

City of Jurupa Valley

Brian Berkson, Mayor . Anthony Kelly, Mayor Pro Tem .
Micheal Goodland, Council Member . Lorena Barajas, Council Member . Chris Barajas, Council Member

March 28, 2019

Robin Huntley, Housing Policy Manager
California Department of Housing & Community Development
2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

Subject: City of Jurupa Valley's Final Revised Housing Element

Dear Ms. Huntley:

With this letter, I am pleased to transmit the City of Jurupa Valley's Final Revised Housing Element to HCD.

As you know, the City adopted its 2017 General Plan and Housing Element on September 7, 2017 and staff transmitted the Housing Element to HCD for a mandatory certification review in November of 2017. We then worked with your staff over the next year to identify minor changes that would result in a determination of compliance. On October 25, 2018, the City received the attached letter from Zachary Olmstead indicating that if the changes discussed with HCD staff are made, HCD will find the element in compliance with State housing element law. Following receipt of the letter, the City began the process to initiate a general plan amendment to make the requested changes. The amendments were approved by the Jurupa Valley Planning Commission on February 27, 2019 and the Jurupa Valley City Council on March 21, 2019.

As requested, I am transmitting one hard copy and one electronic copy of the Housing Element and attachments to you, together with HCD's letter of October 25, 2018 and Jurupa Valley City Council Resolution No. 2019-17 adopting the changes.

We look forward to your confirmation of compliance of the City of Jurupa Valley's Final Revised Housing Element.

Sincerely,



Mary P. Wright, AICP
General Plan Program Manager

cc: Brian Berkson, Mayor
Gary Thompson, City Manager
Peter Thorson, City Attorney
Vicki Wasko, City Clerk
Tom Merrell, Planning Director

Attachments: October 25, 2018 Letter from Zachary Olmstead, HCD
Jurupa Valley City Council Resolution No. 2019-17
Final Amended Jurupa Valley Housing Element & Attachments

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 263-2911 / FAX (916) 263-7453
www.hcd.ca.gov



October 25, 2018

Mr. Thomas Merrell, Planning Director
City of Jurupa Valley
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Dear Thomas Merrell:

RE: Review of the City of Jurupa Valley's 5th Cycle (2013-2021) Draft Housing Element

Thank you for submitting Jurupa Valley's revised draft housing element update received for review on September 4, 2018, along with revisions received on October 22, 2018. Pursuant to Government Code, section 65585, subdivision (b), the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is reporting the results of its review. Our review was facilitated by a telephone conversation on September 19, 2018.

The revised draft housing element meets the statutory requirements described in HCD's February 22, 2018 review. The revised element will comply with state housing element law (Article 10.6 of the Government Code) when it is adopted and submitted to HCD, in accordance with Gov. Code section 65585, subdivision (g).

Public participation in the development, adoption and implementation of the housing element is essential to effective housing planning. Throughout the housing element process, the city must continue to engage the community, including organizations that represent lower-income and special needs households, by making information regularly available while considering and incorporating comments where appropriate.

Several federal, state, and regional funding programs consider housing element compliance as an eligibility or ranking criteria. For example, CalTrans Senate Bill (SB) 1 Sustainable Communities grants; the Strategic Growth Council and HCD's Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities programs; and the upcoming SB 2 Planning grant as well as ongoing SB 2 funding considering housing element compliance and/or annual reporting requirements pursuant to Gov. Code section 65400. Without a compliant housing element, Jurupa Valley may be ineligible for some funding sources.

For your information, some general plan element updates are triggered based upon housing element adoption. For example, a jurisdiction must address environmental justice in their general plans, by the adoption of a separate environmental justice element or to integrate environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives into their general plans. This requirement is applicable upon the adoption or next revision of two or more elements

concurrently on or after January 1, 2018 (Gov. Code 65302, subd. (h)). In addition, the safety and conservation elements of the general plan must include analysis and policies regarding fire and flood hazard management (Gov. Code section 65302, subd. (g)). Also, the land-use element must address disadvantaged communities (unincorporated island or fringe communities within spheres of influence areas or isolated long established legacy communities). HCD urges Jurupa Valley to consider timing provisions and welcomes the opportunity to provide assistance. For information, please see the Technical Advisories issued by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research at:
http://opr.ca.gov/docs/SB244_Technical_Advisory.pdf and
http://opr.ca.gov/docs/Final_6.26.15.pdf.

HCD appreciates the hard work and dedication Jeff Hook, Thomas Merrell, and Mary Wright provided in preparation of the housing element and looks forward to receiving the City of Jurupa Valley's adopted housing element. If you have any questions or need technical assistance, please contact Hillary Prasad, of our staff, at (916) 263-1784.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Zachary Olmstead", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Zachary Olmstead
Deputy Director

RESOLUTION NO. 2019-17

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 19002 TO AMEND THE 2017 GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT TO REFLECT CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND DETERMINING NO FURTHER CEQA REVIEW REQUIRED

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. **Project.** The City has initiated General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) the (“Project”).

Section 2. **General Plan Amendment.**

(a) Section 9.30.010.A. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that any amendment to any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan, shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 65300 *et seq.* of the Government Code, as now written or hereafter amended, and Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. No mandatory element of the General Plan may be amended more frequently than four (4) times during any calendar year, unless otherwise allowed by Government Code Section 65358. Subject to that limitation, an amendment may be adopted at any time, as determined by the City Council. Each amendment may include more than one change to the General Plan.

(b) Section 9.30.010.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for the amendment of any part of the Jurupa Valley General Plan shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.30 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(c) Section 9.30.040.B. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that the initiation of proceedings for any amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040 requires an order of the City Council, adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the entire membership of the City Council. The City Council may adopt an order initiating amendment proceedings at any time. The adoption of an order by the City Council initiating amendment proceedings does not require a public hearing and does not imply any such amendment will be approved.

(d) Section 9.30.040.C. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that either the Planning Director or the Planning Commission may recommend that the City Council adopt an order initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.040. All such recommendations must be in writing and submitted to the City Clerk for placement on the City Council agenda as a matter not requiring a public hearing.

(e) On November 15, 2018, upon recommendation by the Planning Director, the City Council ordered the initiation of proceedings for the General Plan Amendment No. 19002 by an affirmative vote of 5-0 of the City Council.

(f) Section 9.30.040.E. of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after adoption of an order of the City Council initiating proceedings for an amendment pursuant to Section 9.30.004, the amendment shall be processed, heard and decided in accordance with Sections 9.30.010 and 9.30.100 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code.

(g) Section 9.30.100(1) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that proposals to amend the Jurupa Valley General Plan, or any part or element thereof, shall be heard by the Planning Commission during a public hearing on the matter. Notice of the public hearing shall be given pursuant to Section 9.05.040 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. If the proposed amendment to the General Plan would affect the permitted uses or intensity of uses of real property, notice of the public hearing shall also be given pursuant to Section 9.05.050 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Further, Government Code Section 65353 provides that when a city has a planning commission authorized by local ordinance or resolution to review and recommend action on a proposed general plan, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing before approving a recommendation on the adoption of a general plan.

(h) Section 9.30.100(2) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation for approval or disapproval within a reasonable time, by resolution, including therein its findings, and transmit it to the City Council with a copy mailed to the applicant. A recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission cannot reach a decision within a reasonable time after closing the hearing, that fact shall be reported to the City Council and shall be deemed a recommendation to deny the proposal. Further, Government Code Section 65354 provides that the planning commission shall make a written recommendation on the adoption of a general plan, that a recommendation for approval shall be made by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the commission, and that the planning commission shall send its recommendation to the legislative body.

(i) Section 9.30.100(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that upon receipt of a recommendation of the Planning Commission on amendment of the General Plan, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing before the City Council at the earliest convenient day and shall give notice of public hearing in the same manner as notice was given of the hearing before the Planning Commission.

(j) Section 9.30.100(4) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that after closing the public hearing, the City Council shall render its decision within a reasonable time. A decision to amend the General Plan, or any part or element thereof, shall be made by resolution, which resolution shall be adopted by the affirmative vote of not less than the majority of the total membership of the City Council. The City Council may approve, modify or disapprove the recommendation of the Planning Commission; provided, however, that any substantial modification of the Planning Commission's recommendation not previously considered by the Commission must first be referred to the Commission for its recommendation.

(k) Section 9.30.100(5) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code provides that a proposal to amend any part or element of the General Plan may not be approved by the City Council until all procedures required by the Jurupa Valley CEQA implementing procedures to approve a matter have been completed.

Section 3. **Procedural Findings.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find, determine and declare that:

(a) The Project was processed including, but not limited to, a public notice, in the time and manner prescribed by State law and Jurupa Valley Ordinances.

(b) On February 27, 2019, the Planning Commission of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the Planning Commission on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the Planning Commission closed the public hearing. At the conclusion of the Planning Commission hearing and after due consideration of the testimony, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 2019-02-27-01, recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, initiate amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map to implement the 2017 General Plan Housing Element, and determine that no further CEQA review is required.

(c) On March 21, 2019, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley held a public hearing on the Project, at which time all persons interested in the Project had the opportunity and did address the City Council on these matters. Following the receipt of public testimony the City Council closed the public hearing.

(d) All legal preconditions to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

Section 4. **California Environmental Quality Act.** The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby makes the following environmental findings and determinations in connection with the approval of the Project:

(a) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City's local CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of General Plan Amendment No. 19002. City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan (SCH #2016021025) and certified by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on September 7, 2017, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein, and prepared a Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, attached hereto as Exhibit "A," in accordance with CEQA for the Project. Based on that review, the City of Jurupa Valley Planning Department has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan. All potential environmental impacts

associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(b) The City Council has independently reviewed the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and based upon the whole record before it, the Previous Environmental Document Review Determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that the Project is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because:

1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan; and

2) All potential environmental impacts associated with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and General Plan Amendment No. 19002 are adequately addressed by the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR will reduce certain impacts to a level that is less than significant.

(c) The custodian of records for the Final EIR prepared for the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council's action is based, is the Planning Department of the City of Jurupa Valley. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Department located at 8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, California 92509.

Section 5. Findings for Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19002. The City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley does hereby find and determine that General Plan Amendment No. 19002 should be adopted because:

(a) The City submitted a copy of the Housing Element of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan to HCD for a mandatory consistency review and HCD has indicated that it will certify the Housing Element if the proposed amendments are made;

(b) The Housing Element, including the proposed amendments, will guide the City's decision-making and development processes regarding housing through 2021;

(c) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the City's history, future goals, and long-term objectives;

(d) The proposed Housing Element, as amended, will be consistent with the City's goals and objectives that support the provision of a variety of housing choices for all income levels in the City; and

(e) The proposed amendments to the Housing Element are consistent with the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Section 6. **Approval of General Plan Amendment No. 19002.** Based on the foregoing, the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley hereby approves General Plan Amendment No. 19002 to amend the 2017 General Plan Housing Element to reflect changes requested by HCD.

Section 7. **Certification.** The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on this 21st day of March, 2019.



Brian Berkson
Mayor

ATTEST:



Victoria Wasko, CMC
City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE) ss.
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY)

I, Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Jurupa Valley, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-17 was duly passed and adopted at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Jurupa Valley on the 21st day of March, 2019, by the following votes, to wit:

AYES: C. BARAJAS, L. BARAJAS, BERKSON, GOODLAND, KELLY

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Jurupa Valley, California, this 21st day of March, 2019.



Victoria Wasko, CMC, City Clerk
City of Jurupa Valley

5 – HOUSING ELEMENT



Figure 5-1: New housing construction in Jurupa Valley

A. INTRODUCTION

This Housing Element identifies the housing needs and goals, policies, and programs for Jurupa Valley, and promotes expanded housing opportunities, community safety, prosperity, and quality of life for all, consistent with Jurupa Valley’s adopted Community Values Statement, included in *Appendix 8.0*.

This Housing Element was prepared to establish a strategy to meet this young City’s housing needs for all income levels, including affordable and market-rate housing. This Housing Element was prepared to meet the State of California’s 5th Cycle Housing Element Update Planning Period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021. The primary issues addressed include: 1) the provision of a decent housing in a healthy environment for all income levels, 2) affordable housing for special needs populations, 3) implementation of housing programs, 4) rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing, and 5) removal of blight. Housing is a key part of the City’s overall economic development efforts to improve and expand its housing stock, improve property values, diversify the employment base, and improve the quality of life for all residents.

This update is part of a larger effort to prepare Jurupa Valley’s inaugural General Plan. The City intends to update this element no

later than October 2021, or as required by law. All elements must remain consistent when revisions to the General Plan are complete. To ensure consistency, elements to be updated will be made consistent with the Housing Element, and any needed changes will be made to this document. In addition, as portions of the 2017 General Plan are amended following adoption, the City will periodically review all the elements to ensure that internal consistency is maintained. Housing Elements are to be reviewed and updated every 7 years, or as otherwise required under state law.

