource	63.71% - 77.95%	28% - 48%	No	6.03%	32.90%	47.30%
Total	9.7%	4,971	14.4%	935	3.9%	253	9.5%	618	1.0%	64	0.0%								

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	% Total	% Total	% of all units	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: North																			
Census Tract 6500.01	4.1%	2,094	9.0%	584	0.3%	21	7.0%	450	1.7%	113	0.0%	0	High Resource	78.10% - 80.31%	14% - 42%	No	1.86%	53.20%	27.00%
Census Tract 6500.03	2.3%	1,163	0.9%	57	0.4%	25	0.2%	16	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	High Resource	73.43% - 77.90%	35% - 60%	No	8.22%	35.00%	47.30%
Census Tract 6500.04	3.0%	1,529	1.6%	104	1.4%	90	0.0%	0	0.2%	14	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	75.84% - 79.88%	47% - 48%	No	5.12%	58.40%	41.30%
Census Tract 6501.01	4.1%	2,095	2.3%	152	1.9%	121	0.2%	16	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	High Resource	77.57% - 86.90%	21% - 49%	No	3.05%	62.40%	18.50%
Census Tract 6502	3.7%	1,895	0.8%	55	0.6%	39	0.0%	0	0.2%	16	0.0%	0	High Resource	58.76% - 69.21%	19% - 33%	No	3.72%	56.90%	39.30%
Census Tract 6503	4.9%	2,520	3.7%	241	3.3%	214	0.4%	23	0.1%	4	0.0%	0	Moderate Resource	65.85% - 67.85%	31% - 48%	No	2.95%	55.00%	41.40%
	21.9%	11,296	18.4%	1,193	7.9%	510	7.8%	505	2.7%	178	0.0%	0							
Neighborhood: Southeast																			
Census Tract 6510.01	3.5%	1,799	0.6%	37	0.2%	12	0.2%	14	0.2%	11	0.0%	0	High Resource	59.80% - 67.82%	21% - 51%	No	2.22%	57.80%	37.20%
Census Tract 6510.02	3.3%	1,703	3.9%	252	2.2%	142	1.5%	95	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	High Resource	61.53% - 65.53%	22% - 35%	No	2.34%	39.10%	28.20%
Census Tract 6511.01	3.6%	1,850	7.6%	491	6.8%	442	0.7%	43	0.1%	6	0.0%	0	High Resource	59.25% - 65.52%	19% - 35%	No	3.26%	46.80%	48.20%
Census Tract 6511.02	3.2%	1,645	1.2%	77	0.9%	60	0.0%	0	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.53%	43%	No	4.04%	47.20%	52.10%
	13.6%	6,997	13.2%	857	10.1%	656	2.3%	152	0.8%	49	0.0%	0							

Tract	Households		Total Capacity (Units)		Income Distribution								TCAC Opp. Category	% Non-White (Block Group)	% LMI Pop. (Block Group)	R/ECAP?	% Over-crowded	Renter Cost Burden	Owner Cost Burden
	%	Total	%	Total	Lower		Moderate		Above Moderate		Mixed								
					% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total	% of all units	Total							
Neighborhood: Southwest																			
Census Tract 6512.01	3.2%	1,634	0.1%	8	0.1%	8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	36.99%	15%	No	0.91%	29.40%	37.60%
Census Tract 6512.21	2.7%	1,395	2.0%	128	2.0%	128	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	65.41%	44%	No	2.30%	38.10%	16.60%
Census Tract 6512.22	4.5%	2,329	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	0.3%	17	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	59.67%	41%	No	4.98%	44.90%	45.30%
Census Tract 6513.02	4.4%	2,287	0.2%	15	0.2%	15	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	39.61% - 52.60%	7% - 39%	No	2.89%	49.30%	45.40%
Census Tract 6513.04	4.5%	2,327	0.4%	25	0.4%	23	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	25.15% - 26.94%	16% - 36%	No	0.59%	48.40%	57.50%
Census Tract 6514.02	4.5%	2,293	5.5%	354	1.4%	88	1.8%	118	2.3%	148	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	51.44% - 65.72%	7% - 45%	No	6.09%	51.30%	41.90%
	23.8%	12,265	8.5%	547	4.0%	262	2.1%	135	2.3%	150	0.0%	0							
Neighborhood: West																			
Census Tract 6505.02	2.9%	1,478	0.1%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	5	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	48.61%	22%	No	2.33%	41.30%	40.70%
Census Tract 6506.02	5.3%	2,726	6.5%	421	3.0%	194	1.1%	71	1.1%	69	1.3%	87	Highest Resource	65.97% - 81.93%	27% - 51%	No	8.49%	42.40%	12.40%
Census Tract 6506.03	2.9%	1,492	0.1%	9	0.1%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	60.23%	47%	No	1.66%	37.60%	34.90%
Census Tract 6507.02	3.0%	1,550	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	Highest Resource	46.15%	25%	No	0.56%	54.50%	31.70%
	14.1%	7,246	6.8%	438	3.1%	203	1.1%	71	1.2%	77	1.3%	87							

D.2.8 Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Table D-25, below, summarizes the fair housing issues identified in this Fair Housing Assessment. As discussed in the previous sections of this analysis, the following conclusions were determined regarding potential fair housing concerns and indicators of certain disadvantaged populations:

- The highest resource areas (environment, education, income, etc.) are in the western portion of the City, while the high resource areas are located on the eastern side of the City. While there are only a few pockets of low resource areas, the largest area is located within the middle eastern portion of the City, which is also identified as having a higher percentage of LMI population. The only moderate resource area in the City is located on the north border in the central part of the City. The City’s high and low distribution of resource areas are consistent with cities in areas surrounded by the ocean, hillside, and urban communities.
- Overall, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experience a disproportionately higher percent of housing problems when compared to all other races/ethnicities within the City and may be underserved and in need of additional affordable housing opportunities.
- The southwestern portion of the City that experiences high resources and greater incomes, contains a sizable gap of predominately White residents. Areas outside of the southwestern portion of the City contains a sizable gap of predominately minority concentrations.
- Seniors experience a disproportionate percentage of housing problems compared to other family types within the City.

Overall, this analysis shows that the primary barrier to fair housing in Torrance is high housing cost, which has the effect of limiting access by lower-income households to the high opportunities and resources available in the City. There is no evidence to suggest that discrimination against racial groups or persons with disabilities is a major issue. The Housing Plan includes several programs to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development, as well as the provision of accessory dwelling units, which can expand affordable housing opportunities for lower-income persons such as seniors, female-headed households, and others working in service occupations.

Table D-25: Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Fair Housing Issue	Summary
Enforcement and Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRC conducts outreach and education throughout Los Angeles County, including Torrance. • Between January 2013 and March 2021, Torrance received 48 fair housing inquiries. • LACDA has committed to complying with the Fair Housing Act and related regulations. • There are 227 units with renters receiving HCVs in the city, primarily in the northwest and southeast areas of the city. • There are no public housing buildings in Torrance.
Integration and Segregation	

Race/Ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been a small decrease in overall racial/ethnic minority populations, from 50% in 2010 to 47% in 2019, but an increase in concentration of racial/ethnic minorities within census tracts. Based on HUD dissimilarity indices, segregation between non-White and White communities is high and has worsened since 1990. Racial/ethnic minorities are more concentrated in the eastern and central areas of the city.
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.0% of Torrance residents experience a disability, a slight increase from 6.9% in 2012. Populations of persons with disabilities are spread evenly throughout the city.
Familial Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.0% of households have one or more children under age 18; 4.6% of households are single-parent households; 3.9% of households are single-parent female-headed households. Over 60% of children live in married-couple households in the city, with few locations that have a higher concentration of children in female-headed households.
Income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36.1 of households earn less than 80% of the area median family income. Median household income is \$116,447, higher than the countywide average. There are two tracts in the city with at LMI population greater than 51%, one in the center of Torrance and one on the north boundary.
Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty	
Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no R/ECAPs located in Torrance. The R/ECAPs closest to the city are located to the southeast and northeast.
Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Torrance is predominantly White in the area adjacent to the coast, becoming less so farther to the east and north. All areas of the city have at least 20% racial/ethnic minority concentrations. Nearly all block groups in the city have median incomes exceeding the 2020 State median, and there is no clear concentration of higher or lower median incomes.
Access to Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Urban County, Hispanic residents are most likely to be impacted by poverty, low labor market participation, and poor environmental quality. All tracts in Torrance are considered Moderate to Highest Resource areas.
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All tracts in Torrance have economic scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has an economic score of less than 0.25.
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All parts of Torrance have education scores above 0.50, with the exception of the one tract located along the eastern boundary of the city that has a score of less than 0.25.
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About half the tracts in the city have the highest environmental scores between 0.75 and 1.0. Many of the central and northeast tracts in the city have the lowest environmental scores (0.25).
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block groups on in the central areas of the city scored the best in jobs proximity, while areas around the city's boundaries scored increasingly poorer. There are limited HQTAs in Torrance, with HQTAs in the north-central part of the city, as well as along its eastern boundary.

Disproportionate Housing Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29.8% of owner households and 53.9% of renter households have a housing problem. • Non-White owner-occupied households have higher rates of housing problems than White owner-occupied households. • In renter-occupied households, more than half of Asian, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic households experienced a housing problem • Renter-occupied households experience housing problems at a higher rate than owner-occupied households, with the exception of Other and Black households in the city.
Cost Burden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black households have the highest rate of cost burden for owner-occupied units in the city but make up a small overall proportion of households. • Over 25% of Hispanic owner-occupied households, and over 48% of Hispanic renter-occupied households have a cost burden. • Cost burdened households most concentrated in the areas along the north and south boundaries of the city.
Overcrowding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.9% of owner households and 10.7% of renter households are overcrowded. • 0.5% of owner-occupied households and 3.0% of renter-occupied households are severely overcrowded. • There are two tracts in Torrance with a concentration of overcrowded households above 20%, but in most of the city the concentration of overcrowded households is less than 5%.
Substandard Housing Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 125 owner-occupied households and 1,079 renter-occupied households lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities in Torrance, which represents 2.2% of city households. • Tracts with a higher percentage of old housing are spread throughout the city, without clear clusters of higher and lower percentage tracts.
Displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several vulnerable communities at risk of displacement in Torrance, but significantly more to the east and northeast of the city.

