

CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO



SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

MONDAY, MAY 9, 2005

AGENDA ITEM
JOINT SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL/
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 9, 2005 ITEM No. 2

DISCUSSION

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE FEATURES TO REGULATE
THE CONVERSION OF MULTI-FAMILY RENTAL
APARTMENTS TO CONDOMINIUMS**



CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO

Planning Division

2200 University Avenue, East Palo Alto, CA 94303
(650) 853-3185, (650) 853-3179 (fax)

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF REPORT

DATE: May 9, 2005

TO: Honorable Members of the City Council and the Planning Commission

VIA: Alvin D. James, City Manager

FROM: Michael Lawson, City Attorney
Maria Banico, City Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Proposed Ordinance Features to Regulate the Conversion of Multi-Family Rental Apartments to Condominiums

RECOMMENDATION:

That the City Council and Planning Commission review and endorse the recommended features of a Condominium Conversion Ordinance and direct staff to prepare a detailed ordinance for adoption by the Planning Commission and City Council.

A Council action to endorse staff's recommended features of the proposed Condominium Conversion Ordinance anticipates a prior confirmation that it is the City Council's desire to allow conversion of a small segment of the City's housing stock (estimated to be between 150 and 450 dwelling units) which would consist of developments that meet the following criteria:

- Contains 4 or more units
- Are not within the Rent Stabilization Program.
- Meet the 2001 California Building Code Requirements
- Meet the Zoning Regulations Parking Requirements

ISSUE:

The City's current Condominium Conversion Code provides a single criteria, vacancy rate, for the acceptance of a condominium conversion application. The Code does not give policy guidance or criteria to guide the processing of a condominium conversion application. There

is a need to adopt a comprehensive ordinance that does two things: clarifies when a conversion can be allowed and, indicates what criteria should be used when a conversion is approved.

BACKGROUND:

In February, 2004, the City Council approved a moratorium on condominium conversions and created a Condominium Conversion Advisory Committee to study potential alternative measures, policies and procedures that might be included in a condominium conversion ordinance. In April, 2004, the Council also authorized the City Manager to issue a Request for Proposal and the enter a contract with an independent consultant to prepare recommendations for features to be considered as part of a proposed condominium conversion ordinance. At the November 8, 2004 Planning Commission meeting and at the December 2, 2004 Committee meeting, staff was directed by the Planning Commission to prepare draft ordinance language for discussion. Likewise, at the February 1, 2005 City Council meeting, during its deliberation regarding a possible extension of the Condominium Conversion moratorium, the Council directed that staff forward to the City Council a draft of the proposed ordinance. (See attachment F Chronology). The City Council invited the City Planning Commission to join it in considering the proposed measures that are the subject of the remainder of this report.

STRUCTURE OF STAFF REPORT:

In response to the Council's request, this staff report identifies the recommended features of the proposed Condominium Conversion Ordinance. **Staff is recommending that the ordinance include the features as outlined below.** The recommendations stem from discussion during meetings listed in Attachment F, Chronology of Events related to the formulation and discussion of a list of potential features for the proposed ordinance.

The outline of the proposed Condominium Conversion Ordinance represents staff's recommendation on the ordinance features presented in the Kendall report dated 11/1/04. (See Attachments A and B). Ms. Kendall was the consultant hired by the City to undertake the research.

Following the outline, this staff report includes a brief discussion on each entry. The discussion presents staff's rationale for the recommendation for each proposed feature and solicits the City Council and Planning Commission's input or direction. For ease of reference, the outline and the corresponding discussions are color coded. The uncolored portion of the outline represents the procedural portions of the ordinance. The procedural portions are not discussed in detail in this staff report. These items will be addressed when the detailed ordinance is presented to the Planning Commission and City Council.

This staff report also includes a discussion on ordinance features that were considered but are **not being recommended by staff** for inclusion in the proposed ordinance. The City Council or the Planning Commission may identify features in this portion of the staff report that should be incorporated into the ordinance.

