



CITY OF EL SEGUNDO HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

November 2022

Community Development Department
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245 (310) 524-2350

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
| | A. California State Housing Element Law | 3 |
| | B. Organization of the Housing Element | 3 |
| | C. Relationship to Other General Plan Elements | 4 |
| | D. Public Participation | 4 |
| | E. Sources of Information | 5 |
| 2. | Community Profile | 6 |
| | A. Population | 6 |
| | B. Household Characteristics | 11 |
| 3. | Housing Characteristics | 24 |
| | A. Housing Growth | 24 |
| | B. Housing Type and Tenure | 24 |
| | C. Age and Condition of Housing Stock | 26 |
| | D. Housing Costs | 26 |
| | E. Assisted Rental Housing At-Risk of Conversion | 32 |
| 4. | Housing Constraints | 33 |
| | A. Market Constraints | 33 |
| | B. Environmental Constraints | 35 |
| | C. Governmental Constraints | 36 |
| 5. | Housing Opportunities | 52 |
| | A. Availability of Sites for Housing | 52 |
| | B. Opportunities for Energy Conservation | 71 |
| 6. | Housing Plan | 75 |
| | A. Housing Goals and Policies | 75 |
| | B. Housing Programs | 77 |
| | C. Summary of Quantified Objectives | 87 |
| | APPENDIX A: HOUSING ACCOMPLISHMENTS | A-1 |
| | APPENDIX B: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION | B-1 |
| | A. Mailing List | B-1 |
| | B. Outreach Materials | B-4 |
| | C. Summary of Public Comments | B-11 |
| | APPENDIX C: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING | C-1 |
| | A. Introduction and Overview of AB 686 | C-1 |
| | B. Assessment of Fair Housing Issues | C-1 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends | 6 |
| Table 2-2: El Segundo Age Distribution | 7 |
| Table 2-3: School Enrollment by Grade - El Segundo Unified School District | 8 |
| Table 2-4: School Enrollment by Grade – Vistamar School | 9 |
| Table 2-5: El Segundo Racial and Ethnic Change 2000 to 2018 | 9 |
| Table 2-6: Jobs Held by El Segundo Residents | 10 |
| Table 2-7: El Segundo Household Characteristics | 11 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2-8: Average Household Size | 12 |
| Table 2-9: Income Distribution – 2018 | 14 |
| Table 2-10: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households – 2017 | 15 |
| Table 2-11: El Segundo Special Needs Groups..... | 16 |
| Table 2-12: El Segundo Disability Status of Non-Institutional Persons | 18 |
| Table 2-13: Housing Problems and Cost Burden of ELI Households..... | 22 |
| Table 2-14: Inventory of Homeless Services and Facilities in the South Bay Region | 23 |
| Table 3-1: Housing Growth Trends in El Segundo and Neighboring Communities..... | 24 |
| Table 3-2: El Segundo Comparative Housing Unit Mix in 2010-2020 | 25 |
| Table 3-3: El Segundo Household Size by Tenure | 25 |
| Table 3-4: El Segundo Elderly Householders by Tenure by Age | 25 |
| Table 3-5: Age of Housing Stock | 26 |
| Table 3-6: Median Home Sales Prices (Regional Comparison) October 2020 | 27 |
| Table 3-7: 2018 Median Housing Rental Rates | 27 |
| Table 3-8: Tenure by Number of Units in Structure | 28 |
| Table 3-9: Median Rents in El Segundo November 2020 | 29 |
| Table 3-10: Housing Affordability Matrix (2020) | 31 |
| Table 4-1: Disposition of Home Purchase and Improvement Loan Applications | 35 |
| Table 4-2: El Segundo Residential Development Standards | 39 |
| Table 4-3 El Segundo Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District..... | 41 |
| Table 4-4: El Segundo Planning Fees | 47 |
| Table 5-1: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) 2021-2029 | 53 |
| Table 5-2: Potential Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) | 54 |
| Table 5-3: Entitled Projects..... | 55 |
| Table 5-4: Remaining RHNA Obligations..... | 55 |
| Table 5-5: Candidate Sites for Rezoning to Mixed Use Overlay | 57 |
| Table 5-6: Lot Consolidation and Income Level Distribution..... | 60 |
| Table 5-7: Potential Re-developable Sites in Housing Overlay..... | 66 |
| Table 5-8: Comparison of Sites Inventory and RHNA | 69 |
| Table 5-9: Estimated Water Demand | 70 |
| Table 5-10: Estimated Wastewater Generation..... | 70 |
| Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions..... | 87 |
| Table 6-2: 2021-2029 Quantified Objectives | 92 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1-1: Regional Location Map..... | 2 |
| Figure 2-1: Median Household Income – 2018..... | 13 |
| Figure 5-1: Candidate Rezone Sites as Mixed Use Overlay | 61 |
| Figure 5-2: R-3 Rezone Sites for Housing Overlay | 64 |
| Figure 5-3: Potential Redevelopment Sites in Housing Overlay..... | 65 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The City of El Segundo was incorporated in 1917 and is located in the South Bay Region of Los Angeles County, approximately 20 miles southwest of downtown Los Angeles (see Figure 1-1). The City occupies an area of 5.46 square miles, and is home to 16,777 residents according to 2020 Department of Finance (DOF) estimates. The City is bordered on the north by the Los Angeles International Airport; on the west by the Pacific Ocean; to the south by the city of Manhattan Beach; and to the east by the 405 Freeway. These barriers isolate El Segundo's residential and downtown communities from other South Bay communities. Figure 1-1 depicts El Segundo's regional location and City boundaries respectively.

According to DOF estimates, there were a total of 7,463 dwelling units in the City in 2020. All of the residential population is located west of Pacific Coast Highway on approximately 532.8 acres of land. The office/industrial/commercial areas east of Pacific Coast Highway include a broad range of businesses including aerospace, computer related companies, and travel related companies; several of these are Fortune 500 companies.

The City's stock of 7,463 dwelling units is characterized by a relatively even balance between single and multi-family residences; 2020 DOF estimates document a majority of the City's dwelling units (55.7%) are renter-occupied. Similar to other communities in the South Bay area, home prices have increased dramatically since adoption of the current Housing Element making both owner occupied and rental housing units less affordable. However, compared with neighboring jurisdictions, El Segundo still provides a range of housing opportunities to the varied income levels of residents in the community.

This 2021-2029 Housing Element of El Segundo's General Plan sets forth the City's strategy to preserve and enhance the community's residential character, expand housing opportunities for all economic segments, and provide guidance and direction for local government decision-making in all matters relating to housing.


Figure 1-1: Regional Location Map



A. CALIFORNIA STATE HOUSING ELEMENT LAW

California State Housing Element Law (Government Code §§ 65580, *et seq.*) establishes the requirements for Housing Elements of the General Plan. Specifically, Government Code § 65588 requires that local governments periodically review and revise the Housing Element of their General Plans according to a statutory timeline.

El Segundo's Housing Element was last updated in 2013 for the 2013-2021 planning period and as part of the fifth update cycle for jurisdictions within the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”) region. The Element sets forth a strategy to address the City’s identified housing needs, including specific implementing programs and activities. This sixth cycle update of the Housing Element is an eight-year plan, extending from October 15, 2021 to October 15, 2029. Other General Plan elements typically address a 10- to 20-year planning horizon.



1. Regional Housing Needs Assessment

In accordance with Government Code § 65584, projected housing needs for each city and county in the Southern California region are prepared by SCAG under a process known as the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). RHNA allocates regional housing needs by income level among member jurisdictions.

California law established the planning period for the current RHNA from June 30, 2021 to October 15, 2029. SCAG’s allocation for El Segundo is 492 units. The 492 housing units for El Segundo are out of the anticipated total construction need of 1,341,928 units in the SCAG region (812,060 of which are in the Los Angeles County). The allocation of 492 units for El Segundo is broken down into the four categories as follows: 189 very low income households, 88 low income households, 84 moderate income households, and 131 above moderate income households.

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT

The Housing Element sets forth housing goals and policies for El Segundo to address the City’s existing and projected needs. Specific housing programs to implement these goals and policies will be identified in the Housing Program section of the updated document. The updated El Segundo Housing Element will be comprised of the following major components:

1. An assessment of past housing achievements.
2. An analysis of the City's population, household and employment base, and the characteristics of the City's housing stock.
3. An updated evaluation of housing need.
4. Preparation of an inventory of potential housing sites in the community.

- a. An examination of governmental and non-governmental constraints on the production, maintenance, and affordability of housing.
 - b. Preparation of a Housing Program to address El Segundo's identified housing needs, including housing goals, policies and programs.
5. An assessment of fair housing.

C. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS

The City of El Segundo General Plan is comprised of the following ten elements: 1) Land Use; 2) Economic Development; 3) Circulation; 4) Housing; 5) Open Space and Recreation; 6) Conservation; 7) Air Quality; 8) Noise; 9) Public Safety; and 10) Hazardous Materials and Waste Management. The Housing Element complements the other General Plan elements. As portions of the General Plan are amended in the future, the Housing Element will be reviewed to ensure internal consistency is maintained. Pursuant to California law, the City will be updating the Safety Element to address recent changes regarding high fire hazards and severe weather conditions.



D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Government Code § 65583 (c)(7) states that, “[t]he 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.”

As part of this Housing Element update, the City conducted multiple outreach activities to solicit public input. These included:

- April 13, 2021 - Community meeting to obtain input on housing needs and suggestions for programs and policies
- City webpage on Housing Element Update (<https://www.elsegundo.org/housing-element>)
- Community Survey through Mentimeter
- YouTube Video regarding Housing Element Update (<https://youtu.be/SC9DJxxGQq8>)
- Social media postings (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and City website)
- June 14, 2021 – Joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting to discuss the selection of sites for RHNA

- September 30, 2021 – Planning Commission meeting to discuss the Draft Housing Element
- February 1, 2022 – City Council meeting to consider and adopt the Housing Element

The City submitted the adopted Housing Element for HCD review on February 7, 2022 and received HCD’s review letter on April 8, 2022. Additional revisions are necessary to address HCD comments. In response to HCD comments, the City made additional revisions to the adopted Housing Element, including revising its strategy for meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Revisions were made available for public review for seven days prior to the October 27, 2022 meeting (see below).

- October 27, 2022 – Planning Commission public hearing to consider and make a recommendation on the revised Housing Element
- November 15, 2022 – City Council to review and re-adopt the revised Housing Element

All meetings were advertised through social media, postcards to agencies and organizations that serve low and moderate income and special needs residents, local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and religious facilities. Notices of meetings were also published in El Segundo Herald. The Housing Element responded to public comments by continuing to adjust the sites inventory after each public meeting.

E. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The Housing Element needs assessment is based primarily on the sources listed below:

1. SCAG Certified 2014-2018 American Community Survey data (5-year estimates)
2. 2015-2019 ACS data (5-year estimates)
3. City of El Segundo Municipal Code, Title 15 (Zoning Regulations), 2020
4. SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment, 2020
5. Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data (based on the 2013-2017 ACS), 2020.
6. California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Data Viewer, 2021.

2. COMMUNITY PROFILE

Assuring the availability of adequate housing for all social and economic sectors of the present and future population is an important goal for El Segundo. To achieve this goal requires an assessment of the housing needs of the community and region. This section discusses the demographic, socio-economic, and housing characteristics of the City of El Segundo in an effort to determine the specific housing needs of the City and its residents.

A. POPULATION

1. Population Growth Trends

The 2000 Census reported that the City of El Segundo’s population was 16,033 persons, marking a population increase of over five percent since the 1990 Census. This growth rate was slightly less than the seven percent for Los Angeles County as a whole. Cities surrounding El Segundo, such as Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach, experienced growth patterns similar to El Segundo, with decreases in population in the 1970s and modest increases in the 1980s. The 2010 Census reported that the population of El Segundo had increased to 16,654, representing an increase in the population of approximately four percent for the ten-year period from 2000 to 2010.



As of 2020, the Department of Finance (DOF) determined that the City's population numbered 16,777, an increase of less than one percent in the ten years since the 2010 U.S. Census. This rate of growth is lower than the rate of growth for Los Angeles County and in the middle of the spectrum in comparison to El Segundo’s adjacent communities as shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: Population Growth Trends

| Jurisdiction | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | Change | |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2000-2010 | 2010-2020 |
| El Segundo | 16,033 | 16,654 | 16,777 | 3.90% | 0.74% |
| Hawthorne | 84,112 | 84,293 | 86,903 | 0.20% | 3.10% |
| Hermosa Beach | 18,556 | 19,506 | 19,614 | 5.10% | 0.55% |
| Inglewood | 112,580 | 109,673 | 111,971 | -2.60% | 2.10% |
| Manhattan Beach | 33,852 | 35,135 | 35,250 | 3.80% | 0.33% |
| Redondo Beach | 63,261 | 66,748 | 66,994 | 5.50% | 0.37% |
| Los Angeles County | 9,519,338 | 9,818,605 | 10,172,951 | 3.10% | 3.61% |

Source: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census; DOF E-1 Population Estimates, January 2020.

2. Age Characteristics

Age distribution is an important indicator in determining the future demand of certain types of housing. Traditional assumptions indicate that the young adult population (20 to 34 years old) has a trend of choosing apartments, low to moderate cost condominiums, and smaller single-family units. The adult population (35 to 65 years old) is the primary market for moderate to high-end apartments, condominiums, and larger single-family homes. This age group traditionally has higher incomes and larger household sizes. The senior population (65 years and older) generates demand for low to moderate cost apartments and condominiums, group quarters, and mobile homes. Table 2-2 shows the age distribution of the population of the City of El Segundo from 2000 to 2018, and the proportionate age distribution of all Los Angeles County residents in 2018.

Table 2-2: El Segundo Age Distribution

| Age Group | 2000 | | 2010 | | 2018 | | LA County % of Total |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| | Persons | % of Total | Persons | % of Total | Persons | % of Total | |
| Under 5 | 956 | 6.0% | 831 | 5.0% | 1,274 | 7.6% | 6.2% |
| 5-9 | 1,069 | 6.6% | 920 | 5.5% | 1002 | 5.9% | 6.0% |
| 10-14 | 1,037 | 6.4% | 1,180 | 7.1% | 1,047 | 6.2% | 6.2% |
| 15-19 | 856 | 5.3% | 1,140 | 6.8% | 978 | 5.8% | 6.5% |
| 20-24 | 715 | 4.4% | 768 | 4.6% | 701 | 4.2% | 7.3% |
| 25-34 | 2,855 | 18.0% | 2,511 | 15.1% | 2,435 | 14.4% | 15.9% |
| 35-44 | 3,348 | 21.8% | 2,671 | 16.0% | 2,505 | 14.9% | 13.8% |
| 45-54 | 2,444 | 15.2% | 3,076 | 18.5% | 2,829 | 16.7% | 13.6% |
| 55-64 | 990 | 6.9% | 1,879 | 11.3% | 2,128 | 12.6% | 11.7% |
| 65-74 | 794 | 4.9% | 888 | 5.3% | 1,185 | 7.0% | 7.2% |
| 75+ | 735 | 4.5% | 790 | 4.7% | 766 | 4.5% | 5.6% |
| Total | 16,033 | 100.0% | 16,654 | 100.0% | 16,850 | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Median Age | 36.4 | | 39.2 | | 38.7 | | 36.2 |

Source: 2000 and 2010 Census; ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table S0101.

As shown in Table 2-2, the 2018 American Community Survey (ACS) indicated median age in El Segundo of 38.7 years is slightly higher than the County median age of 36.2 years. While the City has seen a drop in the young adult (age 25-34) and mid-adult (age 35-44) populations, the City witnessed proportional and numeric growth during the last 20 years in its older-adult populations (age 45-64). These increases are likely attributed to the previous existing young adult populations continuing to live in El Segundo. Additionally, the City encourages housing options that allow residents to remain in the community as they age.

These characteristics of an employment center with comparatively modest housing costs have resulted in stable neighborhoods and a tightening of the housing market in El Segundo. El Segundo is a predominantly renter-occupied community, with approximately 56 percent of all households occupied by renters (Table 2-3). Associated with growth in the young and mid-adult populations, this may be an indication of the potential need for increasing first-time homebuyer opportunities in the City.



Between 2010 and 2018, there was a 30 percent increase in the City’s early school age population (age 0-9 years) and decrease of nearly 13 percent in population for children ages 10 to 19. This trend typically reflects a population with younger families. Enrollment statistics provided by the California Department of Education for the El Segundo Unified School District are provided in Table 2-3. Table 2-4 provides enrollment data at Vistamar School.

Table 2-3: School Enrollment by Grade - El Segundo Unified School District

| Grade | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| K | 237 | 264 | 284 | 260 | 256 | 304 |
| 1 | 219 | 181 | 222 | 236 | 211 | 219 |
| 2 | 219 | 225 | 188 | 226 | 228 | 204 |
| 3 | 238 | 217 | 241 | 198 | 222 | 228 |
| 4 | 213 | 241 | 232 | 254 | 297 | 228 |
| 5 | 235 | 219 | 252 | 239 | 255 | 211 |
| 6 | 278 | 286 | 252 | 284 | 278 | 283 |
| 7 | 263 | 287 | 278 | 268 | 280 | 277 |
| 8 | 276 | 262 | 291 | 274 | 267 | 279 |
| 9 | 300 | 334 | 317 | 329 | 318 | 325 |
| 10 | 318 | 298 | 319 | 316 | 321 | 326 |
| 11 | 345 | 314 | 287 | 315 | 301 | 320 |
| 12 | 336 | 343 | 306 | 275 | 319 | 298 |
| Total | 3,477 | 3,471 | 3,469 | 3,474 | 3,453 | 3,502 |
| Source: California Department of Education, 2020. | | | | | | |

Table 2-4: School Enrollment by Grade – Vistamar School

| Grade | 2013 | 2020 |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| 9 | 53 | 56 |
| 10 | 69 | 69 |
| 11 | 81 | 77 |
| 12 | 59 | 67 |
| Total | 262 | 269 |

Source: Vistamar School, 2013; California Department of Education, 2020.

3. Race and Ethnicity

Table 2-5 shows the changes in the racial/ethnic composition of El Segundo between 2000 and 2018. There were several dramatic shifts in the years between 2000 and 2018. The most notable of these changes were increases in the Other/Two or More Races and Black populations, although these groups represent just about 13.3 percent of the City’s total population. El Segundo’s ethnic composition continues to be predominately White at 64.0 percent of the population. However, this represents a decrease from 2000 when the White population comprised 79.7 percent of the population total.

Table 2-5: El Segundo Racial and Ethnic Change 2000 to 2018

| Race/Ethnicity | 2000 | | 2010 | | 2018 | | Change 2000-2010 | | Change 2010-2018 | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | Persons | % of Total | Persons | % of Total | Persons | % of Total | # | % | # | % |
| White (Non-Hispanic) | 12,356 | 79.7% | 11,515 | 69.1% | 10,780 | 64.0% | -841 | -6.8% | -735 | -6.4% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,765 | 11.4% | 2,609 | 15.7% | 2,178 | 12.9% | 844 | 47.8% | -431 | -16.5% |
| Asian/Pac. Islldr. (Non-Hispanic) | 1,052 | 6.8% | 1,457 | 8.7% | 1,638 | 9.7% | 405 | 38.5% | 181 | 12.4% |
| Black (Non-Hispanic) | 181 | 1.2% | 321 | 1.9% | 628 | 3.7% | 140 | 77.3% | 307 | 95.6% |
| Am. Indian (Non-Hispanic) | 52 | 0.3% | 40 | 0.2% | 21 | 0.1% | -12 | -23.1% | -19 | -47.5% |
| Other/Two or More Races (Non-Hispanic) | 87 | 0.6% | 712 | 4.3% | 1,605 | 9.5% | 625 | 718.1% | 893 | 125.4% |
| Total | 15,493 | 100.0% | 16,654 | 100.0% | 16,850 | 100.0% | 1,161 | 7.5% | 196 | 1.2% |

Source: 2000, and 2010 U.S. Census; ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP05.

El Segundo’s ethnic make-up does not reflect the racial diversification that is occurring elsewhere in Los Angeles County. A greater proportion of the City’s residents are White, compared to 26.3 percent of the County, while persons from the Hispanic and Black groups comprise a smaller proportion of the City’s population than they do County-wide (48.5 percent Hispanic and 7.9 percent Black). The distribution of the American Indian population is nearly equal to that of the County (0.2 percent American Indian) but the Other Races/Two or More Races population of 9.5 percent is higher than the countywide population of 2.5 percent.

4. Employment

As shown in Table 2-6, the 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) reports that there were 9,801 El Segundo residents in the labor force, representing a labor force participation rate of 73.5 percent of persons ages of 16 and over. A majority of the City's residents are employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations (55.7 percent) or in sales and office occupations (20.6 percent). The unemployment rate reported in the ACS was 8.0 percent, compared to the countywide unemployment rate of 6.8 percent.

A general measure of the balance of a community's employment opportunities with the needs of its residents is through a “jobs-housing balance” test. A balanced community would have a match between employment and housing opportunities so that most of the residents could also work in the community. Comparing the number of jobs in El Segundo in 2020 (over 70,000) to the 2018 ACS population estimates (16,850) indicates a high job-population ratio of approximately 4.2:1.¹ This is reflective of the large employment base in El Segundo. Large employers include the Chevron Refinery as well as major aerospace corporations such as the Aerospace Corporation, Boeing Corporation and Raytheon. In addition, El Segundo is a community whose daytime population far exceeds the nighttime population due to the large employment base in the City. The City’s large employment base relative to the small number of housing units indicate that there may be a need to continually seek ways to add housing in the community. According to SCAG, the City’s employment base was estimated at 48,300 in 2016 and is projected to reach 52,400 by 2045.²

Table 2-6: Jobs Held by El Segundo Residents

| Job Category | Number | Percent |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Management, Business, Science, and Arts | 5,005 | 55.7% |
| Service Occupations | 926 | 10.3% |
| Sales and Office Occupations | 1,851 | 20.6% |
| Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance Occupations | 508 | 5.6% |
| Production, Transportation, and Material Moving Occupations | 703 | 7.8% |
| Total Employed Persons | 8,993 | 100.0% |
| Total Persons in Labor Force (16 years and over) | 9,801 | -- |
| Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP03. | | |

¹ El Segundo Chamber of Commerce Community & Business Directory, 2020.

² Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Demographics and Growth Forecast, 2020.

B. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Information on household characteristics is an important indicator of housing needs in a community. Income and affordability are best measured at the household level, as are the special needs of certain groups, such as large-family households or female-headed households.

1. Household Composition and Size

The Bureau of 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, or unrelated persons sharing living quarters. Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories, or other group living situations are not considered households. The characteristics of the households in a city are important indicators of the type of housing needed in that community.

Table 2-7 below describes the household characteristics for El Segundo. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, there were 6,639 households in the City of El Segundo, about 62.4 percent of which were family households. This proportion is less than that of Los Angeles County, where 66.8 percent of all households consisted of families. Single-person households represent the second largest household group in the City, comprising about 29.6 percent of all households. The remaining 8.0 percent of households fall into the unrelated non-family household category, which consist of unrelated persons living together.



Table 2-7: El Segundo Household Characteristics

| Household Type | 2000 | | 2010 | | 2018 | |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Population | 16,033 | 100.0% | 16,654 | 100.0% | 16,850 | 100.0% |
| In Group Quarters | 23 | 0.1% | 66 | 0.4% | 36 | 0.2% |
| Total Households | 7,060 | 100.0% | 7,085 | 100.0% | 6,639 | 100.0% |
| Average Household Size | 2.27 | | 2.34 | | 2.53 | |
| Families | 3,908 | 55.3% | 4,105 | 57.9% | 4,145 | 62.4% |
| Single Households | 2,420 | 34.2% | 2,254 | 31.8% | 1,963 | 29.6% |
| Unrelated Non-Family Households | 732 | 10.3% | 726 | 10.2% | 752 | 8.0% |

Source: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census; ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Tables DP02 and B09019.

Household size is an important indicator of a source of population growth. A city’s average household size can depend on household trends such as a trend towards larger families will increase the city’s average household size over time while, average household size will often decline in communities where the population is aging.

Between 2010 and 2018, the average persons per household in El Segundo increased slightly from 2.34 to 2.53 persons per household. The average household size in the City is significantly less than

the estimates for the County of Los Angeles (3.00 persons per household in 2018) and is fairly comparable with the relatively small average household sizes of all of El Segundo’s neighboring communities. Average household size in nearby cities is shown in Table 2-8.

Table 2-8: Average Household Size

| City | Persons Per Household |
|---|-----------------------|
| El Segundo | 2.53 |
| Hawthorne | 2.96 |
| Hermosa Beach | 2.19 |
| Inglewood | 2.96 |
| Manhattan Beach | 2.63 |
| Redondo Beach | 2.45 |
| Los Angeles County | 3.00 |
| Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP02. | |

2. Overcrowding


The federal government defines an overcrowded household as one with more than one occupant per room, excluding bathrooms, kitchens, hallways, and porches. Overcrowding in households results from either a lack of affordable housing (which forces more than one household to live together) and/or a lack of available housing units of adequate size.

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, 3.1 percent (207 households) of households in El Segundo were living in overcrowded conditions, compared to 11.4 percent Countywide. Approximately 1.4 percent of households in the City were considered severely overcrowded. Overcrowding among renter-households was more prevalent than among owner-households. Of the total 207 overcrowded households, 136 were renter-occupied households. In contrast, of the total overcrowded households, only 34.3 were owner-occupied households. The ACS indicates that 96.9 percent of the households in El Segundo have less than 1.00 person per room; therefore, overcrowding of households does not appear to be a primary issue for the City.

3. Household Income and Income Distribution

Income is a major factor in evaluating the affordability of housing in a community. According to the 2014-2018 ACS the median household income in El Segundo was \$98,813 per year, which is significantly more than the County median household income of \$64,251 per year. In comparison with its neighbors, the median household income in El Segundo was higher than that of Hawthorne and Inglewood; somewhat lower than Redondo Beach; and significantly lower than Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach. Figure 2-1 shows that El Segundo’s median household income was nearly double that of neighboring communities Hawthorne and Inglewood but lower that of neighboring beach communities.

Figure 2-1: Median Household Income – 2018



Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table S1901.

To facilitate the analysis of income distribution among households in communities, the Health and Safety Code groups households into categories by income. Income categories are determined as a percentage of the Area Median Income (AMI) and then adjusted for household size in the following manner:

- Extremely Low Income – 0 to 30 percent AMI
- Very Low Income – 31 to 50 percent of the AMI
- Low Income – 51 to 80 percent of the AMI
- Moderate Income – 81 to 120 percent of the AMI
- Above Moderate Income – above 120 percent of the AMI

The ACS does not collect information on the number of households belonging to each of the income categories described above. However, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in preparing the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), has developed income distribution data for its member jurisdictions (Table 2-9). As shown below, between 2014 and 2018, approximately 25 percent of the City’s households earned lower incomes, while approximately 16 percent earned moderate incomes. During this same period, Los Angeles County as a whole had a higher proportion of lower income households (41 percent).

Table 2-9: Income Distribution – 2018

| Income Group | El Segundo | L.A. County |
|-----------------|------------|-------------|
| Very Low Income | 13% | 26% |
| Low Income | 12% | 15% |
| Moderate Income | 15% | 16% |
| Above Moderate | 61% | 43% |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

Source: SCAG RHNA Calculator, March 2021, based on 2014-2018 ACS.

4. Housing Affordability and Overpayment

The HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) provides detailed information on housing needs by income level for different types of households in El Segundo. Detailed CHAS data based on the 2013-2017 ACS data is displayed in (Table 2-10). Housing problems considered by CHAS 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 vary according to household income, type, and tenure. Some highlights include:

- In general, renter-households had a higher level of housing problems (44.3 percent) compared to owner-households (35.5 percent).
- Large family renter-households had the highest level of cost burden regardless of income level (49.7 percent).
- Very low income and low-income households had the highest incidence of housing problems (79.7 percent and 72.3 percent, respectively).

Table 2-10: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households – 2017

| Household by Type, Income, and Housing Problem | Renters | | | | Owners | | | | Total |
|--|---------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------|
| | Elderly | Small Families | Large Families | Total Renters | Elderly | Small Families | Large Families | Total Owners | |
| Extremely Low (0-30% HAMFI) | 85 | 150 | 50 | 455 | 50 | 40 | 0 | 105 | 560 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 78.0% | -- | -- | -- | 38.1% | 70.5% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 35.3% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 75.8% | 28.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 38.1% | 68.8% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 0.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 64.8% | 8.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 58.0% |
| Very Low Income (31-50% HAMFI) | 50 | 280 | 4 | 400 | 165 | 15 | 25 | 215 | 615 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 93.8% | -- | -- | -- | 53.5% | 79.7% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 60.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 93.8% | 50.9% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 53.5% | 78.9% |
| % with cost burden >50% | 30.0% | 78.6% | 100.0% | 75.0% | 32.7% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 48.8% | 65.9% |
| Low Income (51-80% HAMFI) | 95 | 260 | 0 | 575 | 105 | 25 | 15 | 165 | 740 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 76.5% | -- | -- | -- | 57.6% | 72.3% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 52.6% | 82.7% | 0.0% | 73.9% | 37.1% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 54.6% | 70.3% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.8% | 13.3% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 39.4% | 14.9% |
| Moderate Income (81-100% HAMFI) | 125 | 105 | 20 | 460 | 65 | 110 | 35 | 260 | 720 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 46.7% | -- | -- | -- | 59.6% | 51.4% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 28.0% | 9.5% | 0.0% | 39.1% | 36.9% | 54.6% | 71.4% | 59.6% | 45.9% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 0.0% | 9.5% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 30.8% | 36.4% | 71.4% | 38.5% | 15.3% |
| Above Moderate Income (100%+ HAMFI) | 105 | 925 | 75 | 1,790 | 455 | 1,305 | 155 | 2,215 | 4,005 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 14.0% | -- | -- | -- | 14.7% | 14.4% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 0.0% | 6.0% | 26.7% | 5.0% | 4.4% | 13.7% | 9.7% | 14.0% | 10.0% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.5% |
| Total Households | 460 | 1,720 | 149 | 3,680 | 840 | 1,495 | 230 | 2,960 | 6,640 |
| % with any housing problem | -- | -- | -- | 44.3% | -- | -- | -- | 24.5% | 35.5% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 31.5% | 39.5% | 49.7% | 38.5% | 21.6% | 19.0% | 34.8% | 24.0% | 31.9% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 3.3% | 20.4% | 36.2% | 17.7% | 11.0% | 6.0% | 28.4% | 10.8% | 14.6% |

Note: This table presents the percent of households with housing problems by tenure, income, and household type. For example, 78.0 percent of the extremely low income renter-households had housing problems compared to 38.1 percent of the extremely low income owner-households with housing problems. Data presented in this table are based on special tabulations from sample Census data. The number of households in each category usually deviates slightly from the 100% total due to the need to extrapolate sample data out to total households. Interpretations of these data should focus on the proportion of households in need of assistance rather than on precise numbers.

Elderly Households = 1- to 2-person households with elderly persons aged 62+

Small Families = 2- to 4-person family households

Large Families = 5+ person family households

Other non-family households are not included in this table.

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), based on 2013-2017 ACS data.

5. Special Needs Groups

Certain segments of the population may have particular difficulties in finding decent, affordable housing due to their special needs. These special needs groups, as defined by State housing element law, include the elderly, disabled persons, large households, female-headed households, farm workers, extremely low-income households and the homeless. In addition, military households are a group with special housing needs in El Segundo. Table 2-11 summarizes the numbers of households/persons in each of these special needs groups in the City of El Segundo.

Table 2-11: El Segundo Special Needs Groups

| Special Needs Groups | Number of Households or Persons | Owners | | Renters | | Percent of Total Households/ Persons |
|---|---------------------------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|--------------------------------------|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| Households that Include at Least One Senior (person age 65 or over) | 1,448 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 21.8% |
| Senior-Headed Households | 1,277 | 877 | 68.7% | 400 | 31.3% | 19.2% |
| Senior Living Alone | 461 | 232 | 50.3% | 229 | 49.7% | 6.9% |
| Persons with Disabilities | 1,306 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7.8% |
| Large Households* | 390 | 226 | 57.9% | 164 | 42.1% | 5.8% |
| Single-Parent Households | 417 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.3% |
| Female-Headed Households with Children (no husband present) | 318 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4.8% |
| Farmworkers** | 12 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.1% |
| Armed Forces*** | 29 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.2% |
| People Living in Poverty | 1,306 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7.8% |
| Homeless | 47 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.3% |

Notes:
 *=ACS 2012-2016 (5-Year Estimates), Table B25009. ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates) data not available.
 **=All farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.
 ***= Percentage of population 16 years and over.
 -- = Data not available.

Single-Parent Households: A single-parent household is headed by either a male or female householder, no spouse present but have children under the age of 18.
 Female Headed Households with Children: A single parent household whose householder is a female.
 Sources: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Tables DP02, DP03, S2501, S2502, and S1701; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), 2020 Homeless Count by Community/City.

SENIORS

The ACS shows that roughly 19.2 percent of the City's households were headed by elderly persons age 65 and above. Of these approximately 1,277 households, 461 consisted of elderly persons living alone (Table 2-11). Members of this subpopulation of the elderly may have special needs for assistance with finances, household maintenance, and other routine activities. This is particularly true of persons aged 75 and older who are more likely to be among the “frail elderly.”

The 2014-2018 ACS also indicates that there were at least 158 persons age 65 and over living below the poverty level. This indicates that there may be a need for additional affordable senior housing. CHAS data shown in Table 2-10 indicates that housing problems were an issue for elderly both renter and owner lower income households, with 60.0 percent of very low income renter and 50.9 percent of very low income owner households experiencing a housing cost burden. In all income categories, more elderly renter-households (31.5 percent) experienced a housing cost burden than owner-households (21.6 percent).

Resources

The special needs of seniors can be met through a range of services, including congregate care, rent subsidies, shared housing, and housing rehabilitation assistance. According to Community Care Licensing Division records, one adult day care facility with a capacity to serve 40 persons and two adult residential facilities with a capacity to serve 10 persons are also located in the City. Senior residents also have access to various classes, programs, activities, and services, such as transportation and outreach coordination, at the Joslyn Community Center.

Park Vista is a 97-unit senior housing project for seniors capable of independent living. Rents are restricted to levels of affordable to very low income households, and occupancy is limited to El Segundo residents with incomes that fall below moderate income levels. Discussions with management at Park Vista indicate that there is a need for further affordable senior housing facilities as there are extensive waiting lists for such facilities in the City with an approximate waiting time of one and a half to two years. Additionally, management at Park Vista indicated that there is a need for assisted living facilities in the City.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Physical and mental disabilities can hinder access to traditionally designed housing units as well as potentially limit the ability to earn adequate income. As shown in Table 2-12, the 2014-2018 ACS indicates that approximately 7.8 percent of El Segundo's population has some form of work or mobility/self-care difficulty.

