



City of Arts & Innovation

Housing and Homelessness Committee Memorandum

TO: HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS COMMITTEE MEMBERS **DATE: NOVEMBER 27, 2023**

FROM: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT **WARDS: ALL**

SUBJECT: INFILL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES UPDATE

ISSUE:

Update on selected policy options to address infill development and encourage housing production in the City.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Housing and Homelessness Committee:

1. Receive and file the report on small lot subdivision policy, density transfer best practices, and a draft infill development ordinance; and
2. Provide staff with direction on the strategies presented.

BACKGROUND:

On July 24, 2023, Staff presented six infill housing development strategies to the City Council Housing and Homelessness Committee (Committee) for consideration. Staff provided a policy matrix comparing the advantages, disadvantages, and potential for success of each strategy (Attachment 1). After discussion, the Committee asked staff to return with additional information on:

1. A Small Lot Subdivision policy for the Committee's consideration;
2. Best practices from existing Density Transfer Programs within the region for the Committee's consideration; and
3. A draft Infill Development Ordinance for the consideration and recommendation of the City Planning Commission.

On August 17, 2023, Staff presented the same development strategies to the City Planning Commission at a workshop for consideration and feedback. The Planning Commission's feedback was in alignment with Committee discussion and no further direction was provided (Attachment 2).

The discussion below contains additional information gathered on the three identified strategies. Specific direction needed from the committee is summarized at the end of each sub-section.

DISCUSSION:

Small-Lot Subdivision Policy:

Attachment 3 details the benefits and deficiencies of existing infill development tools for single family zones in Riverside and examples of existing small lot development policies within the Region. The report concludes with two policy options and implementation questions for the Committee to consider. The two options are summarized below, while Attachment 2 provides greater detail.

Option 1, Small-Lot Subdivision in Single-Family Zones.

Senate Bill 9 (SB 9, 2021) is an existing statewide infill development tool using Urban Lot Splits/Two-Unit Development to encourage more units on existing single-family properties. Chapter 19.443 of the Riverside Municipal Code (RMC) establishes standards and a ministerial approval process for two-unit development on single family lots. Two-unit developments coupled with urban lot splits can accommodate up to two new parcels and four dwelling units per existing single-family lot, consistent with SB 9.

The Planned Residential Development Permit (PRD) is an existing tool permitted through Chapter 19.780 of the RMC to encourage the development of small-lot subdivisions, (Attachment 4). PRDs allow for bonus density (Table 1) and more flexible development standards like reduced setbacks and increased lot coverage. In exchange, the project must meet at least five of the 11 design criteria under Section 19.780.050.E to ensure superior site design and high-quality common open space and amenities.

TABLE 1 – PRD Benchmark and Bonus Densities

Zone	Benchmark Density - Dwellings per Gross Acre	Maximum Density with Bonus - Dwellings Per Gross Acre
RC	0.5	0.63
RR	3.0	3.3
RE	3.0	3.3
R-1-7000	7.3	8.0
R-1-8500	6.3	6.9
R-1-10500	5.5	6.0
R-1-13000	4.8	5.3
R-1-1/2 acre	3.0	3.3

The current PRD requirements lend themselves to larger-scale subdivision development. Of recent PRDs processed in the City, the average project site is 16.8 acres and the average number of units is 70. There are approximately 1,896 lots between one-half (0.5) and one-and-one-half (1.5) acres in the R-1 Zones. While these parcels may be considered “oversized” for a single-family property and therefore good candidates for subdivision, they are not large enough to support a standard PRD due to the design requirements or financial feasibility given their size and relatively small number of lots that can be developed (between four and 12 lots in the R-1-7000 Zone, for example).

To address these development limitations, the Committee may consider expanding the PRD standards to allow an administrative process for PRDs resulting in 4 or fewer lots/units. Removing

the need for discretionary review may make development of 4 units more feasible. The Committee may also consider streamlining or simplifying the density bonus requirements or development standards for PRDs 15 units or fewer, relieving small-scale infill projects from standards more appropriate for traditional, larger subdivision development.

Committee Direction Needed on Small Lot Subdivisions in Single-Family Zones:
Should small PRDs (4-15 small-lot units) be permitted, or are the existing Two-Unit Development, Urban Lot Split, and standard PRD regulations sufficient? If so:
Should an administrative PRD process be created for projects with 4 or fewer lots/units?
Should a streamlined PRD process be created for projects with 15 lots/units or fewer?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should these projects receive the maximum available PRD density bonus without needing to satisfy the criteria in 19.780.050.E?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should these projects have modified development standards than what exists for PRDs today?
Should there be a limitation on the square footage or number of bedrooms for homes created through a small lot subdivision?