Primary Goals

- HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.
- HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special needs households.
- HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.
- HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.
- HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.

Policy and Program Sections

1. *Introduction*
2. *What's New in This Housing Element*
3. *Background*
4. *Housing Action Plan*
5. *Quantified Housing Objectives*
6. *Housing Element Goals, Policies, and Programs*
7. *Community Profile*
8. *Housing Inventory and Market Conditions*
9. *Existing Housing Needs*
10. *Housing Constraints*

Attachments

- A *Housing Sites Inventory and Analysis*
- B *Public Meetings Input*
- C *General Plan Advisory Committee Report*

B. WHAT'S NEW IN THIS HOUSING ELEMENT?

The following key findings and policy recommendations address comments received from the General Plan Advisory Body (GPAC), residents and property owners, and City decision-makers:

Continuance of the Inclusionary Housing Program

Since the last Housing Element update, housing costs in western Riverside County have risen dramatically. Inclusionary housing is a policy ensuring that a portion of new housing units are reserved for working persons of modest means who already live in or wish to move to the community, such as teachers, police and fire personnel, health care workers, sales clerks, and administrative support staff. Jurupa Valley intends to work with Riverside County to continue and update an existing Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) previously administered by the County of Riverside.

The IHP will help ensure that a portion of new housing units are affordable to working-class residents with incomes up to 80% of the area-wide median income (AMI), which is about \$65,000 per year in Riverside County in 2017. This program requires that 1 out of every 25 new units (4%) be reserved for households at the 50% AMI income level. Projects of six or more units are required to participate in the program. These affordable units must be provided on-site, off-site, or through the payment of an in-lieu fee. These fees are combined with other sources of funds, such as Low Income Tax Credit funding, and are used to assist in providing additional affordable housing opportunities in the City. The program is not expected to significantly affect market rate housing projects and will, at the same time, allow the City to address its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

Emphasis on Incentives and Grants Rather than Regulations

Generally, incentives are preferable to regulations as the means to facilitate the production of housing for all income levels. Although state law requires cities to regulate development in many respects, this Housing Element emphasizes incentives to encourage the production of lower-cost housing. Among these possible incentives are modifications to development standards, reduced development fees, expedited permit processing and direct financial assistance from in-lieu IHP fees, non-profit housing developers, and state or federal grants.

Neighborhood Improvements and Removal of Blight



Figure 5-2: Subdivision under construction, Jurupa Valley

Jurupa Valley includes nine distinct communities with varied settings, housing types, and housing needs. Some neighborhoods in the older communities of Rubidoux, Mira Loma, Belltown, and Glen Avon consist mostly of pre-1980s houses, many with deferred maintenance and code compliance issues; a lack of storm water drainage and other public improvements; and localized blighted areas caused by accumulated trash, illegal dumping, and graffiti. These conditions can discourage reinvestment in these areas, lower property values, and detract from neighborhoods' safety and appearance. It is a primary goal of this young city to reverse urban blight and improve residential neighborhood quality and pride through code enforcement, public and private capital investment, and heightened awareness and attention to community needs.

Reduce Homelessness

In the 2015 Point-In-Time Count conducted by Riverside County, 168 unsheltered, homeless individuals were documented in the City of Jurupa Valley. After the City of Riverside, this is the second highest number of homeless persons among incorporated and unincorporated areas in Riverside County. Most of the homeless persons are residing in and near the Santa Ana River Basin, which runs along the City's east and south boundaries. As described in *Appendix 13.0*, the causes of homelessness are varied and complex, and not readily resolved. In addition to complying with SB 2 regarding suitable zoning for a homeless shelter (the City has already set aside a zone that allows homeless shelters without discretionary review), the Housing Element includes a program calling for the City to actively work with neighboring jurisdictions to achieve regional cooperation to reduce homelessness.

Increased Emphasis on Energy-Efficient Development

In the years since the last Housing Element update, energy costs have risen dramatically, and it has become clear that we must take steps as a society to make more efficient use of our natural resources. While local governments are limited in the impact they can have in this area, there are some significant steps cities can take to support this goal. The Housing Element contains new policies encouraging sustainable design and resource conservation in both new construction and remodeling projects.

C. BACKGROUND

The Housing Element of the General Plan is only one facet of a City's planning program. The *California Government Code* requires that General Plans contain an integrated, consistent set of goals and policies. This Housing Element helps shape and is influenced by policies contained in the other nine Elements of this General Plan; particularly the Land Use Element, which establishes the location, type, intensity, and distribution of land uses throughout the City, and by the Mobility Element, which establishes policies for the movement of people, goods, and services throughout the City.

State Housing Element Requirements

State law requires the preparation of a Housing Element as part of a jurisdiction's General Plan (*California Government Code* §65302(c)). It is the primary planning guide for local jurisdictions to identify and prioritize housing needs and to determine ways to meet these needs best while balancing community objectives and resources. The 2017 Housing Element consists of ten sections, including: 1) Introduction, 2) Housing Inventory and Market Conditions, 3) Housing Needs, 4) Housing Constraints, and 5) Housing Action Plan. *Attachment A* in this Housing Element contains background details regarding the City's inventory of sites for housing development.

The California State Housing Law (*California Health and Safety Code*, Division 13, Part 1.5) and guidelines adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), were used in the preparation of the element (*California Government Code* §65585). Periodic review of the element is required to evaluate 1) the appropriateness of its goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goals, 2) its effectiveness in attaining the City's housing goals and objectives and 3) the progress of its implementation (*California Government Code* §65588).

The preparation of the Housing Element is regulated by Title 7, Chapter 3, Article 10.6, §65580 through §65589.8 of the *California Government Code*. The law governing the contents of Housing Elements is among the most detailed of all elements of the General Plan. According to Section 65583 of the *Government Code*, "The Housing Element shall consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The housing element shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, and emergency shelters, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community."

Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan

This Housing Element builds upon the other General Plan elements and is consistent with the policies and proposals set forth in them. By law, general plans must be internally consistent. Therefore, proposed amendments to any element must be evaluated against the other General Plan elements to ensure that no conflicts occur.

The Housing Element was last updated as part of the Riverside County General Plan in 2008. When the City of Jurupa Valley incorporated in 2011, the new City adopted the County's General Plan, including the Housing Element. The 2017 Housing Element is the City's first locally prepared housing element and is being developed as part of its new 2017 General Plan.

Housing must be viewed in a context that includes more than the availability of adequate shelter. External factors affecting the adequacy of housing include the quality of public services, aesthetics and visual characteristics, and proximity to related land uses. For example, the location of housing often determines the extent of school, park, library, police, fire, and other services associated with housing.

Housing Element Organization

The Housing Element is divided into ten sections. The first two sections provide an overview of the contents, scope, and purpose of the Housing Element. The third and fourth sections summarize the City's Action Plan to address housing needs and issues and lay out the City's housing construction objectives. The fifth and sixth sections contain the City's housing goals and policies and the programs to implement these goals and policies. The seventh and eighth sections contain the Community profile and the Housing Inventory and Profile, which provides an overview of population, employment, and housing characteristics in Jurupa Valley. The ninth and tenth sections describe the City's housing needs, opportunities, and constraints.

In addition, this element addresses the mandatory housing element sections required under state law, as summarized below.

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints related to meeting these needs.
- An analysis and program for preserving assisted housing developments.
- A statement of community goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing.

- A program that sets forth a 5-year schedule of actions that the City is undertaking, or intends to undertake, in implementing the policies set forth in the Housing Element.

Public Participation

Public participation was an essential part of the preparation of the Housing Element update. The update process provided residents and other interested parties numerous opportunities for review and comment. During preparation of this element, public participation and input was actively encouraged in a number of ways. The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was particularly valuable in developing housing policies and programs, particularly with regard to identifying community values, housing needs and priorities. For example, GPAC identified the City's diverse housing stock as one of Jurupa Valley's greatest assets. Members cited the City's mix of new and established residential neighborhoods, its mix of housing types and costs, and the mix of semi-rural, large-lot residential areas with conventional suburban neighborhoods as positive housing assets. Primary housing needs were identified as: 1) affordable housing, particularly for seniors and first-time homebuyers; 2) quality multi-family housing, including apartments and condominiums; and 3) large lot homes suitable for equestrian/animal keeping. In terms of multi-family housing, most Committee members felt it should: 4) be located close to jobs, commercial centers, and major thoroughfares, and 5) include high-quality patio or garden homes near parks. In terms of meeting special housing needs, Committee members generally supported: 6) more senior housing, including independent living and assisted living centers; 7) housing for homeless persons; and 8) safe housing for single heads of households and children. Committee members also identified several areas where mixed-use housing might be appropriate, including: 9) along Mission Boulevard; 10) in old town Rubidoux and Glen Avon; 11) near retail centers; and 12) near the Metrolink Station and freeway access areas. This input formed the basis of Policies 1.2, 1.6, 1.8, 2.2, 2.7, and Programs 1.1.5, 1.1.13, 1.1.15, 2.1.1, 2.1.3. and 4.1.2, among others.

The outreach effort included:

- Early in the update process, the City held eight public workshops to solicit community ideas, concerns, and perspectives on planning issues in Jurupa Valley, including housing. Workshops were held throughout the City at various times to reach a wide audience, and a broad cross section of residents was represented. A summary of the input received is included in *Attachment 5B*.
- The City Council appointed an ad hoc General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) to work with staff and consultants in



Figure 5-3: Community planning meeting

developing the 2017 General Plan. During that 1-year-long effort, the 31-member Committee reviewed a wide range of general plan issues, including housing—during its monthly public meetings. The Final Report of GPAC’s findings and recommendations is included as *Attachment 5C*.

- The Planning Commission conducted a study session to review existing policies in the 2011 Housing Element and identified those that should remain, should be modified, or were no longer relevant to the City and should be deleted.
- On February 18, 2016, the City Council and the Planning Commission held a joint study session on the Housing Element. The public meeting included an introduction to the Housing Element and key housing issues in Jurupa Valley. Minutes from the meeting are included as *Attachment 5B*.
- A public workshop on the City’s housing conditions, issues, and needs was held on March 10, 2016. Over 150 housing agencies, advocates, non-profits, business and real estate groups, and interested citizens received direct mail notice. A summary of topics discussed and input received is included as *Attachment 5B*.
- The Planning Commission and City Council held over 40 advertised public meetings on the Draft 2017 General Plan, during which land use, housing, and/or community needs and concerns were discussed.

Announcements of all Housing Element committee meetings and public hearing notices were published in the local newspaper in advance of each meeting, typically in Spanish and English, as well as posting the notices on the City’s website. The draft Housing Element was made available for review at City Hall, and posted on the City’s website. The document was also circulated to housing advocates and nonprofit organizations representing the interests of lower-income persons and special needs groups. After receiving comments on the draft Housing Element from the California Department of Housing and Community Development a proposed final Housing Element was prepared and made available for public review prior to adoption by the City Council.

Evaluation of the Previous Housing Element

Per *California Government Code §65588*, “Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate all of the following: (1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal; (2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community’s housing goals and objectives; And

(3) The progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementation of the housing element.”

The City of Jurupa Valley incorporated on July 1, 2011 and adopted the County of Riverside Housing Element at that time. As a recently incorporated city, Jurupa Valley did not adopt a new 4th Cycle housing element after incorporation, and received a time extension to complete its first locally prepared General Plan and Housing Element. Consequently, the City has not completed a review of the previous housing element.

D. HOUSING ACTION PLAN

An important component of the Housing Element is the City’s description of what it hopes to achieve during the current planning period. This is accomplished with a statement of goals, policies, actions, and quantified objectives on the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing to help meet the housing needs of all residents. The legislative requirements for what must be included in the Action Plan are as follows:

- Improvement and conservation of housing, including affordable housing stock [§65583(b) and §65583(c)(4)];
- Production of housing as set forth in the goals and quantified objectives [§65583(b)];
- Assist in the development of housing to meet the needs of very low, low and moderate income households [§65583(c)(2)];
- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints [§65583(c)(3)];
- Adequate sites for housing [§65583(c)(1)];
- Adequate provision of housing for existing and projected needs, including regional share, for all economic segments of the community [§65583(c)];
- Promotion of equal housing opportunities for all persons [§65583 (c)(6)];
- Preserve assisted housing at risk of converting to non-low income uses [§65583(c)(6)].

This section of the Housing Element presents the City’s Housing Action Plan for the period 2014-2021. The objectives and actions described in *Table 5.1* below reflect the assessment of the City’s housing needs and summarize Housing Element programs, responsible parties, and anticipated time frames for their implementation. Time frames are intended to be achieved unless determined by the City Council to be infeasible due to budget or staffing constraints.