Finally, the staff report includes attachments that address the proposed features of the ordinance and supplement the discussion in the staff report in terms of the recommended features. It also includes two other letters of correspondence --- one from Wind River Investments containing recommendations regarding an ordinance and one from Malcolm Constantine regarding ordinance provisions specifically pertaining to an ordinance as it relates to mobile park conversion. The attachments do not include the complete record nor all of the correspondence received on this subject matter. The record is voluminous and is available for review at the Planning Division office.

PROPOSED CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION ORDINANCE:

Staff is recommending that the condominium conversion ordinance be developed based on the outline below:

I. Purpose

- A. Protect Rental Housing Supply
- B. Reduce Tenant Displacement
- C. Protect Affordable Housing
- D. Protect Mobilehome Parks from Conversion unless the conversion is sought by residents of the Park
- E. Provide for Affordable Home Ownership
- F. Upgrade Existing Housing

II. Requirements at the Time of Application

- A. Must meet the current Building Code (2001 California Building Code)
- B. Must meet Zoning Standards on parking for multi-family dwellings
- C. Must carry out notice requirements in the State Subdivision Map Act
- D. Must meet Required Percentage of Tenant Approval
- E. Must meet Minimum Number of Units per Structure
- F. Must not be included in the Rent Stabilization Program
- G. Must meet the requirements in the Mobilehome Parks Conversion section

III. Requirements / Conditions to be part of Approval

- A. Pay Park-In-Lieu Fee
- B. Comply with provisions of the BMR Code

- C. Pay Affordable Housing Fee
- D. Provide Relocation Assistance / Pay Relocation Cost
- E. Provide Tenant Purchase Assistance
- F. Provide Tenant Right of First Refusal to Purchase
- G. Provide Incentives for Senior & Disabled Persons
- H. Protect Tenants of Existing BMR Rental Units
- I. Bring up to Code Requirements / Adopted Standards

IV. Process

- A. Prior to Application
- B. Submittal Requirements
- C. Approval of Conversion

V. Required Findings

VI. Appeals

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FEATURES OF THE ORDINANCE:

I. PURPOSE: Staff is recommending that the proposed ordinance contain language to express the following purposes and goals of the Condominium Conversion Ordinance:

- A. Protect Rental Housing Supply
- B. Reduce Tenant Displacement
- C. Protect Affordable Housing
- D. Protect Mobilehome Parks from Conversion unless the conversion is sought by residents of the Park
- E. Provide for Affordable Home Ownership
- F. Upgrade Existing Housing

These were the goals identified during the community meeting held on August 10, 2004 through a survey of the participants. The City Council and Planning Commission should give guidance on whether this list is complete and if it should serve as the basis for the purpose statement of the ordinance. Likewise, the Council and Commission should identify if any of these items should be deleted.

The recommended features have been broken down into two categories in the ordinance:

- 1) circumstances or features at the time of a condominium conversion application and
- 2) recommended requirements (either by code or as conditions of approval) if an application is approved by the Planning Commission.

The former would affect the number of buildings that could be considered for condominium conversion. The latter would result in requirements imposed upon or conditioned as part of an approval of a conversion. A partial description of each feature is listed below. Some of the features, as discussed below could belong to either category. Staff has exercised discretion, with the purpose of initiating further discussion, on which category to place each feature.

II. Requirements At Time of Application: The following features listed below are proposed to be the requirements at the time of application. If an application does not meet any of the features, a variance application would be required, unless another process (e.g. waiver by the Planning Commission as part of the condominium conversion application, use permit, etc.) is allowed by the ordinance. The City Council and the Planning Commission should give guidance to staff on what, if any, flexibilities should be built into the ordinance on these features that could allow or preclude an application for conversion.

II A. Must meet current Building Code (2001 California Building Code CBC): Staff is recommending that any developments for conversion be constructed in compliance with the 2001 California Building Code.