D.3 PRIORITIZATION OF CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

The following are contributing factors that affect fair housing choice in Torrance.

D.3.1 Insufficient and Inaccessible Outreach and Enforcement

According to the Fair Housing Survey included in the 2018 Regional AI, 39% of respondents were not aware of their right to request accommodations per Fair Housing, Section 504, and ADA laws. The City currently has limited information regarding fair housing laws, discriminatory practices, and services available to the public. Very few renters in Torrance receive housing choice vouchers despite the concentration of overpaying renters in some Torrance tracts.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of a variety of input media (e.g., meetings, surveys, interviews)
- Lack of fair housing information on the City’s website
- Insufficient local public fair housing enforcement and testing

D.3.2 Lack of Income Diversity

There are fewer low-moderate income households and a higher median household income in Torrance compared to other cities countywide, and the lowest and highest income households are not concentrated in any particular area of the city. While higher household incomes are generally considered a good thing, the overall lack of lower-income households in Torrance suggests that many people may be priced out of housing in the city entirely.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of private investment in affordable housing
- Development costs
- Land use restrictions

D.3.3 Displacement Risk to Low Income Households Due to Economic Pressures

There are several locations that have been identified as vulnerable communities at risk of displacement according to the Urban Displacement Project, primarily in the east/northeast areas of the city. A higher percentage of Black and Asian owner-occupied households, and Pacific Islander and Hispanic renter-occupied households have a cost burden compared to White households. While the number of overpaying owners and renters has been decreasing over time, there are still a large number of tracts where owners and renters overpay for housing.

Contributing Factors

- Unaffordable rents
- Lack of available affordable housing
- Lack of private investment in new housing construction

D.3.4 Concentration of Environmental Challenges

The TCAC identified a concentration of census tracts in the central/northeast part of the city with poor environmental health scores. Residents in these areas may be subject to environmental hazards that other communities do not face. These include hazards from air and water pollution, traffic, and nearby cleanup sites and waste facilities.

Contributing Factors

- Pollution burden
- Cleanup site locations
- Waste facilities locations

D.3.5 Lack of Affordable Housing

Home values are very high throughout the City, with the city's median home price approximately \$1.05 million in 2021. Home values have risen nearly 20% in the 2020-2021 time period. These prices make homeownership untenable for low- and moderate-income households in the City. Rental availability is limited in the City and is similarly expensive, with a two-bedroom apartment renting for nearly \$2,400

in 2021 and larger apartments and homes renting for even more, rents that are outside the affordability range for low- and moderate-income households in the City. Overall, most housing is not affordable to even moderate-income families in Torrance, and low- and extremely-low income households face even more challenges finding affordable housing in the City.

Contributing Factors

- High land costs
- Limited housing stock

D.3.6 Historic Patterns That Affect Exclusion

When the city of Torrance incorporated in 1921, it covered approximately 3.8 square miles and had a population of 1,800. It was established by Jared Sidney Torrance (1852- 1921), a Pasadena real estate developer and vice president of Union Oil Company, who envisioned a planned residential and industrial community. Only a few years after the City's incorporation in 1921, petroleum was discovered in Torrance—the discovery transformed the City from a small town to a major industrial area. Industry in Torrance continued to shape its development as a major employment center in the region.

According to census data, the population (and number of housing units) in Torrance skyrocketed between 1950 and 1960, growing from 22,241 to 100,991 residents in one decade. By 1970, the population had risen to 134,968. The majority of this development occurred in single-family neighborhoods that were developed by both national and local developers. California's aerospace industry began in Torrance and surrounding communities, and has played an important role in City history as well. The new neighborhoods catered to people working in cutting-edge technologies like the aerospace industry, as a mecca for young, middle class families who were almost exclusively white. Another draw for young families in the high growth era of the 1950's to 1970's was the public school district in Torrance, the Torrance Unified School District (TUSD), which serves the entire city, has long been—and continues to be—a desirable location for families due to its public school district. The TUSD was established in 1947 and unified in 1948. It is a highly rated district with a graduation rate of 95% (tUSD.org). According to Niche (niche.com), which ranks nearly 100,000 schools and districts, TUSD ranks #45 of 438 school districts in California.

The population in Torrance leveled off significantly after the development and population boom of the 1950's to 1970's, increasing by only 9,462 residents in the past 50 years. This was largely due to Torrance being built out.

In addition to the city's development history, over the past century, discriminatory lending practices and informal exclusion of non-white buyers prevented many non-white households from purchasing homes in Torrance. Even after these practices were declared unconstitutional, the established patterns of racial and economic segregation remained in place. Existing residents lobbied to retain single-family zoning and ensure high home values in desirable neighborhoods in Torrance. Though the intent of these actions may not have been to directly discriminate, the effect was to exclude certain groups of people, such as lower-income and/or non-white families, from moving into the City. That pattern has been changing over the past several decades—today, Torrance is a majority minority city.

Contributing Factors

- Historic redlining and informal discrimination against non-white buyers
- Land use and zoning rules that promoted housing for higher-income households
- Lack of developable land

D.4 PRIORITIES, GOALS, AND ACTIONS

To adequately meet the housing needs of all segments of the community, the Housing Plan must promote housing opportunities for all people. Table H-45 in Section 5 (Housing Plan) presents a summary of the issues, contributing factors, and the City’s actions in addressing the issues.

**APPENDIX E: SAMPLING OF ENTITLED AND
CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS**

Project Identification: A (Entitled Project)

Year: 2021

Project Description: Mixed use development (horizontal) with 32 units & 6,440 ft² of commercial, including restaurant, office, retail. (Previous request for 46-unit project at 38.3 du/ac, developed to R-4 standards, was denied in 2019. This project is a redesign)

- CUP (CUP20-01023)

Address: 18045 Western Ave. (formerly 1802—18141 Western Ave.)

APN: 4096-018-034, 4096-018-033, 4096-018-032

Size: 52,388 ft² parcel (1.2 acre) (6-lot consolidation)

Existing Use: Combination of undeveloped, former market/parking, and former structure that was razed in 2019

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: C-2 (General Commercial) (Site was approved a ZON from C-R to C-2 in 2019)

- Allowable density: 43 du/ac (C-2 zone allows R-4 residential uses with a CUP)

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 26.7 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable Zoning density: 62.1%
- Percent of expected GP density: N/A

Units: 32 units on 2nd & 3rd floors; parking in garage on ground floor

- 993 – 1,295 ft²
- 2-bedroom (all)

Parking: 106 required; 100 provided—7 residential guest spaces are also commercial spaces


Height: 35 – 45 feet

FAR: 1.07:1 (max allowable is 1.0:1, which will be achieved via redesign)

Income Category: Market rate (above moderate)



Rendering of entitled project at 18045 Western Ave.



Project Identification: B (Entitled Project)

Project Description: 24-unit townhouse condominium development

- CUP (CUP20-01016)
- Precise Plan of Development (PRE20-01014)
- Tentative Tract Map for parcel merger & condominiums (DIV20-01007)

Year: Anastasi Development (2021)

Address: 18080 – 18090 Prairie Avenue

APN: 4088-006-CONDO01 (current)

Size: 42,294 ft² (0.97 acre) (2 parcels consolidated)

Existing Use(s): Residence, store, & mixed-use building (1959) and a church (1974)

General Plan: Existing: R-MD (Medium Density Residential)

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: R3-PP (Restricted Residential – Precise Plan Overlay)

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 24.7 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 79.7%
- Percent of expected GP density: 106.2%

Units: 24 townhouse units in 4 buildings (two 2-unit buildings, two 10-unit buildings)
1,086 ft² each

2-bedroom (all)

Parking: 53 required; 55 proposed

Height: 22 feet

FAR: 0.62:1 (proposed); project conditioned to reduce to maximum allowable 0.6:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: C (Entitled)

Project Description: 3-story Mixed Use Development (9 dwelling units + office area)

- CUP (CUP20-01008)
- Development Permit (DVP20-00001)
- Division of Lot to consolidate 2 parcels (DIV20-01003)

Date: 2020

Address: 24449 Hawthorne Blvd. & 24453 Hawthorne Blvd. (HBCSP-WT)

APN: 7534-021-038, 7534-021-039

Size: 15,132 ft² combined (0.35 acre) (2 lots, to be consolidated)

Existing Use(s): Commercial building (1963), with storage building and shed (1999)

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed: No change

Zoning (Existing): HBCSP, Walteria Sub-District (H-WT)

- Allowable Density: 27 du/ac max.

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 25.7 du/ac

- Percent of maximum zoning allowable: 95.2%
- Percent of expected GP: N/A

Units: 9 dwelling units (apartments)
 1,028 ft² (average per unit)
 2-bedroom (all)

Height: 45 feet

FAR: 0.99:1 (C-GEN allows 1:1 FAR for MU)

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: D (Entitled)

Project Description: 15-unit residential condominium development

- CUP (CUP20-01002)
- Zone Change (ZON20-01001)
- Precise Plan of Development (PRE20-01007)
- Tentative Tract Map (DIV20-01001)

Year: 2020

Address: 18419 Western Ave.