Figure 5-4: Housing construction in Jurupa Valley

Table 5.1: Housing Action Plan Summary

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Goal HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.			
Ensure that the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map designate sufficient land at appropriate densities and in appropriate locations to accommodate the City's fair share of regional housing needs.	HE 1.1.1. General Plan and Zoning Amendments. Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 16 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs. The Land Use Map will be amended concurrently with the 2017 General Plan. Zoning Ordinance amendments shall be initiated within 1 year of adopting the new General Plan.	Planning Department	Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.
Provide incentives to encourage development of Opportunity Sites and adaptive reuse of properties in all Residential Zones, with emphasis on Medium-High, High, Very High, and Highest Density Residential zones.	HE 1.1.2. Housing Authority Coordination. Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the non-profit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.		Ongoing, 2017-2021
Encourage construction of multi-family housing affordable to moderate and lower income households.	HE 1.1.3. Tax Exempt Bonds. Consider using tax-exempt revenue bonds to help finance new multi-family construction.		
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 1.1.4. Mobile Homeowner Assistance. As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.		
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.5. Affordable Housing Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).		Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Maintain consistency with state law and encourage production of smaller, affordable housing where appropriate.	HE 1.1.6. Density Provisions. Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.	Planning Department	Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of General Plan adoption, whichever comes first. CDBG and HOME funds coordination is annual and ongoing.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.7. City Development Fees. Develop a sliding scale Fee Assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).		
Utilize grant funding to assist in the development of affordable housing and to improve neighborhoods.	HE 1.1.8. CDBG and HOME Funds. When available, use CDBG; HOME and other grant or housing trust funds to write down costs of acquiring sites and to offset infrastructure and construction costs for residential developments in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).		
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.9. Site Identification. Work with public, private and non-profit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.		
	HE 1.1.10. Residential Incentive Zone (R-6). Update and continue to encourage development of affordable housing in the R-6 zone, and other multi-family residential zones, where appropriate. Utilize incentives for development as established in Ordinance 348, or in the 2017 General Plan and subsequent Zoning Ordinance amendments.		
Assist developers, decision makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.	HE 1.1.11. Updated Land Use Inventory and Map. Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City's GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.		Ongoing, 2017-2021
Assist developers, decision-makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.	HE 1.1.12. Candidate Sites. Encourage developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.		

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Establish a shelter to help meet local needs for safe housing for homeless adults and children.	HE 1.1.13. Homeless Shelter. In cooperation with non-profit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley's and adjacent communities' homeless shelter needs. Consider tax incentives and other financial incentives to encourage homeless shelter development.	Planning Department	Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 18 months of Housing Element certification, whichever comes first.
Address the broad range of needs of homeless persons.	HE 1.1.14. Homelessness Strategy. Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services.		
Provide government incentives to promote creative, private- and public sector housing products, particularly for lower income households.	HE 1.1.15. Creative Housing Solutions. Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called "tiny houses," and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers.		
Encourage and coordinate activities of non-profit housing providers in Jurupa Valley.	HE 1.1.16. Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers. Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for moderate and lower income households.		City will consult with non-profit housing providers at least annually and on an on-going basis as part of its annual HOME and CDBG outreach.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.	HE 1.1.17. Flexible Standards. Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.		Ongoing, 2017-2021
Comply with new state law and to provide housing that meets the needs and budgets for small households, such as single parent families, adult children, seniors.	HE 1.1.18. Accessory or Second Dwelling Units. Update the Municipal Code to allow "Accessory Dwelling Units" in compliance with state law within 1 year of Housing Element adoption.		Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan, no later than within 1 years of Housing Element certification.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing, and allow for the construction or expansion of high-quality mobile home parks.	HE 1.1.19. Mobile and Manufactured Homes. Continue to allow mobile homes, modular and manufactured homes in single-family residential zones “by right,” and mobile home parks subject to a CUP, and encourage construction of new mobile home parks and manufactured housing to increase the supply of affordable dwelling units, where appropriate.	Planning Department	Ongoing, 2017-2021
Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.	HE 1.1.20. Mixed Housing Types and Densities. Encourage residential development proposals to provide a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including market rate housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.		
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.21. Accessible Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage single- and multi-family housing developers to designate accessible and/or adaptable units already required by law to be affordable to persons with disabilities or persons with special needs.		
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.22. Universal Design. Encourage “universal design” features in new dwellings, such as level entries, wider paths of travel, larger bathrooms, and lower kitchen countertops to accommodate persons with disabilities.		
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.23. Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage, and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.		
GOAL HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.			
Maintain and improve the overall quality, safety and appearance of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock.	HE 2.1.1. Infrastructure. As budget allows, City shall include sufficient resources for adequate maintenance of public facilities such as streets, sidewalks, and drainage in the City’s capital improvement program and encourage community services districts to do likewise.	Engineering and Public Works Department; Community Services Districts	Ongoing, 2017-2021
Conserve housing resources, particularly for historic resources and to provide cost- and resource-efficient, high quality affordable housing.	HE 2.1.2. Adaptive Housing Strategies. Support creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.	Planning Department	
Protect public health, safety and neighborhood quality for all persons; administer codes in a fair, consistent and community-responsive manner.	HE 2.1.3. Code Enforcement. Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.	Building and Code Enforcement Department	

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 2.1.4. Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation. Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.	Planning Department	Ongoing, 2017-2021
Offer all persons and equal opportunity to participate in planning and housing decisions that affect them.	HE 2.1.5. Bilingual Outreach. As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.		
Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.	HE 2.1.6. Monitor Assisted Units. Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.		
Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.	HE 2.1.7. Preserve At-Risk Housing Units. Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by working with the Riverside County Housing Authority or other nonprofit housing entities to 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.		
Preserve affordable housing as required by the funding agency or source of funds providing assistance to the project.	HE 2.1.8 Affordability Covenants. As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.		
Remove or mitigate governmental constraints to housing such as outmoded, unnecessary, conflicting and excessive requirements.	HE 2.1.9 Remove Government Constraints. Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the City’s density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.	Planning Department, assisted by Building and Engineering Departments	Annually, starting the second year following 2017 General Plan Update adoption.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
GOAL HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.			
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.1. Fair Housing Council. Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources.	Planning Department	Ongoing, 2017-2021
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.2. Education and Outreach. Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (also see HE 3.1.1 above).	Planning Department	
Preserve existing public housing.	HE 3.1.3. Public Housing and Rental Assistance. Encourage Riverside County to continue to maintain 300+ public housing units and continue to assist very low-income recipients in Jurupa Valley with Section 8 rental assistance vouchers.		
Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers.	HE 3.1.4. First-Time Homebuyers Assistance. Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers.		
Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers.	HE 3.1.5. Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Program. Encourage the Housing Authority to continue the Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Assistance Program, which assists potential homeowners in leasing a property while moving towards ownership at the end of 3 years.		
Accommodate new market rate housing to diversify the housing stock, increase property values, increase median income and create the elements for prosperity for all households.	HE 3.1.6. Housing Variety. Facilitate new market rate residential projects that provide a variety of housing types and densities.		
Provide safe pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle linkages between neighborhoods; promote walkability.	HE 3.1.7. Neighborhood Connectivity. Require new residential neighborhoods to interconnect with existing neighborhoods to provide for social interaction, assure pedestrian-friendly connectivity, and minimize vehicle trips.		
Ensure new multi-family housing meets the same high quality standards for safety, quality and environmental health that other housing types must meet for all income levels.	HE 3.1.8. Multi-Family Dwellings Standards. Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking that apply to single-family housing.		

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Ensure fair treatment of all persons in securing safe housing and to promote equal housing opportunities.	HE 3.1.9. Amend the Zoning Ordinance. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand housing opportunities, as required by state and federal law, including but not limited to: amending the definition of “Family,” removing the minimum distance requirement between emergency shelters, permitting multi-family development without discretionary land use approval, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and encouraging development of a variety of housing for all income levels, such as manufactured housing, rental housing, mobile homes, single-room occupancy housing, employee housing and transitional and supportive housing.		Concurrent with Zoning Ordinance update for consistency with 2017 General Plan or within 1 year of Housing Element certification, whichever comes first.
GOAL HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.			
Enhance the quality of life in all residential areas and promote residents’ active involvement in and support for neighborhood pride and improvement activities.	HE 4.1.1. Neighborhood Participation. Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.	Planning Department	Ongoing, 2017-2021
	HE 4.1.2. Neighborhood Needs. Identify specific neighborhood needs, problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.		
	HE 4.1.3. Neighborhood Improvements. As budget allows, help fund neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs, sidewalks, pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways, street trees and other public facilities to improve aesthetics, safety, and accessibility.		
Establish a pro-active code enforcement program to identify housing in need of repair and make owners aware of resources for financial assistance	HE 4.1.4. Neighborhood Pride. Working with Riverside County, CSDs and non-profit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.	Planning Code Enforcement Public Works	Within 18 months of Housing Element certification
GOAL HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.			
Conserve resources, reuse and recycle solid waste, and improve environmental sustainability.	HE 5.1.1. Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.	Building, Planning and Engineering	Ongoing, 2017-2021

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
<p>Conserve resources, reuse and recycle solid waste, and improve environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>HE 5.1.2. Energy Programs for Lower Income Households. Encourage and participate in Riverside County’s and utility providers’ programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.</p>	<p>Engineering Department, assisted by Planning and Building Departments.</p>	<p>Ongoing, 2017-2021</p>
	<p>HE 5.1.3. Energy Conservation Grants. Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.</p>		
	<p>HE 5.1.4. City Requests for Proposals. City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.</p>		
	<p>HE 5.1.5. City Facilities. Utilize energy/water saving measures in City-owned buildings and facilities, including landscaping, to meet industry sustainable design standards.</p>		
	<p>HE 5.1.6. Sustainable Design. Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.</p>		

E. QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES

The City’s quantified objectives for new construction, rehabilitation and conservation are presented in *Table 5.2*. It is the City’s overarching objective to ensure that all residents have decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing, regardless of income, and that their neighborhoods are protected from conditions that lead to blight. This element’s goals, policies, and programs are the City’s primary tools to help meet housing and neighborhood quality needs and to achieve the City’s Quantified Objectives – 2014-2021 (*Table 5.2 below*).

Table 5.2: Quantified Objectives – 2014-2021

Category	Income Category					Totals
	Ex. Low	V. Low	Low	Mod	Upper	
New Construction*	10	126	103	116	239	584
Rehabilitation	30	30	20			80
Conservation	30	30				60

*Quantified objective for new construction is for the period 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021 per the RHNA

F. HOUSING ELEMENT GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

The condition, availability, and cost of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock are of vital importance to its residents and employers, and the City’s economy as a whole. The primary housing goals are meeting housing needs for all income groups, including market rate housing needs, housing conservation and improvement, equal housing opportunity, neighborhood improvement and removal of blight, energy conservation, and housing policy implementation. Policies and programs for each goal are described below.

Goals

- HE 1 Encourage and, where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City’s share of the region’s housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.
- HE 2 Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.
- HE 3 Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.
- HE 4 Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.
- HE 5 Reduce residential energy and water use.

Policies and Programs

HE 1 – Encourage Development of Quality Housing That Meets the City’s Affordable Housing Needs

Policies

- HE 1.1 **Regional Housing Needs Allocation.** Changes to the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and Map shall provide and/or maintain sufficient land at appropriate densities to meet the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the 2014-2021 Planning Period.
- HE 1.2 **Affordable Housing.** To encourage affordable residential development on sites zoned to allow multi-family residential uses and identified in the vacant land inventory, the City will adopt development incentives and standards to encourage lot consolidation, and to allow residential development at a density of up to 25 dwelling units per acre in the Highest Density Residential (HHDR) designation, where appropriate.
- HE 1.3 **Preservation of Affordable Housing.** All residential development projects that receive City financial incentives shall be required to remain affordable, in compliance with the specific requirements of the program in which they participate.
- HE 1.4 **Availability of Suitable Sites.** Ensure the availability of suitable sites for the development of affordable housing to meet the needs of all household income levels, including special needs populations.
- HE 1.5 **Housing for Mentally Disabled.** Encourage the development of additional housing for the mentally disabled.
- HE 1.6 **Housing for Homeless Persons.** In cooperation with other cities and/or the County of Riverside, assist in the development of emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive housing for homeless persons and families.
- HE 1.7 **Self-Help Housing.** City will promote self-help housing programs (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) and, as budget allows, provide financial assistance
- HE 1.8 **Innovative Housing.** Encourage innovative housing, site plan design, and construction techniques to promote new affordable housing, improve energy efficiency, and reduce housing costs.

- HE 1.9 **Starter Housing.** Consider allowing construction of high quality “starter housing” (single-family units up to 1,600 square feet) on smaller lots in Medium-High Density and High Density zones, and consider providing incentives such as flexible development standards, permit fast tracking, and City fee reductions.

