

**City of Riverside – Stakeholder Infill & Small Lot Subdivision Workshop Summary –  
February 13, 2024**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Stakeholder Feedback</b>
<b>Question 1: Have you worked on an infill or small lot subdivision project? If so, which city?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearly all stakeholders had worked on such projects</li> <li>• Many Southern California cities named: Corona, San Bernardino, Chino, Victorville, Hesperia, La Quinta, Moreno Valley, Loma Linda, Fontana, Colton, Desert Hot Springs, Murrieta, Wildomar, Anaheim, Oceanside, Redlands, Menifee, Irvine, San Marcos, West Covina, Yucaipa, Murrieta, and Temecula. County of Riverside also mentioned.</li> </ul>
<b>Question 2: How would you describe working on developing undersized lots/small lot subdivision?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inefficiencies in terms of time and cost most frequently cited</li> <li>• Benefits of providing diverse, affordable housing and encouraging responsible growth also cited</li> </ul>
<b>Question 3: What are some challenges or opportunities you've encountered when working on undersized lots?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Most frequently cited: Community opposition, slow permit processing, cost of materials and labor, high interest rates, contradicting development codes, inflexible and burdensome zoning standards (i.e., setbacks, parking, required amenities) resulting in fewer units that can be built</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Opportunities               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Most frequently cited: Housing is in high demand, undersized lots promote a new pathway to homeownership, &amp; zoning changes can encourage creative development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Question 4: Have you encountered any positive experiences working on infill or small lot subdivision projects in other cities? If so, what did you like about their program?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Los Angeles, Murrieta, Temecula, Menifee, and Yucaipa received the most praise. LA was especially praised for its small lot subdivision ordinance.</li> <li>• Favorite aspects of programs: Streamlined permitting, flexible zoning, ability to meet with planners before and during permitting process</li> <li>• Riverside was praised for its One Stop Shop process, 2004 Infill Single Family Residential Development Program, and RPU and PW rebates</li> </ul>
<b>Question 5: Which development standards should be considered when evaluating housing production feasibility for undersized lots or small lot subdivisions?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAR, setbacks, building heights, density, lot size/configuration, access easements, and parking most commonly cited               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Parking is often requested even if not required</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For PRDs specifically, shared driveways are preferred over private streets and public maintenance/finance districts are preferred over private management such as HOAs. Fewer required amenities are also preferred.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ WQMD stormwater treatment requirements were cited as an obstacle to HOA independence</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Question 6: Which areas of the planning, permitting, or construction process could be streamlined to increase market feasibility of infill or small lot subdivision housing development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shorter deadlines, consecutive/overlapping processes, preliminary applications with clear entitlement paths, coordinated departmental responses, combined variances, fee reductions and credits to offset costs, flexible zoning, and the ability to match projects to existing neighborhood conditions rather than the underlying zoning were most frequently cited.</li> </ul>

**City of Riverside – Stakeholder Infill & Small Lot Subdivision Workshop Summary –  
February 13, 2024**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One stakeholder mentioned that the City's 2004 Infill Single Family Residential Development Program should be expanded.</li> </ul>
<b>Question 7: Should small lot subdivisions apply to multi-family zones or be limited to single-family zones?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consensus was to include both types of zones for flexibility</li> </ul>
<b>Question 8: What challenges or opportunities would a required minimum density present for an infill/small lot subdivision project?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size, shape, topography, and market conditions were frequently cited challenges</li> <li>• Flexibility on setback and parking standards strongly encouraged</li> </ul>
<b>Question 9: What challenges or opportunities would a required maximum density present for an infill/small lot subdivision project?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility encouraged, especially for setback, parking, and height standards</li> <li>• Minimum and maximum density discouraged; should be left to the developer's discretion</li> </ul>
<b>Question 10: Any additional feedback you would like to share?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamlining and zoning flexibility requests were reiterated.</li> <li>• Appreciation for reaching out &amp; building a stakeholder-staff relationship was expressed.</li> </ul>