

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER
FROM: BOB LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR *Bob*
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION OF MULTI-FAMILY ZONING CODE AMENDMENT
AND THE STATUS OF THE CURRENT MORATORIUM
DATE: JANUARY 18, 2000

Needs: For the City Council to conclude (if necessary) the discussion of the content of a Zoning Code Amendment regarding Multi-Family Development Standards, and evaluate the status of the current Moratorium on approval of Multi-Family Development Projects.

- Facts:
1. On January 12, 2000 the City Council was scheduled to discuss and provide direction to staff regarding a possible Amendment to the Zoning Code regarding Multi-Family Development Standards.
 2. This same subject is being scheduled for consideration at the January 18, 2000 meeting just in case the discussion is not completed on January 12, 2000.
 3. The status of the current Moratorium on approval of Multi-Family Development Projects is also being scheduled for Council consideration for January 18, 2000, in case the Council wishes to consider eliminating the current Moratorium.
 4. If the Council wishes to Amend the Zoning Code regarding Multi-Family Development Standards, that Amendment needs to follow the formal Code Amendment process, involving noticed public hearings before both the Planning Commission and City Council.

Analysis
and
Conclusion:

These two matters are being scheduled for Council consideration to provide the City Council with the flexibility to address one or both issues if the Council desires.

By way of related information, the following is an anticipated schedule for adoption of a Zoning Code Amendment to incorporate whatever direction the Council provides to staff regarding Multi-Family Development Standards:

January 12/18: CC gives direction as to what should be in the Code Amendment

January 13/19: staff takes steps to initiate the Zoning Code Amendment, noticing a public hearing before the PC on February 8 (minimum 20-day notice needed for Negative Declaration).

- February 8: PC holds noticed public hearing and makes recommendation to Council
- March 7: CC holds noticed public hearing and gives First Reading to Ordinance
- March 21: CC gives Second Reading to Ordinance
- April 19: Moratorium expires
- April 20: New Multi-Family Development Standards become effective

The above schedule is contingent upon the Council reaching a consensus on January 12; delays in receiving direction or complications as to the content of the code amendment would require a revised schedule.

Policy
Reference:

Zoning Code

Fiscal
Impact:

None on the City; the extent of fiscal impact on Multi-Family development would be a function of the nature of the code amendment and adjustments in profit expectations by the developer and/or the property owner.

Options:

- a. That the City Council provide any additional applicable direction to staff regarding the content of a Zoning Code Amendment that would be scheduled for Planning Commission and City Council consideration, and that the Council consider the status of the current Moratorium.
- b. Amend, modify or reject Option a.

h:\bob\60\code amend\multi-fam\rpt to cc on moratorium 11 Jan 00

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER
FROM: BOB LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION OF MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
DATE: JANUARY 12, 2000

Needs: To consider a set of potential revisions to the Zoning Code's multi-family development regulations. The purpose of the proposed revisions is to improve both the quality of life for City residents and improve the compatibility of multi-family development with the community at large.

- Facts:
1. At its meeting of December 16, 1999, the City Council reviewed a set of recommendations from the Planning Commission for revising the Zoning Code's multi-family development regulations.
 2. On December 16, the Council did not conclude its review of the Planning Commission's recommendations, but continued the discussion to January 12, 2000.
 3. Attached is a revised table of proposed changes to the multi-family development regulations. The new table includes what appears to be the consensus of the four Council members present on December 16 (based on just those topics that were discussed). For those items the Council has yet to discuss, the new table retains the Planning Commission's recommendation.
 4. The new table also includes some updated cost estimates. These new cost estimates will be discussed in the analysis, below.
 5. At this step in the process, the Council is being requested to determine which particular code revisions are desired. Subject to the Council's direction, a draft ordinance can be prepared for consideration at public hearings by the Planning Commission on February 8 and the City Council on March 7. With these dates, the ordinance could become effective on April 20. (The established moratorium period expires April 19, 2000.)
 4. "Multi-family" development includes the following:
 - a. All residential development with two or more dwelling units per lot (duplexes on up to multi-unit apartment buildings);
 - b. "Air space" condominiums designed like "stacked flat" apartment buildings (one unit above another);
 - c. Townhouses (two story attached units) in ownership may be either air space (confined to each dwelling unit) or small, "postage stamp"/"Planned Unit Development" lots (in which the unit and the underlying land may be owned).
 5. Attached is an inventory of vacant land that is designated by the General Plan for multi-family residential use. The pending application for the Chandler Ranch property proposes an additional 434 multi-family units on a 43 acre site.
 6. Attached is a memo from the City's Fire Marshall, commenting on fire protection issues associated with multi-family development. This memo concludes that the codes and standards already adopted by the City are sufficient to address fire protection concerns.