Option 2, Small Lot Subdivision in Multifamily Zones

Allowing small-lot subdivisions in higher-density multifamily zones may result in fewer units if builders opt for single-family home product types instead of multi-family buildings. As of October 11, the Governor signed SB 684 to address this gap, requiring cities to ministerially approve a subdivision and housing development of 10 units or fewer – but only if the project will meet the maximum allowed density in its Zoning district.

The requirement to meet maximum density presents potential challenges. Developing a project to the maximum density can become challenging or cost prohibitive. Often, developers will choose to build multifamily projects to less than allowable density to avoid physical constraints and higher costs. Currently, the Zoning Code does not permit single-family subdivisions (small-lot or otherwise) in the Multifamily Zones; as such, with the implementation of SB 684, small lot developers’ only option is meeting the density standards of the law for multifamily properties.

While projects under SB 684 require the project to be built to the maximum density, the project must result in 10 units/lots or less. The unit cap also presents potential for under-filling larger multifamily properties with fewer units than what the underlying zone would otherwise allow. The Committee may consider creating a process, complementing SB 684, for all small-lot subdivisions of more than 10 units on multifamily sites that can accommodate them.

Committee Direction Needed on Small Lot Subdivisions in Multifamily Zones:
Should small lot subdivisions apply to multi-family zones, or is the existing Multifamily development process sufficient? If so:
Should a minimum density be required for small lot subdivisions in multifamily zones?

Should small-lot subdivisions in multifamily zones be allowed for projects exceeding 10 parcels/units?
--

Should there be a cap on the size or number of units allowed in multifamily small-lot subdivisions?

Density Transfer Program Characteristics and Best Practices

To understand density transfer implementation and best practices, Staff surveyed five cities in the region with existing Density Transfer Programs to compare purpose, type, site criteria, number of units transferred and approval process. Findings are summarized below, and further detail can be found in Attachment 5.

Program Purpose

The survey found three general applications of density transfer amongst the programs studied. Three of the programs (Anaheim, Palm Springs, Santa Clarita) are driven by the need to conserve or preserve open space, agricultural, tourism, and recreational lands within sending sites. The City of Escondido's program is driven to increase density and development opportunity in receiving sites. The City of Carlsbad is unique in its application of density transfer as a density bonus tool for Inclusionary Housing implementation. Should a density transfer program be considered for Riverside, Committee direction would be needed to define the purpose of the program.

Area of Focus

Three of the programs surveyed focus on density transfer within, to, and from Specific Plan areas. The City of Anaheim only allows density transfer between properties within the same Specific Plan, to redistribute density amongst planned developments to maintain the maximum number of units set by the plan. The City of Palm Springs focuses the program on the Environmentally Sensitive Areas Specific Plan (ESA-SP) Zone. All sending sites must be within the ESA-SP Zone and may send density to any property within or outside of the zone to encourage preservation of environmentally sensitive areas. The City of Escondido requires both sending and receiving sites to be within the Downtown Specific Plan, focusing growth on specific properties in the Downtown.

Two of the programs surveyed do not focus density transfer to one specific plan, but rather allow city-wide transfer. The City of Santa Clarita (in partnership with the County of Los Angeles) requires sending sites to be areas designated open space or agricultural in unincorporated Los Angeles County, and receiving sites to be areas with mixed use, commercial, and transit-oriented development within the City of Santa Clarita. The City of Carlsbad allows city-wide transfer subject to the requirements of the Growth Management Plan.

Bank Model vs. Transactional Model

Density transfer programs are typically implemented in either a bank model or transactional model. Three of the programs surveyed (Anaheim, Palm Springs, Santa Clarita) are transactional, allowing sending sites to send units directly to receiving sites. Two of the programs surveyed (Carlsbad and Escondido) use a bank model, where sending sites send density to a bank or pool managed by the City. Receiving sites may then apply for increased density using the available density in the pool. The City of Escondido "kick-started" their density pool with unused density from City-owned properties.

