

From housing plans to delivered change: a 17-city research report

A dated review of local housing plans, what their milestones actually establish, and the evidence needed to test whether development benefits existing homeowners.

Housing Alpha Research | Published 2026-09-17

Evidence reviewed 2026-09-17 | Research prepared 2026-09-17

Desk research. Sales calculations use the retained Redfin city-level, non-seasonally-adjusted three-month history downloaded September 16, 2026 (source update September 3), with matching June-August 2026, 2025 and 2021 windows. Official planning sources were reviewed September 17; their own document dates remain distinct. Source extracts, hashes and calculations are retained in the repository.

City medians reflect the mix of homes sold, not repeat-sales appreciation or an address valuation. Prices and changes require at least ten sales in each relevant window; that threshold does not eliminate sampling uncertainty.

Historical observations come from a currently retained source vintage and may be revised. This is descriptive history, not an as-of-2025 backtest or a validated forecast.

Planning capacity, policy adoption, project approval, construction and completion are different stages. This review is not a comprehensive current permit, occupancy or completion census.

These 17 cities have market and planning articles. Individual sales, municipal-finance comparisons, jobs/completed-housing panels and Model Lab coverage have not been extended to them by this edition.

The question behind the development thesis

New housing and useful public improvements can change a place. Whether an existing homeowner benefits financially depends on what is delivered, where it is, which housing products it affects and what the buyer paid. This report records the official planning evidence reviewed for the seventeen new city articles. It does not convert planning capacity into a forecast of completions or appreciation.

Read the stage before the number

An adopted plan establishes a framework. An individual project approval is a different event; a building permit, construction start and completed or occupied building are later evidence. A staff recommendation or draft is earlier still. The distinction matters when a document contains a large unit count: capacity, planned units and completed homes cannot be added together as if they measure the same thing.

City-by-city planning record

Atherton

Atherton's official multifamily page records an October 2024 multifamily overlay and March 18, 2026 zoning amendments concerning transit-related housing. It describes optional redevelopment on specified properties. These are changes to development rules, not a count of completed homes. The same page contains older implementation material, so its historical steps should not all be read as current project status. Official source (<https://www.athertonca.gov/672/Multi-Family-Housing>).

Next evidence to seek: The next useful check is another matched summer window with sale counts, plus a retained sample of genuinely comparable properties. A persistent premium after controlling for size, condition and lot characteristics would strengthen the scarcity hypothesis. A large reversal in the median with little movement in matched comparables would point toward transaction mix. Any planning update should record a specific application, permit or completion separately from the zoning framework.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/atherton-housing-and-planning>).

Belmont

The city says the Belmont Village Specific Plan was adopted on November 14, 2017. It links the area's potential growth to proximity to transit and describes a framework for development and public spaces. This is an adopted planning framework with a historical adoption date; the page does not establish that every planned improvement has been delivered. Official source (<https://www.belmont.gov/departments/community-development/belmont-village-specific-plan>).

Next evidence to seek: The next research step is to pair completed Village improvements with a consistent set of nearby home sales and a comparison area. Without that evidence, the plan remains context rather than a return forecast. For the market series, review the next matched summer window and whether the condo sample becomes large enough to support a useful comparison. Do not combine overlapping three-month counts to manufacture a larger sample.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/belmont-housing-and-planning>).

Brisbane

Brisbane's September 15, 2026 update says the September 14 City Council hearing began review of the Baylands plan and that unfinished discussion would continue September 29. It also records the Planning Commission's recommendation for Council action. A recommendation and a hearing schedule are not final Council approval or construction completion. Future hearing dates are scheduled milestones, subject to change. Official source (<https://www.brisbaneca.gov/228/Brisbane-Baylands>).

Next evidence to seek: The next evidence milestone is the Council's recorded decision, followed separately by infrastructure commitments, building permits and completed or occupied phases. For prices, retain nonoverlapping comparison windows and a property-level sample before claiming a local premium. If the plan

advances while matched existing-home prices do not outperform a suitable comparison area, that would weaken the simple claim that planning progress automatically creates homeowner gains.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/brisbane-housing-and-planning>).

Colma

Colma's adopted 2023-2031 Housing Element, retained by the state housing department, distinguishes Sterling Park single-family opportunities from El Camino Real multifamily development potential. Table H-46 lists 255 units of corridor development potential. Those are planning estimates in an adopted document, not evidence that 255 homes have been built, approved as individual projects, or offered for sale. Official source (<https://hcdpowerbi.blob.core.windows.net/housing-elements/colma-6th-adopted-011124.pdf>).