Programs

- HE 1.1.1 **General Plan and Zoning Amendments.** Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 16 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs. The Land Use Map will be amended concurrently with the 2017 General Plan. Zoning Ordinance amendments shall be initiated within 1 year of adopting the new General Plan.
- HE 1.1.2 **Housing Authority Coordination.** Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the non-profit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.
- HE 1.1.3 **Tax Exempt Bonds.** Consider using tax-exempt revenue bonds to help finance new multi-family construction.
- HE 1.1.4 **Mobile Homeowner Assistance.** As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.
- HE 1.1.5 **Affordable Housing Incentives.** Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).

- HE 1.1.6 **Density Provisions.** Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.
- HE 1.1.7 **City Development Fees.** Develop a sliding scale Fee Assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).
- HE 1.1.8 **CDBG and HOME Funds.** When available, use CDBG; HOME and other grant or housing trust funds to write down costs of acquiring sites and to offset infrastructure and construction costs for residential developments in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).
- HE 1.1.9 **Site Identification.** Work with public, private and non-profit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.
- HE 1.1.10 **Residential Incentive Zone (R-6).** Update and continue to encourage development of affordable housing in the R-6 zone, and other multi-family residential zones, where appropriate. Utilize incentives for development as established in Ordinance 348, or in the 2017 General Plan and subsequent Zoning Ordinance amendments.
- HE 1.1.11 **Updated Land Use Inventory and Map.** Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City's GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.
- HE 1.1.12 **Candidate Sites.** Encourage developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.

- HE 1.1.13 **Homeless Shelter.** In cooperation with non-profit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley's and adjacent communities' homeless shelter needs. Consider tax incentives and other financial incentives to encourage homeless shelter development.
- HE 1.1.14 **Homelessness Strategy.** Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services.
- HE 1.1.15 **Creative Housing Solutions.** Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called "tiny houses," and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers.
- HE 1.1.16 **Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers.** Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for moderate and lower income households.
- HE 1.1.17 **Flexible Standards.** Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.
- HE 1.1.18 **Accessory or Second Dwelling Units.** Update the Municipal Code to allow "Accessory Dwelling Units" in compliance with state law within 1 year of Housing Element adoption.
- HE 1.1.19 **Mobile and Manufactured Homes.** Continue to allow mobile homes, modular and manufactured homes in single-family residential zones "by right," and mobile home parks subject to a CUP, and encourage

construction of new mobile home parks and manufactured housing to increase the supply of affordable dwelling units, where appropriate.

- HE 1.1.20 **Mixed Housing Types and Densities.** Encourage residential development proposals to provide a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including market rate housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.
- HE 1.1.21 **Accessible Housing for Disabled Persons.** Encourage single- and multi-family housing developers to designate accessible and/or adaptable units already required by law to be affordable to persons with disabilities or persons with special needs.
- HE 1.1.22 **Universal Design.** Encourage “universal design” features in new dwellings, such as level entries, wider paths of travel, larger bathrooms, and lower kitchen countertops to accommodate persons with disabilities.
- HE 1.1.23 **Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons.** Encourage, and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.

HE 2 – Conserve and Improve the Housing Stock, Particularly Housing Affordable to Lower Income and Special Housing Needs Households

Policies

- HE 2.1 **Retain Housing.** Where feasible and appropriate, older, sound housing should be retained, rehabilitated, and maintained as a significant part of the City’s affordable housing stock, rather than demolishing it. Demolition of non-historic housing may be permitted where conservation of existing housing would preclude the achievement of other housing objectives or adopted City goals.
- HE 2.2 **Removal of Affordable Housing.** Discourage the removal or replacement of sound housing that is affordable to extremely low, very-low, low- and moderate income households, and avoid discretionary approvals or other municipal actions that remove or adversely impact such housing unless: 1) it can be demonstrated that rehabilitation of lower-cost units at risk of replacement

is financially or physically infeasible, or 2) an equivalent number of new units comparable or better in affordability and amenities to those being replaced is provided, or 3) the project will remove substandard, blighted, or unsafe housing.

- HE 2.3 **Public Housing.** Encourage the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue federal and state funds to modernize public housing affordable to very low and low-income households.
- HE 2.4 **Tax-Exempt Bonds.** Consider using tax-exempt private activity bonds for the financing of multi-family housing rehabilitation.
- HE 2.5 **Historic Residential Properties.** Consider adopting incentives for the preservation of historic residential structures, such as the Mills Act Program, which provides property tax relief for rehabilitation of historic properties, as well as grants for the identification of historic structures.
- HE 2.6 **Housing Rehabilitation Funding.** Pursue all available federal, state, and local funds to assist housing rehabilitation.
- HE 2.7 **Neighborhood Quality.** The condition and quality of residential neighborhoods is a key measure of a community's housing health. The City will consider and promote the safety, appearance, and quality of residential neighborhoods by preserving the fabric, amenities, spacing (i.e., building heights and setbacks), and overall character and quality of life in established neighborhoods.
- HE 2.8 **At-Risk Housing Preservation.** Work with Riverside County Housing Authority and other housing agencies to preserve the affordability of assisted housing and other affordable housing resources at risk of conversion to market rate housing utilizing federal, state, and local financing and subsidies, as City resources allow.

Programs

- HE 2.1.1 **Infrastructure.** As budget allows, City shall include sufficient resources for adequate maintenance of public facilities such as streets, sidewalks, and drainage in the City's capital improvement program and encourage community services districts to do likewise.
- HE 2.1.2 **Adaptive Housing Strategies.** Support creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential,

commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.

- HE 2.1.3 **Code Enforcement.** Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.
- HE 2.1.4 **Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation.** Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.
- HE 2.1.5 **Bilingual Outreach.** As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.
- HE 2.1.6 **Monitor Assisted Units.** Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.
- HE 2.1.7 **Preserve At-Risk Housing Units.** Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by 1) working with the Riverside County Housing Authority or other nonprofit housing entities to 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. The City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.
- HE 2.1.8 **Affordability Covenants.** As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.
- HE 2.1.9 **Remove Government Constraints.** Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the City's density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for

housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.

HE 3 – Promote Equal Housing Opportunities for All Persons

Policies

- HE 3.1 **Fair Housing Program.** Continue to support fair housing laws and organizations that provide fair housing information and enforcement.
- HE 3.2 **Housing Information.** Provide referrals to low-income households and households with special housing needs on how to obtain housing counseling, financing, and other housing information.
- HE 3.3 **Housing Opportunities for Seniors, Disabled Persons and Veterans.** Encourage and, as budget allows, help support programs and activities that promote affordable housing opportunities for seniors, disabled persons, and veterans.

Programs

- HE 3.1.1 **Fair Housing Council.** Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources.
- HE 3.1.2 **Education and Outreach.** Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (*also see HE 3.1.1 above*).
- HE 3.1.3 **Public Housing and Rental Assistance.** Encourage Riverside County to continue to maintain 300+ public housing units and continue to assist very low-income recipients in Jurupa Valley with Section 8 rental assistance vouchers.
- HE 3.1.4 **First-Time Homebuyers Assistance.** Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers.
- HE 3.1.5 **Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Program.** Encourage the Housing Authority to continue the Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Assistance Program, which assists potential homeowners in leasing a property while moving towards ownership at the end of 3 years.

- HE 3.1.6 **Housing Variety.** Facilitate new market rate residential projects that provide a variety of housing types and densities.
- HE 3.1.7 **Neighborhood Connectivity.** Require new residential neighborhoods to interconnect with existing neighborhoods to provide for social interaction, assure pedestrian-friendly connectivity and minimize vehicle trips.
- HE 3.1.8 **Multi-Family Dwellings Standards.** Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking that apply to single-family housing.
- HE 3.1.9 **Amend the Zoning Ordinance.** Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand housing opportunities, as required by state and federal law, including but not limited to: amending the definition of “Family” to comply with state and federal law, removing the minimum distance requirement between emergency shelters, permitting multi-family development without discretionary land use approval, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and encouraging development of a variety of housing for all income levels, such as manufactured housing, rental housing, mobile homes, single-room occupancy housing, employee housing and transitional and supportive housing.

HE 4 – Maintain and Enhance Residential Neighborhoods and Remove Blight

Policies

- HE 4.1 **Removal of Blight.** As part of development approvals, City budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) program and other municipal actions, give high priority to removing and reversing the effects of blight, particularly in residential neighborhoods and highly visible locations along major street and highway corridors. Within established neighborhoods, new residential development shall be of a character, scale, and quality that preserve the neighborhood character and maintain the quality of life for existing and future residents.
- HE 4.2 **Design Compatibility.** Higher density housing should maintain high quality standards for unit design, privacy, security, on-site amenities, and public and private open space. Such standards should be flexible enough to allow innovative and affordable design solutions and shall be designed to enhance prevailing neighborhood architectural and site character.

- HE 4.3 **Neighborhood Integration.** New neighborhoods should be an integral part of an existing neighborhood or should establish pedestrian, bicycle, and, where appropriate, equestrian linkages that provide direct, convenient, and safe access to adjacent neighborhoods, schools, parks and shopping.

Programs

- HE 4.1.1 **Neighborhood Participation.** Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.
- HE 4.1.2 **Neighborhood Needs.** Identify specific neighborhood needs, problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.
- HE 4.1.3 **Neighborhood Improvements.** As budget allows, help fund neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs, sidewalks, pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways, street trees and other public facilities to improve aesthetics, safety, and accessibility.
- HE 4.1.4 **Neighborhood Pride.** Working with Riverside County, CSDs and non-profit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.

HE 5 – Reduce Residential Energy and Water Use

Policies

- HE 5.1 **New Construction.** Encourage the development of dwellings with energy-efficient designs, utilizing passive and active solar features and energy-saving features that exceed minimum requirements in state law.
- HE 5.2 **Sustainable Design.** Residential developments should promote sustainability in their design, placement, and use. Sustainability can be promoted through a variety of housing strategies, including the following:
1. Maximize use of renewable, recycled-content and recycled materials, and minimize use of building materials that require high levels of energy to produce or that cause significant, adverse environmental impacts.

2. Incorporate renewable energy features into new homes, including passive solar design, solar hot water, solar power, and natural ventilation and cooling.
3. Minimize thermal island effects through reduction of heat-absorbing pavement and increased tree shading.
4. Avoid building materials that may contribute to health problems through the release of gases or glass fibers into indoor air.
5. Design dwellings for quiet, indoors and out, including appropriate noise mitigation for residential uses near noise sources such as highways, major streets, railroad tracks, and industrial uses.
6. Design dwellings to be economical to live in due to reduced energy or resource use, ease of maintenance, floor area, or durability of materials.
7. Help inform residents, staff, and builders of the advantages and methods of sustainable design, and thereby develop consumer demand for sustainable housing.
8. Consider adopting a sustainable development rating system, such as the LEED® or Green Globes program.

HE 5.3 **Site and Neighborhood Design.** Residential site, subdivision, and neighborhood designs should consider sustainability. Some ways to do this include:

1. Design subdivisions to maximize solar access for each dwelling and site.
2. Design sites so residents have usable outdoor space with access to sun and shade.
3. Streets and access ways should minimize pavement devoted to vehicular use.
4. Use multi-purpose neighborhood “pocket parks”/ retention basins to purify street runoff prior to its entering creeks. Retention basins shall be designed to be visually attractive as well as functional. Fenced-off retention basins should be avoided.
5. Encourage cluster developments with dwellings grouped around significantly sized, shared open space in return for City approval of smaller individual lots.
6. Treat public streets as landscaped parkways, using continuous plantings at least 6 feet wide and, where feasible, median planters to enhance, define, and buffer residential neighborhoods of all densities from the effects of vehicle traffic.

Programs

- HE 5.1.1 **Incentives.** Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.
- HE 5.1.2 **Energy Programs for Lower Income Households.** Encourage and participate in Riverside County’s and utility providers’ programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.
- HE 5.1.3 **Energy Conservation Grants.** Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.
- HE 5.1.4 **City Requests for Proposals.** City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.
- HE 5.1.5 **City Facilities.** Utilize energy/water saving measures in City-owned buildings and facilities, including landscaping, to meet industry sustainable design standards.
- HE 5.1.6 **Sustainable Design.** Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.

G. COMMUNITY PROFILE

This section analyzes demographic and housing characteristics that influence the demand for and availability of housing in the City of Jurupa Valley. These analyses form a foundation for community-based housing programs.

Data and Methodology

The 2013-2021 Housing Element is the first Housing Element prepared for the City of Jurupa Valley since its incorporation. Preparation of this Housing Element requires the assemblage and presentation of relevant demographic and housing data for Jurupa Valley as an individual jurisdiction. The following key data sources were used to complete this Housing Element. Sources of specific information are identified in the text, tables, and figures.