Cognitive difficulties were the most common amongst residents under 65 years of age. Of the disabled population aged 65 years and older, ambulatory and independent living difficulties were the most common. The ACS estimates that 357 residents aged 65 years and older experience a hearing or vision difficulty, compared to only 258 residents under 65 years old.

Although no current comparisons of disability with income, household size, or race/ethnicity are available, it is reasonable to assume that a substantial portion of disabled persons would be within the federal Housing Choice Voucher Program (commonly known as Section 8) [Title 24 of the Housing

and Urban Development Act Part 982] income limits, especially those households not in the labor force. Furthermore, most lower income disabled persons are likely to require housing assistance.

Their housing need is further compounded by design and location requirements, which can often be costly. For example, special needs of households with wheelchair-bound or semi-ambulatory individuals may require ramps, holding bars, special bathroom designs, wider doorways, lower cabinets, elevators, and other interior and exterior design features.

There are no zoning or building regulations or special approval procedures that unfairly inhibit or discourage the development of housing for disabled persons. The City’s Community Development Department implements the provisions of the California Building Code and the regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in their routine application and enforcement of building code requirements.

Table 2-12: El Segundo Disability Status of Non-Institutional Persons

| Disability Type | Less than 65 Years Old | Percent of Total Population* | 65+ Years Old | Percent of Total Population* |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| With a hearing difficulty | 167 | 0.99% | 235 | 1.40% |
| With a vision difficulty | 91 | 0.54% | 122 | 0.73% |
| With a cognitive difficulty | 363 | 2.16% | 153 | 0.91% |
| With an ambulatory difficulty | 178 | 1.06% | 295 | 1.75% |
| With a self-care difficulty | 41 | 0.24% | 88 | 0.52% |
| With an independent living difficulty | 164 | 0.98% | 238 | 1.42% |
| Total with disability | 746 | 4.44% | 560 | 3.33% |
| * = Noninstitutionalized population. Note: Some residents have more than one disability. Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table S1810. | | | | |

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

A recent change in California law requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. As defined by Welfare and Institutions Code § 4512, “developmental disability” means

“a disability that originates before an individual attains 18 years of age; continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely; and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. [T]his term shall include intellectual disability, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This term shall also include disabling conditions found to be closely related to intellectual disability or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with an intellectual disability, but shall not include other handicapping conditions that are solely physical in nature.”³

³ Welfare and Institutions Code § 4512 as amended by SB 816, effective January 1, 2014.

This definition also 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.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5 percent. This equates to 253 persons in the City of El Segundo with developmental disabilities, based on the 2014-2018 ACS population. According to the State's Department of Developmental Services, as of June 2020, the Westside Regional Center, serving the Los Angeles region from Malibu to El Segundo, served 7,834 residents with developmental disabilities. Most of these individuals were residing in a private home and 66 percent of these persons with developmental disabilities were under the age of 21.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals 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 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.

Resources

Housing options for persons with disabilities include three community care facilities. Combined, these facilities offer a capacity of 50 beds. Residents with disabilities can also benefit from a range of services offered by various agencies throughout Los Angeles County and South Bay region, such as, the Westside Regional Center, Ability First, Team of Advocates for Special Kids, and the Disabled Resources Center.

LARGE HOUSEHOLDS

According to the 2012-2016 ACS, only 5.8 percent of all households in the City of El Segundo consisted of large households (Table 2-11). In contrast to many communities where large households consist predominately of renters, 58.0 percent of all large households in El Segundo were owner-households.

Large households are defined as those with five or more members. A large family household is a household with five or more related members. The special needs of this group are based on the limited availability of adequately sized, affordable housing units. Because of housing stock limitations, and the fact that large families often have lower incomes, they are frequently subjected to overcrowded living conditions. The increased strain which overcrowding places on housing units only serves to accelerate the pace of unit deterioration.

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, approximately 42.9 percent of the City's housing stock is comprised of three or more-bedroom units. Therefore, the City has more than an adequate supply of housing units to accommodate the needs of its large family households.

Resources

Large households in El Segundo can benefit from the general housing programs and services offered by the City. The Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers program also extends assistance to large households with overcrowding and cost burden issues.

SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

A single-parent household is headed by either a male or female householder, no spouse present but have children under the age of 18. Single-parent households often require special consideration and assistance due to their greater need for affordable and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. In particular, female-headed households with children tend to have lower-incomes than other types of households, a situation that limits their housing options and access to supportive services.

Among the single-parent households, female-headed households tend to have more need for housing assistance, compared to male-headed households; female-headed households often have lower incomes. The 2014-2018 ACS indicates that there are 777 female-headed households in the City of El Segundo, 318 of which have children under the age of 18. These numbers account for approximately 11.7 percent and 4.8 percent respectively of all households in the City.

Resources

El Segundo's single-parent households can benefit from the City's general affordable housing programs for lower income households including Housing Choice Vouchers. Single-parent households in El Segundo can also benefit from various services offered by the City, especially child care services. The El Segundo Teen Center offers year-round recreational and special interest classes to youth and teen residents. Additional opportunities for youth of all ages include various aquatic, drama, arts and craft, exercise and fitness, and sports programs.

A number of service agencies located in areas surrounding El Segundo provide services including emergency and transitional shelter, food distribution, vouchers for various needs, and rental and utility assistance that can benefit lower income single-parent households living in poverty or who are at risk of becoming homeless.

FARMWORKERS

Farmworkers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through seasonal agricultural work. Farmworkers have special housing needs because they earn lower incomes than many other workers and move throughout the season from one harvest to the next. The 2014-2018 ACS reported that less than one percent (12 persons) of the City of El Segundo's residents were employed in farming, forestry, and fishing occupations.

Regionally, according to the USDA Census on agricultural population, there were 413 farms in Los Angeles County and 3,266 farmworkers.

Resources

Due to El Segundo's urban setting and nominal farmworker population, the special housing needs of this group can generally be addressed through overall programs for housing affordability.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, there were 29 persons in the labor force employed in military occupations (Table 2-11). The U.S. Air Force base in El Segundo directly employs approximately 6,300 individuals (military, civilian and contractor), the majority of whom are military personnel.

Resources

Housing for base personnel is provided by Tierra Vista, including four unique neighborhoods at or near Fort MacArthur and San Pedro, approximately 22 miles south-east of Los Angeles Air Force Base. There are currently a total of 592 units, including two-, three- and four-bedroom units to accommodate all military ranks and their families. The four neighborhoods and number of units offered at each include:

- Fort MacArthur—356 two, three- and four-bedroom apartments/townhomes, and 20 three- and four-bedroom single-family homes
- Pacific Heights I—91 three- and four-bedroom single-family homes
- Pacific Heights II—74 three- and four-bedroom single-family homes
- Pacific Crest—71 three- and four-bedroom single-family homes

RESIDENTS LIVING BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL

Families with incomes below the poverty level, typically with extremely low and very low incomes, are at greatest risk of becoming homeless and typically require special programs to assist them in meeting their rent and mortgage obligations so as to not become homeless. The 2014-2018 ACS identified 7.8 percent of all El Segundo residents as living below the poverty level (Table 2-11). Approximately 5.0 percent of family households in the City were living in poverty, while 7.9 percent of families with children were living below the poverty level. These households need assistance with housing subsidies, utility and other living expense subsidies, and other supportive services.

Resources

There are limited opportunities to address the housing needs of persons living with incomes below the poverty level in El Segundo. However, the needs of this special needs group are taken into consideration and are generally addressed through the City's overall programs for housing affordability.

A number of service agencies located in areas surrounding El Segundo provide services including emergency and transitional shelter, food distribution, vouchers for various needs, and rental and utility assistance that can benefit lower income single-parent households living in poverty or are at risk of becoming homeless.

EXTREMELY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Extremely low income (ELI) households earning 30 percent or less than the area median income may be exposed to housing problems at a higher rate. As shown in Table 2-13, 68 percent of ELI households experience one or more housing problem and 67 percent are cost burdened. ELI renter-households experience housing problems at a higher rate than ELI owners; 70 percent of ELI renters are cost burdened compared to only 57.6 percent of owners.

Table 2-13: Housing Problems and Cost Burden of ELI Households

| | Owner | Renter | Total |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| With one or more Housing Problem | 57.6% | 72.5% | 68.1% |
| Cost Burdened | 57.6% | 70.0% | 67.3% |
| Total Households | 165 | 400 | 565 |
| Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2014-2018 ACS), 2021. | | | |

Resources

As discussed above, there are limited opportunities to address housing needs for ELI households in El Segundo. The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program represents a significant resource for addressing ELI housing needs. Specifically, HUD policy requires dedicating the majority of new vouchers to ELI households. For additional assistance, see the resources outlined above under *Residents Living Below the Poverty Level*.

HOMELESS

According to the 2020 Los Angeles County Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) Homeless Count, the overall homeless population in Los Angeles County was 54,291 persons. The same study estimated that there were 47 homeless persons in El Segundo (Table 2-11). All 47 homeless persons in El Segundo were unsheltered. The City saw a significant increase in homeless persons since 2019, when there were only 18 unsheltered persons.

Resources

There are no emergency shelters or transitional housing facilities in the City of El Segundo. The closest shelters are located five miles away in Redondo Beach or in nearby Lawndale. However, the Salvation Army continues to provide the Police Department with nominal funding on an ad hoc basis to assist homeless persons that come through El Segundo. These funds are used to provide fast food coupons, and bus fare, which would allow transportation to overnight facilities. Since they are located outside of El Segundo, any resident homeless population would seek emergency or transitional shelter in an outside jurisdiction such as Redondo Beach, Lawndale, Long Beach, Carson or San Pedro. Table 2-14 lists some of the key service providers for homeless persons in the South Bay region capable of servicing the needs of homeless persons in El Segundo.

Table 2-14: Inventory of Homeless Services and Facilities in the South Bay Region

| Organization | Services Provided |
|---|--|
| 1736 Family Crisis Center (562) 388-7652 (310) 370-5902 | Provides beds for up to 15 women with children under 18 who are victims of domestic violence. Shelter for adolescents at risk of becoming homeless is also provided. Services include referrals to homeless shelters and outpatient counseling. Stays of up to 6 months are permitted. |
| Harbor Interfaith Shelter 663 W 10 th Street San Pedro, CA 90731 (310) 831-0589 | Provides 20 single-bedroom units for families and children for up to 90 days. Provides food services to the public. |
| People Assisting the Homeless (PATH) (323) 644-2200 | Provides services including employment programs, outreach, eviction prevention, and interim housing. |
| The Good Seed 1230 Pine Avenue Long Beach, CA 90813 (855) 968-8452 | Provides supportive housing, job training, comprehensive services, and individual planning to youths aged 18 to 25 experiencing homelessness. |
| St. Margaret’s Center 10217 S. Inglewood Avenue Lennox, CA 90304 (310) 672-2208 | Provides advocacy, counseling services, emergency food, immigration services and utility bill assistance to individuals in the South Bay area. |
| U.S. Veterans Initiative 733 Hindry Avenue Inglewood, CA 90304 (310) 486-0025 | Provides services, including case management, employment assistance, job placement, counseling, and drug and alcohol free housing to veterans experiencing homelessness |

3. HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

The Census defines a housing unit as a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other person in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. A community's housing stock is the compilation of all its housing units.

A. HOUSING GROWTH

According to the Department of Finance (DOF) Housing Estimates, there are 7,463 dwelling units in El Segundo, an increase of 53 units (0.72 percent) since 2010. This growth rate is significantly lower than the housing growth rate for the County of Los Angeles (4.2 percent). A comparison of housing growth trends for El Segundo and neighboring cities is provided in Table 3-1. According to the DOF, during the same period, El Segundo's population is estimated to have grown by 123 persons (0.74 percent). There has been a slight increase in the average household size from 2.34 in 2010 to 2.35 in 2020.

Table 3-1: Housing Growth Trends in El Segundo and Neighboring Communities

| Jurisdiction | Housing Units | | Change 2010-2020 |
|--|---------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | 2010 | 2020 | |
| El Segundo | 7,410 | 7,463 | 0.72% |
| Hawthorne | 29,869 | 30,634 | 2.56% |
| Hermosa Beach | 10,162 | 10,092 | -0.69% |
| Inglewood | 38,429 | 38,688 | 0.67% |
| Manhattan Beach | 14,929 | 15,032 | 0.69% |
| Redondo Beach | 30,609 | 30,892 | 0.92% |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,413,995 | 1,517,755 | 7.34% |
| Los Angeles County | 3,445,076 | 3,590,574 | 4.22% |
| Sources: 2010 U.S. Census; DOF E-5 Population and Housing Estimates, January 2020. | | | |

B. HOUSING TYPE AND TENURE

Table 3-2 provides the breakdown of the City's housing stock in 2010 and 2020 by unit type. As shown, while single-family detached homes remain the predominant housing type. During the ten-year period, there was a slight decrease in the proportion of single-family detached homes, while all other home types, single-family attached and multi-family housing, increased slightly proportionately. Due to the scarcity of vacant residential land in the City, most of the housing unit growth has been accommodated through redeveloping existing lower density residential, and particularly of smaller multi-family projects with 2-4 units. As indicated previously, in 2018, the proportion of owner-occupied households in El Segundo (44.3 percent) is significantly lower than that of renter-occupied households (55.7 percent). Table 3-3 and Table 3-4 indicate household sizes by tenure in El Segundo and elderly households by tenure and age.

Table 3-2: El Segundo Comparative Housing Unit Mix in 2010-2020

| Housing Type | 2010 | | 2020 | |
|--|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| | No. of Units | % of Total | No. of Units | % of Total |
| Single-Family | | | | |
| Detached | 3,174 | 42.8% | 3,195 | 42.8% |
| Attached | 354 | 4.8% | 366 | 4.9% |
| Total | 3,528 | 47.6% | 3,561 | 47.7% |
| Multi-Family | | | | |
| 2-4 Units | 767 | 10.4% | 789 | 10.6% |
| 5+ Units | 3,100 | 41.8% | 3,098 | 41.5% |
| Total | 3,867 | 52.2% | 3,887 | 52.1% |
| Mobile Homes | 15 | 0.2% | 15 | 0.2% |
| Total Housing Units | 7,410 | 100.00% | 7,463 | 100.0% |
| Total Occupied | 7,085 | 95.6% | 7,111 | 95.3% |
| Owner-occupied* | 3,139 | 44.3% | 3,150 | 44.3% |
| Renter-occupied* | 3,946 | 55.7% | 3,961 | 55.7% |
| Vacancy Rate | 4.4% | | 4.7% | |
| * = ACS 2010 and 2018 (5-Year Estimates). Sources: DOF E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2010-2020; ACS 2010 and 2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP04. | | | | |

Table 3-3: El Segundo Household Size by Tenure

| | 1- 4 Persons | | 5+ Persons | | Total | |
|--|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Owner | 2,703 | 43.0% | 226 | 58.0% | 2,929 | 43.9% |
| Renter | 3,580 | 57.0% | 164 | 42.0% | 3,744 | 56.1% |
| Total* | 6,283 | 94.2% | 390 | 5.8% | 6,673 | 100.0% |
| * = Percent of total households Source: ACS 2012-2016 (5-Year Estimates), Table B25009. | | | | | | |

Table 3-4: El Segundo Elderly Householders by Tenure by Age

| Householder Age | Owners | Renters | Total |
|--|------------|------------|--------------|
| 65-74 years | 554 | 221 | 775 |
| 75 plus years | 323 | 179 | 502 |
| Total | 877 | 400 | 1,277 |
| Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table S2502. | | | |

C. AGE AND CONDITION OF HOUSING STOCK

Table 3-5 shows the age of the housing stock in El Segundo. In general, housing over 30 years old is usually in need of some major rehabilitation, such as a new roof, foundation work, plumbing, etc. The majority (about 88.8 percent) of El Segundo's housing units were constructed before 1990. This represents a significant proportion of the City's housing stock and indicates that preventative maintenance will be essential to ward off widespread housing deterioration. Some households, such as seniors who have owned their homes for many years and have relatively low house payments, may just be able to afford their monthly housing costs. For such households, the cost of major repairs or renovation may be impossible.

The Community Development Department maintains statistics pertaining to the condition of the City's housing stock. According to the Community Development Department, there are relatively few substandard dwellings in the City. In 2014-2021, 538 residential violations of the El Segundo Municipal Code property maintenance standards were reported. Most building violations are related to property maintenance issues, such as trash and debris or overgrown vegetation. Some violations related to the illegal conversion of garages and accessory structures to dwellings and single-family to multi-family unit conversions. The City estimates that only a very small portion of the City's housing stock (less than one percent) is in need of substantial rehabilitation. No housing units within the City are in need of replacement.

Table 3-5: Age of Housing Stock

| Structures Built | Number | Percent |
|------------------|--------|---------|
| 2014 or later | 15 | 0.2% |
| 2010 to 2013 | 66 | 0.9% |
| 2000 to 2009 | 364 | 5.2% |
| 1990 to 1999 | 335 | 4.8% |
| 1980 to 1989 | 933 | 13.4% |
| 1970 to 1979 | 902 | 12.9% |
| 1960 to 1969 | 1,039 | 14.9% |
| 1950 to 1959 | 1,909 | 27.4% |
| 1940 to 1949 | 744 | 10.7% |
| 1939 or earlier | 668 | 9.6% |
| Total | 6,975 | 100.0% |

Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP04.

D. HOUSING COSTS

1. Housing Prices

In October 2020, the median sales price for single-family homes, condos, and new homes was \$1,466,000. Since October 2019, the median home price in El Segundo increased by 67.4 percent.

Geographical comparisons of housing prices are shown in Table 3-6. The median sales prices of homes in El Segundo was above those in Hawthorne (\$730,000), Inglewood (\$720,000), and Redondo Beach (\$1,076,000) and exceeded the Countywide median of \$715,000. Median home prices remained below those in Hermosa Beach (\$1,650,000) and far below those in Manhattan Beach (\$2,850,000).

Table 3-6: Median Home Sales Prices (Regional Comparison) October 2020

| Jurisdiction | Single Family Homes, Condos, and New Homes | | |
|--------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| | # of Sales | Median Sale Price | % Change from 2019 |
| El Segundo | 14 | \$1,466,000 | 67.4% |
| Hawthorne | 44 | \$730,000 | -6.1% |
| Hermosa Beach | 21 | \$1,650,000 | -1.7% |
| Inglewood | 43 | \$720,000 | 20.0% |
| Manhattan Beach | 53 | \$2,850,000 | 48.1% |
| Redondo Beach | 99 | \$1,079,000 | -1.9% |
| Co. of Los Angeles | 7,602 | \$715,000 | 15.3% |

Source: Corelogic.com California Home Sale Activity by City, October 2020.

2. Housing Rental Rates

The median contract rent for El Segundo according to the 2014- 2018 ACS was \$1,785 per month. This was lower than the median rent in Manhattan Beach (\$2,499), Hermosa Beach (\$2,143), and Redondo Beach (\$1,987) but higher than the median in Hawthorne (\$1,188), Inglewood (\$1,267), the City of Los Angeles (\$1,376), and Los Angeles County (\$1,390) (Table 3-7).



The ACS also indicated that nearly 12 percent of the City’s housing stock were renter-occupied single-family detached homes and 2.2 percent were renter-occupied attached units (includes condominiums or townhouses). Renter-occupied multifamily units (2 or more units) accounted for 41.7 percent of the total housing stock (Table 3-8).

Table 3-7: 2018 Median Housing Rental Rates

| Jurisdiction | Median Gross Rent |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| El Segundo | \$1,785 |
| Hawthorne | \$1,188 |
| Hermosa Beach | \$2,143 |
| Inglewood | \$1,267 |
| Manhattan Beach | \$2,499 |
| Redondo Beach | \$1,987 |
| City of Los Angeles | \$1,376 |
| County of Los Angeles | \$1,390 |

Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table DP04.

Table 3-8: Tenure by Number of Units in Structure

| Tenure by Units in Structure | Number | Percent |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Total Housing Units | 6,639 | --- |
| <i>Owner-Occupied</i> | <i>2,938</i> | <i>44.3%</i> |
| 1-unit detached | 2,276 | 34.3% |
| 1- unit attached | 209 | 3.2% |
| 2 units | 31 | 0.8% |
| 3 - 4 units | 25 | 0.4% |
| 5 or more units | 397 | 6.0% |
| Other Unit Types | 0 | 0.0% |
| <i>Renter-Occupied</i> | <i>3,701</i> | <i>55.8%</i> |
| 1-unit detached | 790 | 11.9% |
| 2-units attached | 143 | 2.2% |
| 2 units | 157 | 2.4% |
| 3 – 4 units | 669 | 10.1% |
| 5 or more units | 1,942 | 29.3% |
| Other Unit Types | 0 | 0.0% |
| Source: ACS 2014-2018 (5-Year Estimates), Table B25032. | | |

A review of Zillow, Craigslist, and Westside Rentals, a rental real estate service; indicates that rental rates in El Segundo are fairly comparable to those in immediate coastal neighboring cities. A summary of the rental rate ranges by unit size is shown below in Table 3-9, as compiled from a recent review of the sources listed above. In November 2020, 135 units were listed for rent in El Segundo. Rents for these housing units ranged from \$1,100 for a one-bedroom unit to \$10,263 for a four-bedroom unit. These rent ranges are based on the City’s vacant rental units only and not all rental units in general. This rent survey was an attempt to approximate the cost of rental housing in the City. The median rent level in El Segundo ranged from \$1,825 for a studio to \$5,995 for a four-bedroom unit.

A sample of rental unit availability in Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach from Westside Rentals reveals that rental housing opportunities are more plentiful in comparison to El Segundo. However, El Segundo had a much narrower monthly rental rate range in comparison. Rent ranged from \$1,300 for a studio apartment to \$60,000 for a four-bedroom home in Hermosa Beach, while Manhattan Beach rental prices ranged from \$1,500 for a one-bedroom apartment to \$100,000 for a five-bedroom home.

Table 3-9: Median Rents in El Segundo November 2020

| Bedroom | Number Listed | Median Rent | Average Rent | Rent Range |
|---------|---------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| Studio | 15 | \$1,825 | \$1,885 | \$1,300-\$2,580 |
| 1 | 32 | \$2,000 | \$1,999 | \$1,100-\$2,500 |
| 2 | 68 | \$2,663 | \$2,727 | \$1,900-\$4,500 |
| 3 | 13 | \$3,300 | \$3,589 | \$2,900-\$4,800 |
| 4+ | 7 | \$5,995 | \$6,220 | \$4,200-\$10,263 |
| Total | 135 | \$2,550 | \$2,725 | \$1,100-\$10,263 |

Note: Some rental units may have been advertised on more than one rental website.
Sources: Zillow, 11/6/2020 (50 listings); Craigslist, 11/6/2020 (28 listings); Westside Rentals, 11/6/2020 (57 listings).

3. Housing Costs and Affordability

The costs of home ownership and renting can be compared to a household’s ability to pay for housing to determine the general affordability of a community’s housing stock. HUD conducts annual household income surveys to determine the maximum affordable housing payments that could be made. In evaluating affordability, it should be noted that the maximum affordable price refers to the maximum amount that could be paid by households in the top of their respective income category. Households in the lower end of each category have less available income and therefore may experience some level of overpayment.



Table 3-10 shows the annual income for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households by the size of the household and the maximum affordable housing payments based on the federal standard of 30 percent of household income. From these income and housing cost limits, the maximum affordable home prices and rents are determined. The table also shows the maximum amounts that households at different income levels can pay for housing each month (e.g., rent, mortgage and utilities) without exceeding the 30 percent housing cost-to-income ratio. The maximum affordable payments can be compared to current market prices for single-family homes, condominiums, and apartments to determine what types of housing opportunities a household can afford.

Comparison of these maximum affordable housing costs with the sales price data shown previously in Table 3-6, indicates that not even moderate income households (up to 120 percent AMI) would be able to afford single-family homes sold in El Segundo. It should be noted however that asking prices can often be higher than actual sales prices. At a maximum affordable purchase price of about \$347,334, it is not likely that low income households (80 percent AMI) could afford even a small condominium unit. The high price of single-family housing indicates that the opportunities for home ownership in the City are limited for lower and moderate income groups. In addition, the down payment and closing costs may still represent a significant obstacle to home purchase.

Table 3-6 and Table 3-7 suggest that larger low-income households are able to afford lower priced one- and two-bedroom apartments in El Segundo. Extremely low and very low-income households (50 percent AMI) may experience limited affordability for rental units in El Segundo. Rental options

exist for moderate-income households (120 percent AMI) in El Segundo; however even moderate-income households may struggle to find appropriately priced rentals.

The Housing Element acknowledges that opportunities to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households in El Segundo are limited. This is based on surveys conducted to determine rental rates for apartment units in El Segundo (Table 3-7) as well as information gathered to determine for-sale housing costs (single-family homes, condominiums, and new homes). Similar to other cities in this region of the South Bay (Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach), El Segundo's housing rental and for-sale costs remain relatively high because of the desirability of the City's location.

The City is pursuing a number of initiatives to expand affordable housing opportunities. These include entering an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) with Many Mansions to serve as the City's Affordable Housing Services Provider to develop and manage affordable units, services, and programs. Many Mansions will prepare an Affordable Housing Strategic Plan for City Council consideration in December 2021.

Table 3-10: Housing Affordability Matrix (2020)

| Household | Annual Income ¹ | Affordable Costs (All Costs) | Estimated Utility Allowance, Taxes & Insurance ² | | Affordable Rent | Affordable Home Price |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | | | Utilities | Taxes, Ins., HOA (Ownership) | | |
| Extremely Low-Income (0-30% AMI) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$23,700 | \$593 | \$151 | \$207 | \$442 | \$61,790 |
| 2-Person | \$27,050 | \$676 | \$166 | \$237 | \$510 | \$72,096 |
| 3-Person | \$30,450 | \$761 | \$190 | \$266 | \$571 | \$80,244 |
| 4-Person | \$33,800 | \$845 | \$223 | \$296 | \$622 | \$86,069 |
| 5-Person | \$36,550 | \$914 | \$264 | \$320 | \$650 | \$86,953 |
| Very Low Income (31-50% AMI) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$39,450 | \$986 | \$151 | \$345 | \$836 | \$129,241 |
| 2-Person | \$45,050 | \$1,126 | \$166 | \$394 | \$960 | \$149,182 |
| 3-Person | \$50,700 | \$1,268 | \$190 | \$444 | \$1,077 | \$166,966 |
| 4-Person | \$56,300 | \$1,408 | \$223 | \$493 | \$1,185 | \$182,427 |
| 5-Person | \$60,850 | \$1,521 | \$264 | \$532 | \$1,257 | \$191,020 |
| Low Income (51-80% AMI) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$63,100 | \$1,578 | \$151 | \$552 | \$1,427 | \$230,524 |
| 2-Person | \$72,100 | \$1,803 | \$166 | \$631 | \$1,637 | \$265,026 |
| 3-Person | \$81,100 | \$2,028 | \$190 | \$710 | \$1,837 | \$297,157 |
| 4-Person | \$90,100 | \$2,253 | \$223 | \$788 | \$2,030 | \$327,179 |
| 5-Person | \$97,350 | \$2,434 | \$264 | \$852 | \$2,170 | \$347,334 |
| Moderate Income (81-120% AMI) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$64,900 | \$1,623 | \$151 | \$568 | \$1,472 | \$238,233 |
| 2-Person | \$74,200 | \$1,855 | \$166 | \$649 | \$1,689 | \$274,020 |
| 3-Person | \$83,500 | \$2,088 | \$190 | \$731 | \$1,897 | \$307,435 |
| 4-Person | \$92,750 | \$2,319 | \$223 | \$812 | \$2,096 | \$338,527 |
| 5-Person | \$100,150 | \$2,504 | \$264 | \$876 | \$2,240 | \$359,325 |
| Assumptions: 2020 income limits; 30% of household income spent on housing; LACDA utility allowance; 35% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10% down payment; and 3% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Taxes and insurance apply to owner costs only; renters do not usually pay taxes or insurance. | | | | | | |
| Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development 2020 Income Limits; Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA), 2020 Utility Allowance Schedule; Veronica Tam & Associates, 2020. | | | | | | |

E. ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING AT-RISK OF CONVERSION



California law requires the Housing Element to identify, analyze and propose programs to preserve housing units that are currently restricted to low-income housing use and will become unrestricted and possibly lost as low income housing. Based on review of Federal and State subsidized housing inventories, and confirmed by interviews with City staff, there are no “Assisted Housing Projects” at risk in El Segundo, as defined by Government Code § 65583 (A) (8).

The City owns Park Vista, a 97-unit senior housing project developed in 1984 using City funds. The project is operated and regulated by the non-profit El Segundo Senior Citizens Housing Corporation. The Articles of Incorporation for the corporation require units in Park Vista to be available only to low income seniors in perpetuity. The City has no plans to convert this affordable housing project to market-rate housing.

4. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Market conditions, environmental conditions, and governmental programs and regulations affect the provision of adequate and affordable housing. Housing Element law requires a city to examine potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints to the development of new housing and the maintenance of existing units for all income levels. Market, governmental, and environmental constraints to housing development in El Segundo are discussed below.

A. MARKET CONSTRAINTS

1. Construction Costs

One cost factor associated with residential building is the cost of building materials, which can comprise a significant portion of the sales price of a home. An 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 is national and does not consider regional differences and does not include the price of the land upon which the building is built. The national average for development costs per square foot for apartments and single-family homes in August 2020 are as follows:

- Type I or II, Multi-Family: \$130.52 to \$168.94 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, Multi-Family: \$113.88 to \$118.574 per sq. ft.
- Type I or II, One and Two Family Dwelling: \$136.62 to \$157.40 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, One and Two Family Dwelling: \$123.68 to \$131.34 per sq. ft.

The unit costs for residential care facilities generally range between \$143.75 and \$199.81 per square foot. These costs are exclusive of the costs of land and soft costs, such as entitlements, financing, etc. The City's ability to mitigate high construction costs is limited without direct subsidies. Another factor related to construction cost is development density. With an increase in the number of units built in a project, overall costs generally decrease as builders can benefit from the economies of scale.

Variations in the quality of materials, type of amenities, labor costs and the quality of building materials could result in higher or lower construction costs for a new home. Pre-fabricated factory built housing, with variation on the quality of materials and amenities may also affect the final construction cost per square foot of a housing project. Furthermore, the unit volume - that is the number of units being built at one time - can change the cost of a housing project by varying the economies of scale. Generally, as the number of units under construction at one time increases, the overall costs decrease. With a greater number of units under construction, the builder is often able to benefit by making larger orders of construction materials and pay lower costs per material unit.

Density bonuses granted to a project can serve to reduce per unit building costs and thus help mitigate this constraint. The granting of a density bonus provides the builder with the opportunity to create more housing units and therefore more units for sale or lease than would otherwise be allowed without the bonus. Since greater units can potentially increase the economy of scale, the bonus units could potentially reduce the construction costs per unit. This type of cost reduction is of particular benefit

when density bonuses are used to provide affordable housing. Allowances for manufactured housing in residential zones also addresses housing cost constraints by avoiding the use of costly building materials and construction techniques that can drive up the costs of housing.

2. Land Costs

The price of raw land and any necessary improvements is a key component of the total cost of housing. The diminishing supply of land available for residential construction combined with a fairly steady demand for such development has served to keep the cost of land high and rising in southern California. In addition, the two factors which most influence land holding costs are the interest rate on acquisition and development loans, and government processing times for plans and permits. The time it takes to hold land for development increase the overall cost of the project. This cost increase is primarily due to the accrualment of interest on the loan, the preparation of the site for construction and processing applications for entitlements and permits.

Due to its desirable location, land costs in El Segundo are high. High land costs in this area of the South Bay are a constraint to the construction of affordable housing. Residentially designated vacant land in El Segundo is virtually non-existent. A Zillow search showed two lots available for sale in neighboring communities (Inglewood and Playa del Rey) for approximately \$1 million for 0.12 acre.

3. Availability of Mortgage and Rehabilitation Financing

The availability of financing affects a person's ability to purchase or improve a home. Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local government can do to affect these rates. Jurisdictions can, however, offer interest rate write-downs to extend home purchasing opportunities to a broader economic segment of the population. In addition, government-insured loan programs may be available to reduce mortgage down payment requirements.

Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications and the income, gender, and race of loan applicants.

As shown in Table 4-1, a total of 621 households applied for loans, either conventional or government-backed, to purchase homes in El Segundo in 2017. Approval rates were higher for government-backed purchase loans with an approval rate of 77 percent, in comparison to only 45 percent of conventional loan applications being approved. However, 36 percent of conventional purchase loans were either withdrawn or closed for incompleteness. The approval rate was 67 percent for refinance loans and 71 percent for home improvement loans. Given the high rates of approval for home purchase, refinance, and improvement loans, financing was generally available to El Segundo residents.

Table 4-1: Disposition of Home Purchase and Improvement Loan Applications

| Loan Type | Total Applications | % Originated | % Approved Not Accepted | % Denied | % Other |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Government Backed Purchase | 213 | 74.65% | 2.35% | 7.04% | 15.96% |
| Conventional Purchase | 11 | 45.45% | 0.00% | 18.18% | 36.36% |
| Refinance | 48 | 58.33% | 8.33% | 14.58% | 18.75% |
| Home Improvement | 349 | 67.05% | 4.30% | 11.75% | 16.91% |
| Total | 621 | 68.60% | 3.86% | 10.47% | 17.07% |

Note: Percent Other includes loan applications that were either withdrawn or closed for incompleteness.
Source: www.LendingPatterns.com, 2017.

4. Timing and Density

Housing growth in the City has been limited due to the lack of vacant residentially designated land. Multi-family land was developed primarily prior to the incorporation of the City under County standards and are at or above the City’s allowable densities. The majority of the recent residential construction activities have been the recycling of single-family homes and construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). Pending projects (see Housing Resources section) tend to reach the high end of the density range.

Time lapse between project entitlement and building permit issuance can be a constraint to housing development. Typically, this time lapse can be about three to six months and primary a function of developer’s ability to respond quickly to needed corrections for construction documents. However, the City allows developers to submit building permit applications for projects -at their own risk- concurrently with the entitlements. This can shorten the time lapse to as little as 2-4 weeks, with building permits issued shortly after entitlement approval. Building permit can be applied online through the City’s website.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

As a City with a variety of both large and mid-size industrial, commercial and manufacturing uses, numerous environmental related factors are present which pose constraints to residential development within El Segundo. Historically, less than 25 percent of the land within the City has been used for residential development. The remaining land has been used primarily for a mixture of light and heavy industrial purposes, including oil refineries, aircraft and space vehicle manufacturing, a United States Air Force Base, chemical production, research and development uses, retail, large scale corporate offices, restaurants, and hotels. The development invested in these properties is substantial, making conversion to residential uses economically infeasible. When sufficient amounts of these properties have become available for redevelopment, the City has permitted residential uses in a mixed-use environment west of Pacific Coast Highway, provided that infrastructure issues could be successfully addressed, and residential uses could be buffered from non-residential uses.

