**On-Line Appendix**

**Initiative Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Appendix Table A1*** | | | | | |
| **CNTYNAME** | **PLACE** | **LTR** | **BALQUEST** | **Restrict Residential** | **PASSFAIL** |
| SAN DIEGO | San Diego | B | (INITIATIVE) Shall this Initiative be adopted for the purpose of amending the County General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Code of Regulatory Ordinances and approving the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan (“Plan”)? The Plan provides for the development of a 608-acre master-planned community including 1,746 dwelling units, three commercial centers, a public park, 10 private parks and 16 miles of trails. The project site is generally located north of Escondido and east of I-15 in the unincorporated area of North San Diego County. | 0 | Fail |
| LOS ANGELES | Beverly Hills | HH | (INITIATIVE) Shall an ordinance be adopted allowing a 26 story (345 feet) residential building instead of two residential buildings of 8 and 18 stories (101 and 218 feet); increasing open space from 3.28 to 3.89 acres and identifying 1.7 acres of open space as private garden generally open to the public subject to property owner's reasonable restrictions; removing conference center and relocating its uses; prohibiting discretionary architectural review; reducing graywater use requirements? | 1 | Fail |
| LOS ANGELES | Calabasas | F | Shall the Ordinance No. 2016-333 approving changing the existing Zoning from Planned Development - Residential Multifamily (20) - Open Space Development Restricted - Scenic Corridor to Commercial Retail - Residential Multifamily (20) - Open Space Development Restricted - Scenic Corridor - Development Plan to accommodate: 67 Single-Family Detached Homes and two Affordable Duplexes; a 72,872 square-foot, three-story hotel; and preservation of approximately 61.0 acres as Permanent Open Space on a 77-acre property at 4790 Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas be approved? | 0 | Fail |
| LOS ANGELES | Santa Monica | LV | Shall the City's General Plan and Municipal Code be amended to require: a new permit process for major development projects exceeding base sizes or heights of 32-36 feet, with exceptions such as single unit dwellings and some affordable housing projects; voter approval of major development projects and development agreements, excluding affordable housing and moderate income and senior housing projects, among others; and voter approval of changes to City land use and planning policy documents. | 1 | Fail |
| ORANGE | Costa Mesa | Y | (INITIATIVE) Shall the ordinance to require voter approval of development projects that require adoption, amendment, change or replacement of the General Plan, the Zoning Code, a specific plan, or an overlay plan, and that generates over 200 additional trips, increases intersection volume/capacity, changes the intersection utilization/level of service, adds 40 or more dwelling units, adds 10,000 sq.’ of non-residential use, or changes a public use to a private use under specified conditions, be adopted? | 1 | Pass |
| ORANGE | Cypress | GG | Shall an ordinance that approves the "Cypress Town Center and Commons Specific Plan" to allow for development of a town center, single-family and multi-family housing, commercial/senior housing and a public park on portions of Los Alamitos Race Course, the former Cypress Golf Club and adjacent properties, together with related general plan and specific plan amendments and zone changes, be adopted? | 0 | Fail |
| SAN DIEGO | Del Mar | R | Shall the ordinance which proposes to amend the Del Mar Community Plan, Housing Element, and Municipal Code to require voter approval for certain development projects be adopted? | 1 | Fail |
| SAN DIEGO | Encinitas | T | Shall City Council Resolution No. 2016-52 and Ordinance No. 2016-04, which collectively update the City’s General Plan Housing Element, amend related General Plan provisions, and amend Specific Plans, Zoning Code, Zoning Map, Municipal Code, and Local Coastal Program, in an effort to comply with State law, incentivize greater housing affordability, implement rules to protect the character of existing neighborhoods, maintain local control of Encinitas zoning, and resolve existing lawsuits, be adopted? | 1 | Pass |
| SAN MATEO | Pacifica | W | (INITIATIVE) Shall the Initiative which amends Ordinance Number 391-C.S. to authorize up to 206 multi-family units of residential development at the Rockaway Quarry only under certain conditions specified in the Initiative measure entitled "Pacifica Initiative Amending Ordinance No. 391-C.S. To Authorize a Future Rezone of the Quarry Which Could Include Residential Development, Under Certain Conditions", be adopted? | 0 | Fail |
