

INYO COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT

Adopted July 1, 1992

UPDATED DECEMBER 2001, APRIL 2004 AND AUGUST
2009

2014 Housing Element Update



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i

List of Tables ii

 Chapter One: Introduction 1

 Purpose of the Element 1

 Public Participation 2

 Consistency with the General Plan **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Chapter Two: Housing Needs 5

 Housing Stock Characteristics 19

 Special Housing Needs 22

 Units At Risk of Converting to Market-Rate Uses 31

Chapter Three: Resources and Constraints 31

 Regional Housing Need 32

 Land Inventory 33

 Other Housing Resources 41

 Analysis of Governmental Constraints 42

 Analysis of Non-Governmental Constraints 57

 Energy Conservation 61

Chapter Four: Review and Revise 63

Chapter Five: Housing Program 64

 Goals and Policies 65

 Quantified Objectives 74



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Population Growth Trends (2000–2013) – Unincorporated Inyo County.....5

Table 2 Inyo County Population (1960–2013).....6

Table 3 Inyo County Population by Race/Ethnicity 2010.....7

Table 4 Employment by Industry (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County.....8

Table 5 Growing Lower Income Occupations in the Eastern Sierra Region, 2004–2014.....9

Table 6 Household Growth Trends (1980–2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County10

Table 7 Population by Household Type (2000-2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County11

Table 8 Households by Tenure (1980–2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County11

Table 9 Overcrowded Households (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County.....13

Table 10 Households Overpaying (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County14

Table 11 Inyo County State Income Limits by Household Size, 2013.....15

Table 12 Housing Affordability by Income Level – Inyo County16

Table 13 Point-in-Time Rental Survey (Bishop, Independence, Lone Pine).....17

Table 14 Inyo County Median Home Sales: 2009-201318

Table 15 Housing Units by Type (2008– 2013) – Unincorporated Inyo County19

Table 16 Housing Units by Age – Unincorporated Inyo County21

Table 17 Housing Units by Tenure by Age (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County.....21

Table 18 Housing Conditions.....22

Table 19 Unincorporated Inyo County Households by Income Level 2010.....23

Table 20 Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2011)23

Table 21 Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type (2011) Unincorporated Inyo County24

Table 21 A Residential Care: Population By Zip Code (2013)25

Table 21 B Residential Care by Age.....26

Table 21 C Residential Care by Type of Residence26

Table 22 Householders by Tenure by Age (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County27

Table 23 Household Size by Tenure (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County28

Table 24 Single Parent Headed Households (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County29

Table 25 Number of Farmworkers (2007) – Inyo County.....30

Table 26 Farmworkers by Days Worked (2007) – Inyo County30



Table 27 Regional Housing Needs (2014 to 2019) – Unincorporated Inyo County32

Table 28 Progress Toward Regional Housing Needs (2014 to 2019).....33

Table 29 Vacant Land Inventory – Unincorporated Inyo County.....38

Table 30 RHNA and Vacant Land Summary.....41

Table 31 Land Use Designations.....43

Table 32 General Plan Land Use Designations for Residential and Commercial Uses45

Table 34 Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District.....48

Table 35 Inyo County Typical Fees for a Typical Residential Development53

Table 36 Inyo County Land Costs by Area.....58

Table 37 Quantified Objectives.....75



CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE ELEMENT

In response to California’s critical housing needs, the state legislature enacted housing element law to fulfill the goal of adequate, safe and affordable housing for every Californian. The attainment of housing for all requires the cooperation of local and state governments. Housing element law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs including their share of the regional housing need.

Housing element law is the State’s primary market-based strategy to increase housing supply. The law recognizes the most critical decisions regarding housing development that occur at the local level within the context of the general plan. In order for the private sector to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land-use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development for all income groups.

Unlike the other mandatory elements of the general plan, the housing element is subject to detailed statutory requirements regarding its content and must be updated periodically. The housing element is also subject to mandatory review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). This reflects the statutory recognition that the availability of housing is a matter of statewide importance and that cooperation between all levels of government and the private sector is critical to attainment of the State’s housing goals.

Inyo County adopted a Housing Element in 1992. That element was updated in 2001 when the County updated the entire General Plan. The 2001 update anticipated State housing element requirements as adapted to meet the intent of the “Frontier County” provisions of housing element law, but did not meet statutory requirements for the next update cycle in 2004. Accordingly, the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures included in the 2001 General Plan were incorporated into the 2004 element with very minor revisions. The 2004 and subsequent 2009 Housing Element updates met the statutory requirements and were adopted by Inyo County and certified by the State.

This 2014 update has incorporated all the new statutory requirements affecting housing elements and will guide Inyo County’s housing policy through the end of this planning period, which ends in 2019. In 2008, the California legislature adopted Senate Bill 375 which built upon foundations set in California’s 2006 climate change law (AB 32). SB 375 regional transportation agencies to develop a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS) for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and modified Housing Element Law to achieve consistency between the land use patterns outlined in the SCS and Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation. The legislation also increased local agencies’ accountability for carrying out their housing element plans. With adoption of SB 375, communities that are covered by an adopted Regional Transportation Plan became eligible for an extended housing element planning period of 8 years (instead of 5 years). Inyo County is not part of a region with an adopted Regional Transportation Plan, and is therefore not subject to the requirements of SB 375.

Pursuant to SB 812, this current Housing Element update addresses the housing needs of the County’s developmentally disabled residents in accordance with requirements of SB 812. This



analysis includes an estimate of the number of persons with developmental disabilities, an assessment of the housing need, and a discussion of potential resources. A "developmental disability" is defined as a disability that originates before an individual becomes 18-years old and continues (or can be expected to continue) indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual, including mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. Chapter Three: Resources and Constraints - Senate Bill 812 (Persons with Disabilities) provides a discussion and analysis of the County's disabled residents.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Housing Element reflects the values and preferences of Inyo County residents. The County began work on the 2014 update in January 2014. To initiate the outreach process, more than 40-letters/emails were sent to a broad cross-section of stakeholders in the County. Consultation invitations were also sent to 10-tribal representatives. The letters briefly described the reason for the update and called upon the stakeholders to provide their input at any time during the update process by visiting the Housing Element update section on the County's website, by directly contacting County staff, by requesting a meeting, or by attending a public workshop held in Bishop.

Tribal Consultations

Staff had one consultation request from the Big Pine Paiute Tribe. A consultation was held on February 13, 2014 at the tribal meeting room in Big Pine. Tribal members expressed their concern about the aging community and the pressures this puts on access to affordable housing as well as the trend it creates in smaller household sizes. Staff agreed with tribal members as the County's over 65-year old population is 20-percent. This is a significant proportion of the County's population and does have affects. Seniors tend to live in one or two persons households that cause the overall household sizes in the County to be lower. Most seniors are retired, on fixed incomes and many require more services than those in the younger adult age groups. Access to affordable housing close to goods and services and transportation is a high priority for seniors. Tribal members are concerned about the provision of services to seniors and how the proportion of seniors in the population affects the rest of the population with regard to housing issues. Staff met again with the Big Pine Paiute Tribe on June 9, 2014 to review the update draft and explain the changes that were made since the February 13, 2014 meeting. The Tribe had no additional comments nor recommended changes to the draft.

Public Workshops

The County held one public workshop during the draft stage of the 2014 Housing Element update. The goal of the public workshop was to gather feedback from stakeholders and the attending public regarding housing concerns of Inyo County residents. The public workshop was held on Thursday, February 20, 2014, at the City of Bishop Council Chambers.

There were 3 attendees plus staff at the workshop, which consisted of a presentation of the Draft Housing Element and an opportunity for attendees to share comments. The comments from the public workshop have been addressed throughout the Housing Element update, including in the programs section. Below is a summary of the comments voiced at the workshop and the County's response in the Housing Element.



Comments from the public/stakeholder meeting included:

- A discussion about the new requirements per SB-1241: Section 4, regarding tentative and parcel map applications in a very high fire danger zone or a state responsibility area in the Government constraints section.
 - Response: A section regarding the new fire findings requirements per SB-1241 can be found in the Analysis of Governmental Constraints section.
- Comment: Add a stronger discussion about the important role that manufactured and mobile homes play in providing affordable housing.
 - Response: The current policies regarding manufactured and mobile homes adequately promote their use and their importance as affordable housing options. Please see Policy 3.4. Staff added language in the Housing Units Types, emphasizing the importance of manufactured and mobile homes as an affordable option.
- Comment: Add language about DWP releasing properties that are appropriate for private ownership that are not currently included in the Land Release program and inventory.
 - Response: A discussion has been added about additional DWP properties not on the land release inventory in the county and their potential for private ownership, in Chapter Three: Resources and Constraints – Land Inventory.
- Comment: County should be more proactive in helping to provide affordable housing through partnerships with local non-profit agencies that help support affordable housing and by participating in available grant programs.
 - Response: There are currently adequate policies addressing the County’s participation in affordable housing programs. The County has not had the staffing or the funds to administer these programs through the past housing element cycle, so has not taken a lead role in applying for them.

Also with regard to SB-1241 the County sent its Safety Element to the California Department of Forestry and Fire for comment.

- Comment: Identify plans and actions for existing residential structures and neighborhoods, and particularly substandard residential structures and neighborhoods, to be improved to meet current fire safe ordinances pertaining to access, water flow, signing, and vegetation clearing.
 - Response: The County has added to Program 1.2.1 and 1.3 addressing fire safety and substandard residential structures and housing rehabilitation.



Comment Letters

In addition to gathering comments from attendees at the public workshop, residents were invited to submit comments directly to the County regarding the draft of the Housing Element update. No comment letters were received by the County during the housing element update process.

Public Hearings

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 28, 2014 to review the draft housing element and receive public comments. No one from the public attended the hearing and no further public comment was received by staff. The planning commission unanimously voted 4-0 with one absent to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the draft 2014 housing element update. On June 17, 2014 the Board of Supervisors held a public hearing to review the draft housing element and receive public comments. One person from the public commented during the hearing to request maps showing LADWP land release parcels and maps that better illustrate where the parcels identified in the Housing Element for the planned RHNA units are. Staff explained that the LADWP land release maps can accessed at the Planning Department and staff can work with him on the planned units map. Staff also explained that within the Housing Element each parcel identified for the planned units is described, geographically and with an assessor parcel number for locating purposes. The Board of Supervisors voted 5-0 to approve the 2014 Housing Element Update.

The Housing Element is consistent with the goals and policies of the current Inyo County General Plan. Since each element in the General Plan is currently being updated in 2014, there are no General Plan land use designations or regulations that require revision in order to meet the policies and objectives of this element or to provide for the County's fair share of the regional housing need.

In the future, this Housing Element will be amended as necessary to maintain consistency with the Inyo County General Plan by incorporating appropriate revisions to the goals and policies. Additionally, the County will maintain consistency throughout the planning period upon any amendments to the Inyo County General Plan.



CHAPTER TWO: HOUSING NEEDS

POPULATION

Population Growth Trends

An understanding of the demographics of Inyo County – past, present, and future – is essential to the process of updating the Housing Element. According to the Department of Finance, the population of the entire county in 2013 was 14,696. Table 1 shows population growth trends from 1970 through 2013 for the unincorporated county.

In the 1960s, Inyo County experienced a 4-percent growth rate as the county gained popularity as a destination for recreation activities and retirement. This was the largest population boom in Inyo County since the early 1900s. In the 1970s, the county saw continued but more limited growth. Population growth slowed in the 1980s, when it increased by only 244 people. Most of this population growth was the result of in-migration of older persons of retirement or near-retirement age.

The 2000 Census showed unincorporated Inyo County as one of the few California jurisdictions that lost population. In the ten-year period from 1990 to 2000, Inyo County’s population declined by 390 individuals. The 2010 Census indicated that population grew by 251 people, or 1.7-percent. The population of the unincorporated county has increased at an average annual rate of 0.1-percent, or eight people per year, between 2000 and 2013.

**Table 1
Population Growth Trends (2000–2013) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Year	Population	Numerical Change	Average Annual Change	
			Number	Percentage
1970	12,073	--	--	--
1980	14,562	2,489	249	2%
1990	14,806	244	24	0.2%
2000	14,416	-390	-39	-0.3%
2008	14,601	185	23	0.2%
2010	14,667	66	18	0.1%
2013	14,696	29	8	0.1%

**Source: Census Bureau (2010 Census, 2000Census, SF3: P1 and 1990 Census, STF3: P1), 2008 DOF (Report E-5); HCD-HE Data Package 2013.*

According to the Department of Finance (DOF) information, the total population of Inyo County in 2013 was 18,573. Table 2 shows how the total county population between 1960 to the beginning of 2013 was distributed between the City of Bishop, the only incorporated city in the county, and the unincorporated areas of the county. Between 1960 and 2013, the distribution of the county’s



population between the unincorporated areas and the City of Bishop remained relatively stable, with Bishop’s share of the population increasing slightly. As the table shows, at the beginning of 2013 79-percent of the total county population resided in unincorporated areas, while the balance (21-percent) resided in the City of Bishop.

**Table 2
Inyo County Population (1960–2013)**

Year	Total Population	City of Bishop	Percentage	Unincorporated County	Percentage
1960	11,684	2,875	25%	8,809	75%
1970	15,571	3,498	23%	12,073	78%
1980	17,895	3,333	19%	14,562	81%
1990	18,281	3,475	19%	14,806	81%
2000	17,945	3,575	20%	14,416	80%
2008	18,152	3,551	20%	14,601	80%
2010	18,546	3,879	21%	14,667	79%
2013	18,573	3,877	21%	14,696	79%

**SOURCE: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, HISTORICAL CENSUS POPULATION OF COUNTIES IN CALIFORNIA, 1850–1990; HISTORICAL CENSUS POPULATION OF PLACES, TOWNS, AND CITIES IN CALIFORNIA, 1850–1990; CITY/COUNTY POPULATION & HOUSING ESTIMATES, 1990–1998 (REPORT E-5); CITY/COUNTY POPULATION & HOUSING ESTIMATES, 2000–2008 (REPORT E-5); HCD-HE DATA PACKAGE 2013. RACE AND ETHNICITY*

Table 3 provides a summary of the population by race/ethnicity for Inyo County (unincorporated and Bishop) from the 2010 Census. Those reporting White, American Indian, and Hispanic/Latino race and/or ethnicity made up the majority of the population in the county with 67-percent, 12-percent, and 16-percent, respectively. The share of the population of American Indians and Hispanic/Latinos in Bishop differed from that of the unincorporated county. In Bishop, American Indians represented approximately 2-percent of the city’s population, which is 10-percent less than the share in the unincorporated county (12-percent). The Hispanic/Latino population in Bishop was 15-percent higher than in the unincorporated County (31-percent and 16-percent respectively). Other than these noted differences in the dispersion of the population by race and ethnicity, the City of Bishop and the unincorporated County have similar racial and ethnic populations.



**Table 3
Inyo County Population by Race/Ethnicity 2010**

Race/Ethnicity	Unincorporated County		Bishop		Total County	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
White	9,832	67%	2,464	63%	12,296	66%
Black or African American	81	<1%	21	< 1%	102	< 1%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,828	12%	67	2%	1,895	10%
Asian	170	< 1%	59	2%	229	1%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	15	< 1%	0	0%	15	< 1%
Hispanic/Latino	2,397	24%	1,200	31%	3,597	19%
Some other race	17	< 1%	4	< 1%	21	< 1%
Two or more races	327	< 1%	64	2%	391	2%
Total Population	12,296	100%	3,879	100%	18,546	100%

Source: Census Bureau (2010 Census)

EMPLOYMENT

The economic base of the county consists of employers that serve primarily (or in some cases exclusively) the local population. Two major employment sectors in the county are considered export employers: hotels and the federal and state components of public administration. The local-serving employers are affected almost exclusively by population and income trends while export industries are affected by factors external to Inyo County.

Table 4 provides a summary of employment by industry for Inyo County as reported by the 2011 American Community Survey (ACS).

Of nearly 6,782 total jobs, the service sector was by far the largest employer in the county at about 40-percent, including services both to the local population and to visitors.

The next largest category is retail trade at 13.5-percent. Public administration follows with 11-percent of total employment.

Economic projections suggest a continued increase in tourism-related employment and income, and only marginal growth in other private sector industries. The tourism expansion generates a substantial increase in higher paying government jobs, with the effect of increasing per capita income despite the lower pay of other tourism-supported business sectors, such as retail and



lodging. Other demographic trends contribute to the upward push in local incomes, such as the continued influx into the county of retirees with independent incomes and lower than average household sizes.

**Table 4
Employment by Industry (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Employment by Industry	Unincorporated Inyo County	
	Estimate	Percent
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	6,782	77.6
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	115	1.7
Construction	569	8.4
Manufacturing	348	5.1
Wholesale trade	89	1.3
Retail trade	916	13.5
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	670	9.9
Information	40	0.6
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	250	3.7
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	291	4.3
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	1,312	19.3
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	1,086	16.0
Other services, except public administration	328	4.8
Public administration	768	11.3

**Source: ACS DP-03 2007-2011*

The California Employment Development Department (EDD) published projections for the fastest growing occupations in the Eastern Sierra Region (Alpine, Inyo, and Mono counties) for the years 2004 to 2014. Table 5 displays the occupations that were projected to have the most growth in the three-county region through the end of the 2009 Housing Element planning period. The table displays the occupations that have annual median salaries less than Inyo County’s median income as shown in Table 11 in an effort to highlight occupation growth among lower-income occupations.