Next evidence to seek: The priority is a verified, deduplicated set of individual sales with clear boundaries and property characteristics. Until that exists, use nearby city histories for regional context and label the actual Colma comparison as unavailable. On development, retain project applications and completion records against the Housing Element's opportunity sites. Evidence of completed, relevant housing would change the choice set; a planning capacity number by itself would not.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/colma-housing-and-planning>).

East Palo Alto

The city adopted the Ravenswood Business District/4 Corners Specific Plan update on December 17, 2024, replacing the 2013 plan. Its published chapters address land use, public facilities, mobility, utilities, community benefits and implementation. The adoption establishes a framework; this edition does not verify that its infrastructure or development program has been completed. Official source (<https://www.cityofepa.org/planning/page/ravenswood4-corners-specific-plan-adopted-12172024>).

Next evidence to seek: The next useful evidence is delivered infrastructure and occupied development, connected to a matched set of nearby homes and a comparison area. Track the next same-season market window as context, retaining sales counts and property type. Evidence that matched homes narrow the gap after actual improvements would strengthen the convergence hypothesis. A persistent raw gap or a one-period rebound would not, on its own, settle it.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/east-palo-alto-housing-and-planning>).

Foster City

Foster City's General Plan page records state certification of its 2023-2031 Housing Element on April 18, 2024. It separately lists Parks and Open Space and Conservation elements adopted November 3, 2025. These are policy documents with different dates and purposes. Their adoption is not evidence that a particular improvement is funded, finished or available to residents. Official source (<https://www.fostercity.org/326/General-Plan>).

Next evidence to seek: Follow both property types through the next matched summer window, then test whether the difference persists within comparable buildings or homes. For the planning story, record a specific funded project and its completion before measuring nearby effects. Evidence that the condo pattern disappears after matching buildings would weaken a citywide condo-recovery thesis. A consistent result across comparable properties and successive independent periods would justify a stronger interpretation.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/foster-city-housing-and-planning>).

Half Moon Bay

Half Moon Bay's official Local Coastal Program page states that the whole city lies within the coastal zone. It identifies the land-use plan and implementation plan as the two parts of the program. The land-use plan was adopted in October 2020 and certified by the Coastal Commission in April 2021. Those dates describe the framework, not a current determination for an individual parcel. Official source (<https://www.half-moon-bay.ca.us/154/Local-Coastal-Program-Land-Use-Plan>).

Next evidence to seek: The next market check is another matched period with a comparable sales mix. To test a coastal premium, separate otherwise similar homes by the specific amenity or access characteristic being studied and retain a suitable comparison group. Planning evidence should identify an actual approval or completed improvement under the applicable jurisdiction. A broad reference to the coast is too imprecise to connect a development decision to a resale outcome.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/half-moon-bay-housing-and-planning>).

Hillsborough

The town's published housing-site fact sheet describes two town-owned multifamily opportunity sites: the Town Hall campus and Tobin Clark. It identifies conceptual totals of 16 and 100 units respectively. The fact sheet distinguishes those concepts from project approvals. Its publication date is not stated, so this edition does not treat its approval-status wording as a freshly verified September 2026 project register. Official source (<https://www.hillsborough.net/DocumentCenter/View/5609>).

Next evidence to seek: A stronger price thesis would require repeated observations of comparable properties, plus evidence that the premium persists against a suitable alternative market. For the opportunity sites, the next research item is a dated project record showing what has changed since the fact sheet. If a current median increase largely disappears after matching property characteristics, we should revise the interpretation toward transaction mix rather than citywide appreciation.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/hillsborough-housing-and-planning>).

Los Altos

The city's Measure D FAQ says its Housing Element credits downtown parking plazas with 124 units of housing capacity. As reviewed September 17, 2026, it describes the initiative conditionally, including unresolved effects if it is adopted. The city explicitly distinguishes this inventory capacity from larger zoning-capacity estimates. We do not treat the ballot proposal as adopted or the 124 units as a construction pipeline. Official source

(<https://www.losaltosca.gov/793/Measure-D>).

Next evidence to seek: Revisit the official policy record after the initiative's outcome and any subsequent city action, preserving this edition's dated interpretation. Then follow applications and completed housing separately. On market performance, compare the next same-season observations and seek building-level condo comparables. Consistent divergence across matched homes would strengthen a segmentation thesis; a reversal driven by a few transactions would suggest the current split was largely composition.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/los-altos-housing-and-planning>).