| SANTA CLARA | Cupertino | C | (INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative ordinance be adopted amending Cupertino’s General Plan to limit redevelopment of the Vallco Shopping District, limit building heights along major mixed-use corridors, increase to 45 feet the maximum building height in the Neighborhoods, limit lot coverages for large projects, establish new setbacks and building planes on major thoroughfares, and require voter approval for any changes to these provisions? | 1 | Fail |
| SANTA CLARA | Cupertino | D | (INITIATIVE) Shall an initiative be adopted enacting the Vallco Town Center Specific Plan for the 58-acre Vallco Shopping District Special Area requiring residential (approximately 389-800 units, including approximately 20% senior housing), office (2,000,000 sf), commercial (640,000 sf), hotel, park, civic/educational uses; requiring funding/community benefits for transportation (approximately $30,000,000), schools (approximately $40,000,000), green roof (approximately 30 acres), recycled water; granting initial entitlements; establishing development standards and limited future approval process; and making related Cupertino General Plan and Municipal Code amendments? | 0 | Fail |
| SANTA CLARA | Milpitas | K | Shall an ordinance amending the City of Milpitas General Plan be adopted to mandate that any attempt to rezone parks, parklands or open space to residential, commercial or industrial, or any proposal for residential, commercial or industrial development in parks, parkland or open space, must be placed before Milpitas voters and secure two-thirds support in the City’s next general election? | 1 | Pass |
| SANTA CLARA | Morgan Hill | S | Shall a measure be adopted to amend the Morgan Hill General Plan and Municipal Code to update the City’s voter-approved Residential Development Control System (RDCS) to extend it to 2035, establish a population ceiling of 58,200, with a slower rate of growth than currently exists, and improve policies to maintain neighborhood character, encourage more efficient land use, conserve water, and preserve open space? | 1 | Pass |
| SONOMA | Healdsburg | R | Shall Healdsburg voters amend the existing Growth Management Ordinance to increase inclusionary housing requirements on new development to 30%, remove existing restrictions on the number of new residential units allowed per year, adopt and periodically amend new growth management measures in conjunction with the Housing Element update, and adopt and periodically update a Housing Action Plan to provide a greater variety of housing? | 0 | Fail |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Table A2: San Francisco Propositions, 2002*** | | | | |
| Title | Purpose | Ballot Placement Source | Vote  Needed | Vote Received |
| Prop B: Affordable Housing Bonds | General obligation bond authorizing city to borrow $250,000,000 to make grants or loans to buy, build, or renovate housing for low income households | Supervisorial Vote  9 – Yea  2 – No | 66 2/3% | 56% |
| Prop O: Conditions for Providing Services and Payments to Homeless Individuals | Ordinance requiring development of 1000 housing units for homeless individuals and drug and alcohol treatment services for at least 700 individuals. | 4 – Supervisor Signatories | 50% +1 | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Table A3: Ballot Statements: Local California Development Initiatives, 2016*** | | | |
|  |  | **Anti-Development Arguments** | **Pro-Development Arguments** |
| San Diego | B | Measure B is a developer attempt to build 1,746 houses and 90,000 square feet of retail space in a critical agricultural area where only 110 homes and no retail uses are allowed by law (a 1,487% density increase). | Measure B authorizes development of Lilac Hills Ranch, a pedestrian-oriented village in North County that includes housing priced to start at $300,000 – within reach of most working families and first-time home buyers – to address the County’s housing crisis and reduce development pressures near your neighborhood. |
| Beverly Hills | HH | Using a legal loophole that circumvents the process used by every other project in Beverly Hills, Measure HH will allow a tower 345-feet high with an additional 30 foot rooftop canopy. Do you want a 345-foot skyscraper, taller than the Statue of Liberty; twice the height of any building in Beverly Hills, extending the Wilshire Corridor into Beverly Hills? | Measure HH creates a beautiful western gateway to Beverly Hills with more green space by combining two condo buildings into one, removing the 8-story building and replacing it with a beautiful 1.7-acre garden for Beverly Hills residents to enjoy year-round |
| Calabasas | F | The project is too big for this sensitive canyon. Invaluable scenic vistas would be obstructed. | The proposed hotel is expected to provide over $500,000 per year in revenue to the City which can be used for additional Sheriff’s patrols, youth and senior programs, and enhanced beautification, environmental and community services. |