The fastest growing lower-income occupations in the region are projected to add 550 jobs by 2014, a growth of 22-percent among lower-income occupations. The “Customer Service Representatives” occupation is projected to have the largest growth in the region, at 67-percent between 2004 and 2014, earning an annual median salary of \$29,390, which would fall into the low-income category for a family of four as shown in Table 11. “Counter Attendants, Cafeteria, Food Concession, and Coffee Shop” occupations are the lowest wage earners among the fastest growing occupations in the region, earning an annual median salary of \$16,827.



Table 5
Growing Lower Income Occupations in the Eastern Sierra Region,
2004–2014

Occupation	Annual Average Employment		Percentage Change	Annual Median Salary ¹
	2004	2014		
Customer Service Representatives	90	150	67%	\$29,390
Nursing Aides, Orderlies, and Attendants	110	150	36%	\$22,422
Truck Drivers, Heavy and Tractor-Trailer	120	160	33%	\$33,155
Food Preparation Workers	220	280	27%	\$19,406
Stock Clerks and Order Fillers	80	100	25%	\$18,678
Paving, Surfacing, and Tamping Equipment Operators	80	100	25%	\$25,251
Construction Laborers	50	60	20%	\$33,238
Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	270	320	19%	\$24,045
Counter and Rental Clerks	110	130	18%	\$20,987
Maintenance and Repair Workers, General	410	480	17%	\$30,763
Cooks, Fast Food	120	140	17%	\$16,973
Counter Attendants, Cafeteria, Food Concession, and Coffee Shop	60	70	17%	\$16,827
First-Line Supervisors/Managers of Personal Service Workers	60	70	17%	\$32,552
Recreation Workers	60	70	17%	\$31,866
Retail Salespersons	600	700	17%	\$20,301
Reservation and Transportation Ticket Agents and Travel Clerks	60	70	17%	\$23,442
Total Occupation Growth	2,500	3,050	22%	--

Source: Employment Development Department, Labor Market Info: "Fastest Growing Occupations," 2009.

¹ The median hourly wage has been calculated to reflect the median annual salary.



HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Household Growth Trends

In 1980, there were 5,654 households in unincorporated Inyo County. According to the 2000 Census, the county had grown to 6,033 households, representing a 6-percent increase between 1980 and 2000. According to the 2010 Census there were 6,301 households in unincorporated Inyo County representing an 11-percent increase from 1980 and a 4-percent increase from 2000.

Inyo County’s aging population has a significant effect on household characteristics, as household trends for seniors differ from other demographic cohorts. Twenty-percent of the unincorporated county’s population in 2010 was at least 65-years of age. Statewide, 11-percent of the population is at least 65 years old. The high percentage of residents aged 65 and over suggests that Inyo County is an attractive location for retirees, and/or the people who live in Inyo County choose to age in place.

Table 6
Household Growth Trends (1980–2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Year	Households	Numerical Change	Annual Numerical Change
1980	5,654	--	--
1990	5,884	230	23
2000	6,033	149	15
2010	6,301	268	27

Source: Census Bureau (2010 Census P12, 2000 Census, SF3: H6 and 1990 Census, STF3: H4) and DOF (E-5 Report)

Of the total population in unincorporated Inyo County (14,667), the majority (97.8-percent) are in households as opposed to group quarters (2-percent). Table 7 presents a summary of the differing household types in the unincorporated county in the years 2000 and 2010. The percentage of people in non-family households is up from 15-percent in 2000 to 19-percent in 2010. 79-percent is in family households, down from 84-percent in 2000, and 2-percent are living in group quarters.



Table 7 Population by Household Type (2000-2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Household Type	2000		2010	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Population in Households	14,338	99.5%	14,342	98%
Family Households	12,138	84%	13,631	79%
Non-family Households	2,200	15%	1,036	19%
Population in Group Quarters	78	0.5%	325	2%
Institutional	76	0.5%	232	1.5%
Non-institutional	2	0%	93	0.5%
Total Population	14,416	100%	14,667	100%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census, SF3: P9 and 1990 Census, STF3: P17; 2010 Census P29)

Households by Tenure

According to the 2010 Census, 70-percent of the population in unincorporated Inyo County owned their homes. This was a decrease of 3-percent since 2000, and most likely due to the down-turn in the economy during the decade 2000-2010. Table 8 provides a summary of the change in tenure in the unincorporated portion of the county between 1980 and 2010. The ratio of owner to renter moves back and forth by 2-3-percent over time, indicating relative stability.

**Table 8
Households by Tenure (1980–2010) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

	1980		1990		2000		2010	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Owner	3,941	70%	4,227	72%	4,386	73%	4,230	70%
Renter	1,713	30%	1,657	28%	1,647	27%	1,804	30%
	5,654	100%	5,884	100%	6,033	100%	6,034	100%

Source: Census Bureau (2010 Census SF1: H16; 2000 Census, SF 3: H7; 1990 Census, SF 3: H8; and 1980 Census)

According to Census 2010 the vacancy rate in the unincorporated portion of the county was 16.6-percent, a difference of less than 1-percent in decrease from the 2000 vacancy rate, indicating that there has not been a significant change in the characteristics of housing needs or stock.

Per the 2010 California DFA data there are 1,251 vacant units in the unincorporated county representing 16.6% of units, of these, 678 were reported vacant as second homes used for “seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.” Vacant second homes represented about 51-percent of the vacancies in the unincorporated county, showing a growing trend of second homeownership in Inyo



County (vacant second homes represented 46-percent of vacancies in 2000) and can have an effect on housing availability and housing conditions for full time residents within the community.

The Census reports that the homeownership vacancy rate was 1.7-percent and the rental vacancy rate was 5.8-percent. The low homeowner vacancy rate is a direct reflection of the tight real estate market and lack of private land available for new development. The majority of private land in Inyo County is already developed.

As previously stated, the DFA reported that the 2010 vacancy rate for the unincorporated county was 16.6-percent, a decrease of 0.06-percent from 2000. The DOF does not report vacancy rates by tenure, but the very small change in vacancy rates between 2000 and 2010 and little housing production indicate that the tenure of the 2010 vacant housing stock is similar to 2000. The 2010 share of second homeowners is also likely to be similar to the 2000 proportion.

Given these factors, housing growth has been minimal in Inyo County in recent years. In order to facilitate development of affordable housing, the County currently allows the placement of mobile homes on all residentially zoned lots and has actively rezoned acreage in order to allow mobile homes. As a result, a large share of housing production between 2000 and 2010 was for mobile homes. In addition, current County policy is designed to concentrate new growth within and contiguous to existing communities (e.g., Bishop, Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine). This will ensure development of housing units in the places of greatest need and where infrastructure is readily available.

Overcrowded Households

The United States Census Bureau defines an overcrowded household as a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room (not including kitchens and bathrooms). Units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded and indicate a significant housing need.

According to the 2011 American Community Survey only 159 of the total households in the unincorporated County (6,034), approximately 3-percent, were in overcrowded situations. This percentage is very low compared to the statewide average of 8-percent. Overcrowding has been declining since 1980 in the unincorporated areas of Inyo County. In 1990, there were 287 overcrowded households, 2000 Census reported 237 overcrowded households and in 2011, 159.

Table 9 presents overcrowding data for the unincorporated county and California as a whole. As seen in the table, 1-percent of all owner-occupied households were overcrowded, compared to 6-percent of renter-occupied households. The state reported higher percentages of overcrowding for owners (4-percent) and renters (13-percent).



Table 9
Overcrowded Households (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Households	Owners		Renters		Total
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Total Overcrowded Households	49	1%	110	6%	159
1–1.5 Persons per Room	39	0.9%	110	6%	149
1.5 or More Persons per Room	10	0.2%	0	0	10
Total Households	4,230	70%	1,804	30%	6,034
Statewide Overcrowding Rates	4%		13%		8%

Source: ACS 2011: B25014

Households Overpaying

Overpayment calculations were provided by HCD with ACS data and HCD guidelines for calculating overpayment. As a rule of thumb, housing is considered affordable if less than 30-percent of household income is spent on rent or mortgage. Table 10 compares overpayment for housing between owners and renters for different income categories.

According to 2010 ACS data, 32-percent of all households (both renter and owner) paid more than 30-percent of their income on housing costs. This has increased from 2000 when it was 19%. The table below shows the number of households by income category that spent over 30-percent (constituting a cost burden) on housing in unincorporated Inyo County.

Based on the 2010 median household income for the County of \$44,808, lower-income households (those earning up to 80-percent of the median income) are those making up to \$ 35,846 per year. These households are shown in the table below in the first two income range categories and a very small portion of the third category. According to this data, there were approximately 427 lower-income renter households that suffered from cost burdens in paying housing costs, representing 33-percent of all renter households. The percentage of lower-income owner households that experienced a cost burden was lower with approximately 615 households or 15-percent of all owner households.



Table 10
Households Overpaying (2011) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Renter-Occupied Households			
Income Range	Households Paying > 30% of Income	Total Households	% of Total Households Overpaying
\$0 to \$20,000	230	280	82%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	197	258	76%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	108	249	43%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	14	186	8%
\$75,000 or more	9	302	3%
Subtotal	558	1,275	44%
Owner-Occupied Households			
\$0 to \$20,000	396	648	61%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	219	586	37%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	132	494	27%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	209	822	25%
\$75,000 or more	245	1,663	15%
Subtotal	1,201	4,213	29%
TOTAL	1,759	5,488	32%

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2013

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Household income is one of the most significant factors affecting housing choice and opportunity. Income largely determines a household’s ability to purchase or rent housing. The state and federal government classify household income into several groupings based upon the relationship to the county adjusted median income (AMI), adjusted for household size. The State of California utilizes the income groups presented in Table 11. For purposes of the Housing Element, the state income definitions are used throughout the document.



Table 11
Inyo County State Income Limits by Household Size, 2013

	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons	5 persons	6 persons	7 persons	8 persons
Extremely Low (0-30%)	\$13,850	\$15,800	\$17,800	\$19,750	\$21,350	\$22,950	\$24,500	\$26,100
Very Low (31-50%)	\$23,050	\$26,350	\$29,650	\$32,900	\$35,550	\$38,200	\$40,800	\$43,450
Low (51-80%)	\$36,900	\$42,150	\$47,400	\$52,650	\$56,900	\$61,100	\$65,300	\$69,500
Median (100%)	\$46,050	\$52,650	\$59,200	\$65,800	\$71,050	\$76,350	\$81,600	\$86,850
Moderate (81-120%)	\$55,250	\$63,150	\$71,050	\$78,950	\$85,250	\$91,600	\$97,900	\$104,200

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2013

Affordability of Housing

As shown in Table 11 above, HCD publishes official state income limits each year. The income categories are used as a determinant for qualifying households for housing programs as well as to understand how much households in the unincorporated county can afford to spend on housing costs. Table 12 provides a summary of the 2013 state income limits for households by household size. The income limits are sorted by income group and presented as monthly income, monthly rent, and maximum (max.) sales price.

Monthly income is determined by dividing the annual income limit by 12-months. Monthly rent is 30-percent of the monthly income, which is the standard for determining affordable monthly housing cost. Maximum sales price is an estimate of the maximum amount a household could afford assuming a 6-percent interest rate over 30 years, in which no more than 30-percent of the household's gross monthly income is spent on housing cost.

For example, a 2-person household with an annual income of \$26,350 has a gross monthly income of \$2,196 and is considered to be a very low-income household. The affordable rent that the 2-person household could afford without being cost burdened is \$659, and the maximum sales price of a home this household can afford is \$79,026.

The affordable monthly rent and the maximum purchase price of homes in each income category will be used to determine the availability of housing affordable to each income group. This analysis can be found in the following sections of this Housing Element: Housing Rental Market and Housing Sales Market.



**Table 12
Housing Affordability by Income Level – Inyo County**

Income Group	1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person
Extremely Low				
Monthly Income	\$1,154	\$1,317	\$1,483	\$1,646
Monthly Rent	\$346	\$395	\$445	\$494
Max. Sales Price	\$26,887	\$35,043	\$43,349	\$57,505
Very Low				
Monthly Income	\$1,921	\$2,196	\$2,471	\$2,742
Monthly Rent	\$576	\$659	\$741	\$823
Max. Sales Price	\$65,266	\$79,026	\$92,786	\$106,346
Low				
Monthly Income	\$3,057	\$3,513	\$3,950	\$4,380
Monthly Rent	\$923	\$1,054	\$1,185	\$1,314
Max. Sales Price	\$123,009	\$144,925	\$166,792	\$188,308
Moderate				
Monthly Income	\$4,604	\$5,262	\$5,920	\$6,579
Monthly Rent	\$1,381	\$1,579	\$1,776	\$1,974
Max. Sales Price	\$199,516	\$232,411	\$265,365	\$298,340
Above Moderate				
Monthly Income	>\$4,604	>\$5,262	>\$5,920	>\$6,579
Monthly Rent	>\$1,381	>\$1,579	>\$1,776	>\$1,974
Max. Sales Price	>\$199,516	>\$232,411	>\$265,365	>\$298,340
Monthly Income	\$3,838	\$4,388	\$4,933	\$5,483
Monthly Rent	\$1,151	\$1,316	\$1,480	\$1,645
Max. Sales Price	\$161,187	\$188,708	\$215,978	\$243,499

Source: 2013 Income Limits, California Department of Housing and Community Development, January 2014

Note: Affordable housing cost for renter-occupied households assumes 30% of gross household income, not including utility cost.

Monthly mortgage calculation: <http://www.imoortgageguide.com/calculators/MortgageMax.aspx>

Note: Affordable housing sales prices are based on the following assumed variables: 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 6% annual interest rate. \$1,200 per year in real estate taxes, \$600 per year in hazard insurance, and \$35 per month for mortgage insurance.



Housing Rental Market

A survey of rental rates for single-family and multi-family housing in Inyo County was conducted in February and March 2014. Comparing the market rental rates with the affordable monthly rent amounts presented in Table 13 helps determine the supply of affordable housing for each income level. According to the results of the surveyed rental rates and the monthly rental amounts that households with 1 to 4 persons can afford, households that fall between the very low-income and low-income category can afford rental rates for multi-family housing. The survey results show that households at or below the very low-income category pay in excess of 30-percent of the monthly gross household income. Households at or above the low-income category earn sufficient monthly incomes to afford the median monthly rental rates found in the survey for all housing types (single-family, multi-family, and mobile homes).

Table 13 reports median rental rates for the county as a whole. Communities in and around Bishop tend to offer rental rates at or above the county median rental rates. Conversely, the communities of Independence and Lone Pine typically have rental rates that are below the county median rates.

**Table 13
Point-in-Time Rental Survey (Bishop, Independence, Lone Pine)**

NUMBER OF BEDROOMS	SINGLE-FAMILY		MULTI-FAMILY	
	MEDIAN RENT	NUMBER OF UNITS SURVEYED	MEDIAN RENT	NUMBER OF UNITS SURVEYED
1 BEDROOM	685	31	\$625	4
2 BEDROOM	863	40	\$850	5
3+ BEDROOM	1,300	23	\$1,995	1
TOTAL	863	94	\$850	10

Source: Point-in-Time Rental Survey, Inyo County February & March 2014

Housing Sales Market

Home sales prices have been analyzed and compared with the affordability data in Table 12. This analysis allows the County to identify which income groups have the most difficult time finding affordable housing.

New Home Sales

The resale price of homes in the county between 2009 and 2014 as provided by the County Assessor is shown in Table 14. The assessor sales data is shown for the communities of Unincorporated Bishop, Bishop, Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, and the county as a whole. According to the Assessor’s report, the median sales price for mobile homes situated in mobile home parks in the county as a whole was \$22,000, which means that households at or above the extremely low-income range can afford to purchase a mobile home without being cost burdened. The community with the lowest median mobile home sale price in a park was Lone Pine at \$5,000.



The median price at which condominium units sold in the county as a whole was \$152,500, affordable to households earning above moderate income. The City of Bishop was the only community to have condo sales and the median price was \$152,500. It is difficult to calculate the resale amount of projects with 2 or more units, because the median price reports the total cost of the project and not each individual unit. The median sales price for duplex projects in the county was \$193,500, with the lowest median sale price in Independence at \$117,000. The median sale price of projects with 3 and 4 units in the county as a whole was \$202,500.

Single-family homes have the highest median sales price for all unit types. Between 2009 and 2014, the median sales price for single-family homes in the county as a whole was \$276,500. The only household income groups in Table 12 that would be able to afford the median resale price of a single-family home in the county is moderate and above moderate-income households. The community of Independence had the lowest median sales price of single-family homes at \$127,901 and would be affordable to the Low Income Group. The overall median sales prices for all housing types in the entire county decreased from \$189,500 in 2009 to \$150,000 in 2014. The decreases in the median sales prices can be attributed to the economic downturn and real estate crash in 2008. This decline in sales prices does indicate that housing is becoming somewhat more affordable to more income groups.

**Table 14
Inyo County Median Home Sales: 2009-2013**

Community	Single-family	Condo	Duplex	Triplex/ Fourplex	Mobile Home	
					In park	Private (with a foundation)
Unincorporated Bishop	\$330,493	--	\$425,000	-- \$182,850	\$23,000	\$226,250
Bishop	\$255,000	\$152,500	\$226,450	\$290,000	\$17,000	\$215,400
Big Pine	\$215,000	--	--	--	\$85,000	\$175,400
Independence	\$127,901	--	\$117,000	--	--	\$75,000
Lone Pine	\$169,900	--	\$75,700	--	\$5,000	\$195,000
County Total	\$276,500	\$152,500	\$193,500	\$202,500	\$22,000	\$188,500

Source: Inyo County Assessors Office, February 2014



HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

Housing Units by Type

As shown in Table 15, unincorporated Inyo County contains a variety of housing types, including 4,689 detached single-family residences, 137 attached single-family residences, 2,267 mobile homes, and 290 multi-family units (includes “2–4 units” and “5 plus units”).