Los Altos Hills

A December 11, 2025 state environmental filing submitted for Los Altos Hills describes a Housing Element amendment involving multifamily rezoning and site feasibility. It names the Twin Oaks, Foothill College and St. Nicholas School parcel groups. The filing explicitly says the amendment does not approve development projects or grant project entitlements. This edition uses it as a documented planning action, not a current construction inventory. Official source (<https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2025120534>).

Next evidence to seek: Track subsequent ordinances, applications and completion evidence for the named locations, each with its own date and status. For prices, retain the next matched summer window and investigate whether the apparent increase survives a property-level comparison. A documented supply change could alter the choice set well before it produces a measurable citywide price effect; those are separate outcomes that future research should record separately.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/los-altos-hills-housing-and-planning>).

Menlo Park

The city's ConnectMenlo page records approval of the land-use and circulation elements in November 2016 and Bayfront zoning in December 2016. It describes development potential of up to 4,500 residences, 2.3 million square feet of additional nonresidential space and 400 hotel rooms. These are historical plan capacities, not this edition's estimate of remaining pipeline, occupied space or completed homes. Official source (<https://www.menlopark.gov/Government/Departments/Community-Development/Planning/Comprehensive-planning/ConnectMenlo>).

Next evidence to seek: The next research layer should retain completed housing, occupied commercial space and measured employment with compatible dates and geography. Compare nearby matched homes with a credible comparison group rather than selecting cities after seeing which appreciated. A development-based thesis weakens if delivered activity fails to produce the expected relative outcome. The present price history is context for that future test, not its result.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/menlo-park-housing-and-planning>).

Mountain View

The city's North Bayshore Circulation Study page links the 2014 Precise Plan and its 2017 amendment to commercial and residential growth alongside limits on gateway vehicle trips. It records Council approval of the circulation study in December 2021. These are dated planning and transport decisions; they do not verify the present completion of every housing or mobility improvement envisioned there. Official source (<https://www.mountainview.gov/our-city/departments/public-works/roads-and-transportation/transportation-planning/north-bayshore-circulation-study>).

Next evidence to seek: The most useful test is to compare repeat or closely matched condo sales within the same buildings, alongside matched single-family homes, across independent periods. Track completed North Bayshore housing and delivered transport changes with dates before looking for nearby effects. If the home-type split survives those controls, it deserves a stronger explanation. If it vanishes, the article should be updated to emphasize transaction mix.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/mountain-view-housing-and-planning>).

Palo Alto

Palo Alto's published North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan identifies its adoption by Resolution 10183 on August 5, 2024. The adopted document is the planning evidence used in this edition. It should be read at the plan-area scale, rather than treated as proof of citywide redevelopment or as a statement that every contemplated project has been built. Official source (https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/v/2/planning-amp-development-services/north-ventura-cap/nvcap-reports/adopted_nvcap_8_26_24.pdf).

Next evidence to seek: A stronger local thesis would connect dated North Ventura delivery milestones to matched nearby properties and a comparison group, with outcomes chosen before examining returns. Independently, follow both home-type histories through the next same-season window. If one segment's apparent strength disappears after matching the homes sold, revise the market interpretation. If completed improvements have no relative effect, revise the development hypothesis rather than explaining away the result.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/palo-alto-housing-and-planning>).

Portola Valley

A December 4, 2025 town staff report records the Housing Element's January 2024 adoption and certification, followed by recertification in May 2025. It discusses proposed changes to housing opportunity sites. We use that dated report to illustrate a changing site strategy, not to assert that its proposed amendments were later approved or that the contemplated homes are complete. Official source (<https://www.portolavalley.net/home/showpublisheddocument/20187/639003547160230000>).

Next evidence to seek: The priority is a matched-property or repeat-sales analysis that preserves sale dates, building area and relevant property characteristics. A future median increase accompanied by stable comparable-property prices would favor the mix explanation. For planning, check a subsequent adopted record before changing the status of the staff report's proposals. Both tests require new evidence; neither should be

replaced with an automatic prediction based on the current headline.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/portola-valley-housing-and-planning>).

San Carlos

The city's state-filed Notice of Determination records approval of the Northeast Area Specific Plan on June 8, 2026. It describes capacity for a net 1,890 additional residences over an approximate twenty-year buildout and changes to the area's street and mobility network. These are plan-level expectations. They are not a tally of permitted starts, completed homes or near-term inventory for buyers. Official source (<https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2024070063/4>).

Next evidence to seek: Retain the next dated applications, permits, infrastructure commitments and completions for the plan area. Pair those records with local, matched home sales before making a causal claim. The next same-season citywide comparison can show whether the broad home-type split persists, but it cannot by itself validate the development thesis. A useful follow-up will explicitly report delayed milestones as well as completed ones.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/san-carlos-housing-and-planning>).

