

Attachment 6
Housing Element Changes



MEMO

To: Lone City Council
From: Cynthia Deane-Alviso, Jennifer Gastelum - PMC
Cc: Christopher Jordan-City of Lone
Date: August 20, 2009
Re: Response to HCD Comments on the Draft Housing Element

A. HOUSING NEEDS, RESOURCES, AND CONSTRAINTS

1. Include an analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected needs for all income levels, including extremely low-income households (Section .55583(a)(1)).

While the element quantifies the number of projected extremely low-income (ELI) households (page 9-5), in accordance with Chapter 891, Statutes of 2006 (AB 2634), it must also include an estimate of the existing number of ELI households and analyze their housing needs. This analysis is essential to formulating policies and programs to assist in the development and conservation of housing for ELI households. For your information, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data identifies 90 renter and 129 owner, ELI households in Lone. To assist in the analysis, refer to the enclosed CHAS data which includes information on overpayment by ELI households as well as the Department's sample analysis from the Building Blocks' website

Response: Please refer to page HNA-51 for an estimate of the existing number of ELI households within the City.

Revisions made:

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), which was developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to assist jurisdictions in writing their consolidated plans, has special tabulation data based on the 2000 Census. According to this data (see **Table HE-21**) there were 117 owner households and 168 renter households earning less than 50 percent of the Median Family Income (MFI) in the City in 2000. Of ~~those householdese~~, 39 ~~of the extremely low income~~ owner-occupied households and 90 ~~of the extremely low income~~ renter-occupied households fell into the extremely low-income category.

TABLE HE-21
HOUSING PROBLEMS FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS

	Total Renters	Total Owners	Total Households
Household Income ≤ 50% MFI	168	117	285
Household Income ≤ 30% MFI	90	39	129
% with any housing problems	67.8%	79.5%	71.3%
% Cost Burden > 30%	67.8%	79.5%	71.3%
% Cost Burden > 50%	50.0%	59.0%	52.7%

Source: CHAS, 2000

2. Include an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having the potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites (Section 65583(a)(3)). The inventory of land suitable for residential development shall be used to identify sites that can be developed for housing within the planning periods (Section 65583.2).

Suitability and Availability of Infrastructure: The element indicates the only infrastructure constraint stems from water and wastewater facilities running at total capacity (page 79). The element should describe the impact of the capacity constraint on the ability of the City to accommodate the regional housing need allocation (RHNA).

For your information, Chapter 727, Statutes of 2005 (SB 1087), establishes processes to ensure the effective implementation of Government Code Section 65589.7. This statute requires local governments to provide a copy of the adopted housing element to water and sewer providers. In addition, water and sewer providers must grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-88 for a more thorough analysis on water and wastewater. In addition, the City has added Actions H-2.2.3 and H-2.2.4 to ensure infrastructure capacity for the 2007-2014 planning period.

Revisions made:

Infrastructure. Infrastructure is available throughout the City. Currently, the only infrastructure constraint stems from water and wastewater facilities running at nearly capacity. The City currently has water and wastewater capacity to meet the majority of its 2007-2014 RHNA allocation has included Actions H-2.2.3 and H-2.2.4 to ensure capacity by the end of the 2007-2014 planning period.

Sewer Infrastructure. The City provides for stormwater and wastewater collection, as well as the treatment system for the wastewater. A secondary treatment plant processes the wastewater for users within the City. The existing Waste Water Treatment Plant has a capacity of 0.41 mgd. As of 2006, the plant was operating at 0.388 mgd. The secondary treatment plant is operating very near

capacity. The City also has a tertiary treatment plant that was brought on line in the early 1990s and is designed to process up to 0.8 million gallons per day (mgd) of secondary effluent received from another agency.

The City is in the process of developing a Wastewater Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report that will identify necessary improvements and a plan for implementing these improvements to alleviate the existing constraints. Current planning envisions the construction of a treatment plant with primary/secondary/tertiary components for users within the City. The existing stand-alone tertiary facility would be retained for treatment of effluent received from the other agency. The Wastewater Master Plan is being planned and programmed, on a phased basis, based upon the carrying capacity contemplated in the updated General Plan. The intent is that once the existing capacity issues are addressed, as new development occurs, improvements are made to the facility well in advance of demand from new development so that by the time any units come on line, there will be sufficient capacity.

The Phase 1 improvements will increase capacity to a total of 0.8 mgd. A future Phase 2 expansion (prior to 2030) will take the capacity of the system to 1.6 mgd. The Master Plan for sewer services is in administrative draft and will be released for public comment, concurrently with a project/program EIR in Fall 2009. The City anticipates starting construction of the Phase 1 improvements in 2010/2011. The City is committed to ensuring that there is capacity to meet its fair share allocation for the 2007- 2014 planning period (Action H-2.2.4)

To comply with Senate Bill 1087, the City will immediately forward its adopted Housing Element to its water and wastewater providers so they can grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include units affordable to lower-income households.

Domestic Water. The domestic water system for the City is owned and operated by the Amador Water Agency and serves the City and surrounding area from a 2.5 mgd treatment plant. The State of California has reserved 1.33 mgd of treatment plant capacity for its facilities (Mule Creek Prison, Preston School of Industry, and CAL FIRE) and the remaining 1.2 mgd is for residential, industrial, public, and commercial use. This facility is nearing capacity, although recent improvements to the facility and completion of a new water storage tank have provided near-term capacity improvements.