- Census data (2000-2010) and American Community Surveys
- California Department of Finance (2015)

- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2008-2012

The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated on July 1, 2011, after the 2010 Census had been conducted. As such, the City of Jurupa Valley was not identified as a city in the decennial censuses. While the City was not recognized as an incorporated city in the decennial census, demographic and housing data for Jurupa Valley is extracted from the decennial censuses (2000 and 2010 U.S. Census) by retrieving the data for the block groups and census tracts that generally describe the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. See *Appendix 3.0* for the 2000 and 2010 Census Tracts and Block Groups, and 2009-2013 American Community Survey Census Tracts and Block Groups.

Another method of compiling decennial census data for the City of Jurupa Valley is using data for the Census Designated Places (CDPs) that comprise the City of Jurupa Valley. Six CDPs generally form the boundaries of Jurupa Valley, Crestmore Heights, Glen Avon, Mira Loma, Pedley, Rubidoux, and Sunnyslope.

Since the 2010 Census, the Bureau of Census has been conducting sample surveys, known as the American Community Surveys (ACS), on specific demographic and housing variables. ACSs are conducted every 1, 3, or 5 years, depending on the specific variables in question and the population size of the community. Some ACSs do contain data for the City of Jurupa Valley as an incorporated city. Therefore, by necessity, this report draws from multiple ACS data sets that depend upon the availability of data for the City. The ACS data gives us an opportunity to analyze demographic and housing data in the City as recent as 2012. When data is not available at the city-level, this report applies the same method used above for retrieving data from the decennial censuses, and extracts data at the block-group or tract-level.

Population Trends and Characteristics

Housing needs are influenced by population and employment trends. This section provides a summary of the changes to the population size, age, and racial/ethnic composition of the City of Jurupa Valley since 2000.

Historical, Existing, and Forecast Growth

The City of Jurupa Valley is a recently incorporated city in Riverside County. The City covers a 44-square-mile area and encompasses the neighborhoods of Jurupa Hills, Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Pedley, Indian Hills, Belltown, Sunnyslope, Crestmore Heights, and Rubidoux.

Jurupa Valley is located in a region that, since 1990, has experienced robust population growth. According to the U.S. Census, Riverside County had a population of just over 2.1 million persons in 2010. Overall, the County has experienced steady population growth over the last two decades, with the total number of residents increasing by 87% since 1990. *Table 5.3* compares the population of Riverside County with neighboring counties.

Table 5.3: Regional Population Trends (1990-2010)

County	1990	2000	2010	Percent Change 1990-2000	Percent Change 2000-2010
Riverside	1,170,413	1,545,387	2,189,641	32.0	41.7
San Bernardino	1,418,380	1,709,434	2,035,210	20.5	19.1
Imperial	109,303	142,361	174,528	30.2	22.6

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1990-2010

According to the U.S. Census, Jurupa Valley experienced a 16% population increase between 2000 and 2010. During the same period, Riverside County's population increased by more than 40% (Table 5.4). Compared with other larger CDPs (more than 10,000 in population in 2010), growth in Jurupa Valley was also considered moderate.

Table 5.4: Population Growth in Unincorporated Areas

City ^{1/} Unincorporated Area ²	2000	2010	2013	Percent Change 2000-2010	Percent Change 2010-2013
Jurupa Valley	80,596	93,817	95,679	16.4	2.0
French Valley CDP	--	23,067	24,746	--	7.3
Temescal Valley CDP	--	22,535	23,397	--	3.8
Mead Valley CDP	--	18,510	18,751	--	1.3
East Hemet CDP	14,823	17,418	17,684	17.5	1.5
Valle Vista CDP	10,488	14,578	15,131	38.9	3.8
Woodcrest CPD	2,624	14,347	16,559	446.8	15.4
El Sobrante CPD	4,803	12,723	13,900	164.9	9.3
Home Gardens CPD	2,365	11,570	11,151	389.2	-3.6
Lakeland Village CPD	2,185	11,541	11,393	428.2	-1.3
Riverside County	1,545,387	2,189,641	2,204,724	41.7	0.7


¹ Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level; ACS 2009-2013 data aggregated at census tract level.

² Data for Census Designated Places (CDPs) aggregated at the CDP level.

³ "--" = data not available

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1); American Community Survey 2009-2013 (B01003)

In 2010, the population of Jurupa Valley accounted for 4% of Riverside County's population. As indicated in *Figure 5-5*, SCAG forecasts steady population growth for Jurupa Valley during the next 20 years with a projected population of approximately 126,000 persons by 2035, as shown in *Figure 5-5*.



Note: Jurupa Valley city-level data available from the California Department of Finance and SCAG. Source: California Department of Finance, 1850-2010 Historical US Census Populations of Counties and Incorporated Cities/Towns in California. and SCAG 2012-2035 Regional Growth Forecast.

Figure 5-5: Population Growth Forecast (2000-2035), City of Jurupa Valley

Age Composition

To estimate the age profile of Jurupa Valley residents, census tract level data from the 2000 and 2010 Census was used. Table 5.5 presents the median age for those Census Designated Places (CDPs) within the City of Jurupa Valley. Between 2000 and 2010, the Jurupa Valley population experienced growth in all age groups, but overall, the City’s population is getting older. The “prime working” population, residents between the ages of 25 and 54 years, remains the largest age group in the City. The “school age” population, those between the ages of 5 and 17 years, makes up the next largest segment of the City’s residents. The percentage of residents over age 45 increased during the previous decade, while the City’s younger population decreased proportionally. The State of California, Riverside County, and most CDPs comprising the City of Jurupa Valley saw slight increases in median age from 2000 to 2010, as shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.5: Median Age by Community, County, and State (2000-2010)

Jurisdiction	Median Age	
	2000	2010
Crestmore Heights CDP ¹	--	33.7
Glen Avon CDP	33.3	31.7
Mira Loma CDP	30.3	30.4
Pedley CDP	31.7	33.4
Rubidoux CDP	27.9	29.2
Sunnyslope CDP	30.7	31.1
Riverside County	33.1	33.7
California	33.3	35.2

Table 5.6: Age Distribution (2000-2010), Percent of Total Population

Age Group	2000		2010	
	City of Jurupa Valley ¹	Riverside County ²	City of Jurupa Valley ¹	Riverside County ²
0 - 4 years	8.2	7.9	8.0	7.4
5 - 17 years	29.2	25.4	26.2	24.3
18 - 24 years	6.5	6.2	8.0	7.1
25 - 44 years	29.0	28.9	26.5	26.3
45 - 54 years	12.4	11.4	13.4	13.4
55 - 64 years	7.2	7.5	9.6	9.8
65+	7.6	12.7	8.3	11.8
Total	100	100	100	100

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1).

Ethnicity/Cultural Identity

In terms of ethnicity and cultural identity, most Jurupa Valley residents are Hispanic. As of 2010, 67% of Jurupa Valley residents were of Hispanic origin (Table 5.7). Between 2000 and 2010, the Non-Hispanic White population of Jurupa Valley declined by almost 16%, while persons of Hispanic origin increased by 18%. The Black/African American population represented the third largest ethnic group in the City (3% in 2010).

Table 5.7: Racial and Ethnic Composition (2000-2010)

Ethnic Group	2000				2010			
	City of Jurupa Valley ¹		Riverside County ²		City of Jurupa Valley ¹		Riverside County ²	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Non-Hispanic White	33,684	41.8	788,831	51.1	24,488	26.1	869,068	39.7
Black/African American	3,577	4.4	92,403	6.0	3,079	3.3	130,823	6.0
Hispanic or Latino	39,416	49.0	559,575	36.2	62,376	66.5	995,257	45.4
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	507	0.6	10,135	0.6	311	0.3	10,931	0.5
Asian/Pacific Island	1,805	2.2	58,483	3.8	2,286	2.4	131,770	6.0
Other	96	0.1	2,425	0.1	136	0.2	3,682	0.2
Two or more races	1,511	1.9	33,535	2.2	1,141	1.2	48,110	2.2
Total Population	80,596	100	1,545,387	100	93,817	100	2,189,641	100

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level; 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 (P004) and 2010 (DP1)

Employment Trends

Housing needs are influenced by employment trends. Significant employment opportunities within the City can lead to growth in demand for housing in proximity to jobs. The quality (including job security, and stability) and/or pay of available employment can determine the need for various housing types and prices.

As shown in Table 5.8, between 2009 and 2013, over 16% of Jurupa Valley's residents were employed in educational, health, and social services industries. About 14% were employed in retail trade; 13% in manufacturing; 10% in construction; 9% in arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services; and 9% in professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste

management services. There is no data to show that these percentages are based on job sectors within the City of Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.8: Employment by Industry (2009-2013)

Industry	Jurupa Valley*		Riverside County	
	Employees	%	Employees	%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining	606	1.6	13,722	1.6
Construction	3,813	10.0	72,017	8.2
Manufacturing	5,040	13.2	81,173	9.3
Wholesale Trade	2,066	5.4	29,676	3.4
Retail Trade	5,311	13.9	114,208	13.0
Transportation and Warehousing, and Utilities	3,103	8.1	47,094	5.4
Information	299	0.8	14,384	1.6
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental & Leasing	1,305	3.4	47,236	5.4
Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and Waste Management Svcs	3,391	8.9	87,990	10.0
Educational, Health and Social Services	6,214	16.3	181,003	20.6
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Services	3,419	8.9	96,865	11.1
Other Services (except Public Administration)	2,047	5.4	45,966	5.2
Public Administration	1,584	4.1	45,696	5.2
Total	38,198	100	877,030	100

Data indicates the occupations held by Jurupa Valley/Riverside County residents; the location of the related workplace is not indicated by this data.

*Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (DP03).

Table 5.9 shows Jurupa Valley’s labor force, which increased from 45,200 in 2000 to 45,900 in 2014. According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), the unemployment rate in Jurupa Valley has steadily declined since 2010. In 2014, the City’s unemployment rate was recorded at 10.7%, higher than the County’s unemployment rate of 8.1%.

Table 5.9: Labor Force Trends in the City, County and State (2010-2014)

Year	Persons in Labor Force	Employed Persons	Unemployed Persons	Unemployment Rate, % of Labor Force
Jurupa Valley				
2010	45,200	37,200	8,000	17.6
2011	45,200	37,600	7,600	16.8
2012	45,500	38,700	6,800	14.9
2013	45,600	39,800	5,800	12.8
2014	45,900	41,000	4,900	10.7
Riverside County				
2010	976,200	841,100	135,200	13.8
2011	978,200	849,400	128,800	13.2
2012	989,100	873,900	115,200	11.6
2013	998,600	899,800	98,800	9.9
2014	1,010,700	927,300	83,400	8.2
California				
2010	18,336,300	16,091,900	2,244,300	12.2
2011	18,419,500	16,260,100	2,159,400	11.7
2012	18,554,800	16,630,100	1,924,700	10.4
2013	18,671,600	17,002,900	1,668,700	8.9
2014	18,811,400	17,397,100	1,414,300	7.5

Source: State of California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2015.

Household Characteristics

This section describes Jurupa Valley’s household characteristics. The Census Bureau defines a household as all persons living in a single housing unit, whether or not they are related. One person living alone is considered a household, as is a group of unrelated people living in a single housing unit.

Household Growth

In 2010, the Census reported 24,787 households in Jurupa Valley, an 11% increase from 2000, as shown in *Table 5.10*. According to the Census, however, the number of households in Jurupa Valley is growing at a significantly slower pace than Riverside County, but at a rate similar to the State of California overall. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of households in Riverside County increased by 36%, more than triple the rate of increase in Jurupa Valley (11%) and almost four times the rate in California (9%). During the same period, the number of dwelling units in the City grew by almost 11%, as shown in *Table 5.10*.

Table 5.10: Total Households and Household Growth (2000-2010)

Area	2000	2010	Percent Increase 2000-2000
Jurupa Valley ¹	22,411	24,787	10.6
Riverside County ²	506,218	686,260	35.6
California	11,502,870	12,577,498	9.3

¹ Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the block group level.

² Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (H16)

Household Characteristics and Size

As shown in *Table 5.11*, the majority of households in Jurupa Valley in 2010 were family households (81%), at a higher proportion than the County as a whole (74%). About 41% of all households in the City were families with children and more than 23% of households had at least one elderly member (65+ years). About 6% of all households were made up of an elderly person living alone.

Table 5.11: Household Characteristics, Percent of Total

	City of Jurupa Valley ¹	Riverside County ²	California
Household Type			
Families	80.5	74.4	68.7
Families with Children	41.2	37.5	33.0%
Married Families with Children	30.3	27.0	23.4
Male Headed Families with Children	4.2	3.2	2.8
Female Headed Families with Children	6.9	7.3	6.8
Non-Family Households	19.5	25.6	31.3
Senior Living Alone	6.2	8.7	8.1
Households with Elderly (65+ years)	23.2	27.3	24.7
Household Size			
Large Households (5+)	33.0	21.3	16.4
Large Households - Owners	22.0	13.5	9.0
Large Households - Renters	11.0	7.8	7.4

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract and block group level.