Single-family homes represent the dominant type of housing in the County. Between 2000 and 2008, the number of detached single-family residences increased by 1.7 percent from 4,610 to 4,689. The number of attached single-family residences increased by 2-percent from 134 to 137 units. Most of the single-family unit growth occurred adjacent to the City of Bishop and in the northern portion of the county.

The 2000 Census reported 2,038 mobile homes in the unincorporated county, which represented 29 percent of the total unincorporated county’s housing stock. The percentage of mobile homes in the county grew by 11 percent between 2000 and 2008 or from 2,038 to 2,267, which represented the and in 2011 the number of mobile homes decreased by 89 or 4-percent. Mobile homes have historically been immensely popular within Inyo County as they have remained affordable, and the construction quality and public acceptance levels have improved. The County also actively rezoned acreage in order to allow mobile homes, and the Zoning Ordinance allows the placement of mobile homes on all residentially zoned lots.

Table 15 shows how Inyo County’s housing stock has changed since 2008. A total of 183 units have been added to the unincorporated portion of Inyo County’s housing stock, an increase of 2-percent.

**Table 15
Housing Units by Type (2008– 2013) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Housing Unit Type	2008		2011		Change	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Single-Family Detached	4,689	64%	4,860	64%	171	4%
Single-Family Attached	137	2%	133	2%	-4	-3%
2–4 units	145	2%	229	3%	84	6%
5 Plus Units	145	2%	139	2%	-6	-4%
Mobile Home *	2,267	30%	2,205	29%	-62	-3%
Total Units	7,383	100%	7,566	100%	183	2%

Source: ACS 2011 DP04

*Mobile home category includes “Other” (e.g., RVs, campers).

Between 2008 and 2013, the county experienced an increase in single-family development and a decrease in total mobile homes, for the most part this has been the case since 1990, indicating that



single-family development is consistently replacing mobile homes as the primary unit type in the County. In 1990, there were 2,514 mobile homes in the county. By 2000 that number had declined to 2,038 a reduction of 476 mobile homes. In 2008 there were 2,267 mobile homes in Inyo County, an increase of 229 homes from 2000 and then in 2011 there was a decrease again of 62 for an overall decrease in mobile homes from 1990 to 2011 of 309 or 12-percent.

Mobile Homes are, especially in rural areas, a common alternative option for affordable housing. The time between 2000 and 2013 included the spike in real estate prices, as well as onset of the recession. Both of these factors would create a need in the housing market for more affordable options. As the economy and housing market have stabilized the eminent need for affordable housing, and therefore, mobile homes may have subsided. There has also been an increase in single family attached units, as well multi-family structures with 2-4 units. These housing types may be replacing some of the mobile homes as affordable housing opportunities in Inyo County, but mobile and manufactured homes are likely to continue to be an important affordable housing option in the County.

In an effort to ensure there is adequate affordable housing, the County offered a variety of policies to address the need for affordable housing during previous updates to the Housing Element. The policies include:

- Expedited project review of residential developments with an affordable housing component
- Provision of technical and financial assistance to mobile home park residents who want to purchase their mobile home park
- Provision of density bonus incentives
- Encouragement of accessory dwelling unit development
- Reductions in site development and/or design standards (e.g., reduction in setback or parking requirements, increase in building coverage requirements)
- Approval of mixed-use development if the non-residential land uses will reduce the cost of the housing project and the non-residential land uses are compatible with the housing project and surrounding development

Housing Stock Conditions

Structures older than 30-years are used as the accepted standard determining the need for “major rehabilitation.” Based on the 2011 ACS data, as of 2005, approximately 42-percent of all housing units within the unincorporated areas of the county were older than 30-years of age, indicating that close to half either need or have had major rehabilitation. This data is presented in Table 16 below.



Table 16
Housing Units by Age – Unincorporated Inyo County

Year Structure Built	Number	Percentage
Built 2005 or later	125	2%
Built 2000 to 2004	292	4%
Built 1990 to 1999	824	11%
Built 1980 to 1989	1,099	15%
Built 1970 to 1979	1,983	27%
Built 1960 to 1969	993	13%
Built 1950 to 1959	745	10%
Built 1940 to 1949	663	9%
Built 1939 or earlier	692	9%
Total	7,416	100%

Source: Census Bureau 2011 DP04

As illustrated in Table 17, approximately 20-percent more renters than owners inhabited housing which was classified as needing major rehabilitation. Tenure for the inventory of housing units is not available beyond the 2000 Census. Since 2000 the county has added 494 housing units and the majority (70-percent) are owner occupied, indicating more change has happened with regard to newer units, for use as owner occupied. Therefore, the 2000 data still provides a fair indication of how many and what type of units may require significant rehabilitation.

Table 17
Housing Units by Tenure by Age (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Year	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1990 to 2000	648	15%	191	12%
1980 to 1989	1,020	23%	235	14%
1970 to 1979	1,142	26%	293	18%
1960 to 1969	689	16%	278	17%
1950 to 1959	389	9%	204	12%
Pre-1950	498	11%	446	27%
Total	4,386	100%	1,647	100%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: H36)



The County Assessor collects a myriad of data regarding the sale of homes in the county, including important information related to the condition of the sold housing unit. The conditions of the sold housing units are categorized as good, average, fair, or poor. Table 18 provides a summary of housing units sold in the county between 2009 and 2013. This does not represent all of the housing units that were sold as the conditions are reported by the buyer on their change in ownership statement and about half of the buyers do not report the condition. The majority of housing units were in either good or average condition.

Table 18
Housing Conditions

Condition	Number	Percentage
Good	229	44%
Average	177	34%
Fair	77	14%
Poor	42	8%
TOTAL	525	100%

Source: Inyo County Assessor, estimate, 2009-2013

As the county's housing stock continues to age, ongoing maintenance is vital to prevent widespread deterioration. The Housing Element focuses on expanding rehabilitation efforts by pursuing available federal and state funds to upgrade and maintain the county's housing stock.

SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS

Certain segments of the population may have more difficulty in finding decent, affordable housing due to special circumstances. In unincorporated Inyo County, these "special needs" groups include extremely low-income households, senior citizen households, large families, disabled and developmentally disabled persons, single-parent-headed households, the homeless, and farmworkers.

Extremely Low-Income Households

Table 19 displays the share of households by income category by median family income (MFI) in the unincorporated portion of the county. The data presented in the table is reported by CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) in 2010. According to CHAS, 12-percent of all households in 2010 were extremely low-income. Of the 740 extremely low-income households, 330 are renters and 410 are owners. In conjunction with local community agencies and nonprofit service providers, the County has supported providing assistance to lower-income households and will continue to implement programs providing support that meets the housing needs of all income segments in the county.



Table 19
Unincorporated Inyo County Households by Income Level 2010

Income Level	Renters	Owners	Total	Percentage
Extremely low (0–30% MFI)	330	410	740	12%
Very low (30–50% MFI)	280	395	675	11%
Low (50–80% MFI)	440	685	1,125	18%
Moderate and above moderate (80% and above)	735	2,860	3,595	59%
Total	1,785	4,350	6,135	100%

Source: *Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data Report, 2010*

Local nonprofit community agencies and the County Health and Human Service Department organize and operate a number of programs countywide, including low-income housing, emergency shelter, emergency food/commodities, and weatherization programs.

Inyo County has one assisted housing project in its jurisdiction owned by the Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation, the Mt. Whitney Apartments, which is a 33-unit housing project developed with funds from the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rental Housing Program and managed by a nonprofit staff.

The Housing Authority of the County of Stanislaus administers the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program - Housing Choice Voucher program, which provides vouchers for local privately owned housing to eligible families. The vouchers represent credit that can be applied to rental cost of any housing unit. Currently, there are approximately 18 vouchers allocated to Inyo County residents.

Persons with Disabilities

As seen in Table 20 and reported by the 2011 ACS 2,076 (15%) of the population reported a disability, of which about 3-percent are not employed and another 8-percent are over the age of 65. The remaining 4-percent are employed persons.

Table 20
Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2011)

	Number	Percentage
Age 5–64, Employed Persons with a Disability	554	4%
Age 5–64, Not Employed Persons with a Disability	428	3%
Persons Age 65 Plus with a Disability	1,094	8%
Total Persons with a Disability	2,076	15%
Total Population (Civilian Non-institutional)	14,367	100%

Source: HCD 5th Element Data Package



Table 21 displays the total number of disabilities reported by type of disability. For persons between the ages of 5 and 64, ambulatory disabilities were the most prevalent, followed by cognitive difficulties. In the 65-years and over category ambulatory disabilities were also the most prevalent, followed by hearing.

The Census Bureau does not include developmental disabilities in their data and so it is not shown on Table 21. Developmental disabilities are defined as a continuing disability that originates before an individual becomes 18 years old, and includes Mental Retardation, Cerebral Palsy, Epilepsy, and Autism. The Kern Regional Center located in Bakersfield, CA provides services to individuals with developmental disabilities who live in Inyo County. The Center estimates that approximately 74 people with developmental disabilities, who live in Inyo County, are currently receiving services from them.

This data indicates that the County’s new reasonable accommodation procedures are needed and the County will continue to implement Program 6.2.1 to address these needs.

**Table 21
Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type (2011) Unincorporated
Inyo County**

Disability	Number	Percentage
Total Disability Population 5 to 64 years	869	50%
With a hearing difficulty	150	9%
With a vision difficulty	100	6%
With a cognitive difficulty	411	24%
With an ambulatory difficulty	526	30%
With a self-care difficulty	257	15%
With an independent living difficulty	338	19%
Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over	872	50%
With a hearing difficulty	398	23%
With a vision difficulty	160	9%
With a cognitive difficulty	206	12%
With an ambulatory difficulty	499	29%
With a self-care difficulty	151	9%
With an independent living difficulty	238	14%
Total Disabilities	1,741	100%

Source: 2012 ACS S1810

Tables 21 A – C illustrate residential care in the County. The County has 78 persons living in some type of residential care facility. Of these 78, 24 or 31-percent are under the age of 18 and 54 or 69-percent are 18-years and older. Five are over 62-years (6-percent). The majority (64-percent) live in Section 8 housing and 31-percent have independent living arrangements.



Table 21 A
Residential Care: Population By Zip Code (2013)

93513	Inyo	2-Active Client	10 to 13 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93513	Inyo	2-Active Client	14 to 17 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93513	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	2
93513	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Indep Living	1
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	3 to 5 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	6 to 9 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	4
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	10 to 13 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	5
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	14 to 17 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	8
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	18 to 21 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	2
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	9
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Indep Living	3
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Other	1
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	32 to 41 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	4
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	32 to 41 yrs	Indep Living	3
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	42 to 51 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	3
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	42 to 51 yrs	Indep Living	7
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	52 to 61 yrs	Indep Living	4
93514	Inyo	2-Active Client	62 and Older	Indep Living	3
93526	Inyo	2-Active Client	10 to 13 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93526	Inyo	2-Active Client	18 to 21 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93542	Inyo	2-Active Client	10 to 13 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	10 to 13 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	14 to 17 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1



HOUSING ELEMENT

93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	18 to 21 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	3
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	22 to 31 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	32 to 41 yrs	Home Prnt/Grdn	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	42 to 51 yrs	Indep Living	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	52 to 61 yrs	Indep Living	2
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	52 to 61 yrs	SNF	1
93545	Inyo	2-Active Client	62 and Older	SNF	2

Zip Codes: 93513 Big Pine; 93514 Bishop City and surrounding; 93526 Independence; 93545 Lone Pine
 Source: HCD 5th Element Data Package

**Table 21 B
 Residential Care by Age**

# Pop	Age												Total	
		0 to 2 yrs	3 to 5 yrs	6 to 9 yrs	10 to 13 yrs	14 to 17 yrs	18 to 21 yrs	22 to 31 yrs	32 to 41 yrs	42 to 51 yrs	52 to 61 yrs	62 and Older		
County	ZIP													
Inyo	93513				1	1		3						5
Inyo	93514		1	4	5	8	2	13	7	10	4	3	57	
Inyo	93526				1		1						2	
Inyo	93542				1								1	
Inyo	93545				1	1	3	1	1	1	3	2	13	

Source: HCD 5th Element Data Package

**Table 21 C
 Residential Care by Type of Residence**

# Pop	Residence								Total
		Community Care	Home Parent/Guardian	ICF	Independent Living	Other	SNF		
County	ZIP								
Inyo	93513			4		1			5
Inyo	93514			36		20	1		57
Inyo	93526			2					2
Inyo	93542			1					1
Inyo	93545			7		3		3	13

Source: HCD 5th Element Data Package



Disabilities can hinder access to housing units of conventional design as well as limit the ability to earn adequate income. Although needs can vary widely, disabled persons need special facilities to help them overcome their disability or make their housing units more convenient. Some of these amenities include wide doorways that can accommodate wheelchairs, special bracing for handrails, lower countertops, and switches and outlets at the proper height to allow easy use. Unfortunately, very few housing units have these features, and consequently, they must be remodeled to serve the disabled. The conversion of a conventionally designed housing unit is usually well beyond the financial capability of most disabled persons.

The County actively implements state standards for the provision of accessible units in new developments. The County also encourages housing provided for disabled persons to be in close proximity to public transportation and services.

Seniors

The special needs of many senior citizen households result from limited fixed incomes and from physical disabilities and dependence needs. As a result, seniors experience financial difficulty in coping with rising housing costs. The financial capacity for coping with increased housing costs depends heavily on the tenure status (owner or renter) of the elderly household. With infrequent and small increases in income and potentially large increases in housing costs, seniors who rent are at a disadvantage compared to seniors who own. Table 22 displays householders by tenure and age from the HCD 5th Element Data Package derived from the 2011 ACS. As shown in the table, 1,917 households had a senior householder (age 65 years and older) in Inyo County, representing a significant portion of Inyo County’s household population, 28-percent of the total households. Of the over 65-years household population, only 3-percent rent their home, making the at-risk senior population small in comparison to the state average and less than that of non-senior households.

**Table 22
Householders by Tenure by Age (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Householder Age	Owners	Renters	Total
15–24 years	23	98	121
25–34 years	195	414	609
35–64 years	2,315	1,072	3,387
65–74 years	906	128	1,034
75 plus years	791	92	883
Total Households	4,960	1,804	6,764

Source: HCD 5th Element Data Package 2014

One area of great concern relates to rent increases in mobile home parks. Senior citizens are particularly vulnerable and often cannot afford the cost of moving their mobile homes to less expensive spaces. For example, disassembling, moving, and reassembling a doublewide mobile home can cost several thousand dollars. To troubleshoot this problem, the County supports local assistance organizations in addressing senior housing needs through policies and programs



supporting rental subsidies, tenant purchase of mobile home parks, and housing rehabilitation assistance, including weatherization.

Large Families

Large households are defined as households with more than 5 persons. ACS data from 2011 indicate that Inyo County has 7-percent of households meeting that criterion. In comparison with the 2000 Census, the percentage of large families had decreased only slightly by 1-percent. In circumstances in which the housing market does not meet the unique needs of large families, overcrowding can result. Fortunately, the county’s relatively small overcrowding problem does not indicate this trend occurring on a broad scale. Table 23 shows households by tenure including large families in the unincorporated county.

The Housing Element establishes programs such as density bonus incentives for larger units and self-help housing to meet the needs of the county’s large families.

**Table 23
Household Size by Tenure (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

	1–4 persons		5+ Persons		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Owner	3,992	66%	238	4%	4,230	70%
Renter	1,624	27%	180	3%	1,804	30%
Total Households	5,616	93%	418	7%	6,034	100%

Source: Source: HCD 5th Element Data

Single-Parent-Headed Households

According to the 2011 ACS Census, 16-percent of all households within Inyo County are headed by single parents. It has been reported that a large number of these single-parent households are in need of assistance and are often the households most in need of affordable housing, childcare, job training, and rehabilitation funds.

Of the households headed by a single parent, 69-percent are headed by a female. The financial constraints of single-parent households, especially those headed by females, are seen by the share of households reporting to be below the poverty level. Single-parent-headed households comprised 47-percent of all households below the poverty line. Of the 153 single-parent households below poverty level, 64-percent were headed by females. Table 24 provides a summary of single-parent households in the county as reported by the 2011 ACS.



Table 24
Single Parent Headed Households (2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County

Householder Type	Number	Percentage
Single-Parent-Headed Householders	619	16%
Total Householders	3,792	100%
Single-Parent-Headed Householders Under the Poverty Level	153	4%
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	326	9%

Source: ACS 2011 B17012

The needs of the single, employed parent typically include housing that requires minimal maintenance and is located near employment, schools, transit, shopping, and day care. To address the housing needs of single-parent-headed households, the 2009 Housing Element included an expansion of existing affordability programs, such as rent subsidies, and sets forth several new programs, including supporting affordable housing development to increase the supply.

Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelter

There are many social, economic, and physical conditions that have led to an overall increase in the homeless populations throughout the State of California. Factors contributing to the rise in homelessness include the general lack of housing affordable to low, very low, and extremely low-income persons, increases in the number of persons whose incomes fall below the poverty level, reductions in public subsidies to lower-income persons, and the deinstitutionalization of persons with mental illness. The County’s Health and Human Services estimates that approximately 100-people in Inyo County are homeless. Many of these people are living out of their cars and/or stay with family and friends on a short term basis, constantly moving from one to another.

Inyo County has a transitional housing program (THP+) that serves foster or group home children when they reach age 18. The County helps these populations find an apartment, helps with financial support, and assists with searching for employment. The County does not have a homeless shelter, but assists homeless in finding temporary shelter, long-term housing, and services. For example, the County has assisted several homeless men in Lone Pine to use existing resources (SSI) plus leveraged funds to locate inexpensive housing. For homeless families, County Child Protective Services will rent a hotel room for one night; then, County Social Services will pay for a longer-term temporary hotel rooms and assist with finding long-term housing and obtaining services. The least expensive rents in the Bishop area are \$ \$500 to \$600 per month. There is also a hostel in Lone Pine that is relatively inexpensive.