APN: 4096-019-055

Lot Size: 28,250 ft² parcel (0.65 acre)

Existing Use(s): Vacant—undeveloped & unpaved

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)
 Proposed: No change

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Zoning: Existing: C3-PP (Solely Commercial, Precise Plan Overlay)
 Proposed: C2-PP (General Commercial District, Precise Plan Overlay)

Project Density: 23.1 du/ac (zone allows 17 units)


Units: 5-unit building, 7-unit building, & 3-unit building, all 3-story
 1,522 to 1,650 ft²
 3-bedroom (all)

Height: 32.5 feet (2 stories over ground-floor parking)

FAR: 0.825:1 proposed (0.762:1 being considered to address staff concerns)

Income Category: Market rate





Project Identification: E (Entitled)

Project Description: 48-unit townhouse development (condominiums) with retention of the church sanctuary—demolition of chapel, office, and preschool)

- CUP (CUP19-00031)
- Zone Change (ZON19-00002)
- Waiver (WAV19-00002)
- Tentative Tract Map (DIV19-00010) (for condos, merger, and re-subdivision)

Year: 2020

Address: 2706 182nd St.

APN: 4095-020-030)

Lot Size: 3.7 ac (original)

Proposed Lot 1 (Existing Church): 40,090 ft² parcel (0.92 acre)

Proposed Lot 2 (Proposed residential development): 121,710 ft² (2.79 ac)

Existing Use: Church sanctuary, chapel, church offices, and preschool (operational)

General Plan: Existing: Medium Density Residential District

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: A1/R2 (Light Agricultural District/Two-Family Residential)

Proposed: R-3 (Limited MFR District)

Project Density: 17.2 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 0.56%
- Percent of expected GP density: 0.74%

Units: 48 three-story townhouse units in 9 buildings


Forty 3-bedroom units (1,725 ft²) and eight 4-bedroom units (2,257 ft²)


Parking: 144 spaces, including 10 guest spaces) (required + provided)

Height: 35 feet

FAR: 0.72:1 (Max allowed is 0.6:1)

Income Category: Above-moderate income





Project Identification: F (Entitled)

Project Description: 6-unit townhouse condominium development

- CUP (CUP19-00006) (for condos & to exceed 0.6 FAR)
- Division of Lot (DIV19-00002)
- Planning Commission Review (PCR19-00001)

Date: 2019

Address: 1750 Manuel Ave. (in the Torrance Tract)

APN: 7359-001-038

Lot Size: 14,678 ft² parcel (0.34 acre)

Existing Use(s): Church building (still operating at the time of the application) (1941)

General Plan: Existing: Medium Density Residential

- Allowable Density: 18.1 – 31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: R-3 (Limited MFR District)
Proposed: No change

Project Density: 17.8 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable: 57.4%
- Percent of expected: 76.6%

Units: 6 attached & detached townhouse units in 4 buildings
1,270 to 1,538 ft²
2-bedroom (all)

Height: 26.33 feet

FAR: 0.537:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: G (Constructed)

Project Description: Mixed Use development (restaurant, office, & retail) with 39 dwelling units, with commercial and parking garage on ground floor (project results in 30 new units, net)

- CUP (CUP18-00013)
- Division of Lot (DIV18-00008)

Date: 2018

Address: 1954 – 1978 Carson St. (Downtown Torrance/Torrance Tract)

APN: 7357-016-001 – 005 (5 parcels to be consolidated into 1)

Lot Size: 38,500 ft² (0.88 acre) (total 5 parcels to be consolidated)

Existing Use: Commercial building (beauty college) (1966), one SFR (1922), 2 detached units (1929), and a MU building with 6 dwelling units (1950); (total 9 dwelling units)

General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

General Plan: Proposed: C-CTR (Commercial Center)

Zoning: Existing: D-T (Downtown Torrance District / Torrance Tract Overlay District)

- Allowable density: 43 du/ac
- Proposed: No change

Project Density: 38.5 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable zoning density: 89.5%
- Percent of expected GP density: N/A



Units: 39 dwelling units (apartments) on the 2nd and 3rd floors
515 to 945 ft²
Mix of 6 studios, 25 one-bedroom units, and 8 two-bedroom units

Parking: 70.4 required; 71 provided

Height: 38.5 feet

FAR: 1.21:1

Income Category: Above moderate



Project Identification: H (Constructed)

Project Description: 25-unit residential condominium development

- CUP (CUP16-00005)
- Tentative Tract Map
- Zone Change
- Waiver

Year: 2016

Address: 20411 Earl St. (East Victor Precinct)

APN: 7524-006-CONDO05 (current)

Lot Size: 61,184 ft² parcel (1.4 acre) (1 parcel)

Existing Use(s): 2 light industrial buildings (1960s), 4 tennis courts (West End Tennis & Racquet Club plus related parking)

General Plan: Existing: R-LM (Low-Medium Density Residential)

- Allowable Density: 9.1 – 18 du/ac
- Expected Density: 13.5 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: ML(M1-PP) Limited Manufacturing (Light Manufacturing w/Precise Plan Overlay)

Proposed: R-3 (up to 27 du/ac) (Rezoning required to be consistent with the GP designation and to allow residential)

Project Density: 17.8 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable: 98.9%
- Percent of expected: 139.9%


Units: 18 duplexes & 7 stand-alone units
1,522 to 1,650 ft²
3-bedroom (all)

Parking: 3 parking spaces/unit + 1 guest space/unit (required + provided)

Height: 26 feet

FAR: 0.6:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: I (Constructed)

Project Description: 16-unit residential condominium development

- Conditional Use Permit for condominiums CUP (CUP15-00009)
- Zone Change (ZON15-00002)
- Tentative Tract Map for parcel mergers & condominiums (DIV15-00004)
- Waiver (to exceed the maximum height of the R-P zone)

Year: 2015

Address: 23625-23649 Arlington Ave.

APN: Original not available

Lot Size: 28,635 ft² parcel (0.66 acre), after consolidation (2 parcels consolidated into 1)

Existing Use(s): Small mixed-use center with a residence, offices, & retail building (1964); and small retail center (1958)

General Plan: Existing: R-OF (Residential-Office)

- Allowable Density: 18-31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25 du/ac

Proposed: No Change

Zoning: Existing: C-5 (Conditional Commercial)

Proposed: R-P (Residential-Professional) (Rezoning required because residential uses are prohibited in the C-5 zone)

Project Density: 25 du/ac



- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 80.7%
- Percent of expected GP density: 107.5%

Units: Four rows of two 2-unit buildings (total 16 units)
1,073 ft² (each)
2-bedroom (all)

Parking: 32 spaces in garages, + guest parking (required + provided)

Height: 31.83 feet (R-P zone allows 27' maximum—Waiver required)

FAR: 0.60:1 **Income Category:** Market rate





View of project from Arlington

Project Identification: J (Constructed)

Project Description: Mixed use development (horizontal) with 8 dwelling units + 2,700 ft² commercial office building

- CUP
- DVP (Development Permit)
- DIV (Division of Lot for Condominium purposes)
- Waiver (for setback for residential use)

Year: 2015

Address: 24444 Hawthorne Blvd. (HBCSP, WALTERIA Sub-District, H-WT)

APN: 7534-020-038

Lot Size: 13,696 ft² parcel (0.32 acre)

Existing Use: Recreational swimming school (1958)

General Plan: Existing: General Commercial (allows MU development @ 1.0:1 FAR)

- Maximum Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed): No change

Zoning: Existing: HBCSP, WALTERIA Sub-District, H-WT

- Maximum allowable density: 27 du/ac

Proposed: No change

Project Density: 25.4 du/ac


- Percent of maximum allowable zoning density: 94.1%
- Percent of expected GP density: N/A

Units: Two 4-unit, 3-story residential buildings
1,062 ft² (all)
2-bedroom (all)

Height: 36'-2" feet

FAR: 0.82:1

Income Category: Market rate



Project Identification: K (Constructed)

Project Description: Development of a total of 4 detached-style condominium units, 2 per lot

- CUP (CUP14-00001)
- DIV (DIV14-00001)
- ZON (ZON14-00001)
- GPA (GPA14-0001)

Year: 2014

Address: 1008 Sartori Ave.

APN: 7354-019-012, 7354-019-013

Size: Two 4,140 ft² lots (Total of 8,280 ft² or 0.19 acre)

Existing Use: Off-site parking facility (that served a community services facility—the Switzer Center—that ceased operation on the subject property in 2007)

General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)

Proposed: Medium Density Residential (requested by COT)

- Allowable Density: 18-31 du/ac
- Expected Density: 23.25

Zoning: Existing: P-1 (Open Area, Parking, Planting)

Proposed: R-3 (Limited MFR District)

- Allowable density: 27 du/ac

Project Density: 21 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 0.78%
- Percent of expected GP density: 90.0%



Units: Four 2-story detached units
 Unit A = 1,338 ft²; Unit B = 1,353 ft²
 3-bedroom (all)

Parking: 8 garages spaces + 2 open guest spaces (required + provided)

Height: 27 feet

FAR: 0.65:1

Income Category: Above-moderate (presumed, since no income category was proposed)





Project Description: L (Constructed)
Date: 2013
Project Description: Mixed use development with 44 dwelling units (workforce housing) and 3,700 ft² of commercial (Cabrillo Family Apartments)
 • CUP (CUP13-00001)
 • Waiver (WAV13-00002) (for front setback)
Address: 1640 Cabrillo Ave. (Downtown Torrance)
APN: 7355-030-905 (City-owned property)
Size: 37,260 ft² parcel (0.86 acre) (4 adjoining parcels consolidated into 1; purchased by the COT Redevelopment Agency in 2009 for workforce housing)
Existing Use(s): Multiple structures housing showroom/office, vehicle maintenance, & storage (1940s – 1950s)
General Plan: Existing: C-CTR (Commercial Center)
 • Allowable Density: N/A
 • Expected Density: N/A
Zoning: Existing: Downtown Project Area, Commercial Sector
 Proposed: No change
Project Density: 51 du/ac
Units: 43 units for low- and very low-income households + 1 manager’s apartment
 560 to 1,087 ft² (density bonus concession for unit size)
 22 one-bedroom units, 8 two-bedroom units, and 14 three-bedroom units
Parking: 79 required; 79 provided (utilizes tandem parking, a density bonus concession)
Height: 35-44 feet
Income Category: Low- and Very Low-Income households (tax credits, density bonus, RDA property)