Amador Water Agency is in the process of developing a plan for increasing the availability of domestic water to the Ione area. A multitude of options are being investigated, including a new regional treatment facility at Tanner (which would replace the Ione WTP), improvements to the local treatment facility, or some combination of the two. The Agency is in the beginning stages of an analysis to determine the interim improvements that can be constructed at the Ione WTP and the associated costs per EDU (by specific interim improvement). The Agency is also considering creation of a Community Facilities District to pay for construction of the new Tanner WTP.

The City will continue to work collaboratively with Amador Water Agency to identify both short and long-term viable and cost effective solutions to maintaining potable water availability in the City (Action H-2.2.3).

Natural Gas and Electricity. Natural gas and electricity are available throughout the City and are provided by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E).

Revisions made (New Actions incorporated):

Action H-2.2.3 Wastewater Capacity. The City is committed to ensuring that there is enough wastewater treatment capacity to support its fair share of the region's housing needs. The City is working towards updating its Wastewater Master Plan and anticipates adoption of the updated plan by the end of 2009. The Master Plan will call for phased improvements to the City's sewer service. Contingent upon Regional Water Quality Control Board approval, the City anticipates initiating construction of sewer treatment improvements within 18 months of General Plan adoption. To comply with Government Code Section 65589.7 the City shall grant a priority for the provision of these services to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower income households. (Cross Reference: Goal PF-5 and related policies and actions)

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Council, City Manager, Wastewater Operator, City Engineer, City Planner

Funding Source: Wastewater Fund

Schedule: Dependent upon RWQCB approval, construction starting by February 2011

Action H-2.2.4 Potable Water Capacity. The City is committed to ensuring that there is enough potable water to support its fair share of the region's housing needs. The City will continue to work collaboratively with the region's potable water provider, Amador Water Agency, to identify both short and long-term viable and cost effective solutions to maintaining potable water availability in the City. (Cross Reference: Goal PF-4 and related policies and actions)

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Council, City Manager, City Engineer, City Planner

Funding Source: General Fund

Schedule: On-going, target completion of upgrades by 2014

Environmental Constraints: The element did not address this statutory requirement. The element must describe any known environmental constraints on identified sites that could impede development in the planning period

Response: Please refer to page HNA-79 and Table HE-4I for a description of environmental Constraints. Please note that none of the environmental constraints noted in Table HE-4I pose a constraint to development.

Revisions made:

Environmental Constraints.

Amador County lies between two seismically active regions in the western United States. Tectonic stresses associated with the North American Pacific Plate boundary can generate damaging

earthquakes along faults to the west of the County. Eastern Amador County borders the Basin and Range provinces that entail most of Nevada and western Utah. This area is riddled with active faults that are responsible for and form the boundary between each basin or valley and the neighboring mountain range.

Although Amador County has felt ground shaking from earthquakes with epicenters located elsewhere, no major earthquakes have been recorded within the county. Notable regional earthquake events include those detailed below. It is unknown whether damages occurred within Amador County and to what extent these events were actually felt by county residents. The entirety of Amador County, including the Planning Area, is shown as being located in a relatively low intensity ground shaking zone and does not pose a constraint to any of the sites listed in the inventory below (Table HE-41).

In addition, the site inventory contains a description of additional constraints on each site. None of the associated constraints identified limit the realistic capacity stated in Table HE-41.

**TABLE HE-41
AVAILABLE LAND INVENTORY**

Site #	APN	Existing GP/ Land Use	Allowable Density	Proposed GPLU	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Acres	80% capacity	Infra-structure	Environmental Constraints	Income Range
1	004-290-002	SP/RV	15.1-25.0	RH	R-1a	R-4 ¹	7.0	84 ³	No	None	VL/L
2	004-030-009	SP/RV	15.1-25.0	RH	PD	PD ²	9.3	112 ³	No	None	VL/L
Total High Density Sites							16.3	196			VL/L
3	011-150-021	SP/RV	15.1-25.0	RH	PD	PD ²	6.78	81 ³	No	None	Mod
4	004-010-039	RM/RV	3.1-15.0	RL	R-2	R-2	0.52	6	Yes	None	Mod
5	004-010-038	RM/RV	3.1-15.0	RL	R-2	R-2	0.37	4	Yes	None	Mod
6	005-320-038-501	SP/RV	3.1-15.0	RM	PD	PD	2.64	25	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Mod
7	004-262-002	SP/RV	3.1-15.0	DT	C-1	R-2 ¹	0.91	10 ⁴	Yes	Steep Slope	Mod
8	004-262-003	SP/RV	3.1-15.0	DT	C-1	R-2 ¹	0.46		Yes	None	Mod
Total Medium Density Sites							11.68	126			Mod
<u>9</u>	<u>0040220010</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.58</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>0040700200</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>0040700210</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>0040700350</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>13</u>	<u>0040700340</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.43</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>14</u>	<u>0040700360</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>15</u>	<u>0040700330</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>16</u>	<u>4070032000</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>17</u>	<u>0040700310</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.29</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>0040700300</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>