The County operates two Wellness Centers one on Short Street in Bishop and one on Washington Street in Lone Pine. These are operated with Prop. 63 funds (1-percent tax on wealthy for mental health). The centers provide case management services and provide a place for anyone who needs a free shower, coffee, meals, a safe place to be, referrals, bilingual services, and activities. If no temporary shelter can be found, the centers will provide a free sleeping bag and tent. The centers do not advertise their services and instead depend on referrals from the County’s Social Services and



Mental Health divisions, the Salvation Army, and Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA). Wellness Center staff also regularly search for people in need, especially during the summer months when there are more homeless in the area.

See the Governmental Constraints section of this Housing Element for more discussion on housing for persons in need of emergency shelter and transitional housing services.

Farmworkers

According to the 2007 USDA Census of Agriculture as shown in Tables 25 and 26, there were approximately 202 farmworkers in Inyo County, 53-percent of which are seasonal workers (i.e., less than 150 days). The housing needs of farmworkers do not represent a large portion of the County’s housing needs and can be addressed through existing programs to identify lands and assist in the development of housing for low and moderate-income households.

**Table 25
Number of Farmworkers (2007) – Inyo County**

Hired Farm Labor	
Farms	32
Workers	202
Farms with 10 Workers or More	
Farms	3
Workers	135

Source: USDA 2007 Census of Farmworkers

**Table 26
Farmworkers by Days Worked (2007) – Inyo County**

150 Days or More		
	Farms	20
	Workers	95
Farms with 10 or More Workers		
	Farms	1
	Workers	Not Available
Fewer than 150 Days (Seasonal)		
	Farms	22
	Workers	107



Farms with 10 or More Workers		
	Farms	3
	Workers	Not Available

Source: USDA 2007 Census of Farmworkers

The 2004 update of the Inyo County Zoning Code included amendments that ensured the County is in compliance with Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, the Employee Housing Act, to facilitate the provision of employee housing, including farmworkers.

UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERTING TO MARKET-RATE USES

In the previous updates to the Housing Element, the County conducted an inventory of affordable housing units available to low-income households. The inventory included all low-income housing units in Inyo County that were at risk of converting to market-rate housing units between July 1, 1992, and December 1, 2003. The inventory included all multi-family rental units assisted under federal, state, and/or local programs, including HUD programs, state and local bond programs, redevelopment programs, local in-lieu fees, and inclusionary, density bonus, or direct assistance programs. The inventory covered all units that are eligible to change to non-low-income housing units due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage pre-payment, or expiring use restrictions. The inventory was compiled by interviews with County staff and IMACA, and review of “Inventory of Federally Subsidized Low-Income Rental Units at Risk of Conversion” (California Housing Partnership Corporation) and “The Use of Housing Revenue Bond Proceeds – 1990” (California Debt Advisory Commission).

The inventory indicated that Inyo County had only one assisted housing project in its jurisdiction, the Mt. Whitney Apartments. It is a 33-unit housing project developed with funds from the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rental Housing Program. The project was constructed in 1987 and is owned by the Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation (LPEDC). Given its nonprofit ownership and operation, it has been determined that the project is not at risk of converting to market-rate housing. This has not changed since the 2009 update as no new assisted housing projects have been built since.



CHAPTER THREE: RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

REGIONAL HOUSING NEED

A Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan is required pursuant to Section 65584 of Article 10.6 of California Housing Element law. The housing need is the minimum number of units needed to serve the county’s own projected household population and to accommodate a normal vacancy rate and the expected loss of housing stock.

As shown below in Table 27, Inyo County has a projected housing unit need of 160 total units based on household growth expected between 2014 and 2019, with at least 37-percent of these units targeted toward lower-income households. The County was originally allocated 35-units for very low-income households but approximately half of those are presumed to be for extremely low-income households (in accordance with AB 2634, which requires the County to document their projected extremely low-income housing need). Note that in past Housing Element cycles, the County has not experienced the forecasted population increase and therefore the projected housing need has not been realized, and the County does not anticipate it will be met in the 2014-2019 cycle.

**Table 27
Regional Housing Needs (2014 to 2019) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Income Group	Number	Percentage
Extremely Low	18	11%
Very Low	17	10%
Low	25	16%
Moderate	28	18%
Above Moderate	72	45%
Total	160	100%

Source: Regional Housing Need Plan, 2014-2019, HCD

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) period begins approximately six months prior to the Housing Element due date. For this cycle, the RHNA period started on was January 1, 2014, so all units built or permitted between that date and the present day can be credited toward the County’s RHNA. For a credit to apply to an extremely low, very low, low, or moderate-income allocation, it must have a deed restriction or otherwise documented sales price or rental rate that falls within the affordable range for those income groups.

Development in general has been slow throughout the state, and the county has been no exception. As shown in Table 28, the County has issued no building permits since January 1, 2014. Therefore, there has been no RHNA progress in Inyo County so far.



**Table 28
Progress Toward Regional Housing Needs (2014 to 2019)**

Income Group	RHNA 2007–2014	Units Built Since 2014	Remaining RHNA 2014-2019
Extremely Low	18	0	18
Very Low	17	0	17
Low	25	0	25
Moderate	28	0	28
Above Moderate	72	0	72
Total	160	0	160

Source: Regional Housing Need Plan, 2014–2019; County of Inyo Planning Department

LAND INVENTORY

Since 1970, Inyo County and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) have been in litigation over the construction of a second aqueduct and associated groundwater pumping and water export. In 1989, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors and Los Angeles City Council gave tentative approval to a groundwater management agreement. An environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared by the two parties to address the impacts of the second aqueduct and the agreement. One of the mitigation measures identified in both the tentative agreement and the EIR was the need to release Department-owned lands in the Owens Valley to lessen the impacts of DWP land ownership patterns on the orderly growth of the county and affordability of housing.

The final agreement provides for the release of 75-acres of land in the county adjacent to communities with access to water and sewer systems. A majority of the properties selected are currently zoned for residential development and were given General Plan designations appropriate for residential development. The identified parcels are in or adjacent to the communities of Lone Pine, Big Pine, and Bishop. The County and the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power are continually cooperating to schedule land for release, and it is anticipated that additional land may become available for residential development within the Housing Element planning period (2014–2019). Some of this land is included in the vacant land inventory below.

The LADWP also owns properties, many located along the main streets of Inyo County towns that could be considered for sale. Many of these properties include buildings that have or could have small businesses located in them. There are also properties owned by the LADWP with single family homes that could also be sold into private ownership.

For the 2009 update staff included a list of several pending applications for residential development, including approximately 469 acres of residentially designated land. This section of the Housing Element evaluates the potential residential development that is likely to occur in Inyo County under the current General Plan and Zoning Code. It also includes the site summaries from 2009 with an



update to their status, and Table 29 below provide descriptions of vacant land considered through the DWP land release program. Table 29 also quantifies the number and type of dwellings that can be constructed on each site and identifies each by zoning district, General Plan designation, size, maximum unit capacity, realistic capacity, and availability of infrastructure.

Most of the sites contained in Table 29 are currently completely vacant; however, a few have existing structures, which is noted in the table. These existing structures do not affect the potential for the remaining land to be developed. A vacant land inventory was conducted to identify residentially zoned properties that are available for residential development. County Assessor Parcel Maps were reviewed by County staff to determine the precise development potential of residential lots. The following discussion describes those areas in the county with significant remaining development potential.

Analysis of Suitability: Physical and Environmental

There are many physical and environmental attributes of land in Inyo County that can impede development. There are potential physical and environmental constraints to consider that can inhibit development on vacant and underutilized sites.

Physical Attributes – A majority of vacant parcels in Inyo County have development limitations based on their proximity to existing infrastructure. Most of the undeveloped private land in the county is located in remote or rural communities that do not have water and sewer systems. Of the first 10 sites listed in Table 29, all have adequate water and wastewater system infrastructure or plans in place to provide these services. For the DWP land release parcels (sites 11–15) sewer and wastewater infrastructure is available in the vicinity.

One property (site 4) lies within an Avalanche Hazard zone. This is reflected in the lower number of realistic units in relation to the maximum allowed by zoning.

Environmental Attributes – Several of the identified properties have environmental attributes that affect the developable area of the parcels. Wetlands and the presence of endangered species are the most common. These physical attributes do not prohibit development but rather restrict development and increase development costs. The capacity projections for these sites in the land inventory reflect this environmental constraint.

The County of Inyo does not have any Williamson Act properties but does have several large tracts of agricultural land. These lands are not included in the land inventory identifying potential residential development.

Availability of Infrastructure to Identified Lands

Many communities in Inyo County are not served by water or sewer services primarily due to the expense of creating new systems to serve outlying rural areas. Infrastructure constraints confronting individual communities are considered in the “Infrastructure Constraints” section of the Housing Element.



The Residential Site Inventory only evaluates those lands that are sufficiently served by existing infrastructure, can be easily connected to sewer and water systems, or will have an individual water well and a septic or leach system installed at the time of development.

See also Non-Governmental Constraints.

Analysis of Realistic Capacity

Site 1 – Bishop/Summit – This project was located in the Starlite Subdivision near Bishop. The General Plan designation of this parcel is Residential Very Low (RVL) and allows up to 2 dwelling units per acre. This parcel is zoned Rural Residential with a minimum lot size of .5 acre and the project proposed 48-lots that were expected to be priced above (affordable to above moderate-income households). Adequate sewer and water is available to this parcel. This development proposal was abandoned, the capacity, however is still available

Site 2 – Whitney Portal – Located west of Lone Pine, this parcel is designated Rural Residential Medium and zoned Rural Residential with a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres. The proposal contains 27 lots that will be priced affordable to above moderate-income households. Adequate sewer and water is available to this parcel. This parcel has been subdivided and the capacity is still available.

Site 3 – Pine Creek – Located northwest of Bishop, this project was intended to contain a variety of housing types in its proposal including Phase III, 47 manufactured homes on 12.3 acres zoned R-3 that were intended to be priced affordable to moderate. There were also 28 “patio homes” on 6.4 acres on R-3 zoned land priced at the above moderate range that are planned. Additionally, there is approximately 83 acres of RR-10 zoned land, which require a minimum lot of 10 acres. There were between 8 and 10 above moderately priced lots planned for this lot. Adequate sewer and water is available or planned to this parcel. This project is currently ‘on hold’, but the capacity of the site is unchanged

Site 4 – Hinds – This 70-acre site is located 8 miles west of Big Pine. It is designated and zoned commercial recreation and rural residential, the proposal was to subdivide the parcel into four lots. Three of the lots will total 50.33 acres of Residential Estate/Rural Residential 5 land. Even though the theoretical capacity based on zoning would be approximately 10 dwelling units, the proposal is for 3 units. There is also an existing summer cabin on the parcel. A Snow Avalanche Hazard Overlay zone applies to portions of the site. This parcel has been subdivided and the capacity is still available.

Site 5 – Delaney – This proposal was to subdivide a 3-acre property near Wilkerson into 1.73 and 1.27 acres (total of .41 will be offered for dedication to the County for roadways) for a total of 2.59 net acres. The General Plan designation is Residential Rural High and the property is zoned RMH-1.0 for a minimum lot size of 1 unit per acre. The project will have individual wells and septic systems. This parcel has not been subdivided, but the capacity is still available.

Site 6 – Dosch – This proposal was to subdivide a 1.18-acre parcel in the Starlite Subdivision into two separate parcels of .58 acre and .60 acre. The parcel has a General Plan designation of Residential Very Low and is zoned Rural Residential 5. This parcel has been subdivided and the capacity is still available.



Site 7 – Sorrells – This project proposal, located in Chicago Valley, contains a total of 160 acres of OS-40 zoned land, which has a potential for 1 unit per 40 acres as currently zoned. This will allow for up to a maximum of 4 units total. This project is ‘on hold’, but the capacity still remains.

Site 8 – Barlow – The 2009 evaluations included the proposed 16-units for these parcels, which are designated as Residential Low and zoned R-1-10,000. The project ended up being changed from a tentative parcel map to a lot line adjustment, therefore no additional parcels or potential for the 16-units is still viable and this site will be removed from the potential capacity.

Site 9 – Wells/Harboldt – This project was for the subdivision of a 40-acre property located in the Starlite Subdivision near Bishop, which currently contains one recently constructed home into four parcels: two at approximately 5 acres each (5.0–Parcel 1 and 5.10–Parcel 3) and two at approximately 15 acres each (15.0–Parcel 4 and 15.3 –Parcel 2). The home that was already completed (on Parcel 2) took approximately .1 acre and left 15.2 net acres on that lot. Water and wastewater services are available. This capacity remains.

Site 10 – The Arbors – This project was for a 22-unit detached condo project in North Bishop on 2 acres, proposed on a parcel designated Residential Medium-High and Retail Commercial and zoned R-3 2.0, which allows 15 units per acre. Water and wastewater services are available. This project was started, but is currently ‘on hold’. This capacity remains.

Site 11 – DWP Land Release – This parcel, located east of Bishop, is zoned R-3 with a General Plan designation of Residential Medium-High permitting a density range of 7.6 to 15. Development to the west is generally single-family, with adjacent development only on the north and southwest. Directly west is parkland and to the east is open space. A mixed income development, with a few multi-family developments, single-family units, second units, and mobile homes, an average density of 10 dwelling units (du) per acre seems appropriate. As the parcel is adjacent to the City of Bishop, water and wastewater services are available in the vicinity. This capacity remains.

Site 12 – DWP Land Release – Located east of Lone Pine and zoned RMH-5,800 and designation Residential Medium, this parcel’s permitted density is between 4.6 and 7.5. Development to the west, north, and south is predominantly single-family. No development is adjacent to the east. Given the minimum parcel size, single-family zoning, and surrounding development, it is reasonable to assume that a relatively low density mix of single-family homes and mobile homes will be developed, at an average density of 5 dwelling units per acre. As the parcel is adjacent to the community of Lone Pine, water and wastewater services are available nearby. This capacity remains.

Site 13 – DWP Land Release – Located east of Big Pine, this parcel is designated for Residential Medium-High and zoned R-2-6,500MH (Mobile Home Overlay). Its permitted density ranges from 7.6 to 15. No development lies to the north or east, with single-family homes lying to the south and west. However, the parcel is relatively near Main Street and may be appropriate for higher density. The zoning permits single-family and duplexes, so with a mix of these types, an average of 8-units per acre is reasonable. As the parcel is adjacent to the community of Big Pine, water and wastewater services are readily available. This capacity remains.

Site 14 – DWP Land Release – This parcel is located east of Big Pine and designated Residential High and zoned R-3-1.0 (minimum 1 acre lots). Its permitted density ranges from 15.1 to 24. No



development lies to the north, south, or east, and single-family homes lie to the west. Although the zoning permits multi-family, it is unlikely that it will be developed at the higher end of the permitted density range given the neighborhood. A relatively small apartment complex is an appropriate assumption and 12 dwelling units per acre is a likely density. As the parcel is adjacent to the community of Big Pine, water and wastewater services are available nearby. This capacity remains.

Table 29 below provides a site-by-site inventory of the primarily vacant land that is currently available to provide sites to meet the County's 2014 RHNA. Table 30 provides a comparison of the County's remaining RHNA with the capacity provided by the sites in Table 29. The capacity for the following sites is considered a reasonable estimate based on General Plan designation, zoning, surrounding uses, the parcel's location within the County, and general development trends as understood by County staff.

These sites were identified during the 2009 update, as was the comparison of RHNA to capacity. In 2009 the County's RHNA was a total of 435 units; in 2014 it is 160. During the years between 2009 and 2014 California, like the rest of the US, experienced a real estate crisis and with it a glut of housing foreclosures and empty units. In response to this the HCD lowered the RHNA numbers for all jurisdictions. In Inyo County, from 2009 through 2013 there were a total of 16 single family homes built and 22 mobile home placements, for an average of 7.5 units per year. None of these occurred on sites included in the inventory and therefore do not significantly affect the projected numbers from the site inventory. With only the elimination of the Barlow site's 16 units the overall site inventory has not changed significantly, and coupled with the lower number in the County's 2014 RHNA, there is now a surplus of sites identified to meet the 2014 RHNA.



**Table 29
Vacant Land Inventory – Unincorporated Inyo County
(SEE MAP IN APPENDIX B)**

Site number	APN	Project Name	GP Designation	Zoning	Allowable Density	Acres	Maximum Unit Potential	Realistic/Actual Capacity	Existing Use	Infrastructure Present/On-site Constraints
1	01228002, 01228005, 01228006, 01224006	Bishop/Summit	RVL	RR0.5- Starlite	2	28.72	57.44	48	Vacant	Yes
2	02327011 and 02327010	Whitney Portal	RRM	RR2.5	0.4	74.15	29.66	27	Vacant	Yes
3	00912019	Hooper/Pine Creek Village	RM	R-3	7.5	18.7	140.25	75	Vacant	Water present; wastewater service needs upgrades. Process to determine degree of need in progress and will be resolved well before end of planning period.
	00912021		RR	RR-10MH	0.1	84.8	8.48	8	Vacant	Water present; wastewater service needs upgrades. Process to determine degree of need in progress and will be resolved well before end of planning period.