This recommended feature of the ordinance addresses the construction of the building in-lieu of another feature that was considered which was the age of a building.

The City Council adopted the 2001 California Building Code (hereinafter referred to as the 2001 Building Code) as the City's Building Code on December 7, 2004. In effect, this adoption will require that condominiums (whether new or conversions) comply with the 2001 Building Code. The City Council or the Planning Commission has no authority to waive requirements of the 2001 Building Code as it a requirement of state law. The ordinance, however, can add requirements over and above the 2001 Building Code in the condominium conversion ordinance. Staff is not recommending additional requirements above the 2001 Building Code.

If adopted, the feature of the condominium conversion ordinance will peg conversions to the 2001 Building Code, even if the City adopts a later version of the code in the future.

There is already a mechanism for review and approval by the Chief Building Official of alternate materials, methods and devices (AMMDs) where s/he will then be able to administratively approve deviations from the current code in the 2001 Building Code. Inclusion of this feature in the condominium conversion ordinance would be redundant since it is already included in the 2001 Building Code regulations. Therefore, it is not recommended as a provision in the ordinance. However, the ordinance may add restrictions, e.g., where AMMDs could be considered or, it may add limitations to the authority of the Chief Building Official for granting administrative waivers to the extent such is not inconsistent with the Building Code. Staff is not recommending any changes to the AMMD procedure in the 2001 Building Code.

It is presumed that all buildings constructed hence will meet the 2001 Building Code. There are existing buildings (built before 2001) that may have been built in a manner that exceeds the code that applied to them at the time of construction and, that may already meet 2001 Building Code requirements or, can readily be upgraded to meet the 2001 Building Code. It is, however, generally presumed that the older a building is, the more upgrades will be required to meet code requirements and, specifically, the less likely the building was built to the standards specified by the 2001 Building Code.

The Planning Commission Committee discussed this feature and agreed unanimously on its inclusion as a feature of the ordinance. The Committee did not recommend any further restrictions on the AMMD process or construction of buildings over and above the 2001 Building Code.

II B. Must meet Zoning Standards on Parking for multi-family dwellings: Staff is recommending that any developments applying for a conversion be required to meet the current parking requirements in the Zoning Regulations. The current regulations for condominium conversions are silent on parking standards, among other requirements. If the ordinance remains silent on parking standards, the absence of specific language could be interpreted to mean that a conversion from apartments to condominiums could be allowed without consideration of the actual parking available in the existing apartment building. If the ordinance speaks to parking, either as a minimum requirement or a standard subject to

Commission review, then parking can be analyzed as part of an application. The current parking requirement for apartments are:

Size: 9.5 ft. by 18 ft. for standard spaces
8 ft. by 16 ft. for compact spaces

Number of spaces for apartments:

1 space for each dwelling unit having 0 bedrooms or studio apartment
1.2 spaces for each dwelling unit having 1 bedroom
1.5 spaces for each dwelling unit having 2 bedrooms
2 spaces for each dwelling unit having 3 or more bedrooms
Plus 1 additional uncovered guest parking space for each 5 units
40% of required parking spaces may be compact size spaces

II C. Must carry out notice requirements in the State Subdivision Map Act: Staff is **not** recommending any additional notice requirements but **is** recommending, for ease of reference, to repeat the requirements in the State Subdivision Map Act in the Condominium Conversion Ordinance. This feature is already in place and must be carried out by a condominium applicant per state law. The condominium conversion ordinance may include more restrictive notice requirements than those contained in the State Subdivision Map Act.

II D. Must meet Required Percentage of Tenant Approval: Staff is recommending that the condominium conversion ordinance contain a provision to require 50% tenant approval as part of the submittal requirements for a conversion application. The proposed 50% rate is higher than most other cities (e.g. Santa Monica has a 30% tenant approval requirement.) This feature is geared towards avoiding tenant displacement.

The Committee recommended a tenant approval requirement but did not specify a tenant approval percentage rate. The Committee stated that the approvals should come from tenants who are eligible to purchase the proposed condominium units.