Site #	APN	Existing GP/ Land Use	Allowable Density	Proposed GPLU	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Acres	80% capacity	Infra-structure	Environmental Constraints	Income Range
<u>19</u>	<u>0040700370</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>20</u>	<u>0040700380</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>21</u>	<u>0040700220</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.23</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>22</u>	<u>0040700230</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.23</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>23</u>	<u>0040700390</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>0040700400</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>25</u>	<u>0040700190</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>26</u>	<u>0040700180</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>27</u>	<u>0040700170</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>0040700160</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>29</u>	<u>0040700150</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.19</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>30</u>	<u>0040800050</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.40</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>31</u>	<u>0040700140</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>32</u>	<u>0040410410</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.69</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>33</u>	<u>0043400090</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.51</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>0043400080</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>35</u>	<u>0043400120</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>0043400130</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.33</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>27</u>	<u>0043400070</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>0043400140</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>29</u>	<u>0043400150</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.41</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>40</u>	<u>0043400060</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>

Site #	APN	Existing GP/ Land Use	Allowable Density	Proposed GPLU	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Acres	80% capacity	Infra-structure	Environmental Constraints	Income Range
										<u>plain</u>	
<u>41</u>	<u>0043400160</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>42</u>	<u>0043400320</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>43</u>	<u>0043400310</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>44</u>	<u>0043400050</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>45</u>	<u>0043400300</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>46</u>	<u>0043400330</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>47</u>	<u>0043400040</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>48</u>	<u>0043400290</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>49</u>	<u>0043400340</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>50</u>	<u>0043400180</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>51</u>	<u>0043400030</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>52</u>	<u>0043400190</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>53</u>	<u>0043400350</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>54</u>	<u>0043400020</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>55</u>	<u>0043400200</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.19</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>56</u>	<u>0043400360</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>57</u>	<u>0043400010</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>
<u>58</u>	<u>0043400250</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>2.1-7.0</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>R-1a</u>	<u>0.21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>100 Year flood plain</u>	<u>Abv Mod</u>

Site #	APN	Existing GP/ Land Use	Allowable Density	Proposed GPLU	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Acres	80% capacity	Infra-structure	Environmental Constraints	Income Range
59	0043400220	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.22	1	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
60	0043400240	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.20	1	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
61	0043400230	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.29	2	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
62	0042710060	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.42	2	Yes	Steep Slope	Abv Mod
63	0041600040	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.15	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
64	0042710070	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.75	4	Yes	Steep Slope	Abv Mod
65	0041580030	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1a	R-1a	0.44	2	Yes	Steep Slope	Abv Mod
Total Low Density R-1a Sites							15.06	84			
66	0040620010	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.75	4	Yes	None	Abv Mod
67	0040500120	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.28	2	Yes	None	Abv Mod
68	0040410620	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.18	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
69	0053380040	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.16	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
70	0053370180	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.21	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
71	0042200250	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.68	4	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
72	0042200170	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.25	1	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
73	0042020110	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.50	3	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
74	0042200200	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.40	2	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
75	0042200180	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.51	3	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
76	0053320280	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.28	2	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
77	0053340180	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.20	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
78	0053350010	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.32	2	Yes	None	Abv Mod
79	0041300460	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.21	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
80	0041300520	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.24	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
81	0053360130	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.30	2	Yes	None	Abv Mod

Site #	APN	Existing GP/ Land Use	Allowable Density	Proposed GPLU	Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Acres	80% capacity	Infra-structure	Environmental Constraints	Income Range
82	0053370090	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.16	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
83	0053370250	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.19	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
84	0053380010	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.19	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
85	0053370200	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.25	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
86	0053370120	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.17	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
87	0053370130	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.19	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
88	0053370140	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.18	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
89	0051300020	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	1.67	9	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
90	0042020130	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.50	3	Yes	None	Abv Mod
91	0041900040	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	4.15	23	Yes	100 Year flood plain	Abv Mod
92	0042470060	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.12	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
93	0041060210	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.28	2	Yes	None	Abv Mod
94	0041060150	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	R-1b	R-1b	0.11	1	Yes	None	Abv Mod
95	0051300390	RV	2.1-7.0	RL	MP	MP	0.49	3	Yes	None	Abv Mod
Total Low Density R-1b Sites							14.12	79			

Source: City of Ione, February 2009

Notes:

Default density assumed when calculating realistic capacity.

The majority of sites included in the inventory have infrastructure available and the City has included Actions H-2.2.3 and Action H-2.2.4 to ensure capacity by the end of the 2007-2014 planning period.

1 These sites will be rezoned as part of the Zoning Code update in August 2009. This rezone is not required to meet the City's RHNA.

2 These sites will have stipulations requiring development to be at a minimum of 15 units per acre (default density used for this site).

3 Capacity is based on minimum units per acre (15.01 units/ acre) and a capacity of 80 percent.

4 Washington Place (4 single-family units and 2 multifamily units) has a tentative map approved and entitlements will expire in November 2009. This project will be affordable to moderate income households because of the typical land values in that specific area. The two sites (004-262-002 and 004-262-003) will be rezoned from C-1 to R-2.

3. Analyze potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing for all income levels, including land use controls, building codes, and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures. The analysis shall also demonstrate local efforts to remove governmental constraints that hinder the locality from meeting its share of the regional housing need in accordance with Section 65584.