Site number	APN	Project Name	GP Designation	Zoning	Allowable Density	Acres	Maximum Unit Potential	Realistic/Actual Capacity	Existing Use	Infrastructure Present/On-site Constraints
4	01828025	Hinds	RE	RR5	0.2	50.28	10.066	3	Summer cabin, various outbuildings on western portion	Water and septic available but in Avalanche Hazard zone.
5	01318002	Delaney	RRH	RMH-1.0	1	2.59	2.59	2	Vacant	Yes, individual wells and septic systems
6	01221021	Dosch	RVL	RR0.5-Starlite	2	1.2	2.4	1	Vacant	Yes
7	046-100-02	Sorrells	OSR	OS-40	0.025	160	4	3	Vacant	Yes, provided with wells and septic systems
8	01228001	Wells/Harboldt	RVL	RR0.5-Starlite	2	40	80	3	One home under construction - subdivided into four parcels total	Yes
9	01030125	The Arbors	RMH	R-3-2.0	15	2	30	22	Vacant	Yes
10	00801031	DWP Land Release (East Bishop)	RMH	R-3	15	13	195	130	Vacant	Yes, near existing communities
11	02606024	DWP Land Release (East Lone Pine)	RM	RMH 5,800	7.5	13	97.5	65	Vacant	Yes near existing communities



HOUSING ELEMENT

Site number	APN	Project Name	GP Designation	Zoning	Allowable Density	Acres	Maximum Unit Potential	Realistic/Actual Capacity	Existing Use	Infrastructure Present/On-site Constraints
12	00315101	DWP Land Release (East Big Pine)	RMH	R2-6,500MH	15	1.75	26.25	14	Vacant	Yes near existing communities
13	00316301	DWP Land Release (East Big Pine)	RH	R-3-1.0	24	1.5	36	18	Vacant	Yes near existing communities



Numerous small parcels are scattered around the county in developed areas that can accommodate new or additional residential development, including in the Central Business Zoning District in Lone Pine, Independence, Big Pine, and Keeler. The County also has approved a zone text amendment that will permit mixed-use and multiple dwellings in the remaining commercial zoning districts. In addition, the County owns property that may be appropriate for future residential development, including several parcels in the vicinity of Bishop and Big Pine. Communities in southern and southeastern Inyo County, such as Darwin, Cartago, Olancho, Tecopa, Shoshone, Sandy Valley, and Charleston View, include vacant parcels with residential zoning, and limited development of residences in these areas can be anticipated as well. Although not included in the land inventory, these areas provide for additional residential development opportunities throughout the planning period.

Table 30 below provides a summary of the County's RHNA needs and the units provided to meet the remaining allocations in the land inventory from Table 29 above. Table 30 shows that based on the reasonable estimates of realistic capacity that were developed by the County, there is a surplus of sites to fulfill the RHNA in surplus.

Table 30
RHNA and Vacant Land Summary

Income Level	Remaining RHNA Need ⁴	Unit Provided by Land Inventory	Shortfall/Surplus
Extremely Low	18	190 ¹	+130
Very Low	17		
Low	25		
Moderate	28	84 ²	+56
Above Moderate	72	145 ³	+73
Total	160	419	+259

¹ The DWP sites are appropriately zoned to allow for medium and higher density development to meet the extremely low-, very low-, and low-income allocations.

² Approximately 37 units from DWP lands and 47 manufactured homes from the Pine Creek proposal

³ The remainder of the sites from the proposed projects (sites 1-10).

OTHER HOUSING RESOURCES

Bishop Tribe Housing Department

Local Native American tribes provide housing services, including programs for construction and rehabilitation of residences, relocation assistance, and emergency housing. Although units produced pursuant to these programs on tribal lands cannot be counted toward the RHNA, the programs provide important resources for housing production and support for affordable and emergency housing in Inyo County.



ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Housing affordability is affected by factors in both the private and public sectors. Actions by the County can have an impact on the price and availability of housing in Inyo County. Land use controls, site improvement requirements, building codes, fees, and other local programs intended to improve the overall quality of housing may serve as a constraint to housing development.

Land Use Controls

Land use and zoning regulations are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents as well as implement the policies of the General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance also serves to preserve the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods.

The Land Use Element of the Inyo County General Plan and corresponding zoning provide for a full range of residential types and densities dispersed throughout the county. Residential densities in Inyo County provide for a wide range of development from Residential High (RH), which has a minimum density requirement of 15.1 dwelling units per acre and a maximum of 24-dwelling units per acre and its corresponding zoning districts for multiple residential, to larger lot 1-acre minimum rural residential designations.

The Zoning Ordinance contains six residential districts that correspond to the residential densities established in the General Plan, plus the Mobilehome Overlay Zone (MH). The MH Overlay Zone enables the County to review mobile home placements for building code standards and some aesthetic requirements such as skirts. Further description of each zone can be found in Table 31 below.



Table 31
Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Description
Rural Residential (RR)	Intended to protect established neighborhoods of one-family dwellings and to provide space in suitable locations for additional development of this kind, with appropriate community facilities.
Starlite Estates Zone (RR-0.5)	Provides suitable areas and appropriate environment for low density, single-family rural residential uses, where certain agricultural activities can be successfully maintained in conjunction with residential uses. The RR (rural residential) 0.5 acre-Starlite Estates zone is intended to be applied to the area known as Starlite Estates and adjoining private lands which may be without fully developed services.
One Family Residence (R-1)/RMH	Intended to protect established neighborhoods of one-family dwellings and to provide space in suitable locations for additional development of this kind, with appropriate community facilities.
Multiple Residential (R-2)	Intended to protect established neighborhoods of such dwellings and to provide space suitable in appropriate locations for additional housing developments of duplexes.
Multiple Residential (R-3)	Provides a zone classification for those areas designated for multiple residential development beyond that permitted by the R-2 zoning district. It is intended to provide locations for multiple-housing developments such as apartments, townhouses, condominiums and mobile home parks.
Mobilehome Overlay Zone (MH)	Provides flexibility as to the use of mobile homes as a single-family residential dwelling in various areas of Inyo County. The MH overlay zone is intended to enable the County to selectively permit mobile homes depending on circumstances and the character of existing development, and planning studies indicating the appropriate type of mobile home use in various areas of Inyo County. The MH overlay zone is expected to be applied in the rural communities, special service centers, and other residential areas of Inyo County.

Source: Inyo County Code, 2009



HOUSING ELEMENT

Tables 32 and 33 below show the development standards for each residential land use and zoning designation. Residential densities range from less than 1 dwelling unit per acre in the Residential Ranch, Residential Estate, and Rural Residential designations to between 15.1 and 24 units per acre in the Residential High designation. The maximum height limit for residential units in the R-2 and R-3 zones under the Residential Medium High and Residential High designations allows up to 3 stories or 40 feet, which is appropriate for population centers where higher density development is encouraged in a rural area such as Inyo County. Parking standards for single-family require two off-street parking spaces per unit. The requirements are appropriate for a rural county and are considered vital to preserving the county's character. Therefore, considering the variety of land use and zoning designations provided by the County's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, the development standards displayed in the following two tables do not constrain housing development.



Table 32
General Plan Land Use Designations for Residential and Commercial Uses

General Plan					Zoning		
Land Use Designation	Label	Residential Density (du/acre)	Non-residential Intensity (FAR)	Minimum Parcel Size (Acre)	District	Label	Minimum Lot Size
Residential							
Residential High	RH	15.1–24.0	N/A	N/A	Multiple Residential	R-3	10,000 sq. ft.
Residential Medium-High	RMH	7.6–15	N/A	N/A	Multiple Residential	R-2	6,500 sq. ft.
					Multiple Residential	R-3	10,000 sq. ft.
					Single Residential or Mobilehome Combined	RMH	Varies (5,800 sq. ft. typical)
Residential Medium	RM	4.6–7.5	N/A	N/A	One Family	R-1	1 acre
					Single Residential or Mobilehome Combined	RMH	Varies (5,800 sq. ft. typical)
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.
Residential Low	RL	2.0–4.5	N/A	N/A	One Family	R-1	1 acre
					Single Residential or Mobilehome Combined	RMH	Varies
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.
Residential Very Low	RVL	2.0	N/A	0.5	One Family	R-1	None
					Single Residential or Mobilehome Combined	RMH	Varies
					Starlite Estates	RR-0.5 Starlite	0.5 acre



HOUSING ELEMENT

General Plan					Zoning		
Land Use Designation	Label	Residential Density (du/acre)	Non-residential Intensity (FAR)	Minimum Parcel Size (Acre)	District	Label	Minimum Lot Size
Residential Rural High	RRH	1.0	N/A	1.0	Rural Residential	RR	1 acre
					One Family	R-1	1 acre
					Single Residential or Mobilehome Combined	RMH	Varies
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.
Rural Residential Medium	RRM	0.4	N/A	2.5	Rural Residential	RR	1 acre
Residential Estate	RE	0.2	N/A	5	Rural Residential	RR	1 acre
Residential Ranch	RR	0.1	N/A	10	Rural Residential	RR	1 acre
Commercial							
Central Business District	CBD	7.6–24.0	1.00	N/A	Central Business	CB	10,000 sq. ft.
Retail Commercial	RC	7.6–24.0	0.40	N/A	General Commercial and Retail	C-1	10,000 sq. ft.
					Highway Services and Tourist Commercial	C-2	10,000 sq. ft.
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.
Heavy Commercial/Commercial Service	HC	7.6–24.0	0.40	N/A	Heavy Commercial	C-4	10,000 sq ft.
Resort/Recreational	REC	0.4–24.0	0.40	2.5	Open Space	OS	40 acres
					Commercial Recreation	C-5	5.0 acres
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.
					Misc.	Misc.	Misc.

Source: Inyo County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan.



TABLE 33
ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Development Standard	RR	RR-0.5	R-1	R-2	R-3	RMH
Minimum Lot Width	125 ft	100 ft	50 ft	50 ft	75 ft	50 ft
Front Yard Setback	50 ft	25 ft	25 ft	25 ft	15 ft ³	25 ft
Interior Side Yard Setback ²	20 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft ¹	5 ft
Street Side Yard Setback ²	20 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft ¹	5 ft
Rear Yard Setback ²	30 ft	25 ft	20 ft	20 ft	15 ft	20 ft
Maximum Building Height of Primary Structures ¹	2.5 stories	2.5 stories	2.5 stories	3 stories (or 40 ft)	3 stories (or 40 ft)	2.5 stories
Parking	2 sp/du	2 sp/du	2 sp/du	2 sp/du	2 sp/du; 1 guest sp/4 du	2 sp/du

Source: Inyo County Code, 2009; Land Use Element of General Plan

¹ 5 feet for one-story. An additional 5 feet per story is required for multi-story projects.

² Accessory structures (other than second dwelling units) may encroach into required side and rear yards in the rear half of the property, provided that at least a 5-foot setback from the property line is maintained. In the R-3 zone, no rear yard setback is required. In the RMH zone, primary structure encroachments may be permitted into the rear yard under specified circumstances.

³ Exceptions apply.



Provision for a Variety of Housing Types

The Housing Element must identify adequate sites that are available for the development of housing types for all economic segments of the population. Part of this identification is evaluating the County's Zoning Code and its provision for a variety of housing types. Housing types include single-family dwellings, duplexes, guest dwellings, mobile homes, group residential homes, multiple unit dwellings, convalescent homes, accessory structures, supportive housing, and single-room occupancy units. Table 34 below summarizes the housing types permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited under the County's Zoning Code.

The Zoning Ordinance permits residential development in the county's non-CB commercial districts as an accessory use. In the CB zone, multi-family uses are conditionally permitted and mixed-use is permitted by right. A single dwelling unit is allowed in the commercial and industrial zones as an accessory use if occupied by the owner, lessee, caretaker, or watchman of the business. Mobile home parks are also permitted in the C-5 zone. The County has approved an ordinance to conditionally permit multiple dwellings and mixed uses in the remaining non-CB commercial zones.

Table 34
Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District

Housing Types	RR	RR-0.5	R1/RMH	R-2	R-3	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	CB
Single-Family Attached	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ³	C ¹
Single-Family Detached	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ²	C ¹
Duplexes	NP	NP	NP	P	P	C	C	C	C	C	C
3 & 4-plexes	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	C	C	C	C	C	C
Multi-family (< 15 units)	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	C	C	C	C	C	C
Multi-family (>15 units)	NP	NP	NP	NP	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Mobile Homes	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ³	C ¹
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	P	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ²	P ³	C ¹
Second Units ⁴	C	C	C	C	P	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Emergency Shelters	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	NP
Single-Room Occupancy (SRO)	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	P	P	NP	NP	P



Housing Types	RR	RR-0.5	R1/RMH	R-2	R-3	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	CB
Transitional Housing/ Supportive Housing/ Group Homes	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*
Boardinghouse	NP	NP	NP	C	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Mobilehome Park	NP	NP	NP	C	C	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Residential Care Facility	P	P	P	P	P	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP

Source: Inyo County Zoning Code, 2014 updates

P = Permitted Use

C = Conditional Use

A = Accessory Use

NP = Not permitted

P* = Transitional housing and supportive housing are permitted in the same manner as other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone (Government Code Section 65583(a)(5)). ¹ Conditionally allowed when: A detached residential dwelling unit, if it is for occupancy by the owner or lessee of the business premises on the same parcel, or by a caretaker or watchman.

² A dwelling unit within a business building may be qualified as an accessory use if it is for occupancy by the owner or lessee of business premises therein, or by a caretaker or watchman, provided that a minimum fifty percent of the usable floor area is being utilized for the principal permitted use.

³ As an accessory use: dwellings of persons regularly employed on the premises for commercial recreational activities. Mobile homes may be used for this purpose.

⁴ Although the Zoning Code conditionally permits second units in residential zones, the County does not enforce the CUP requirement..

Density Bonus Overlay Zoning District

The State enacted significant changes to the density bonus law, which allows developers to build residential projects at greater densities than the General Plan allows if such projects include low- and moderate-income housing units. Based on the recommendations of the (1) 2004 Housing Element Update, (2) 2005 Eastern Sierra Housing Assessment, and (3) Inyo County Housing Task Force, Inyo County’s Density Bonus Overlay Zone District (Inyo County Code Chapter 18.65) was amended accordingly in 2007. Some of the most basic differences between the County’s previous density bonus provisions and the updated version include the following:

- The new ordinance allows for densities up to 35-percent above regular zoning, while the previous ordinance allowed for densities only up to 25-percent above regular zoning.
- The new ordinance is more “stepped” in its approach to density calculations than the existing ordinance, allowing a greater range of density possibilities.
- The new ordinance also allows developers increased densities in exchange for donated land to the County, rather than requiring them to actually construct



affordable housing units as part of a development. The donated land would be used for affordable housing.

- The new ordinance allows increased densities if child care facilities are constructed as part of a development.
- The new ordinance requires that the affordable units shall “be reasonably dispersed throughout the development” and shall be comparable in number of bedrooms and exterior appearance to the other units in the proposed development.

Central Business Zoning District

The County’s General Plan update, which was adopted in 2001, included provisions to allow for mixed and residential uses in commercially designated areas. Subsequently, the County implemented the General Plan’s direction to permit such uses in the Central Business (CB) District land use designation. This action instituted a new CB zoning district in the hearts of Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, and Keeler that conditionally permits multiple dwellings and permits mixed uses by right. The ordinance creating the new CB zoning district regulations and amending the County’s zoning maps accordingly was adopted in early 2007, and it is current.

Multiple Dwellings and Mixed Uses in Commercial Zoning Districts

The County’s General Plan and Zoning Code have been updated to include provisions to allow for mixed and residential uses in commercially designated areas.

Constraints to Housing for Persons with Disabilities (Community Care Facilities Act SB 520)

Inyo County recently updated its Zoning Code with a process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for reasonable accommodation with respect to zoning, permit processing, or building laws. The Planning Director may administratively approve requests for modification to certain standards with regard to reasonable accommodation. The County Building and Safety Division is also responsible for ensuring that all building permit applications for new construction meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the California Disabled Accessibility Guidebook (CalDAG). Additionally, any permits for renovation or structure modification require that the structure be brought into conformance with ADA and CalDAG.

Senate Bill 812 (Persons with Disabilities)

In January 2011, California housing element was amended by SB 812. This new law requires an analysis of the special housing needs of persons with disabilities, including an estimate of the number of persons with developmental disabilities, an assessment of their housing needs, and discussion of potential resources. SB 812 defines a "developmental disability" as a continuing disability that originates before an individual becomes 18 years old, and includes Mental Retardation, Cerebral Palsy, Epilepsy, and Autism.



The Housing Element contains Policy 6.2 - Reasonable Accommodation that ensures the availability of reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities to make modification or exception to the rules, standards, and practices for the siting, development, and use of housing or housing-related facilities in an effort to eliminate barriers to equal opportunity to housing of their choice. The County has also updated its Zoning Code to address reasonable accommodation.

Zoning and Land Use

In effort to remove any zoning or land use regulations that may inhibit the development of housing and facilities for disabled persons the County update its Zoning Code with language addressing reasonable accommodation. Also, the 2004 update of the Zoning Code reviewed and modified the County's policies to ensure compliance with fair housing law, including occupancy standards. These are still relevant in this 2014 update.

The Zoning Code does not provide residential parking standards for persons with disabilities that differ from the County's regulated parking standards. However, exceptions to the parking requirements may be granted in conjunction with any discretionary development permit, including a reduction in parking requirements for special needs housing.

Inyo County has made efforts to remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities by providing flexibility as to the location of group homes, adult day care homes, and residential care homes and facilities. Residential care facilities for 6 persons or less must be permitted without discretionary review in all residential zones. In an effort to ensure compliance with SB 520, the County has updated the Zoning Code to allow residential care facilities for 6 or fewer persons by right in all residential zones.

Permits and Processing

The County strives to remove any permitting and processing barriers for persons with disabilities by ensuring that requests to retrofit homes for accessibility comply with ADA and CalDAG, and meet all of the development and building standards in Title 24.