In comparison to other areas in Los Angeles County, the City of El Segundo is heavily affected by traffic, air quality, odor and safety issues related to flight operations at Los Angeles International

Airport. Those residential areas located near the northern boundaries of the City are particularly subject to these impacts. The Circulation, Air Quality, and Noise Elements of the City's General Plan all contain policies that seek to minimize the negative effects upon these residential areas, and help ensure the protection of area residents.

Many of the industries operating in El Segundo use hazardous materials in their operations and have sites that are contaminated by toxins. Since heavy industry is a significant land use in the City, hazardous materials use and management is a serious consideration. Heavy manufacturing comprises about 30 percent of the City's area. Additionally, heavy industrial uses are located immediately adjacent to the City's western boundary, which include the Hyperion Treatment Plant and Scattergood Power Generation Station. Housing opportunities are limited near or adjacent to these heavy industrial uses. Although industries in El Segundo generate a diverse mix of hazardous waste, heavy industrial uses within the City must conform to the policies of the Hazardous Materials Element of the General Plan.

Despite the environmental constraints discussed above, they have had no significant impact on the City's ability to construct and maintain housing in those areas and zones in the City where residential development is currently permitted, including non-residential zones. Further, the ability to construct and maintain housing at maximum densities has not been affected by environmental constraints. Established residential areas and several non-residentially zoned areas in the City are buffered from industrial uses and, as previously noted, the City has implemented policies in its General Plan that address and minimize the negative effects these uses may have on residential areas of the City. Finally, none of the parcels included in the Vacant and Underutilized Parcel Inventory of this element (see Appendix) are significantly constrained environmentally. All of the listed parcels are supported by existing infrastructure and can be developed with units based on permitted densities. Furthermore, there are no wetlands, flood plains, earthquake zones, or other natural hazards areas in the City that would constrain residential development in the City.

C. GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Housing affordability is affected by factors in both the private and public sectors. In the public sector, additional city government requirements can contribute to the reduction of the affordability and availability of new housing although the intent of local legislative action is to maintain or improve the quality of life within a community. Necessary land use controls, site improvement requirements, building codes, fees, and other local programs intended to improve the urban environment can add cost and perhaps time delays to the construction of new housing projects.

1. Compliance with Transparency in Development Regulations

The El Segundo City website provides a full array of information regarding development regulations and procedures under the Community Development Department webpages:

- Apply for a building permit
- Planning application
- Zoning Code
- Plan check
- Building safety
- Report a code violation

- Planning
- Record requests
- Maps

Specifically, the City offers online building permit application.

2. Land Use Controls

The Land Use Element of El Segundo General Plan sets forth the City's policies for regulation of land uses within the City's jurisdiction. These policies, together with zoning regulations for implementing the General Plan, establish the location, amount and distribution of land to be allocated for various land uses within the City. The El Segundo General Plan and El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") provide for a range of residential land use development densities as follows:

- a) Single-Family Residential (R-1) (8 du/ac) – a maximum of one dwelling unit per parcel with a minimum parcel size of 5,000 square feet (ESMC §15-4A-2; Land Use Element Objective LU 3-1, Policy LU3-1.1, Policy LU3-1.2).

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) or junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU) is permitted by right throughout any zone where residential uses are permitted. In no case may an R-1 property proposed to be used for a second dwelling unit consist of more than one lot. Attached ADUs must not be 50 percent or more of the total floor area of the combined dwellings. Detached ADUs must not exceed 1,200 square feet (ESMC §15-4E-3).

- b) Two-Family Residential (R-2) (12 du/acre) – up to 2 units per lot with a minimum of 7,000 square feet required per lot (ESMC §15-4B-2 and Land Use Element Objective LU 3-2 and Housing Element Policy 3.2).

Third and/or fourth ADUs are permitted in the R-2 Zone. One ADU or 25 percent of the existing multi-family dwelling units, whichever is greater, is permitted. Two detached ADUs are allowed per lot with an existing multi-family dwelling. Attached ADUs must not be 50 percent or more of the total floor area of the combined dwellings. Detached ADUs must not exceed 1,200 square feet (ESMC §15-4E-3; Housing Element Policies 3.7 and 4.1).

- c) Multi-Family Residential (R-3) (18 du/acre, 27 du/acre) – Multi-family residential with up to 27 dwelling units per acre. On property of 15,000 square feet or less, one unit for every 1,613 square feet is allowed. A fraction of a lot greater than 1,075 square feet will allow an additional unit (ESMC §15-4C-5).

On property greater than 15,000 square feet in size, one unit for every 2,420 square feet of lot area is allowed. A fraction of a lot greater than 1,613 square feet will allow an additional unit (ESMC §15-4C-5).

This Housing Element includes a program action to increase the R-3 zone density from 27 units per acre to 30 units per acre. The different lot areas per unit based on lot size will also be removed to encourage lot consolidation.

- d) Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) – residential uses as an accessory use on the floor above street level only with a maximum density of 10 units per acre (ESMC §15-5B-3 and Housing Element Policy 4.1).
- e) Downtown Commercial (C-RS) – residential uses as an accessory use on the floor above street level only, above a ground floor use, with a maximum density of 10 dwelling units per acre (ESMC §15 5A-3 and Housing Element Policy 4.1).
- f) Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) – The DSP regulates 25.8 acres within the City’s downtown area. The majority of the lots within the DSP are 25-foot wide by 140-foot deep and 3,500 square feet in area. The DSP does not permit the development of any new residential units except owner and/or tenant occupied units at the ratio of one per legal building site or business establishment (whichever is greater) up to a density of 10 dwelling units per acre (above ground floor commercial use). (Housing Element Policy 4.1).
- g) Medium Density Residential (MDR) – In addition to the residential categories described above, the MDR zone is used as a type of “floating zone” which can be activated within certain areas of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan and used in place of the base zone regulations. If the MDR zone is activated, R-3 zoning standards will apply (ESMC §15 7A-2, §15 7A-3 and Ordinance No. 1573). This Housing Element includes a program action to increase the R-3 zone density from 27 units per acre to 30 units per acre and, thus, remove the different lot areas per unit based on lot to encourage lot consolidation

The Land Use Element of the General Plan documents the residential build out in the City at 7,674 residential units. By 2020, it was estimated that there were 7,463 residential units in the City, 211 units less than the projected build-out. Based on just residentially designated land, the City does not offer adequate capacity for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 6th cycle Housing Element.

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN AREA

The Smoky Hollow Specific Plan was updated in 2018. Smoky Hollow is a light industrial/manufacturing region located in central El Segundo, generally bounded by Standard Street to the west, El Segundo Boulevard to the south, Pacific Coast Highway to the east, and Grand Avenue to the north. The project area encompasses approximately 94.3 acres. Residential units other than accessory caretaker units are not permitted in the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan area. The Plan includes a Medium Density Residential (MDR) Overlay Zone. The MDR Overlay Zone is considered a “floating zone” that can be activated once a need is identified. The MDR Overlay Zone may be used in place of current Smoky Hollow Specific Plan zoning designations. As stated before, this Housing Element includes an action to increase the implementing zoning standards - R-3 density to 30 units per acre and remove the different lot areas per unit based on lot size.

DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN

In 2000, the City adopted a Downtown Specific Plan in order to enhance the Downtown environment. The Plan area is a small, distinct district approximately two blocks by five blocks in size and is currently developed with commercial, residential and public uses. Future development is anticipated to be similar in nature. The current zoning allows for a maximum of 276 dwelling units within the Plan area. This equates to one unit per 25-foot wide lot (12.5 dwelling units per acre), not including the Civic

Center site. As of September 2021, there are approximately 83 residential units in the Plan area. The City’s residential sites inventory includes a number of properties in the Downtown Specific Plan area with a total capacity of 26 units.

DENSITY BONUS

The City complies with Government Code §56915 regarding density bonus requirements. This Housing Element includes a program to amend the ESMC to comply with the State Density Bonus law.

3. Residential Development Standards

The City’s residential development standards are within and typical of the range of standards of other nearby cities. The density, setback, and other standards regulating residential development within the City are in concert with those being used by other surrounding municipalities. The ESMC limits all residential building heights to 32 feet and two stories. Residential development standards for the City of El Segundo are as summarized below in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: El Segundo Residential Development Standards

| Zone | Min. Lot Area | Min. Front Setback | Min. Rear Setback | Min. Side Setbacks | Max. Height | Parking Requirements | Max. Lot Coverage |
|-------------------------|---------------|--|-------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| R-1 | 5,000 s.f. | 22 ft./30 ft. total when combined with rear yard | 5 ft. | 3 - 6 ft. 10 % Modulation Required | 32 ft./2 stories for pitched roofs 26 ft./2 stories for flat roofs | 2 spaces/unit & 1 additional space for du >3,500 sf ³ | 40 - 60% ¹ |
| R-2 | 7,000 s.f. | 20 ft./30 ft. when combined with rear yard | 5 ft. | 3 - 5 ft. 10% Modulation Required | 32 ft./2 stories for pitched roofs 26 ft./2 stories for flat roofs | 2 spaces/unit & 1 additional space for du >3,500 sf ³ | 50% |
| R-3 | 7,000 s.f. | 15 ft. | 10 ft. | 3 - 5 ft. 10% | 32 ft./2 stories for pitched roofs 26 ft./2 stories for flat roofs | 2 spaces/unit plus 1 visitor space/3 units | 53% |
| MDR (SHSP) ³ | 7,000 s.f. | 15 ft. ⁴ | 10 ft. | 3-5 ft. 10% ⁴ | 32 ft./2 stories for pitched roofs 26 ft./2 stories for flat roofs | 2 spaces/unit plus 1 visitor space/3 units | 53% |

Notes:

1. Lot coverage permitted varies according to specific conditions on the site.
2. The ESMC requires covered parking for each housing type as follows:
 - a. Single-family dwelling – fully enclosed two-car garage for each home;
 - b. Two-family dwelling – fully enclosed two-car garage per unit;

- c. Multiple-family dwelling – enclosed in a carport (excluding guest parking spaces which are allowed to be uncovered). Multiple-family dwellings include apartments, condominiums and townhouses.
3. Designated as “floating zone.”
4. The setback along Grand Avenue shall be 30 ft. minimum for properties east of Kansas Street, whether it is for a front or side yard.

Source: City of El Segundo Municipal Code.

The City’s residential development standards (building setbacks, height requirements, parking and lost coverage standards) as shown in Table 4-2 above, do not act as a constraint on the development of housing in the City. Furthermore, they allow the achievement of the maximum allowable density permitted by the respective zoning designation, including up to 27 units per acre in the R-3 Zone. Over the last few years, many R-3 properties have been redeveloped to higher intensity residential uses. Most of these are condominium development with larger units. Some examples include the following:

- 335 Penn Street (0.13 acre) – three-unit project (achieved 23 units per acre)
- 231 Virginia Street (about 0.18 acre) – three-unit project (achieved 17 units per acre)
- 535 Richmond Street (0.16 acre) – two-unit project (achieved 12.5 units per acre)
- 701-705 West Maple Street (0.30 acre) – six-unit project (achieved 20 units per acre)
- 224 Whiting Avenue (0.13 acre) – three-unit project (achieved 23 units per acre)

The ESMC allows the Planning Commission to approve a 20 percent reduction in the number of required parking spaces for any use in any zone in the City. The City used to allow tandem parking spaces for properties in its R-3 Zones; however, the City eliminated the allowance for tandem spaces in the R-3 Zone after observing over time that these tandem spaces were mostly utilized by residents for purposes other than parking vehicles. Residents made use of tandem parking spaces for storage or for habitable uses, which resulted in numerous illegal conversions and nuisance complaints.

To encourage redevelopment of R-3 sites that are currently occupied by lower intensity residential uses such as single units and duplexes, the City is proposing to increase the R-3 density to 30 units per acre and remove the different lot areas per unit based on lot size. As part of this Zoning amendment, the City will also evaluate the height restriction, setbacks, lot coverage, and parking requirements as constraints to housing development. Specifically, the City will adjust parking requirements based on unit size to encourage the development of a range of housing unit sizes.

While tandem parking may not be appropriate citywide, allowing tandem parking for affordable housing projects could serve to enhance the financial feasibility of affordable housing in El Segundo. The City will consider reducing certain development standards (such as parking requirements) for income-restricted residential units. Examples of reduced parking requirements for residential uses may include allowing tandem parking, allowing compact parking spaces, and reducing the number of enclosed parking spaces.

Housing development potential in El Segundo based on existing zoning is limited. As part of this Housing Element update, the City is proposing to create a Housing Overlay (HO) and a Mixed Use Overlay (MU-O) that allow up to 70 units per acre and 85 units per acre, respectively. These new zoning designations offer new opportunity in the City and require new development standards for implementation. This Housing Element includes a program action to ensure appropriate development

standards (parking, height, setbacks, lot coverage, etc.) are established to allow the achievement of maximum density on sites identified in the inventory.

4. Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types

Housing element law requires jurisdictions to identify available sites in appropriate zoning districts with development standards that encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all income levels, including multi-family rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, emergency shelters, and transitional housing.

In addition to single-family dwellings, the City offers a variety of housing opportunities that are available to residents of all economic segments, as well as some of the more vulnerable members of the community, including lower income households, seniors, and the homeless. These housing opportunities include multi-family dwellings, mobile homes, second units, and a number of special needs housing options. The following discussion outlines how the City provides for these types of housing:

Table 4-3 El Segundo Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District

| Residential Use | Zone District | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------|----------------|------|------|
| | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | MDR | DSP | C-2 | CRS | SH-W | SH-E |
| Single-Family Detached | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Single-Family Attached | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | -- | -- |
| 2-4 Dwelling Units | -- | -- | P | P | -- | p ¹ | p ¹ | -- | -- |
| 5 + Dwelling Units | -- | -- | P | P | -- | p ¹ | p ¹ | -- | -- |
| Manufactured Homes | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Mobile-Home Parks | CUP | CUP | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 2 nd Dwelling Unit | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Caretaker Unit | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | P | P |
| Residential Care < 6 ² | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Senior Citizen Housing | -- | -- | CUP | CUP | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Live/ Work | -- | -- | -- | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

P=Permitted by Right in Zoning District; CUP=Conditional Use Permit Required; -- = Not Permitted

Notes:

1. Maximum number of units is dependent upon the density allowed in each zone, based upon General Plan density and size of parcel.
2. The City permits licensed residential care facilities with fewer than six persons by right (California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 5115 and 5116) in all residential zones in the City. Furthermore, residential care and group homes in residential zones are not restricted by distance requirements.

Source: City of El Segundo Municipal Code.

Multi-Family Rental Housing: Multiple-family housing is the predominant dwelling type in the City. The Department of Finance (DOF) estimated that in 52 percent of the total housing units were multi-family in 2020. The total number of multi-family housing units has remained stable over the previous decade as single and two family homes in the R-3 Zone, are replaced with new multiple-family units in two-story apartment buildings. The City’s zoning regulations provides for multiple-

family units in the R-3, C-2, and CRS zones as well as the MDR zone of the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHSP) area.

Mobile Homes/Manufactured Housing: The City provides for mobile or manufactured homes within its residential zoning districts if they meet specific standards. Both mobile homes and manufactured housing units must be certified according to the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 and cannot have been altered in violation of applicable law. The units must also be installed on a permanent foundation in compliance with all applicable building regulations and the Health and Safety Code.

Mobile home parks are conditionally permitted in R-1 and R-2 zones. Development standards are subject to regulations codified in the State Health and Safety Code. However, given the unique site planning considerations of mobile home parks, CUP is a typical process for most jurisdictions in reviewing mobile home park proposals. However, mobile home park is not an efficient use of land given the high land costs and limited vacant land. Development of new mobile home parks has limited potential in urbanized areas such as El Segundo.

Second, Third and Fourth Units: The City's zoning regulations provide for ADUs or JADUs in any zone where residential uses are permitted. ADUs and JADUs are restricted to the following densities:

- One ADU or JADU per lot within a proposed or existing single-family dwelling or existing accessory structure;
- One detached or attached to an accessory structure ADU that may be combined with one JADU per lot with a proposed or existing single-family dwelling;
- Multiple ADUs within the portions of existing multi-family dwelling structures that are not used as livable space, provided each unit complies with State building standards for dwellings;
- One ADU or 25 percent of the existing multi-family dwelling units, whichever is greater, within an existing multi-family dwelling;
- Two detached ADUs per lot with an existing multi-family dwelling.

Residential Care Facilities: A community residential care facility is defined as a facility licensed for 24 hour care pursuant to the Community Care Facilities Act. In accordance with California law, the ESMC permits licensed residential care facilities with fewer than six persons by right in all residential zones. Furthermore, residential care facilities and group homes are not restricted by distance requirements in these zones. However, the ESMC does not explicitly address the provision of residential care facilities for seven or more persons. This Housing Element includes a program to address large residential care facilities.

Senior Housing: Senior housing is conditionally permitted in R-3 and MDR zones. The CUP requirement was originally put in place with the intention of granting senior housing higher density and lower parking requirements. However, such incentives are also offered under the State Density Bonus law. Therefore, the Housing Element includes an action to remove the CUP requirement for senior housing. Senior housing will be treated as a residential use to be similarly permitted in zones where residential uses are permitted.

Emergency Shelters: California law requires that local jurisdictions strengthen provisions for addressing the housing needs of the homeless, including the identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without discretionary approval. Health and Safety Code § 50801(e) defines emergency shelters as housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or fewer by a homeless person. There are currently no emergency shelters for the homeless within the City.

The City amended the Municipal Code to permit emergency shelters in the Light Manufacturing (M1) zones through Ordinance 1497. The M1 zone is compatible with emergency shelter uses and is located in close proximity to personal services (e.g., shopping centers, banks, etc.) and transit opportunities (Green Line stations, bus routes, and transit stops). The typical industrial uses found in this zone are “clean” industrial uses such as research and development firms, engineering and architectural design firms, and office uses with nearby restaurants and other such amenities located close by. Overall, 90 parcels totaling 257 acres are zoned M1 and adequate to accommodate the City’s unsheltered homeless population of 47 persons as of 2020 Point-in-Time Count by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. However, amendments to the ESMC are needed to remove the separation requirements pertaining to uses other than another shelter. State law allows local jurisdictions to establish a 300-foot distance requirement from another shelter only.

Furthermore, AB 139 requires the City to base the needs for emergency shelter on the:

- Most recent homeless point-in-time count conducted before the start of the planning period;
- Number of beds available on a year-round and seasonal basis;
- Number of shelter beds that go unused on an average monthly basis within a one-year period; and
- percentage of those in emergency shelters that move to permanent housing solutions.

AB 139 also requires that parking for emergency shelters be based on staffing level only. The City will amend the ESMC to comply with State law requirements on emergency shelters.

Low Barrier Navigation Center (LBNC): AB 101 requires jurisdictions to permit Low Barrier Navigation Centers that meet specified requirements by-right in mixed use zones and other nonresidential zones permitting multifamily residential development. The bill also imposes a timeline for cities to act on an application for the development of a Low Barrier Navigation Center. The provisions of AB 101 are effective until 2026. The City will amend the ESMC to address the provision of LBNC.

Transitional Housing: “Transitional housing” means buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and recirculating of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than six months from the beginning of the assistance (Government Code § 65582 (h)). There are currently no transitional housing facilities within the City.

Government Code § 65583, transitional housing constitutes a residential use and therefore local governments cannot treat it differently from other types of residential uses (e.g., requiring a use permit when other residential uses of similar function do not require a use permit). This Housing Element includes a program to amend the ESMC to address the provision of transitional housing.

Supportive Housing: “Supportive housing” means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an onsite or offsite service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community (Government Code Section 65582 (f)).

“Target population” means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Welfare and Institutions Code § 4500, *et seq.*) 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 (Government Code Section 65582 (g)).

Furthermore, additional amendments to the City’s Zoning Code are required to address AB 2162, which streamlines affordable housing developments that include 100 percent affordable developments that include a percentage of supportive housing units, either 25 percent or 12 units whichever is greater, on sites that are zoned for residential use. Such supportive housing, if located within ½ mile from transit, is not subject to minimum parking requirements. This Housing Element includes a program to address the provision of supportive housing.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing: The ESMC does not contain specific provisions for SRO units. The City is currently in the process of amending the ESMC to conditionally permit SRO or Micro units in the Multi-family Residential (R-3) Zone. The City would also establish appropriate development standards in the ESMC for SRO or Micro units.

Farmworker/Employee Housing: Under California Health and Safety Code § 17021.6, farmworker housing up to 12 units or 36 beds must be considered an agricultural use and permitted in any zoning district that permits agricultural uses. The ESMC was amended in 2014 to remove agriculture as a permitted use in the Open-Space (O-S) Zone.

Additionally, California Health and Safety Code § 17021.5 covers the provision of employee housing. Specifically, employee housing for six or fewer employees is to be treated as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other dwellings of the same type in the same zone. The City amended the ESMC to comply with State law regarding employee housing during the 2013-2021 Housing Element cycle.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Land Use Controls: Welfare and Institutions Code § 5115 and 5116 declare that mentally and physically disabled persons are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings. The use of property for the care of six or fewer persons with disabilities is a residential use for the purposes of zoning. A State-authorized or certified family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a-day basis is considered a residential use that is permitted in all residential zones. The City has not established any distance requirement between any facilities. This Housing Element includes a program to amend the ESMC to address the provision of residential care facilities for seven or more persons.

Definition of Family: The ESMC defines “family” as “an individual or two (2) or more persons living together as a single household in a dwelling unit.” This definition does not constrain the development of housing for persons with special needs.

Building Codes: The City enforces Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations that regulates the access and adaptability of buildings to accommodate persons with disabilities. Furthermore, Government Code § 12955.1 requires that 10 percent of the total dwelling units in multi-family buildings without elevators consisting of three or more rental units or four or more condominium units are subject to the following building standards for persons with disabilities:

- The primary entry to the dwelling unit must be on an accessible route unless exempted by site impracticality test;
- At least one powder room or bathroom must be located on the primary entry level served by an accessible route;
- All rooms or spaces located on the primary entry level must be served by an accessible route. Rooms and spaces located on the primary entry level and subject to this chapter may include, without limitation, kitchens, powder rooms, bathrooms, living rooms, bedrooms, or hallways;
- Common use areas must be accessible; and
- If common tenant parking is provided, accessible parking is required.

The City has not adopted unique restrictions that would constrain the development of housing for persons with disabilities. Compliance with provisions of the Code of Regulations, California Building Code, and federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is assessed and enforced by the Building Division of the Community Development Department as a part of the building permit submittal.

Reasonable Accommodation: Both the Federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act direct local governments to make reasonable accommodations (i.e., modifications or exceptions) in their zoning regulations when such accommodations may be necessary to afford disabled persons an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. For example, it may be reasonable to accommodate requests from persons with disabilities to waive a setback requirement or other standard of the zoning regulations to ensure that homes are accessible for the mobility impaired. Whether a particular modification is reasonable depends on the circumstances.

In 2011, the City adopted Reasonable Access Accommodation regulations to provide an administrative review process for reasonable accommodation requests. In addition, the ESMC contains an administrative adjustment process to request deviations from the standards and number of parking spaces. One of the primary reasons for this request is to address reasonable accommodation needs. Furthermore, the ESMC also provides for an administrative process to grant adjustments for minor exceptions for nonconforming uses and structures. The City has utilized this section of the ESMC to issue an approval for a house to exceed the allowable lot coverage with an addition that involved a tower to house an elevator shaft in a single-family home for a disabled resident.

The reasonable accommodation procedures are located in the Zoning Code, which is Title 15 of the El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC). In summary, the reasonable accommodation process is administrative in nature. It involves submittal of a written request, review by the Community Development Director, and issuance of an approval letter. The ESMC was recently amended by

Ordinance 1629, which has not yet been codified. Ordinance 1629 reorganized certain chapters in the Zoning Code, including those addressing reasonable accommodation procedures. In the amended ESMC, this topic is addressed in Chapter 15-22 (Administrative Determinations, Administrative Use Permits and Adjustments), specifically section 15-22-4(A)(7), which permits Adjustments to any development standard to make reasonable accommodations for disabled persons. The process/procedures for reviewing and approving Adjustment requests for reasonable accommodations can be found in the amended ESMC in Chapter 15-23 (Director Discretionary Decisions). However, Ordinance 1629 inadvertently removed reasonable accommodation from the fast-tracking processing. This is an oversight and this Housing Element includes a zoning text amendment to expressly indicate that reasonable accommodation is processed with an Administrative Adjustment.

5. Development and Planning Fees

The City collects various fees from developers to cover the costs of processing permits and providing necessary services and infrastructure. Certain of these fees are typically collected upon filing of an application for development projects that require discretionary approval. City development and impact fees are posted on the City's website on the Planning Division webpage at <https://www.elsegundo.org/government/departments/community-development-department/planning-division>

Development in Single Family Residential (R-1), Two Family Residential (R-2) and Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Zones does not require entitlements except for the subdivision of land, residential condominiums, and site plan review for developments involving more than 10 residential units. Table 4-4 provides a listing of development entitlement fees the City charges for residential development. Entitlements and fees for those entitlements, other than for subdivisions of land, condominiums, and site plan review are limited primarily in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone. In addition, there may be other fees assessed depending upon the circumstances of the development. For example, the builder may need to pay an encroachment fee for sidewalks, curbs, and gutters if their installation is needed. The fees listed in Table 4-4 are those entitlement fees that are typically charged for residential development.

All residential projects involving 10 or fewer units go through ministerial review and involve only issuance of building (and related grading permits). While the fee for Conditional Use Permits is the largest planning fee, currently no residential development is required to go through either Administrative Use Permits or Conditional Use Permits, except for senior housing and mobile home parks. This Housing Element includes an action to remove the CUP requirement for senior housing and development of new mobile home parks is unlikely. Therefore, these processes or fees are not constraints to residential development.

Table 4-4: El Segundo Planning Fees

| Fee Type | Fee |
|--|----------|
| Administrative Use Permit | \$2,805 |
| Lot Line Adjustment ¹ | \$1,680 |
| Lot Merger ¹ | \$1,680 |
| Conditional Use Permit | \$16,050 |
| Tentative Parcel Map Review ¹ | \$6,395 |
| Tentative Tract Map Review ¹ | \$10,590 |
| Variance Review | \$15,770 |
| Zone Text Amendment/Zone Change | Deposit |
| Site Plan Review | Deposit |
| 1. Plus \$1,500 deposit for actual cost for contract surveyor. | |
| Source: City of El Segundo Planning Division, 2020. | |

6. Development Impact Fees

Development impact fees are also collected for development projects. In accordance with California law, these are collected at the time the City issues certificates of occupancy. For example, for any new construction greater than 500 square feet there is a school fee collected. However, there are no art or childcare fees required for any new development projects. Impact fees charged by the City (fire, law enforcement, library, streets, etc.) are required for new and expanded development and the fees must be paid before the City issues a certificate of occupancy. These fees are shown in **Error! Reference source not found.** Solid waste collection is currently without cost to single-family residences; there is a fee for all other uses. Residents are charged a utility users tax (electric, gas, phone and water).

| Facility Type | Detached Dwelling Unit | Attached Dwelling Unit | Accessory Dwelling Unit |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Law Enforcement Facilities | \$964 | \$970 | \$964 |
| Fire Protection Facilities | \$115 | \$276 | \$115 |
| Streets, signals and Bridges | \$1,893 | \$1,263 | \$1,893 |
| Storm Drainage Facilities | \$2,482 | \$1,297 | \$2,482 |
| Water Distribution Facilities | \$6,405 | \$4,377 | \$6,405 |
| Wastewater Collection Facilities | \$3,001 | \$2,625 | \$3,001 |
| General Government Facilities | \$201 | \$44 | \$201 |
| Library Collection/Computers | \$907 | \$863 | \$907 |
| Public Meeting Facilities | \$7,686 | \$7,307 | \$7,686 |
| Aquatic Center Facilities | \$1,769 | \$1,682 | \$1,769 |
| Parkland Facilities Development | \$27,003 | \$25,672 | \$27,003 |
| Total | \$52,426 | \$46,376 | \$52,426 |
| Notes: | | | |
| 1. Residential Development fees are calculated on a per dwelling basis. | | | |
| 2. ADUs less than 750 square feet are not required to pay Development Impact Fees | | | |
| 3. Fee schedule is effective September 1, 2022. | | | |
| Source: City of El Segundo Planning Division, 2022. | | | |

Generally, overall fees (including both planning fees and development impact fees) total approximately \$52,426 per detached dwelling unit and \$46,376 per attached dwelling unit. The combined costs of all fees for residential projects are low because the City requires only minimal processing of applications for new single- and multi-family residences. In addition, there are no special discretionary entitlement requirements for these types of projects (such as the need to obtain a conditional use permit). New residential projects submitted to the City for review and approval are typically “Code-compliant” projects thus eliminating the need and costs to obtain a variance from site development standards.

7. Building Codes and Enforcement

In addition to land use controls, local building codes affect the cost and quality of construction of new housing units. El Segundo implements the provisions of the 2019 California Building Code (after January 1, 2023, it will enforce the 2022 California Building Code as amended by the ESMC) which establishes minimum construction standards and which contains accessibility standards for the disabled for multi-family housing. These minimum standards cannot be revised to be less stringent without sacrificing basic safety considerations and amenities. No major reductions in construction costs are anticipated through revisions to local building codes. The City has adopted several local amendments to the California Building Code but all of the amendments are related to health and safety improvements for the City’s commercial uses. No amendments for residential uses were adopted. Working within the framework of the existing codes, however, the City will continue to implement planning and development techniques that lower costs and facilitate new construction where possible. Enforcement of all City codes is handled by the appropriate departments and is typically coordinated by the Community Development Department. The Planning Division enforces zoning regulations.

8. Local Processing and Permit Procedures

Generally, local processing times are quite comparable to those experienced in neighboring communities. Currently it takes approximately four to six weeks to review and process non-discretionary plans. Minor permits are issued in a much shorter time frame including “over-the-counter” approval and permit issuance for small interior and exterior alterations and the installation of household utilities such as water heaters. Additionally, the City allows separate grading and foundation permits before it issues building permits. City Council approval is required for zone changes, general plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone text amendments and development agreements. Presented below are descriptions of processing procedures for typical single- and multi-family projects, including the type of permit, level of review, decision-making criteria and design review requirements.

Ministerial level. All residential projects involving 10 or fewer units go through ministerial review and involve only issuance of building (and related grading) permits, except for those projects involving discretionary applications/permits discussed below. Generally, local processing times for building and grading permits are quite comparable to those experienced in neighboring communities. Currently it takes approximately 30 days to review and process non- discretionary plans. Minor permits are issued in a much shorter time frame including “over-the-counter” approval and permit issuance for small interior and exterior alterations and the installation of household utilities such as water heaters. Additionally, the City allows separate grading and foundation permits before it issues building permits.

Planning Commission review and approval is required for discretionary permits such as Site Plan Review and Subdivisions.

The City requires a Site Plan Review permit/application for Single or Multi-Family residential projects involving more than 10 residential units (ESMC Chapter 15-25 – Site Plan Review). Subdivision permits/applications are not required by the City, but they are discretionary permits requiring Planning Commission review/approval. Only one public hearing is required before the Planning Commission for the review and approval of these types of discretionary permits. Once the City receives a complete application, the review and approval process takes approximately 6-8 weeks.

City Council approval is required for zone changes, general plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone text amendments and development agreements for projects regardless of size or number of units. The number of hearings/meetings for these types of discretionary permits is three: one public hearing by the Planning Commission, one public hearing by the City Council, and one public meeting by the City Council (consent agenda). Presented below are descriptions of processing procedures for typical single- and multi-family projects, including the type of permit, level of review, decision-making criteria and design review requirements. Once the City receives a complete application, the review and approval process takes approximately 8-12 weeks.

The Planning Commission and City Council public hearing process, which was recently reorganized, is described in ESMD Chapter 15-28 (See Ordinance 1629 pages 48-53).

Subdivision and Site Plan Review. The findings for Subdivision applications are found in ESMD Section 14-1-6. These findings are consistent with the State Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66474). Given that the City is built-out and the lot sizes are relatively small, subdivision requests, particularly those involving condominium units are approved routinely as long as the physical development conforms to all applicable development standards of the zone in which it is proposed. Requirements for off-site improvements and/or dedications are minimal, due to the fact that sidewalks, roadway, and utility infrastructure is largely in place and consistent with the City's General Plan requirements.

The findings for Site Plan Review applications are found in ESMD Section 15-25-4 (See ordinance 1629 page 45 of 57):

- The proposed development, including the general uses and the physical design of the development, is consistent with the General Plan;
- The proposed development, including the general uses and the physical design of the development, is consistent with the intent and general purpose of the [Municipal] Code and any applicable development agreement; and
- The proposed development, including the general uses and the physical design of the development, will not adversely affect the orderly and harmonious development of the area and the general welfare of the City.

These findings generally ensure that a proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, the applicable ESMD development standards, and the general welfare of the City. They are not intended to inhibit development, but rather ensure that new development has beneficial impact on the community. The finding relating to adverse impact to the area may be construed as subjective. However, given that the City is built-out and the lot sizes are relatively small, site plan review requests would be approved routinely as long as the physical development conforms to all applicable

development standards of the zone in which it is proposed. Nevertheless, this Housing Element includes an action to revise the findings to ensure they are objective and provide certainty in outcomes.

Requirements for off-site improvements and/or dedications are minimal, due to the fact that sidewalks, roadway, and utility infrastructure is largely in place and consistent with the City's General Plan requirements.

To facilitate residential development, the City may consider a ministerial subdivision process for projects involving 10 or fewer units.

SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS (R-1)

A single-family dwelling development requires approximately two to three weeks to approve from the time an applicant presents building plans to Community Development Department until a Building Permit is granted for the unit. A typical single-family dwelling only requires a building permit that conforms to all applicable development standards of the zone in which it is proposed. There is no other discretionary review required to issue the building permit unless a subdivision of land is involved. A subdivision of land is subject to the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and the ESMC regulations regarding subdivisions. There are no design review requirements for single-family dwellings in El Segundo.

MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS (CONDOMINIUMS OR TOWNHOMES) (R-2, R-3)

A multiple-family dwelling development (apartments or condominiums) requires approximately four to six weeks to approve from the time an applicant presents building plans to Community Development Department until a Building Permit is granted for the unit. A condominium project in El Segundo only requires a building permit if it conforms to all applicable development standards of the zone in which it is proposed. All condominium projects, however, do require a subdivision map. This process normally requires 6 to 8 weeks from the time the applicant submits a complete tentative map application until it is approved by the Planning Commission. There are no other discretionary review requirements. There are no design review requirements for multi-family development projects in El Segundo.

A multi-family residential project involving up to 10 units in El Segundo only requires a building permit if it conforms to all applicable development standards of the zone in which it is proposed (ministerial approval). This only requires approximately 30 working days to approve from the time an applicant presents building plans to Community Development Department until a Building Permit is granted for the unit. All condominium projects (regardless of size or number of units), however, do require a subdivision map. In addition, as mentioned above, all residential development projects involving more than 10 units require a Site Plan Review permit/application. The subdivision and Site Plan Review process normally requires 6 to 8 weeks from the time the applicant submits a complete application until it is approved by the Planning Commission. There are no design review requirements for multi-family development projects in El Segundo.

CARETAKER AND ABOVE-GROUND FLOOR UNITS

Caretaker units are permitted in conjunction with proposed development in the City's Smoky Hollow Specific Plan West (SH-W) and East (SH-E) zones. Above-ground floor units are permitted in the City's CRS, DSP, C-2, zones. Similar to multiple-family dwelling development, these units require approximately four to six weeks to approve from the time an applicant presents building plans to

Community Development Department until a building permit is granted for the unit. If the unit is to be owner-occupied, a subdivision map is required to be processed which usually requires 6 to 8 weeks from the time the applicant submits a complete tentative map application until it is approved by the Planning Commission. There are no design review requirements for caretaker units or above-ground floor units in El Segundo, except in the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). In addition, in 2010, the City enacted new parking regulations for caretaker units, reducing the required number of parking spaces from two spaces to one space. Residential units in the DSP Zone require 0.5 spaces per unit. The parking requirement was updated in 2017 through Ordinance 1549. Ordinance 1549 also removed the requirement that the occupant of the residential unit had to be the owner of the property or the owner of the business on the ground level.

9. On/Off-Site Improvement Requirements

The City is a completely built-out community with subdivision level on and off-site improvement requirements (such as street dedication requirements) already established on almost all major arterial, secondary, and local streets in the community. Where both sides of the street are served equally in residential areas, the common right-of-way width is 60 feet with a 36-foot pavement width. In multi-family areas where street parking is permitted, a minimum of 40 feet of right-of-way is required.

10. Coastal Zone

Approximately 50 acres within the City lies within the coastal zone. The area is a narrow strip, approximately 0.8 of mile wide and 200 yards in length. All of this area is zoned and has a land use designation of Heavy Industrial (M-2) and Open Space (O-S). The coastal zone is completely developed with a major electrical power generating station owned by El Segundo Power/Dynergy, a Marine Petroleum Transfer Terminal, owned by Chevron, and a Chevron automobile service station. Currently there is no residential development within the coastal zone. The General Plan, Zoning Code, and Local Coastal Plan do not allow residential development within the coastal zone. No changes are anticipated in the future which would allow the development of new residential uses in this area.

5. HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

This section of the Housing Element evaluates the potential for additional residential development that could occur in El Segundo and discusses opportunities for energy conservation in residential development.

B. AVAILABILITY OF SITES FOR HOUSING

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 City's regional share of housing. To determine whether the City has sufficient land to accommodate its share of regional housing needs for all income groups, the City must identify "adequate sites." Government Code § 65583 provides that 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. Compliance with this requirement is measured by the jurisdiction's ability to provide adequate land to accommodate the RHNA. SCAG is responsible for allocating the RHNA to individual jurisdictions within the region.

AB 1233 ANALYSIS

During the 5th Cycle Housing Element period, the City's RHNA was 69 units including 18 very low income units, 11 low income units, 12 moderate income units, and 28 above moderate income units. To accommodate the lower income RHNA, the City relied upon the 504 E. Imperial Avenue Specific Plan which initially included the development of 46 affordable income units. The 2013-2021 Housing Element committed to identifying replacement site should the number of affordable units provided in this Specific Plan fall short of the need to accommodate the RHNA. Ultimately, no lower income units were included as part of the 504 E. Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. In exchange, the City received an in-lieu payment of \$5.3 million. The City has retained Many Mansions to develop and implement the City's affordable housing strategy with this fund and other available resources. Pursuant to AB 1233, the City must carry forward the 29-unit lower income shortfall to the 6th cycle RHNA.

6TH CYCLE RHNA

For the 2021-2029 Housing Element update, the City is allocated a RHNA of 492, including 189 very low income and 88 low income units. The 2014-2021 shortfall requires the City to accommodate an additional 18 very low income and 11 low income units, for a total of 521 units. The City's RHNA is shown by income level in Table 5-1.

While the Housing Element covers the planning period of October 15, 2021 through October 15, 2029, the RHNA planning period is slightly different – June 30, 2021 through October 15, 2029 (i.e., 2021-2029 RHNA).

Table 5-1: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) 2021-2029

| Income Category | 5 th Cycle Carryover | 6 th Cycle RHNA | Total RHNA | Percent |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---------------|
| Extremely/Very Low Income* | 18 | 189 | 207 | 39.7% |
| Low Income* | 11 | 88 | 99 | 19.0% |
| Moderate Income | 0 | 84 | 84 | 16.1% |
| Above Moderate Income | 0 | 131 | 131 | 25.1% |
| Total | 29 | 492 | 521 | 100.0% |
| <p>Note: The City has a RHNA allocation of 207 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% of the very low income units as extremely low. Assuming an even split, the City’s RHNA allocation of 207 very low income units may be divided into 104 very low and 103 extremely low income units. However, for purposes of identifying adequate sites for the RHNA allocation, State law does not mandate the separate accounting for the extremely low income category.</p> <p>* Includes the 5th Cycle Housing Element shortfall of 18 extremely/very low and 11 low income units.</p> <p>Source: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), 6th Cycle Final RHNA Allocation Plan, 2021.</p> | | | | |

2. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

New State laws passed since 2017 have substantially relaxed the development standards and procedures for the construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). In response to AB 881, the City amended the ADU ordinance in 2019 to comply with new State law, including allowing for Junior ADUs. The City reviewed its Housing Element progress reports and determined that those reports contained only partial records. The City reviewed its permit records and confirmed the following ADU permitting trend:⁴

- 2018 – 17 ADUs
- 2019 – 12 ADUs
- 2020 – 22 ADUs
- 2021 – 9 ADUs
- 2022 (as of August) – 13 ADUs

The City’s ADU permit records averaged to 15 units annually. During 2020, the City continued to process ADU applications received prior to or at the beginning of COVID. However, the delayed impact of COVID resulted in lower ADU activities in 2021. The impacts of COVID on the building permit trends for regular residential unit construction tend to be different from the ADU permit trends. The primary reason is that ADU construction is by individual homeowners who are already living in place. There is no urgency to pursue ADU construction during COVID, and in fact many would prefer not to come into contact with non-household members (such as construction workers) at the home site (i.e., site of ADU). Whereas, regular residential construction is pursued by developers who would be financially impacted by any delays in construction (due to interest in construction loans, expiration of entitlements, uncertainties in the future housing market, etc.)

With the removal of social distancing requirements, ADU construction and other home remodeling activities are beginning to resume to regular levels. As of August 2022, the City has already issued

⁴ The City has submitted revised APRs that corrected its ADU activities.

building permits for 13 ADUs, indicating an upward trend of activities with a potential of 19 ADUs in 2022.

Therefore, the City projects an average of 15 ADUs annually. This Housing Element includes a program to proactively facilitate ADU development. Based on annual averages and increased City efforts, the City conservatively anticipates 120 ADUs during the eight-year planning period from 2021 and 2029. Affordability of the potential ADUs, shown in Table 5-2 is based on SCAG’s Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis as approved by HCD.

Table 5-2: Potential Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

| Income Category | ADUs | SCAG ADU Affordability |
|--|------------|------------------------|
| Extremely Low | 18 | 15.0% |
| Very Low | 2 | 2.0% |
| Low | 52 | 43.0% |
| Moderate | 7 | 6.0% |
| Above Moderate | 41 | 34.0% |
| Total | 120 | 100.0% |
| Source: Income distribution based on SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis, 2020. | | |

3. Entitled Projects

203 RICHMOND STREET

The 203 Richmond Street project was approved by the Planning Commission on July 8, 2021. The project consists of one 0.24-acre parcel (4136-024-017) located at the, now closed, City jail and accompanying surface parking. The project includes the development of three above moderate income units. The 203 Richmond Street project is located in the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) with an allowed density of 12.5 units per acre. The site is bordered by DSP-zoned parcels to the north, east, and south, and R-3 zoned parcels to the west. This project is expected to be completed within the 6th cycle Housing Element planning period. The 203 Richmond Street project is detailed in Table 5-3.

209 RICHMOND STREET

This project is comprised of one market rate (above moderate) unit to be constructed at 209 Richmond Street. The Planning Commission approved the project on July 8, 2021. The project consists of two parcels (4136-024-008, 4136-024-009) totaling 0.16 acres. The project is located in the DSP zone and is currently used for retail. This project is detailed in Table 5-3.

Pacific Coast Commons

In April 2022, the City Council approved the Pacific Coast Common project that includes 263 units and 11,252 square feet of ground floor retail. Specifically, a total of 32 units (12 percent) will be set aside as affordable housing (29 low income and 3 very low income units). This project demonstrates that the feasibility of developing on excess surface parking, in this case for the Fairfield Inn and Suites and Aloft Hotel. The project involves also the demolition of the “food and beverage” building for Fairfield Inn and Suites. The site is currently being prepared for construction.

Table 5-3: Entitled Projects

| Parcel Number | Acres | Address | Zone | Allowed Density | Existing Use | Affordability | Total Capacity |
|--|-------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|---|----------------|
| 4136-024-017 | 0.24 | 203 Richmond St | DSP | 12.5 | Old City Jail/ Open-air parking lot | Above Moderate | 3 |
| 4136-024-008; 4136-024-009 | 0.16 | 209 Richmond St | DSP | 12.5 | Retail (Haydenshapes Surfboards) | Above Moderate | 1 |
| 4139-025-073 4139-025-074 4139-025-075 4139-025-076 4139-024-057 4139-024-058 | 3.3 | PCH and Holly Avenue | Pacific Coast Commons SP | 80.0 | Surface parking for the Fairfield Inn & Suites and Aloft Hotels, and a vacated restaurant | Above Moderate Low Very Low | 263 |

4. Remaining RHNA Obligations

Accounting for entitled projects and projected ADUs, the City has a remaining RHNA of 279 units, primarily in the lower and moderate income categories.

Table 5-4: Remaining RHNA Obligations

| Income Category | Total RHNA (from Table 5-1) | Projected ADUs | Entitled Projects | Remaining RHNA |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Extremely/Very Low Income | 207 | 20 | 3 | 184 |
| Low Income | 99 | 52 | 29 | 18 |
| Moderate Income | 84 | 7 | 0 | 77 |
| Above Moderate Income | 131 | 41 | 235 | 0 |
| Total | 521 | 120 | 267 | 279 |

5. Residential Sites Inventory

An important component of the El Segundo Housing Element is the identification of sites for future housing development, and an evaluation of the adequacy of those sites in fulfilling the City’s share of regional housing needs. To accomplish this, all city parcels were surveyed to determine their development capacity. Due to the lack of vacant and underutilized sites in El Segundo, the City has selected candidate sites for rezoning. Each site was analyzed in light of the development standards for its proposed zoning designation. All parcels in El Segundo were evaluated through a process of elimination based on required criteria set by the State (HCD).

Sites are selected for rezoning to one of the following designations:

- Housing Overlay (HO) with a density range of 60 to 70 units per acre
- Mixed Use Overlay (MU-O) with a density range of 75 to 85 units per acre

METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING MIXED USE SITES

The following methodology was used to select candidate rezone sites in the City:

- The analysis was conducted by a combination of the City's GIS system, Google Earth, a windshield field survey, and staff knowledge
- Sites with viable uses and newer buildings not likely to be redeveloped within the next 8 years were screened out.
- Sites without a realistic development capacity and site suitability were screened out.
- The City uses the following criteria to determine realistic capacity and site suitability according to:
 - City's zoning code and policy
 - Lot size
 - Environmental constraints and adequate infrastructure
 - Development trends
- Sites were analyzed based on proximity to existing high opportunity areas (schools, parks, retail, services, transit, etc.), mixed-used potential, sites with obsolete uses (sites for lease) that have the potential for redevelopment, and substandard or irregular lots that could be consolidated.

In addition to the site conditions described above, locational advantages such as the following are also considered:

2. Within ¼ mile from school
3. Within ¼ mile from parks
4. Within ¼ mile from religious institution
5. Within ¼ mile from healthcare facility
6. Within ¼ mile from grocery store
7. Within ¼ mile from fire station
8. ¼ mile from police department

Candidate Rezone Sites for Mixed Use Overlay (MU-O)

The City has selected four candidate rezone sites (comprising of 14 parcels, 4.47 acres). The sites will be rezoned as Mixed Use Overlay (MU-O). Currently, the sites are zoned for commercial, parking, and office uses but are considered significantly underutilized based on low existing Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and have not gone through improvements for many years. Mostly these parcels are currently used for parking. One site (703 N. PCH) has a recently submitted application for the development of 60 units, including 10 lower income units. For the remaining three sites, using a minimum density of 75 units per acre, these parcels can accommodate another 286 housing units. A complete list of the current and proposed general plan and zoning designations are included in Table 5-6. Parcels are grouped based on the potential for consolidation and the potential income distribution of RHNA sites using a conservative assumption compared to allowable under state law.

Table 5-5: Candidate Sites for Rezoning to Mixed Use Overlay

| Site ID | Parcel Number | Acres | Address | Current GP | Current Zone | Proposed GP | Proposed Zone | Min. Density | Max. Density | Existing non-res. sf | Description | Total Capacity Based on Minimum Density |
|---------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 1 | 4139-017-040 | 1.83 | 835 N Pacific Coast Highway | Corporate Office | CO | Mixed Use Overlay | MU-O | 75 | 85 | 10,283 | <p>Existing use is a small bank with larger parking space. Regionwide, banking services have increasingly moved to online and many bank branches are consolidating or closing.</p> <p>This site is located within two blocks from Pacific Coast Commons, a high-density residential project that involves the redevelopment of parcels with similar conditions. This site is also located within proximity to another similar site at 703 N PCH (Site 2) where there is expressed interest from developers.</p> <p>Year Built: 1980 Existing FAR: 0.14 ILR: 0.06 Site meets 3 of 7 public services/amenities criteria: 1/4 mile from park, religious, and healthcare facilities.</p> | 137 |

Table 5-5: Candidate Sites for Rezoning to Mixed Use Overlay

| Site ID | Parcel Number | Acres | Address | Current GP | Current Zone | Proposed GP | Proposed Zone | Min. Density | Max. Density | Existing non-res. sf | Description | Total Capacity Based on Minimum Density |
|---------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 2 | 4139-018-001 | 0.68 | 703 N Pacific Coast Highway | General Commercial | C-3 | Mixed Use Overlay | MU-O | 75 | 85 | 7,270 | This site has an application under review. The project proposes to build 60 units, including 10 low income units over a 14,000-square-foot commercial ground floor. Year Built: 1957 Existing FAR: 0.24 ILR: 0.14 | 60 |
| 3 | 4139-018-002 | 0.33 | 739 N Pacific Coast Highway | General Commercial | C-3 | Mixed Use Overlay | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | Lot consolidation potential (4139-002 and -003) to create a 0.66-acre site that could accommodate affordable housing. Both lots are primarily vacant and there is expressed interest from developers Site meets 5 of 7 public service/amenities criteria: ¼ mile from school, park, religious facility, grocery, fire and police station. Year Built: 1958 Existing FAR: 0 ILR: 0 | 25 |
| | 4139-018-003 | 0.33 | 755 N Pacific Coast Highway | General Commercial | C-3 | Mixed Use Overlay | MU-O | 75 | 85 | 2,476 | Lot has as restaurant with large parking lot. See descriptions on 4139-018-002 Year Built: 1963 | 25 |

Table 5-5: Candidate Sites for Rezoning to Mixed Use Overlay

| Site ID | Parcel Number | Acres | Address | Current GP | Current Zone | Proposed GP | Proposed Zone | Min. Density | Max. Density | Existing non-res. sf | Description | Total Capacity Based on Minimum Density |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | Existing FAR: 0.17 ILR: 0.06 | |
| 4 | 4135-027-011 | 0.11 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | Privately owned lot that is accessible to the public as open space. Park is located next to an active oil well. Phase 1 Assessment will be required with potential need for remediation. Property is for sale and prospective buyers have inquired about potential to develop property as residential use. | 8 |
| | 4135-027-024 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-010 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-025 | 0.15 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 11 |
| | 4135-027-009 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-036 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-008 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-035 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-007 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| | 4135-027-034 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | Smoky Hollow SP | P | Smoky Hollow SP | MU-O | 75 | 85 | NA | | 10 |
| Total | | 4.47 | | | | | | | | | 346 | |

Table 5-6: Lot Consolidation and Income Level Distribution

| Consol. | Parcel Number | Acres | Address | Lower Income | Moderate Income | Above Moderate Income | Total Capacity |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 4139-017-040 | 1.83 | 835 Pacific Coast Highway | 55 | 41 | 41 | 137 |
| 2 | 4139-018-001 | 0.68 | 703 N Pacific Coast Highway | 10 | 0 | 50 | 60 |
| 3 | 4139-018-002 | 0.33 | 739 N Pacific Coast Highway | 10 | 8 | 7 | 25 |
| | 4139-018-003 | 0.33 | 755 N Pacific Coast Highway | 10 | 8 | 7 | 25 |
| 4 | 4135-027-011 | 0.11 | Wiley Park | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| | 4135-027-024 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-010 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-025 | 0.15 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| | 4135-027-009 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-036 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-008 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-035 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-007 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| | 4135-027-034 | 0.13 | Wiley Park | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| Total | | 4.47 | | 124 | 86 | 136 | 346 |

Figure 5-1: Candidate Rezone Sites as Mixed Use Overlay



METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING HOUSING OVERLAY SITES

In addition to sites that may be rezoned to mixed use, the City has also identified areas that are currently designated Multi-Family Residential (R-3 zoning) to be rezoned with a Housing Overlay (HO), allowing a density range of 60 to 70 units per acre (see Figure 5-2). The R-3 zone currently allows up to 27 units per acre and the Housing Overlay covers 723 parcels totaling 405 acres.

In the last few years, the City has begun to see the intensification of the R-3 neighborhoods:

- 137-151 Virginia Street – 10-unit project (demolition of six existing units)
- 125-131 West Palm Avenue – four-unit project (demolition of one existing unit)
- 335 Penn Street – three-unit project (demolition of one existing unit)
- 231 Virginia Street - three-unit project (demolition of one existing unit)
- 535-541 Indiana Street - four-unit project (demolition of one existing unit)
- 535 Richmond Street – two-unit project (demolition of one existing unit)
- 701-705 West Maple Street – six-unit project
- 224 Whiting Avenue - three-unit project (demolition of two existing units)

The City retained a consultant to evaluate the potential rezoning of multi-family (R-3 zoning) to promote their redevelopment and production of new housing units. The consultant's study (Study) provides economic analysis of the value of existing R-3 properties based on current rents as compared to the value of the underlying land if developed at various densities and with various affordability standards. The Study concludes a key finding that in order for a developer to feasibly acquire and redevelop a typical existing R-3 property, the land would need to be upzoned to allow a density of 68 units per acre and development standards (including height, lot coverage, and parking) would need to be revised. In total 723 R-3 parcels totaling about 400 acres are proposed to be rezoned to Housing Overlay (HO).


Given the interest in redeveloping these older neighborhoods and intensifying existing parcels that are developed with duplex, triplex, or fourplex structures, the City is proposing to create a Housing Overlay (HO) that increases the allowable density to a range of 60 to 70 units per acre. To identify potential parcels available for intensification, the following steps were performed:

- Exclude parcels that are currently developed with condominiums and townhomes. Such properties are unlikely to redevelop due to financial feasibility and difficulty in assembling parcels with fragmented ownership.
- Parcel is at least 0.5 acre, unless it is contiguous with other parcels to form a larger site.
- Based on the minimum density of 60 units per acre, exclude the parcels that would have a net yield that is less than 200 percent of the existing number of units on site. For example, if a parcel has five existing units, the potential number of units needs to be at least 15 (net yield of ten units or 200 percent) to be considered a potential property for redevelopment. This assumption is based on the recent recycling trend noted previously.

This analysis effectively reduced the parcels with near-term redevelopment potential in the Multi-Family Residential R-3 zone to seven parcels (5.16 acres), including five parcels that are currently

developed with nonconforming, nonresidential uses built during 1950s and 1960s. The nonconforming uses are not permitted to be redeveloped as other nonresidential uses and expansion is not permitted. Based on the existing underutilized conditions (age of structure, low existing FAR, and low improvement-to-land value ratio) and the significantly increased density (from 27 du/ac to 70 du/ac), the potential redevelopment of these properties can be financially attractive.

Figure 5-2: R-3 Rezone Sites for Housing Overlay



-  Housing Overlay
-  R3 Zoning
-  Parcels
-  City Boundary

City of El Segundo R3 Zoning with Housing Overlay

0 1,000 2,000
US Feet



Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS, FEMA, City of El Segundo, County of Los Angeles, California State Parks, Esri, HERE, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS, Bureau of Land Management, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA

Figure 5-3: Potential Redevelopment Sites in Housing Overlay




Table 5-7: Potential Re-developable Sites in Housing Overlay

| APN | Address | Existing Use | Acre | Potential Units (Based on Minimum 60 du/ac) | Extg Units | Net Yield | Lower Income | Moderate Income | Above Moderate Income |
|--------------|--------------------|--|------|---|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 4135-022-035 | 205 Lomita St | Churches – St. Anthony Pre-School. City contacted the Archdiocese (property owner), which has no objection to be included in the sites inventory. The elementary school on the property closed a few years ago and has no plan to reopen. Year Built: 1957 Existing FAR: 0.15 ILR: 0.29 | 2.84 | 170 | 0 | 170 | 68 | 51 | 51 |
| 4136-022-033 | 710 E. Grand Ave | Churches – St. Anthony’s Catholic Church. While the church will likely remain, the housing density can be transferred to the pre-school site based on common ownership. The existing unit is used as a pre-school, not as a residential unit. Year Built: 1957 Existing FAR: 0.23 ILR: 0.17 | 0.68 | 41 | 1 | 40 | 16 | 12 | 12 |
| 4132-001-018 | 514 W Imperial Ave | 514 W Imperial and 546 W Imperial are owned by the Moose Lodge. Nonconforming use - the property is underutilized and has a large parking lot. Year Built: 1962 Existing FAR: 0.37 ILR: 0.58 | 0.54 | 33 | 0 | 33 | 13 | 10 | 10 |
| 4132-001-035 | 546 W Imperial Ave | | 0.12 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

Table 5-7: Potential Re-developable Sites in Housing Overlay

| APN | Address | Existing Use | Acre | Potential Units (Based on Minimum 60 du/ac) | Extg Units | Net Yield | Lower Income | Moderate Income | Above Moderate Income |
|--------------|---------------------|--|-------------|---|------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 4139-011-036 | 1300 E Imperial Ave | Nonconforming uses on both parcels - Light Manufacturing; small shops in similar underutilized condition. | 0.37 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 4139-011-037 | 1306 E Imperial Ave | 4139-011-036 Year Built: 1960 Existing FAR: 0.31 ILR: 0.82 4139-011-037 Year Built: 1960 Existing FAR: 0.50 ILR: 0.49 | 0.37 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 4135-017-900 | 210 Penn St | This vacant site is owned by the School District. The City contacted the District, which has no objection to be included in the sites inventory. | 0.64 | 38 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 11 | 12 |
| Total | | | 5.56 | 333 | 1 | 332 | 133 | 100 | 99 |

REUSING SITES FROM 5TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT

There are no vacant sites in the sites inventory. While some nonvacant sites included in the list of candidate sites for rezoning have been previously identified in the 5th cycle Housing Element, these sites are being proposed for rezone and therefore are considered “new” sites. These rezone sites are subject to by-right approval if the project includes 20 percent lower income units.

SMALL LOT DEVELOPMENT AND LOT CONSOLIDATION

Of particular interest in El Segundo is the large number of very small residentially-zoned parcels in the City. While it may be possible to build housing on a very small parcel, the nature and conditions necessary to construct the units often render the provision of affordable housing infeasible. For example, assisted housing developments utilizing State or federal financial resources typically include 50-80 units. Despite this, there are opportunities in the City where lot consolidation could provide greater potential for the development of units that would be affordable to lower-income households. To facilitate lot consolidation, the City has expanded Program 7 during the 2013-2021 Housing Element to facilitate development on small lot sites as well as underutilized sites. This includes the granting of development incentives (such as modified parking, lot coverage, open space, and setback standards) to encourage development of these lots. Consolidation of lots will also be encouraged through the on-going identification of those lots in the City’s inventory that offer the best possibility for consolidation to achieve greater building density and affordability.

Site 3 in the Mixed Use Overlay (739 and 755 N. Pacific Coast Highway) consists of two lots that are used primarily as open parking. The adjacent parcel 703 N. Pacific Coast Highway has recently been sold to a developer. An application for 60 units (including 10 lower income units) has already been filed. Site 3 parcels are all under one owner, with the potential for a similar development as the adjacent property.

In the Housing Overlay, 514 and 546 W. Imperial are adjacent parcels under one owner. Also 1300 and 1306 E. Imperial are two contiguous parcels in similar underutilized conditions. All these four parcels contain nonconforming uses. The significant increase in allowable density will make redevelopment financially attractive.

LOT CONSOLIDATION TREND AND REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

The City is primarily built out and many existing parcels are small. Therefore, residential development often involves consolidating small lots to facilitate a large development.

The Pacific Coast Commons project involves consolidation and reconfiguration of 16 legal lots into 6 ground lots for the purpose of developing 231 above moderate and 32 affordable units (29 low and 3 very low). The residential density of this project is approximately 90 units per acre. The project involves a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (among other entitlements) to implement the above-described lot consolidation/reconfiguration. The project was approved by the City Council in April 2022.

The 1160-1170 East Mariposa Avenue project, not included in the City’s sites inventory, involves consolidation of 5 lots into 1 (1.44-acre) lot and addition of six new residential units to a neighborhood shopping center. Staff has met with the property owner to review a proposed site plan and discussed potential reduction in parking requirements to accommodate the project.

The Downtown Specific Plan is currently being updated. One of the goals of this update is to provide for additional housing in the City. Through the process the City will identify (strategic) sites where additional residential density could be accomplished. The City is in the early stages of public outreach and existing conditions analysis.

COMPARISON OF SITES INVENTORY AND RHNA

The City can accommodate 1,065 additional housing units through ADUs, entitled projects, and its inventory of candidate rezone sites. This capacity is more than adequate to accommodate the City’s 2021-2029 RHNA of 492 units and the carryover of 29 units from the 5th cycle. The combination of ADUs, entitled projects, and candidate rezone sites can accommodate a total of 361 lower income units, 193 moderate income units, and 511 above moderate income units. The sites inventory provides an adequate buffer for the RHNA. Table 5-8 provides a summary of the City’s available sites and RHNA status.

Table 5-8: Comparison of Sites Inventory and RHNA

| | Lower | Moderate | Above Moderate | Total |
|---|------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| Overall RHNA (Including 5 th Cycle Carryover) | 306 | 84 | 131 | 521 |
| ADUs | 72 | 7 | 41 | 120 |
| Entitled Projects | 32 | 0 | 235 | 267 |
| Rezoning | | | | |
| Mixed Use Overlay | 124 | 86 | 136 | 346 |
| Housing Overlay | 133 | 100 | 99 | 332 |
| Total Capacity | 361 | 193 | 511 | 1,065 |
| Surplus/Shortfall | 55 | 109 | 380 | 544 |
| | 18% | 130% | 290% | 104% |
| Note: State HCD recommends a sites inventory with a buffer for that is at least 15-30%, especially for lower income RHNA. | | | | |

6. Availability of Infrastructure and Services

As the City is an urbanized community, all sites identified in the Housing Element have access to water and sewer services.

WATER

Water service in the City is provided by the City of El Segundo’s Water Division, which is a partner of the West Basin Municipal Water District (WBMWD). The WBMWD provides wholesale potable water to 17 cities, serving approximately 900,000 people. According to the West Basin Municipal Water District’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), water supply in the City in 2020 consists of: 19 percent groundwater; 52 percent imported water; 12 percent recycled water; 17 percent water conservation savings; and less than one percent desalinated water. The City has an Urban Water Management Plan, which it updates every 5 years. The City’s UWMP must be updated every 5 years, and the City is in the process of preparing the 2020 UWMP.

According to the City’s most recent 12-month water consumption figures, El Segundo utilizes approximately 9,000-acre feet of potable water annually. The City of El Segundo projected water supply for 2035 is 17,750-acre feet per year (AFY), and the current projected demand for water supply in 2035 during a single dry year is 17,250 AFY. Implementation of the Housing Element would result in an additional net water demand ranging from 232.6 to 253.2 AFY (see Estimated Water Demand table below), which would be within the single dry year supply.

Table 5-9: Estimated Water Demand

| Land Use | Size (parcel) | Average Daily Demand Rate ^a (gpd/parcel) | Average Daily Demand (AFY) | Total Adjusted Demand (AFY) ^b |
|---|---------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| Residential - Minimum Density | 1,065 | 260 | 310.17 | 232.62 |
| Residential - Maximum Density | 1,159 | 260 | 337.54 | 253.16 |
| Notes: gpd = gallons per day ^a The average daily demand is based on 100 percent of County of Los Angeles Sanitation District average wastewater generation factors. Assumed all units were single-family. ^b Water demand would be reduced by 25% by utilizing water-saving fixtures in accordance with CALGreen. | | | | |

WASTEWATER

Wastewater in the City is treated by the Sanitation District of Los Angeles County (the Sanitation District) at two facilities: the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) and the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). Sewer flow from the City’s residential area, west of Pacific Coast Highway, goes to the Hyperion Plant in the City of Los Angeles for treatment. Sewer flow from the commercial area of the City, east of Pacific Coast Highway, goes to the County Sanitation District JWPCP for treatment. El Segundo’s residential area’s most recent 12-month sewer flow figures to Hyperion Plant average approximately 1.3 MGD. The City’s agreement with the City of Los Angeles permits an average flow of 2.75 MGD of sewer treatment and disposal capacity in the Hyperion system. The addition of 1,165 new housing units would generate approximately 0.3 MGD (see Estimated Wastewater Generation table below), which would bring the total residential wastewater flow to 1.6 MGD, well below the maximum permitted under the City’s agreement with the City of Los Angeles. New housing development can be accommodated through potential offsite water and/or sewer improvements without making much difference to overall citywide demand. Therefore, adequate remaining capacity is available to accommodate the City’s RHNA obligations of 521 units through 2029.

Table 5-10: Estimated Wastewater Generation

| Land Use | Size (parcel) | Average Daily Generation Rate ^a (gpd/parcel) | Average Daily Generation (gpd) |
|--|---------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Residential - Minimum Density | 1,065 | 260 | 276,900 |
| Residential - Maximum Density | 1,159 | 260 | 301,340 |
| Notes: gpd = gallons per day ^a The average daily demand is based on 100 percent of County of Los Angeles Sanitation District average wastewater generation factors. Assumed all units were single-family. | | | |

The City will provide a copy of the adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element to its water and sewer service providers, reaffirming their policy to provide priority allocation to affordable housing developments, as required by State law, should a rationing system is instituted.

C. OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

As residential energy costs rise, increasing utility costs reduce the affordability of housing. The City has many opportunities to directly affect energy use within its jurisdiction. Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations Code sets forth mandatory energy standards for new development and requires adoption of an “energy budget.” The following are among the alternative ways to meet these energy standards:

Alternative 1: The passive solar approach, which requires proper solar orientation, appropriate levels of thermal mass, south facing windows, and moderate insulation levels.

Alternative 2: Generally requires higher levels of insulation than Alternative 1, but has no thermal mass or window orientation requirements.

Alternative 3: Also is without passive solar design but requires active solar water heating in exchange for less stringent insulation and/or glazing requirements.

In turn, the home building industry must comply with these standards while localities are responsible for enforcing the energy conservation regulations. Some additional opportunities for energy conservation include various passive design techniques. Among the range of techniques that could be used for purposes of reducing energy consumption are the following:

- Locating the structure on the northern portion of the sunniest portion of the site;
- Designing the structure to admit the maximum amount of sunlight into the building and to reduce exposure to extreme weather conditions; and
- Locating indoor areas of maximum usage along the south face of the building and placing corridors, closets, laundry rooms, power core, and garages along the north face to the building to serve as a buffer between heated spaces and the colder north face.

1. Insulation and Weatherproofing

Most homes in El Segundo are greater than 30 years old. Therefore, to conserve the heat generated by older heating units and minimize the heat loss ratio, the earlier-built homes in El Segundo can be insulated in the attic space and exterior walls. Windows and exterior doors, in these less recent homes, can be fitted with air-tight devices or caulking, or can be replaced with the more energy efficient (dual pane) windows and doors that now available.

2. Natural Lighting

Daytime interior lighting costs can be significantly reduced or eliminated with the use of properly designed and located skylights. Skylights/solar tubes can be easily installed at reasonable expense in existing houses, thereby substantially reducing electricity costs and energy consumption.

3. Solar Energy

Implementing solar energy strategies, noted above, is a practical, cost effective, and environmentally sound way to heat and cool a home. In California, with its plentiful year-round sunshine, the potential uses of solar energy are numerous. With proper building designs, this resource provides for cooling in the summer and heating in the winter; it can also heat water for domestic use and swimming pools and generate electricity.

Unlike oil or natural gas, solar energy is an unlimited resource which will always be available. Once a solar system is installed, the only additional costs are for the maintenance or replacement of the system itself. The user is not subject to unpredictable fuel price increases. Moreover, solar energy can be utilized without any serious safety or environmental concerns.

Solar heating and cooling systems are of three general types: passive, active, or a combination thereof. In passive solar systems, the building structure itself is designed to collect the sun's energy, then store and circulate the resulting heat similar to a green house. Passive buildings are typically designed with a southerly orientation to maximize solar exposure, and constructed with dense materials such as concrete or adobe to better absorb the heat. Properly placed windows and overhanging eaves also contribute to keeping a house cool.

Active systems collect and store solar energy in panels attached to the exterior of a house. This type of system utilizes mechanical fans or pumps to circulate the warm/cool air, while heated water can flow directly into a home's hot water system.