Local Processing and Permit Procedures: While the element indicates development of single- and multi-family units on appropriately zoned lots only require a building permit filed with the Building Department, it must specifically describe and analyze the City's permit processing and approval procedures by zone and housing type. The element should evaluate processing procedures, including the Site Plan Review, and times for typical single- and multi-family projects, including type of permit, level of review, and any discretionary approval procedures or design review requirements.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-103 for a more detailed description of the Site Plan Review process

Revisions made:

Permit Processing. While permit processing and development review are necessary to ensure that development proceeds in an orderly manner, permit processing fees, the costs of studies and implementation of conditions, as well as time consumed, can impact the cost of housing development.

~~The City Planning Department and Building Department are responsible for permit processing in Ione.~~ In general, development of a ~~single family home residential unit, both multifamily and single-family units,~~ on an appropriately zoned lot requires a building permit. The application for the permit must be filed with the Building Department ~~and then.~~ ~~The application~~ the application is sent to the City Planning Department to ensure that the development conforms ~~to~~ with the required standards for that district. The Building Department then issues the permit to the developer. This process takes approximately 5 to 10 days for a single family unit. A multifamily development requires a site plan review which takes approximately 2 to 4 months and building permit review which takes an additional 5 to 25 days. The entire process for a multifamily development takes about 3 to 6 months. The City does not see this as a constant to the development of housing. For subdivision maps, it is usually a four- to six-month process, which includes Planning Commission and possibly City Council review and approval. Improvement plan review takes about three to four weeks and final maps usually take 60 to 90 days. Building permit issuance usually takes two weeks, depending on the size of the development.

Site Plan Review. The City of Ione requires all new multifamily and non-residential development, as well as additions to such projects where more than 500 or more gross square feet is being added to existing structures, go through a Site Plan Review process. The intent of Site Plan Review is to provide a process for promoting the orderly and harmonious growth of the City; to encourage development in keeping with the desired character of the City; and to ensure physical and functional compatibility between uses. The Site Plan Review permit provides a process for consideration of development proposals to ensure that the design and layout of commercial, retail, industrial, or institutional uses or multifamily residential development will constitute suitable development and

will not result in a detriment to the City of Ione or the environment. The applicant is required to submit to the City a site plan, detailed elevation drawings, landscape plans, drawings of the site, and other plans that may reasonably be required to assure compliance with development. These are reviewed by City staff, who will either accept the application as complete or return it to the applicant with a request for additional information within 30 days. The Planning Commission reviews the application and is responsible for making a decision on the project (approval or denial) based on a set of findings and considerations. Specifically, the Commission is considering the following:

- Considerations relating to site layout, the orientation and location of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, and other development features in relation to the physical characteristics, zoning, and land use of the site and surrounding properties;
- Considerations relating to traffic, safety, and traffic congestion, including the effect of the development plan on traffic conditions on abutting streets, the layout of the site with respect to locations and dimensions of vehicular and pedestrian entrances, exits, driveways, and walkways, the adequacy of off-street parking facilities to prevent traffic congestion, and the circulation patterns within the boundaries of the development;
- Considerations necessary to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan and all applicable Specific Plans or Planned Development Master Plans, including but not limited to the density of residential units; and
- Considerations relating to the availability of City services, including, but not limited to, water, sewer, drainage, police and fire; and whether such services are adequate based upon City standards. (Ione Municipal Code, Section 17.10.090.F)

In addition, Sites 2 and 3 (page 77, Table HE-41) are listed with Planned Development (PD) zoning. While the element indicates the City's PD processes offer flexibility and innovation in the site planning, design, and mix of housing types, it must describe and analyze the typical permit process procedures and development standards applied to developments within PD areas including potential impacts on the certainty and predictability of development.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-97 for a more detailed description of the PD process.

Revisions made:

Planned Development Zoning District (PD). The PD process is identical to the Specific Plan, but has fewer content requirements than a Specific Plan. The intent of a Planned Development district is to provide procedures for the consideration and regulation of areas suitable for proposed comprehensive development with detailed development plans and of those areas that require special planning to provide for appropriate planned development in harmony with their natural features and other environmental consideration. Ideal areas of the City for the establishment of new Planned Development zoning districts include medium and large residential subdivisions and areas identified in the Land Use Element as Policy Areas.

Because of their comprehensive nature and intent, Planned Developments provide a process for establishing unique and “stand-alone” development standards separate from those found in more “conventional,” City-wide zoning districts. In effect, the PD is the zoning for the property, just like with Specific Plans.

All new Planned Developments require the establishment of a Master Plan that includes the following:

- A list of permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited uses;
- Performance and development requirements related to yards, lot area, intensity of development on each lot, parking, landscaping, and signs;
- Other design standards appropriate for the specific site and development;
- Legal description of property covered by the Master Plan; and
- Reasons for establishment of a Planned Development Master Plan on the particular property.

Additional contents may be required as determined by the City including, but not limited to, regulations relating to nonconforming lots, uses, structures, and signs; time, phasing, and sequence of development projects; infrastructure planning; and circulation planning.

Design Review. The element indicates the City has a two-tier design review process (page 98, Table HE-51); however, it provides no further information describing the process or standards. The element should include a complete analysis of the design review guidelines and process, including identifying types of projects and requirements for both Tier 1 and Tier 2, approval procedures, and the impact of the process on housing costs and approval certainty.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-112 for a description of the Design Review process.