Building Codes

The County uses the Uniform Building Code as its local building code as mandated by the State Attorney General. The County has not made amendments to this code that might diminish the ability to accommodate persons with disabilities.

The county had over 1,741 residents living with a disability according to the 2012 American Community Survey and 74 with Developmental Disabilities per the HCD data. To better accommodate the needs of this population and provide for persons with disabilities seeking fair access to housing in the application of its zoning and building regulations, the County has incorporated a reasonable accommodations ordinance into the Zoning Code per Program 6.2.1. This ordinance will provide a means of requesting exceptions to the zoning and building regulations that may be a barrier to fair housing opportunities. Additionally, the County has amended the Zoning Code to allow residential care facilities for 6 or fewer persons in all residential zones as permitted uses (reference Program 5.4.1).



State Requirements Regarding Fire Hazards

Senate Bill 1241 Section 66474.02 was added to the Government Code on September 13, 2012. 66474.02. It requires that before approving a tentative or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, the legislative body of a County make three findings regarding areas located in either a state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone, these findings include:

- (1) A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the design and location of each lot in the subdivision, and the subdivision as a whole, are consistent with any applicable regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.
- (2) A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through any of the following entities:
 - (A) A county, city, special district, political subdivision of the state, or another entity organized solely to provide fire protection services that is monitored and funded by a county or other public entity.
 - (B) The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection by contract entered into pursuant to Section 4133, 4142, or 4144 of the Public Resources Code.
- (3) A finding that to the extent practicable, ingress and egress for the subdivision meets the regulations regarding road standards for fire equipment access adopted pursuant to Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code and any applicable local ordinance.
 - (b) This section shall not supersede regulations established by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection or local ordinances that provide equivalent or more stringent minimum requirements than those contained within this section.

These new requirements have already affected the County's ability to subdivide land, as the findings have proven impossible to meet due to the County's very rural nature and the fact that the Fire Districts in the County are all volunteer organizations. This makes providing additional facilities and firefighters extremely difficult. Currently, no subdivision applications affected by SB-1241 include those that have been identified in this updated Housing Element for meeting the County RHNA, the County anticipates, however, that the fire findings could be an issue until there are changes or clarifications in SB-1241.

Second Residential Units

To ensure compliance with AB 1866 and to mitigate the constraints to the development of second residential units, the County amended the Zoning code allow for second dwelling units as permitted uses, in all Residential Zones, which will allowed second unit applications to be ministerially reviewed for conformance with the minimum allowable standards under AB 1866.

Emergency Shelters, Transitional and Supportive Housing

The County has also updated the Zoning Code to allow transitional housing as a permitted use in all residential zones and emergency shelters as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone – Highway Services and Tourist Commercial (C2). This complies with Senate Bill 2 (SB 2) that was signed into law effective January 1, 2008. Additionally, transitional and supportive housing types must be considered residential uses and be subject only to the restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. Both “transitional” and “supportive” housing must be explicitly defined as they are in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 50675.2 and 50675.14, respectively. Transitional housing may take many forms, including group housing or multi-family



units, and may provide supportive services for its recipients but with a limited stay of up to 6-months. Supportive housing is more permanent in nature, is linked to either on-site or off-site services, and is occupied by a target population as defined by Health and Safety Code 53260 such as persons with AIDS, low-income persons with mental disabilities, person recovering from substance abuse, or persons with chronic illnesses.

To comply with SB 2, the County has expanded its definition of transitional housing and added a separate definition for supportive housing types to ensure clarity in the Zoning Code. Transitional and supportive housing are also listed as permitted uses in each residential zone to satisfy the requirement that these use types must be regulated the same as other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

Currently, there are 8-vacant parcels of land with the C2 Zoning designation. They range in size from about 100,000-sq-ft to 8,000-sq-ft. Any of these could be used as a whole parcel or the parcel could be partially used for emergency shelters. They also range in location and are found in Pearsonville, Olancho, Cartago, and there are several in Bishop. This indicates there is potential for emergency shelters to be built on each end of the County and in the most populated area – Bishop.

Extremely Low-Income Households

Assembly Bill 2634 (AB 2634) (Lieber, 2006) requires the quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of extremely low-income households. The County's existing need is documented in Table 19 and its projected need is 18-units, which is half of its official very low-income allocation as discussed in the RHNA section. Housing Element updates must also identify zoning to encourage and facilitate housing for extremely low-income households. These housing types tend to be supportive housing and single-room occupancy units (SROs). As noted in the discussion of transitional and supportive housing above, Program 2.3.1 addresses the County's need to facilitate supportive housing types.

In an effort to facilitate the development of housing for extremely low-income households and comply with AB 2634, the County has explicitly listed single-room occupancy unit as a use type in the updated Zoning Code. SROs are typically meant for occupancy by one person as they are small (200–250 square feet) and may include food preparation or sanitary facilities, or both. The update includes SROs has a permitted use in the C1, C2, C3 and CBD Zones.

Fees and Exactions

Inyo County charges various fees and assessments to cover the cost of processing permits and providing certain services and utilities. Table 35 summarizes the County's fee requirements for residential development. These fees are considerably lower than fees charged in most jurisdictions throughout the state. Fees do not impose an unreasonable burden upon applicants, as Inyo County has one of the lowest fee structures in the state.

Table 35
Inyo County Typical Fees for a Typical Residential Development



TYPICAL FEES FOR TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT		
FEE CATEGORY	FEE AMOUNT	
PLANNING AND APPLICATION	Single-Family	Multifamily
Plan Check	\$50	\$50
Conditional Use Permit – A conditional use permit is required by the County for Multi-family structures over 15-units (R-3 zone)	Not Typical	\$1,490
SUBDIVISION		
Certificate of Compliance	\$1,000	\$1,000
Parcel Merger	\$415	\$415
Parcel Map	\$1,800	\$1,800
Tract Map	\$2,325	\$2,325
ENVIRONMENTAL		
Initial Study	\$500	\$500
Negative Declaration	\$600	\$600
Environmental Impact Report	Cost deemed by estimate	Cost deemed by estimate
IMPACT		
List typical fees, e.g., Police, fire, water and sewer, etc.	N/A	N/A



On-/Off-site Improvement Standards

The County does not currently charge the type of impact fees common in many municipalities. Instead, it requires each land developer to mitigate only the problems that their subdivision or project creates. For example, if a subdivision is located in an area where drainage may be an issue, the developer is required to mitigate the problem so that it will not adversely affect surrounding properties. For roads, the County's requirements are based on Caltrans requirements which specify only those on- and off-site improvements necessary to maintain an efficient and safe road system.

The exclusion of costly impact fees effectively reduces the cost of developing housing in Inyo County. More specifically, the County subdivision ordinance requires 60-foot street widths for local and collector streets, with curbs, gutters and sidewalks (40 feet with a waiver). However, "rolled curbs" are permitted, and the Planning Commission often waives requirements for sidewalks where circumstances warrant, such as in lower density developments. The County also provides flexibility in these requirements for affordable housing projects. Circulation improvements in mobile home parks are governed by Title 25, which allows for gravel roads and reduced street widths, resulting in lower development costs.

In addition to County fees charged at the time building permits are issued, fees for sewer and water connections and school impact fees are collected by each individual district. These fees vary widely by district according to the services they provide, individual financial and project objectives, and the special circumstances of each district. The fees these districts charge are not under the control of the County.

Typical Processing and Procedures by Project Type

The evaluation and review process required by a jurisdiction's procedures may contribute to the cost of housing in that holding costs incurred by developers are ultimately manifested in the unit's selling price. However, Inyo County's processing and fee structure is easier and less expensive than most. The following describes typical time requirements for project processing in Inyo County (costs are shown above in Table 35).

For Single Family Dwellings

Plan Check Review: A plan check review is conducted by the planning department and typically takes about one week. It is reviewed for zoning and general plan compliance, including height, setbacks, use and environmental factors.

Ministerial Building Permit: The review of a ministerial building permit typically takes between two days and two weeks. For new homes, building permits typically can be reviewed and approved in two to three weeks. The permit is reviewed by both the Building and Planning Departments before final approval.

Tentative Tract Map: The approval process for a tentative tract map requires 45 to 90 days with a negative declaration or 120 days if an environmental impact report (EIR) is required. The process involves five steps:

1. The tentative tract map is submitted to the Planning Department and distributed to the Subdivision Committee and other required agencies.



2. The Subdivision Committee reviews the maps and formulates their recommendation.
3. A negative declaration (or EIR) is prepared.
4. Planning staff reviews the issues presented by the Subdivision Committee and environmental documentation, and makes their recommendation to the Planning Commission.
5. The Planning Commission hears public testimony on the proposed action and approves or denies the tentative tract map. The applicant then has 2-years to complete and submit the Final Map.

Conditional Use Permit and Variance: Forty-five to 60-days is a typical time frame needed for the Planning Commission's final action on both a conditional use permit and variance. The approval process for a conditional use permit and variance is similar to a tentative tract map. After the pre-application discussion with the applicant and review of the initial application, either a negative declaration or EIR is prepared, if the project is not deemed exempt. Planning staff uses this information to formulate their recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission action becomes final after a 15-day appeal period.

For Multi-Family Dwellings

Plan Check Review: A plan check review is conducted by the planning department and typically takes about one week. It is reviewed for zoning and general plan compliance, including height, setbacks, use and environmental factors.

Ministerial Building Permit: The review of a ministerial building permit typically takes between two days and two weeks. For new multi-family homes, with less than 15-units, building permits typically can be reviewed and approved in two to three weeks. The permit is reviewed by both the Building and Planning Departments before final approval.

Tentative Tract Map: The approval process for a tentative tract map requires 45 to 90 days with a negative declaration or 120 days if an environmental impact report (EIR) is required. The process involves five steps:

1. The tentative tract map is submitted to the Planning Department and distributed to the Subdivision Committee and other required agencies.
2. The Subdivision Committee reviews the maps and formulates their recommendation.
3. A negative declaration (or EIR) is prepared.
4. Planning staff reviews the issues presented by the Subdivision Committee and environmental documentation, and makes their recommendation to the Planning Commission.
5. The Planning Commission hears public testimony on the proposed action and approves or denies the tentative tract map. The applicant then has 2-years to complete and submit the Final Map.

Conditional Use Permit and Variance: Forty-five to 60-days is a typical time frame needed for the Planning Commission's final action on both a conditional use permit and variance. The approval process for a conditional use permit and variance is similar to a tentative tract map. After the pre-application discussion with the applicant and review of the initial application, either a negative declaration or EIR is prepared, if the project is not deemed exempt. Planning staff uses this



information to formulate their recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission action becomes final after a 15-day appeal period.

A conditional use permit is required for multi-family dwellings over 15-units in the R-3 Zone. In most other cases, regarding multi-family housing with less than 15-units, a conditional use permit is not typical. When a Conditional Use Permit is required

Per ICC 18.81.110, the findings required for a Conditional Use Permit include:

The planning commission shall receive, hear and decide every application for a conditional use, and after the hearing may authorize approval as to zoning if it finds that the use is properly located as specified and otherwise it shall disapprove the same.

Per ICC 18.81.100, this would be based on:

Certain uses, referred to in this title as conditional uses, are declared to possess characteristics which require special appraisal by the planning commission in each instance, to determine whether or not the use is necessary or desirable and will be properly related to other uses and to transportation and service facilities in the vicinity, and whether or not the use would, under all the circumstances of the particular case, affect adversely the health or safety of persons living or working in the vicinity or be materially detrimental to the public welfare.

Building Codes and Enforcement: Inyo County enforces the California State Building Codes. These codes are considered to be the minimum necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare. No amendment to the code has either been initiated or approved which directly affects housing standards or processes.

Enforcement of the UBC is delegated to the County's Building and Safety Division and is carried out at the plan review stage and at the time of building/site inspection. All work for which a building permit is issued must be inspected at the time of completion or at specified stages of construction.

Inyo County primarily enforces housing code violations through inspections performed on a complaint basis. Where code citations are issued, property owners are given a reasonable time frame in which to correct deficiencies.

ANALYSIS OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Fees, site improvement costs, processing and permit procedures, building codes, land use controls, availability of public services, and environmental considerations are necessary considerations but do not impose significant constraints to development in Inyo County in comparison to non-governmental factors such as limited private land resources and high housing costs in relation to incomes. These variables are national in scope and widely recognized. The discussion below focuses on these non-governmental and market constraints to housing development.

Land Costs

While land costs in Inyo County are well below highly urbanized areas, the scarcity of privately owned land has resulted in inflated land values (especially in northern Inyo County). The most significant constraint to provision of additional housing opportunities in Inyo County is the lack of privately owned land.



**Table 36
Inyo County Land Costs by Area**

Location	Average 1992	Range 1992	Average 2003	Range 2003	% Change (1992- 2003)	Average 2009	Range 2009	% Change (2003- 2009)
Independence, Fort Independence, Aberdeen, Big Pine, Knight Manor, Rolling Green, Lone Pine	\$25,370	\$9,364 to \$61,200	\$49,084	\$21,000 to \$123,000	48.31%	\$80,000	\$60,000 to \$120,000	63%
Alabama Hills	\$49,040	\$26,520 to \$153,000	\$120,967	\$48,000 to \$164,900	59.46%	\$245,000	\$150,000 to \$400,000	103%
Wright's 40 Acres	\$79,798	\$45,900 to \$156,060	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$180,000	\$150,000 to \$300,000	N/A
Mustang Mesa, Alta Vista	\$27,100	\$20,400 to \$30,600	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$170,000	\$160,000 to \$180,000	N/A
Dixon Lane, Meadowcreek, Laws	\$50,633	\$18,025 to \$66,300	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$180,000	\$130,000 to \$210,000	N/A
Bishop, Rocking K	\$65,257	\$33,293 to \$142,800	\$187,834	\$38,922 to \$123,000	188%	\$180,000	\$160,000 to \$300,000	-4%
Starlite	\$49,623	N/A	\$155,000	N/A	67.99%	\$250,000	\$225,000 to \$275,000	61%
Wilkerson, Sierra Grande	\$38,587	\$25,500 to \$71,910	\$128,460	\$15,000 to \$314,000	233%	\$150,000	\$120,000 to \$200,000	17%
Aspendell	\$31,582	\$20,400 to \$85,000	\$92,750	\$42,000 to \$240,000	194%	\$185,000	\$130,000 to \$300,000	99%
Mountain View	\$25,775	\$25,500 to \$26,010	\$69,900	N/A	171%	\$140,000	\$130,000 to \$150,000	100%
Cartago, Olancho, Sage Flat	\$10,790	\$4,162 to \$21,848	\$27,300	\$500 to \$168,000	153%	\$10,000	\$5,000 to \$40,000	-63%
Keeler	\$3,500	N/A	\$9,267	\$6,000 to \$14,000	N/A	\$15,000	\$10,000 to \$24,000	61%
Darwin	\$4,903	\$2,448 to \$9,364	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$4,000	\$4,000	N/A
Trona area, Homewood Canyon, BLM Tract	\$9,282	\$2,500 to \$17,687	\$1,600	\$300 to \$3,935	82%	\$5,000	\$5,000 to \$20,000	213%
Shoshone, Tecopa	\$8,041	\$4,590 to	\$7,500	\$7,000 to	-7%	\$20,000	\$15,000 to	167%



Location	Average 1992	Range 1992	Average 2003	Range 2003	% Change (1992- 2003)	Average 2009	Range 2009	% Change (2003- 2009)
		\$14,280		\$8,000			\$30,000	
Pahrump Valley, Sandy Valley, Stewart Valley, Resting Spring	\$5,100	N/A	\$38,375	\$30,000 to \$43,500	86.71%	\$50,000	\$40,000 to \$60,000	23.25%
Spring Valley	N/A	N/A	\$17,165	\$300 to \$34,000	N/A	\$12,000	\$5,000 to \$25,000	-43.04%
Round Valley	N/A	N/A	\$63,514	\$34,000 to \$110,000	N/A	N/A	\$80,000 to \$320,000	N/A

Source: Inyo County Application Fee Deposits, 2009; Inyo County Recorder Fee Schedule, 2009

Construction Costs (based on 2009 analysis)

Construction costs include materials, labor, construction financing, and builder profit. These costs will vary depending on structural requirements and by the quality of the construction (such as roofing materials, carpeting, cabinets, bathroom fixtures, and other amenities). Because of these factors, it is hard to establish an absolute measure of construction cost.

Building-cost.net uses an on-line calculator to estimate the construction cost of single-family residential homes. The calculator formulates estimates using the cost estimating procedures established by the "National Building Cost Manual." The cost to construct a 1,200 square foot home with building materials slightly above the minimum needed to ensure full protection of health and safety for occupants in Inyo County is \$169,707 or \$141 per square foot. Material cost (\$95,894) represents 57-percent of the total cost estimate, labor cost (\$71,362) represents 42-percent of the total cost estimate, and equipment cost (\$2,451) represent 1-percent of the total cost estimate. Compared with the average construction cost of new homes in the state, construction cost in Inyo County is approximately \$22,500 less. In California, the average construction cost for new homes is \$192,200.

Custom homes and units with extra structural requirements or amenities can run much higher. Lower costs can be achieved by reducing amenities and using less costly building materials, decreasing construction financing costs, and use of alternative construction methods such as manufactured housing or mobile homes. Additional savings can be realized through use of mass production methods; this can be of particular benefit when density bonuses are used for the provision of affordable housing.

Though the County does not have much control over market conditions, lower housing costs can be achieved by encouraging (a) reduction in amenities and quality of building materials (above a minimum acceptability for health, safety, and adequate performance); (b) availability of skilled



construction crews who will work for reasonable wages; and (c) use of manufactured housing (including both mobile home and modular housing).