| Santa Monica | LV | Vote YES on LV to protect Santa Monica from overdevelopment and increased traffic congestion. Measure LV is the Land Use Voter Empowerment (LUVE) Initiative. | Why do most responsible community leaders and organizations say Measure LV is too extreme? Because a one-size-fits-all height limit of two stories citywide goes too far, and Measure LV is full of unintended consequences. While it claims to reduce traffic, Measure LV may make our unbearable traffic problems worse by reducing housing for workers, forcing them to commute and clog our streets. |
| Costa Mesa | Y | Measure Y is a citizens’ initiative to give the people of Costa Mesa control of their future. A vote FOR Measure Y is a vote about the future of our neighborhoods and our community, ensuring that residents determine the future character of Costa Mesa. | Measure Y, will force a vote of certain projects, is so restrictive in nature that if it were in place years ago, Costa Mesa as we know it today wouldn’t exist. The suppression of new housing would essentially lock out middle class families from entering the market. |
| Del Mar | R | Protect Our Community Plan and Small Town Character - Vote “YES” on “R” - Ensure Your Right to Vote. If a developer wants to change the zoning to create a Specific Plan where the allowed density, height of buildings, floor area ratio and lot coverage are changed, the development must be submitted to the voters for their approval. | Measure R is a barrier to providing affordable housing in Del Mar; It eliminates Community Plan goals for mixed use residential housing |
| Encinitas | T | Passage of this measure will result in 12,000 to 24,000 more cars on the road each day causing more congestion, strain on infrastructure, gridlock, and air pollution. Developers have an incentive to increase the number of units by 35% over zoning. Preserve our small town character. | A Yes vote will enable more housing choices for seniors, millennials, first time home buyers, and young families. This could be your parents, adult children, or even you as your needs change. This housing plan allows for smaller, more accessible and affordable homes, and brings the city into compliance with California law. |
| Pacifica | W | Measure W authorizes the City to approve 206 multi-family units but doesn't commit the developer to build anything. We are voting without any review of environmental or traffic impacts. Haven't we learned what coastal erosion, flooding, and storms do to coastal developments? | You will see that Measure W is a thoughtful approach; ensuring our community will benefit from permanent open space; limited development, significant tax revenue; and needed traffic mitigation. |
| Cupertino | C | Measure C empowers the electorate to reject uncontrolled growth in Cupertino. Uncontrolled growth will damage the quality of life we enjoy today | Measure C will block mixed-use revitalization of Vallco, resulting in an empty 'ghost mall' for years to come. Measure C will block the construction of much deserved housing for seniors. |
| Cupertino | D | Too Dense! Too Tall! The site would be turned into a concrete jungle with insignificant ground level green space. | Measure D will revitalize Vallco as an innovative, sustainable mixed-use town center as called for in Cupertino's community-created General Plan. |
| Milipitas | K | The people will have the right to decide what is best for the city. Measure K will ensure that any attempt to change Milpitas Parks or Open space into residential, commercial, or industrial uses first must be approved by the people of Milpitas with a two-thirds (66.7%) vote before a change in use can take place. | But what this ordinance does is drive the cost of modification up substantially and takes the outcome out of the hands of the professionals. |
| Healdsburg | R | Now a few people want to take away your right to stop unlimited growth. We negotiated in good faith with the City to find creative solutions to house more workers and families, but the City rejected our ideas. Instead, they want to remove voters’ right to limit large projects altogether | Housing prices have skyrocketed, young families can no longer afford to live in Healdsburg, and our middle-income workforce has been priced out of the market. By voting yes on Measure R we can correct these inequities and provide greater housing opportunities for all Healdsburg residents. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Table A4: Correlates of Support for Restricting Residential Development, Controlling for Partisan Registration*** | | | | |
| ***2016 Elections in***  ***6 California Counties*** | | | | |
|  | β | SE | P>|t| |
| % White | 0.127 | 0.022 | 0.000 |
| % Wealthy | -0.028 | 0.021 | 0.167 |
| % Homeowners | 0.065 | 0.012 | 0.000 |
| % Democrat | -0.546 | 0.035 | 0.000 |
| Constant | 0.606 | 0.026 | 0.000 |
| N | 456 | | |
| R2 (within) | 0.623 | | |

**Note: Fixed effects for measure included but not presented**