

# Tracking California Housing Attitudes Over Time

September 2022

The housing tracker measures levels of awareness, salience, and sentiment toward key housing issues and housing affordability policies among California registered voters over time. The tracker has been conducted twice a year starting in May 2020. Fall 2022 was the sixth wave of the tracker.

Attitudes measured in the tracker include support for the “3Ps” (**Production** of housing in California and in one’s community, **Preservation** of below-market housing, and **Protections** for renters) as well as specific policies related to the 3Ps. In addition, the tracker measures foundational beliefs about housing such as whether access to a safe and affordable home is something that should be guaranteed or earned or whether ensuring access to safe and affordable housing is an individual or community responsibility. The tracker also includes an omnibus section that provides space for CZI partners and grantees to ask one-off timely questions.

The following attitude trends among Californians were measured in September 2022. The full sample margin of error\* for the September 2022 estimates is 4.1%.

- The state of housing availability is perceived to be getting worse since May 2020 (71%). This level increased by 7 points since April 2022 alone, and by 12 points since November 2021.
- Significantly\* more Californians view ensuring people have access to affordable housing as a community responsibility now (55%) than when this attitude was first measured in June 2021 (41%).
- The share of Californians who believe that access to housing that is affordable should be guaranteed has remained fairly stable (58%).

**Overall, support for each of the 3Ps has been increasing over at least the last three waves:**

## Production



**69% of Californians support production in California**, a significant increase since June 2021 (63%).



**64% of Californians support production in one’s community**, a significant increase since November 2021 (59%).



**59% of Californians support increased housing density**, and this level has increased since June 2020 when it was 53%.

## Preserve existing housing that is affordable



**69% of Californians support preservation**, a significant increase since November 2021 (64%).



**59% of Californians support the right of first refusal**.



**61% of Californians support 1-1 replacement**.



Opposition to right of first refusal and for 1-1 replacement **is relatively low** (25% and 22% respectively), though has been increasing since November 2021.

## Protection



**72% of Californians support protection**, a significant increase since June 2021 (65%).



Support for tax breaks has remained steady:

**79% of Californians support tax breaks for tenants**.



**83% of Californians support rent control**, a significant increase since June 2020 (77%).



**84% of Californians support tax breaks to help homeowners**.

## Behavior



**One in five Californians say they have taken some action** related to housing affordability in the last three months.

This level of engagement is an increase since June 2021 (14%), though lower than was measured in June 2020 (28%).

The majority of actions include sharing messages on social media or signing a petition.

Among the 79% of Californians who have not taken any actions related to housing, 21% say they believe their actions won’t change the housing issue in California, 24% don’t think they have the time, 13% don’t know how to take action, and 21% did not have the opportunity.

The September 2022 omnibus section included questions related to several approaches to increase the availability and accessibility of housing that is affordable in California.



**81% of Californians support requiring cities and counties** to publicly report how long it takes to get and how much it costs for building permits in their jurisdictions.



**65% of Californians support imposing a tax** on those making more than \$1 million a year to address the housing or homelessness crisis.



**61% of Californians support removing zoning restrictions** to allow faith-based organizations and nonprofit colleges to build 100% affordable housing on their property.

## Key definitions

**\*Significant:** In this brief, this term refers to a statistically significant difference. That is, the measured difference in attitudes is more than can be explained by chance alone. Our benchmark for significance is a 5% chance.

**\*Sample margin of error:** This measures how close estimates from the survey sample are to the measures we would get if every registered voter in the state answered the survey.

## Methodology

The 20 minute survey was fielded in English and Spanish using the probability-based KnowledgePanel developed by Ipsos. This survey was completed online by n=1,021 registered voters in California. The full sample margin of error is 4.10%. Weighting accounted for different probabilities of selection and post-stratification weights were applied to adjust for demographic imbalance among sampled registered voters. Weighting benchmarks included gender, age, education, and race/ethnicity.



Public Opinion and Survey Science

Any questions please contact [popss@chanzuckerberg.com](mailto:popss@chanzuckerberg.com)

For additional tools and resources to support housing reform in California, visit [cadreamtoolkit.org](http://cadreamtoolkit.org)