An additional factor related to construction costs is the number of units built at the same time. As the number of units developed increases, construction costs over the entire development are generally reduced based on economies of scale. This reduction in costs is of particular benefit when density bonuses are used for the provision of affordable housing.

Infrastructure Constraints

Another factor adding to the cost of new construction is the cost of providing adequate infrastructure including major and local streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, water and sewer lines, and street lighting. In many cases, these improvements are dedicated to the County which is then responsible for their maintenance. The cost of these facilities is borne by developers and added to the cost of new housing units. These expenses are eventually passed on to the homebuyer or property owner.

The remaining vacant lands available for residential development in Inyo County are few due to large land holdings by governmental agencies. Much of the development in unincorporated Inyo County is dependent on adequate on-site sewer (septic tank-leach line systems) and water systems (wells). In some areas of the county, on-site systems cannot operate correctly or there is inadequate water in terms of quantity and quality. Those areas are identified as the following:

Mustang Mesa Area

Located 8-miles northwest of Bishop on Highway 395, the Mustang Mesa Community Service District has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Inyo County Environmental Health Department requiring engineered on-site wastewater treatment systems and annual monitoring of the aquifer due to geological properties in the area.

Wilkerson Area

In the Wilkerson Area, 5-miles south of Bishop and west of Highway 395, variable soils and geological conditions affect water supply regularity and on-site wastewater treatment systems (e.g., faults, poor percolation), and individual lots are evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Darwin

Located southeast of Owens Dry Lake and Lone Pine, the community of Darwin is experiencing a limited water supply which restricts any significant growth.

Alabama Hills

Alabama Hills serves as a bedroom community of Lone Pine. Some parcels are affected by high water tables, which can alter on-site wastewater treatment requirements.

Cartago

In the north portion of Cartago, small lot sizes can inhibit development due to on-site wastewater treatment requirements. The result is that in most cases several lots need to be combined to accommodate the on-site wastewater treatment system and a well.

Availability of Financing

Interest rates are determined by national policies and economic conditions, and there is little that local governments can do to affect these rates. Although Inyo County cannot affect interest rates charged by lending institutions, they can assist developers of low cost housing in finding more favorable financing, such as financing through the Community Reinvestment Act. According to



lending institutions in the county, most homebuyers will secure a mortgage with an interest rate between 4.5 and 8 percent, depending on the financial position of the mortgage applicants.

Environmental Constraints

Some land in Inyo County is unavailable for development because of environmental features. These features either pose a hazard to those who may choose to build in the area or diminish valuable resources. As a result, County regulations limit development in these areas because of the danger involved. Environmental constraints to development include the following:

- **Geologic Hazards** – Landslide and avalanche areas and other geologic hazards may pose a threat to property and lives. County policy discourages development in these areas to ensure the public's safety; however, the County does not prohibit development in avalanche areas, as demonstrated by Tract 2 in Aspendell.
- **Soils with Low Permeability Rates** – Many parts of the county are not served with public sewer systems and therefore must rely on septic systems. In some parts of the county, non-engineered septic systems cannot be used because the soils have low permeability rates which prevent effective operation of septic tank systems.
- **Excessive Slope** – In areas of 30 percent slope, improvements for accessibility, site preparation, and sewage disposal are very difficult.
- **Endangered Species** – In some areas of the county, private land is situated within endangered or threatened species habitats. Development within these areas requires mitigation measures that may be costly to implement.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Inyo County has adopted and implemented Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations through its Building and Safety Department. This allows the County to apply the most up-to-date energy conservation standards to all new residential buildings (and additions to residential buildings) except hotels, motels, and buildings with four or more habitable stories. The regulations specify energy-saving design for walls, ceilings, and floor installations, as well as heating and cooling equipment and systems, gas cooling devices, conservation standards, and the use of non-depleting energy sources, such as solar energy or wind power.

Opportunities for additional energy conservation practices include the implementation of “mitigation measures” contained in environmental documents prepared on residential projects in Inyo County. The energy consumption impacts of housing developments may be quantified within the scope of these reports, prepared by or for the County. Mitigation measures to reduce energy consumption may be proposed in the appropriate section of the reports. These mitigation measures, in turn, may be adopted as conditions of project approval.

Although the new standards seem extensive and costly, builders and consumers realize that the benefits in energy savings over the long run outweigh the initial cost, especially in climates like Inyo County's. Utilities now account for a substantial amount of the total monthly cost of maintaining a house. Building energy-efficient homes and encouraging weatherization programs will over time reduce residents' monthly housing expenses.



Zoning Ordinance 18.79 governs the installation of small wind energy conversion systems in the unincorporated portion of the county. The ordinance is designed to allow residents to take advantage of generating power via wind while ensuring that the placement and installation of wind energy conversion systems does not have an adverse impact on public health and safety.

The county also encourages small-scale renewable energy facilities in the Government Element and provides for streamlined permitting for small-scale, such as roof-top solar energy generation.

Energy Conservation Programs for Low-Income Households

Southern California Edison (SCE) operates numerous programs that are available to assist low-income families with conserving energy and reducing expenditures for electricity. The High Bill Helper provides for rebates for new air conditioners, refrigerators, swamp coolers, and pool pumps. The Energy Star Lighting program provides compact fluorescent bulbs. Through its Energy Management Assistance program, SCE pays for purchase and installation of certain appliances for income-qualified applicants. SCE's CARE and FARE programs provide for utility bill reductions for income-qualified applicants as well. Additionally, local SCE staff will undertake on-site energy audits upon request to advise how to reduce energy consumption and associated costs.

LADWP has similar programs to help with rebates for inefficient appliances and assistance for low-income rate payers through its Lifeline program. LADWP staff will also provide energy audits upon request.



CHAPTER FOUR: REVIEW AND REVISE

For the Housing Element update in 2014, the County has relied on the extensive work done for the 2009 update by the housing task force. The Inyo County Board of Supervisors established the Inyo County Valley Housing Task Force in January 2005. The Task Force met in two housing workshops, including a joint workshop with Mono County, and in nine regular meetings. They invited presentations from housing and finance experts, developers, and affordable housing providers. They reviewed local and state reports and statistics regarding housing issues, discussed and debated numerous topics, and held four additional meetings. The result was a Housing Plan and the formation of a Housing Plan Committee to pursue the objectives of the Plan. The outcome of this committee's efforts was the receipt of a HOME grant and the revision of the County Density Bonus Overlay Zoning District. Currently the County manages four HOME grant loans.

Many of the implementation measures were not fully realized due to a lack of staff or appropriate funding or because the service was not requested. One example of this is the rehabilitation program, which was not initiated due to a lack of staff and funding for this type of program. However a local nonprofit housing assistance provider has a weatherization program that is active and the County supports their efforts. Other examples include the mobile home purchase program, which was not an issue during the planning period; housing choice vouchers, which the County does not administer and has little influence over how they are issued; the roommate location program, which is administered by a local nonprofit but the County continues to support when necessary; energy assistance, which the County does not provide directly but refers residents in need of assistance to utility companies and the U.S Department of Health and Human Service's Low-Income Energy Assistance Program); and constructing a rental project, which was not feasible and may not be appropriate for the County to pursue. Instead, the County has focused on land releases to increase capacity for housing opportunities.

Appendix A includes a detailed analysis of the effectiveness of the implementation measures from the 2009 Housing Element. The County's primary accomplishment regarding the Housing Element has been working with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) to release land located in the county to increase the amount of buildable land, thus increasing the capacity for residential development in the county, which facilitates development of housing for all income levels. Another major accomplishment was the reclassification of the Central Business (CB) zone in the County Code to allow for mixed and residential uses, thus increasing the residential development capacity throughout the county. In addition, amendments to the remaining commercial zones have been approved that will open up land in these zones to residential development as well. These actions will provide additional capacity for nearly 500 residential units. As stated previously, the result of the Housing Plan Committee was a HOME award, which was used for four first-time homebuyer activities between 2005 and 2008.

Another important change was the revision of the County's Density Bonus Ordinance, which was updated in 2007. It includes guidelines for one, two or three concessions for affordable housing: one concession for housing developments that include at least 5-percent of the total units for very low-income households, at least 10-percent for lower-income households, or at least 10-percent for moderate-income households in a common interest development; two concessions for housing developments that include at least 10-percent of the total units for very low-income households, at least 20-percent for lower-income households, or at least 20-percent for moderate-income



HOUSING ELEMENT

households in a common interest development; three concessions for projects that include at least 15-percent for very low-income households, at least 30-percent of the total units for lower-income households, or at least 30-percent for persons or families of moderate income in a common interest development.

In many cases, the essence of existing programs has been continued but may have been combined with other programs or the language may have been modified to better reflect the County's role in the housing market and to focus on the tools it has at its disposal to facilitate the development of housing affordable to all income levels.



CHAPTER FIVE: HOUSING PROGRAM

This section of the Housing Element contains goals and policies the County has adopted and will continue to implement as practicable to address a number of important housing-related issues. Six major issue areas are addressed by the goals and policies of the Housing Element: (1) maintain the supply of sound, affordable housing through the conservation of existing sound housing stock; (2) provide adequate sites for housing; (3) ensure that a broad range of housing types are provided to meet the needs of both existing and future residents; (4) increase opportunities for homeownership; (5) remove constraints to the development of affordable housing; and (6) promote equal opportunity of housing choice for all residents. Each issue area and the supporting goals and policies are identified and discussed in the following section. Implementation measures identifying the time frame in which each policy will be implemented and the responsible entity follows the discussion of each program.

GOALS AND POLICIES

Maintenance and Preservation of Housing

Existing housing conditions vary considerably throughout Inyo County. Although much of the housing stock may be sound, there are many dwelling units that are dilapidated or require substantial repairs. As the County's housing stock continues to age, ongoing maintenance is vital to prevent widespread deterioration. The Housing Element focuses on expanding rehabilitation efforts by pursuing available federal and state funds to upgrade and maintain the County's housing stock.

Goal 1.0 - Maintain the existing housing stock and eliminate substandard housing conditions in Inyo County.

Policy 1.1 - Housing Rehabilitation Funding

The County shall seek additional federal and state funds for housing rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.

Program 1.1.1: The County supports the provision of rehabilitation assistance to lower-income owner and renter-occupied households to facilitate unit upgrading. The County will encourage initiation of a rehabilitation program with the goal of improving 15-units over the planning period (3 per year).

Funding: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). The County shall encourage financing housing rehabilitation efforts and affordable housing construction. To do this, the County shall consider and if appropriate complete grant applications for CDBG and possibly HOME funds at least twice during the planning period. Research available state funds on an annual basis as Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) is released.

Responsible Party: County Planning Department

Time Frame: Twice during the planning period 2014 - 2019 as appropriate and as NOFAs are released.



Policy 1.2 - Housing Rehabilitation Code Enforcement

The County shall advocate the rehabilitation of substandard residential properties by homeowners and landlords.

Program 1.2.1: The County shall ensure sensitive residential code enforcement and provide information on available rehabilitation assistance to bring substandard residential structures and neighborhoods into compliance with County Codes and to be improved to meet current fire safe ordinances pertaining to access, water flow, signing, and vegetation clearing. Fire safety is also enforced by the County Building and Safety officials as a required element of their inspections of new buildings and is commonly an element of subdivision applications.

Funding: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). The County shall encourage financing housing rehabilitation efforts and affordable housing construction. To do this, the County shall consider and if appropriate, complete grant applications for CDBG and possibly HOME funds. Research available state funds on an annual basis and pursue as appropriate (as Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) is released).

Responsible Party: County Planning Department

Time Frame: 2014-2019 as NOFAs are released

Policy 1.3 - Housing Rehabilitation Education

The County shall promote increased awareness among property owners and residents of the importance of property maintenance to long-term housing quality and fire safety.

Program 1.3.1: The County shall continue to provide outreach programs to educate the public about available housing rehabilitation assistance and fire safety issues.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Annually according to program funding availability

Policy 1.4 - Energy Efficiency

The County will focus efforts to promote energy efficiency by supporting programs such as weatherization and utility assistance programs that alleviate energy costs for households. The County shall maintain its webpage dedicated to energy efficiency education and programs.

Program 1.4.1: The County shall continue to support efforts to improve the energy efficiency of dwelling units by providing weatherization assistance to low-income households.

Funding: CDBG, LIHEAP



Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers, Southern California Edison, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 1.4.2: The County shall work to provide assistance to low-income households with utility bills by encouraging utilities and local housing service providers to continue to implement and expand programs to assist such households, including reductions and other utility assistance programs for income-qualified candidates. Augment current program funding.

Funding: CDBG, LIHEAP

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers, Southern California Edison, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 1.4.3: The County shall continue to encourage utility providers and local housing service providers in reducing housing cost through energy conservation by providing households with light bulbs, reduced price energy-efficient appliances, energy audits, and other services.

Funding: Southern California Edison

Responsible Party: Housing service providers, Southern California Edison, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)

Time Frame: Ongoing

Provision of Adequate Sites

Less than 2-percent of the land in Inyo County is available for development due to large public land holdings. Limited land resources severely restrict the amount of residential development that is able to occur in the county. The County will need to play an active role in identifying land suitable for new housing.

Goal 2.0 - Provide adequate sites for residential development.

Policy 2.1 -Vacant and Underutilized Land

The County shall facilitate the development of vacant and underutilized residential parcels identified in the Housing Element residential site inventory.

Program 2.1.1: The County shall maintain an up-to-date inventory of sites suitable for residential development and provide this information to residential developers and to the real estate community. This inventory will include DWP land release sites.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County



Time Frame: Ongoing

Housing Opportunities

Inyo County encourages the construction of new housing units to ensure that an adequate housing supply is available to meet the County's existing and future needs. Providing a balanced inventory of housing in terms of unit type (single-family, mobile home, multi-family, etc.), cost, and location will allow the County to fulfill a variety of housing needs.

Goal 3.0 - Encourage the adequate provision of housing by location, type of unit, and price to meet the existing and future needs of Inyo County residents.

Policy 3.1 - Variety of Housing

The County shall continue to identify and evaluate the best approaches to providing a variety of residential development opportunities in the county including single-family homes, mobile homes, second units, and apartments to fulfill regional housing needs.

Program 3.1.1: The County shall continue to work with DWP, BLM, the Forest Service and other federal, state, and local agencies to identify appropriate land for release, thus enabling the County to provide additional sites for housing development. Additionally, the County will continue to coordinate with various Tribal Councils to pursue development of affordable housing units on reservations.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers, Tribal Councils, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), DWP, Forest Service

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 3.1.2: The County shall provide expanded affordable housing opportunities by partnering with local organizations and providing technical assistance and/or pass-through funds as appropriate for the development of units affordable to extremely low, very low, or low-income households.

Funding: Available State, Federal, and local funds (HOME, MHP, CDBG, etc.)

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing as opportunities arise

Program 3.1.3: The County will explore an Employer Assisted Housing Program by forming a working group with major employers in the area to discuss how the County can assist in the development of employer-assisted housing in Inyo County.

Funding: Planning Department Budget; available state, federal, and local funds (HOME, MHP, CDBG, etc.)

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers



Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 3.1.4: The County will continue to implement the final Housing Plan developed by the Housing Task Force adopted in 2005 in conjunction with the Housing Element programs.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 3.1.5: The County shall support local housing assistance providers to work to assist in locating roommates to share existing housing. This will be accomplished by contributing to funding and assisting in program outreach to expand program utilization.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing

Policy 3.2 - High Density Housing

The County shall encourage the development of higher density housing in appropriate locations throughout the communities. Locate higher density residential development within close proximity to services, jobs, transit, recreation, and neighborhood shopping areas.

Program 3.2.1: The County shall encourage higher density residential development in areas of population concentration by conducting outreach to developers and property owners to encourage higher density residential development. In addition, the County will explore funding options for appropriate housing as funds become available.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing basis as development applications are processed

Program 3.2.2: The County shall encourage development of housing for low-income households through provision of density bonus incentives. The County shall provide the updated density bonus chapter of the code as requested to inform applicants of opportunities for density increases.

Funding: Planning Department Budget (development fees)

Responsible Party: County, local community agencies, local nonprofit organizations

Time Frame: Ongoing



Policy 3.3 - Second Units

Encourage the development of second units as another way to promote housing opportunities for lower-income households.

Policy 3.4 - Manufactured and Mobile Homes

The County will continue to promote the utilization of manufactured housing and mobile home purchase and placement as an affordable homeownership opportunity.

Program 3.4.1: The County shall provide technical assistance to mobile home park residents who want to purchase their mobile home park. To accomplish this, the County will advertise the program to mobile home park residents, including conducting meetings with tenants.

Funding: Planning Department Budget, Mobilehome Park Resident Ownership Program (MPROP)

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing on an as-needed basis and as NOFAs for MPROP are released

Program 3.4.2: The County will continue to allow manufactured housing as a permitted use in all residential zones.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Ongoing

Policy 3.5 - Financial Assistance for Housing

Provide financial assistance for the conservation and/or development of housing affordable to extremely low, very low, and low-income households.

Program 3.5.1: The County will support the efforts of local housing service providers to assist low-income households with utility bills by providing assistance to a minimum of 150-households annually through the LIHEAP (Low-income Energy Assistance Program).

Funding: State Department of Economic Opportunity, CSBG

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 3.5.2: The County shall encourage rental subsidies for lower-income families and elderly persons. The County shall encourage listing of rental units with local housing service providers. Coordinate with HCD to receive additional subsidies for rental assistance.