II E. Must meet Minimum Number of Units: Staff is recommending that the ordinance include a provision that the buildings involved in a conversion should contain four or more units. This number of units is a threshold in the construction type of the buildings pursuant to the Building Code with more restrictive standards on exiting and common open space than buildings with fewer than four units.

The Committee voted to limit condominium conversions to four or more units.

II F. Must not be included in the Rent Stabilization Program: Staff is recommending that units in the Rent Stabilization Program (RSP) be excluded from condominium conversions. . In previous discussion, some City Councilmembers have expressed a desire to protect affordable housing from conversions. The Council can make this legislative distinction as long as it is rationally-related to the governmental objective.

This feature of the ordinance would only preclude conversion of RSP units. However, the condominium conversion ordinance could not bar the redevelopment and reconstruction of RSP units as provided for in state law under the Ellis Act.

The Committee voted unanimously to preclude conversions of units that are under the Rent Stabilization Program.

II. G. Must meet the requirements of this Mobilehome Parks Conversion section. Staff is recommending that the condominium conversion ordinance contain this section to protect the state law rent control provisions already in effect for mobilehome parks. Staff is recommending the procedures contained in Attachment D, letter from Mr. William Constantine, legal counsel for Palo Mobile Estates.

III. Requirements / Conditions to be part of Approval: This section of the ordinance imposes requirements or conditions upon approval of a condominium conversion application.

III. A. Pay Park-In-Lieu Fee: Staff is recommending that any conversion application that is approved be charged park-in-lieu fees which is the source of City funds for the purchase and development of park lands. The Subdivision Regulations exempt conversions of apartment buildings over five (5) years old from the payment of park in-lieu fees. Currently, the Subdivision Regulations based on the State Map Act, provides for the collection of park-in-lieu fees for subdivision of lands and new condominiums. The fee is currently based on the market price of land and the number of lots in the proposed land subdivision.

Staff is recommending that condominium conversion application be required to pay a park-in-lieu fee regardless of the age of the building and that this fee be calculated based on the number of proposed condominium units. This recommendation could potentially result in a higher park-in-lieu fee for developments that have a high density of units and little or no open space within the existing development.

Alternatively, the park-in-lieu fee could be calculated based on the number of bedrooms in the development. A survey of other cities (e.g. Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Redwood City) showed that other cities have charged a park impact fee for multi-family developments (condominiums and apartments).

The Committed voted unanimously to support the imposition of park-in-lieu fees.

III. B. Comply with the provisions of the BMR Code: Staff is recommending that the Condominium Conversion Ordinance require compliance with the BMR regulations. Staff is also recommending that there be a companion change in the BMR regulations that requires the provision of BMR units and the payment of BMR in-lieu fees for condominium conversions. The latter currently only covers new development. The current BMR regulations requires a 20% set aside for affordable housing. Staff is recommending that the Condominium Conversion Ordinance require the same 20% set aside for affordable housing

within the development. A new fee, an Affordable Housing Fee, is discussed below to enable the development of new affordable housing outside the development which is the subject of the conversion application.

The Committee voted unanimously for a higher rate of BMR units.

III. C. Pay Affordable Housing Fee: Staff is recommending that an Affordable Housing Fee be charged for approved conversions and that the fee be pegged at 10% of the sales price of the condominium unit. During the meetings on condominium conversions, the Affordable Housing Fee was described in the context of creating a fund that could assist low-income residents in purchasing condominium units, furthering assistance to low-income renters or, promoting the development and construction of affordable housing units. This Affordable Housing Fee is justified given that the structures for conversion are existing structures and the property owners for such applications have already captured the appreciation in land and structures. The fees collected under this provision would be under the control of the City and should be used to facilitate development of affordable housing. There is already a fund in place for this process and the funds are generated from the collection of BMR in-lieu fees for new developments.