2 Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1, H16, QTH2)

The average household size for each Census Designated Place (CDP) within Jurupa Valley is listed below in *Table 5.12*. In 2010, all of these CDPs had a larger average household size than Riverside County (3.14 persons per household) and the state (2.90 persons per household).

Table 5.12: Average Household Size by CDP

	Average Household Size, Number of Persons Per Household					
	Owner Households		Renter Households		Total Households	
	2000	2010	2000	2010	2000	2010
Crestmore Heights CDP*	--	3.49	--	3.27	--	3.43
Glen Avon CDP	3.62	3.95	2.43	2.95	3.11	3.49
Mira Loma CDP	3.79	4.05	4.05	4.42	3.84	4.15
Pedley CDP	3.46	3.54	3.56	3.89	3.48	3.62
Rubidoux CDP	3.58	3.78	3.65	3.84	3.60	3.80
Sunnyslope CDP	3.95	4.14	4.04	4.61	3.96	4.23
County of Riverside						3.14
State of California						2.90

*2000 Census data not available

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 (DP1)

Tenure

Tenure refers to whether housing is rented or owned. Housing tenure is, in turn related to household income, composition (household size and relationships), and age of the householder. Communities need to have an adequate supply of units available both for rent and for sale to accommodate a range of households with varying incomes, family sizes, composition (individuals living together and their relationships to one another), and life styles. Approximately 67% of Jurupa Valley households owned their homes, and 33% of households rented their homes in 2010. As shown in *Table 5.13*, the homeownership rate in Jurupa Valley was only slightly lower than in Riverside County but noticeably higher than in the State of California as a whole.

Table 5.13: Occupied Units by Tenure (2010)

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Jurupa Valley ¹	16,526	66.7	8,261	33.3	24,787	100
Riverside County ²	462,212	67.4	224,048	32.6	686,260	100
California	7,035,371	55.9	5,542,127	44.1	12,577,498	100

Jurupa Valley: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the block group level.

Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census 2010 (H16 -SF1)

As shown in *Table 5.14* and *Table 5.15* households of three or more persons made up the majority of households in 2000 and 2010, and the number of larger households increased between 2000 and 2010. Larger renter-households (with five or more persons) had the greatest relative increase between 2000 and 2010, while owner-occupied households with three to four persons had the greatest decrease. This trend may reflect that ownership housing has become increasingly unaffordable to larger households.

Table 5.14: Household Size Distribution (2000)

Household Size	Total Households ²	% of Total	Renter-Households	% of Total ³	Owner-Households	% of Total ²
Jurupa Valley¹						
1 Person	3,482	15.5	1,590	7.1	1,892	8.4
2 Persons	5,073	22.6	1,228	5.5	3,845	17.2
3-4 Persons	7,521	33.6	1,945	8.7	5,576	24.9
5+ Persons	6,335	28.3	1,736	7.7	4,599	20.5
Total	22,411	100	6,499	29.0	15,912	71.0
Riverside County						
1 Person	132,494	19.3	51,493	7.5	81,001	11.8
2 Persons	194,449	28.3	48,107	7.0	146,342	21.3
3-4 Persons	213,472	31.1	71,139	10.4	142,333	20.7
5+ Persons	145,845	21.3	53,309	7.8	92,536	13.5
Total	686,260	100	224,048	32.6	462,212	67.4
California						
1 Person	2,929,442	23.3	1,588,527	12.6	1,340,915	10.7
2 Persons	3,653,802	29.1	1,384,739	11.0	2,269,063	18.0
3-4 Persons	3,927,263	31.2	1,632,962	13.0	2,294,301	18.2
5+ Persons	2,066,991	16.4	935,899	7.4	1,131,092	9.0
Total	12,577,498	100	5,542,127	44.1	7,035,371	55.9

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level.

2 Represents Total Households

3 Percent of Total Households

Source: U.S. Census 2000 (H15-SF3)

Table 5.15: Household Size Distribution (2010)

Household Size	Total Households ²	% of Total	Renter-Households	% of Total ³	Owner-Households	% of Total ²
Jurupa Valley¹						
1 Person	3,657	14.8	1,786	7.2	1,871	7.6
2 Persons	5,289	21.3	1,445	5.8	3,844	15.5
3-4 Persons	7,666	30.9	2,310	9.3	5,356	21.6
5+ Persons	8,175	33.0	2,720	11.0	5,455	22.0
Total	24,787	100	8,261	33.3	16,526	66.7
Riverside County						
1 Person	104,557	20.7	41,914	8.3	62,643	12.4
2 Persons	153,900	30.4	36,092	7.1	117,808	23.3
3-4 Persons	154,827	30.6	49,399	9.8	105,428	20.8
5+ Persons	92,934	18.4	30,281	6.0	62,653	12.4
Total	506,218	100	157,686	31.1	348,532	68.9
California						
1 Person	2,708,308	23.5	1,468,111	12.8	1,240,197	10.8
2 Persons	3,408,296	29.6	1,254,291	10.9	2,154,005	18.7
3-4 Persons	3,549,929	30.9	1,429,355	12.4	2,120,574	18.4
5+ Persons	1,836,337	16.0	804,779	7.0	1,031,558	9.0
Total	11,502,870	100	4,956,536	43.1	6,546,334	56.9

1 Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Represents Total Households

3 Percent of Total Households

Source: U.S. Census 2010 (QTH2-SF1)

Household Income

Table 5.16 shows the median household incomes, according to the 2007-2011 ACS, for the CDPs generally comprising the City of Jurupa Valley. Median incomes in Jurupa Valley varied considerably by tenure. During this time, the median incomes for owner-occupied households in the CDPs were consistently nearly double those of renter-occupied households. According to 2000 Census and 2011 ACS data, in absolute terms and when inflation is factored in, the median incomes recorded in the different CDPs have risen since 2000).

About 47% of Jurupa Valley households are lower-income. Between 2009 and 2013, about one-third (31%) of Jurupa Valley households earned less than \$35,000 and only 19% earned more than \$100,000, as shown in Table 5.16 and Table 5.17, and in Figure 5-6.

Table 5.16: Median Household Income

Jurisdiction	Median Household Income, \$ 2000 ²	Median Household Income, \$ 2000 ³	Median Household Income, \$ 2011 ²	% Change 2000-2011
Crestmore Heights CDP ³	-	-	49,395	-
Owner-Occupied Households	-	-	49,395	-
Renter-Occupied Households	-	-	-	-
Glen Avon CDP	36,709	47,951	45,616	4.9
Owner-Occupied Households	50,364	65,789	60,478	8.1
Renter-Occupied Households	20,585	26,890	28,900	7.5
Mira Loma CDP	48,941	63,930	66,635	4.2
Owner-Occupied Households	52,490	68,566	71,880	4.8
Renter-Occupied Households	31,994	41,793	52,118	24.7
Pedley CDP	60,045	78,434	65,012	17.1
Owner-Occupied Households	63,555	83,020	72,553	12.6
Renter-Occupied Households	38,750	50,618	43,433	14.2
Rubidoux CDP	38,539	50,342	52,108	3.5
Owner-Occupied Households	50,274	65,671	63,831	2.8
Renter-Occupied Households	21,573	28,180	37,953	34.7
Sunnyslope CDP	47,390	61,904	68,313	10.4
Owner-Occupied Households	51,378	67,113	75,788	12.9
Renter-Occupied Households	38,214	49,918	38,646	22.6
Riverside County	42,811	55,926	58,365	4.4
Los Angeles County	42,030	54,902	56,266	2.5
Orange County	58,500	76,417	75,762	-0.9
California	47,288	61,771	61,094	-1.1

1 2007-2011 ACS data is the latest available for these CDPs.

2 Not adjusted for inflation

3 In 2011 inflation-adjusted dollars

“-” Data not available

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 (HCT036 – SF4); American Community Survey (ACS), 2007-2011 (B25119)


The relatively high percentage of lower income persons residing in Jurupa Valley is one of several indicators showing a concentration of low-cost rental or sale housing in the City, particularly in several older neighborhoods in Mira Loma, Sunnyslope, Belltown, Glen Avon, and Rubidoux.

Table 5.17: Household Income by Tenure (2009-2013)

	Owner-Households		Renter-Households		Total Households	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than \$5,000	173	1.1%	402	4.7%	575	2.3%
\$5,000 to \$9,999	307	1.9%	375	4.4%	682	2.8%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	395	2.5%	814	9.4%	1,209	4.9%
\$15,000 to \$19,999	695	4.3%	642	7.4%	1,337	5.4%
\$20,000 to \$24,999	507	3.2%	762	8.8%	1,269	5.1%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	1,529	9.5%	1,135	13.1%	2,664	10.8%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	1,953	12.1%	1,489	17.2%	3,442	13.9%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	3,397	21.1%	1,455	16.8%	4,852	19.6%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	3,015	18.8%	958	11.1%	3,973	16.1%
\$100,000 to \$149,000	2,547	15.8%	418	4.9%	2,965	12.0%
\$150,000 or more	1,557	9.7%	194	2.2%	1,751	7.1%
Total	16,075	100%	8,644	100%	24,719	100%

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25118)



Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.
 Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 (HCT011 - SF 3); American Community Survey 2009-2013

Figure 5-6: Household income, 2009-2013

For the purposes of the Housing Element, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has established five income groups based on Area Median Income (AMI):

- Extremely Low Income: up to 30% of AMI
- Very Low Income: 31% to 50% of AMI
- Low Income: 51% to 80% of AMI
- Moderate Income: 81% to 120% AMI
- Above Moderate Income: >120% AMI
- County Median Income as published by HCD must be used to establish income groups for the purpose of the Housing Element.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) periodically receives “custom tabulations” of Census data from the Census Bureau that are largely not available through standard Census products. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2008-2012 ACS. This dataset, known as the “CHAS” data (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy), provides insight on the extent of housing problems experienced by lower-income

households. The Jurupa Valley CHAS data in this report was extracted at the census tract level (using the same census tracts as those used to aggregate Jurupa Valley data from the 2010 U.S. Census).

According to the CHAS data presented in *Table 5.18*, approximately 27% of Jurupa Valley households can be considered extremely low or very low income (50% or less of the AMI) and an additional 20% can be classified as low income (51% to 80% AMI). The majority of the City’s households (53%), however, were within the moderate and above moderate-income category (greater than 80% AMI). By comparison, about 58% of Riverside County households were moderate or above moderate-income households.

Table 5.18: Distribution by Income Group, Percent of Total Households

Jurisdiction	Total Households	Extremely Low Income (0-30% of AMI)	Very Low Income (31-50%)	Low Income (51-80%)	Moderate/Above Income (80%+)
Jurupa Valley ¹	24,738	12.5	14.4	20.3	52.9
Riverside County	676,620	11.9	12.9	17.6	57.6
State of California	12,466,330	14.7	12.8	16.7	55.8

¹ Jurupa Valley: 2008-2012 CHAS data aggregated at the census tract level.

² Data presented in this table is based on special tabulations from sample Census data. The number of households in each category usually deviates from the 100% count due to the need to extrapolate sample data out to total households. Interpretations of this data should focus on the proportion of households rather than on precise numbers. Furthermore, because HUD programs do not cover households with incomes above 80% of the County AMI, CHAS data does not provide any breakdown of income groups above 80% AMI.

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2008-2012.

H. HOUSING INVENTORY AND MARKET CONDITIONS

This section describes housing stock and market conditions in the City of Jurupa Valley.

Housing Growth

According to the 2000 and 2010 Census counts, only a small percentage of Riverside County’s over 500,000 new housing units were located within the City of Jurupa Valley. The number of housing units in Jurupa Valley, both existing and new, comprised just 3% of the County’s total existing housing stock in 2000 and 4% in 2010, as shown in *Table 5.19*.

Table 5.19: Housing Unit Growth (Nearby Cities)

City/County ^{1,2}	# of Units 2000	# of Units 2010	# Units 2015 ³	% Change 2000-2010	% Change 2010-2015
Jurupa Valley	23,429	26,176	26,874	11.7	2.7
Moreno Valley	41,431	55,559	55,935	34.1	0.7
Perris	10,553	17,906	18,536	69.7	3.5
Hemet	29,401	35,305	35,836	20.1	1.5
Riverside County	584,674	800,707	822,910	36.9	2.8
California	12,214,549	13,680,081	13,914,715	12.0	1.7

- 1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
 - 2 Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet and Riverside County, State of California: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the city, county or state level.
 - 3 Department of Finance estimates are corrected for demolition; therefore, housing growth in this table presents net increases in the housing stock; data available at city, county or state level for all jurisdictions (including Jurupa Valley).
- Sources: Bureau of the Census 2000 (H001) and 2010 (QT-H1), State Department of Finance, Housing Estimates, May 2015.