Funding: HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers

Responsible Party: County, Stanislaus Housing Authority

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 3.5.3: The County shall provide for the continued affordability of the County's low and moderate-income housing stock. Although not anticipated, if any deed-restricted affordable units currently serving County residents are at risk of converting to market rates, the County will facilitate a preservation program with the owner and/or operator of the project at risk. The goal will be to identify additional funds to either continue the affordability of the at-risk project or to replace those units once they are no longer affordable to lower-income households.

Funding: HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers

Responsible Party: County, Stanislaus Housing Authority

Time Frame: Ongoing

Homeownership

The option of homeownership in California has become a privilege which is often not available to lower-income households or potential first-time homebuyers. Rising construction and land costs due to the scarcity of land for residential development in Inyo County have greatly contributed to the cost of housing. In addition, interest rates can exclude certain households from qualifying for loans. The County will continue to help facilitate the creation of affordable homeownership opportunities in its jurisdiction.

Goal 4.0 - Provide increased opportunities for homeownership.

Policy 4.1 - Self-Help

The County shall encourage "self-help" housing to allow lower-income households to build their own homes.

Program 4.1.1: The County will continue to make efforts to coordinate with established self-help housing groups to solicit interest in developing projects in the county to facilitate self-help housing as a form of homeownership for lower-income households.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing

Policy 4.2 - Purchase Assistance Programs

The County will facilitate the availability of home purchase assistance programs for low and moderate-income households.



Program 4.2.1: The County will consider, as appropriate, applying for state and federal grant funds to provide homeownership opportunities that may include interest rate write-downs, down payment assistance, and mortgage revenue bond financing through state and federal programs.

Funding: Planning Department Budget, CDBG, HOME

Responsible Party: Planning Department

Time Frame: Ongoing, with a goal of completing at least one project benefiting low income households.

Program 4.2.2: The County shall coordinate with local lenders to provide program information to the public about homebuyer assistance programs such as CalHFA, RCRC, and USDA.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers

Time Frame: Ongoing

Removal of Constraints on Housing Development

Governmental and non-governmental constraints to development can impede both the supply and affordability of housing. Certain governmental constraints can be minimized to facilitate new construction.

Goal 5.0 - Remove governmental constraints on housing development.

Policy 5.1 - Residential in Commercial Areas

Encourage the development of residential units in commercial areas.

Program 5.1.1: The County shall continue to allow second units, condominium conversions, density bonuses, and residential units in commercial zones as specified in the County's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: Planning Department

Time Frame: Ongoing

Program 5.1.2: The County's 2001 General Plan calls for the provision of mixed and residential uses in commercial areas. The County has already completed a reclassification of commercial areas in the county and will continue to encourage mixed and residential uses in these areas.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: Planning Department



Time Frame: Ongoing

Policy 5.2 - Expedited Permit Processing and Project Review

The County shall continue to expedite project review and facilitate timely building permit and development plan processing for residential developments, including those with an affordable housing component.

Program 5.2.1: The County routinely works with homeowners to expedite their permits and provide flexibility in submittal requirements for owners developing their own homes. The County will also annually review its permit and development plan processing timelines and look for ways to expedite or simultaneously conduct development reviews to ensure timely processing.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Annually and ongoing as projects are submitted for review

Program 5.2.2: The County shall consider alternative processes in updates to the Zoning Ordinance to facilitate housing projects, such as administrative approvals of use permits and modifications to setbacks and other development standards, and/or other procedures to otherwise expedite and encourage residential development.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Concurrently with Zoning Ordinance updates

Policy 5.3 - Infrastructure

The County will work to provide adequate infrastructure to accommodate residential development in all areas of the unincorporated county.

Program 5.3.1: The County shall facilitate provision of infrastructure to accommodate residential development where such actions are at least revenue-neutral and consistent with Land Use Element Goals and Policies.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Annually and ongoing as projects are submitted for review

Policy 5.4 - Residential Care Facilities



The County will continue efforts to mitigate or remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Ongoing

Accessibility of Housing

In order to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, the County must ensure equal and fair housing opportunities are available to all residents.

Goal 6.0 - Promote equal opportunity for all residents to reside in housing of their choice.

Policy 6.1 - Equal Opportunity

The County shall work to prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of housing with regard to race, ethnic background, religion, handicap, income, sex, age, or household composition.

Program 6.1.1: The County shall take positive action to assure unrestricted access to housing. The County will continue to support local housing service providers to provide fair housing services and assist in program outreach.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County, local housing service providers, Stanislaus Housing Authority

Time Frame: Ongoing

Policy 6.2 - Reasonable Accommodation

Ensure the availability of reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities, including developmental disabilities to make modification or exception to the rules, standards, and practices for the siting, development, and use of housing or housing-related facilities in an effort to eliminate barriers to equal opportunity to housing of their choice.

Funding: Planning Department Budget

Responsible Party: County

Time Frame: Ongoing

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Housing Element law requires quantified objectives that establish the maximum number of housing units by income category that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over a five-year time period. These objectives include private activity as well as County-planned activity.



Table 37
Quantified Objectives

Task	Income Level					Total
	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Fair Share Allocation	18	17	25	28	72	160
Residential Permits Issued Since January 1, 2014	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Construction Objectives	18	17	25	28	72	160
Rehabilitation	0	5	5	5	0	15 ¹
Preservation (at-risk)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	17	25	28	72	160

Source: HCD, 2014 and Inyo County Planning Department, 2014

¹ Per Program 1.1.1, the County will encourage the rehabilitation of approximately 15 units over the planning period.



Appendix A Housing Program Review

2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.1</i> The County supports the provision of rehabilitation assistance to lower-income owner- and renter-occupied households to facilitate unit upgrading. The County will encourage initiation of a rehabilitation program with the goal of improving 15 units over the planning period (3 per year). Funding: CDBG</p>	2014–2019	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County did not initiate a rehabilitation program during the planning period due to a lack of staff and funding for this type of activity. A local community agency administers a weatherization program in the county and that program assists an average of 72 units per year.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to support local housing assistance providers’ efforts when called upon but is unable to initiate its own rehabilitation program at this time.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.2</i> The County shall ensure sensitive residential code enforcement and provide information on available rehabilitation assistance to bring substandard units into compliance with County Codes and to meet current fire safe ordinances.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County coordinated a series of task forces to educate the public and stakeholders about housing programs, including housing rehabilitation (weatherization) assistance.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to support outreach efforts for rehabilitation, fire safety or weatherization efforts in the county.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.3</i> The County shall continue to provide outreach programs to educate the public about available housing rehabilitation assistance and fire safety. Funding: HCD</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County works with local non-profits and other governmental agencies to raise awareness of housing rehabilitation, fire safety, and weatherization programs.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to support outreach efforts for rehabilitation or weatherization efforts in the county.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.4</i> The County shall continue to support efforts to improve the energy efficiency of dwelling units by providing weatherization assistance to low-income households. Funding: HUD Section 8 Certification and Housing Vouchers</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County does not provide funding for this activity but if a need for this service arises, the County would refer inquiries to local housing service providers. The County coordinated a series of task forces to educate the public and stakeholders about housing programs, which may have included roommate location assistance.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: This program will be continued.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.4</i> The County shall work to provide assistance to low-income households with utility bills by encouraging utilities and local housing service providers to continue to implement and expand programs to assist such households, including reductions and other utility assistance programs for income-qualified candidates. Augment current program funding. Funding: State of California Older Americans Act, CDBG</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: According to DWP, one local housing service provider assists approximately 150 households per year through the LIHEAP (Low-income Energy Assistance Program). The utilities also provide assistance to income-qualified families. They intend to continue and expand these programs.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: This program will be continued.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 1.4</i> The County shall continue to encourage utility providers and local housing service providers in reducing housing cost through energy conservation by providing households with light</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County is not aware of the effectiveness or progress of this light bulb program. However, if possible, the County would continue to support this program if implemented. Alternatively, the County refers interested</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to support weatherization and energy efficiency efforts administered by other entities</p>



2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
<p>bulbs, reduced price energy-efficient appliances, energy audits, and other services. Funding: CDBG</p>		<p>residents to the Southern California Edison (SCE) California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA) program.</p>	<p>in the county.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 2.1</i> The County shall maintain an up-to-date inventory of sites suitable for residential development and provide this information to residential developers and to the real estate community. This inventory will include DWP land release sites. Funding: State Department of Economic Opportunity, CDBG</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: Site information was provided through the housing task forces, as well as upon request. The Planning Department provides information about property that is available for housing development upon request. The County coordinated with DWP and other public agencies for land releases of property available for housing development.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: This program is updated and will be continued.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.1</i> The County shall continue to work with DWP, BLM, the Forest Service and other federal, state, and local agencies to identify appropriate land for release, thus enabling the County to provide additional sites for housing development. Additionally, the County will continue to coordinate with various Tribal Councils to pursue development of affordable housing units on reservations. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County has worked with DWP to release lands for residential development. The County is currently working with a variety of local, state, and federal agencies to identify appropriate government lands for release. The County coordinated a series of task forces to educate the public and stakeholders about housing issues, and the tribes were among those invited to attend. The tribes work to provide affordable housing and institute programs to provide for low-cost housing and related services. The County has worked with the various agencies on the release of land. Some land was released and sold to private parties, whereas other lands did not sell at the public auction.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: Continue to work with DWP and various federal, state, and local agencies to identify appropriate government land for release. This program will continue</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.1</i> The County shall provide expanded affordable housing opportunities by partnering with local organizations and providing technical assistance and/or pass-through funds as appropriate for the development of units affordable to extremely low, very low, or low-income households. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County did apply for CDBG funding in 2013, but was not awarded. The County will continue to facilitate the application for funding with local partners.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to pursue funding opportunities as appropriate.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.1</i> The County will explore an Employer Assisted Housing Program by forming a working group with major employers in the area to discuss how the County can assist in the development of</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County was not able to make progress on this program due to the depressed economy and staff resources.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will facilitate discussions with employers regarding housing assistance.</p>



2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
<p>employer-assisted housing in Inyo County. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>			
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.1</i> The County will continue to implement the final Housing Plan developed by the Housing Task Force adopted in 2005 in conjunction with the Housing Element programs. Funding: Planning Department budget (development fees)</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress:	Appropriateness: The County will continue to provide information about the density bonus provisions to developers.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.1</i> The County shall support local housing assistance providers to work to assist in locating roommates to share existing housing. This will be accomplished by contributing to funding and assisting in program outreach to expand program utilization. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County does not provide funding for this activity but if a need for this service arises, the County would refer inquiries to local housing service providers. The County coordinated a series of task forces to educate the public and stakeholders about housing programs, which may have included roommate location assistance.	Appropriateness: This program will be continued.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.2</i> The County shall encourage higher density residential development in areas of population concentration by conducting outreach to developers and property owners to encourage higher density residential development. In addition, the County will explore funding options for appropriate housing as funds become available. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County works with land owners and develops to encourage and aid in the development of high density residential construction.	Appropriateness: This program will be continued to facilitate the provision for affordable home opportunities.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.2</i> The County shall encourage development of housing for low-income households through provision of density bonus incentives. The County shall provide the updated density bonus chapter of the code as requested to inform applicants of opportunities for density increases. Funding: Respond to NOFAs for MHP, HOME program</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County does offer a density bonus to developers. The ordinance was updated in 2007. It includes guidelines for one, two, or three concessions for affordable housing: one concession for housing developments that include at least 5 percent of the total units for very low-income households, at least 10 percent for lower-income households, or at least 10 percent for moderate-income households in a common interest development; two concessions for housing developments that include at least 10 percent of the total units for very low-income households, at least 20 percent for lower-income households, or at least 20 percent for moderate-income households in a common interest development; three concessions for projects that include at least 15 percent	Appropriateness: This program is not appropriate to continue because the County is not a developer. However, it does support the efforts of developers planning to build homes affordable to low- or moderate-income households.



2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
		for very low-income households, at least 30 percent of the total units for lower-income households, or at least 30 percent for persons or families of moderate income in a common interest development. The density bonus chapter of Title 18 of the County Code is distributed upon request.	
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.4</i> The County shall provide technical assistance to mobile home park residents who want to purchase their mobile home park. To accomplish this, the County will advertise the program to mobile home park residents, including conducting meetings with tenants. Funding: Available State, Federal, and local funds (HOME, MHP, CDBG, etc.)</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County provides information to mobile home park residents and provides referrals to HCD and other mobile home advocacy groups, as well as local real estate lenders.	Appropriateness: This program will continue as appropriate
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.4</i> The County will continue to allow manufactured housing as a permitted use in all residential zones. Funding: Planning Department budget, HOME, MHP</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: County Code allows for manufactured housing in all residential zones.	Appropriateness: The program will be continued.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.5</i> The County will support the efforts of local housing service providers to assist low-income households with utility bills by providing assistance to a minimum of 150 households annually through the LIHEAP (Low-income Energy Assistance Program). Funding: Pursue FmHA funds</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County works with local non-profit recipients of LIHEAP funding to continue this program	Appropriateness: This program will be continued.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.5</i> The County shall encourage rental subsidies for lower-income families and elderly persons. The County shall encourage listing of rental units with local housing service providers. Coordinate with HCD to receive additional subsidies for rental assistance. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: One local housing service provider administers Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8) for the County. The County routinely refers inquiries to local housing service providers.	Appropriateness: This program will be continued.
<p><i>Implements Policy 3.5</i> The County shall provide for the continued affordability of the County's low and moderate-income housing stock. Although not anticipated, if any deed-restricted affordable units currently serving County residents are at risk of converting to market rates, the County will facilitate a preservation program with the owner and/or operator of the project at risk. The goal will be to identify additional funds to</p>	Ongoing	Effectiveness/Progress: The County works with housing developers to provide for and maintain housing, in the event that deed restricted units are at risk, the County will work to preserve the units and educate the public regarding the importance of low-income units.	Appropriateness: This program will continue



2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
<p>either continue the affordability of the at-risk project or to replace those units once they are no longer affordable to lower-income households. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>			
<p><i>Implements Policy 4.1</i> The County will continue to make efforts to coordinate with established self-help housing groups to solicit interest in developing projects in the county to facilitate self-help housing as a form of homeownership for lower-income households. Funding: Planning Department Budget, CDBG</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County routinely works with potential housing developers to increase housing supply. The County coordinated a series of task forces to educate the public and stakeholders about housing issues, which were open to self-help housing groups.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The County will continue to provide homeownership information to county residents.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 4.2</i> The County will annually consider applying for state and federal grant funds to provide homeownership opportunities that may include interest rate write-downs, down payment assistance, and mortgage revenue bond financing through state and federal programs. Funding: Planning Department budget</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County did not directly apply for any funding to construct new rental housing for low-income households.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: This program will be continued.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 4.2</i> The County shall coordinate with local lenders to provide program information to the public about homebuyer assistance programs such as CalHFA, RCRC, and USDA.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County works with local lenders, real estate professional and housing providers to provide information to the public on loan opportunities available.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The program will continue.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 5.1</i> The County shall continue to allow second units, condominium conversions, density bonuses, and residential units in commercial zones as specified in the County's Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: Zoning code allows for all of these affordable options to be available to County residents.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: The program will be continued.</p>
<p><i>Implements Policy 5.1</i> The County routinely works with homeowners to expedite their permits and provide flexibility in submittal requirements for owners developing their own homes. The County will also annually review its permit and development plan processing timelines and look for ways to expedite or simultaneously conduct development reviews to ensure timely processing.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Effectiveness/Progress: The County routinely works with homeowners to expedite their permits and provides flexibility in submittal requirements for owners developing their own homes. Typical processing times are relatively short. County staff attempt to do all plan processing as efficiently as possible. A planner is assigned to a project when it is first submitted as follows it through permitting to minimize some inefficiency.</p>	<p>Appropriateness: This program will continue.</p>
<p>COMPLETED PROGRAMS</p>			
<p>Chapter 633 of the Statutes of 2007, also known as SB 2, requires jurisdictions to allow for</p>	Completed		



2009 Housing Program	Time Frame	Accomplishments	Continue/Modify/ Delete
<p>permanent emergency shelters as a permitted use in at least one zone. This zone may be residential, commercial, or industrial but must be appropriate for this type of use and not be completely built out. In accordance with SB 2, the County will evaluate the most appropriate zone to permit shelters and amend the County Code accordingly within one year of the adoption of this Housing Element.</p>			
<p>According to Chapter 633 of the Statutes of 2007, also known as SB 2, the County must explicitly allow both supportive and transitional housing types in all residential zones. The County shall update its Zoning Ordinance to include separate definitions of transitional and supportive housing as defined in Health and Safety Code Sections 50675.2 and 50675.14. Both transitional and supportive housing types will be allowed as a permitted use subject only to the same restrictions on residential uses contained in the same type of structure.</p>	Completed		
<p>To ensure zoning flexibility that allows for the development of single-room occupancy (SRO) units, the County will update its Zoning Ordinance to explicitly allow for SROs in developed areas near services and transit.</p>	Completed		
<p>Chapter 1062 of the Statutes of 2002, also known as AB 1866, requires jurisdictions to allow second units ministerially in all residential zones. The County will amend the County Code to reflect this requirement while maintaining its current standards for second units that require a floor area of up to 30 percent of the principal dwelling unit up to a maximum of 1,200 square feet.</p>	Completed		
<p>Currently residential care facilities are permitted with a conditional use permit in the RR and R-3 zones. Pursuant to Chapter 671 of the Statutes of 2001, also known as SB 520, the County will amend the County Code to allow flexibility for the location of residential care facilities by permitting facilities for 6 or fewer persons by right in all residential zones.</p>	Completed		
<p>The County shall incorporate reasonable accommodation provisions into its Zoning Code to provide a means for persons with disabilities to request exceptions to zoning and building regulations that may act as a barrier to their housing choice.</p>	Completed		



This page is intentionally left blank.



Appendix B: Vacant Lands Inventory (Map of Table 29)