Revisions made:

Design Review. The City has established a design review process for new development and certain types of redevelopment/remodeling within the Downtown core. This core is defined by a special Historic Overlay Zoning District and is referred to as the Historic (H) Overlay District. The City is not relying on any sites within the Historic Overlay District to accommodate its fair share allocation. The design review process requires that for the following types of activities on property within the Historic (H) Overlay District, an Architectural Design Review permit be issued:

- Installation of new features on existing structures/facades;
- Additions to existing structures;
- Placement, alteration, or relocation of signs;

- New development; and
- Changes to exterior architectural style.

Exemptions to the permit requirement include repair and maintenance to the site or structure with like materials, interior alterations, public utility work, and construction, alteration, and maintenance of buildings used exclusively and solely for residential uses. In other words, the permit requirement applies to commercial and mixed use development and is not applicable to single family or multifamily residential that is not integrated with a non-residential use.

The permit process is divided into two tiers, depending upon the complexity of the project. Major projects (referred to as Comprehensive Architectural Design Review), such as new construction and wholesale redevelopment of a property, or the wholesale change in the architectural style of a building, require Planning Commission review and approval. Such a project could be processed in two to four months, depending on location, compatibility with the California Environmental Quality Act, and application completeness/Permit Streamlining Act requirements.

The second tier is referred to as Administrative Architectural Design Review. This process is aimed at the installation of new features on existing buildings consistent with the existing architectural style of the building, as well as the placement, alteration, or relocation of signs. Under this process, the approval authority is the City Planner, rather than the Planning Commission. No public hearing is required for Administrative review. Rather, a notice of the filing of the application is posted in the project site for a minimum of 10 days and the notice is mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. Such notice indicates that interested persons must request in writing that a hearing be held for the project within 10 business days of the notice being posted; otherwise the City Planning Department will make a decision on the project without a hearing. If a hearing is requested, it is held before the Planning Commission after public notice of that meeting has been completed consistent with State law.

Generally, Administrative Review can be completed in 20-30 days, unless it is elevated to Planning Commission; in which case it becomes similar to Comprehensive Review.

The Architectural Design Review permit requirement is supplemented by a series of design guidelines and standards that are codified in the City's Zoning Code (Section 17.28.020, Historic Overlay (H) District). These provisions provide the information architects, designers, and property owners need to understand and achieve the City's expectations for high quality development in the Downtown.

Table HE-52 below identifies the approximate time necessary for review of residential development

**TABLE HE-52
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TIMES**

Development Permit/Review Process	Time Frame
Plan Review	5 days
Zone Change and GP Amendment	4 to 8 months
Environmental Review	45 to 60 days
<u>Architectural</u> Design Review	<u>20-30 days (Administrative Review); 2 to 4 months (Comprehensive Review) 10 to 15 days (tier 1); 30 to 90 days (tier 2)</u>
<u>Typical single family development</u>	<u>6 to 8 months</u>
<u>Typical multifamily development</u>	<u>6 to 8 months</u>

Sources: City of Ione, February 2009

Affordable Housing Program (AHP): The element describes the AHP requires developments with ten or more units must include five percent of unit³ as affordable to very low-, low-, or moderate-income households. While the element describes some requirements and potential incentives, it should include a complete description and analysis of the program.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-98 for a complete description of the AHP.

Revisions made:

Affordable Housing Program: The Affordable Housing program provides opportunities for developing housing units affordable to lower-income persons in the community and does not act as a constraint to the over all development of housing. The goal of this program is to develop a mix of housing types targeted to a variety of income groups. This program provides flexibility and provides incentives for developers building in the City of Ione..

The City requires that residential projects of ten or more units include five percent of the units in the project as affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. Developers of less than ten housing units are exempt from this requirement.

Developers of ten or more housing units shall provide the following:

- In a rental housing project of ten or more units two percent of the units shall be affordable to very low -income households, two percent shall be affordable to low-income households and one percent shall be affordable to moderate-income households.
- In a for-sale project of ten or more units two percent shall be affordable to low-income households and three percent shall be affordable to moderate-income households.

- Affordable units shall be built on site and must be comparable in infrastructure (including wastewater, water and other utilities), construction quality, and exterior design to the market-rate residential units. Affordable units may be smaller in aggregate size and have different interior finishes and features than market-rate units, so long as the interior features are durable, of good quality, and consistent with contemporary standards for new housing. The number of bedrooms should be the same as those in the market-rate units, except that if the market-rate units provide more than three bedrooms, the affordable units need not provide more than three bedrooms
- All affordable units must be constructed and occupied concurrently with or prior to the construction and occupancy of market-rate units. In phased developments, the affordable units must be evenly distributed throughout the development and will be constructed and occupied in proportion to the number of units in each phase of the residential development
- Deed restrictions shall be provided to assure that rental units developed for very low-, low- and moderate-income persons will remain affordable for 55 years and ownership units developed for low- and moderate-income units will remain affordable for 45 years.
- If an owner sells an affordable unit before the end of the 45 year resale restriction term, the owner shall repay the City/ subsidy balance. The balance is any remaining principal and accrued interest after the subsidy has been reduced as defined in the Buyer's Resale Agreement (to be determined at the time of purchase).
- Per the deed restriction of the affordable units, all affordable units resold shall be required to be sold to an income-eligible household.
- The City will develop and maintain a waiting list of eligible persons wishing to purchase or occupy an affordable housing unit.