Analysis and
Conclusion:

Both the Land Use and Housing Elements of the General Plan call for the City to take measures to increase the quality of housing. The present set of multi-family zoning regulations (for the R-2, R-3 and R-4 Zones) were adopted in 1995, as part of the City's efforts to implement General Plan policies. The current evaluation is consistent with that continuing effort.

Land Use and Housing Element policies also call for the City to evaluate development policies and regulations to ensure that they do not unnecessarily increase the cost of housing while striving to attain other important City objectives.

Cost estimates for the possible code revisions are listed on the attached table. For most items, the costs cited reflect expected development costs for each unit (adjustments to the market price of land are not reflected). Exceptions from the development costs include the following:

- For those items that would pertain only to certain types of units (e.g. to studio and one-bedroom units), the cost estimate indicates that the cited costs are restricted to the type of units discussed.
- The proposed increase in shared open space from 300 sq ft per unit to 375 sq ft per unit could cause a reduction in density (e.g. a unit may be "lost" in order to meet the increased open space standard). There would be a cost associated with foregone profit from the "lost" unit (or units). This cost is expressed in an annual (recurring) cost that is spread out over the remaining units. The cost figure of \$110 per year cited in the table assumes that a project that would otherwise be allowed to have 16 units would have to lose one unit, with 1/16 of the lost annual profit to be borne by the remaining 15 units.
- The estimated cost for the proposed inclusionary zoning requirement would also be expressed in an annual (recurring) cost associated with the loss of profit necessary to subsidize rents for very low income households. The figure of \$575 per year assumes that 2 units in a 16 unit complex will be reserved for very low income households earning 40% of the County median income.

Not including costs associated with additional resident parking spaces for studio and one-bedroom units and for additional visitor parking spaces for three and four bedroom units, the set of code revisions recommended by the Council, so far, as of December 16 total \$3,755 per unit plus possibly \$110 per year per unit (for the increase in open space).

The cost estimate for the remaining items, should the Council agree with the Planning Commission's recommendations would add an additional \$3,750 to the cost of each dwelling unit, plus \$575/year per unit (for the inclusionary requirement). This would bring the total cost estimate to about \$7,000 per unit plus annual cost increases of \$685 per unit.

Staff polled multifamily developers, who estimated that each \$1,000 in added development costs would, in turn, add between \$6 and \$10 to the monthly rent. A cost increase of \$7,000 plus annual costs of \$685 per unit, could therefore, add between \$100 and \$130 per month to monthly rents. (Again, this assumes no changes to the land price.)

Attached is a table showing income groups, the maximum affordable rent (at 30% of household income) and affordability to low and very low income households. From this table, which is based on federal and state income standards, it can be seen that a monthly rent increase between

\$100 and \$130 appears to make apartments unaffordable to very low- and low-income households.

One means of compensating for the negative effect on affordability is to provide financial assistance to dwelling units or multi-family development projects that limit occupancy to low and very low income households. An example of such assistance might be a grant or loan of Redevelopment Low and Moderate Income Housing Funds. It is generally customary to require developers requesting such assistance to submit pro forma analyses that substantiate the need for the amount of assistance requested. California Redevelopment Law requires that rents for multi-family units assisted with LMIH funds be restricted to levels affordable to low and very low income households for a period of not less than 15 years. Cities and redevelopment agencies may, however, choose longer periods for such affordability restrictions.

If the Council decide that certain revisions to the code are desirable to improve the quality of multi-family residential development, it is suggested that the Council identify which of the items in the attached table should be incorporated into an ordinance. This could be accomplished by taking a straw vote on each of the items in the table (which is the procedure followed by the Planning Commission).