Project Identification M (Constructed)

Project Description: Planned Development permit to establish development standards for a gated, 104-unit residential condominium development

- Zone Change (ZON03-00003)
- General Plan Amendment (GPA03-00002)
- Planned Development (PD03-00001)
- CUP (CUP03-00013)
- Tentative Tract Map for condominiums (TTM53091)

Year: 2003

Address: 2829 Maricopa Street

Lot Size: 435,746 ft² parcel (10 acres)

Existing Use(s): Industrial building, used for warehousing & distribution and a church (154,000 ft²)

General Plan: Existing: I-LT (Light Industrial)
Proposed: R-LM (Low-Medium Density Residential)

- Allowable Density: 9.1 – 18 du/ac
- Expected Density: 13.5 du/ac

Zoning: Existing: M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) and P-1 (Planting and Parking)
Proposed: PD (Planned Development)

Project Density: 10.4 du/ac

- Percent of maximum allowable GP density: 57.8%
- Percent of expected GP density: 77.0%

Units: 104 detached units (patio homes)
2,638 to 3,206 ft²
4-5 bedrooms

Height: 25'-9" to 34'-2"

FAR: 0.68:1

Income Category: Market rate





Project Identification N (Constructed)

Project Description: This project is a proposal to construct a 160-unit condominium development that includes 60 senior units and 100 townhome units.

- Development Permit (DVP02-00002)
- CUP (CUP02-00020 & CUP02-000021)
- Tentative Tract Map for condominiums (TTM53955)
- Waiver (WAV02-00010—front setback)
- Variance (VAR02-00001—parking)

Year: 2002

Address: 3520 Torrance Boulevard

Lot Size: 5.37 acres

Existing Use(s): Secondary oil recovery site

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

- Allowable Density: N/A
- Expected Density: N/A

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: HBCSP-DA-1 (Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Del Amo Sub-District 1)

Project Density: 29.8 du/ac

Units: 100 townhouse condominium units:

- 1,591 to 2,143 ft²
- 3 bedrooms

60 senior citizen condominium units:

- 442-613 ft²
- 2 floorplans are studio units; 1 floorplan is 1-bedroom unit


Height: 36.5' (townhouse development)

45.42" (senior citizen development)

FAR: 0.97:1

Income Category: Market rate





Project Identification: O (Entitled Project)

Year: 2020

Project Description: Mixed use development with 53 senior residential condominium units and 1,500 ft² of commercial area.

- CUP (CUP15-00014)
- Division of Lot (DIV15-00006 for condominium purposes)
- Zone Change (ZON15-00003)

Address: East side of Prairie Avenue approximately 100 Feet North Of 176th Street

APN: 4088-002-021

Size: 1.6 acre

Existing Use: Vacant property

General Plan: Existing: C-GEN (General Commercial)

Proposed: No change

Zoning: Existing: C-R (Restricted Commercial)

Proposed: C3-PP (Solely Commercial with Precise Plan Overlay)

Project Density: 33.1 du/ac

Units: 53 units; commercial uses located on the first floor of the western-most building, with residential units on the second floor, and a two-story residential building to the east.


- 16 one-bedroom units
- 37 two-bedroom units

Parking: 72 required; 111 provided (92 spaces provided in a semi-subterranean garage with 19 surface parking spaces)

Height: 24 feet

FAR: 0.9:1 (max allowable is 1.0:1)

Income Category: Market rate (above moderate)



**APPENDIX F: CORRESPONDENCE FROM
PROVIDERS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Hi Julia,

Following up on the question from yesterday. Yes we do plan to be affordable for the next 10 years.

Thank you,



Silvia Rangel | Community Manager
Harmony Court Senior Apartment Homes
Western National Property Management
CA DRE LIC#00838846

4502 186th Street | Redondo Beach, CA 90278



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Julia

22520 Ocean houses people with Developmental Disabilities. We do plan to remain for at least the next 10 years.

Thank you,

David Dreben
Director of Property Management

Momentum

6430 Independence Ave

Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Office: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.momentum4all.org

The logo for Momentum features the word "momentum" in a lowercase, sans-serif font. The letters are filled with a vibrant, multi-colored gradient that transitions from light blue on the left, through purple and pink, to bright orange and yellow on the right. The background within the letters appears to be a soft-focus image of a sunset or sunrise over a body of water.

Note: This message is intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, disclosure of which is governed by applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this information is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately to arrange for return or destruction of these documents.

APPENDIX G: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX G

6th Cycle 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element – Public Comments and Responses

(Does not include comments/responses concerning associated environmental documents (ISND) or from/to State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD))

Date Comment Received and Commenter	Comment Summary	Draft Responses to be released prior to June 14, 2022, City Council Public Hearing
<p>3.15.2021 Aidan Schwing, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Kari Gallegos, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Prabhu Reddy, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Scarlett Davis, resident</p> <p>3.15.2021 Sunny Zhou, resident</p> <p>3.16.2021 Ciera Coronado, resident</p> <p>3.16.2021 Margaret Gilbert, resident</p> <p>3.21.2021 Aron Sanchez, resident</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p> <p>Commented concern about the region’s affordable housing shortage and its impact on the future of the city.</p> <p>Commented about frustration by homelessness issues, by the burden that displacement and gentrification place on neighbors, and by policies that promote exclusion and housing scarcity in neighborhoods.</p> <p>Commented about opinion that exclusionary zoning and land use practices have led to an undersupply of affordable housing near transit.</p> <p>Commented about pattern of redlining that divided city’s neighborhoods by race and income.</p> <p>Commented that a new approach is needed to solve city and region’s housing crisis.</p> <p>Suggests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating an estimate of the likelihood of development and the net new units that can be developed for inventory sites • Using and HCD-recommended “safe Harbor” methodology for forecasting future ADU production • Prioritizing high-opportunity census tracts and well- 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is based on net potential units. The assumed capacity is below actual potential capacity and is supported (in the revised document) by a new evaluation of trends. Programs are provided to facilitate development at or above assumed capacity; this provides a reasonable and conservative estimate of potential units. • The City calculated the average number of ADU permits issued for 2018, 2019, & 2020 to estimate the production of ADUs during the 6th Cycle. The average is 68.7, but the City used 60 ADUs per year as the estimate, which the City believes is a conservative estimate. Note that this is a reduction from the 100 ADU/year assumed in the initial submittal to HCD. The City used the methodology for ADUs as provided by SCAG and approved by HCD for calculating affordability estimates. • One of the City’s strategies is to promote new housing for all income levels on corridors that offer transit and are near or within employment areas and offer other quality-of-life amenities such as parks, schools, and shopping and services that are important for residents. Per the analysis distribution of RHNA units by TCAC • Opportunity Area Category conducted for AFFH evaluation because • most of Torrance is within a “Highest Resource” or “High Resource” category, most RHNA sites are located within one of those two categories. Over 56 percent are located within the Highest Resource category, and nearly 40 percent are located within the High Resource category. Similarly, over 60 percent of census tracts in the City are within the Highest Resource category, and over 30 percent are within the High Resource category. • The Torrance Sites Inventory has a total buffer 31%; when entitled and pipeline projects and estimated ADUs are included, the buffer is

	<p>resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing in order to affirmatively further fair housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the HCD-recommended buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity in the sites inventory to avoid violating the No Net Loss requirement. • Adopt policies legalizing more housing, making housing easier to build, funding affordable housing and ending homelessness, and strengthening tenants' rights. 	<p>53.4 percent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding legalizing more housing and making housing easier to build; funding affordable housing, ending homelessness, and strengthening tenants' rights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City's Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. ○ The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. ○ The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at:
--	--	--

		<p>www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City's Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City's recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center. The City established the Social Services Commission to address issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters' (tenants') rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City.
--	--	---

<p>3.29.2021 Morgan Bennyworth</p> <p>3.30.2021 Yazmine Mihojevich, resident</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p> <p>Concerned with policies that ban apartments in much of the city, as this promotes housing scarcity, high rents, exclusion, and displacement in neighborhoods.</p> <p>Expressed concern that apartments are banned on over 80% of residentially-zoned land in LA County. Concerned this had led to undersupply of affordable medium and high-density housing near jobs and transit. Concern this has perpetuated segregated living patterns, lack of access to opportunity, and the exclusion of BIPOC individuals and communities.</p> <p>Concerned that high median home values, scarce affordable apartments and single-family zoning effectively guarantee that high-opportunity neighborhoods remain restricted to wealthy households who tend to be white</p> <p>Would like to see the city legalize apartments citywide.</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <p>Regarding legalizing apartments citywide, the City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. While this does not legalize apartments everywhere, it greatly expands opportunities for apartments throughout Torrance. The corridors were selected to consider adjacent uses to mitigate negative externalities on new residents and to promote use of transit and easy access to goods and services needed by residents. The Housing Element also includes programs to promote affordable housing in neighborhoods that are typically single-family by facilitating construction of ADUs, thereby increasing opportunities for additional housing that is affordable to all income levels.</p>
--	---	---