Transactional models allow for owner-to-owner negotiation, whereas bank models reduce the negotiation value of density from sending areas, allowing for more intentional application of density in receiving areas. While both models will require some monitoring from the City, administering a density pool increases administrative and accounting tasks not required from a transactional model. Staff is seeking direction from the Committee on which model would be most appropriate for a density transfer program in Riverside.

Number of Units Transferred

The programs that use bank models (Carlsbad, Santa Clarita, Escondido) do not have a limit on the number of units transferred, and number of units are determined by bank availability. The City of Anaheim limits the number of units that may be transferred to 10% of the total number of units allowed in the Specific Plan. The City of Palm Springs has an opposite approach and offers additional density to incentivize growth outside of the ESA-SP Zone. Properties within the same planning area in the ESA-SP Zone may transfer density (units) on a one-to-one basis. Properties within the ESA-SP Zone may transfer density to properties outside at a ratio of 1.2 units received for every 1 unit sent, thus incentivizing transfers to sites outside of sensitive areas.

Approval Process

Four of the five programs assessed require City Council review and approval at some point in the density transfer process. In the case of the City of Palm Springs, the density transfer program lends itself to larger scale planned development. The transfer of density is still subject to amendments to Specific Plans or the General Plan and environmental review. The City of Escondido requires a Development Agreement between the receiving site and the City to ensure the additional density results in benefit to the community. The City of Anaheim has the only program surveyed that allows for administrative approval of density transfer, due to the scale and containment in well-defined planning areas. Committee direction on the above criteria will help inform the level of approval appropriate for a density transfer program in Riverside.

Committee Direction Needed on Density Transfer Programs
Is a density transfer program an appropriate tool for the City of Riverside to encourage infill housing development? If so:
Should the program be city wide or focused on a specific zone/area?
Should the program use a bank model or transactional model?
Should there be an unlimited transfer of units or should there be a unit cap?
If more information is required, what specific details would the Committee like to explore?

Undersized Lot (Infill) Development Draft Ordinance

Staff along with the consulting team have drafted amendments to Title 19 of the Riverside Municipal Code (RMC) to allow the development of undersized lots in residential zones based on prior direction from the Committee. The proposed amendment includes two new sections:

- §19.100.065 – Regulations for infill development on undersized lots in the R-1 Zones
- §19.100.075 – Regulations for infill development on undersized lots in the R-3 and R-4 Zones

Each section provides new development standards appropriate for smaller lots including setbacks, building heights, number of stories, lot coverage, usable open space, and privacy considerations. Also included are amendments to existing sections of the code to ensure landscaping, parking, and design guidelines are consistent with the proposed regulations for undersized lot development. The full text amendment is found in Attachment 6 of this staff report. The Committee also requested a list of surplus City-owned properties that could potentially support infill development; this is included as Attachment 7. Although no specific direction from the Committee is needed currently, the draft is submitted to the Committee for general feedback. The amendments will be presented to the Planning Commission for recommendation, and ultimately to the full City Council for adoption by ordinance.

Committee Direction Needed for Draft Infill Development Ordinance:

No specific direction required; general feedback is welcomed.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT:

This item contributes to **Strategic Priority 2 – Community Well-Being, Goal 2.1** – Facilitate the development of a quality and diverse housing supply that is available and affordable to a wide range of income levels and **Goal 2.3** – Strengthen neighborhood identities and improve community health and the physical environment through amenities and programs that foster an increased sense of community and enhanced feelings of pride and belonging citywide.

This Project aligns with the following Cross-Cutting Threads:

1. **Community Trust** – The housing strategies are presented at an open public meeting and contains transparent information on City processes and regulations.
2. **Equity** – The housing strategies seek to promote equity so that housing development responds to the needs of residents within environmental justice neighborhoods.
3. **Fiscal Responsibility** – The potential housing strategies may have some fiscal impact, depending on the policy pursued.
4. **Innovation** – The housing strategies seek best practices that will innovate how the City addresses plans for and accommodates housing.
5. **Sustainability & Resiliency** – The housing strategies seek to minimize environmental impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact related to this report. Research, preparation of memoranda and draft Ordinances were funded by the City's SB 2 Planning Grant.