Historically, housing growth in Jurupa Valley lagged behind the County and other neighboring jurisdictions, but experienced growth similar to the state as a whole. Between 2000 and 2010, Jurupa Valley’s housing stock increased at a significantly slower rate than the County’s and other nearby cities. However, housing growth in the region was severely impacted by the recent recession and, since 2010, the City’s housing stock has grown at rates similar to the rest of the County and at a higher rate compared to the state average. According to the California Department of Finance, the housing stock in Jurupa Valley was estimated at 26,874 units as of January 1, 2015, representing a 3% increase from 2010; compared to the County’s 3% increase and the state’s 2% increase during the same interval. Among the most populous unincorporated areas (with population over 10,000 in 2010) in Riverside County, Jurupa Valley had moderate housing production rate between 2000 and 2013, as shown in Table 5.20.

Table 5.20: Housing Unit Growth (Unincorporated Areas)

City ^{1/} Unincorporated Area ²	# of Units 2000	# of Units 2010	# Units 2013	% Change 2000-2010	% Change 2010-2013
Jurupa Valley	23,429	26,176	26,668	11.7	1.9
French Valley CDP	--	6,635	6,982	--	5.2
Temescal Valley CDP	--	7,617	7,808	--	2.5
Mead Valley CDP	--	4,601	4,593	--	-0.2
East Hemet CDP	5,064	5,869	5,900	15.9	0.5
Valle Vista CDP	4,909	6,112	6,062	24.5	-0.8
Woodcrest CPD	2,624	4,622	4,651	76.1	0.6
El Sobrante CPD	4,803	3,827	3,928	-20.3	2.6
Home Gardens CPD	2,365	2,865	2,969	21.1	3.6
Lakeland Village CPD	2,185	3,967	3,961	81.6	-0.2
Riverside County	584,674	800,707	822,910	36.9	2.8

- “--” = data not available
- Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level; ACS 2009-2013 data aggregated at the block group level.
- All data for Census Designated Places (CDPs) aggregated at the CDP level.
- The minor negative growth rates are probably results of sampling errors.
- Sources: Bureau of the Census 2000 (H001) and 2010 (QT-H1), American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25001).

Composition of Housing Stock

The composition of the City’s housing stock, specifically in regard to its available housing inventory by unit type, has remained fairly stable since 2000, which is to be expected given the City’s limited housing growth during this time. The California Department of Finance, which records building permit data submitted by local jurisdictions, estimates that single-family detached units comprise the vast majority of the City’s housing stock (77%) while multi-family units make up about 12% of the housing stock (Table 5.21). Countywide, in 2015, 68% of housing units were single-family detached units compared to 58% in the state. In Riverside County, multi-family units represented about 16% of the housing stock in 2015; compared to 31% in the state. Dwelling unit size and type significantly affect housing cost, density and character. In general, smaller, single-family housing and multi-family housing allow more cost-efficient construction and tend to be more affordable for lower income households.

Table 5.21: Housing Inventory by Unit Type (2000-2015)

Housing Type	2000 ¹	% of Total	2009-2013 ²	% of Total	2015 ³	% of Total
Single-family, detached	18,044	73.5	20,399	76.5	20,645	76.8
Single-family, attached	1,083	4.4	1,104	4.1	1,026	3.8
Multi-family	3,589	14.6	3,188	12.0	3,237	12.0
Mobile homes	1,683	6.9	1,909	7.2	1,966	7.3
Other (boats, RVs)	152	0.6	68	0.2	0	0.0
Total Housing Units	24,551	100	26,668	100	26,874	100

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.

3 Jurupa Valley: 2015 DOF data available at the city level

Source: U.S. Census Bureau of the Census 2000, (DP-4); American Community Survey 2009-2013, (B25024); and State Department of Finance, Housing Estimates, May 2015.

As shown in Table 5.22, owner-occupied housing units were predominantly single-family detached, comprising 87% of all owner-occupied units. The majority of renter-occupied units were also single-family detached housing units (58%).

Table 5.22: Unit Type by Tenure (2009-2013)

	Owner-Occupied		Renter- Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	% ¹	Units	% ¹	Units	%
Single-family, detached	14,244	87.4	5,067	58.3	19,311	77.3
Single-family, attached	414	2.6	564	6.5	978	3.9
Multi-family (2-4 units)	35	0.2	617	7.1	652	2.6
Multi-family (5+ units)	0	0.0	2,137	24.5	2,137	8.5
Mobile Homes	1,537	9.4	305	3.5	1,842	7.4
Other (Boats, RV.)	62	0.4	6	0.1	68	0.3
Total	16,292	100	8,696	100	24,988	100

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013, (B25032).

As shown in *Table 5.15* (page [5-39](#)), Jurupa Valley has a significant number of large households (i.e. households with five or more bedrooms). Approximately 28% of all Jurupa Valley are larger households, compared with about 21% in the County and 16% in the state. Between 2009 and 2013, about 34% of renter-occupied units were two-bedroom units, and about 30% were three-bedroom units, as shown in *Table 5.23*. Over 43% of owner-occupied units had three bedrooms and 35% had four bedrooms. Generally, housing units with three or more bedrooms are the most suited for large households, indicating that adequately sized rental units may be in limited supply in Jurupa Valley considering that the majority (57%) of the City’s rental units have two bedrooms or fewer.

Table 5.23: Unit Size by Tenure (2009-2013)

	Owner-Occupied		Renter- Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	%*	Units	%*	Units	%*
Studio/1 bedroom	452	2.8	2,025	23.3	2,477	9.9
2 bedrooms	2,236	13.7	2,916	33.5	5,152	20.6
3 bedrooms	7,102	43.6	2,570	29.6	9,672	38.7
4 bedrooms	5,643	34.6	999	11.5	6,642	26.6
5 or more bedrooms	859	5.3	186	2.1	1,045	4.2
Total	16,292	100	8,696	100	24,988	100

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.

Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25042).

Vacancy Rates

A certain number of vacant units are needed in the housing market to moderate the cost of housing and allow sufficient housing choice. Vacancy rates are generally higher among rental properties, as rental units have greater attrition than owner-occupied-units do. A healthy vacancy rate (one that permits sufficient choice and mobility among a variety of housing units) is considered to be 2% to 3% for ownership units and 5% to 6% for rental units. In 2000, the vacancy rate in Jurupa Valley was 4.3%, as shown in *Table 5.24*. By 2010, the overall vacancy rate for the City was determined to be 6.3%. This overall rate, however, includes housing units that were vacant due to foreclosures, seasonal occupancy, or other reasons. The actual vacancy rate (actual number of unoccupied dwelling units at any given time) for the City is likely to be lower than the listed rate. According to the 2010 Census, only about 59% of the City’s 1,650 vacant units were actually available for rent or sale, which reflects a relatively high number of seasonably occupied and possibly abandoned units.

Table 5.24: Household Occupancy Status (2000-2010)

Occupancy Status	2000	Percent of Total	2010	Percent of Total
Occupied Housing Units	22,411	95.7	24,526	93.7
Vacant Housing Units	1,018	4.3	1,650	6.3
For Sale	287	1.2	561	2.3
For Rent	281	1.2	409	1.6
Total Housing Units	23,429	100	26,176	100

Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract.

Riverside County: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 and 2010, (QT-H1);

Housing Conditions

Age of Housing Stock

The age of a housing unit is often an indicator of housing conditions. In general, housing that is 30 years or older may exhibit a need for repairs based on the useful life of materials. Housing more than 50 years old is considered aged and is more likely to exhibit a need for major repairs.

Jurupa Valley’s housing stock is older. Approximately 52% of the owner-occupied units in the City were built before 1980, and 20% were built before 1960. Of the City’s renter-occupied units, 61% were built before 1980, and 28% were built before 1960. Table 5.25 summarizes the age of the City’s housing stock by tenure. Based on housing age alone, a significant portion of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock could require rehabilitation in the upcoming decade.

Table 5.25: Tenure by Age of Housing Stock (Occupied Units)

Year Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter- Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	% ¹	Units	% ¹	Units	% ¹
2000 or later	1,786	11.0	1,175	13.5	2,962	8.8
1990 - 1999	1,700	10.4	714	8.2	2,414	15.3
1980 - 1989	4,295	26.3	1,506	17.3	5,801	15.5
1970 - 1979	3,797	23.3	1,318	15.2	5,115	21.6
1960 - 1969	1,431	8.8	1,511	17.4	2,942	16.0
1950 - 1959	2,193	13.5	1,375	15.8	3,568	13.1
1940 - 1949	632	3.9	818	9.4	1,450	5.3
1939 or earlier	458	2.8	279	3.2	737	4.4
Total	16,292	100	8,696	100	24,988	100

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.

The data are from the American Community Survey and therefore, is based on a sample of units and extrapolated to represent the entire housing stock. This table is intended only to provide a general picture of age and tenure of the housing stock.

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013 (B25036).

Housing Conditions

Housing condition refers to the ability of various systems in a house to meet adopted building codes for health and safety, including plumbing, heating, electrical, and structural systems. Housing

conditions are considered substandard when one or more systems are found to be below the minimum standards required by Section 1001 of the Uniform Housing Code. Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents’ health and safety that substandard housing poses.

In addition to structural deficiencies and standards, the lack of infrastructure and utilities often serves as an indicator for substandard conditions. According to the 2009-2013 ACS, 68 occupied units in Jurupa Valley (0.3% of all units) lacked complete plumbing facilities and 221 units lacked complete kitchen facilities (0.9% of all units), as shown in *Table 5.26*. This may be due to the fact that in Jurupa Valley, “substandard” dwellings such as tack rooms, storage or other outbuildings are often used illegally as guest quarters or as separate dwelling units. Under the City’s Zoning Code, guest quarters are not permitted to have kitchens.

One possible reason for the common use of substandard dwellings in the City is the relatively high number of lower income/large households and overcrowding in some residential areas. It should be noted that there might be some overlap in the number of substandard housing units, as some units may lack both complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. Similar to the County and the state, housing units lacking appropriate infrastructure and utilities comprise a very small proportion of the City’s housing stock.

Table 5.26: Number of Dwellings Lacking Plumbing or Complete Kitchen Facilities, 2009-2013

Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Total	% of Total Housing Units
Jurupa Valley¹				
Lacking plumbing facilities	32	36	68	0.3
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	42	179	221	0.9
Riverside County²				
Lacking plumbing facilities	1,621	1,341	2,962	0.4
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	1,883	4,390	6,273	0.9
California³				
Lacking plumbing facilities	20,916	43,006	63,922	0.5
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	26,676	124,714	151,390	1.2

1 Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Riverside County Housing Units: 683,144

3 California Housing Units: 12,542,460

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2013 (B25049, B25053).

Code Enforcement Activities

The City of Jurupa Valley has established a Code Enforcement program to ensure a high quality of life throughout the communities and maintain property values. Code compliance in the City is a responsive program under which property inspections are done only

when inspection requests and complaints are received. Such a system may result in under-reporting of code compliance issues, particularly with regard to the rental housing stock. Often, tenants fear retaliation from the landlords and are therefore less willing to report an issue. Legal residency issues or language barriers may be another obstacle for reporting code compliance issues. According to the Code Enforcement staff, in January 2016 Jurupa Valley had 776 active code enforcement cases dealing with housing conditions and/or safety issues, and the City has closed 815 such cases since incorporation. Therefore, as a general estimate, less than 0.5% of the City’s housing stock (or approximately 1,300 units) may be considered substandard in the City.

Housing Costs and Affordability

Home Prices and Rents

Realtor.com® was used to provide housing market data for Jurupa Valley. This information is sourced daily from listings and property data on the realtor.com website, which includes an up-to-date and accurate aggregation of real estate listings from approximately 800 regional listings from Multiple Listing Service (MLS). According to realtor.com, in November 2015, the average home listing price in Jurupa Valley was \$379,000. The average selling price for homes in the City was slightly lower at \$343,500. These figures are based on the City’s 24,412 property records and a realtor.com search of 510 listings of recently sold homes and 293 listings of homes available for sale.

Information on current rental rates in the City was obtained through a review of advertisements on Craigslist during October 2015. Available rental housing ranged from single-room studios to four- or more bedroom units. Most of the available units in the City were two-bedroom, three-bedroom, and four-bedroom units. *Table 5.27* summarizes average rents by unit size. Overall, 81 units of varying sizes were listed as available for rent in October 2015 with an average rent of \$1,517.

Table 5.27: Average Rent by Unit Size

Studio	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom	4+ Bedroom
\$808	\$1,146	\$1,203	\$1,694	\$1,943

Source: www.craigslist.org, accessed October 16, 2015

Affordability Gap Analysis

To determine overall housing affordability, the costs of homeownership and renting are compared to a household’s ability to pay these costs. Housing affordability is defined as spending no more than 30% to 35% of gross household income (depending on tenure and income level) on housing expenses. *Table 5.28* summarizes affordable rents

and purchase prices by income category based on the 2015 HCD median income of \$65,000 for Riverside County. General cost assumptions for utilities, taxes, and property insurance are shown. Affordable purchase price assumes a 4% interest rate with a 30-year fixed rate mortgage loan and a 10% down payment.