<p>4.27.2021 From unknown commenter (redacted) Sent in advance of Planning Commission Public Workshop, April 28, 2021</p>	<p>The following comment letter was a form letter received from multiple residents. The dates submitted and commenter name is listed in the column to the left. The following are the comments and concerns listed in the letter:</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p>
<p>4.28.21 Aziz Fellague, resident</p>	<p>Expressed concern that Torrance continues to experience a severe housing crisis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods.
<p>4.28.21 Name redacted</p>	<p>Stated that the City has added over 9,000 jobs since 2010 and housing stock only increased by a little over 200 homes during the same time period.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City’s Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment. The City’s Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California.
<p>4.28.21 Keiko Thomas</p>	<p>Expressed concern that apartments are banned on 75% of Torrance’s residentially-zoned land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City’s Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to
<p>4.28.21 Name redacted</p>	<p>Stated that just under 40% of Torrance households are burdened by high housing costs.</p>	
	<p>Stated that homelessness has increase nine times since 2013.</p>	
	<p>Urges the city to adopt a transformative housing element that furthers the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legalizes more homes and makes homes easier to build • Funds affordable housing • Addresses and ends homelessness • Strengthens Renters Rights 	

		<p>continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City’s recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center. The City established the Social Services Commission to address issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City. • The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City’s Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City’s recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter at the Civic Center. The City’s Social Services Commission addresses issues concerning the City’s veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs.
--	--	--

<p>4.24.21 From Tieira Ryder. Sent in advance of Planning Commission Public Workshop, April 28, 2021</p>	<p>Commented that affordable housing should include both rent and homeownership options for the working class, senior, students and those with low or no income.</p> <p>Stated that it's time to end redline, racist and classist zoning in LA County that has over 60,000 unhoused residents.</p> <p>Expressed that everyone deserves housing that we can afford, rent was not meant to take more than 30% of a resident's income, with some rent taking over 80% of a resident's income, and that's not acceptable.</p> <p>Stated that in the last 10 years in SoCal, rent has increased by over 65%, and during that time period the number unhoused resident increased by over 50%.</p> <p>Expressed support for a variety of housing types, including affordable tiny and small homes, apartments, condos, and townhomes.</p> <p>Stated that the state can capture land from local sub cities that do not meet housing element requirements.</p>	<p>Programs in the City's Housing Element are intended to increase both the number and type of units that will be constructed in Torrance, as well as provide for a wide range of income levels and those with special needs.</p>
--	---	---

<p>4.27.21 Chris Dreike, resident</p>	<p>Encouraged Torrance to join with any legal actions against SCAG, HCD, and the Legislature regarding the false RHNA numbers, to repeal SB828, and SB35.</p> <p>As part of comment, provided a one-page analysis of housing needs for the State of California for the next 10 years. The following are the points made in the commenter's analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated California's population grew by only .2% in 2019, which equates to an increase of 80,000 people. • LA County, including Torrance, Redondo, Hermosa, Manhattan and Carson all lost population. • Commenter stated that we are building more housing than we need, and more apartments than single family homes. Stated that the market is looking for single family homes. • Provided a mathematical analysis for the conclusion that HCD's RHNA calculations are greatly overestimated both Statewide and for the SCAG region. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City filed an appeal to SCAG to challenge its RHNA allocation. Unfortunately, the City was not successful, nor were the majority of cities that filed appeals. • The City carefully considers all state legislation that impacts it and its authority as a charter city and takes action as appropriate.
---	---	---

<p>4.27.21 Prabhu Reddy</p>	<p>Stated the commenter was writing on behalf of Torrance for Everyone and noted that 4 documents were attached to her email:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brutal Facts: Document lays out commenter’s concerns about Torrance’s housing crisis including that more than 45% of Torrance renters are cost-burdened, and a 9-times increase in homelessness since 2013. 2. Our Platform: Document includes 17 policies across 4 key areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Legalize more homes b. Fund affordable housing c. Support unhoused neighbors d. Strengthen renters’ rights 3. Public Outreach: Intent is to remind the City of public outreach obligations. 4. Site Inventory Analysis: Includes letter prepared by Abundant Housing LA summarizing state law, and points to the “affirmatively furthering fair housing” requirement, especially the requirement to distribute low-income housing across the City of Torrance. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. b. The City’s Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state’s dissolution of Redevelopment. The City’s Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California.
---------------------------------	--	---

		<p>c. The City prepared and has adopted the Torrance <i>Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness</i> available at: www.TorranceCA.Gov/Homeless. This multi-year plan was created as a guiding document after an extensive review of other community homeless plans, researching promising practices, speaking to industry leaders, and listening to community inputs. The City's Housing Element Housing Plan includes a program to continue its implementation and extend the plan for another 3 years by June 2024. Implementation of the plan includes the City's recent approval of a temporary homeless shelter on City-owned property at the Civic Center.</p> <p>d. The City has utilized a variety of methods for public outreach. They are summarized in Section 1 of the Housing Element, while Appendix A includes documentation of the various efforts.</p> <p>e. The revised Housing Element significantly expands discussion regarding preparation of the Sites Inventory and adds many new sites based on public interest. Refer to the responses to the Abundant Housing LA Letter—they are not repeated here.</p>
--	--	--

<p>11.1.21 Lisa Hirsch Marin, Our Future LA Coalition</p>	<p>Commented that the reason for the letter is multiple concerns about the housing crisis. Provided a considerable amount of background data, summarized here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black and Latino residents feel housing crisis more than most. • Black households have 1.12% the wealth of white households and Latino households have less than 5% • Black people make up 8% of the county population but 33.7% of people experiencing homelessness • Black and Latino neighborhoods face disproportionately higher eviction threats • 25% of AAPI populations are considered severely cost-burdened <p>Stated that decades of racist policies have not been eradicated.</p> <p>The pandemic exacerbated these disproportionate impacts resulting in higher disease and death rates among Black and Latino people.</p> <p>LA County ranks last in counties in the US in housing affordability, overcrowding and unsheltered homelessness. Stated that LA County needs to double the amount of affordable homes built by 2030.</p> <p>Comments specific to the Torrance Housing Element are detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protections: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should expand just-cause eviction protections to cover all tenants and establish a corresponding enforcement program. b. The housing element should implement a local RSO or strengthen/reduce the annual allowable rent increase for the existing RSO program. c. The housing element should codify a tenant’s right to counsel in an eviction proceeding. d. The housing element should create a permanent tenant education program to inform tenants of their rights and how to access eviction defense resources. e. The housing element should create and implement a tenant anti-harassment ordinance combined with enforcement resources. 2. Preservation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element must do more to prioritize rezoning – with value capture – in high-resource neighborhoods which are transit-and job-rich, including single-family zoned areas. This is necessary to expand affordable housing opportunities while 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Protections: b. a.– e.: The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. c. The City does not currently propose to adopt specific ordinances proposed by the commenter, although the City may consider them as part of its ongoing implementation program to enforce fair housing. d. Preservation: e. The City’s Housing Element includes many programs to allow for and incentive increased production of housing in Torrance. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. f. The Sites Inventory does not include parcels containing RSP units. Per Program 16 in the Housing
---	---	---

	<p>minimizing the impact on existing renters in multifamily-zoned areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The housing element should exclude parcels containing RSP housing units in the housing element’s site inventory. c. The housing element should require that no net loss provisions apply to parcels in the site inventory and rezoning program with a monitoring and implementation program. d. The housing element should institute local programs and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing. <p>3. Prioritization of affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should utilize a value capture mechanism, such as inclusionary zoning, to locally fund and/or incentivize affordable housing. b. The housing element should prioritize creation of affordable housing on public land. c. The housing element should streamline affordable housing production. d. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas. e. The housing element should include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays, and should ensure that these overlays apply to high-opportunity areas currently zoned R1. 	<p>Element, the City will amend the Zoning Code to require the replacement of units affordable to the same or lower income level as a condition of any development on a nonvacant site consistent with those requirements set forth in State Density Bonus Law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Per Program 1, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis. h. Preserve existing affordable housing i. Prioritization: j. The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element. k. The City has a history of facilitating the construction of affordable housing on City-owned property, especially via the former Redevelopment Agency. The Housing Element already includes a policy to “Prioritize development of housing for moderate- and lower-income households on City-owned property.” (Policy H.2.9) l. The Housing Element includes programs to streamline the production of housing via updates to the Zoning Code. m. & e. The Housing Element includes a program to add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for 100% lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are
--	---	---

4. Site Capacity Assessment

- a. The housing element should estimate and report both the likelihood of development and the net new units if developed of inventory sites, both vacant and nonvacant. A table was provided in the letter, showing how the draft housing element will fall short of the RHNA goal, by 5,020 units of realistic capacity. The City must *fairly* estimate the likelihood of development for all parcels on the suitable sites inventory.
- b. The housing element should report the proportion of sites from the previous housing element’s inventory that were developed during the previous planning period, and HCD-recommended methodologies and data sources should be used in order to conduct a thorough “analysis of sites’ realistic development capacity.
- c. The housing element assigns more than 50% of the lower-income RHNA target to nonvacant sites, but should use statistical methods (e.g., surveying a random sample of owners of nonvacant sites) to determine that the sites’ existing uses are likely to be discontinued during the planning period.
- d. A buffer of at least 15-30% extra capacity is not included in the housing element site inventory. This capacity buffer is especially necessary in order to accommodate the lower-income RHNA target. (See No Net Loss (NNL) section of 4A.
- e. The housing element should provide a quantitative estimate of the likelihood that in-pipeline projects will be completed, based on historical data, and should adjust the number of in-pipeline units counted towards the 6th cycle RHNA target accordingly.
- f. The housing element should commit to a mid-cycle review to verify the housing element’s assumptions about development probabilities.

located in and near established neighborhoods, including those zoned R-1, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. The City does not propose other overlays that apply to R-1 zoned property.