Prepared by: Jennifer Lilley, Community & Economic Development Director
Approved by: Rafael Guzman, Assistant City Manager
Certified as to
availability of funds: Kristie Thomas, Finance Director/Assistant Chief Financial Officer
Approved as to form: Phaedra A. Norton, City Attorney

Attachments:

1. July 24, 2023, Housing and Homelessness Committee Report
2. August 17, 2023, City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
3. Small Lot Subdivision Memo
4. PRD Standards (Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 19.780)
5. Density Transfer Program Best Practices Summary Table
6. Draft Amended Ordinance for Undersized Lot Development
7. Surplus Properties Infill Development Potential
8. Presentation



City of Arts & Innovation

Housing and Homelessness Committee Memorandum

**TO: HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS
COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

DATE: JULY 24, 2023

**FROM: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT**

WARDS: ALL

SUBJECT: INFILL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

ISSUE:

Summary of policy options to address infill development and encourage housing production in the City of Riverside.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Housing and Homelessness Committee:

1. Receive and file the report on infill development strategies and policy options; and
2. Provide staff with direction to pursue one or more of the strategies presented.

BACKGROUND:

In October 2021, the City adopted the 6th Cycle Update of the General Plan 2025 Housing Element, which identifies infill development as a mechanism to address the region's housing shortage by increasing housing opportunities on existing and underutilized lots. The Housing Element defines infill development as the "addition of housing, businesses, or other new uses on existing sites within developed, urbanized areas as opposed to outlying or undeveloped areas, where the efficient use of existing in-place infrastructure and services can be realized."

The policies and programs of the Housing Element support increasing housing supply through infill development. This is to be accomplished through the specific implementation measures included in the Action Plan, which include the preparation of Zoning Code Amendments to encourage and incentivize building the maximum number of homes allowed (Action HE-4.2), encourage mixed use development through a potential density transfer program (Action HE-5.6), and the preparation of an infill development ordinance to streamline and increase housing production (Action HE-EJ-7.5). The current General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Element also includes policies that promote affordable infill development (Policy LU-43.1), discourage the premature development of nonurbanized areas (Policy LU-10.1), and ensure infill development and allow for increased density along established transportation corridors (Policy LU-8.1).

In September 2019, the City of Riverside applied for and received a package of Senate Bill (SB) 2

Planning Grant Program (PGP) funds from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to facilitate projects that will assist with the implementation of Housing Element policies and actions. Specifically, these funds are intended to support projects that will:

1. Streamline approvals for housing for both owners and renters at all income levels;
2. Facilitate housing affordability for all income groups;
3. Promote development consistent with the State Planning Priorities; and
4. Ensure geographic equity in the distribution and expenditure of allocated funds.

Among other projects, the PGP funds allowed Staff to partner with Sagecrest Planning as a consultant to examine potential infill housing development, as outlined in the Housing Strategy Options Report (Attachment 1). The report details different strategies to increase housing production and address the infill development policy goals and objectives outlined in the General Plan. These strategies are presented for the Committee's review, consideration, and discussion to provide staff with direction for facilitating infill housing development in the City.

DISCUSSION:

Staff and the consultant team identified six strategies that could serve to facilitate and streamline infill residential development:

1. Infill Development Ordinance;
2. Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance;
3. SB 10 Implementation;
4. Density Transfer Program;
5. Minimum Density Requirements; and
6. Increased General Plan Densities.

Each identified strategy was then evaluated based on the following criteria to compare the advantages, disadvantages, and potential success of each:

1. Impact on Increasing Residential Density. Does the option increase the residential density levels beyond what is approved in the General Plan?
2. Impact on Increasing Housing Unit Production. Does the option increase the City's capacity for residential development?
3. Level of Community Interest. How likely is the community to support the option?
4. Impact on City Financial/Staffing Resources. Would additional City resources be required to develop and/or implement the option?
5. Consistency with Adopted Plans/Regulations. Would the option require amendments to adopted plans and regulations.
6. Impact on Development Feasibility. Would the option increase financial feasibility of housing development based on either decreased costs or increased value?
7. Impact on Established Single-Family Neighborhoods. Would the option change the character of established single family residential neighborhoods?
8. Impact on Housing Mix. Would the option promote an expanded mix of housing types available to the City?
9. Timing. How long would it take to implement the option?
10. CEQA Requirements. What type of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review would the option require?

A detailed breakdown of this evaluation is available in Attachment 1. Additionally, the ten criteria have been arranged in a matrix to easily compare each policy option in Attachment 2. A brief description of each option, their potential benefits, and impacts are provided below.