Alternatives

- Payment of an in-lieu fee for ownership or rental units may be acceptable and the amount of in-lieu fees shall be established by a nexus study to be completed by June of 2010. The money will then be placed into an affordable housing trust fund. The City will develop a set of priorities for the use of Housing Trust Fund monies once the Housing Trust Fund is established (Action H-4.7.1).
- If the developer is permitted to dedicate land for the development of affordable units in satisfaction of part or all of its affordable housing requirement, the agreement shall identify the site of the dedicated land and shall provide for the implementation of such dedication in a manner deemed appropriate and timely by the City.

Incentives

Possible incentives that may be included but are not limited to the following:

- Assistance with accessing and apply for funding (based on availability of federal, state, local foundations, and private funds);
- Mortgage-subsidy or down payment assistance programs to assist first time homebuyers and other qualifying households, when such funds are available;
- Expedited/streamlined application processing and development review;
- Modification of development requirements, such as reduced set backs and parking standards on a case-by-case basis; and
- Density Bonuses.

Constraints on Persons with Disabilities: The element must include a complete analysis of potential constraints on the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. The analysis should address zoning, development standards, building codes, and approval procedures for the development of housing for persons with disabilities. Examples of standards and requirements that should be analyzed include: (1) any definitions of family in the zoning code; (2) .Spacing or concentration requirements; and, (3) whether the City has an adopted reasonable accommodation policy or procedure for providing exception in zoning and land-use.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-108 for a more detailed analysis on persons with disabilities. The City does not have any specific land use or development standards related to the spacing or concentration of persons with disabilities or any special parking requirements but rather evaluates the need for reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities on a case-by-case basis (Action H-5.1.1). In addition, Action H-5.1.1 has been revised to update the City's definition of family to state "One or more persons living together in a dwelling unit, with common access to, and common use of all living, kitchen, and eating areas within the dwelling unit".

Revisions made:

Housing for Persons with Disabilities: Compliance with provisions of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is assessed and enforced by the Building Official in Ione. ADA access is enforced through building permit entitlement and is required for all commercial development, new construction of multifamily apartments with three or more units in any one building, and new construction of congregate housing or shelters. Special ADA access retrofitting is not required for remodeling or renovation of buildings, but only for new construction. In the last planning period the City adopted a Transition Plan and has been installing/replacing ADA curb ramps and making other improvements to public facilities. The City does not have and specific land use or development standards related to the spacing or concentration of persons with disabilities, or any special parking requirements but rather ~~The City also currently~~ evaluates the need for reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities on a case-by-case basis. Action 6.1.1 states that the City shall ensure that reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities are provided as required under Senate Bill 520 (Chapter 671 of the Government Code). To further comply with SB 520, the City will amend the zoning code to update the definition of family to state "One or more persons living together in a

dwelling unit, with common access to, and common use of all living, kitchen, and eating areas within the dwelling unit” (Action H-5.1.1).

Action H-5.1.1 **Persons with Disabilities Access.** In May 2009 the City established a reasonable accommodation procedure (section 17.10.060 of the City’s Zoning Code) to ensure a fair and efficient process for persons with disabilities to make necessary accessibility adjustments to their homes. The City shall ensure that reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities are provided as required under Senate Bill 520 (Chapter 671 of the Government Code). The City shall annually review its Reasonable Accommodations permit process for consistency with State law. To further comply with SB 520, the City will update its definition of family to state “One or more persons living together in a dwelling unit, with common access to, and common use of all living, kitchen, and eating areas within the dwelling unit.”

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Planner, City Manager

Funding Source: General Fund

Schedule: Ongoing, provide an updated definition of family by August 2010.

In addition, while the element indicates residential care facilities for six or fewer persons are allowed in all residential zones and in C-1 and C-2 zones (page 02), it should also describe zoning and permit requirements for residential care facilities for seven or more persons

Response: Please refer to page HNA-106. The element now states where residential care facilities of seven or more persons are permitted.

Revisions made:

Residential Care Facility: A residential care facility is a facility that provides 24-hour non-medical care for more than six persons 18 years of age or older, or emancipated minors, with chronic, life threatening illness in need of personal services, protection, supervision, assistance, guidance, or training essential for sustaining the activities of daily living, or for the protection of the individual. This classification includes group homes, residential care facilities for the elderly, adult residential facilities, wards of the juvenile court, and other facilities licensed by the State of California. The City currently allows residential care facilities in all the R-2, R-3 and C-1 districts with a conditional use permit and as a permitted use in the R-4 district.

B. HOUSING PROGRAMS

1. The housing element shall contain programs which "address, and where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing" (Section 65583(c)(3)).

As-noted in finding A2, the element requires a complete analysis of potential governmental constraints. Depending upon the results of that analysis, the City may need to strengthen or add programs and address and remove or mitigate any identified constraints.

Response: The element now gives a complete analysis of potential governmental constraints.

2. *The Housing element shall contain programs which “assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of extremely low-, very low-, low, and moderate-income households (Section 65583(c)(2)).*

Several programs should include more complete descriptions of proposed actions, as described below:

While the element includes some programs to assist in the development of very low-, low-, and moderate-income households, existing programs should either be expanded or new programs added to specifically assist in the development of a variety of housing types to meet the housing needs of ELI households. Action 5.4.1 states the City will continue to allow single-room occupancy (SRO) units as a permitted use in R-3 and in R-4 with a conditional use permit. This Action could be revised to describe how the City will encourage and facilitate the development of SROs with tools such as prioritizing funding for the development of SROs, and/or offer financial incentive, or regulatory concessions to encourage the development of this housing type.