n. Site Capacity Assessment:

o. The Sites Inventory provides the net number of units that are estimated to be constructed on vacant and non-vacant property. Through implementation of the Housing Element, the City will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing via programs that will allow residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, a program to codify target densities identified in the Land Use Element will meaningfully increase overall housing production (e.g., disincentivize development of housing at densities below densities in the Land Use Element). Other programs will increase densities; rezone properties to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Also, based on a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as input from local developers and property owners, continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. The City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income

	<p>5. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element should meaningfully increase the concentration of lower-income households in areas of the city where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low. b. The housing element should meaningfully reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with significant exposure to noise/pollution and commit to 	<p>category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. The City respectfully disagrees that its RHNA goal falls short by 5,020 units of realistic capacity.</p> <p>p. As part of the Housing Corridor Study, which informs the Housing Element update and provides 33.9% of the sites for the City’s RHNA, a Feasibility Study of potential development prototypes and a pro forma financial feasibility analysis were conducted to determine project feasibility for the development prototypes. The financial factors for the prototypes were generally developed based on the industry-standard cost factors, which reflected a review of site design requirements associated with various zoning districts, and historic property sale data. The analysis was also informed by input from development and design professionals active in the South Bay and comparable southern California markets. The prototypes were evaluated based on the City’s existing parking standards. The fiscal analysis determined that, in many cases, densities could be achieved if the parking standards were reduced. This finding will inform finalization of the development and design standards for the study area so that rezoning of the HCS sites facilitates financial feasibility. This analysis also will inform the revision to other development standards to implement the Zoning Code to facilitate financial feasibility. The City undertook this level of design and fiscal analysis to incentivize development of housing. The Sites Inventory (in the revised document) has been expanded to include information on existing uses, land vs. improvement value, age of the structures, local knowledge regarding underutilization, and interest from the public regarding redevelopment. In addition, a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by</p>
--	---	---

	<p>reducing/addressing noise and pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The housing element should ensure community-serving investment in historically disinvested areas. This includes place-based strategies that create a net gain of affordable housing and stop displacement, prioritize environmental justice, enhance community health, and strengthen equitable community leadership in land use planning. d. The housing element should include a thorough analysis of local patterns in socioeconomic/racial segregation and integration, including patterns of overt racial or ethnic discrimination in the housing and land development market. e. The housing element should adequately prioritize high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas (e.g. near transit, jobs, schools, parks, etc.) when selecting sites for lower-income housing opportunities. f. The housing element should adequately identify funding sources, public resources, and density bonus programs to maximize the likelihood that projects with below-market-rate units are built. g. The jurisdiction did not adequately solicit public feedback and commentary on the housing element in a way that accurately reflects the jurisdiction’s socioeconomic makeup. 	<p>input from local developers and property owners indicates that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. Programs to reduce impediments and incentivize development of housing will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing by allowing residential development by- right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> q. See responses to (a) and (b) above. r. The 1st submittal of the Housing Element did include a buffer of over 30% for all income categories. The Sites Inventory in the revised draft Housing Element has a total buffer 31%; when entitled and pipeline projects and estimated ADUs are included, the buffer is 53.4 percent. s. The revised Housing Element added a new section providing information on historical trends to support the capacity estimates. t. Per Program 1, the City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis rather than waiting until a mid-cycle review. u. v. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: w. The Sites Inventory as proposed will meaningfully increase the concentration of lower income households within the City, including areas where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low throughout the City. Because the City’s residentially designated areas are built out, sites large enough to provide for lower-income housing are challenging to identify. Several used include rezoning
--	--	---

		<p>non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, adding an overlay to allow affordable housing by-right on property owned and operated by religious institutions, which often are in or near neighborhoods of predominantly SFR properties, and facilitating ADUs. The City has adopted an ordinance consistent with SB 9, which also may result in additional affordable units.</p> <p>x. The Torrance Noise Element identifies goals, policies, and programs to mitigate noise impacts. The City has a Noise Ordinance that it actively enforces to mitigate noise violations. Preparation of an Environmental Justice Element is a future action the City will undertake that will address environmental hazards that disproportionately affect lower-income neighborhoods in Torrance.</p> <p>y. Policy H.1.7 commits the City to employ place-based strategies in making neighborhood improvements, where place-based strategies address the physical, social, structural, and economic conditions of a community that affect the well-being of the children, families and individuals who live there. Place-based strategies include any effort to enhance the livability and quality of life in a given community. Implementation of the City's Strategic Plan over the past two decades demonstrates a place-based approach, which is also implemented via the City's budgeting and CIP processes. The City also recently established a Social Services Commission that addresses issues concerning the City's veterans, homeless population, adults with developmental disabilities and children with special needs and advises the City Council.</p> <p>z. The AFFH analysis has been updated to include historic redlining maps, as well as transit, homelessness, and housing loan information, and additional regional information about racial/ethnic minority population, income, disability, and familial</p>
--	--	--

	<p>6. Forecasts of ADU Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The housing element did not use an HCD-recommended safe harbor methodology for forecasting future ADU production. b. The housing element should provide for mid-cycle adjustments if inventory sites are developed at lower rates, or lesser densities, than the housing element anticipated and if ADU production falls short of projections. Mid-cycle adjustments should automatically implement a by-right density bonus on inventory sites, starting mid-cycle, and be large enough to make up for an ADU shortfall. c. The housing element should assess the affordability of forecasted ADUs using city-specific data; it instead uses a regional average. 	<p>status. Contributing factors have been prioritized based on the re-evaluations noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> aa. The Housing Element includes strategies and programs to promote new housing near and along key commercial and transportation corridors. This strategy supports AFFH opportunities because it supports use of transit, bicycling, and walking as alternatives to the use of a personal automobile. Goods and services that residents rely upon are within proximity to housing, which is beneficial to a broad spectrum of residents who depend on or choose alternative modes of transportation. It also provides greater opportunities to distribute housing for all income levels throughout the city. It has economic benefits as well, as additional residents in proximity to businesses provides an enhanced customer base. bb. The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. See also Policy H.3—"Offer financial and/or regulatory incentives, where feasible, to offset or reduce the costs of developing quality housing affordable to a wide range of Torrance households." The City has a density bonus program in accordance with the state Housing Density Bonus law.
--	---	---

		<p>cc. The City has utilized a variety of methods for public outreach, which are summarized in Section 1 of the Housing Element, while Appendix A includes documentation of the various efforts. In addition, the City’s process for updating its Strategic Plan informed preparation of the Housing Element. The process included considerable public outreach, including two statistically valid surveys (one for residents and one for the business community). For the Residents Survey, 1,336 Torrance residents over the age of 18 were surveyed. The survey was conducted online and by telephone. To ensure the representation of all adult residents, a random sample of those without publicly available email addresses or telephone numbers received a postcard in the mail with an invitation to take the survey online. Results were weighted slightly using figures from the U.S. Census to ensure the sample proportions reflect demographic and geographic proportions within the actual population as a whole. Several of the questions were open-ended. When asked what is the biggest issue of concern facing the residents, 11 percent stated housing costs/affordable housing, and three percent responded “homelessness.” The survey tested eight issues facing the City, and 75 percent cited the number of homeless residents as extremely important/very important, and 59 percent cited affordable housing as extremely important/very important. Residents want to see Torrance as a City that provides a wide-range of affordable housing options, with 73 percent ranking this as very/somewhat important.</p> <p>dd. Forecasts of ADU Development:</p> <p>ee. The City calculated the average number of ADU permits issued for 2018, 2019, & 2020 to estimate the production of ADUs during the 6th Cycle. The average is 68.7, but the City used 60 ADUs per year as the estimate, which the City believes is a conservative estimate. Note that this is a reduction from the 100 ADU/year assumed in the 1st submittal to HCD.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>ff. Per Program 3, to facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, within 6 months of adoption of the Housing Element the City will develop a monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction goal. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU goal, the City will review and revise polices and efforts to increase ADU construction as necessary. (This was already in the 1st submittal of the draft Housing Element.)</p> <p>gg. The City used the methodology for ADUs as provided by SCAG and approved by HCD for calculating affordability estimates.</p> <p>hh.</p> <p>ii.</p>
--	--	--

<p>11.5.21 Letter from Californians for Homeownership, sent by email from Matthew Gelfand</p>	<p>Expressed concern that the sites inventory is legally inadequate, and that the City will not be able to meet its obligation to support the inventory with evidentiary findings as the law requires.</p> <p>Stated these inadequacies may expose the City to the risk of litigation.</p> <p>Stated their letter is intended to assist the City in identifying additional information and facts prior to adopting its Housing Element, so the City can reduce this risk and comply with the law.</p> <p>Discussed state law governing the use of nonvacant sites to satisfy housing element obligations.</p> <p>Outlined where they feel are inadequacies in the City’s Draft Housing Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated the sites inventory does not adequately account for the impediment created by the existing uses on the listed nonvacant sites, including the possibility that a site will be maintained in its current use rather than redeveloped during the planning period. • Inventory appears to assume that every listed nonvacant site will be redeveloped during the planning period. Information about the existing uses only identifies a broad category such as residential, commercial or industrial. • City’s draft housing element appears to rely on nonvacant sites to satisfy over 50% of the City’s lower income RHNA but does not identify evidence that the existing uses on each site will be discontinued during the planning period. • Draft housing element provides a general overview of various possible housing corridors and makes broad statements about sites in these areas. Evidence is not provided that these sites have the potential to recycle, making those sites inappropriate for inclusion. • The letter requests additional information and provides a table listing the nonvacant sites identified for lower income housing in the City’s sites inventory. The letter goes on to request that the City complete the table and return it to the sender within 14 days. The information requested included identifying the percentage of similar sites that were redeveloped in the Fifth Cycle or otherwise explain how its prior experience justifies its assumptions. The table also included a space to identify the site-specific evidence for particular sites. • The letter states that if the City does not respond to the letter, the assumption will be that the City has no further analysis or evidence to provide. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is supported (in the revised document) by a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by input from local developers and property owners, that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. Programs to reduce impediments and incentivize development of housing will significantly increase opportunities for additional housing by allowing residential development by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. For example, densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. Since many religious institutions are located in and near established neighborhoods, this strategy also promotes affordable housing in high-opportunity neighborhoods. • The City has provided a Sites Inventory that demonstrates there are adequate sites in the City to accommodate its RHNA. The City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. • The City is mostly built out and must rely on non-vacant sites. Based on analysis, including age of buildings, land-
---	---	---