Although passive systems generally maximize use of the sun's energy and are less costly to install, active systems have greater potential application to both cool and heat the house and provide hot water. This may mean lower energy costs for El Segundo residents presently dependent on conventional fuels. The City should also encourage the use of passive solar systems in new residential construction to improve energy efficiency for its citizens.

4. Water Conservation

Simple water conservation techniques can save a family thousands of gallons of water per year, plus many dollars in water and associated energy consumption costs. Many plumbing products are now available which eliminate unnecessary water waste by restricting the volume of water flow from faucets, showerheads, and toilets. In this regard, the City will continue to require the incorporation of low flow plumbing fixtures into the design of all new residential units.

The use of plant materials in residential landscaping that are well adapted to the climate in the El Segundo area, and the use of ample mulch to retain soil moisture, can measurably contribute to water conservation by reducing the need for irrigation, much of which is often lost through evaporation. A family can also save water by simply fixing dripping faucets and using water more conservatively. In addition, such conservation practices save on gas and electricity needed to heat water and the sewage

system facilities needed to treat it. By encouraging residents to conserve water and retrofit existing plumbing fixtures with water saving devices, the City can greatly reduce its water consumption needs and expenses.

5. Energy Audits

The Southern California Edison Company provides energy audits to local residents on request. Many citizens are not aware of this program. The City can aid in expanding this program by supplying the public with pertinent information regarding the process including the appropriate contacts. Energy audits are extremely valuable in pinpointing specific areas in residences, which are responsible for energy losses. The inspections also result in specific recommendations to remedy energy inefficiency.

6. New Construction

The City of El Segundo will continue to require the incorporation of energy conserving (i.e., Energy Star) appliances, fixtures, and other devices into the design of new residential units. The City will also continue to review new subdivisions to ensure that each lot optimizes proper solar access and orientation to the extent possible. The City will also continue to require the incorporation of low flow plumbing fixtures into the design of all new residential units.

7. South Bay Environmental Services Center

The South Bay Environmental Services Center (SBESC) partners with local agencies, including the City of El Segundo and local utility providers. The SBESC acts as a central clearinghouse for energy efficiency information and resources. The purpose of the organization is to help significantly increase the availability of information and resources to the people in the South Bay region to help them save water, energy, money, and the environment. The SBESC assists public agencies, 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. It recently expanded their services through implementation of an Energy Efficiency Plus (EE+) program to deliver energy savings to local public agencies, including the City of El Segundo.

8. Green Building Program

The City implements a Green Building Program that encourages homeowners and building professionals to incorporate green building design in construction activities through the use of “green” building materials. This can be accomplished by referencing the City’s Home Remodeling Green Building Guidelines and implementing green measures into a home remodeling project.

Green buildings are sited, designed, constructed and operated to enhance the wellbeing of occupants, and to minimize negative impacts to the community and the natural environment.

The five components of green design included in the program are:

- Implementing sustainable site planning;
- Safeguarding water and water efficiency;
- Ensuring energy efficiency and employing renewable energy;
- Using conservation of materials and resources; and
- Providing indoor environmental quality

9. Environmental Action Plan and El Segundo Environmental Committee

The El Segundo Environmental Committee addresses a broad range of environmental issues facing the City of El Segundo. The Environmental Committee reviews existing City environmental programs and recommends new green policies and programs to the City Council. El Segundo has many accomplishments and has received awards for its accomplishments in the areas of conservation and environmental sustainability.

6. HOUSING PLAN

A. HOUSING GOALS AND POLICIES

This section of the Housing Element includes the housing goals and policies of the City of El Segundo currently in the adopted Housing Element. The City intends to continue to implement these goals to address a number of important housing-related issues. Some policies, however, have been modified from the adopted Housing Element to address current housing issues, the new RHNA, and requirements of State Housing Element Law applicable to the current planning period. These revised policies are presented in this section.

The following five major issue areas are addressed by the goals and policies of the current Housing Element. These same goals are proposed to be carried over to this Housing Element. Several policies, however, have been changed or updated to reflect current housing issues and these are presented in this section.

- Conserving and improving the condition of the existing affordable housing stock;
- Assisting in the development of affordable housing;
- Providing adequate sites to achieve a diversity of housing;
- Removing governmental constraints, as necessary; and
- Affirmatively furthering fair housing.

CONSERVING EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, about 90 percent of El Segundo's housing units are more than 30 years old, the age at which a housing unit will typically begin to require major repairs. This represents a significant proportion of the City's housing stock, and indicates that programs which assist with preventive maintenance may be necessary to avoid housing deterioration.

GOAL 1: PRESERVE AND PROTECT THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK BY ENCOURAGING THE REHABILITATION OF DETERIORATING DWELLING UNITS AND THE CONSERVATION OF THE CURRENTLY SOUND HOUSING STOCK.

Policy 1.1: Continue to promote the use of rehabilitation assistance programs to encourage property owners to rehabilitate owner-occupied and rental housing where feasible.

Policy 1.2: Encourage investment of public and private resources to foster neighborhood improvement.

Policy 1.3: Encourage the maintenance of sound owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing.

Policy 1.4: Continue to promote sound attenuation improvements to the existing housing stock.

ASSISTING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

There is a range of household types in El Segundo that need housing to fit their particular circumstances. For example, the housing needs assessment indicates there may be a need for additional senior housing in El Segundo. The City seeks to expand the range of housing opportunities, including those for low- and moderate income first-time homebuyers, seniors on fixed incomes, extremely low-, very low-, low, and moderate-income residents, the disabled, military personnel, and the homeless.

GOAL 2: PROVIDE SUFFICIENT NEW, AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE CITY TO MEET THE NEEDS OF GROUPS WITH SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS, INCLUDING THE NEEDS OF LOWER AND MODERATE- INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Policy 2.1: Provide regulations, as required by California Law, to facilitate additional housing and develop programs to serve special needs groups (including persons with developmental disabilities).

Policy 2.2: Facilitate the creation of affordable housing opportunities for extremely low, very low and low- income households.

Policy 2.3: Provide an allowance in the City's zoning regulations, as required by California Law, to permit transitional/supportive housing facilities as residential uses and emergency shelters in commercial zones.

PROVIDING ADEQUATE SITES

Provision of adequate sites through land use planning and development regulations to accommodate the City's housing needs is a key purpose of the Housing Element.

GOAL 3: PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEW HOUSING CONSTRUCTION IN A VARIETY OF LOCATIONS AND A VARIETY OF DENSITIES.

Policy 3.1: Provide for the construction of adequate housing in order to meet the goals of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).

Policy 3.2: Facilitate the development of properties designated for multi-family use that currently contains single-family development for multi-family residential development.

Policy 3.3: Facilitate development on vacant and underdeveloped property designated as residential or mixed use to accommodate a diversity of types, prices and tenure.

Policy 3.4: Permit accessory dwelling units pursuant to State law.

REMOVING GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

In addition to the private sector, actions by the City and other governmental regulations can have an impact on the price and availability of housing. Land use controls, site improvement requirements, building codes, fees, and other local programs intended to improve the overall quality of housing may serve as a constraint to housing development.

GOAL 4: REMOVE GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

Policy 4.1: Continue to allow second units, condominium conversions, caretaker units and second floor residential use in commercial zones as specified in the El Segundo Municipal Code.

Policy 4.2: Continue to allow factory-produced housing according to the El Segundo Municipal Code.

Policy 4.3: Facilitate timely development processing for residential construction projects and expedite the project review process.

Policy 4.4: Facilitate provision of infrastructure to accommodate residential development.

AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

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.

GOAL 5: PROVIDE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES INCLUDING OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL, FAIR-MARKET AND ASSISTED, IN CONFORMANCE WITH OPEN HOUSING POLICIES AND FREE OF DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES.

Policy 5.1: Disseminate and provide information on fair housing laws and practices to the community.

Policy 5.2: Promote City efforts to provide equal opportunity housing for existing and projected demands in El Segundo.

B. HOUSING PROGRAMS

The goals and policies contained in the City's Housing Element address El Segundo's identified housing needs and are being implemented through a series of on-going housing programs and activities. The housing programs introduced on the following pages include past programs that are currently in operation and new programs which have been added to address the City's unmet housing needs and to fulfill the requirements of California Housing Element law.

CONSERVING AND IMPROVING EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PROGRAM 1: RESIDENTIAL SOUND INSULATION (RSI)

This program provides eligible property owners a means of having improvements made to their residential property to reduce the impacts of noise from Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to the interior habitable portions of the residence(s). This program was previously suspended due to lack of funding. However, as of October 2022, the RSI program will resume and will be administered directly by Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). LAWA recently initiated outreach to eligible owners in El Segundo.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Beginning in 2023 and annually thereafter, coordinate with LAWA to assist in outreaching to eligible owners in El Segundo. Assist 200 households annually.

Funding Source: LAWA – Sound Insulation Grant

Responsible Agency: LAWA and Community Development Department/Housing Division

PROGRAM 2: CODE COMPLIANCE INSPECTION PROGRAM

The Community Development Department of El Segundo maintains statistics pertaining to Code compliance inspections and monitors housing conditions throughout the City. The Department responds to violations brought to its attention on a case-by-case basis. Although Code violations in the City are limited, early detection and resolution are essential in preventing the deterioration of residential neighborhoods.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Continue to conduct inspections on a complaint basis through the City’s Community Development Department and Neighborhood Preservation Officer

Funding Source: General Fund

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Neighborhood Preservation officer

ASSIST IN THE PRODUCTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PROGRAM 3: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU)

The City amended its ADU ordinance in 2020 to comply with recent changes to State law and has experienced increased interest and ADU construction activity. ADUs represent an important potential resource for affordable housing in El Segundo. To facilitate ADU development, the City will consider the following:

- Provide technical and resources guides online and pre-approved plans.
- Pursue State funding available to assist lower- and moderate-income homeowners in the construction of ADUs and/or to provide grants in exchange for deed restriction as low-income use.
- Conduct increased outreach and education on ADU options and requirements.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Develop incentives and tools to facilitate ADU construction by the end of 2023, with the goal of achieving 120 ADUs in eight years. Incentives include pre-approved plans and creating an ADU calculator to estimate costs of development in El Segundo. The City is also participating in a REAP-funded project administered by the South Bay Council of Governments to accelerate ADU production.
- In 2022, update City website to provide information of ADU resources, such as grants available to homeowners for ADU construction from the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA).
- Beginning in 2022 and annually thereafter, pursue available funding to facilitate ADU construction, including affordable ADUs.

- Monitor ADU construction trends in 2024 to determine if adjustments to incentives and tools are necessary to meet the City’s projected goal. Make necessary adjustments to incentives and tools within six months.

Funding Source: General Fund

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

PROGRAM 4: INCLUSIONARY HOUSING ORDINANCE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY

The City seeks to proactively encourage and facilitate the development of affordable housing for lower income households, particularly those with special needs including seniors, large households, extremely low-income (ELI) households, and households with persons who have disabilities (including developmental disabilities). To facilitate affordable housing development, the City will:

- Provide technical assistance with Federal and State funding applications;
- Offer streamlined processing of permit applications;
- Waive or defer development fees;
- Consider reducing certain development standards (such as parking requirements); and/or
- Provide financial assistance to nonprofit developers to the extent possible.

The City is currently considering an inclusionary housing ordinance to include a 15 to 20 percent requirement with a potential in-lieu fee option. Once established, the ordinance will have the potential of creating affordable housing opportunities in the community and generating potential in-lieu fees to be deposited into the City’s Affordable Housing Fund. As of 2020, the City had allocated \$5.3 million to the Affordable Housing Fund.

On April 19, 2021, the City entered into an agreement with a consultant to assist in the City in the development of an Inclusionary Housing policy/ordinance. As of December 2021, the following tasks were completed:

- Conducted research on inclusionary housing policies in the South Bay region and statewide.
- Initiated community outreach, including contacting local for-profit developers, real estate brokers, and housing-related non-profit groups.
- Conducted a study session with the Planning Commission.
- Completed financial feasibility analysis for various development types.
- Conducted a study session with the City Council.

On February 16, 2021, the El Segundo City Council agreed to enter into an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) with Many Mansions to serve as the City’s Affordable Housing Services Provider to develop and manage affordable housing units, services, and programs. Many Mansions will be developing an Affordable Housing Strategic Plan to assist the City in meeting the needs of lower- and moderate-income residents and state-mandated affordable housing goals. On October 5, 2021, the City Council entered into a contract with Many Mansions to provide the following services:

- Finalize the City’s affordable housing goals and objectives.
- Recommend strategies to remove constraints and/or increase affordable housing.

- Create a list of high priority neighborhoods and/or sites based on the Housing Element, City recommendations, and Many Mansions’ expertise as an affordable housing developer.
- Solicit community feedback via a City-approved community engagement plan that includes at least two community workshops.
- Adopt Final Affordable Housing Strategic Plan (AHSP) with an emphasis on fulfilling the 6th cycle RHNA by summer 2023.
- Work with the City to identify properties with the potential for affordable housing development and existing rental properties that may be suitable for acquisition, rehabilitation, and conversion to City-restricted affordable housing projects.
- Assist the City with the ongoing monitoring and administration of affordable and/or senior housing units.

The Draft Strategic Plan (June 2022) outlines a number of recommendations, including:

- Exploring the creation of an inclusionary housing program (see action included in this program).
- Encouraging multi-family housing similar to that envisioned for the Mixed Use Overlay in the Downtown Specific Plan (see action included in Program 6: Provision of Adequate Sites).
- Focusing affordable housing efforts between Imperial, El Segundo Boulevard, and PCH (see action included in Program 6: Provision of Adequate Sites).
- Consider designating a Civic Center property as surplus land.
- Allowing multi-family consistent with the Mixed Use Overlay in all commercial zones (such as implementation of SB 2011 and AB 6).
- Exploring a religious institution overlay (see Housing Overlay that includes St. Anthony Church).
- Exploring obtaining a State Pro-Housing Designation.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Pending on the outcomes and recommendations of the feasibility study, establish the Inclusionary Housing program by 2025.
- Adopt Final Affordable Housing Strategic Plan by summer 2023 and implement the Affordable Housing Strategic Plan utilizing the services of Many Mansions.
- Establish written procedures to streamline affordable housing pursuant to SB 35 by the end of 2022.
- Continue to facilitate affordable housing development through incentives and technical assistance.

Funding Source: Affordable Housing Fund (\$5.3 million)

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Housing Division

PROGRAM 5: URBAN LOT SPLIT

The City adopted Ordinance 1633 to implement SB 9 (Urban Lot Split). The ordinance allows for urban lot splits to be approved administratively. The ordinance also has an inclusionary component that requires one unit per lot to be offered for sale or rent to households that fall in the moderate, low, and very low income categories.

Objectives and Timeline:

- By summer 2023, develop checklist for SB 9 application.
- **Funding Source:** Affordable Housing Fund
- **Responsible Agency:** Community Development Department/Planning Division

PROVIDING ADEQUATE SITES

A key element in satisfying the housing needs of all segments of the community is the provision of adequate sites for all types, sizes and prices of housing. Both the general plan and zoning regulations identify where housing may be located, thereby affecting the supply of land available for housing. The Housing Element is required to identify adequate sites to address the City's share of regional housing needs (RHNA).

PROGRAM 6: PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SITES

For the 6th cycle Housing Element, the City has been assigned a RHNA of 492 units (189 very low income, 88 low income, 84 moderate income, and 131 above moderate income units). In addition, the City has incurred a carryover of 29 lower income units (18 very low and 11 low income units) from the 5th cycle Housing Element. The City relied on the 540 E. Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to accommodate the 5th cycle lower income RHNA. However, this project ultimately did not include any affordable units. Therefore, the City has a total RHNA obligation of 521 units (207 very low income, 99 low income, 84 moderate income, and 131 above moderate income units).

Based on entitled projects and projected ADUs, the City is able to accommodate 387 units, with a shortfall of 279 units (184 very low income, 18 low income, and 77 moderate income units). To accommodate this shortfall, the City has identified properties to be redesignated as Mixed Use Overlay or Housing Overlay. A total of 14 parcels will be rezoned to Mixed Use Overlay (MU-O) at a density range of 75 to 85 units per acre. Another 723 R-3 parcels will be rezoned Housing Overlay (HO) at a density range of 60 to 70 units per acre. Within the proposed HO, further factors were used to identify the parcels with near-term redevelopment potential. Specifically, seven parcels in the proposed HO are included in the sites inventory with the potential to accommodate 332 additional residential units. Combined, the candidate rezone sites (Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay) can accommodate up to 678 units (257 lower income, 186 moderate income, and 235 above moderate income). Along with ADUs and entitled projects, total capacity is estimated at 1,065 units (361 lower income, 193 moderate income, and 511 above moderate income units).

Consistent with the requirements of Government Code § 65863, rezoning and upzoning for the lower income RHNA shortfall must meet the following minimum State requirements:

- Permit owner-occupied and rental multi-family uses by-right for developments in which 20

percent or more of the units are affordable to lower income households. By-right means local government review must not require a conditional use permit (CUP), planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval.

- Accommodate a minimum of 16 units per site;
- Require a minimum density of 20 units per acre; and
- At least 50 percent of the lower income need must be accommodated on sites designated for residential use only or on sites zoned for mixed uses that accommodate all of the very low and low income housing need, if those sites:
 - Allow 100 percent residential use, and
 - require residential use occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project.

While State law requires the rezoned sites for lower income RHNA to have a floor of 20 units per acre, all units used to meet the City’s lower income RHNA will comply with the standards above and are proposed overlay (O) sites with a minimum density of 60 units per acre for HO and 75 units per acre for MU-O. Minimum density was used to estimate capacity as a conservative assumption. Furthermore, the City assumes only 40 percent of these sites as lower income units even though all sites at least double the State default density of 30 units per acre as feasible for facilitating lower income housing.

The City will develop objective development standards to implement the Housing Overlay and Mixed Use Overlay. New development standards, including parking, lot coverage, height, and setbacks, will ensure that the maximum allowable density can be achieved on parcels identified in the sites inventory.

Objectives and Timeline:

- By October 15, 2022, rezone adequate sites to accommodate the 29-unit RHNA shortfall carry over from the 5th cycle Housing Element. Approval of a rezone in April 2022 to accommodate the Pacific Coast Commons project results in the provision of 263 units, including 32 lower income units (29 low income and 3 very low income).
- By summer 2023, rezone adequate sites as Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay for the 6th cycle RHNA shortfall of 279 units (184 very low income, 18 low income, and 77 moderate income units).
- By Summer 2023, develop objective design standards for residential development consistent with SB 330 in conjunction with the establishment of Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay.
- By October 15, 2023, amend the ESMC to provide by right approval of projects on rezoned sites for lower income RHNA if the project provides 20 percent of the units as affordable housing for lower income households.
- By October 15, 2024, update Downtown Specific Plan and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan to increase housing capacity by 300 units.

Funding Source: General funds

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

PROGRAM 7: MONITORING OF NO NET LOSS (SB 166)

To ensure that the net future housing capacity is maintained to accommodate the City's RHNA figures, pursuant to AB 1397, the City will continue to maintain an inventory of adequate housing sites for each income category. This inventory details the amount, type, size and location of vacant land, recyclable properties and parcels that are candidates for consolidation to assist developers in identifying land suitable for residential development. In addition, the City will continuously and at least annually monitor the sites inventory and the number of net units constructed in each income category. If the inventory indicates a shortage of adequate sites to accommodate the remaining regional housing need, the City will identify alternative sites so that there is no net loss of residential capacity pursuant to Government Code Section 65863.

To facilitate annual evaluation, the City will implement a formal ongoing project-by-project procedure pursuant to Government Code Section 65863 which will evaluate identified capacity in the sites inventory relative to projects or other actions potentially reducing density and identifying additional sites as necessary. This procedure and annual evaluation will address non-residentially or mixed use zoned land to determine whether these sites are being developed for uses other than residential. If a shortfall in sites capacity occurs, the City will identify replacement sites within six months.

Objectives and Timeline:

- By October 15, 2022, develop a formal ongoing procedure to evaluate identified capacity and identify additional sites as necessary
- Continue to perform project-by-project evaluation to determine if adequate capacity remains for the remaining RHNA.

Funding Source: General fund

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

PROGRAM 8: LOT CONSOLIDATION

The City facilitates the development of new units on small lots either through the consolidation of small lots or through the development of incentives to encourage development of these lots. Consolidation of lots will be encouraged through the on-going identification of those lots in the City's inventory that offer the best possibility for consolidation to achieve greater building density and affordability. Incentives to encourage development on small lots may include the development of a "package" of incentives (such as modified development standards for small lots including parking, lot coverage, open space, and setback reductions) targeting projects that include very low and extremely low-income units.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Continue to facilitate the redevelopment of underutilized sites by annually contacting the development community through various outreach methods, such as promoting opportunities and incentives on the City's website, meeting with developers, and participating in local forums (City forums, Chamber of Commerce, or local real estate brokers' events).
- By October 15, 2024, develop strategies to encourage the development and consolidation of small lots, specifically for affordable housing.

Funding Source: General funds

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

REMOVING GOVERNMENTAL AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS

PROGRAM 9: EL SEGUNDO MUNICIPAL CODE (ESMC) AMENDMENTS

As part of the City's SB 2 grant-funded planning efforts, the City is currently in the process of amending the ESMC to address the following:

Density Bonus: The ESMC does not currently include Density Bonus regulations. The State has recently passed several bills that change the State Density Bonus law. These include:

- **AB 1763 (Density Bonus for 100 Percent Affordable Housing)** – Density bonus and increased incentives for 100 percent affordable housing projects for lower income households.
- **SB 1227 (Density Bonus for Student Housing)** - Density bonus for student housing development for students enrolled at a full-time college, and to establish prioritization for students experiencing homelessness.
- **AB 2345 (Increase Maximum Allowable Density)** - Revised the requirements for receiving concessions and incentives, and the maximum density bonus provided.

Transitional and Supportive Housing: The City is in the process of amending the ESMC to allow transitional and supportive housing in all zones where residential uses are permitted, subject to the same development standards and permitting processes as the same type of housing in the same zone. Furthermore, AB 2162 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 (such as being 100 percent affordable to lower income households and setting aside 25 percent of the units for target population). The bill also prohibits minimum parking requirements for supportive housing within ½ mile of a public transit stop.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) or Micro-Unit Housing: The City is currently in the process of amending the ESMC to address the provision of SRO or micro units.

In addition, other revisions to the ESMC are necessary to facilitate the development of a variety of housing types and streamlined development review process:

Residential Care Facilities for Seven or More: The ESMC does not currently address the provision of large residential care facilities (for seven or more persons). The City will amend the ESMC to accommodate and facilitate the development of this use type as a residential use to be conditionally permitted in zones where residential uses are permitted. Findings for approval will be objective and facilitate certainty in outcomes.

Emergency Shelters: The City amended the ESMC to permit emergency shelters in the Light Manufacturing (M1) zones by right without discretionary review. However, the ESMC contains provisions that are not consistent with State law:

- **Separation Requirement** - State law allows a maximum 300-foot separation requirement from another emergency shelter only. No other separation requirements are allowed. However, the ESMC includes additional separation requirements from residentially zoned property, schools, parks and open space, and childcare facilities.
- **Parking Standards** – ESMC requires one parking space per three bed, plus one space per employee. AB 139 limits parking requirements for emergency shelters based on the number of employees only and not to exceed the requirements for other uses in the same zone.

Low Barrier Navigation Center (LBNC): AB 101 requires cities to allow a Low Barrier Navigation Center development by right in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements. 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.” Low Barrier shelters may include options such as allowing pets, permitting partners to share living space, and providing storage for residents’ possessions.

Employee Housing: Pursuant to State Employee Housing Act, employee housing for six or fewer employees is required to be treated as a single-family structure and permitted in the same manner as other dwellings of the same type in the same zone. The City will consider amending the ESMC to comply with State law regarding employee housing.

Reasonable Accommodation: Recent City amendment to the ESMC inadvertently removed reasonable accommodation from the Administrative Adjustment process that can fast tracks approval requests for flexibility in zoning/development standard in order to accommodate the housing needs of persons with disabilities. The ESMC will be amended to address this clerical error to reestablish the review and approval of reasonable accommodation through an Administrative Adjustment process.

R-3 Zone: The City will increase allowable density in the R-3 zone from 27 units per acre to 30 units per acre. To facilitate multi-family development, the City will revise the R-3 development standards (including lot area per unit based on lot size, parking, height, setback, and lot coverage) to ensure that the maximum density can be achieved. These standards will also apply to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) floating zone.

Parking Requirements: The City currently requires two parking spaces plus one guest parking space per unit, regardless of unit size. The City will revise its parking standards to a sliding scale based on unit size, similar to the recently approved Pacific Coast Commons project which achieved 83 units per acre.

Senior Housing: The City will revise the ESMC to remove the CUP requirement for senior housing and permit senior housing as a regular residential use to be similarly permitted as other residential uses in the same zone.

Findings for Site Plan Review: The City will revise the findings required for Site Plan Review approval to ensure that the findings are objective and provide certainty in outcomes.

Micro Units: The City will establish development standards to facilitate the construction of micro units.

Objectives and Timeline:

- By the end of 2023, complete ESMC amendments as outlined above.

Funding Source: General funds; SB 2

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING

PROGRAM 10: COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The City will conduct consultation meetings with the following boards and committees to gather information of housing-related issues and concerns, evaluate policy implications, and obtain recommendations:

- **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee (DEI):** On Tuesday, June 16, 2020, the City Council agreed to establish a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee. The purpose of the committee is to work with the community to gain a deeper understanding of the issues and determine how to move forward to bring positive change so everyone who lives, works and visits El Segundo feels welcome. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee will engage the community, evaluate current policies, and offer its recommendations to the City Council.
- **Senior Housing Corporation Board:** Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board actively oversees the management, operation and maintenance of Park Vista, specialty housing for seniors. The Board actively works with residents on compliance, financial and legal matters. They also advise on building amenities and programs. The Senior Citizen Housing Corporation Board is a non-profit corporation formed in 1984 for the construction of the low-income housing facility for seniors. The board is in an operating agreement with the City Council, and enlists a management company to operate the facility. The board, comprised of five directors who are all El Segundo residents.

Objectives and Timeline:

- Conduct annual consultation meetings with the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee and Senior Housing Corporation Board.

Funding Source: General funds

Responsible Agency: Community Development Department/Planning Division

PROGRAM 11: FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

The City will undertake a number of actions to affirmatively further fair housing. These actions are outlined in .

Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions

| Program | Specific Commitment | Timeline | Geographic Targeting | Eight-Year Metrics |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach | | | | |
| AFFH: State and Federal Laws | Use local annual CDBG funds to separately contract with a fair housing service provider to conduct outreach and education locally. This service will be additional to the City’s participation in the Los Angeles Urban County program. | Beginning FY 2023/24 and annually thereafter | Citywide | One local workshop annually with the goal of reaching at least 30 persons each meeting. |
| AFFH: Regional Efforts | Participate in regional efforts to address fair housing issues and monitor emerging trends/issues in the housing market. | Annually | | |
| | Participate in the update of the five-year update of the Regional Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice. The last regional AI was adopted in 2018. | 2023 | | |
| AFFH: Interest List | Develop interest list for update on fair housing and affordable housing projects and contact interest list with updates. | By the end of 2022 | | |
| AFFH: Fair Housing Outreach | Update the City website with affordable housing projects and resources. | Semi-annually | Citywide | Current Housing Rights Center (HRC) contract with LACDA does not include providing fair housing records by jurisdiction. Petition in 2023 to receive city-specific data from HRC to serve as baseline. Serve 50 people through fair housing services annually. |
| | Include fair housing information on the City’s website, including up-to-date fair housing laws, services, and information on filing discrimination complaints. | By January 2023 | | |
| | Utilize non-traditional media (i.e., social media, City website) in outreach and education efforts in addition to print media and notices. | 2021-2029 | | |
| | Continue advertising and providing programs related to fair housing including the Home Delivered Meals program, Senior In-Home Care program, and Juvenile Diversion program. | 2021-2029 | | |

Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions

| Program | Specific Commitment | Timeline | Geographic Targeting | Eight-Year Metrics |
|---|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | Update fair housing information and resources available. |
| Program 4: Affordable Housing Strategy | Conduct community outreach with an emphasis on outreaching to special needs populations and households impacted by disproportionate needs in the northern and eastern areas of the City. | By end of 2023 | Northern and eastern areas of City | Conduct at least two community workshops. |
| Program 10: Community Outreach | Conduct consultation meetings with the City’s new Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee and Senior Housing Corporation Board. | Annually beginning 2023 | Citywide | Conduct at least one consultation meeting with each committee/board annually. |
| New Opportunities in High Resource Areas | | | | |
| Program 3: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) | Develop incentives and tools to facilitate ADU construction. | By end of 2023 | Citywide | Facilitate the construction of 120 ADUs. |
| | Update City website to provide information of ADU resources, such as grants available to homeowners for ADU construction from the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA). | In 2022 | | |
| | Pursue available funding to facilitate ADU construction, including affordable ADUs. | In 2022 and annually thereafter | | |
| Program 4: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and Affordable Housing Strategy | Continue to facilitate affordable housing development through incentives and technical assistance. | 2021-2029 | Northwestern corner of City (all highest resource tracts) | Facilitate the development of 390 affordable units (207 very low income, 99 low income, and 84 moderate income units, with at least 50 percent in highest resource tracts. |
| Program 5: Urban Lot Split | Develop checklist to implement SB 9 (Urban Lot Split) through an administrative process. | Develop checklist by summer 2023 | Citywide in single-family neighborhoods | |

Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions

| Program | Specific Commitment | Timeline | Geographic Targeting | Eight-Year Metrics |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Program 6: Provision of Adequate Sites | Rezone adequate sites to accommodate the 29-unit RHNA shortfall carry over from the 5th cycle Housing Element. | By October 15, 2022 | Pacific Coast Commons | Approved rezoning of Pacific Coast Commons site to accommodate a 263-unit project including 32 lower income units. |
| | Rezone adequate sites for the 6th cycle RHNA shortfall. | By October 15, 2024 | Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay | Establish Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay with the potential to accommodate 655 additional units. |
| | Incorporate additional housing opportunities in the Downtown Specific Plan and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan updates. | By October 15, 2024 | Downtown Specific Plan and Smoky Hollow Specific Plan areas | Increase multi-family housing capacity by 300 units. |
| Place-Based Strategies for Neighborhood Improvements | | | | |
| AFFH: Public Improvements in Areas with Housing Element Sites | Prioritize the City’s annual budget of approximately \$200,000 on sidewalk repairs and pedestrian ramp improvements for locations in the Housing Element sites inventory. | Annual budget process | Mixed Use Overlay and Housing Overlay areas | One public improvement project annually |
| Program 1: Residential Sound Insulation | Coordinate with LAWA to assist in outreach to owners eligible for the Residential Sound Insulation Program (RSI). | In 2023 and annually thereafter | Within the 65 dB CNEL contour of aircraft noise from LAWA – primarily North El Segundo | Assist 200 households annually |
| Housing Mobility | | | | |
| Program 4: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and | Engage in dialogues with affordable housing providers to learn if there are actions the City can take to support their continued operation. | 2021-2029 | Citywide | Facilitate the development of 390 affordable housing units. |

Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions

| Program | Specific Commitment | Timeline | Geographic Targeting | Eight-Year Metrics |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Affordable Housing Strategy | Establish the Inclusionary Housing program. | By 2025 | | |
| | Adopt Final Affordable Housing Strategic Plan and implement the Affordable Housing Strategic Plan utilizing the services of Many Mansions. | By Summer 2023 | | |
| | Establish written procedures to streamline affordable housing pursuant to SB 35. | By end of 2022 | | |
| Program 9: El Segundo Municipal Code Amendments | Amend the Zoning Code to comply with State laws related to low barrier navigation centers, emergency shelters, transitional housing, supportive housing, employee housing, reasonable accommodation, and residential care facilities. | By end of 2023 | Citywide | 20% of new affordable units serving special needs populations. |
| AFFH: Mobility | Collaborate with other jurisdictions to create a new countywide source of affordable housing – South Bay Affordable Housing Trust. | By October 2022 | South Bay region including El Segundo | Housing Trust Fund appropriated for South Bay |
| Tenant Protection and Anti-Displacement | | | | |
| AFFH: Displacement | Retain city fair housing service providers to conduct additional outreach and education. | Establish city program by the end of FY 2023 | Northwestern corner of City | One local workshop annually with the goal of reaching at least 30 persons each meeting. |
| | Focus fair housing outreach and education in areas with high displacement risk, specifically where renters, including overpaying renters, are most concentrated. | | | |
| | Expand outreach and education on recent State laws (SB 329 and SB 222) supporting source of income protection for publicly assisted low income households (HCVs). | By October 2023 | Citywide | Increase rental opportunities through ADUs by 120 units |

Table 6-1: Fair Housing Actions

| Program | Specific Commitment | Timeline | Geographic Targeting | Eight-Year Metrics |
|---------|---|----------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | Include a fair housing factsheet with ADU and SB 9 application packets. | | | |

C. SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

The following summarizes the City's quantified objectives for the 2021-2029 Housing Element planning period.