Policy

Reference: General Plan Elements; Zoning Code; 1999 Economic Strategy; California Health and Safety Code

Fiscal

Impact: The cost of providing City services to residential development exceeds the revenues obtained from property taxes. Some development standards (e.g. open space and recreation amenities) help alleviate demand for City park and recreation services and, therefore, could have a beneficial fiscal effect.

Options:

After consideration of all public testimony, that the City Council to consider the following options:

- a. Direct staff to initiate a Zoning Code Amendment for formal consideration by both the Planning Commission and the City Council. The content of the code amendment would be based on the consensus direction provided by the City Council following review of the Planning Commission's matrix of options. (Because of the required noticed public hearings before both the Planning Commission and City Council, the Zoning Code Amendment is anticipated to be effective on April 20, 2000, a date that is nearly coincidental with the expiration of the Moratorium on April 19, 2000.)
- b. Amend, modify or reject the foregoing option.

Prepared By:

Ed Gallagher
Housing Programs Manager

Attachments:

1. Table of Possible Revisions to Multi-Family Residential Regulations
2. Inventory of Vacant Multi-Family Residential Land
3. Income and Rent Table
4. Memo from the Fire Marshal

ED:\CODE AMENDMF STANDARDS 89\CCR 011200

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

NOTE: Per unit cost estimates are based on a 16 unit apartment complex. Some per unit costs may be lower for larger complexes.

A. ITEMS REVIEWED BY CITY COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 16, 1999

PARKING

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	City Council Consensus (12/16/99)
# of <u>resident</u> spaces per unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 spaces per studio or 1 bedroom unit 2 spaces per unit with 2 or more bedrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 spaces per studio or 1 bedroom unit 2 spaces per unit with 2 or more bedrooms 	\$250/ <i>studio or 1 bedroom unit</i> (assuming no units are lost to make room for extra parking)	3-1 in favor of proposal, subject to update on cost (which had been reported at \$30/unit)
# of <u>visitor</u> spaces per unit	1 space per 5 units for projects with 5 or more units	Increase ratio to 1 space per 4 units plus additional visitor spaces as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 space for each 3 bedroom unit 2 spaces for each 4 bedroom unit 	\$125/ <i>any unit</i> plus \$500/3 bedroom unit and \$1,000/4 bedroom unit (assuming no units are lost to make room for extra parking)	4-0 opposed to proposal
covered parking requirement	2 car garage or carport required for single family units and condos; not required for multi-family units	All resident spaces are to be provided in an attached 2 car garage (no carports)	\$11,300	4-0 opposed to proposal
		Option: Allow garages to be detached.	\$10,160	4-0 opposed to proposal
		Option: Allow 2 car carports instead of garages	\$6,120	4-0 opposed to proposal
		Option: Require only one carport space per unit	\$3,060	4-0 opposed to proposal
RV/Boat Spaces	no requirement; no restrictions	Prohibit outdoor storage/parking in visitor spaces	No cost	4-0 in favor of proposal
automatic garage door openers	no requirement; they have been required for condos that were set back less than 20 feet from the interior drive.	Require for all garage doors (if garages are to be provided)	\$200	to be deleted from consideration since covered parking will not be required
Carwash area (with sump)	no requirement	Require for projects with 16 or more units. Would consist of a 10' x 20' concrete slab, drain and clarifier, hose bib with backflow valve.	\$350	4-0 opposed to proposal

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

OPEN SPACE & AMENITIES

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	City Council Consensus (12/16/99)
Shared open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 300 sq ft per unit, which may be offset with private open space, which has 1.5 times the value of shared open space (e.g. 200 sq ft of private open space = 300 sq ft of shared open space). slope must be 10% or less. Minimum dimension is 15 feet. may not include front or street side yard set-backs, rec. rooms, parking spaces or drives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a provision that roof-top open space (e.g. deck over a garage) is not permitted as part of the calculation for shared open space. Require the same open space ratios used for single family under the Quimby Act (3-5 acres/1,000 population, which equates to 354 – 589 sq ft per unit) (The City’s Parks & Recreation Element calls for 5 acres per 1,000 population.) 	No cost	4-0 in favor of proposal
		Option: Increase open space per unit to 450 sq ft.	\$10,600	4-0 opposed to proposal
		Option: Increase open space per unit to 450 sq ft, but allow 300 sq ft per unit for condominiums (which will pay Park Fees under the Quimby Act).	\$10,600 for apartments; \$509/unit for condominiums (City’s Park Fee).	4-0 opposed to proposal
		Option: Increase open space per unit to 375 sq ft.	\$110/yr in lost profit *	4-0 in favor of proposal
Private open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be provided in combination with, or as alternative to, shared open space. patios (ground floor) must be fenced (3-6’ high) have a minimum area of 100 sq ft and minimum dimension of 8 feet. Balconies must have a minimum area of 50 sq ft (not including walkways to adjacent units) and a minimum dimension of 5 feet. 	Add a provision that roof-top open space (e.g. deck over a garage) is not permitted as part of the calculation for private open space.	No cost	4-0 in favor of proposal