Strategy 1: Infill Development Ordinance

An infill development ordinance would streamline the development of existing residential lots that do not meet the minimum dimensions required by the current Zoning Code. The ordinance would create a simplified process and realistic development standards that allow for the efficient development of substandard lots. Revisions to the Zoning Code may include reduced minimum lot sizes, reduced setbacks, greater building heights, or less required parking to eliminate the need for variances. It is not likely that an infill development ordinance will generate significant community opposition as the existing allowed density, zoning and General Plan Land Use designation would remain the same. However, it is not likely to result in a substantial increase in the number of housing units as there are a limited number of existing substandard lots available for development.

An infill development ordinance would require a Zoning Text Amendment. It would not require a General Plan amendment as it would maintain the existing density limit. This option is considered short-term as the ordinance would take less than a year to draft. Input would be sought from architects, engineers and builders specializing in infill development in addition to stakeholders and the general public. CEQA environmental review would not be required under Government Code Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15061(b)(3).

Strategy 2: Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance

A small lot subdivision ordinance would allow for existing residential lots to be subdivided into multiple smaller lots which may be offered for purchase to individual homebuyers. Housing developed through small lot subdivisions often results in a cluster of detached units with the ability for residents to own the actual land that the unit sits on. Although this development type is typically compatible with single-family neighborhoods in terms of building scale and appearance, it may generate some community opposition due to the perceived intensification of the existing property. In multifamily residential neighborhoods, small lot subdivisions could result in fewer housing units should developers prefer to construct small lot single-family homes instead of conventional higher-density multifamily projects, which could have a negative effect on the City's ability to meet its housing obligations. For this reason, this option may pair well with one or more other strategies (such as SB 10 implementation, density transfer or minimum densities).

A small lot subdivision ordinance would create a process for review and approval of small lot subdivisions, including the required Tract or Parcel Map, and may also include reduced minimum lot sizes, reduced setbacks, greater building heights, or less parking to accommodate small lot development. The ordinance would require the approval of a Zoning Text Amendment but would not require any General Plan amendment if the existing density limits of the General Plan are maintained. This option is considered short-term as the ordinance would take less than a year to draft. On its own, it would be exempt from CEQA review under Government Code Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15061(b)(3) and would not need further environmental analysis. Alternatively, the ordinance could be paired with increased General Plan densities to accommodate additional development, but this would substantially add to the required time, resources and receive potential opposition.

Strategy 3: SB 10 Implementation

In 2021 Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill (SB) 10, which authorizes cities to adopt an ordinance to zone any parcel for up to 10 units, 2 ADUs, and 2 JADUs if the parcel is in a transit-rich area or an urban infill site (as defined in Section 65913.5 of the Government Code). The ordinance would allow for up to 14 units per parcel and could potentially create a sizable increase

in the City's housing stock. Although the City has complete local control in deciding where SB 10 is implemented (if at all), the bill has been controversial and seen as a further usurpation of local land use authority. Consequently, very few jurisdictions have adopted and assessed the outcomes of SB 10, resulting in no known successful case studies or best practices. As of the writing of this report, the City of San Diego is the only known jurisdiction to be actively pursuing implementation of SB 10 as part of its "Housing Action Package 2.0", and it has chosen to pair SB 10 implementation with a 15% affordability requirement. Should Riverside choose to adopt an SB 10 ordinance, it would be one of the first jurisdictions in the State to do so.

Local governments have until January 1, 2029, to adopt an SB 10 implementation ordinance (though the ordinance operative period may extend beyond that). The ordinance may be implemented through an overlay zone, clearly demarcating the areas that are subject to the ordinance as required by State law. Findings must be made demonstrating the ordinance is consistent with the City's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. Although this option has the potential to substantially increase the housing stock, it also requires more time than other strategies for stakeholder and community engagement, site identification, and establishment of best practices and minimum standards for development. It will also require both a Zoning Text Amendment and, potentially, establishment of a new overlay zone for review by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council.

An ordinance adopted pursuant to SB 10 is not considered a project for the purposes of CEQA, but the resulting development projects themselves are still subject to CEQA review. Some categorical exemptions may apply; however, applicants would need to substantiate exemptions through technical studies. To avoid CEQA processing delay, the City may consider making residential developments of up to 10 units "by-right" or subject only to ministerial approval as part of an SB 10 implementation ordinance.

