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Century Urban, LLC ("Century | Urban") has been engaged by the City of San Jose ("Client") to conduct certain residential feasibility analysis. Market information utilized in this presentation has been drawn from a variety of market participants and sources. Century \| Urban make no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to the accuracy or completeness of any specific data point or information. Any opinions, assumptions, projections, or estimates contained herein are projections only and used for illustrative purposes. The information contained herein is based on market conditions at the time of the valuation and subject to change.

All of the information provided herein is considered confidential and is furnished solely for the purpose of review by Client in connection with the ongoing feasibility analysis. The information is not to be used for any other purpose or made available to any other person without the express written consent of Century | Urban.
© Century | Urban 2023
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## Residential Feasibility Analysis - General Findings

- Relative to 2022 residential feasibility analysis findings, residential development economics are more challenged under current market conditions.
- Since 2022 study, construction costs, interest rates, and target returns have increased.
- Total estimated costs across the prototypes studied increased approximately $12-13 \%$ on average since prior study, completed approximately 18 months ago.
- Interest rates have doubled over past 12 months. Construction interest rates are hovering above $8.0 \%$.
- Rental rates and sales price have also increased, but increase amounts are insufficient to offset increases in costs and target returns.
- Challenged feasibility was reflected across residential prototypes analyzed and was also reflected in sensitivity analyses, which evaluated $5 \%$ changes in rental rates, condominium prices, and development costs.


## Prototypes

| Prototype | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rental/Sale | Rental | Rental | Rental | Sale | Sale |
| Construction Type | Type V | Type III | Type I | Type V | Type I |
| Height/Stories | 5 | 7 | 22 | 5 | 22 |
| Avg Unit Size Net SF | 900 | 900 | 900 | 1,150 | 950 |
| Efficiency | 80\% | 80\% | 78\% | 80\% | 78\% |
| Avg Unit Size Gross SF | 1,125 | 1,125 | 1,154 | 1,438 | 1,218 |
| Density / Acre | 65 | 90 | 350 | 50 | 350 |
| Parking Ratio | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Parking SF Per Stall | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Parking Type | Abovegrade | Abovegrade | Belowgrade | Abovegrade | Belowgrade |
| Submarkets |  <br> East, Central | Central, West, North | Central, West, North, Downtown |  <br> East, Central \& West, North | Downtown |

## Type I Scenarios

| Type I Scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Central | West | North | Downtown |
| For Rent | Type I | Market, Waiver | Market, <br> Waiver, Affordable | Market, Waiver | Market, Waiver |
| For Sale | Type I | NA | NA | NA | Market, Waiver |

Market Scenarios assume that all units are leased or sold at market rental rates/sale prices and all statutory inclusionary in-lieu fees and construction taxes are paid.

Waiver Scenarios assume that all units are leased or sold at market rental rates/sale prices, $100 \%$ of statutory inclusionary in-lieu fees are waived, and $50 \%$ of Building and Structure and Commercial/Residential/Mobile Home Park (CRMP) construction taxes are waived.

Affordable Scenarios assume that $95 \%$ of units are leased or sold at market rental rates/sale price, $5 \%$ of units are leased at $100 \%$ AMI, $100 \%$ of statutory inclusionary in-lieu fees are waived, and $50 \%$ of Building and Structure and Commercial/Residential/Mobile Home Park (CRMP) construction taxes are waived.

## Apartment Rental Rate Assumptions

| Rent Per SF/Month |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | South \& East | Central | West | North | Downtown |
| Type V | $\$ 3.42$ | $\$ 3.60$ | NA | NA | NA |
| Type III | NA | $\$ 3.60$ | $\$ 4.10$ | $\$ 3.40$ | NA |
| Type I | NA | $\$ 3.60$ | $\$ 4.10$ | $\$ 3.40$ | $\$ 3.87$ |


| Rent Per Unit/Month |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type V | $\$ 3,078$ | $\$ 3,240$ | Central | NA | North | Downtown

## Condominium Sale Price Assumptions

| Average Sales Price PSF | Central \& |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | South \& East | West | North | Downtown |
|  | Type V | \$775 | \$725 | \$700 | NA |
|  | Type I | NA | NA | NA | \$775 |


| Average Sales Price Per Unit | Central \& |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | South \& East | West | North | Downtown |
| Type V | \$891,250 | \$833,750 | \$805,000 | NA |
| Type I | NA | NA | NA | \$736,250 |

## Total Hard and Soft Costs Assumptions

| Prototype Costs Per Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prototype Size | Low-Rise | Mid-Rise | High-Rise | Low-Rise | High-Rise |
| Rental/Sale | Rental | Rental | Rental | Sale | Sale |
| Construction <br> Type | Type V | Type III | Type I | Type V | Type I |
| Submarkets | South \& East, <br> Central | Central, West, <br> North | Central, West, <br> North, <br> Downtown | South \& East, <br>  <br> West, North | Downtown, <br> Central, |
| West, North |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Hard <br> Costs | $\$ 563,000$ | $\$ 635,000$ | $\$ 766,000$ | $\$ 758,000$ | $\$ 885,000$ |
| Average <br> Municipal <br> Fees * | $\$ 73,000$ | $\$ 82,000$ | $\$ 82,000$ | $\$ 76,000$ | $\$ 60,000$ |
| Other Soft <br> Costs | $\$ 130,000$ | $\$ 151,000$ | $\$ 190,000$ | $\$ 175,000$ | $\$ 218,000$ |
| Total Hard <br> and Soft Costs | $\$ 765,000$ | $\$ 869,000$ | $\$ 1,038,000$ | $\$ 1,009,000$ | $\$ 1,163,000$ |

* Includes in-lieu affordable fees, construction taxes, parkland fees, planning and building fees, and school fees in addition to other fees.