Staff is recommending that the ordinance not specify a fixed amount or flat fee for the Affordable Housing Fee but that a standard ratio be set, specifically 10% of the sales price of the proposed condominium units. This formula is similar to an affordable housing fee currently being considered by the City of Berkeley. The reason for using a ratio instead of a flat fee is that the financial feasibility of condominium conversion applications differ over time and from case to case.

The Committee voted to charge an affordable housing fee.

III. D. Provide Relocation Assistance / Pay Relocation Cost: Staff is recommending that the ordinance contain a feature for review and approval of the relocation assistance and cost thereof proposed by an applicant. Staff is not recommending a fixed amount or predetermined method for relocation assistance or payment of relocation cost as this would vary from case to case. This assistance will go directly to the affected tenants who need to move because of the conversion, either because they do not wish to purchase a condominium unit or because they cannot purchase the condominium unit. This feature will be provided to all tenants who have to relocate and therefore are displaced by the conversion and is not limited to those tenants who are part of a protected group (e.g. senior, disabled, low income). Staff is recommending that the ordinance features for relocation assistance, cost and procedures be flexible and be part of the proposal submitted by the applicant. The proposal would be subject to review and approval of the reviewing body as part of the application for conversion.

The Committee voted unanimously to impose relocation assistance requirements but did not specify the amount thereof.

III. E. Provide Tenant Purchase Assistance: Staff is recommending that the assistance be based on the subsidy needed to cover the gap between the rents being charged for like units in the BMR program and the cost of purchase of the unit for a period of five years or the needed down payment to be eligible to purchase, whichever is greater. The tenants eligible to receive the tenant purchase assistance should have income levels as those required under the BMR program.

The Committee voted to unanimously to impose a Tenant Purchase Assistance feature.

III. F. Provide Tenant Right of First Refusal to Purchase: Staff is recommending that the ordinance provide a notice and right of first refusal procedure for a tenant of the apartment that is the subject of a condominium conversion application. The applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the reviewing body that the applicant has offered adequate tenant purchase assistance to minimize the dislocation of a tenant due to the tenant's inability to purchase the proposed condominium unit.

III. G. Provide Incentives for Senior & Disabled Persons: During the deliberations on condominium conversions, a proposal to provide lifetime leases to senior and disabled persons was discussed. Staff is not recommending a requirement to impose the provision of lifetime leases to senior and disabled persons, however, because such a requirement may become a disincentive to lease units to senior and disabled persons. Alternatively, staff is recommending that the purchase of units by senior and/or disabled persons shall be taken as a positive criteria the evaluation of whether or not to support the approval of an application for condominium conversion.

III. H. Protect Tenants of Existing BMR Rental Units: Staff is recommending that the ordinance require that the tenants of any existing BMR rental units be allowed to continue renting the units. However, when the tenants voluntarily opt to leave, the BMR rental units may be sold as condominium units and would convert to BMR Ownership units. This feature has also been referred to as "providing lifetime leases to BMR tenants." The units that are maintained as rentals shall be counted as part of the 20% total BMR requirement under III.B.

The Committee voted to recommend to require lifetime leases to BMR tenants.

III. I. Bring up to Code Requirements / Adopted Standards: Staff is recommending that the changes required to bring an existing apartment building to conversion code requirements be completed prior to the recordation of the condominium map for the conversion. This feature of the ordinance is for clarity of implementation. This feature will guard against code enforcement problems that may arise if condominium maps are recorded prior to the necessary upgrades on the building or associated parking.