* Profit loss associated with loss of one of 16 units.

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	City Council Consensus (12/16/99)
Amenities	May include: tot lots with play	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add specific language about amenities (e.g. specify that 	No cost	4-0 in favor of proposal

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

	<p>equipment, picnic areas with barbecue pits and tables, spas, pools, recreation rooms, basketball courts or half-courts, tennis courts. Required # of amenities follows.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th># of units</th> <th># of tot lots</th> <th># of other amenities</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 10</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 - 25</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26 - 50</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51 - 75</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>76 - 100</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>101 - 150</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>151 - 200</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	# of units	# of tot lots	# of other amenities	0 - 10	0	0	11 - 25	1	0	26 - 50	1	1	51 - 75	2	1	76 - 100	2	2	101 - 150	3	2	151 - 200	3	3	<p>tot lots must have play structures that include a slide, swings, monkey bars, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add specific language to require that certain amenities (e.g. picnic tables, tot lots) must be well-landscaped to provide a pleasant environment for the users. 	No cost	4-0 in favor of proposal
# of units	# of tot lots	# of other amenities																										
0 - 10	0	0																										
11 - 25	1	0																										
26 - 50	1	1																										
51 - 75	2	1																										
76 - 100	2	2																										
101 - 150	3	2																										
151 - 200	3	3																										
Recreation rooms	none required; an option as an amenity	Require a recreation room with kitchen facilities for projects with 32 or more units; key size of building to number of units (e.g. 40 gross sq ft per unit, which would require a 32 unit project to have a 1,280 sq ft recreation room/building.)	\$2,640	4-0 in favor, with Day Care Center as an option in lieu of a recreation room																								
Laundry rooms	none required	For projects with 5 or more units, either provide washer and dryer hook-ups in each unit <i>or</i> require laundry rooms with 1 washer and 1 dryer per 8 units for projects with 5 or more units (with fractions rounded to nearest whole number)	\$990 for laundry room; \$750 for hook-ups	4-0 in favor of proposal																								

END OF ITEMS CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 16, 1999

B. ITEMS TO BE REVIEWED BY CITY COUNCIL ON JANUARY 12, 2000

SITE DESIGN

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Front and street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 feet along arterial streets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add requirement to match R-1 setbacks if there is R-1 	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal

15-9

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

side yard setbacks	(except 15 feet along Spring Street) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 feet along collector streets • 15 feet along local streets 	zoned property on the same block (both same side of the street and across the street). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add requirement for second stories along arterial streets to be setback at least 2 more feet for every 1 foot of elevation difference between the ground floor (finished floor elevation) and the street (top of curb). 	No Cost	3-2 in favor of proposal
Interior side yard setback for front doors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 feet for one unit; 10 feet for 2 or more units; • 5 feet from an alley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase to 10 feet (for doorway) for 1 unit; • increase alley setback to 10 feet (for doorway) if front door faces alley. 	No cost No Cost	5-0 in favor of proposal 5-0 in favor of proposal
Parking Lot Location	No restrictions; parking lots adjacent to streets must have 10 feet of landscaping between the lot and the street	Continue to allow parking lots along street frontages but require either a 3 foot high decorative masonry wall (at the 10 foot parking lot setback line) or a 3 foot high berm.	Cost of wall or landscaped berm <u>only</u> if project is designed with parking along street.	4-1 in favor of proposal
Screening for backflow valves, transformers, gas & electric meters	No requirement; has been addressed as part of development plan review.	Add requirements that these items be screened or placed underground in a manner to be determined by the DRC. (Gas and electric meters may be placed in unlocked cabinets.)	No added cost (has been a standard PD requirement).	4-1 in favor of proposal
Trash enclosures	Required; design and materials have been addressed as part of development plan review.	Add requirements that decorative masonry materials be used for projects with 5 or more units and that specify minimum numbers of bins/enclosures per # of units. Include enclosures for recyclables.	No added cost (has been a standard PD requirement).	4-1 in favor of proposal
Bus Shelters	No requirement; has been addressed as part of development plan review.	Add requirement that projects with 16 or more units install a green metal shelter, unless exempted by the Director of Administrative Services.	\$230 (for 16 units; \$115 for 32 units)	4-1 in favor for 32 or more units)
Perimeter Walls	No requirement; has been addressed as part of development plan review.	Require decorative masonry walls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • along arterials (with modulations); • when abutting other land use (single family, commercial, industrial, schools, parks); • when abutting other MF, if complex is a certain minimum size, subject to Planning Commission approval. 	No added cost (has been a standard PD requirement).	5-0 opposed (i.e., address on case by case basis via PD)
Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Defensible Space	No design parameters required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit buildings to 4-8 units. • Limit the number of units that share a common entrance to 4 (except in Senior apartments). • Parking areas should be supervisable from units. 	No cost	4-1 in favor of proposal
Second Story window and balcony orientation	No design parameters required	Require buildings to be designed so that 2nd story windows and balconies on multi-family to avoid directly facing single family residential zoning on adjacent property by either	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal

15-10

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO M... I-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

when adjacent to single family		doubling the setback, use of windows above eye level, or elimination of direct view windows, or screening.		
Bike racks (a typical APCD recommendation)	No requirements.	Require bike racks with 1 bike space per 4 units for projects with 16 or more units.	\$50 per unit	5-0 in favor of proposal

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Roofing materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete or clay tile, fire-retardant wood shake, asphalt composition, crushed rock and metal roofing materials are permitted. No restrictions, other than metal roofs cannot be reflective, glossy or polished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require roofs to be rated for 30 years Require that asphalt composition roofing be architectural quality (dimensioned/laminate). Prohibit crushed rock. 	\$750/unit for increase from 25 year to 30 year roof; no added cost for architectural comp. (DRC and PC have regularly required it.)	5-0 in favor of proposal
Roof design	No requirements; has been addressed as part of development plan review.	Consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit mansards and flat roofs with parapets. Require minimum pitches (e.g. 5/12). Require full hips for projects with 16 or more units when a line of buildings is proposed, unless gable ends are approved by the Planning Commission. 	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal 4-1 in favor of proposal 4-1 in favor of proposal
Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Wall modulations	No requirements; has been addressed as part of development plan review.	Require a change of plane of not less than 2 feet and not more than 4 feet in depth for every 30 feet of building length. Such changes in plan shall have a minimum width of 6 feet. Unenclosed balconies and bay windows may meet this requirement provided that they do not project more than 2 feet into a side yard setback. (Pasadena)	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
Siding materials	Stucco, wood, masonite, brick are permitted; T-111 plywood and metal that is reflective, glossy or polished are prohibited.	Prohibit all plywood (not just T-111) based on appearance and maintenance/weathering concerns.	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
4-sided	No requirements; has been addressed	Require architectural articulation on all sides, or at least	No significant cost	5-0 in favor of proposal

15-11

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

architecture	as part of development plan review on a case-by-case basis.	stating that Planning Commission may impose such a requirement.		
Storage rooms/lockers	No requirement	For each unit, require a separate, enclosed lockable storage space reserved for the occupants of said unit. Said storage space may be located: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in a garage allocated to said unit; • attached to said unit, but accessible only from the exterior; or • elsewhere in the development. Said space shall be a minimum of 250 cu ft, with minimum dimensions of 4 feet by 8 feet. (City of Santa Ana's standard)	\$820 for 32 sq ft (250 cu ft) area	5-0 in favor of proposal
		Option: increase storage area with the size of (or number of bedrooms in) the unit	No significant cost	No support for this option
		Option: Exempt senior/handicapped apartments.	No cost	No support for this option
Insulation	Per California Administrative Code, Title 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase above Title 24 requirements (a typical APCD recommendation), which will necessitate 2"x 6" exterior framing and R-13 insulation. • Require party walls between units with R-13 insulation and "resilient channels" to increase air space for noise attenuation. • For stacked flats, require R-30 insulation between floors. 	\$780/unit	5-0 in favor of proposal
			\$600/unit	5-0 in favor of proposal
			\$520/unit	5-0 in favor of proposal