Figures rounded to nearest $\$ 1,000$. Averages shown for Market Scenarios only.

## Development Cost Comparison

Average Hard and Soft Costs per Unit - Rental Prototypes


Estimated average total hard and soft costs per unit for rental prototypes increased by approximately $12.6 \%$ over 18-month period between 2022 and 2023 studies.

## Development Costs Over Time



[^0]| Residual Values Per Unit - For Rent |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Submarket |  <br> East | Central | West | North | Downtown |
| Type V | $(\$ 322,000)$ | $(\$ 343,000)$ | NA | NA | NA |
| Type III | NA | $(\$ 435,000)$ | $(\$ 364,000)$ | $(\$ 430,000)$ | NA |
| Type I | NA | $(\$ 614,000)$ | $(\$ 542,000)$ | $(\$ 607,000)$ | $(\$ 569,000)$ |
| Type I - Waiver | NA | $(\$ 540,000)$ | $(\$ 469,000)$ | $(\$ 573,000)$ | $(\$ 496,000)$ |
| Type I - Waiver - <br> Affordable | NA | NA | $(\$ 469,000)$ | NA | NA |


| Residual Values Per Unit - For Sale |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Submarket |  <br> East |  <br> West | North | Downtown |
| Type V | $(\$ 342,000)$ | $(\$ 394,000)$ | $(\$ 419,000)$ | NA |
| Type I | NA | NA | NA | $(\$ 611,000)$ |
| Type I - Waiver | NA | NA | NA | $(\$ 569,000)$ |

Figures rounded to nearest $\$ 1,000$.

## Stakeholder Feedback

At meetings coordinated by City staff, stakeholders such as developers, brokers, and other industry professionals provided feedback regarding feasibility analysis assumptions and findings.

## Key Takeaways:

- With exception of comments regarding estimated development costs being higher than development costs observed by some participants in the meeting, stakeholder feedback generally suggested larger feasibility gaps than estimated in feasibility analysis.
- Comments that would likely have more material negative impact on feasibility included:
- Target Return-on-Cost should be higher - 6.0\%-6.5\%
- Rents are too high by $\$ 0.20$ to $\$ 0.80$ per square foot per month
- Operating expenses have increased substantially, especially insurance
- Comments on costs varied and included that hard costs were too high, in the correct range, and too low
- Stakeholders also noted that waiving impact fees would help feasibility, but would be insufficient to spur housing production. Several stakeholders suggested that waiving annual property taxes for a period of time would have more substantial beneficial effect.


## Appendix

## Appendix

| Average Prototype Change 2022/2023 - For Rent |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Item | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | \% Change | \% Effect on <br> Residual Value |
| Hard Cost PGSF | $\$ 435$ | $\$ 484$ | $11 \%$ | $-19 \%$ |
| Soft Costs Incl. City Fees PGSF | $\$ 131$ | $\$ 153$ | $17 \%$ | $-9 \%$ |
| City Fees PGSF | $\$ 33$ | $\$ 38$ | $14 \%$ | $-2 \%$ |
| Total Hard and Soft Costs PGSF | $\$ 566$ | $\$ 636$ | $12 \%$ | $-28 \%$ |
| Rent PNSF | $\$ 3.58$ | $\$ 3.69$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Target ROC | $5.25 \%$ | $5.75 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $-11 \%$ |
| Residual Value Per Unit | $(\$ 370,800)$ | $(\$ 494,800)$ | $-33 \%$ | $-33 \%$ |


| Average Prototype Change 2022/2023 - For Sale |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Item | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | \% Change | \% Effect on <br> Residual Value |
| Hard Cost PGSF - Sale | $\$ 422$ | $\$ 469$ | $11 \%$ | $-19 \%$ |
| Soft Costs Incl. City Fees PGSF | $\$ 122$ | $\$ 142$ | $16 \%$ | $-8 \%$ |
| City Fees PGSF | $\$ 31$ | $\$ 33$ | $8 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| Total Hard and Soft Costs PGSF | $\$ 544$ | $\$ 611$ | $12 \%$ | $-27 \%$ |
| Condo Price PNSF | $\$ 682$ | $\$ 752$ | $10 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Residual Value Per Unit | $(\$ 425,800)$ | $(\$ 485,600)$ | $-14 \%$ | $-14 \%$ |

## Residual Value Example



## Construction Types

Each construction type has multiple subtypes and requirements specified by building code, but in general, the lower the construction type number, the greater the fire-life-safety requirements.

- Type V construction refers to a building type in which the interior and exterior structural materials of the building are permitted to be "combustible". This means that wood may be used as a core structural material in the building's design including for framing, walls, floors and roofs. Wood-framed construction is often used for single-family homes, as well as smaller apartment and retail buildings. Wood frame construction is often lower cost than other construction methods.
- Type III construction refers to a building in which exterior walls are "non-combustible" but other elements (framing, floors, ceilings) may be designed with combustible materials such as wood. Walls are typically constructed from concrete block, precast panels, or other noncombustible materials. This type of construction is generally used in larger apartment buildings, schools and other medium-sized commercial buildings.
- Type I construction refers to a building in which all structural materials are non-combustible. In a Type I building, walls, floors, and roofs are constructed with materials such as concrete and steel. This construction type is generally utilized with high-rise residential and commercial buildings and tends to be the most expensive of the three construction types.


[^0]:    Source of 2018 and 2019 data: Memoranda from Keyser Marston Associates to City of San Jose