Response: Please refer to page 9-19. Action H-5.4.1 has been revised to state that to encourage and facilitate the development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households, the City will prioritize funding and offer financial incentives and regulatory concessions.

Revisions made:

Action H-5.4.1 **Extremely Low-Income Households.** AB 2634 requires the City to identify zoning to encourage and facilitate housing suitable for extremely low-income households, which includes supportive housing and single-room occupancy units. The City will continue to allow single-room occupancy units (SROs) to be permitted in the Multiple-family dwelling (R-3) and High Density Multiple-family dwelling (R-4) zoning districts with a conditional use permit.

In addition, to encourage and facilitate the development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households, the City will prioritize funding and offer financial incentives and regulatory concessions.

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Manager, City Planner, Planning Commission, City Council

Funding Source: General Fund

Schedule: Ongoing, as projects are processed through the Planning Department.

Action 4.1.1: How will the City coordinate with Mercy Housing and other such entities to develop housing and services for lower-income households?

Response: Please refer to page 9-13. Action H-4.1.1 has been revised to state that the City will coordinate once within the planning period or as projects come on board.

Revisions made:

Action H-4.1.1 **Affordable Housing Development Program.** City staff shall continue to coordinate with the appropriate entities, such as Mercy Housing of California, once during the planning period or as projects come onboard that could provide housing and services for lower-income households and take the appropriate steps to recommend that the City Council formally execute an agreement or letter of understanding with these entities.

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Manager

Funding Source: General Fund

Schedule: ~~Ongoing~~, Once during the planning period or as projects come onboard

Action 4.2.1: How will the City coordinate with the county, State and Federal resources to obtain funding for affordable housing?

Response: Please refer to page 9-13. Action 4.2.1 has been revised to state that the City will apply for funding as NOFAs are released.

Revisions made:

Action H-4.2.1 **State and Federal Housing Programs.** The City will apply for funding as NOFAs are released ~~Coordinate with County, State, and federal resources to obtain any available sources of funding~~ for the development of affordable housing units. ~~This activity will be updated annually.~~ (Cross reference: ED 4.2.1)

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Manager

Funding Source: All available federal, state and local sources

Schedule: Ongoing, as NOFAs are released

Action 4.3.1: What funding sources will the City target for programs and how will the City assist in the development of housing for lower-income households?

Response: Please refer to page 9-14. Action 4.3.1 states that the City will use CDBG funding for the First-time Homebuyer Program.

Revisions made:

Action H-4.3.1 **First-Time Homebuyers Down Payment** Assistance Program. Continue to use CDBG funding for the First-time Homebuyer Program in the City.

Responsible Agencies/Departments: City Manager, Mercy Housing California

Funding Source: CDBG

Schedule: Ongoing

C. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Local governments shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the element shall describe this effort (Section 65583(c)(7)).

While the element indicates the City conducted multiple public workshops and special meetings to hear concerns and desires from residents and community organizations, additional information is needed to demonstrate how the City has or will make a diligent effort to achieve the involvement of all economic segments of the community through the adoption process. The element should be revised to specifically describe the City's efforts to circulate the housing element among low- and moderate-income households and organizations that represent them and individuals and to involve such groups and persons in the development. In addition, the element should describe how comments received were incorporated into the element, as appropriate.

Response: Please refer to page HNA-2 for a more detailed analysis on public workshops and how this City reached out to low- and moderate-income households. The element now also describes comments received and how they were addressed.

Revisions made:

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City of Ione has made diligent efforts to solicit public participation pertaining to the formulation of the Housing Element since its initial adoption. Multiple public workshops and special meetings were held prior to the initial writing of the Housing Element in order to obtain City residents' concerns and desires for housing development in the City. The meetings were advertised through the local newspaper and flyers distributed throughout the City in an attempt to reach all residents in the City.

The Housing Element included a public review draft, which was prepared and made available to the community for a 60-day review period during April and May 2009. Extensive effort was made to notify all residents of the City of Ione of the draft Housing Element availability through notices in the local newspaper, as well as postings at government offices and the public library and on the City's website. Public meetings were held before the Executive Committee, the Planning Commission and City Council to allow for public input throughout the update process. The City contacted and made the public review draft available to various local agencies including the Amador County Planning Department, local affordable and fair housing advocates such as Mercy Housing California, Amador/Tuolumne Community Action Agency, nonprofit organizations, various service providers, and any other interested parties. The City received one comment from the Amador Childcare Council. To address their concerns, the City has included Action H-5.6.2.

Public Workshops

The City conducted three public workshops (August 14, 2008, September 8, 2008, and November 1, 2009) at Evalynn Bishop Hall in Howard Park. The workshops provided the public with an introduction to the General Plan process and were a forum for the public to express their ideas and concerns about the future of Ione. During all three workshops, staff conducted informal polling as part of the presentation. The City solicited attendance via the City newsletter, flyers posted around town and distributed at the local grocery store, email blast, and a banner hung over Main Street.