Strategy 4: Density Transfer Program

Housing Element Program HE-EJ 7-2 identifies a density transfer program as a tool to facilitate housing by increasing densities on vacant or underutilized lots. A site that is not built to the maximum density allowed by its General Plan or Zoning designation would be eligible to transfer the unused density to be built on other properties within the City or within a specific geographic area, without resulting in a net increase in overall allowed residential development. This strategy would require development of a method of tracking of unrealized residential units from developments built below the maximum density allowed, and any transaction of those units to other properties/projects. Although some properties may see densities increase beyond what is prescribed by the General Plan, the overall density transferred would not exceed the planned density within the General Plan.

The maintenance of a density transfer pool or equivalent system could require the long-term need for supplementary staffing, technical and financial resources, in addition to one-time costs for program development and CEQA analysis. The Riverside Action Plan assigns a goal of program implementation by 2025. This option's impact on increasing housing production depends on how permissive or restrictive the requirements are for parcels receiving a density increase. This strategy may be paired with one or more other approaches to facilitate increased infill residential development, such as small lot subdivisions or minimum densities.

Strategy 5: Require Minimum Densities

Amending the General Plan and Zoning Code to require a minimum percentage of allowed densities for housing development allows for a more efficient use of land and ensures capacity to

accommodate anticipated growth. Requiring a baseline density discourages inefficient site planning and encourages transit and pedestrian oriented development. Density minimums would only apply to multifamily residential and mixed-use projects, which may serve to reduce neighborhood opposition. However, stakeholder opposition is likely, as density minimums may be seen as overly prescriptive and economically infeasible if set too high or are not sensitive to market conditions. The impact on increasing housing production is subject to several variables and could risk discouraging development over the long term if not appropriately designed.

This option would require community and stakeholder engagement and amendments to the Zoning Code. Program development is anticipated to take one to two years. However, there are potential opportunities to streamline program development with the Phase II General Plan Update which would establish a more long-term timeline.

Strategy 6: Increase Maximum Densities

This option amends the maximum allowable densities in the General Plan and Zoning Code, and could be limited to certain land use designations or zones. This option is most likely to create a large increase in residential capacity, demonstrating the City's commitment to increasing the overall housing stock. Stakeholder support is likely, as increasing the maximums allows the market to respond to changing housing demand. This option is also likely to garner significant community opposition, as increasing the maximum allowed density is often seen as a threat to existing neighborhoods.

Increasing the maximum densities would require a substantial public process with extensive community engagement to ensure the identified maximum meets the needs and expectations of the community. Additionally, it would require review and analysis of existing development standards to ensure the additional density can be achieved and an environmental impact report to assess potential environmental impacts of increasing densities across several land use designations. This results in a long-term project timeline and associated costs. However, there are opportunities to align program development with the planned Phase II General Plan Update at the direction of the Committee. This would result in a more resource-efficient, but longer-term, process.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT:

This item contributes to **Strategic Priority 2 – Community Well-Being** and **Goal 2.1** – Facilitate the development of a quality and diverse housing supply that is available and affordable to a wide range of income levels, and **Goal 2.3** – Strengthen neighborhood identities and improve community health and the physical environment through amenities and programs that foster an increased sense of community and enhanced feelings of pride and belonging citywide.

This Project aligns with the each of the five Cross-Cutting Threads as follows:

1. **Community Trust** – The housing strategies are presented at an open public meeting and contain transparent information on City processes and regulations.
2. **Equity** – The housing strategies seek to promote equity so that housing development responds to the needs of residents within environmental justice neighborhoods.
3. **Fiscal Responsibility** – The potential housing strategies may have some fiscal impact, depending on the policy pursued.

4. **Innovation** – The housing strategies seek best practices that will innovate how the City addresses plans for and accommodates housing.
5. **Sustainability & Resiliency** – The housing strategies seek to minimize environmental impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no immediate fiscal impact related to this report. Development and implementation of infill housing strategies would be absorbed by Community & Economic Development Department staff. Depending on the infill strategies pursued, outside consultant support may be required for CEQA environmental review, which could range from \$30,000 for an Initial Study and Negative/Mitigated Negative Declaration to \$200,000 for an Environmental Impact Report.

Prepared by: Jennifer Lilley, Community & Economic Development Director
Certified as to availability of funds: Edward Enriquez, Assistant City Manager/Chief Financial Officer
Approved by: Rafael Guzman, Assistant City Manager
Approved as to form: Phaedra A. Norton, City Attorney

Attachments:

1. Housing Strategy Options Report
2. Housing Options Comparison Table
3. Presentation