		<p>to-improvement value, sites utilization, use, interest expressed by property owners and developers, and development trends, it is reasonable to assume that the identified sites provide adequate opportunities to meet the City's RHNA. As noted above, the City's Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement "no net loss" requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the "no net loss" requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional information has been provided regarding the various corridors. An analysis of recent trends (including examples of new housing being approved and constructed on non-residential property supports the City's strategy of promoting infill residential and mixed-use development on the various corridors. Further, implementation of the City's Housing Corridor Study (discussed in detail in the Housing Element) as well as implementation of the proposed Housing/Mixed-Use Overlay, will incentive production of housing on property that currently does not have a residential land use designation or zoning.• The City has significantly expanded Section 4 and the Sites Inventory Table (Appendix C) to provide additional information and analysis regarding the sites. See also other responses above.
--	--	--

<p>1.4.22 Letter from Abundant Housing LA to Gustavo Velasquez, Director, California Department of Housing and Community Development</p> <p>Commenter attached analysis results provided by MapCraft Inc.</p>	<p>Letter states that Abundant Housing is writing to HCD on behalf of Torrance’s housing element, and concerns about what Abundant Housing sees as major deficiencies in the City’s housing element update.</p> <p>Expresses concern that City hasn’t identified enough parcels in its site inventory and proposed rezoning program to achieve its RHNA target of 4,939 homes by 2029.</p> <p>Expresses concern that the City has not provided the substantial evidence that the current use of the nonvacant sites allocated to meet their lower-income RHNA target is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.</p> <p>States that Abundant Housing LA has partnered with MapCraft Labs to forecast the true realistic capacity of the City’s site inventory and proposed rezoning program.</p> <p>States that the findings of the MapCraft analysis include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the City’s site inventory and rezoning program claimed capacity for about 6,600 housing units, commenter’s analysis suggests the expected housing capacity could fall short by 1,800 to 3,600 units. • On 374 sites where the City has claimed 6,018 housing units, commenter’s analysis found that these sites are unlikely to be redeveloped to the density that the City is claiming, or are unlikely to be redeveloped altogether. Commenter states that this represents 95% of the housing units in the City’s site inventory. <p>Commenter provides the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that HCD urge the City to reassess its site capacity claims, and revise the sites inventory and proposed rezoning program, • Recommend the City add more parcels to the site inventory and expand its proposed rezoning program, particularly for low-density parcels in high-demand neighborhoods like Old Town Torrance and Waltheria. • Recommend the City consider eliminating or reducing on-site parking requirements, which commenter suggests would greatly improve the economic feasibility of denser housing development. <p>Additional recommendations from the MapCraft executive summary include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend introducing new economic incentives to increase the 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sites Inventory is supported (in the revised document) by a review of 15 recently entitled or constructed residential developments as well as by input from local developers and property owners, that continued development of housing on existing non-residentially zoned property is both a substantiated trend and has significant interest from both developers and property owners. There are many programs in the Housing Element that will significantly incentivize opportunities for additional housing. For example, residential development will be allowed by-right in areas that currently are not designated or zoned to allow it and reduce identified constraints. Densities will be increased; rezonings will occur to allow by-right construction on properties that are currently not zoned for residential development; and an overlay will be created and applied to certain sites to allow by-right stand-alone residential development in addition to mixed use projects. Another program will add an overlay to religious institutions that would allow for lower-income housing to be constructed by-right on properties owned and operated by religious institutions. • Based on analysis, including age of buildings, land-to-improvement value, sites utilization, use, interest expressed by property owners and developers, and development trends, it is reasonable to assume that the identified sites are candidates for recycling and provide adequate opportunities to meet the City’s RHNA. As noted above, the City’s Sites Inventory provides a total buffer of 31%, and development of a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory will ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an <i>annual</i> basis, not just mid-cycle, so that timely adjustments can be made if necessary. The City notes that its evaluation is based on local knowledge, local
---	--	--

	<p>financial feasibility of redevelopment, especially for projects that include below-market-rate units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider establishing development minimums to ensure high utilization of sites with feasible housing capacity. 	<p>trends, and local developer and property owner interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City modified its Sites Inventory after the 1st submittal to eliminate sites that, after further analysis, did not meet its criteria. New sites were added that did meet its criteria and included property owner and/or developer interest. Regarding Old Town Torrance, the draft Housing Element has been revised to directly address and implement the recently approved Downtown Revitalization and Connectivity Plan, which includes many strategies to incentivize housing in and around Downtown Torrance. This is also a location where the City owns several parcels that it may consider for housing (as it has in the past). The Housing Corridor Study also includes rezoning of an area in Old Town to incentivize housing. New mixed-use development is already a trend in the Walteria District of the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP). While other rezoning outside the Walteria District is not currently proposed, there is a possibility that it could be considered in the future. • The Housing Element already includes a program to evaluate and consider reducing certain development standards that may be constraints to residential and mixed-use development, including parking. Other standards that have been expressed by developers as constraints to development also will be considered, including open space requirements, height, FAR, and setbacks, especially identified as a constraints in the HBCSP. • The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element. • The Housing Element already includes an action in Program 1 to adopt an ordinance to revise the minimum
--	---	--

		<p>densities for several existing zones, including all the residential zones, so that the minimum densities are consistent with the “expected” density ranges in the Land Use Element. These are referred to in the Housing Element capacity assessment as “target” densities. Additionally, incentives will be developed to incentivize development at or above the target densities, and disincentives for projects that propose lower than target densities will be developed.</p>
--	--	---

<p>2.28.22 Letter from YIMBY Law Sonja Trauss, Executive Director</p>	<p>Commenter states that findings repeatedly seen are that housing prices are high, segregation exists, and there is a lack of housing for special populations, but the policies and programs of the housing element do not respond to these findings or try to change outcomes.</p> <p>The following is a summary list of YIMBY’s policy recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prioritize rezoning in high resource, historically exclusionary neighborhoods b. Establish a strong tenant protection ordinance so that new housing benefits everyone c. Support homeownership opportunities for historically excluded groups d. Adequately plan for density e. Provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels, including a minimum No Net Loss buffer of 30% f. Use data from the 5th Cycle to calculate the likelihood of development for the 6th Cycle site inventory g. Commit to an automatic mid-cycle adjustment if ADU permitting activity is lower than estimated in the housing element h. Incentivize new ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers. i. Allow residential to be built in areas that are zoned for commercial use. j. All flexibility in inclusionary zoning. k. Ensure that the city has a ministerial process for housing permitting, especially multi-family housing, and remove impact fees for deed-restricted housing. l. Reduce parking standards and eliminate parking minimums. m. Cap fees on all new housing. n. Provide local funding, to possibly include transfer tax, vacancy tax, commercial linkage fee. 	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Sites Inventory as proposed will meaningfully increase the concentration of lower income households within the City, including areas where the existing concentration of lower-income households is low throughout the City. Because the City’s residentially designated areas are built out, sites large enough to provide for lower-income housing are challenging to identify. Several include rezoning non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, adding an overlay to allow affordable housing by-right on property owned and operated by religious institutions, which often are in or near neighborhoods of predominantly SFR properties, and facilitating ADUs. The City has adopted an ordinance consistent with SB 9, which also may result in additional affordable units. b. The City currently actively enforces fair housing laws and promotes and supports renters’ (tenants’) rights. For example, following the passage of AB 1482 (Tenant Protections Act of 2019), the Torrance City Council acted swiftly to stem a surge of arbitrary, no-fault evictions as a number of landlords threatened to or actually served tenants with eviction notices in advance of the implementation of the new law Ordinance 3854 that was approved by the City Council on October 29, 2019. Torrance is part of the CDBG Urban County program, which contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The HRC The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and
---	--	--

		<p>other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City.</p> <p>c. The Housing Element includes policies and programs to support and encourage homeownership, and the City has a history of promoting ownership via its former Redevelopment Agency via facilitation of condominium development in Downtown Torrance for moderate-income households. The City encourages state and federal programs to increase funding opportunities for homeownership for lower-income households, such as increasing state and federal HUD programs. The City may consider local programs if funding opportunities are available.</p> <p>d. See response to (a) above.</p> <p>e. The Sites Inventory and programs provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels--see response to (a) above. The City will develop a procedure to monitor the development of vacant and non-vacant sites in the Sites Inventory and ensure that adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category to implement “no net loss” requirements pursuant to SB 166. The City will monitor and report on the “no net loss” requirement on an annual basis.</p> <p>f. The updated Housing Element includes an evaluation of previously entitled and constructed housing developments (residential and mixed use) including many from the 5th Cycle, as one of the methods used to inform the Sites Inventory.</p> <p>g. To facilitate the construction goal of a minimum of 60 ADUs/JADUs per year, the Housing Element already includes a program to develop a monitoring program to ensure the City is on track to meeting identified construction goal. If by April 2025 the City is not meeting its ADU goal, the City will review and revise polices and efforts to increase ADU construction as necessary.</p> <p>h. The Housing Element already has a program to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>incentivize ADUs. While it does not specifically address those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers, it is something the City can consider when preparing the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Housing Element already includes several programs to allow construction of housing and mixed-use development on property that not currently designated for residential uses. Several include rezoning non-residentially zoned properties to allow residential development via an overlay (see the Housing Corridor Study described in the Housing Element, as well as adding a Housing/Mixed Use Overlay to properties along and near other key commercial corridors. j. The Housing Element includes a program to investigate the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City will look at various options in its evaluation, including methods to promote flexibility. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element k. The Housing Element already includes several programs that will allow housing and mixed-use development to be allowed ministerially. The potential to waive fees is also one of the strategies the Housing Element includes. l. The Housing Element already includes a program to evaluate and consider reducing certain development standards that may be constraints to residential and mixed-use development, including parking. Other standards that have been expressed by developers as constraints to development also will be considered, including open space requirements, height, FAR, and setbacks, especially identified as a constraints in the
--	--	---