General Plan 101 Workshop

The first workshop on August 14, 2008 was an introduction to the General Plan. It provided residents an overview of the General Plan Update process, and asked attendees general questions about the community. The second and third workshops gathered information about residents' ideas on development, housing, downtown, open space, and many other parts of community identity.

Guiding Principles Workshop

At the second public workshop on September 8, 2008, a mapping exercise was conducted with members of the community. The intent of this exercise was to get attendees thinking about the possible locations for future growth in and around the City. Residents were asked to place a dot on a map of Ione to represent a location for future development of residences and businesses.

In the dot mapping exercise, residents identified that the preferred locations for new residential development would be along State Route 124 east of the existing City, northwest of the Castle Oaks development (Q Ranch north of State Route 104 and Ringer Ranch south of State Route 104), and south of West Marlette Street. Preferred locations for new commercial development were identified in the Downtown area and at the State Route 88 and Buena Vista, and the State Route 88 and State Route 104 intersections. Infill development opportunities were seen in the Downtown and along Five Mile Drive near the Tertiary Treatment Plant.

The input collected from participants was used to create three separate land use alternatives maps for consideration during the third public workshop.

General Plan Alternatives Workshop

The third workshop, held on November 19, 2008, focused on review and the consideration of three land use alternatives. Based upon the input gathered during public workshop 1 and 2, along with the direction of the General Plan Executive Committee, staff generated three land use alternative scenarios for the future of Ione. These scenarios characterized future growth of the community based upon location. The public workshop was used to gather input on the three alternative land use scenarios to begin to define the preferred land use plan for the future of Ione.

General Plan Executive Committee Input

The City Council established a General Plan Executive Committee to provide direction to staff on the process of updating the General Plan. The Executive Committee composed of two Council members, two Planning Commissioners, and two Parks Commissioners, all of which are representatives from the elected officials and appointed boards of the community. The Executive Committee met twice a month throughout the update and provided regular input during the creation of this General Plan.

On October 1, 2008 the Executive Committee met to discuss the start of the Housing Element. The City's Consultant informed the EC that the default density for Ione was in fact 15 units to the acre not 20 like they had previously thought.

October 16, 2008 the Executive Committee met and discussed below market rate housing. The EC would like to see alternatives with both 5 acres of below market rate housing (to address 2007-2014 RHNA housing allocation only) and 25 acres of below market rate housing (which would address longer term RHNA housing needs out to 2030). The EC was concerned about BMR housing being built at too high of density, not in line with existing densities. The EC feels that 45 units per acre is too high of a density and would like to see a cap of at most 30 units per acre.

The Executive Committee met on March 4, 2009 to review draft policy language for the Housing Element. The General Plan consultant reviewed the Housing Element with the Executive Committee.

- The Executive Committee asked about State requirements regarding provision of affordable housing and homeless shelters.

Response: General Plan Consultant explained that the City needs to show that they can accommodate affordable housing, not that they need to build affordable housing themselves. As far as homeless shelters, the City will continue to allow emergency shelters in the Limited Manufacturing (M-1) Zoning District as a use permitted by right without a conditional use permit or other discretionary review to allow for the development of a homeless shelters, if someone was interested in doing so (Action H-5.3.1).

The Executive Committee met on April 1, 2009 to review draft Inclusionary Housing language for the Housing Element.

- The Executive Committee directed Planning Staff to draft language for Inclusionary Housing for the Housing Element, with 5 percent of new housing units to be below market rate, or to pay affordable housing in-lieu fee.

Response: Planning Staff presented Inclusionary Housing language.

- The EC felt that while they did not love the idea of having Inclusionary Housing, that it was necessary to ensure an adequate supply of affordable housing. The EC noted the current Ione GP requires 10 percent Inclusionary Housing while this version represents a reduction to 5 percent. The EC asked if other jurisdictions have Inclusionary Housing ordinance requirements, and

Response: Planning Staff responded that many did, some at 10 percent.

- EC was concerned that the number of affordable housing units that Ione has to ensure was too high.

Response: Planning Staff responded that that number has already been set through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process and so it cannot be adjusted downward at this point.

Landowner Coordination

During the General Plan process, the City encouraged and continually received input from landowners regarding their property. City staff received numerous comments and met with many landowners throughout the course of the update process, especially during the land use alternatives recommendation. In addition, both the Planning Commission and the City Council considered each landowner's specific request for changes that would affect their parcels.

Agency Coordination

Throughout the entire preparation of the General Plan, City staff met with various interested and affected agencies to ensure their input and considerations were included in the process. The City met extensively with County staff, ensuring that both the City's and County's objectives were discussed and addressed in a collaborative process, as both the City and County were updating their General Plan at the same time. While the City and County General Plans may include different land use designations for properties within the Planning Area, both Plans contain policies to encourage collaboration and coordination on any potential development within the City's Sphere of Influence.

In addition, City staff consulted with all of the public service providers that are essential for providing services to residents, including:

Amador Childcare Council serving lower-income families,

the Amador Water Agency,

Amador County Recreation Agency,

the California Department of Transportations (Caltrans), and

the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire) for wildfire protection.

Staff also consulted with officials from the Cal Fire Training Academy, Mule Creek State Prison, Preston Youth Correctional Facility, which are located within and have a large impact on the City.

Planning Commission –August 5, 2009

City Council-August 26, 2009