MAINTENANCE

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
major auto repair (of own auto)	No prohibitions	Define major auto repair (major engine or transmission/differential overhaul and body work) and prohibit in parking lots	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
Storage sheds	No prohibitions for sheds less than 120 sq ft in floor area.	Prohibit in front and street side yards and in parking lots; require DRC approval for projects with 5 or more units.	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
Management Plan	no requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Nuisance Code (Chapter 9.06) to include as nuisances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deterioration of paint, roofing and other exterior features; - poorly-maintained landscaping along street frontages. 	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
			No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal

15-18

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO M I-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require on-site/resident manager for projects of 16 units or more. 		
--	--	--	--	--

OTHER

Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Definitions of single and multiple family units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions for "Dwelling, single-family", Dwelling, two-family or duplex", "Dwelling, Multiple" and "Dwelling Groups" need to be updated and clarified. 	Define "dwelling unit", "single family dwelling" and "multiple family" to coincide with definitions in Table 21.16.200 (table of permitted and conditional uses) and delete the outdated definitions.	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
Fence materials	no restrictions on barbed wire, razor wire and electric fences	Revise General Provisions (for all zones) to prohibit those materials in residential zones, except on agriculture and single family (1/2 acre lots) where animals may be kept..	No cost	5-0 in favor of proposal
Inclusionary zoning	No requirements	Require that 25% of each project with 16 or more units be reserved for occupancy by low (15%) and very low income (10%) households, with rents restricted for 30 years via recorded covenant.	\$575/unit/year (profit loss associated with subsidy of 2 units).	5-0 opposed to proposal
Standard	Current Code Requirement	Proposed Changes	Per Unit Estimated Cost	Planning Commission Vote
Enrichment services	none required	Require such enrichment services as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Family (non-senior) Projects</u>: day care, after-school programs, ESL classes, etc. for projects with 32 or more units. <u>Senior housing</u>: recreation programs, health-related services, transportation (van) services for projects with 32 or more units. 	See * note below. See ** note below.	5-0 opposed to proposal 4-1 in favor of proposal

* The Equal Opportunity Commission (EOC) for SLO County, which operates day care centers, cited an operating cost of \$10,000 per year per child for their center at one of the Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo's complexes. (85% of the \$10,000 is wages & salaries.) EOC also indicated that a minimum of 30 children and a rent-free space with about 2,500 gross sq ft are needed to make a day care center financially feasible. Based on 1990 Census figures, an apartment complex of 48 units would yield 30 children ages 0-6. To provide a 2,500 sq ft recreation room for a 48 unit project, the requirements would have to be raised from 40 sq ft per unit to 55 sq ft per unit.

15-5/8/19

TABLE OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS

- ** Creston Village (100 unit residential care facility for the elderly) operates a van 7 days a week. They cited an annual cost of \$60,000 for this service, which would increase rents by \$50/month (for 100 units). Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corp. indicated that they provide health-related services and craft classes at a range of \$350 - \$500 per unit per year, which would increase rents by \$30 - \$40 per month.