Table 6-2: 2021-2029 Quantified Objectives

| | Units/Households Assisted |
|--|------------------------------|
| Housing Production | |
| Extremely Low Income | 103 |
| Very Low Income | 104 |
| Low Income | 99 |
| Moderate Income | 84 |
| Above Moderate Income | 131 |
| Total Units to be Constructed | 521 |
| Rehabilitation | |
| Extremely Low Income | 10 |
| Very Low Income | 10 |
| Low Income | 20 |
| Moderate Income | 0 |
| Above Moderate Income | 0 |
| Total Households to be Assisted | 40 |
| Conservation | |
| Extremely Low Income | 48 |
| Very Low Income | 49 |
| Low Income | 0 |
| Moderate Income | 0 |
| Above Moderate Income | 0 |
| Total Units to be Conserved | 97 |

APPENDIX A: HOUSING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

| Table A-1 Review of Past Accomplishments | | |
|--|--|--|
| Program | 2013-2021 Objectives | Effectiveness and Continued Appropriateness |
| GOAL 1: Preserve and protect the existing housing stock by encouraging the rehabilitation of deteriorating dwelling units and the conversion of the currently sound housing stock. | | |
| Program 1 – Housing Rehabilitation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program 1a. Minor Home Repair (MHR) – Annually consult with HUD to identify and pursue potential funding opportunities and funding sources that may be available and appropriate to reinstate the MHR program. • Program 1b. Residential Sound Insulation Program (RSI) – Assist approximately 150 households annually. | <p>Effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program 1a – The City continues to identify potential funding sources to implement the MHR Program. As of 2019, a funding source has not been identified. • Program 1b – The RSI Program was suspended in 2018 due to lack of funding. However, the City assisted approximately 600 households during the planning period prior to the suspension of the program. <p>Continued Appropriateness: The 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a program to pursue funding for rehabilitation assistance.</p> |
| Program 2 – Code Compliance Inspection Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to conduct inspections on a complaint basis through the City’s Building Safety Division. | <p>Effectiveness: The City continues to implement the Code Compliance Inspection Program in response to complaints.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program is continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p> |
| GOAL 2: Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate- income households. | | |
| Program 3 – Second Units on R-1 Zoned Parcels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to facilitate the development of second units on R-1 zoned parcels. • Maintain a list of eligible properties for second units on the City’s website. | <p>Effectiveness: The City issued 19 Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) permits in 2018 and 40 in 2019. The City has exceeded their objective of facilitating the development of 8 second units during the planning period.</p> |

Table A-1 Review of Past Accomplishments

| Program | 2013-2021 Objectives | Effectiveness and Continued Appropriateness |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and annually evaluate the effectiveness of the second unit ordinance and remove any potential constraints, if any. • Facilitate the development of one second unit per year, for a total of 8 second units during the Housing Element planning period. | <p>The City El Segundo amended the ADU ordinance in 2020 in compliance with State law.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: The 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a program to facilitate ADU production.</p> |
| <p>Program 4 – Affordable Housing Incentives</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactively encourage and facilitate on an ongoing basis the development efforts of non- profit organizations for the construction of affordable housing for lower income households, particularly those with special needs including large households, seniors, extremely low-income (ELI) households, and households with persons who have disabilities or developmental disabilities. • Specifically, facilitate the development of five affordable housing units during the 2013-2021 Housing Element planning period. | <p>Effectiveness: The City is currently developing an inclusionary housing ordinance to include a 15-20% requirement and potential in-lieu fee option.</p> <p>In February 2021, the City entered into a contract with Many Mansions as the City’s Affordable Housing Services Provider to fulfill its affordable housing needs per the RHNA goals.</p> <p>El Segundo has established an affordable housing fund to fund activities under the Housing Division and Affordable Housing Services Provider. As of 2020, the City had allocated \$5.3 million to the affordable housing fund.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: The program in continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>GOAL 3: Provide opportunities for new housing construction in a variety of locations and a variety of densities in accordance with the land use designations and policies in the Land Use Element.</p> | | |
| <p>Program 5 – Provision of Adequate Sites</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to provide a variety of incentives to facilitate the development of vacant and underutilized properties, including the waiver or deferment of fees, reduced parking requirements and priority processing for affordable housing projects. | <p>Effectiveness: In 2017, the City worked with the El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD) to permit the development of a former school site. Permits issued included provision for 6 affordable units. However, this project ultimately did not include any affordable units and the developer provided the City with an in-lieu fee of \$5.3 million. This fund has</p> |

Table A-1 Review of Past Accomplishments

| Program | 2013-2021 Objectives | Effectiveness and Continued Appropriateness |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain an annually updated residential sites inventory on the City’s website. • Annually monitor the adequacy of the City’s residential sites inventory, particularly for sites adequate to facilitate lower income housing. • Should cumulative development on the City’s vacant and underutilized sites (particularly on the mixed use/nonresidential sites) impact the City’s continued ability to meet its RHNA, identify alternative approaches to replenish the City’s sites capacity. • Continue to collaborate with the El Segundo Unified School District to pursue a residential project with an affordable component that will satisfy El Segundo’s lower-income RHNA, with anticipated entitlement by the end of 2015. | <p>been deposited into the City’s Affordable Housing Fund.</p> <p>In 2019, the City prepared a study on the R-3 Zone (high density residential) and concluded that most structures were either new, condos, or built at a density of 35 units per acre.</p> <p>The City is currently exploring alternatives and continues to review the inventory to confirm the provision of adequate sites.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: As part of the 2021-2029 Housing Element development, the City conducted an extensive assessment of available sites for the RHNA. The 2021-2029 Housing Element includes a program to rezone and upzone properties for the RHNA.</p> |
| <p>Program 6 – Facilitate Development on Underutilized Sites on Small Lots</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to facilitate the redevelopment of underutilized sites by annually contacting the development community through various outreach methods, such as promoting opportunities and incentives on the City’s website, meeting with developers, and participating in local forums (City forums, Chamber of Commerce, or local real estate brokers’ events). • Develop strategies to encourage the development and consolidation of small lots, specifically for affordable housing. | <p>Effectiveness: El Segundo has facilitated approximately three lot consolidations per year throughout the planning period. The City has exceeded the one lot consolidation program objective.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program continues to be appropriate for the new sites identified for the 6th cycle RHNA.</p> |

Table A-1 Review of Past Accomplishments

| Program | 2013-2021 Objectives | Effectiveness and Continued Appropriateness |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate one lot consolidation project for a total of five units during the 2013-2021 Housing Element planning period. | |
| GOAL 4: Remove governmental constraints on housing development. | | |
| Program 7 – Zoning Revisions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program 7a. Density Bonus – Consider amending the ESMC to include density bonus provisions, consistent with California law. Program 7b. Emergency Shelters – Consider amending the ESMC to permit emergency shelters in the Medium Manufacturing (MM) and Light Manufacturing (M1) zones by right without discretionary review. no later than October 1, 2014, pursuant to State law. Program 7c. Transitional Housing – Consider amendments to the ESMC to allow transitional housing in all zones where residential uses are permitted, subject to the same development standards and permitting processes as the same type of housing in the same zone. Program 7d. Supportive Housing – Consider amendments to the ESMC to allow supportive housing in all zones where residential uses are permitted, subject to the same development standards and permitting processes as the same type of housing in the same zone. Program 7e. Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing – Consider amendments to the ESMC to | <p>Effectiveness: In 2019, the City amended the ADU ordinance in the ESMC in compliance with AB 881.</p> <p>As of 2019, the City is in the process of amending the ESMC to allow over 200 units, including affordable units, on lots currently developed as surface parking in commercial zones. However, this amendment is not expected to be completed during the planning period.</p> <p>No other zoning amendments have been made during the planning period.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be updated to include new changes to State law.</p> |

Table A-1 Review of Past Accomplishments

| Program | 2013-2021 Objectives | Effectiveness and Continued Appropriateness |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>conditionally permit SRO units in the Multi-family Residential (R-3) Zone and establishment of appropriate development standards in the zoning regulations for SRO units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program 7f. Farmworker/Employee Housing – Consider amending the ESMC to remove agriculture as a permitted use in the Open-Space (O-S) Zone and to comply with State law regarding employee housing within one year of the adoption of the Housing Element. | |
| <p>GOAL 5: Provide housing opportunities including ownership and rental, fair-market and assisted, in conformance with open housing policies and free of discriminatory practices.</p> | | |
| <p>Program 8 – Fair Housing Program</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue providing fair housing services with the Housing Rights Center through participation in the Urban County program coordinated by the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission. • Inform public of the availability of fair housing services by distributive fair housing information at Community Development Department public counters and City website. • Continue to implement the City’s Reasonable Accommodations regulations and promote its availability to interested parties on an ongoing basis. | <p>Effectiveness: The City continues to provide fair housing services to El Segundo residents. The City is still under contract with the Housing Rights Center to provide these services.</p> <p>Information about fair housing services is available on the City’s website and at the Community Development Department counter.</p> <p>Continued Appropriateness: This program will be expanded to address the requirements to affirmatively furthering fair housing.</p> |

Cumulative Impact of Addressing Special Needs

Due to limited funding and staffing capacity, the City was unable to make meaningful progress in address the housing needs of special needs populations. Also, the City has not yet make the ESMC revisions to address the provision of special needs housing, with the exception of accommodating homeless shelters. The 540 East Imperial Specific Plan was originally planned as a senior housing development with 46 units set aside as housing affordable to lower income households. However, the final project did not include any affordable units. Instead, an in-lieu fee of \$5.3 million was paid. This fee allows the City to procure the service of Many Mansions to serve as the City’s affordable housing provider. Overall, the City expects to make significant progress in addressing special needs during the 6th cycle Housing Element planning period.

| Table 6-2 2013-2021 El Segundo Quantified Objectives | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Housing Goals | 2013 to 2021 | Progress 2020 | |
| Housing Production | Number of Units Allocated | Units¹ | Percent Achieved |
| Extremely Low Income | 9 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Very Low Income | 9 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Low Income | 11 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Moderate Income | 12 | 30 | 250.0% |
| Above Moderate Income | 28 | 29 | 103.6% |
| Total Units | 69 | 59 | 85.5% |
| Rehabilitation² | | | |
| Extremely Low Income | 58 | 51 | 87.9% |
| Very Low Income | 40 | 56 | 140.0% |
| Low Income | 88 | 67 | 76.1% |
| Moderate Income | 297 | 65 | 21.9% |
| Above Moderate Income | 297 | 362 | 121.9% |
| TOTAL | 750 | 600 | 80.0% |
| Conservation | | | |
| Extremely Low Income | 48 | 48 | 100.0% |
| Very Low Income | 49 | 49 | 100.0% |
| Low Income | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Moderate Income | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Above Moderate Income | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Source: City of El Segundo Planning and Building Department, 2020 | | | |
| Notes: | | | |
| 1. Objective is based on the Imperial School Specific Plan. | | | |
| 2. Residential Sound Insulation program is not based on income qualifications. Therefore, overall objective is distributed according to the City’s overall income distribution. | | | |
| 3. Affordable housing units to be conserved (Park Vista). | | | |

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A. MAILING LIST

Lori Gangemi, President & CEO
Ability First
1300 E. Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

Ruth Schwartz, Executive Director
Shelter Partnership, Inc.
520 S Grand Avenue, Suite 695
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Samuel Bettencourt, Executive Director
Beacon Light Mission
525 North Broad Avenue
Wilmington, CA 90744

El Segundo Chamber of Commerce
427 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Chancela Al-Mansour, Executive Director
Housing Rights Center
3255 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1150
Los Angeles, CA 90010

South Bay Children's Health Center
410 Camino Real
Redondo, Beach, CA 90277

St. Margaret's Center
10217 Inglewood Avenue
Lennox, CA 90304

Joel John Roberts, CEO
P.A.T.H.
340 N. Madison Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Melissa Moore, Ed.D., Superintendent
El Segundo Unified School District
641 Sheldon Ave
El Segundo, CA 90245

Gregory O'Brien, Superintendent
Centinela Valley Union High School Dist.
14901 Inglewood Avenue
Lawndale, CA 90260

Blake Silvers, Superintendent
Wiseburn School District
201 N Douglas Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Jan Vogel, Executive Director
South Bay Workforce Incentive Board
11539 Hawthorne Blvd, #500
Hawthorne, CA 90250

Boys & Girls Clubs of the South Bay
1220 West 256th Street
Harbor City, CA 90710

Monsignor Gregory Cox, Executive Direct.
Catholic Charities of Los Angeles, Inc.
P.O. Box 15095
Los Angeles, CA 90015-0095

Jane Phillips, Founder & Executive
Director
Crown Jewel Club
531 Main Street #1000
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dr. Alice Harris, Executive Direct.
Foodbank of Southern California
1444 San Francisco Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90813

South Bay Latino Chamber of Commerce
13545 Hawthorne Blvd., # 201
Hawthorne, CA 90250

The Salvation Army
125 W. Beryl St.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

David Garcia, Executive Director
The Society of St. Vincent De Paul
210 North Avenue 21
Los Angeles CA 90031

Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
2355 Crenshaw Blvd, #125
Torrance, CA 90501

Bank of America
835 N Pacific Coast Hwy
El Segundo, CA 90245

CHASE
130 E Grand Ave
El Segundo, CA 90245

Kinecta FCU - Home Loans
1440 Rosecrans Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA. 90266

Wells Fargo Home Mortgage
2141 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 4100
El Segundo, CA 90245

Kathy Kelly, CEO
South Bay Association of Realtors
22833 Arlington Ave.
Torrance, California 90501

Sister Anne Tran, Center Director
Good Shepherd Center
1671 Beverly Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Providence Little Company of Mary
Community Health
4101 Torrance Blvd
Torrance, CA 90505

Planned Parenthood So. Bay Center
14623 Hawthorne Blvd. #300
Lawndale, CA 90260

Elizabeth Eastlund, Executive Director
Rainbow Services
453 West 7th Street
San Pedro, CA 90731

Social Vocational Services, Inc
15342 Hawthorne Blvd., Suite 403
Lawndale, CA 90260

Elise Buik, President /CEO
United Way of Greater Los Angeles
1150 S. Olive St., Suite T500
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Michael Danneker, Director
Westside Regional Center
5901 Green Valley Circle, Suite 320
Culver City, CA 90230

Mike Rotolo
TG Construction Co., Inc
139 Nevada Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

JRO Construction
952 Manhattan Beach Blvd., Suite 220
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Scott Laurie, President/CEO
Olson Company
3010 Old Ranch Parkway #100
Seal Beach, CA 90740

C.A.M. Construction
310 East Imperial Avenue #C
El Segundo, CA 90245

Brad Wiblin, Executive Vice President
Bridge Housing
2202 30th St.
San Diego, CA 92104

Darrell Simien, VP of Community
Development
Habitat for Humanity
18600 Crenshaw Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90504

Laura Archuleta, President/CEO
Jamboree Housing Corporation
17701 Cowan Ave., Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92614

Steve PonTell, President/CEO
National CORE
9421 Haven Ave.
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Mr. Jerry Saunders
Air Force Association
P.O. Box 916
El Segundo, CA 90245

Friends of El Segundo Public Library
111 W. Mariposa Ave.
El Segundo, CA 90245

El Segundo Rotary Club
P.O. Box 85
El Segundo, CA 90245

First Baptist Church
591 East Palm Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

Pacific Baptist Church
859 Main St
El Segundo, CA 90245

Father Alexei Smith
St. Andrew Russian Greek Catholic
Church
538 Concord Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Rev. Robert S. Victoria, Pastor
Saint Anthony's Church
720 East Grand Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

Jon Reed, Minister
Hilltop Community Church of Christ
717 East Grand Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

El Segundo Christian Church
223 W. Franklin St.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Brandon Cash, Pastor
Oceanside Christian Fellowship
343 Coral Circle
El Segundo, CA 90245

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter- day
Saints
1215 East Mariposa Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

Rev. Dr. Dina Ferguson, Rector
St. Michael the Archangel Church
361 Richmond Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Rob McKenna, Lead Pastor
Bridge South Bay Church
429 Richmond Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Jehovah's Witnesses
608 East Grand Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

St. John's Church
1611 East Sycamore Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

Lee Carlile, Pastor
United Methodist Church
540 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

The Bible Church of His Will
2000 E Mariposa Ave
El Segundo, CA 90245

Tierra Vista Communities
2400 South Pacific Ave, Bldg 410, Suite
2
San Pedro, CA 90731

Los Angeles Air Force Base
482 N Aviation Blvd
El Segundo, CA 90245

Los Angeles County Development
Authority
700 W Main Street
Alhambra, CA 91801

Los Angeles Homeless Services
Authority
811 Wilshire Boulevard #600
Los Angeles, CA 90017

El Segundo Residents Association
425 Lomita Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Park Vista
615 E. Holly Avenue
El Segundo, CA 90245

El Segundo Herald
500 Center St.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Jenny Davies, President
El Segundo Council Of PTAs
641 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Donna Mae Ellis, President
El Segundo Woman's Club
P.O. Box 25
El Segundo, CA 90245

Ty Leisher, President
Kiwanis Club
P.O. Box 392
El Segundo, CA 90245

Knights Of Columbus
224-1/2 S. Sepulveda Blvd.
Manhattan Beach CA 90266

Paulette Caudill, President
Road - Reach Out Against Drugs
615 Richmond St.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Tree Musketeers
305 Richmond St
El Segundo, CA 90245

Veronica Dover, CEO/Executive
Director
St. Vincent Meals On Wheels
2303 Miramar Street
Los Angeles, CA 90057

American Red Cross
9800 La Cienega Blvd.
Inglewood, CA 90301

Vistamar School
737 Hawaii St.
El Segundo, CA 90245

Rick Schroeder, President
Many Mansions
811 Wilshire Boulevard #1727
Los Angeles, CA 90017

B. OUTREACH MATERIALS

Housing Element Update: Community Meeting

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2021

5:30 PM



The City of El Segundo is in the process of updating the Housing Element for the 2021-2029 Planning Period and would like your participation. This is your chance to learn about the Housing Element Update.

The **Community Meeting** will cover the basics of the Housing Element Update requirements and is intended to identify housing needs that should be addressed.

The **Housing Element** includes goals, policies, programs, and quantified objectives for adequately housing our future population.

Via web browser: <https://zoom.us/j/91048484015>
Meeting ID: 910 4848 4015

Via telephone: (669) 900-9128

For more information, please visit <http://www.elsegundo.org/housing-element> or contact housingelement@elsegundo.org

Join us for a **Community Meeting** to Discuss the Update of the City's Housing Element



The **Housing Element** is a key component of the
City's General Plan.
The City needs your input!

Where:

<https://zoom.us/j/91048484015>
Meeting ID: 910 4848 4015
One tap mobile: +16699009128,,91048484015#
Dial in: +1 669 900 9128 US
Meeting ID: 910 4848 4015



When:

Tuesday, April 13, 2021
at 5:30 p.m.

For more information about the Housing Element Update process please visit
<https://www.elsegundo.org/housing-element>. If you have any questions,
please email us at housingelement@elsegundo.org
or call city staff, Paul Samaras, Principal Planner, at (310) 524-2340.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting,
please contact the City Clerk's office at 310-524-2305. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the
City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

City of El Segundo - Bulletin Detail Report



Subject: Reminder: Future of Housing in El Segundo Virtual Workshop April 13
 Sent: 04/12/2021 09:56 AM PDT
 Sent By: mghurtado@elsegundo.org
 Sent To: Subscribers of Business Stakeholders, ESB - Business & Real Estate News, General City News, H2O Water Billing, Internal - Media/Local News Outlets, Internal - NetPromoter - Business License, Internal - NetPromoter - Water/Residents, Internal--All City Staff, Internal--E Team, or Residents,

12,923

Recipients

✓ Email

✓ SMS

✗ Facebook

✗ Twitter

✓ RSS

96%


Delivered

0% Pending

4% Bounced

27% Open Rate

4% Click Rate



Delivery Metrics - Details

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| 12,923 | Total Sent |
| 12,402 (96%) | Delivered |
| 0 (0%) | Pending |
| 521 (4%) | Bounced |
| 15 (0%) | Unsubscribed |

Bulletin Analytics

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 5,599 | Total Opens |
| 3318 (27%) | Unique Opens |
| 544 | Total Clicks |
| 469 (4%) | Unique Clicks |
| 16 | # of Links |

Delivery and performance

These figures represent all data since the bulletin was first sent to present time.

| | Progress | % Delivered | Recipients | # Delivered | Opened Unique | Bounced/Failed | Unsubscribes |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Email Bulletin | Delivered | 96.0% | 12,780 | 12,270 | 3318 / 27.0% | 510 | 15 |
| Digest | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 / 0.0% | 0 | 0 |
| SMS Message | Delivered | 92.3% | 143 | 132 | n/a | 11 | n/a |

| Link URL | Unique Clicks | Total Clicks |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| https://www.menti.com/tx8cna1uni?utm_medium=email&utm... | 121 | 135 |
| https://youtu.be/SC9DJxxGQq8?utm_medium=email&utm_so... | 91 | 130 |
| https://www.elsegundo.org/government/departments/develo... | 48 | 57 |
| https://www.elsegundo.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=3389&... | 42 | 51 |
| https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAELSEGUNDO/bul... | 20 | 20 |
| https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAELSEGUNDO/subs... | 15 | 19 |
| https://www.elsegundo.org/?utm_medium=email&utm_sourc... | 18 | 18 |
| https://www.instagram.com/elsegundocity/?utm_medium=e... | 15 | 15 |
| https://www.facebook.com/cityofelsegundo/?utm_medium=e... | 15 | 15 |
| https://twitter.com/elsegundocity?utm_medium=email&utm_... | 15 | 15 |
| https://www.elsegundo.org/contacts/default.asp?utm_mediu... | 15 | 15 |
| https://www.linkedin.com/company/cityofelsegundo?utm_me... | 14 | 14 |
| https://subscriberhelp.granicus.com/s/contactsupport?utm_m... | 14 | 14 |
| https://subscriberhelp.granicus.com/?utm_medium=email&u... | 14 | 14 |
| https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAELSEGUNDO/subs... | 14 | 14 |


What three words would you use to describe El Segundo?



21

Protecting the Integrity of R-1 Neighborhoods


Please rank from 1-5, with 1 being your first choice, in what area of El Segundo should new housing be built?



22


**Please rank from 1 to 6, with one being your first choice,
What type of housing you feel is most needed in El Segundo:**

Mentimeter




Which of these items would you rank as the highest priority when it comes to housing developments?

Mentimeter




In your opinion, what housing types would you like to see more of in El Segundo? (Select the Top 3)

Mentimeter



On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being "very important," how important are the following concerns to you?


Mentimeter



26

These are existing housing goals adopted in the current Housing Element. How applicable are these goals to El Segundo today and for the future?

Mentimeter



C. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

The April 13, 2021 meeting was attended by 70 attendees. Public comments received are summarized below:

- The City lacks affordable housing, including housing for seniors who can no longer afford to live in the City. The former school site did not include any affordable units.
- Need to attract young adults to move back to El Segundo. Housing costs are too high. Need to provide opportunities for young adults to buy affordable housing.
- Should consider more housing on Rosecrans.
- Increasing density should consider how to alleviate gridlocks in traffic.

June 14, 2021 Meeting:

- Ensure affordable housing option includes the option to purchase.
- Housing for teachers and first responders, and housing for the Air Force Base.
- Support quality affordable housing.

APPENDIX C: ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

A. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 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 combating 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, 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, those with populations over 50,000 that can receive 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.

This analysis of fair housing issues in El Segundo relies on the 2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) prepared by the Los Angeles Community Development Authority (LACDA), California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) AFFH Data Viewer mapping tool, 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS), HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, HUD AFFH data, and additional local sources of information.

B. ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING ISSUES

1. Enforcement and Outreach

Federal fair housing laws prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, sex/gender, handicap/disability, and familial status. Specific federal legislation and court rulings include:

- **The Civil Rights Act of 1866** – covers only race and was the first legislation of its kind
- **The Federal Fair Housing Act 1968** – covers refusal to rent, sell, or finance
- **The Fair Housing Amendment Act of 1988** – added the protected classes of handicap and familial status
- **The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** – covers public accommodations in both businesses and in multi-family housing developments

- **Shelly v. Kramer 1948** – made it unconstitutional to use deed restrictions to exclude individuals from housing
- **Jones v. Mayer 1968** – made restrictive covenants illegal and unenforceable

California state fair housing laws protect the same classes as the federal laws with the addition of marital status, ancestry, source of income, sexual orientation, and arbitrary discrimination. Specific State legislation and regulations include:

- **Unruh Civil Rights Act** – extends to businesses and covers age and arbitrary discrimination
- **California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Rumford Act)** – covers the area of employment and housing, with the exception of single-family houses with no more than one roomer/boarder
- **California Civil Code Section 53** – takes measures against restrictive covenants
- **Department of Real Estate Commissioner’s Regulations 2780-2782** – defines disciplinary actions for discrimination, prohibits panic selling and affirms the broker’s duty to supervise
- **Business and Professions Code** – covers people who hold licenses, including real estate agents, brokers, and loan officers.

The City has committed to complying with applicable federal and State fair housing laws to ensure that housing is available to all persons without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status, or sex as outlined in the 2018 AI. Further, the Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA) prohibits discrimination in any aspect of housing on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, disability, familial status, or sex.

During the 2018 AI development process, LACDA implemented a series of outreach efforts including regional discussion groups, three sets of four focus groups each, aimed to address disability and access, education, employment and transportation, and healthy neighborhoods, and a Resident Advisory Board Meetings; community input meetings; and the 2017 Resident Fair Housing Survey. Regional discussions included developer groups, companies, organizations, and agencies, and government groups, including the City of El Segundo. The following topics were covered in the Government Discussion Group meeting:

- Lack of jurisdictions that have R/ECAP areas
- Discussion on community meetings
- Discussion of surveys
- City of Los Angeles R/ECAP areas
- Social engineering in the past due to highway, designing of public housing in poor areas by private, federal, and local governments
- Setting realistic goals and outcomes
- HRC- protect class different in state verses federal law
- Mortgages based on disparate impact-census areas
- Disparate impacts on women

R/ECAPs are discussed in Chapter 3, *Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty*, of this Assessment of Fair Housing. Historical trends, zoning, and home loan trends are also discussed in Chapter 5, *Disproportionate Housing Needs*, of this Assessment of Fair Housing.

Focus group meetings for preparation of the 2018 AI focused on the following contributing factors:

- **Education** – Attendees discussed the location of proficient schools, inadequate funding for schools both public and charter, lack of information on the transfer process for parents, and child safety when walking to school. Attendees expressed concern about school of choice and funding for under-performing schools, promotion of educational opportunities to parents, and safety.
- **Transportation and Jobs** – Attendees discussed lack of available clothing for employment, lack of resources and services for working families, stigma of transgender employees, and the prevalence of low skill workers. They expressed concern about the lack of reliable transportation, jobs located far from workers, and childcare expenses.
- **Healthy Neighborhoods** – This focus group discussed location and access to grocery stores, illegal dumping, poor access to quality healthcare, and general public safety concerns such as safe streets and homeless encampments. There were concerns related to industrial facilities in communities highly burdened by air pollution, proximity to air pollution, bike and pedestrian improvements, and greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies.
- **Disability and Access** – The disability and access focus group discussed availability of accessible housing options, lack of knowledge of the ADA’s Right to Reasonable Accommodation, overlapping needs of people with multiple disabilities, and a long waitlist for accessible and affordable housing.

A total of 6,290 responses were recorded from the 2017 Resident Fair Housing Survey. The survey found that most residents thought their neighborhood had adequate access to public transportation, cleanliness, and schools, and that the condition of public spaces and buildings were good, very good, or excellent. More residents reported availability of quality public housing and job opportunities were only fair or poor. The survey also found that households with a person with a disability found it more difficult to get around their neighborhood or apartment complex. Access to opportunities, housing conditions, and populations of persons with disabilities in El Segundo are further discussed below in this Assessment of Fair Housing Issues.

In preparation of this 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City of El Segundo conducted multiple outreach activities including:

- April 13, 2021 - Community meeting to obtain input on housing needs and suggestions for programs and policies
- City webpage on Housing Element Update (<https://www.elsegundo.org/housing-element>)
- Community Survey through Mentimeter
- YouTube Video regarding Housing Element Update (<https://youtu.be/SC9DJxxGQq8>)
- Social media postings (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and City website)
- June 14, 2021 – Joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting to discuss the selection of sites for RHNA

- September 30, 2021 – Planning Commission meeting to discuss the Draft Housing Element

All meetings were advertised through social media, postcards to agencies and organizations that serve low and moderate income and special needs residents, local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and religious facilities. Notices of meetings were also published in El Segundo Herald. The Housing Element responded to public comments by continuing to adjust the sites inventory after each public meeting. The Draft Housing Element has been available for public review since September 27, 2021.

The following comments were received during community meeting on April 13, 2021, and the Planning Commission/City Council meeting on June 14, 2021:


- The City lacks affordable housing, including housing for seniors who can no longer afford to live in the City; the former school site did not include any affordable units.
- Need to attract young adults to move back to El Segundo; housing costs are too high; need to provide opportunities for young adults to buy affordable housing.
- Should consider more housing on Rosecrans.
- Increasing density should consider how to alleviate gridlocks in traffic.
- Ensure affordable housing option includes the option to purchase.
- Housing for teachers and first responders, and housing for the Air Force Base.
- Support quality affordable housing.

According to HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) records, 130 housing discrimination cases were filed in Los Angeles County in 2020, compared to 291 in 2010. In 2020, a majority of cases were related to disability (66%). Another 21% of cases were related to racial bias. The percent of cases related to disability has increased significantly since 2010, when only 36% of cases reported a disability bias. Public housing buildings, FHEO inquiries by City and housing choice voucher (HCV) recipients by tract are shown in Figure C-1. HCVs are most concentrated in the areas east of El Segundo, near Inglewood, the City of Los Angeles, and in the adjacent unincorporated County areas. Public housing buildings are concentrated in the same area. However, there are many public housing buildings scattered throughout the County.

According to the HCD AFFH Data Viewer, there has been only two FHEO inquiries in El Segundo since 2013. Both were unrelated to a specific basis of discrimination. There is no additional discrimination complaint or case data available for the City of El Segundo.

There are no concentrations of renters receiving housing choice vouchers (HCVs) in the City. There are also no public housing buildings in El Segundo.

Figure C-1: Public Housing Buildings, FHEO Inquiries by City, and HCVs by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD 2013-2021, 2021.

2. Integration and Segregation

RACE AND ETHNICITY

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.

Dissimilarity indices can be used to measure the evenness of distribution between two groups in an area. Dissimilarity indices are commonly used to measure segregation. The following shows how HUD views various levels of the index:

- <40: Low Segregation
- 40-54: Moderate Segregation
- >55: High Segregation

The following analysis of racial/ethnic segregation also includes racial/ethnic minority population trends, maps of minority concentrated areas over time, and an analysis of the City’s sites inventory as it relates to minority (non-White) concentrated areas.

Regional Trend. As shown in Table C-1, racial/ethnic minority groups make up 73.7% of the Los Angeles County population. Nearly half of the Los Angeles County population is Hispanic/Latino (48.5%), 26.2% of the population is White, 14.4% is Asian, and 7.8% is Black/African American. El Segundo and the neighboring cities of Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, and Redondo Beach have significantly smaller populations of racial/ethnic minority (non-White) populations compared to the County, while Hawthorne and Inglewood have racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding the countywide average. Of the selected jurisdictions, Inglewood has the largest racial/ethnic minority population (95.5%), and Hermosa Beach has the smallest (22%).

Table C-1: Racial/Ethnic Composition – L.A. County, El Segundo, and Neighboring Cities

| Race/Ethnicity | El Segundo | Hawthorne | Hermosa Beach | Inglewood | Manhattan Beach | Redondo Beach | LA County |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|
| White | 62.0% | 10.3% | 78.0% | 4.5% | 73.3% | 60.3% | 26.2% |
| Black/African American | 3.7% | 24.1% | 1.0% | 39.6% | 0.4% | 3.1% | 7.8% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| Asian | 10.2% | 7.5% | 5.2% | 2.0% | 13.4% | 13.5% | 14.4% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.1% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Some other race | 0.4% | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.4% | 0.1% | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| Two+ races | 7.4% | 2.2% | 5.6% | 2.2% | 4.5% | 6.1% | 2.3% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16.2% | 54.8% | 9.4% | 50.6% | 8.0% | 16.0% | 48.5% |

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates.

As discussed previously, HUD’s dissimilarity indices can be used to estimate segregation levels over time. Dissimilarity indices for Los Angeles County are shown in Table C-2. Dissimilarity indices between non-White and White groups indicate that the County has become increasingly segregated since 1990. Segregation between Black and White communities has decreased, while segregation

between Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander communities and White communities has increased. According to HUD’s thresholds, all White and non-White communities in Los Angeles County are highly segregated.

Table C-2: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends – Los Angeles County

| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Current |
|---|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| Non-White/White | 56.66 | 56.72 | 56.55 | 58.53 |
| Black/White | 73.04 | 67.40 | 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 |
| Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Database, 2020. | | | | |

Figure C-2 shows that most areas in Los Angeles County have high concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities. Coastal cities, including Santa Monica and Redondo Beach, and the areas surrounding Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, and the Pacific Palisades neighborhood generally have smaller non-White populations. Most block groups in the South Bay, San Gabriel Valley, San Fernando Valley, and central Los Angeles areas have majority racial/ethnic minority populations. El Segundo’s racial/ethnic minority populations are comparable to surrounding jurisdictions. Coastal communities north and south of El Segundo tend to have smaller racial/ethnic minority populations, while communities east of El Segundo, such as Hawthorne and Inglewood, have larger concentrations racial/ethnic minorities.

Local Trend. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, 38% of the El Segundo population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group, an increase from 30.5% during the 2006-2010 ACS. In comparison, 73.7% of Los Angeles County residents belong to a racial or ethnic minority group. Since the 2006-2010 ACS, the City has seen a decline in the White, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic populations and increase in the Black/African American population, Asian population, persons of a race not listed (“some other race”), and persons of two or more races (Table C-3).

Table C-3: Change in Racial/Ethnic Composition (2010-2019)

| Race/Ethnicity | 2010 | | 2019 | |
|---|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Persons | Percent | Persons | Percent |
| White | 11,499 | 69.5% | 10,375 | 62.0% |
| Black/African American | 276 | 1.7% | 626 | 3.7% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 90 | 0.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Asian | 956 | 5.8% | 1,701 | 10.2% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 26 | 0.2% | 9 | 0.1% |
| Some other race | 21 | 0.1% | 70 | 0.4% |
| Two or more races | 649 | 3.9% | 1,241 | 7.4% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3,017 | 18.2% | 2,709 | 16.2% |
| Total | 16,534 | 100% | 16,731 | 100.0% |
| Source: 2015-2019 and 2006-2010 ACS (5-Year Estimates). | | | | |

Because HUD does not provide dissimilarity indices for El Segundo, dissimilarity was calculated based on the 2000 and 2010 decennial census and 2015-2019 ACS. Indices for the City are presented in Table C-4. Dissimilarity between non-White and White communities in El Segundo has worsened since 2000. Based on HUD’s definition of the various levels of the index, segregation between Hispanic/White and Asian /White El Segundo residents is low. However, Black and White communities are highly segregated. Compared to the County as a whole, El Segundo is less segregated based on dissimilarity indices.

Table C-4: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Trends – El Segundo

| | 2000 | 2010 | 2019 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Non-White/White | 14.35 | 13.48 | 22.87 |
| Black/White | 36.67 | 22.11 | 63.26 |
| Hispanic/White | 23.43 | 15.18 | 33.49 |
| Asian/White | 14.83 | 14.21 | 24.51 |
| Source: 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census; 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates); Veronica Tam & Associates, 2021. | | | |


Figure C-3 and Figure C-4 compare racial or ethnic minority concentrations in El Segundo in 2010 and 2018. The eastern side of the City has seen the most significant increase in non-White populations, from less than 20% in 2010 to more than 81% in 2018. Between 21% and 60% of the population belongs to a racial/ethnic minority group in the northeastern corner of the City. Nearly all residential units are located in this section of the City.