DISCUSSION OF CONSIDERED FEATURES THAT WERE NOT RECOMMENDED BY STAFF OR WERE NOT RECOMMENDED AT THIS TIME:

The proposed ordinance outline above does not include the following features that were considered during the deliberations on the condominium conversion ordinance:

- Must meet Vacancy Rate threshold
- Age of building (1983 or 1995)
- Must meet Annual Ceiling on Number of Units
- Must meet Zoning Standards on Private and/or Common Open Space for Condominiums
- Must meet Zoning Standards on Private Storage Space for Condominiums
- Must meet Zoning Standards on Private Service Space for Condominiums
- Must meet Building / Plumbing Standards on utility and service separation
- Provide Replacement Rental Housing

Must meet Vacancy Rate threshold: Staff is not recommending that the ordinance contain a requirement on vacancy rate for various reasons. There is no reliable source of current data on vacancy for the city at present. Although reliable data may be generated in the near future, no defensible nexus can be established between citywide vacancy factors and condominium conversion. Vacancy may be brought about by many factors, e.g., lack of management, economic factors, amount of rent relative to average rent in the area.

The City's Subdivision Regulations require a vacancy rate of 4.15% before an application for condominium conversion can be accepted. The practical difficulty for the vacancy rate in the current regulations is that there is room for misinterpretation on whether the vacancy rate is a County or City vacancy rate. Further, the regulations point to a vacancy rate compiled by the California Department of Finance. There have been discussions at the various committee meetings on whether this data is readily available and whether the data that is available is a reliable measure of the city's vacancy rate. The City also does not currently collect Citywide vacancy data, even under the Rent Stabilization Program. If the Council & Commission wish to consider recommend or establish a vacancy rate threshold, staff recommends that the Council and Commission also give guidance on how the vacancy rate can be determined. There has been some anecdotal information provided at the previous Condominium Conversion Committee meetings that a vacancy rate of 3% to 5% is normal turnover rate for apartments. The Council & Commission could also consider a different basis for the vacancy rate, such as the collection of data on vacancies in the apartments that could be eligible for condominium conversions within the City of East Palo Alto. It should be noted, however, that efforts could be time-consuming, expensive, and beyond the current capacity of staff to accomplish.

In any event, a vacancy rate is not relevant or necessary if the proposed conversion inventory is 150-450 units. A vacancy rate trigger is only relevant if all rental properties are included in the conversion inventory.

The Committee discussed this feature and recommended a vacancy rate of 6% of all multi-family dwellings.

Age of building: Staff is not recommending a specific age of building and has alternatively recommended two other features in the preceding portions of this report, namely, compliance with the 2001 Building Code and exclusion of the RSP units. These two factors would more effectively control the types of buildings that are eligible or ineligible for conversion.

Must meet Annual Ceiling on Number of Units: Given the small number of developments eligible for conversion under the staff recommendation, the small size of the City's housing stock, and the limited number of existing condominiums, staff is not recommending an annual ceiling or cap to the number of units eligible for conversion. Setting an annual ceiling is not needed in the City because of the relatively small inventory of developments that are eligible for conversions, especially given the proposed requirements in this staff report.

The Committee voted to exclude this feature in the ordinance.

Must meet Zoning Standards Related to Parking for Condos: There are currently no separate parking standards for condominiums in the Zoning Regulations. The Planning Commission may require a higher parking requirement for condominiums as opposed to apartments. The rationale for this may be that since condominium units are ownership units, then the household is expected to stay longer in the unit. Further, a homeowner's association is less able to restrict and allocate limited parking spaces in comparison to a landlord. Staff is not recommending that such standards be considered as part of the ordinance.

Must meet Zoning Standards on Private and/or Common Open Space for condos: Currently, the Zoning Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations are silent on requiring private and / or common open space for multi-family developments. Both private and common open space have been provided in newer multi-family developments as part of development applications at the initiative of the applicants and with staff encouragement. However, the City has not adopted dimensional standards to date. Staff is not recommending that such standards be considered as part of the ordinance.

Must meet Zoning Standards on Private Storage Space for condos: The Zoning and Subdivision Regulations also do not have minimum requirements for storage space. The Planning Commission may consider a requirement for the provision of such space in the condominium conversions ordinance or postpone such consideration of a broader study of all types of multi-family dwellings. Alternatively, this feature may be a condition of approval of a conversion application. Staff is not providing a recommendation at this time.