15-14

INVENTORY OF VACANT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LAND

APN	Sub	Base	Overlay	Zoning	Acres	Land Use		
Book	Page	Lot	Area	LUCAT	LUCAT	Zoning	Acres	Land Use
LOTS 2 ACRES OR GREATER IN AREA								
9	571	10	8	RMF-H		R-4,PD	10.00	SFR, vac land ne/o Creston & Sherwood
8	381	01p	1	RMF-L		R-3,PD	5.90	vacant land (w/s Vine @36th)
8	381	03p	1	RMF-L		R-3	2.90	vacant land (w/s Vine @36th)
8	381	04p	1	RMF-L		R-3	9.70	vacant land (w/s Vine @36th)
8	431	34	2	RMF-L		R-2	2.03	vacant land ("Mortuary" site)
9	541	07	6	RMF-L		R-2	2.70	SF residence (w/o Ferro Lane)
9	541	08	6	RMF-L		R-2	3.50	vacant land ("Devine" site, w/o Ferro Lane)
9	611	42p	6	RMF-L	RD	R-2,PD	18.00	Former Meat Plant
9	751	63	7	RMF-L		R-3,PD	2.34	vacant land next to Creston Village
9	761	63p	7	RMF-L		R-2,PD	2.81	vacant land (Pcl 1 of PR 99-013, e/s S. River Rd)
9	761	64p	7	RMF-L		R-2,PD	7.36	vacant land (PD 97012, n/o NOVA site)
9	761	64p	7	RMF-L		R-2,PD	14.44	vacant land (TT 2047-63 lots, e/o NOVA site)
25	391	57p	3	RMF-M	BASP	R-2,PD	8.50	vacant land (Willhoit, w/s Buena Vista Rd)
LOTS 1-2 ACRES IN AREA								
8	092	25	2	RMF-L		R-2	1.77	SF residence (s/s 24th @ Royal Ct)
8	391	21	1	RMF-L		R-2,B-1	1.58	vacant lot (nw/o Vine & 28th)
8	256	07	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.52	3 vacant lots (drainage way included)
9	256	08	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.92	5 vacant lots (drainage way included)
9	441	14	5	RMF-L		R-2,B-3	0.99	vacant land (PR89-375; 2 lots app'd)
9	451	10	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	SF residence (n/s Creston)
9	451	12	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	SF residence (n/s Creston)
9	451	17	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	0.84	vacant land (n/s Creston)
9	451	19	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	SF residence (n/s Creston)
9	451	22	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	vacant land (n/s Creston)
9	451	28	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	SF residence (n/s Creston)
9	451	30	5	RMF-L		R-1,B-3	1.00	vacant land (n/s Creston)
9	531	24	6	RMF-L		R-2	0.90	2 lots (Capitol Hill)
9	641	02	5	RMF-L		R-1	1.00	SF residence (n/s Creston)
9	641	03	5	RMF-L		R-1	1.35	2 SF residences (n/s Creston)
8	041	26	1	RMF-M	RD	R-4,PD	1.10	vacant land (ne/o 34th & Park)
VACANT INFILL LOTS								
8	092	36	2	RMF-L		R-2,PD	0.30	vacant lot
8	092	39	2	RMF-L		R-2,PD	0.47	vacant lot
8	152	18	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
8	222	04	2	RMF-L	RD	R-2	0.16	vacant lot
8	231	03	2	RMF-L	RD	R-2	0.08	vacant lot
8	232	14	2	RMF-L	RD	R-2	0.06	vacant lot
8	234	15	2	RMF-L	RD	R-2	0.16	vacant lot
8	317	10	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
8	391	08	1	RMF-L		R-2,B-1	0.36	vacant lot
8	391	13	1	RMF-L		R-2,B-1	0.06	vacant lot
8	391	24	1	RMF-L		R-2,B-1	0.43	vacant lot
8	391	25	1	RMF-L		R-2,B-1	0.42	vacant lot
9	252	10	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.27	vacant lot
9	252	12	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
9	252	13	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
9	252	14	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
9	252	15	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
9	252	16	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.16	vacant lot
9	282	20	2	RMF-L		R-2	0.21	vacant lot
9	441	16	5	RMF-L		R-2,B-3	0.33	vacant land
9	441	47	5	RMF-L		R-2,B-3	0.52	vacant land
9	531	23	6	RMF-L		R-2	0.50	vacant lot
9	531	28	6	RMF-L		R-2	0.30	2 vacant lots
8	011	27	1	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.12	vacant land
8	011	35	1	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.24	vacant land
8	011	68	1	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.08	vacant land
8	031	03p	1	RMF-M	RD	R-4,PD	0.39	vacant land
8	031	16	1	RMF-M	RD	R-4,PD	0.28	vacant land
8	032	11	1	RMF-M	RD	R-4,PD	0.14	vacant land
8	165	09	2	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.29	vacant land
8	172	13	2	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.36	vacant land
8	226	08	2	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.16	vacant lot
8	227	9p	2	RMF-M	RD	R-3	0.16	vacant land
8	286	10	2	RMF-M	RD, OP	R-3/OP	0.08	vacant lot
8	292	15	2	RMF-M	RD, OP	R-3/OP	0.16	vacant lot
Total								

NOTES: 1. Pot = potential # of units, which is based upon application of maximum allowable density to the estimated of the developable acreage of the parcel.