Sites Inventory. To assess the City’s sites inventory used to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA, the distribution of units by income category and non-White block group population are shown in Figure C-4 and . The City relies on mixed use overlay sites and potential redevelopment sites in the housing overlay to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA. All sites are located in the northwestern corner of the City where nearly all existing residential units are located. Additional information on current zoning designations in El Segundo is provided Section 6, *Other Relevant Factors*, of this Assessment of Fair Housing. Refer to Chapter 5, Housing Opportunities, of this Housing Element for the complete RHNA strategy. Most units are in block where 41-60% of the population belongs to a racial/ethnic minority group, including all 71.6% of lower income units, 70.4% of moderate income units, and 77.4% of above moderate income units. The remaining RHNA units are in block groups where 21-40% of the population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group. It is relevant to note that the block group containing RHNA sites with the largest non-White population has a racial/ethnic minority population of only 46%. The racial/ethnic minority population ranges provided by the HCD AFFH Data Viewer may exaggerate the concentration of minority groups in El Segundo block groups. Of block groups containing RHNA units, racial or ethnic minority populations range from 29.6% to 46%. The City’s RHNA strategy does not concentrate RHNA units, specifically lower income units, in areas where the racial/ethnic minority population exceeds the Citywide trend.

Table C-5: Distribution of RHNA Units by Racial/Ethnic Minority Population

| Racial/Ethnic Minority Population (Block Group) | Lower Income | | Moderate Income | | Above Moderate Income | | Total | |
|---|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent |
| 21-40% | 73 | 28.4% | 55 | 29.6% | 53 | 22.6% | 181 | 26.7% |
| 41-60% | 184 | 71.6% | 131 | 70.4% | 182 | 77.4% | 497 | 73.3% |
| Total | 257 | 100.0% | 186 | 100.0% | 235 | 100.0% | 678 | 100.0% |

Figure C-2: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations by Block Group (2018)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer (2018), 2021.

Figure C-3: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations by Block Group (2010)





Figure C-4: Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentrations by Block Group and Sites Inventory (2018)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer (2010-2018), 2021.

DISABILITY

Persons with disabilities have special housing needs because of their fixed income, the lack of accessible and affordable housing, and the higher health costs associated with their disability.

Regional Trend. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, 9.9% of Los Angeles County residents experience a disability. Only 6.2% of the El Segundo population experiences a disability. El Segundo has a smaller population of persons with disabilities compared to the neighboring cities of Hawthorne (9.6%), Hermosa Beach (6.7%), Inglewood (12.5%), and Redondo Beach (6.5%), but larger than Manhattan Beach (5.6%).


As shown in Figure C-5, less than 20% of the population in most tracts in Los Angeles County experience a disability. Tracts with disabled populations exceeding 20% are not concentrated in one area of the County. Tracts with populations of persons with disabilities exceeding 20% are near the cities of Inglewood, the City of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Norwalk, and Santa Monica. The coastal cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Redondo Beach tend to have smaller disabled populations. The concentration of persons with disabilities in El Segundo is comparable to neighboring jurisdictions.

Local Trend. All tracts in El Segundo have populations of persons with disabilities below 10% (Figure C-6). Independent living and cognitive difficulties are the most common disability type in El Segundo; 2.7% of the population experiences an independent living difficulty, 2.6% experiences a cognitive difficulty, 2.5% experiences an ambulatory difficulty, 2.2% experiences a hearing difficulty, 1.1% experiences a vision difficulty, and 0.9% experiences a self-care difficulty.

Disabilities are generally more common amongst aging populations. Over 35% of El Segundo residents above the age of 75 experience a disability and 17% of residents between the ages of 65 and 74 experience a disability. Approximately 11% of the population citywide is aged 65 or older.


Sites Inventory. All sites selected to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA are in tracts where less than 10% of the population experiences one or more disabilities. The City's RHNA strategy does not concentrate RHNA units of any income level in areas where populations of persons with disabilities are more prevalent.

Figure C-5: Regional Concentrations of Persons with Disabilities by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-6: Concentrations of Persons with Disabilities by Tract and Sites Inventory



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.


FAMILIAL STATUS

Familial status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, whether the child is biologically related to the head of household, and 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. Single parent households are also protected by fair housing law.

Regional Trend. Approximately 32% of El Segundo households are families with one or more child under the age of 18. The City’s share of households with children is larger than the County, and the neighboring cities of Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, and Redondo Beach, but smaller than Hawthorne and Manhattan Beach (Figure C-7). Of the selected jurisdictions, Inglewood has the largest proportion of single-parent households representing 13.9% of all households in the City, while only 4% percent of households in Hermosa Beach are single-parent households.

More than 60% of children in most areas around Rolling Hills, Burbank, Redondo Beach, and the Pacific Palisades neighborhood live in married couple households (Figure C-8). Figure C-9 shows percent of children living in single-parent female-headed households by tract. Children in female-headed households are most concentrated in the areas east of El Segundo, including Inglewood, the City of Los Angeles, and unincorporated Los Angeles County communities, and the areas around Long Beach and Lakewood. In general, there are more children living in female-headed households in the central Los Angeles County areas compared to the South Bay, Westside, Gateway, San Fernando Valley, and San Gabriel Valley cities.

Figure C-7: Households with Children – L.A. County, El Segundo, and Neighboring Cities



Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Local Trend. El Segundo has seen an increase in households with children since 2010. During the 2006-2010 ACS, there were 1,999 households with children representing 27.5% of all City households. The most recent 2015-2019 ACS estimates there is now only 2,074 households with children in El Segundo representing 32% of all households in the City. Approximately 7% of households in the City are single-parent households including 4.9% female-headed single-parent 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.


As shown in Figure C-10, more than 60% of children live in married couple households in all El Segundo tracts. There are no tracts where more than 20% of children live in single-parent female-headed households according to HCD’s AFFH data viewer.

Sites Inventory. The distribution of RHNA units by population of children residing in married couple households is shown in Table C-6 and Figure C-10. Consistent with the Citywide trend, most RHNA units, including 93.8% of lower income units, 93.5% of moderate income units, and 94.9% of above moderate income units, are in tracts where more than 80 percent of children reside in married couple households. There is one tract in the City, in the northwestern corner, where only 75.6 percent of children reside in married couple households. Approximately 5.9% of RHNA units are located in this tract. The City’s RHNA strategy does not disproportionately place sites in areas where fewer children reside in married couple households. As discussed above, there are no tracts in El Segundo where more than 20% of children reside in single-parent female-headed households.

Table C-6: Distribution of RHNA Units by Children in Married Couple Households


| Percent of Children in Married Couple HHs (Tract) | Lower Income | | Moderate Income | | Above Moderate Income | | Total | |
|---|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent |
| 60-80% | 16 | 6.2% | 12 | 6.5% | 12 | 5.1% | 40 | 5.9% |
| >80% | 241 | 93.8% | 174 | 93.5% | 223 | 94.9% | 638 | 94.1% |
| Total | 257 | 100.0% | 186 | 100.0% | 235 | 100.0% | 678 | 100.0% |

Figure C-8: Regional Percent of Children in Married Couple Households by Tract




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-9: Regional Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-10: Children in Married Couple Households by Tract and Sites Inventory



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

INCOME

Identifying low- or moderate-income (LMI) geographies and individuals is important to overcome patterns of segregation. HUD defines a LMI area as a census tract or block group where over 51% of the population is LMI (based on HUD’s income definition of up to 80% of the AMI).

Regional Trend. Table C-7 shows that only 24.3% of El Segundo households earn 80% or less than the area median income and are considered lower income, compared to 41.3% Countywide. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the median household income in El Segundo is \$109,577, significantly higher than \$68,044 countywide. El Segundo also has a higher median income than the nearby cities of Hawthorne (\$54,215) and Inglewood (\$54,400), but lower than Hermosa Beach (\$136,702), Manhattan Beach (\$153,023), and Redondo Beach (\$113,499).

Table C-7: Income Level Distribution

| Income Category | El Segundo | | Los Angeles County | |
|---|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| | Households | Percent | Households | Percent |
| Very Low Income (<50% AMI) | 835 | 12.6% | 859,239 | 26.1% |
| Low Income (50-80% AMI) | 781 | 11.8% | 501,140 | 15.2% |
| Moderate Income (80-120% AMI) | 991 | 14.9% | 532,128 | 16.1% |
| Above Moderate Income (>120% AMI) | 4,031 | 60.7% | 1,402,692 | 42.6% |
| Total Households | 6,638 | 100.0% | 3,295,199 | 100.0% |
| Note: AMI = Area Median Income | | | | |
| Source: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Final RHNA Data Appendix, 2020. | | | | |

Figure C-11 shows LMI areas regionally. Coastal cities, from Rancho Palos Verdes to El Segundo, and the Pacific Palisades neighborhood have low concentrations of LMI households. In these areas, less than 25% of the population is LMI in most tracts. LMI households are most concentrated in the central Los Angeles County region around the City of Los Angeles. There are smaller concentrations of LMI households in and around the cities of Glendale, El Monte, San Fernando, and Long Beach. El Segundo has LMI household concentrations consistent with coastal cities to the north and south.


Local Trend. As discussed above, less than a quarter of El Segundo households are in the low or moderate income categories. Figure C-12 shows LMI concentrations by block group in the City. According to HUD’s definition, there are no LMI areas in El Segundo. Less than 50% of households in all block groups are LMI.

Sites Inventory. Figure C-12 also shows the mixed use overlay sites and potential redevelopment sites in the housing overlay used to meet the 2021-2029 RHNA. None of the sites are in LMI areas where more than 51% of households are low or moderate income. However, a larger proportion of lower and moderate income units are in block groups where 25% to 50% of households are LMI, compared to above moderate income units. Approximately 60% of lower income units and 62% of moderate income units are in tracts where more than 25% of the population is LMI compared to only 50% of above moderate income units. Despite this, none of the sites selected are in LMI areas. The City’s RHNA strategy does not exacerbate existing conditions related to LMI households. Further, sites are located in various areas of the residential section of El Segundo, promoting housing suitable for households of all income levels throughout the City to the greatest extent possible.

Table C-8: Distribution of RHNA Units by Concentration of LMI Households


| Population of LMI HHs (Block Group) | Lower Income | | Moderate Income | | Above Mod. Income | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent |
| <25% | 103 | 40.1% | 71 | 38.2% | 117 | 49.8% | 291 | 42.9% |
| 25-50% | 154 | 59.9% | 115 | 61.8% | 118 | 50.2% | 387 | 57.1% |
| Total | 257 | 100.0% | 186 | 100.0% | 235 | 100.0% | 678 | 100.0% |

Figure C-11: Regional LMI Household Concentrations by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD LMI database (based on 2011-2015 ACS), 2021.

Figure C-12: LMI Household Concentrations by Block Group and Sites Inventory



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD LMI database (based on 2011-2015 ACS), 2021.

3. Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

RACIALLY/ETHNICALLY CONCENTRATED AREAS OF POVERTY (R/ECAPS)

In an effort to identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD identified census tracts with a majority non-White population 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. HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) convened as the Fair Housing Task Force to create opportunity maps. The maps also identify areas of high segregation and poverty. TCAC Opportunity Maps are discussed in more detail in the following section of this fair housing assessment.

Regional Trend. Approximately 15% of the County population is below the federal poverty level (Table C-9). Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, persons of a race not listed (“Some other race”), and Hispanic/Latino populations all experience poverty at a higher rate than the average countywide. The proportion of non-Hispanic White residents under the poverty level is the lowest compared to other racial/ethnic groups in the County. Over 21% of persons with disabilities are also below the poverty level.

Table C-9: Poverty Status by Race/Ethnicity and Disability Status

| | Percent Below Poverty Level | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| | El Segundo | L.A. County |
| Black or African American | 1.6% | 20.8% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 59.5% | 18.1% |
| Asian | 2.4% | 11.1% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0.0% | 11.5% |
| Some other race | 31.2% | 19.2% |
| Two or more races | 6.5% | 11.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 11.9% | 18.1% |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino | 5.1% | 9.6% |
| With a disability | -- | 21.2% |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 5.9% | 14.9% |

Note: -- = Data not available.
Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).


Figure C-13 shows R/ECAPs, TCAC designated areas of high segregation and poverty, and poverty status in the Los Angeles County region. R/ECAPs and areas of high segregation and poverty are concentrated in the central County areas around the City of Los Angeles. Areas of high segregation and poverty have also been identified in tracts east of El Segundo in Hawthorne and Inglewood. Tracts with larger populations of persons experiencing poverty are also concentrated in these areas.

Local Trend. As presented in Table C-9 above, only 5.9% of the El Segundo population is below the poverty level, significantly lower than the rate countywide. American Indian and Alaska Native residents experienced poverty at the highest rate. Nearly 60% the American Indian and Alaska Native population, 31.2% of the population belonging to a race not listed (“some other race”), and 11.9% of the Hispanic or Latino population is below the poverty level.

There are no R/ECAPs or TCAC-designated areas of high segregation and poverty in the City and fewer than 10% of the population in all El Segundo tracts have incomes below the poverty level.

Sites Inventory. There are no R/ECAPs or TCAC areas of high segregation and poverty in El Segundo; therefore, no sites selected to meet the RHNA are in tracts with these designations.

Figure C-13: R/ECAPs, TCAC Areas of High Segregation and Poverty, and Poverty Status by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD 2009-2013 R/ECAP database, TCAC 2021, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

RACIALLY/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.⁵ 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).

Regional Trend. Figure C-14 shows racial/ethnic minority populations and median income by block group in the El Segundo region. Jurisdictions along the coast, including El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, and the Playa Vista neighborhood, have higher median incomes and smaller racial/ethnic minority populations. Cities east of El Segundo such as Hawthorne, Lawndale, and Inglewood, have higher concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities. Many block groups in the areas east of El Segundo also have median incomes below the 2020 State median income of \$87,100. There is a small concentration of RCAAs, block groups with median incomes exceeding \$125,000 and racial/ethnic minority populations below 20%, in Manhattan Beach.


Local Trend. As discussed previously, only 38% of the El Segundo population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group. The remaining 62% of the population is non-Hispanic White. Racial/ethnic minority populations and median income by El Segundo block group are presented in Figure C-15. Of the block groups in the City with data for income, two have median incomes exceeding \$125,000, two have median incomes below the State median, and the remaining have median incomes between \$87,100 and \$125,000. There are no block groups in the City where racial/ethnic minorities make up less than 20% of the population; therefore, there are no RCAAs in El Segundo.

On July 8, 2022, HCD released a map illustrating census tracts designated as RCAAS, in addition to an updated data methodology. A census tract is designated an RCAA if its proportions of non-Hispanic White residents and households earning above the region’s area median income are overrepresented. The map in Figure C-16 illustrates that there is one tract in El Segundo that is considered an RCAA. According to HCD AFFH Data Viewer data, this tract contains block groups with racial/ethnic minority populations ranging from 29.6% to 40.7%, similar to the Citywide trend. Like the remainder of the City, this tract is designated as a TCAC highest resource area.

Sites Inventory. Of the 678 units identified to meet the RHNA in El Segundo, 291 (43%) are located in the RCAA, including 40.1% of lower income units, 38.2% of moderate income units, and 49.8% of above moderate income units. The City’s RHNA strategy ensures above moderate income units alone are not allocated in the RCAA. The strategy promotes a mix of housing types that can adequately serve populations of various income levels in the RCAA. Further, sites selected to meet the RHNA are not located in the RCAA alone and can serve existing and future El Segundo residents throughout the City.


⁵ 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 C-14: Regional Racial/Ethnic Minority Populations and Median Income by Block Group




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021

Figure C-15: Racial/Ethnic Minority Populations and Median Income by Block Group



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-16: RCAAs



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

4. Access to Opportunities

To assess fair access to opportunities regionally and locally, this analysis uses HUD Opportunity Indicators and TCAC Opportunity Area Maps. This section also specifically addresses economic, education, environmental, and transportation 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. HUD only provides indicator scores for jurisdictions receiving CDBG funding. Because El Segundo receives CDBG funds through the County, opportunity indicator scores are not available. Index scores are based on 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.

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 resources 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 related to economic, environmental, and educational opportunities and poverty and racial segregation. 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 C-10 shows the full list of indicators.

Table C-10: 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 |
| Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020. | |

Regional Trend. HUD Opportunity Indicator scores for Los Angeles County are shown in Table C-11. The White population, including the population below the federal poverty line, received the highest scores in low poverty, school proficiency, labor market participation, jobs proximity, and environmental health. Hispanic communities scored the lowest in low poverty and labor market participation and Black communities scored the lowest in school proficiency, jobs proximity, and environmental health. Black residents were most likely to use public transit and have the lowest transportation costs.

Table C-11: HUD Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity – Los Angeles County

| | Low Poverty | School Prof. | Labor Market | Transit | Low Transp. Cost | Jobs Prox. | Env. Health |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 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 |
| Source: HUD AFFH Database – Opportunity Indicators, 2020. | | | | | | | |

The central Los Angeles County areas around the City of Los Angeles are comprised of mostly low and moderate resource tracts and areas of high segregation and poverty. The El Monte/Baldwin Park area and San Fernando area, including Van Nuys/North Hollywood, also have concentrations of low resource areas and some areas of high segregation and poverty. High and highest resource areas are mostly concentrated in coastal communities from Rolling Hills and Rancho Palos Verdes to Santa Monica, and areas in and around Beverly Hills, La Cañada Flintridge, and Pasadena/Arcadia.

Local Trend. Opportunity map scores for El Segundo census tracts are presented in Figure C-18 along with the City’s sites inventory. As discussed previously, nearly all El Segundo residents reside in the northwestern corner of the City. A majority of the southern and northeastern areas are comprised of commercial, corporate, and industrial uses. There are no housing units in these tracts. Only four El Segundo tracts in the northwestern corner of the City have TCAC Opportunity Map designations. Due to insufficient data, the remaining two tracts the City, along the eastern and southern boundaries, do not have TCAC Opportunity Map categorizations.

All tracts with sufficient data in the City are highest resource tracts. There are no tracts in the City that are classified as areas of high segregation and poverty. Opportunity map categorization and domain scores for El Segundo census tracts are shown in Table C-12.


Sites Inventory. All units selected to meet the RHNA are in highest resource areas. The City’s RHNA strategy does not exacerbate fair housing conditions related to TCAC opportunity areas.

Table C-12: Opportunity Map Scores and Categorization

| Census Tract | Economic Score | Environmental Score | Education Score | Composite Score | Final Category |
|--------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 6037620101 | 0.805 | 0.649 | 0.931 | 0.701 | Highest Resource |
| 6037620001 | 0.897 | 0.474 | 0.952 | 0.831 | Highest Resource |
| 6037620002 | 0.918 | 0.288 | 0.963 | 0.845 | Highest Resource |
| 6037620102 | 0.881 | 0.271 | 0.986 | 0.852 | Highest Resource |


Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020.

Figure C-17: Regional TCAC Opportunity Areas by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021.

Figure C-18: TCAC Opportunity Areas by Tract and Sites Inventory



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021.


ECONOMIC

As described previously, the Fair Housing Task Force calculates economic scores based on poverty, adult education, employment, job proximity, and median home values. See Table C-10 for the complete list of TCAC Opportunity Map domains and indicators.

Regional Trend. As presented in Table C-11 above, in Los Angeles County, White residents have the highest labor market participation, while Hispanic residents have the lowest labor market participation. Figure C-19 shows TCAC Opportunity Map economic scores in the Los Angeles region by tract. Consistent with final TCAC categories, tracts with the highest economic scores are concentrated in coastal communities, from the Rancho Palos Verdes to Santa Monica, and areas around Beverly Hills, Pasadena, and Arcadia. Tracts with economic scores in the lowest quartile are concentrated in the central Los Angeles County areas, San Gabriel Valley cities around El Monte, and around the cities of Long Beach and Carson.


Local Trend. As presented in Figure C-20, the northwestern corner of the City is comprised of tracts with economic scores in the highest quartile. As discussed previously, the tracts along the eastern and southern City boundaries are comprised of mostly industrial, corporate, and commercial uses. There are no housing units located in these tracts. These tracts scored in the lowest quartile for economic opportunity. The tract along the eastern City boundary has high concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities exceeding 81% (see Figure C-3).

Figure C-19: Regional TCAC Opportunity Area Economic Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021

Figure C-20: TCAC Opportunity Area Economic Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021.


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. See Table C-10 for the complete list of TCAC Opportunity Map domains and indicators.

Regional Trend. As presented in Table C-11 previously, White Los Angeles County communities are located closest to the highest quality school systems, while Black communities are typically located near lower quality school systems. TCAC Opportunity Map education scores for the region are shown in Figure C-21. The central County areas have the highest concentration of tracts with education scores in the lowest percentile. There is also a concentration of tracts with low education scores around the San Pedro community and City of Long Beach. Coastal communities, and areas near Arcadia, Whittier, and Beverly Hills have the highest education scores.


Local Trend. Figure C-22 shows TCAC education scores for El Segundo tracts. Tracts in El Segundo received education scores consistent with economic scores discussed above. The northwestern corner of the City, where a large majority of El Segundo households are located, scored in the highest quartile, while the tracts along the eastern and southern City boundaries received education scores below 0.25.

Figure C-21: Regional TCAC Opportunity Area Education Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021

Figure C-22: TCAC Opportunity Area Education Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021

ENVIRONMENTAL

Environmental health scores are determined by the Fair Housing Task Force based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) compiles these scores to help identify California communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution. In addition to considering (1) environmental factors such as pollutant exposure, groundwater threats, toxic sites, and hazardous materials exposure and (2) sensitive receptors, including seniors, children, persons with asthma, and low birth weight infants, CalEnviroScreen also takes into consideration socioeconomic factors. These factors include educational attainment, linguistic isolation, poverty, and unemployment.

Regional Trend. As discussed previously, Black residents countywide are most likely to experience adverse environmental health conditions, while White residents are the least likely. A larger proportion of Los Angeles County has environmental scores in the lowest percentile compared to economic and education scores (Figure C-23). The central Los Angeles County, San Gabriel Valley, and South Bay areas all have concentrations of tracts with environmental scores in the lowest percentile. Tracts with the highest environmental scores are in western South Bay areas (i.e., Rolling Hills and Redondo Beach), and areas around Inglewood, Altadena, Whittier, Lakewood, and Malibu.

Local Trend. Environmental scores by tract in El Segundo are shown in Figure C-24. Only one tract in the northwestern corner of the City received an environmental score above 0.50. The three remaining tracts in the northwestern corner scored between 0.25 and 0.50, and the tracts along the eastern and southern City boundaries scored in the lowest quartile. The tract along the eastern City boundary has a larger non-White population compared to the rest of the City (see Figure C-3).

Access to parks, recreation, and open space is also crucial to healthy communities. To affirmatively further fair housing, all residents, regardless of demographics, should have access to recreational areas and open space. Figure C-25 shows protected open space in the City, including City and County land. There are many open space areas accessible to El Segundo residents in all areas of the City. The areas mapped include a variety of uses from national forests to small urban parks. In the case of El Segundo, most areas are parks and smaller open space areas. The northwestern section of the City, where nearly all residential units are located, has the highest density of open space. There are additional open space areas on the eastern side of the City and in the coastal area.

Sites Inventory. The February 2021 update to the CalEnviroScreen (CalEnviroScreen 4.0) and the City's sites inventory is shown in Figure C-26. A census tract's overall CalEnviroScreen percentile equals the percentage of all ordered CalEnviroScreen scores that fall below the score for that area. The areas with the highest (worst) scores are in the northwestern corner of the City; however, nearly all residential units in the City, including potential sites for future residential development projects, are located in this corner.


The distribution of RHNA units by CalEnviroScreen 4.0 score is shown in Table C-13. Approximately 54% of lower income units, 55% of moderate income units, and 45% of above moderate income units are in tracts scoring between the 51st and 60th percentile, the worst scores amongst El Segundo tracts. As shown in Figure C-26, tracts with CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores include the tract bound by City boundaries to the north and west, Sheldon Street to the east, and W. Mariposa Avenue to the south, and the tract bound by W. Mariposa Avenue to the north, the Pacific Coast Highway to the east, El Segundo Boulevard to the south, and Sheldon Street to the west. While there are a significant number of RHNA units in these tracts, it is also relevant to note that 40.1% of lower income units, 38.2% of moderate income units, and 49.5% of above moderate income units are also in tracts with

CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores in the 20th percentile or lower (best scores). RHNA units of all income levels are distributed throughout tracts with variable CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores, ensuring housing units, specifically lower income units, are not concentrated in areas with worse environmental conditions. Further, all units are located in the northwestern area of the City where open space areas are prevalent and accessible (Figure C-25).

Table C-13: Distribution of RHNA Units by CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Score


| CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile (Tract) | Lower Income | | Moderate Income | | Above Moderate Income | | Total | |
|--|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent |
| 11-20% | 103 | 40.1% | 71 | 38.2% | 117 | 49.8% | 291 | 42.9% |
| 21-30% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 31-40% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 41-50% | 16 | 6.2% | 12 | 6.5% | 12 | 5.1% | 40 | 5.9% |
| 51-60% | 138 | 53.7% | 103 | 55.4% | 106 | 45.1% | 347 | 51.2% |
| Total | 257 | 100.0% | 186 | 100.0% | 235 | 100.0% | 634 | 100.0% |

Figure C-23: Regional TCAC Opportunity Area Environmental Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021

Figure C-24: TCAC Opportunity Area Environmental Scores by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, TCAC 2021, 2021.

Figure C-25: Protected Open Space in City of El Segundo (2019)





Figure C-26: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Score by Tract and Sites Inventory




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, CalEnviroScreen 4.0, 2021.

TRANSPORTATION

HUD’s Job Proximity Index, shown in Table C-11, can be used to show transportation need geographically. Block groups with lower jobs proximity indices are located further from employment opportunities and have a higher need for transportation. 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. This section also utilizes All Transit metrics to identify transportation opportunities in Los Angeles County and El Segundo.

Regional Trend. All Transit explores metrics that reveal the social and economic impact of transit, specifically looking at connectivity, access to jobs, and frequency of service. El Segundo’s All Transit Performance score of 5.8 Hawthorne (7.3), Hermosa Beach (6.4), Inglewood (7.7), Lawndale (7.8), Redondo Beach (6.6), and the County (6.8). The City scored slightly higher than Manhattan Beach (5.6). Los Angeles County All Transit metrics are shown in Figure C-27. The County’s All Transit score of 6.8 indicates a moderate combination of trips per week and number of accessible jobs enabling a moderate number of people to take transit to work. All Transit estimates 93.9% of jobs and 90.1% of workers are located within ½ a mile from transit.

Figure C-27: Los Angeles County All Transit Metrics




Source: All Transit Metrics: All Transit Performance Score – Los Angeles County, 2019.

As shown in Figure C-29, block groups around Santa Monica and Beverly Hills, Pasadena, Torrance, downtown Los Angeles, and coastal areas around El Segundo have the highest jobs proximity index scores indicating employment opportunities are most accessible in these areas. Central County areas, from Inglewood to Bellflower, southern South Bay cities, and parts of the San Gabriel Valley have the lowest jobs proximity index scores. Most of the central County areas are considered HQTAs.

Local Trend. All Transit metrics for El Segundo are shown in Figure C-28. El Segundo received an All Transit Performance Score of 5.8, indicating a moderate combination of trips per week and

number of jobs accessible by transit. All Transit estimates that 99.6% of jobs and 99.6% of workers in El Segundo are within 1/2 a mile from transit.

Figure C-28: El Segundo All Transit Metrics




Source: All Transit Metrics: All Transit Performance Score – El Segundo, 2019.

As shown in Figure C-30, all census block groups in El Segundo received the highest jobs proximity index scores exceeding 80, indicating that employment opportunities are very accessible in the City. Additionally, the eastern side of the City is considered an HQTAs (Figure C-29).


Figure C-31 shows bikeways throughout the City. El Segundo has a widespread network of proposed or planned interconnected bikeways according to the SCAG Data/Map Book for the City of El Segundo. Additional bikeways throughout the City will encourage mobility, specifically in the northwestern corner of the City where nearly all residential units are located.

Figure C-29: Regional HUD Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group and HQTAs




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD 2014-2017, 2021.

Figure C-30: HUD Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, HUD 2014-2017, 2021.

Figure C-31: Bikeways in the City of El Segundo



5. Disproportionate Housing Needs

Housing problems in El Segundo were calculated using HUD’s 2020 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data based on the 2013-2017 ACS. Table C-14 breaks down households by race and ethnicity and presence of housing problems for El Segundo and Los Angeles County households. The following conditions are considered housing problems:

- Substandard Housing (measured by incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities)
- Overcrowding (more than 1 person per room)
- Cost burden (housing costs greater than 30%)

In El Segundo, 24.7% of owner-occupied households and 44.4% of renter-occupied households have one or more housing problems. The City has a smaller proportion of households with a housing problem compared to the County, where 38.9% of owner-occupied households and 62.3% of renter-occupied households experience a housing problem. In El Segundo, all Pacific Islander renter-households experience a housing problem. White owner-occupied households, Asian owner-occupied households, and Hispanic renter-occupied households also experience housing problems at a higher rate than the City average.

Table C-14: Housing Problems by Race/Ethnicity

| | El Segundo | | Los Angeles County | |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | Owner | Renter | Owner | Renter |
| White | 26.6% | 43.7% | 32.1% | 52.6% |
| Black | -- | 43.8% | 41.5% | 63.7% |
| Asian | 38.0% | 42.4% | 38.3% | 56.3% |
| American Indian | -- | -- | 39.7% | 56.4% |
| Pacific Islander | -- | 100.0% | 39.7% | 55.5% |
| Hispanic | 0.0% | 53.3% | 48.2% | 71.1% |
| Other | 0.0% | 24.0% | 36.5% | 55.7% |
| All | 24.7% | 44.4% | 38.9% | 62.3% |

Note: -- = 0 households in category.
Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2020.

COST BURDEN

Households are considered cost burdened if housing costs exceed 30% of their gross income for housing, and severely cost burdened if housing costs exceed 50% of their gross income. Cost burden in El Segundo and Los Angeles County is assessed using 2020 HUD CHAS data (based on 2013-2017 ACS estimates) and the HCD Data Viewer (based on 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS estimates).

Regional Trend. Cost burden by tenure and race/ethnicity for Los Angeles County is shown in Table C-15. Approximately 45% of Los Angeles County households are cost burdened, including 35% of owner-occupied households and 54.2% of renter-occupied households. Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic renter households have the highest rate of cost burden of 59.6% and 58.3%, respectively. Non-Hispanic White and non-Hispanic Pacific Islander owner households have the lowest rate of cost burden of 31.1% and 33.3%, respectively. Cost burden is more common amongst renter households than owner households regardless of race or ethnicity.

Table C-15: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure – Los Angeles County

| | Cost Burdened (>30%) | Severely Cost Burdened (>50%) | Total Households |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Owner-Occupied | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 31.1% | 14.8% | 648,620 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 40.0% | 19.6% | 104,895 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 34.4% | 15.8% | 255,890 |
| American Indian, non-Hispanic | 36.9% | 16.3% | 3,215 |
| Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | 33.3% | 14.8% | 2,165 |
| Hispanic | 39.5% | 17.8% | 470,670 |
| Other | 34.9% | 17.2% | 26,905 |
| Renter-Occupied | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 49.4% | 27.5% | 541,545 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 59.6% | 34.8% | 206,950 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 47.6% | 25.5% | 226,765 |
| American Indian, non-Hispanic | 48.8% | 26.8% | 4,420 |
| Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | 47.9% | 22.5% | 4,355 |
| Hispanic | 58.3% | 30.5% | 755,590 |
| Other | 50.9% | 27.5% | 43,210 |

Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2020.

Cost burden Figure C-32 and Figure C-33 show concentrations of cost burdened owners and renters by tract for the region. Tracts with high concentrations of cost burdened owners are generally dispersed throughout the County. Overpaying owners are most prevalent in the central County areas, in the westside cities of Santa Monica and Beverly Hills, and parts of the San Gabriel Valley. In most tracts in coastal areas from Rolling Hills to El Segundo, 20% to 60% of owners are cost burdened. There is a higher concentration of cost burdened renters countywide. More than 40% of renters overpay for housing in most Los Angeles County tracts. Tracts where more than 60% of renters are cost burdened are most concentrated in the central County areas around Inglewood and the City of Los Angeles, Long Beach, eastern County cities including Norwalk, and parts of the San Gabriel Valley. Between 20% and 60% of renters in coastal areas around El Segundo overpay for housing. There is a higher concentration of overpaying renters in tracts to the east of the City.

Local Trend. Cost burden by tenure in El Segundo based on HUD CHAS data is shown in Table C-16. Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Black renter-occupied households have the highest rate of cost burden in the city (100%, 45.3%, and 43.8% respectively). There are no cost burdened Hispanic owners or owners of a race not listed (“other”) in El Segundo. For all racial and ethnic groups other than Asians, cost burden is more prevalent amongst renter-occupied households. Overall, 31.9% of El Segundo households are cost burdened, and 14.6% are severely cost burdened. Only 24% of owners in El Segundo spend more than 30% of their income on housing, compared to 38.3% of renters. Fewer households are cost burdened in El Segundo compared to the County.

Table C-16: Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure – El Segundo

| | Cost Burdened (>30%) | Severely Cost Burdened (>50%) | Total Households |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Owner-Occupied | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 26.2% | 11.5% | 2,350 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | -- | -- | 0 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 38.0% | 20.0% | 250 |
| American Indian, non-Hispanic | -- | -- | 0 |
| Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | -- | -- | 0 |
| Hispanic | 0.0% | 0.0% | 285 |
| Other | 0.0% | 0.0% | 75 |
| Renter-Occupied | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 40.0% | 16.8% | 2,325 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 43.8% | 25.0% | 80 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 22.7% | 3.0% | 330 |
| American Indian, non-Hispanic | -- | -- | 0 |
| Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | 100.0% | 0.0% | 10 |
| Hispanic | 45.3% | 26.3% | 685 |
| Other | 20.0% | 20.0% | 250 |

Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2020.

Figure C-34 through Figure C-37 compare cost burden by tract in using the 2010-2014 and 2015-2019 ACS. The rate of cost burdened owners has decreased or remained the same in all tracts in El Segundo since the 2010-2014 ACS. Between 20% and 40% of owners are currently cost burdened in all tracts. The rate of cost burdened renters has increased in one tract in the northwestern corner of the City. According to the most recently 2015-2019 ACS estimates, between 40% and 60% of renters overpay in most El Segundo tracts. Only 20% to 40% of renters overpay in the tract at the cross section of the PCH and El Segundo Boulevard.