		<p>HBCSP.</p> <p>m. Capping fees on all new housing is not currently a program in the Housing Element.</p> <p>n. The City's Housing Element includes programs and objectives to fund affordable housing to the extent feasible. The City will continue to pursue grants (such as utilizing federally assisted funding the City used for the Cabrillo Family Apartments development in 2015, which provided 43 affordable units) and will apply for eligible programs. The City also will use other mechanisms that can result in reduced development costs, such as using incentives, development agreements, process streamlining, etc. The City notes that funding for affordable housing has been significantly impacted due to the state's dissolution of Redevelopment. The City's Redevelopment Appendix G (Response to Public Comments) pg. 26 Agency funded many affordable housing units in Torrance in the past, from very low to moderate units. Without a replacement for funding under Redevelopment, funding for affordable housing will remain an ongoing constraint for cities and counties in California. The Housing Element currently does not propose programs proposed by the commentator (transfer tax, vacancy tax, commercial linkage fee), although it's possible such programs could be considered during the City's continued analysis of opportunities for funding for housing.</p>
--	--	---

<p>3.4.22 Letter from Californians for Homeownership, Matthew Gelfand</p>	<p>Commenter states that City has not adopted a sixth cycle housing element, missing two compliance dates of October 15, 2021, and February 12, 2022, and they are currently preparing for litigation against cities like Torrance that have not timely adopted housing elements.</p> <p>Commenter states that they could immediately sue the City and the City could face severe penalties. The letter continues with a list of potential penalties.</p> <p>Commenter enclosed an Acknowledgement of the above-referenced statements, and states that if the City signs and returns the Acknowledgement by March 11, 2022, commenter will not initiate litigation at this time. Commenter states that if no Acknowledgement is received, they may initiate litigation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	---	---------------

<p>3.31.22 Email exchange between Greg Sullivan, CBRE and City staff</p>	<p>Commenter offers to help advise the City regarding “market conditions” in the tailoring of any Zoning Ordinance updates where housing and/or mixed use is concerned.</p> <p>States it is important to create the right balance and flexibility to create win/win developments for the community and to help meet the RHNA goals.</p> <p>States that generally, older ULI concepts of vertically/horizontally integrated missed use have evolved with the onslaught of internet retail, and the necessity for this change can be witnessed by the high vacancy rate of commercial in non-core/downtown areas and mixed-use communities.</p> <p>Suggests a re-visit of commercial standards along the Hawthorn Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (HBCSP), and states that CBRE believes that 25% gross floor area requirement has prohibited significant residential development on the corridor. Not only has the market shifted from needing this much commercial, but the parking requirements directly affect capabilities to develop meaningful residential. This is especially true in those Districts that allow lesser maximum densities of 27 units/acre.</p> <p>Commenter followed up with another question looking for more details on the 25% gross floor commercial requirements and if visitor parking and community amenities would be allowed within the 100’ setback from Hawthorne for the benefit of the residential component. A subsequent question was if any changes are being proposed to the HBCSP?</p>	<p>Following are responses to comments in the letter:</p> <p>The Housing Element includes a program to review and update the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan to consider reducing the following constraints, at a minimum, based on specific input and feedback from developers who have and propose to construct mixed-use and residential developments in the HBCSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce setback requirements for the residential portions of Mixed-Use developments in the H-NT, H-PR, and H-MP Sub-Districts. • Reduce the minimum percent of commercial uses required for Mixed-Use projects. • Review the maximum FARs for all sub-districts and increase them if necessary to ensure that projects can develop to the allowable densities. • Add objective design standards—tailor them to each district and sub-district as appropriate. • Consider other standards that may be identified during the review process as constraints to development.
--	--	---

<p>4.23.2022</p> <p>Email received from Mark Hansen, resident</p>	<p>The commenter reviewed demographic statistics from the housing element and noted that past population projections were not realized in Torrance.</p> <p>Commenter noted that if the RHNA of 4,939 units is realized, that the population of Torrance will increase by 12,841 residents.</p> <p>Commenter questioned whether the Urban Water Management Plan can accommodate the resulting increase in water demand, if the City’s wastewater infrastructure can accommodate the increased population, and whether the increased demand for electricity can be accommodated without a deterioration in quality of life.</p>	<p>The City Public Works Department provided the following response:</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The Torrance Municipal Water (TMW) utility serves approximately 78% of Torrance, with the remaining portions of the City in West Torrance and the Hollywood Rivera area served by the California Water Service Company. The City of Torrance is a direct member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who wholesales imported potable supplies (drinking water) to its member agencies in Southern California, including Torrance. Currently MWD supplies, approximately 75% of TMW’s potable water demands. However, the City has embarked on local water source diversification program that will increase local supplies to approximately 70% and reduce imported water to 30% or less within the next five years. This will help “drought proof” the community. The City’s North Torrance Wellfield Project (NTWP) project will be operational this summer and will triple our local potable groundwater production and increase of local supplies to 45% more of our potable water requirements.</p> <p>Specifics of Water Inquiry:</p> <p>Based on State guidelines, the Draft Housing Element forecasts that 4,939 new dwelling units will need to be constructed in the City. Assuming 2.6 people per household, this would result in an additional population of 12,841 once all units are built. In 2009, a bill SBx7-7 was passed requiring retail water agencies to reduce potable water demand by 20% by 2020 (referred to as the 20 by 20 plan). TMW’s 2020 target was set at 142 gallons per day per capita (GPCD), and we actually reduced this demand by 15% below the target to 121 GPCD, as documented in Torrance’s 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Thus, the projected additional housing units would increase water use in the TMW service area over time between 1.554 million gallons per day (mgd) using the actual 121 GPCD number or at 1.838 mgd using the higher 142 GPCD</p>
---	---	---

		<p>target number.</p> <p>Our water demand is generally expressed in acre-feet rather than gallons (1 AF equals approximately 326,000 gallons). Thus, the projected increase in annual potable water use would total between 1,740 AF (at 121 GPCD) to 2,045 AF (at 142 GPCD). In either case, TMW has more than sufficient system capacity and water resources to meet the projected additional demands, without taking into account the demand damping effects of ongoing conservation efforts. Over the last 25 years, TMW's potable water demand has decreased by over 26% from approximately 26,050 AF to 19,200 AF, due to the concerted conservation efforts of our customers. The TWD infrastructure system was sized to meet higher demands of past years, and currently has a total system delivery capacity of more than two and one-half times of our current average demand.</p> <p>Sewer System: The City of Torrance operates and maintains a sewer collection system that conveys sewage from homes and businesses in the City to the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles Joint Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, who provides all treatment. Similar to the water system infrastructure situation, the municipal sewer collection system was sized to meet the higher demands experienced in the 1990s. Reduction in water use has resulted in a corresponding decrease in sewage flows. In 2019, a comprehensive Sewer Master Plan was completed and no major capacity deficiency issues were identified. Based on these findings, the City's sewer system has sufficient infrastructure and pipeline capacity to meet the additional sewage flows for the proposed additional housing units in the Draft Housing Element.</p>
--	--	---

<p>5.18.22</p> <p>Email received from Dennis Piotrowski</p>	<p>The commentor stated he was pleased to see that the Housing Element included a goal to preserve the city's single-family neighborhoods and to retain the character of Torrance as desired by residents. Also concerned about negative impacts from state housing legislation that would negatively impact neighborhoods and homes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	---	---------------

<p><u>4.28.22</u></p> <p><u>Andrew K. Fogg</u></p>	<p><u>Commentor writing on behalf of a client stating that the property owner does not want his property included in the Sites Inventory and has no intent of developing it with residential or mixed use development.</u></p>	<p><u>City removed property from Sites Inventory.</u></p>
--	--	---

5.17.22	Commentor is a reporter surveying cities about their Housing Element practices.	Noted.
Manuela Tobia (CAL MATTERS)		

5.18.22	Commentor followed up regarding questions from an earlier email submitted. Concerned about the state mandating housing based on estimated growth that did not occur. Also concerned about changing the original feel of Torrance by overbuilding.	Previous email was responded to in 2 nd submittal—staff directed commentor to where he could view the response.
Mark Hansen		

<p>6.8.22</p> <p>Doug Maupin</p>	<p>Commentor is a developer who has developed over 800 residential units in Torrance. Provided comments on constraints to development, including FAR, parking ratios and guest parking, and open space and how its calculated. Encouraged the City to increase FAR, reduce parking, reduce open space requirements, and increase height limits. Also encouraged City to allow the Senior Development Standards to be used for non-senior housing.</p>	<p>Noted. The Housing Plan includes programs to increase FAR, reduce parking, reduce open space requirements, and increase allowable building height. Revisions to development standards have not occurred yet, and the commentors can participate in the update process to express their support for higher FARs and densities</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

<p>6.14.22 John Rohan and Keith Hagaman</p>	<p>Commentors appreciate the proposed increase in FAR and hope that ultimate updated Zoning Code will increase the FAR to a greater FAR to allow them to construct the same density as they have constructed on other property in another city.</p>	<p>Revisions to development standards have not occurred yet, and the commentors can participate in the update process to express their support for higher FARs and densities.</p>
---	---	---