INVENTORY OF VACANT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LAND

APN		Sub	Base	Overlay				
Book	Page	Lot	Area	LUCAT	LUCAT	Zoning	Acres	Land Use
Such estimates do not account for density-limiting factors such as topography, oak woodlands or floodways.								
2. EXP = expected # of units per the General Plan (50% of Pot for West Side lots; 75% of Pot for East Side lots).								

INVENTORY OF VACANT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LAND

Exist	#DU	
	Pot ¹	Exp ²
1	159	159
0	47	24
0	23	12
0	77	39
0	16	8
1	20	15
0	28	21
0	144	108
0	18	14
0	23	17
0	44	33
0	63	47
0	90	68
2	752	563
1	13	7
0	12	6
0	6	5
0	10	8
0	6	5
1	7	5
1	7	5
0	6	5
1	7	5
0	8	6
1	7	5
0	8	6
0	7	5
1	7	5
2	8	6
0	13	7
8	132	90
0	1	1
0	1	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	1	1
0	1	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	3	2
0	1	1
0	3	2
0	3	2
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	2	1
0	3	2
0	3	2
0	4	3
0	2	2
0	1	1
0	3	2
0	1	1
0	4	3
0	3	2
0	2	2
0	6	5
0	6	5
0	3	2
0	3	2
0	1	1
0	3	2
0	84	54
10	968	707

INVENTORY OF VACANT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LAND

#DU		
Exist	Pot ¹	Exp ²

INCOME AND RENT
November 1999

Income Group	% of AMI	Household (HH) Size and Annual Income											
		1 person/HH		2 persons/HH		3 persons/HH		4 persons/HH		5 persons/HH		6 persons/HH	
		Income	Max Rent	Income	Max Rent	Income	Max Rent	Income	Max Rent	Income	Max Rent	Income	Max Rent
	30	10,050	250	11,500	290	12,950	320	14,400	360	15,550	390	16,700	420
	40	13,450	340	15,350	380	17,300	430	19,200	480	20,750	520	22,300	560
Very Low	50	16,800	420	19,200	480	21,600	540	24,000	600	25,900	650	27,850	700
	60	20,150	500	23,050	580	25,900	650	28,800	720	31,100	780	33,400	840
	70	23,500	590	26,900	670	30,250	760	33,600	840	36,300	910	39,000	980
Low	80	26,900	670	30,700	770	34,550	860	38,400	960	41,450	1,040	44,550	1,110
Median	100	33,600	840	38,400	960	43,200	1,080	48,000	1,200	51,850	1,300	55,700	1,390

NOTES:

1. AMI = Area (County) Median Income
2. Max Rent is monthly rent equal to 30% of household income.
3. Income levels are those determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for SLO County for 1999.
4. Income Groups are those defined by California Health and Safety Code Sections 50079.5, 50093 and 50105.

AFFORDABILITY AT CURRENT RENTS (based on HUD and State Standards)

Rental Type	Rent Range	Persons per HH	Affordable to <u>Very Low</u> Income Households?	Affordable to <u>Low</u> Income Households?
Studio apartment rent range	440 - 525	1 - 2	not for 1 person HH; only @ 50% AMI for 2 person HH	Yes
1 bedroom apartment rent range	450 - 730	1 - 2	not for 1 person HH; only @ 50% AMI for 2 person HH	Yes, at lower end of rent price range
2 bedroom apartment rent range	575 - 795	2 - 4	No	Yes

AFFORDABILITY IF RENTS ARE RAISED \$60 - \$100/MONTH (based on HUD and State Standards)

Rental Type	Rent Range	Persons per HH	Affordable to <u>Very Low</u> Income Households?	Affordable to <u>Low</u> Income Households?
Studio apartment rent range	500 - 625	1 - 2	No	Yes, at lower end of rent price range
1 bedroom apartment rent range	510 - 830	1 - 2	No	Yes, at lower end of rent price range
2 bedroom apartment rent range	635 - 895	2 - 4	No	Yes

15-19