Sites Inventory. As discussed above, between 20% and 40% of owners overpay for housing in all El Segundo tracts; therefore, all RHNA units are located in tracts with populations of cost burdened owners in this range. The distribution of RHNA units by cost burdened renters is shown below. Over half (51.2%) of RHNA units are in tracts where 20% to 40% of renters overpay for housing, including 53.7% of lower income units, 55.4% of moderate income units, and 45.1% of above moderate income units. The other 48.8% of RHNA units are in tracts where 40% to 60% of renters overpay. As shown in Figure C-37, the distribution of RHNA units is consistent with the Citywide trend where 40% and 60% of renters are cost burdened in a majority of the City. The City’s RHNA strategy does not exacerbate existing fair housing conditions related to cost burden.

Table C-17: Distribution of RHNA Units by Percent of Cost Burdened Renters

| Cost Burdened Renters (Tract) | Lower Income | | Moderate Income | | Above Moderate Income | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent | Units | Percent |
| 20-40% | 138 | 53.7% | 103 | 55.4% | 106 | 45.1% | 347 | 51.2% |
| 40.1-60% | 119 | 46.3% | 83 | 44.6% | 129 | 54.9% | 331 | 48.8% |


| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Total | 257 | 100.0% | 186 | 100.0% | 235 | 100.0% | 678 | 100.0% |
|--------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|

Figure C-32: Regional Cost Burdened Owners by Tract (2019)




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2010-2014 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-33: Regional Cost Burdened Renters by Tract (2019)




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2010-2014 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-34: Cost Burdened Owners by Tract (2014)




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2010-2014 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-35: Cost Burdened Renters by Tract (2014)




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2010-2014 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-36: Cost Burdened Owners by Tract and Sites Inventory (2019)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure C-37: Cost Burdened Renters by Tract and Sites Inventory (2019)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

OVERCROWDING

A household is considered overcrowded if there is more than one person per room and severely overcrowded if there is more than 1.5 persons per room. HUD CHAS data based on the 2013-2017 ACS and the HCD AFFH Data Viewer (2015-2019 ACS) is used to show overcrowding in El Segundo and Los Angeles County.

Regional Trend. As shown in Table C-18, 5.7% of owner-occupied households and 16.7% of renter-occupied households in the County are overcrowded. Severe overcrowding is also an issue in the County, especially amongst renter households. More than 1% of owner households and 7.6% of renter households are severely overcrowded.

Table C-18: Overcrowding by Tenure

| | Overcrowded (>1 person per room) | | Severely Overcrowded (>1.5 persons per room) | | Total Households |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---|---------|---------------------|
| | Households | Percent | Households | Percent | |
| El Segundo | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 25 | 0.8% | 15 | 0.5% | 2,960 |
| Renter-Occupied | 215 | 5.8% | 80 | 2.2% | 3,680 |
| Los Angeles County | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 85,870 | 5.7% | 23,025 | 1.5% | 1,512,365 |
| Renter-Occupied | 298,460 | 16.7% | 134,745 | 7.6% | 1,782,835 |

Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2013-2017 ACS), 2020.


Figure C-38 shows concentrations of overcrowded households by tract regionally. Overcrowded households are most concentrated in the central County areas, including the City of Los Angeles, South Gate, and Compton, and in parts of San Gabriel Valley. Areas north and south of El Segundo have concentrations of overcrowded households below the State average. Tracts east of El Segundo, around Hawthorn and Inglewood, have significantly more overcrowding.

Local Trend. As presented in Table C-18 above, a smaller share of households in El Segundo are overcrowded compared to the countywide average. Less than 1% of owner-occupied households and 5.8% of renter-occupied households in the City have more than one person per room. Only 0.5% of owner households and 2.2% of renter households are severely overcrowded, with more than 1.5 persons per room.

Figure C-39 shows overcrowding by tract in the City. There are no tracts in El Segundo where the percent of overcrowded households exceeds the statewide average of 8.2%.


Sites Inventory. There are no RHNA units in tracts where the population of overcrowded households exceeds the statewide average of 8.2%. The City's RHNA strategy does not exacerbate conditions related to overcrowding.

Figure C-38: Regional Overcrowded Households by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 HUD CHAS data, 2021.

Figure C-39: Overcrowded Households by Tract



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 HUD CHAS data, 2021.

SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

Incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities and housing stock age can be used to measure substandard housing conditions. Incomplete facilities and housing age are based on the 2015-2019 ACS. 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.

Regional Trend. Less than 1% households in the County lack complete plumbing facilities, and 1.5% lack complete kitchen facilities. Incomplete facilities are more common amongst renter-occupied households. Only 0.4% of owner households lack complete kitchen facilities compared to 2.5% of renters (Table C-19).

Table C-19: Incomplete Facilities

| | Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities | | Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities | | Total Households |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|------------------|
| | Households | Percent | Households | Percent | |
| El Segundo | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2,792 |
| Renter-Occupied | 19 | 0.5% | 129 | 3.6% | 3,625 |
| Total | 19 | 0.3% | 129 | 2.0% | 6,417 |
| Los Angeles County | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 3,672 | 0.2% | 5,823 | 0.4% | 1,519,516 |
| Renter-Occupied | 11,410 | 0.6% | 44,441 | 2.5% | 1,797,279 |
| Total | 15,082 | 0.5% | 50,264 | 1.5% | 3,316,795 |
| Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates). | | | | | |

Housing age can also be used as an indicator for substandard housing and rehabilitation needs. 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. In the County, 86% of the housing stock was built prior to 1990, including 60.5% built prior to 1970 (Table C-20).

Local Trend. There are no owner-occupied households lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities in El Segundo (Table C-19). A larger proportion of renter-occupied households in El Segundo lack complete kitchen facilities compared to the share countywide. Of renter households, 0.5% lack complete plumbing facilities and 3.6% lack complete kitchen facilities.


Table C-20 shows the housing stock age in El Segundo and El Segundo block groups. Nearly 90% of the City's housing stock was built prior to 1990, a slightly higher share than the County. Tract 6200.01 block groups 1 and 3, and tract 6201.01 block group 2 have the largest share of housing units aged 50 or older. More than 70% of housing units in these block groups were built prior to 1970. Figure C-40 shows the median year housing units were built by block group. The northernmost tracts, tracts 6201.01 and 6200.01, have slightly older housing stocks.

Table C-20: Housing Unit Age

| Tract/Jurisdiction | 1969 or Earlier (50+ Years) | 1970-1989 (30-50 Years) | 1990 or Later (<30 Years) | Total Housing Units |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Block Group 1, Tract 6200.01 | 73.1% | 21.0% | 5.9% | 442 |
| Block Group 2, Tract 6200.01 | 64.9% | 27.8% | 7.3% | 479 |
| Block Group 3, Tract 6200.01 | 76.5% | 11.0% | 12.4% | 571 |
| Block Group 1, Tract 6200.02 | 55.3% | 29.4% | 15.4% | 494 |
| Block Group 2, Tract 6200.02 | 42.5% | 29.7% | 27.7% | 602 |
| Block Group 3, Tract 6200.02 | 59.9% | 29.1% | 11.1% | 416 |
| Block Group 1, Tract 6201.01 | 57.4% | 38.1% | 4.6% | 680 |
| Block Group 2, Tract 6201.01 | 75.3% | 18.9% | 5.8% | 782 |
| Block Group 3, Tract 6201.01 | 56.8% | 33.3% | 9.9% | 718 |
| Block Group 1, Tract 6201.02 | 57.5% | 23.1% | 19.4% | 381 |
| Block Group 2, Tract 6201.02 | 55.1% | 36.7% | 8.2% | 403 |
| Block Group 3, Tract 6201.02 | 62.0% | 29.9% | 8.1% | 803 |
| Block Group 1, Tract 9800.13 | -- | -- | -- | 0 |
| Block Group 1, Tract 9800.30 | -- | -- | -- | 0 |
| El Segundo | 61.7% | 27.4% | 10.9% | 6,771 |
| Los Angeles County | 60.5% | 25.4% | 14.1% | 3,542,800 |

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure C-40: Housing Stock by Block Group – Median Year Built



Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimate).

DISPLACEMENT RISK

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 that are severely rent burdened households is above the county median,
 - The area or areas in close proximity have recently experienced 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).

Regional Trend. Figure C-43 shows sensitive communities at risk of displacement in the region. Vulnerable communities are most concentrated in the central County areas around the City of Los Angeles, Inglewood, South Gate, and Compton, East Los Angeles, and parts of the San Gabriel Valley. There are fewer vulnerable communities in coastal areas from Rolling Hills to Malibu.

Local Trend. As shown in Figure C-44, there are no sensitive communities at risk of displacement in El Segundo. Tracts just east of the City in Hawthorne and Lawndale are considered vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased redevelopment or shifts in housing cost.

As discussed previously, vulnerability is measured based on several variables including: share of renters exceeding 40%, share of people of color exceeding 50%, share of low income households severely rent burdened, and proximity to displacement pressures. Displacement pressures were defined based on median rent increases and rent gaps. According to 2015-2019 ACS estimates, 56.5% of households in El Segundo are renter-occupied, a slight increase from 55.7% during the 2006-2010 ACS. All racial/ethnic minority groups are more likely to be renters compared to White householders. As presented in Figure C-41, 100% of American Indian and Alaska Native householder (15 total households), 73% of households of some other race, 70.6% of households of two or more races, 68.7% of Hispanic or Latino households, 59.8% of Asian households, and 53.7% of Black or African American households are renter-occupied compared to only 52.7% of non-Hispanic White households. As discussed previously, some racial/ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience housing problems including cost burden (see Table C-16). Based on this demographic data, racial/ethnic minority populations in El Segundo are more likely to be at risk of displacement.


Figure C-41: Tenure by Race (2019)



Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimate).


Figure C-42 shows the median contract rent in El Segundo and Los Angeles from 2010 to 2019. El Segundo tends to have higher median contract rental prices compared to the County. As of 2019, the median contract rent in El Segundo was \$1,855 compared to \$1,356 in Los Angeles County. During this period, both the County and El Segundo have seen significantly median rental price increases. Between 2010 and 2019, the median contract rental price in El Segundo increased by 36.3% compared to only 33.3% Countywide. As presented above, increasing rental prices in the City are more likely to disproportionately affect people of color.

Figure C-42: Median Contract Rent (2010-2019)




Source: 2006-2010 through 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimate).

Figure C-43: Regional Sensitive Communities At Risk of Displacement



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 Urban Displacement Project, 2021.

Figure C-44: Sensitive Communities At Risk of Displacement




Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 Urban Displacement Project, 2021.

HOMELESSNESS

Regional Trend. The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) estimates there were 66,436 persons experiencing homelessness in the Los Angeles County, based on the 2020 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count. Figure C-45 shows the Los Angeles County homeless populations from 2015 to 2020. Approximately 72% of the homeless population is unsheltered and the remaining 28% is sheltered. The homeless population has increased by nearly 50% since 2015, and 12.7% since 2019. According to 2020 Department of Finance (DOF) estimates, the Los Angeles County population as a whole has grown only 0.5% since 2015.

Figure C-45: Los Angeles County Homeless Population Trend (2015-2020)



Source: Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), 2015-2020 LA County/LA Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Counts.

Table C-21 shows the homeless populations in 2019 and 2020 by population type, gender, and health/disability. Approximately 19% of the homeless population belongs to a family with one or more child, 38.4% are chronically homeless, and 22.3% have a serious mental illness. Since 2019, the population of homeless family members (+45.7%), persons experiencing chronic homelessness (+54.2%), persons fleeing domestic violence (+40%), non-binary/gender non-conforming persons (+325.5%), and persons with a substance use disorder (+104%) have increased the most drastically. The population of transgender persons and persons with HIV/AIDS experiencing homelessness have decreased by 81.4% and 4.7%, respectively.

Table C-21: Los Angeles County Homeless Population Demographics (2019-2020)

| | 2019 | | 2020 | | Percent Change |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Persons | Percent | Persons | Percent | |
| Total | 58,936 | 100.0% | 66,436 | 100.0% | 12.7% |
| Individuals | 50,071 | 85.0% | 53,619 | 80.7% | 7.1% |
| Transitional Aged Youth (18-24) | 3,635 | 6.2% | 4,278 | 6.4% | 17.7% |
| Unaccompanied Minors (under 18) | 66 | 0.1% | 74 | 0.1% | 12.1% |
| Family Members* | 8,799 | 14.9% | 12,817 | 19.3% | 45.7% |
| Veterans | 3,878 | 6.6% | 3,902 | 5.9% | 0.6% |
| People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness | 16,528 | 28.0% | 25,490 | 38.4% | 54.2% |
| Fleeing Domestic/Intimate Partner Violence | 3,111 | 5.3% | 4,356 | 6.6% | 40.0% |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 39,348 | 66.8% | 44,259 | 66.6% | 12.5% |
| Female | 18,331 | 31.1% | 21,129 | 31.8% | 15.3% |
| Non-Binary/Gender Non-Conforming | 200 | 0.3% | 851 | 1.3% | 325.5% |
| Transgender | 1,057 | 1.8% | 197 | 0.3% | -81.4% |
| Health and Disability** | | | | | |
| Substance Use Disorder | 7,836 | 13.3% | 15,983 | 24.1% | 104.0% |
| HIV/AIDS | 1,306 | 2.2% | 1,245 | 1.9% | -4.7% |
| Serious Mental Illness | 13,670 | 23.2% | 14,790 | 22.3% | 8.2% |
| Percent of Total County Population | -- | 0.6% | -- | 0.7% | -- |
| *Members of families with at least one child under 18. | | | | | |
| ** Indicators are not mutually exclusive. | | | | | |
| Source: Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), 2019-2020 LA County/LA Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Counts. | | | | | |

The following data refers to the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC) region, covering all Los Angeles County jurisdictions except for the cities of Long Beach, Pasadena, and Glendale. Special needs groups are considered elderly or disabled (including developmental disabilities), female-headed households, large families, farmworkers, and people experiencing homelessness.

Nearly 20% of the homeless population are members of families with one or more child under the age of 18, 9.9% are elderly persons aged 62 and older, 17% have a physical disability, and 8.3% have a developmental disability. Only 32% of homeless persons with a developmental disability, 17.3% with a physical disability, and 21.5% of homeless seniors are sheltered. However, most families (76.3%) are sheltered (Table C-22).


Table C-22: Homeless Populations and Special Needs Groups

| Special Needs Group | Sheltered | Unsheltered | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|
| Developmental Disability | 32.1% | 67.9% | 5,292 |
| Physical Disability | 17.3% | 82.7% | 10,833 |
| Family Members | 76.3% | 23.7% | 12,416 |
| 62+ | 21.5% | 78.5% | 6,290 |

Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count.

Figure C-46 and Table C-23 show the Los Angeles CoC homeless population by race and ethnicity. The Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, and White populations make up the largest proportions of the homeless population. The Black/African American population is the most overrepresented in the Los Angeles CoC region. Nearly 34% of homeless persons are Black or African American, compared to only 7.8% of the population countywide. The American Indian and Alaska Native population is also overrepresented, making up only 0.2% of the County population, but 1.1% of the homeless population.

Figure C-46: Los Angeles CoC Homeless Population by Race/Ethnicity



Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count.


Table C-23: Los Angeles CoC Homeless Population by Race/Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Homeless Population | | % LA County Population |
|--|---------------------|---------|------------------------|
| | Persons | Percent | |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 686 | 1.1% | 0.2% |
| Asian | 774 | 1.2% | 14.4% |
| Black/African American | 21,509 | 33.8% | 7.8% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 23,005 | 36.1% | 48.5% |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 205 | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| White | 16,208 | 25.4% | 26.2% |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 1,319 | 2.1% | 2.6% |

Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count; 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure C-47 and Table C-24 show the distribution of homeless persons in the Los Angeles CoC region by age. Adults aged 25 to 54 make up most of the homeless population, followed by adults aged 55 to 61, and children under 18. Children account for 11.8% of the homeless population and seniors (age 62+) account for 9.9% of the population; 6.6% of the homeless population is transitional aged youths between the ages of 18 and 24.

Figure C-47: Los Angeles CoC Homeless Population by Age



Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count.


Table C-24: Los Angeles CoC Homeless Population by Age

| Age | Homeless Population | | % LA County Population |
|----------|---------------------|---------|------------------------|
| | Persons | Percent | |
| Under 18 | 7,491 | 11.8% | 22.0% |
| 18-24 | 4,181 | 6.6% | 9.7% |
| 25-54 | 37,138 | 58.3% | 43.2% |
| 55-61 | 8,606 | 13.5% | 8.7% |
| 62+ | 6,290 | 9.9% | 16.4% |

Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count; 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Local Trend. According to the Los Angeles County PIT count, there were 47 persons experiencing homelessness in El Segundo in 2020. As presented in Figure C-48, the homeless population in the City has increased from 20 persons in 2016. All persons experiencing homeless in the City are unsheltered. A higher concentration of persons experiencing homelessness were identified in tracts along the eastern side of the City.

Figure C-48: El Segundo Homelessness Population Summary



Source: LAHSA, 2020 LA CoC Homeless Count.

Based on Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System (CES) statistics, of the 27 persons experiencing homelessness assessed in El Segundo between July and December of 2020, three were youth, three were members of families with one or more child, two were veterans, and three were elderly adults aged 62 and over.

6. Other Relevant Factors

HISTORICAL TRENDS

The City of El Segundo was incorporated in 1917. El Segundo was originally purchased by the

Standard Oil refinery in 1911 and remained a “one-industry town” until the 1920s. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) opened in 1930, making El Segundo an aerospace hub.⁶ While El Segundo is predominantly White, historically, the City was given a C-rating under HOLC’s redlining maps, further described below. Lower ratings generally indicated a higher concentration of racial/ethnic minority populations while higher ratings were considered areas better for investments and were typically predominantly White neighborhoods. El Segundo likely received a C-rating due to the high number of blue collar workers brought in by the Standard Oil Company and LAX.


The 1896 Supreme Court ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson* upheld the constitutionality of “separate but equal,” ushering in the Jim Crow Era of racial segregation and disenfranchisement. This sentiment spread beyond the South, where African Americans and other minority groups were expelled from predominantly White communities, through the adoption of policies forbidding them from residing or even being within town borders after dark, known as ‘sundown towns.’ Contrary to the widespread misconception that these existed only in the deep south, sundown towns were prominent throughout the Country, including more than 100 California towns, several of which in Los Angeles County.

The Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC), formed in 1933 under the New Deal Program, established the County’s first red-lining maps. The northwestern corner of El Segundo received a C-rating, indicating the community was “declining” and a higher loan risk. Redlined, or D-rated communities, were typically comprised of large minority communities. Segregation achieved through red-lining was further exacerbated through the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration in 1934. The FHA insured bank mortgages that covered 80% of purchase prices and had terms of 20 years and were fully amortized. However, the FHA also conducted its own appraisals; mortgages were granted only to Whites and mixed-race neighborhoods or White neighborhoods in the vicinity of Black neighborhoods were deemed “too risky.”⁷ Figure C-44 shows the redlining maps for El Segundo and the surrounding areas.

⁶ Megowan Realty Group, Bruce and Maureen Megowan. 2020. <https://maureenmegowan.com/south-bay-history/history-of-el-segundo/>. Accessed January 2022.

⁷ Rothstein, Richard. (2017). *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Figure C-49: Redlining Map – El Segundo and Surrounding Areas



LENDING PRACTICES

Home loan applications in El Segundo by race and income are shown in Table C-25. Black and joint race applicants were denied loans at the highest rates (25% and 18%, respectively), while American Indian/Alaska Native (one applicant; 0 percent), Asian (5.4%), two or more minority race (one applicant; 0%) and Hispanic/Latino (8.7%) applicants were denied at the lowest rates. Applicants belonging to lower income categories had higher denial rates; 50% of loan applications submitted by low income residents were denied compared to 33.3% of moderate income residents, 13.8% of middle income residents, and only 6.1% of applications submitted by upper income residents.

Table C-25: Home Loan Approval and Denial Rates – El Segundo (2020)

| Loan Type/Applicant Demographics | Approved/Originated | Denied | Total Applications |
|---|---------------------|--------|--------------------|
| Loan Purpose and Type | | | |
| Purchase – Conventional | 77.0% | 7.0% | 213 |
| Purchase – Government | 45.5% | 18.2% | 11 |
| Home Improvement | 66.7% | 14.6% | 48 |
| Refinancing | 71.3% | 11.7% | 349 |
| Applicant Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 100.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Asian | 89.2% | 5.4% | 37 |
| Black or African American | 75.0% | 25.0% | 4 |
| Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| White | 71.5% | 11.8% | 407 |
| 2 or More Minority Races | 100.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| Joint Race (White/Minority) | 71.4% | 17.9% | 28 |
| Race Not Available | 70.6% | 6.3% | 143 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 60.9% | 8.7% | 23 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 74.1% | 11.9% | 428 |
| Applicant Income | | | |
| Low (0-49% of Median) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 2 |
| Moderate (50-79% of Median) | 22.2% | 33.3% | 9 |
| Middle (80-119% of Median) | 72.4% | 13.8% | 29 |
| Upper (>=120% of Median) | 72.4% | 10.2% | 532 |
| Income Not Available | 83.7% | 6.1% | 49 |
| Note: This dataset excludes withdrawn/incomplete applications. Sum of percentages may not total 100%. | | | |
| Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) Data – City of El Segundo, 2020. | | | |

ZONING DESIGNATIONS

The El Segundo Zoning Map is shown in Figure C-50. The northwestern section of the City north of El Segundo Boulevard and west of the Pacific Coast Highway, where a majority of residential households are located, is primarily zoned for single-family residential (R-1) and multi-family residential (R-3). There are also two-family residential (R-2) designations as well as the following specific plans: Smoky Hollow East (SHE), Smoky Hollow West (SHW), 222 Kansas Street (222KSSP), and 540 E Imperial Avenue (450EIASP). This area contains block groups with smaller racial/ethnic minority populations compared to the eastern side of the City but slightly larger LMI household populations (see Figure C-4 and Figure C-12). All tracts in this corner of the City are highest resource areas (see Figure C-18). As shown in Figure C-51, there are more renter-occupied households on the southern side of this area compared to the northern side. This area has more R-3 and specific plan zoning designations, whereas the northern area, where there are fewer renter-occupied units, is

predominantly zoned R-1. Housing units also tend to be older in this section of the City (see Figure C-40).

The northeastern section of the City, north of El Segundo Boulevard and east of the Pacific Coast Highway, is primarily zoned for Urban Mixed Use North (MU-N) and Corporate Office (CO). There are also smaller pockets of Light Manufacturing (M-1) and General Commercial (C-3) zones in this section of El Segundo. There are few households residing in this section of the City, therefore demographic data is limited. The tract encompassing the eastern side of the City has a larger racial/ethnic minority population of 90.2% compared to the northwestern area of the City. There are no RHNA sites in this section of the City.

Similarly, there are few households residing in the southeast section of the City, south of El Segundo Boulevard and east of the Pacific Coast Highway. This area is primarily zoned for Light Manufacturing (M-1), Commercial Center (C-4), and The Lakes Specific Plan (TLSP). This area of El Segundo is also located in the tract where 90.2% of the population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group. There are no RHNA sites in this section of the City.

The southwestern section of the City, south of El Segundo Boulevard and west of the Pacific Coast Highway, is zoned only for Heavy Manufacturing (M-2) and contains no residential units. There are no RHNA sites proposed in this section of the City.

Figure C-50: El Segundo Zoning Map





Figure C-51: Renter-Occupied Housing Units by Tract



2018 REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE

The 2018 Los Angeles County Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) cites the following contributing factors as high priority items. These factors are described below as they relate to the City of El Segundo.

Significant disparities in the proportion of members of protected classes experiencing substandard housing when compared to the total population. In El Segundo, Pacific Islander and Hispanic renter households are most likely to experience housing problems compared to other racial or ethnic groups. Renter-occupied households are significantly more likely to experience housing problems including cost burden. Approximately 37 percent of renter households in El Segundo have householders of a racial or ethnic minority group compared to only 21 percent of owner-occupied households according to 2020 HUD CHAS data.

Noise Pollution due to plane traffic from Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). According to the 2018 AI, there are an estimated 8,424 dwelling units impacted by noise from LAX. The 2018 AI states that noise pollution continues to be a hazard for low income households and R/ECAPs. While there are no concentrations of LMI households or R/ECAPs in the City, the northern side of El Segundo is directly adjacent to LAX.

Lack on information on affordable housing. According to HCD AFFH Data Viewer data, there are few to no households in El Segundo receiving housing choice vouchers (HCV) despite populations of cost burdened renters exceeding 40 percent in two City tracts. Outreach related to fair housing is minimal and there is limited fair housing information available on the City website.

Discrimination in private rental and home sales markets. The 2018 AI states that racial and ethnic minorities are more likely to be denied a mortgage and that most HUD fair housing complaints were filed on the basis of disability status, race, or familial status. In El Segundo, Black/African American home loan applicants are significantly more likely to be denied compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

Lack of opportunities for residents to obtain housing in higher opportunity areas. The 2018 AI states there is a lack of affordable housing options in higher opportunity areas, with access to transportation, jobs, and education. El Segundo is considered a TCAC highest resource area. However, there are no public housing buildings or subsidized housing projects in the City. There are also very few renters receiving HCVs in El Segundo.

C. SITES INVENTORY

In general, the El Segundo is an affluent City and is considered a highest resource area according to TCAC Opportunity Maps. There are no concentrations of LMI households or low resource areas in the City; therefore, the City's RHNA strategy does not disproportionately locate units, specifically lower income units, in low income or low opportunity areas. There are also no concentrations of persons with disabilities in the City and the City's RHNA strategy does not disproportionately place lower or moderate units in areas with larger non-White populations, low environmental quality, or cost burdened households. The City's sites inventory is further described below. Table C-26 shows the distribution of RHNA units at the tract level by AFFH variables. Figure C-52 presents the mixed use overlay sites and Figure C-53 shows the potential redevelopment sites in the housing overlay. Sites selected to meet the RHNA are generally distributed throughout the residential area of El Segundo and are not concentrated in a single area of the City. As mentioned previously, much of the City is zoned for manufacturing, commercial uses, or corporate office uses and is not suitable for residential

development. Therefore, nearly all existing residential homes, and all sites selected to meet the RHNA, are in the northwest corner of the City. RHNA sites will not be exposed to adverse fair housing conditions in excess of the Citywide trend. The City's RHNA strategy will not exacerbate fair housing conditions.

1. Tract 6200.01

Tract 6200.01 is located in the northeastern section of the residential area of El Segundo, bound by the northern City boundary, Pacific Coast Highway to the east, W. Mariposa Avenue to the south, and Sheldon Street to the west. As shown in Figure C-50 previously, this tract is predominantly zoned for single-family residential (R-1) uses. There are also areas, mostly located along the borders of this tract, zoned for two-family residential (R-2) and multi-family residential (R-3). The following sites have been identified in the tract to meet the City's RHNA:

- 835 N. Sepulveda Boulevard (Mixed Use Overlay) – 137 units (55 lower income, 41 moderate income, 41 above moderate income).
- 703 N. Pacific Coast Highway (Mixed Use Overlay) – 60 units (10 lower income, 50 above moderate income)
- 739 and 755 N. Pacific Coast Highway (Mixed Use Overlay) – 50 units (20 lower income, 16 moderate income, 14 above moderate income)
- 1300 E. Imperial Avenue (Housing Overlay) – 22 units (9 lower income, 7 moderate income, 6 above moderate income)
- 1306 E. Imperial Avenue (Housing Overlay) – 22 units (9 lower income, 7 moderate income, 6 above moderate income)

A total of 291 RHNA units, 103 lower income, 71 moderate income, and 117 above moderate income units, have been allocated in tract 6200.01. Tracts 6200.01 and 6200.02, discussed below, contain the largest concentration of RHNA units. Like the remainder of the City, tract 6200.01 is a TCAC highest resource tract. This tract contains block groups with smaller racial/ethnic minority populations, ranging from 29.6% to 40.7%, and LMI household populations, ranging from 15.1% to 19.3%. Tract 6200.01 has a moderate renter population (49.9%) compared to other El Segundo tracts and a population of cost burdened renters (42.9%) comparable to the Citywide trend. This tract is the only tract in the City that is considered an RCAA. This tract has few fair housing issues or populations of sensitive/protected persons in excess of the Citywide average. While this tract is considered an RCAA, the City's RHNA strategy allocates a variety of RHNA units that can adequately serve lower, moderate, and above moderate income populations, ensuring units serving a single income level are not concentrated in the RCAA. The City's RHNA strategy in tract 6200.01 does not exacerbate existing fair housing conditions and promotes mixed income communities in El Segundo.

2. Tract 6200.02

Tract 6200.02 is located in the southeastern section of the residential area of the City, generally bound by E. Mariposa Avenue to the north, the Pacific Coast Highway to the east, El Segundo Boulevard to the south, and Sheldon Street to the west. Zoning designations in this tract, presented in Figure C-50 previously, include R-1, R-3, and the Smoky Hollow Specific Plan (SHW and SHE). A small pocket of R-2 zone and the 222 Kansas Street Specific Plan (222KSSP) are also located in this tract. The following sites have been identified in tract 6200.02:

- Wiley Park (Mixed Use Overlay) – 99 units (39 lower income, 29 moderate income, 31 above moderate income)
- 205 Lomita Street (Housing Overlay) – 170 units (68 lower income, 51 moderate income, 51 above moderate income)
- 210 Penn Street (Housing Overlay) – 38 units (15 lower income, 11 moderate income, 12 above moderate income)
- 710 E Grand Avenue (Housing Overlay) – 40 units (16 lower income, 12 moderate income, 12 above moderate income)

Tract 6200.02 has the highest concentration of RHNA units compared to other tracts in El Segundo. A total of 347 units have been allocated in this tract, including 138 lower income units, 103 moderate income units, and 106 above moderate income units. Like all of El Segundo, tract 6200.02 is a highest resource area. Tract 6200.02 has a racial/ethnic minority population comparable to the remainder of El Segundo (40.5%), and a slightly larger LMI population compared to other areas (44%). This tract has the largest renter population compared to other El Segundo tracts (73.1%) but the smallest proportion of cost burdened renters (37.7%). Like El Segundo in general, fair housing issues are not prevalent in tract 6200.02. Though there is a slightly larger population of low and moderate income households in this block group compared to other areas of the City, El Segundo's RHNA strategy ensures lower and moderate income units are not allocated in this tract alone. RHNA sites in tract 6200.02 promote mixed income communities and housing units in an area with the highest access to opportunities. Sites in tract 6200.02 do not exacerbate fair housing conditions.

3. Tract 6201.01

Tract 6201.01 is located in the northwestern corner of the City, bound by Sheldon Street to the east, W. Mariposa Avenue to the south, and City boundaries to the north and west. This tract is predominantly zoned R-1 with R-3 zones generally along Imperial Avenue and Main Street. There are also smaller pockets of R-2 zones in this tract. The following RHNA sites are located in tract 6201.01:

- 514 W. Imperial Avenue (Housing Overlay) – 33 units (13 lower income, 10 moderate income, and 10 above moderate income)
- 546 W. Imperial Avenue (Housing Overlay) – 7 units (3 lower income, 2 moderate income, and 2 above moderate income)

This tract is a highest resource area where 43.6% of the population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group and 30% of households are low or moderate income. The racial/ethnic minority and LMI household populations are consistent with the populations Citywide. Tract 6201.01 has the smallest population of renters (39.7%) compared to other tracts but the largest proportion of cost burdened renters (44.3%). However, the proportion of cost burdened renters in tract 6201.01 is still comparable to the rate Citywide. Like the RHNA strategy in all El Segundo tracts, a variety of units suitable for households of all income levels are allocated in tract 6201.01. RHNA units allocated in this section of the City represent a small proportion of the total units identified, but continue to promote mixed income communities within the City. Further, future households in this area of El Segundo will not be exposed to adverse fair housing conditions in excess of the Citywide trend. Like all of El Segundo, educational, economic, transportation, and environmental opportunities are prevalent in tract 6201.01. RHNA units in this section of the City will not exacerbate conditions related to fair housing.

Table C-26: Distribution of RHNA Units by Tract and AFFH Variable


| Tract | # of HHs in Tract | Total Capacity (Units) | Income Distribution | | | Non-White Pop.* | LMI HH Pop.* | TCAC Opp. Cat. | R/ECAP? | RCAA? | Cost Burdened Renters | Renter Pop. |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|---------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|
| | | | Lower | Moderate | Above Moderate | | | | | | | |
| 6200.01 | 1,445 | 291 | 103 | 71 | 117 | 29.6 – 40.7% | 15.1 – 19.3% | Highest | No | Yes | 42.9% | 49.9% |
| 6200.02 | 1,485 | 347 | 138 | 103 | 106 | 40.5% | 44.0% | Highest | No | No | 37.7% | 73.1% |
| 6201.01 | 2,162 | 40 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 43.6% | 30.0% | Highest | No | No | 44.3% | 39.7% |
| Total | | 678 | 257 | 186 | 235 | | | | | | | |

* Data may be presented as ranges as multiple block groups may be located within a single tract.

Figure C-52: Mixed Use Overlay RHNA Sites



Figure C-53: Potential Redevelopment Sites in Housing Overlay



D. IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

1. Insufficient Fair Housing Monitoring and Outreach Capacity

El Segundo has limited fair housing information available on the City website. Fair Housing outreach efforts in the City are limited. There were two FHEO inquiries in the City between 2013 and 2021, both not related to a specific fair housing issue. There is not a concentration of renters received HCVs anywhere in the City.

Contributing Factors

- Lack of monitoring
- Lack of a variety of media inputs
- Lack of marketing communities

2. Concentration of Protected Groups

While the City generally has low concentrations of racial/ethnic minority populations and LMI households, some block groups in the northwestern area of the City larger non-White and low to moderate income populations. Up to 60% of households also overpay in some of these areas. There are very few HCV recipients in the City despite the level of overpaying households. There are no affordable housing units, other than senior housing, located in the City.

Contributing Factors

- Location and type of affordable housing, lack of HCVs

3. Substandard Housing Conditions

A large proportion of the housing stock in El Segundo was built in 1969 or earlier (61.7% of housing stock). Aging housing units are most concentrated in areas in along the northwestern City boundary. A larger proportion of renter-occupied households also lack complete kitchen facilities (3.6%) compared to the County average (2.5%). In 2014-2021, 538 residential violations of the El Segundo Municipal Code property maintenance standards were reported. While only a small proportion of the housing stock is considered to be in need of rehabilitation, much of the City's housing stock is aging and may be in need of rehabilitation in the near future. Further, aging housing units are most concentrated in areas where there are higher concentrations of overpaying renters and households with lower median incomes.

Contributing Factors

- Age of housing stock
- Cost of repairs/rehabilitation

4. Displacement Risk

Though there are no sensitive communities at risk of displacement identified in El Segundo, there are areas in the City where up to 60% of households overpay for housing. Many of these tracts also have higher concentrations of non-White populations and LMI households. The homeless population in

the City has more than doubled since 2016.

Contributing Factors

- Displacement risk due to economic pressures
- Increasing rents