Must meet Zoning Standards on Private Service Space for condos: Private service space consists of laundry rooms, and other types of services used by the residents of the multi-family dwellings. The Zoning and Subdivision Regulations are silent on such standards.

Must meet Building / Plumbing Standards on utility and service separation: Staff is currently developing standards for separate meters for individual units and is in the process of determining what type of metering is optimal for condominiums versus apartments. The two types of metering being considered consist of separate meters for each unit onto the street or a single meter for the development with individual meter inside the development. This consideration would shape the plumbing design and also the role of the Homeowner's Association. The latter alternative will result in the HOA collecting the utility bills. The site and floor plans of the existing buildings influence whether this feature is easy or hard to implement. This feature could be handled as a possible condition of approval for a conversion application on a case-by-case basis, however, staff is not providing a recommendation at this time..

NEXT STEPS:

Staff is requesting input and guidance from the City Council and Planning Commission on the recommended features of the ordinance at this joint meeting. The next steps will be to prepare a draft ordinance and fee resolutions (as appropriate) for consideration by the Planning Commission and the City Council at some future date.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A Allison Kendall's Report dated 11/1/04
- B Allison Kendall's Power Point Presentation dated August 10, 2004
- C Planning Commission Committee Report dated 2/24/05
- D Letter from William Constantine regarding Mobilehome Parks dated 12/10/04
- E Letter from Patrick Kelly dated 3/24/05
- F Chronology
- G Staff Report to the City Council on the Moratorium dated February 1, 2005, March 18, 2004 and February 16, 2004

ATTACHMENT F
CHRONOLOGY of EVENTS

CHRONOLOGY:

Legislative and Procedural Background / Chronology

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| March 1, 2003 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ City Council Study Session – Two Year Strategic Plan<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Identifies goal of creating a more diverse housing base and opportunities to retain senior population |
| Late 2003 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Rent Stabilization Board Ad-hoc Inquiry Begin<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Identifies need to fix condo conversion ordinance based on experiences with Palo Mobile Estates and West Palm Condos |
| Early 2004 / April 1, 2004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Condominium Conversion Application – Woodland Creek Apts.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Applicant meets with City Council Land Use Committee, the City Manager and City staff regarding potential application○ Formally submits a Condominium Conversion application to the East Palo Alto Planning Division |
| February 16 – March 18, 2004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Moratorium / Condominium Conversion Committee<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ City Council approves moratorium on condominium conversions and creates a Condominium Conversion Advisory Committee to study potential alternative measures, policies and procedures for a condominium conversion ordinance for the City |
| April 8, 2004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Issue RFP and Enter into Contract with an Independent Consultant<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ RFP mailed to four (4) qualified firms and/or individuals○ Staff received one (1) response, from Alison Kendall |
| June 22, 2004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Stakeholder Interviews conducted by Alison Kendall<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Assistant Planner Shapiro was present for all interviews○ Interview List included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Raj Batra, Rent Stabilization Board- Duane Bay- Bernardo Huerta- Robert Sherrard- Chester Smith, Palo Mobile Estates resident- David Woods- Carlos Martinez○ Those invited but unable to attend included: Elizabeth Jackson (RSB), Patsy Johnson & William Rosetti (Property Owners), Robert Jones (EPA CanDo), Allison Lasser (PIA), Thomas Sagehorn |
| March – September 2004 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Condominium Conversion Committee (CCC) Meetings:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ March 29, 2004○ April 13, 2004○ April 28, 2004○ June 22, 2004○ July 13, 2004○ August 10, 2004 (Emergency Meeting)○ September 1, 2004 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| August 10, 2004 | ➤ Community Meeting conducted by Alison Kendall and Maria Banico |
| September 2004 – January 2005 | ➤ Planning Commission / Committee review of Alison Kendall report on issues, options and recommendations for ordinance features. |
| February 1, 2005 | ➤ City Council extends moratorium and directs staff to prepare proposed features of an ordinance. |