San Francisco

SF Planning says the Family Zoning Plan was signed on December 12, 2025 and became effective January 12, 2026. The department provides adopted zoning maps and warns that parts of its explanatory page are being updated to match the final plan. This edition treats the change as an adopted zoning framework, with parcel-specific interpretation requiring the adopted materials. It does not equate added capacity with completed homes. Official source (<https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan>).

Next evidence to seek: The next research layer should split the city into defensible local areas and pair property characteristics with nearby project milestones. Track permits, starts and completions separately after the zoning change, then evaluate actual outcomes against a preselected comparison. Until that exists, use the citywide charts for orientation and the project map for specific questions. Neither supplies an address-level valuation or proof of a development premium.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/san-francisco-housing-and-planning>).

Woodside

Woodside's Town Center Area Plan update page describes a process exploring housing, circulation, parking and public amenities. Its phase schedule extends draft work into January 2027 and review/adoption into February 2027, while an older introductory sentence still anticipates completion in 2026. This edition flags that inconsistency and treats the update as ongoing, rather than claiming a firm completion date or adopted outcome. Official source (<https://woodsidetown.org/485/Town-Center-Area-Plan-Update>).

Next evidence to seek: The next planning check is the actual published draft and subsequent adopted decision, with the final schedule reconciled against the current page. Follow construction and completion separately. The

next market check should preserve the same seasonal window and examine individual comparable homes. If the median remains stable while matched properties diverge, the article should explain that difference rather than present the town average as a universal outcome.

Read the market analysis (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/articles/woodside-housing-and-planning>).

How the thesis should be tested

First specify the outcome before looking at results: for example, the relative price of comparable existing homes near a completed improvement. Retain a suitable comparison area, pre-event observations and the event date. Record which sites failed to progress as well as those that completed. Otherwise a study can quietly select only successful projects.

Then separate three outcomes: delivery, daily usefulness and housing-market response. A completed project could improve resident choices without increasing existing-home prices. More supply could absorb additional demand. An observed price increase could come from a wider regional change. A useful test must be able to report any of these outcomes, including a failed prediction.

The present articles make hypotheses explicit but do not register a new forecast experiment. The site's existing prediction records retain their original inputs, dates and city scope. Extending those models requires compatible retained employment, completed-housing and property evidence for the additional cities.

Evidence date and limits

Official documents were reviewed September 17, 2026. Their publication or adoption dates are stated in the city summaries where established; several are historical frameworks or undated pages. A current retrieval date does not make every statement on a page current. Brisbane's hearings, Los Altos's conditional Measure D discussion and Woodside's inconsistent schedule especially require later dated follow-up. No planning page here is a comprehensive project-completion census.

Read the 17-city market report

(<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/reports/expanded-cities-market-september-2026>) or explore all cities (<https://bayareahousingalpha.com/areas>). Source extracts and hashes are retained with this frozen edition; later findings should be published as an update with a new report ID.

Sources

1. <https://www.athertonca.gov/672/Multi-Family-Housing>
2. <https://www.belmont.gov/departments/community-development/belmont-village-specific-plan>
3. <https://www.brisbaneca.gov/228/Brisbane-Baylands>
4. <https://hcdpowerbi.blob.core.windows.net/housing-elements/colma-6th-adopted-011124.pdf>
5. <https://www.cityofepa.org/planning/page/ravenswood4-corners-specific-plan-adopted-12172024>

6. <https://www.fostercity.org/326/General-Plan>
7. <https://www.half-moon-bay.ca.us/154/Local-Coastal-Program-Land-Use-Plan>
8. <https://www.hillsborough.net/DocumentCenter/View/5609>
9. <https://www.losaltosca.gov/793/Measure-D>
10. <https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2025120534>
11. <https://www.menlopark.gov/Government/Departments/Community-Development/Planning/Comprehensive-planning/ConnectMenlo>
12. <https://www.mountainview.gov/our-city/departments/public-works/roads-and-transportation/transportation-planning/north-bayshore-circulation-study>
13. https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/v/2/planning-amp-development-services/north-ventura-cap/nvcap-reports/adopted_nvcap_8_26_24.pdf
14. <https://www.portolavalley.net/home/showpublisheddocument/20187/639003547160230000>
15. <https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2024070063/4>
16. <https://sfplanning.org/sf-family-zoning-plan>
17. <https://woodsidetown.org/485/Town-Center-Area-Plan-Update>