Given the need for a down payment and the high costs of homeownership, lower income households lacking sufficient savings or transferable equity must usually occupy rental housing. The affordability problem also persists in the rental market. The situation is exacerbated for large households and seniors with lower and moderate incomes given the limited supply of large units.

Table 5.28: Housing Affordability Matrix, Riverside County, 2015

Income	Annual Income	Affordable Monthly Housing Costs		Utilities		Taxes and Insurance	Maximum Affordable Price	
		Rent	Sale	Rent	Sale		Rent	Sale
Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)								
1-Person	\$14,100	\$353	\$353	\$181	\$210	\$123	\$153	\$4,451
2-Person	\$16,100	\$403	\$403	\$192	\$226	\$141	\$189	\$8,291
3-Person	\$20,090	\$502	\$502	\$221	\$265	\$176	\$251	\$14,304
4-Person	\$24,250	\$606	\$606	\$249	\$305	\$212	\$319	\$20,728
5-Person	\$28,410	\$710	\$710	\$277	\$345	\$249	\$390	\$27,151
Very Low Income (30-50% AMI)								
1-Person	\$23,450	\$586	\$586	\$181	\$210	\$205	\$386	\$39,812
2-Person	\$26,800	\$670	\$670	\$192	\$226	\$235	\$456	\$48,758
3-Person	\$30,150	\$754	\$754	\$221	\$265	\$264	\$503	\$52,351
4-Person	\$33,500	\$838	\$838	\$249	\$305	\$293	\$551	\$55,711
5-Person	\$36,200	\$905	\$905	\$277	\$345	\$317	\$585	\$56,613
Low Income (50-80% AMI)								
1-Person	\$37,550	\$683	\$796	\$181	\$210	\$279	\$483	\$71,580
2-Person	\$42,900	\$780	\$910	\$192	\$226	\$319	\$566	\$85,065
3-Person	\$48,250	\$878	\$1,024	\$221	\$265	\$358	\$627	\$93,196
4-Person	\$53,600	\$975	\$1,138	\$249	\$305	\$398	\$688	\$101,094
5-Person	\$57,900	\$1,053	\$1,229	\$277	\$345	\$430	\$733	\$105,551
Median Income (80-100% AMI)								
1-Person	\$45,500	\$1,024	\$1,194	\$181	\$210	\$418	\$824	\$131,808
2-Person	\$52,000	\$1,170	\$1,365	\$192	\$226	\$478	\$956	\$153,896
3-Person	\$58,500	\$1,316	\$1,536	\$221	\$265	\$537	\$1,065	\$170,631
4-Person	\$65,000	\$1,463	\$1,706	\$249	\$305	\$597	\$1,176	\$187,133
5-Person	\$70,200	\$1,580	\$1,843	\$277	\$345	\$645	\$1,260	\$198,473
Moderate Income (100-120% AMI)								
1-Person	\$54,600	\$1,251	\$1,460	\$181	\$210	\$511	\$1,051	\$171,959
2-Person	\$62,400	\$1,430	\$1,668	\$192	\$226	\$584	\$1,216	\$199,783
3-Person	\$70,200	\$1,609	\$1,877	\$221	\$265	\$657	\$1,358	\$222,254
4-Person	\$78,000	\$1,788	\$2,085	\$249	\$305	\$730	\$1,501	\$244,493
5-Person	\$84,250	\$1,931	\$2,252	\$277	\$345	\$788	\$1,611	\$260,421

1 Assumptions: 2015 HCD income limits; Health and Safety code definitions of affordable housing costs (between 30 and 35% of household income depending on tenure and income level); HUD utility allowances; 35% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10.0% down payment; and 4.0% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Taxes and insurance apply to owner costs only; renters do not usually pay taxes or insurance.

2 Riverside County: 4-person household median income = \$65,000

Sources: State Department of Housing and Planning 2015 Income Limits; Housing Authority of the County of Riverside, Utility Allowances, 2015; Veronica Tam and Associates, 2015

Inventory of Sites for Housing Development

Section 65583(a)(3) of the *California Government Code* requires Housing Elements to contain an “inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites.” The City conducted a detailed inventory of potential housing sites as part of the 2017 General Plan process. The results of that study, including methodology, specific parcels, development constraints, and potential development capacity are discussed in Housing Element *Attachment 5A*.

That analysis indicated that the City had 943 942 acres of vacant or underutilized land suitable for residential development, with a development potential of 4,110 dwelling units. The inventory shows the City has adequate site capacity to accommodate the regional housing need for all income groups, except for the Very Low/Extremely Low Income level, as further discussed in *Housing Element Attachment A (Vacant Land Analysis)*.

Residential Development Capacity

Nine of the City’s base General Plan land use designations allow residential development, plus four Overlay Districts. *Table 5.29*, below, describes the minimum and maximum residential density standards for each of these land use designations.

Table 5.29: General Plan Residential Density Standards

Land Use Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)
Small Farm Residential (RR)	–	0.20
Ranch Residential (EDR)	0.2	0.5
Rural Neighborhood (VLDR)	0.5	1.0
Country Neighborhood (LDR and RC-LDR)	1.0	2.0
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	2.0	5.0
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	5.0	8.0
High Density Residential (HDR)	8.0	14.0
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	14.0	20.0
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	25.0	25.0
Community Development Overlay (CDO)	2.0	5.0
Town Center Overlay (TCO)	20.0	25.0
Mixed Use Overlay (MUO)	14.0	20.0
Specific Plan Overlay (SPO)	Unspecified	

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, Draft 2017 General Plan.
 du/ac = dwelling units per acre

Housing Element Attachment A uses the 2017 General Plan land use and zoning designations for each vacant parcel in the City to determine residential development capacity. The analysis showed that development of Opportunity Parcels and Partially Constrained Parcels is estimated to result in the construction of approximately 2,871 to 5,255 new dwelling units. Based on consideration of existing development patterns in the City and the constraints present on the Partially Constrained Parcels, it is assumed that only a percentage of the City's maximum potential residential development capacity will actually be built. The Housing Inventory, Table 7 of Attachment A, projects that, due to physical constraints and land use/zoning standards, approximately 4,110 dwelling units will be built. The number of dwelling units built will depend largely on market demand. These estimates are approximate and do not consider density bonuses or other factors that could affect residential development yields.

Zoning to Encourage Housing for Lower-Income

Density is a critical factor in the development of affordable housing. Affordable housing tends to be developed at the highest density range available in a jurisdiction. In California's current economic state in which public housing grants have diminished in the face of increasing need, and redevelopment funding is no longer available, reducing costs of the development of affordable housing has become even more critical. Overall, higher density lowers the per unit land cost. Fortunately, compared with many other areas in Southern California, land costs in Riverside County and specifically, in Jurupa Valley, are significantly lower.

Pursuant to AB 2348 of 2004, the "default density" for most Riverside County jurisdictions, including Jurupa Valley, is 30 dwelling units per acre¹. The default density refers to the density at which lower-income housing development is presumed to be feasible, although state law allows jurisdictions to propose alternative densities that are sufficient to facilitate affordable housing based on local experience and circumstances. Based on an analysis of multi-family developments in Riverside County, housing affordable to Moderate, Low and Very-Low income households is possible at default densities ranging from 20 to 40 dwelling units per acre due to the County's still relatively low land and construction costs when compared with Orange, Los Angeles, and Ventura counties.

Over half of these projects have been successfully developed at densities of 25 dwelling units/acre or less. The recent history of

1 Memo of June 9, 2005 from California Department of Housing and Community Development on AB 2348 of 2004.

actual affordable developments in Riverside County demonstrates that lower-income units are feasible in the City's Highest Density Residential land use designation District (HHDR), which corresponds with the R-5 and R-6 Zone (Residential Incentive Zone).

These zones are intended to promote affordable multi-family housing development close to jobs, schools, public transit, and services. In combination with the HHDR General Plan designation, housing or mixed use developments with base densities of up to 25 dwelling units per acre are allowed in these zones. In addition, the City will apply density bonuses as allowed by state law, plus available flexible development standards, such as reduced parking requirement (one off-street space per unit required instead of the usual two spaces), streamlined permit processing, and other incentives to encourage affordable housing development.

I. EXISTING HOUSING NEEDS

This section provides an overview of existing housing needs in Jurupa Valley. It focuses on four types of housing need:

1. Housing need resulting from housing cost burden;
2. Housing need resulting from overcrowding;
3. Housing need resulting from population growth; and
4. Housing needs of special needs groups such as elderly persons, large households, persons with disabilities, female-headed households, homeless persons, and farm workers.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing cost burden is generally defined as households paying more than 30% of their gross income on housing-related expenses, including rent or mortgage payments and utilities. High housing costs can cause households to spend a disproportionate percentage of their income on housing. This may result in payment problems, deferred maintenance, or overcrowding.

This section uses data from the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) provided by HUD. The CHAS provides information related to households with housing problems, including cost burden, overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen facilities and plumbing systems. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2008-2012 ACS and include a variety of housing need variables, further broken down by HUD-defined income limits and HUD-specified housing types. It should be noted that HUD-defined income limits differ slightly from the income limits established by the state, as shown in *Table 5.30*.

Table 5.30: Income Limits

HUD Income Limits	State HCD Income Limits
Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)	Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)
Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)	Very Low (31-50% AMI)
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	Low Income (51-80% AMI)
Moderate/Above Moderate Income (81%+ AMI)	Moderate Income (81-120% AMI) Above Moderate Income (>120% AMI)

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2015; Department of Housing and Community Development, 2015.

Overcrowding

Dwelling units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered overcrowded. Overcrowding increases health and safety concerns and stresses the condition of the housing stock and infrastructure. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households and especially very large households and the availability of suitably sized housing. Overcrowding impacts owners and renters; however, renters are generally more significantly impacted. Some households may not be financially able to purchase adequately sized housing and may instead accept smaller housing or reside with other individuals or families in the same home in an effort to lower costs.

Household overcrowding reflects various living situations: 1) a family lives in a home that is too small; 2) a family chooses to house extended family members; or 3) unrelated individuals or families are “doubling up” to afford housing. However, cultural differences also contribute to the overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger household sizes than others do, due to the preference of sharing living quarters with extended family members as a way of sharing living costs among family members. Overcrowding can strain physical facilities and the delivery of public services, reduce the quality of the physical environment, contribute to a shortage of parking, and accelerate the deterioration of homes and neighborhoods.

Approximately 11% of all households in Jurupa Valley were overcrowded, and 6% were severely overcrowded, according to the 2009-2013 ACS. As shown in *Table 5.31*, overcrowding is significantly more common among the City’s renter-households than owner-households. By comparison, the incidence of overcrowding in Riverside County is much lower.

Table 5.31: Overcrowding by Tenure, Percent of Total Households

	Overcrowded (1+ occupants per room)			Severely Overcrowded (1.5+ occupants per room)		
	Renter	Owner	Total	Renter	Owner	Total
Jurupa Valley ¹	14.0	9.0	10.8	9.6	3.3	5.5
Riverside County ²	9.2	3.6	5.5	3.7	1.0	1.9

¹ Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the block group level.

² Riverside County: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the County level.

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013 (B25014).

Projected Housing Needs – 2014-2021

The State of California determines the housing need for the counties that make up the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region. SCAG is responsible for allocating housing needs to each jurisdiction in its region. A local jurisdiction’s share of regional housing need is the number of additional housing units needed to accommodate the forecasted growth in the number of households, to replace expected demolitions and conversion of housing units to non-housing uses, and to achieve a future vacancy rate that allows for healthy functioning of the housing market. The allocation is divided into the four income categories addressed in the RHNA: Very Low, Low, Moderate, and Above Moderate. The allocation is further adjusted to avoid an over-concentration of lower income households in any one jurisdiction. Table 5.32 shows the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the City of Jurupa Valley, as determined by SCAG. This RHNA covers a planning period of January 1, 2014 through October 31, 2021.

Table 5.32: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (2014-2021)

	Total Construction Need ²	Extremely Low Income ¹	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above-Moderate Income
Number of Housing Units ²	1,712	204	205	275	307	721

¹ The City’s RHNA allocation for very low-income units is 409 units; this allocation is evenly split between extremely low and very low income groups.

² Jurupa Valley: SCAG RHNA available at the city level

Source: Regional Housing Needs Allocation, SCAG 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan

The City analyzed its ability to meet Regional Housing Needs in the 5th Housing Cycle allocation of housing need. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 5.33. The table shows that the City’s land inventory, including projects approved and the potential development of vacant and underutilized parcels, exceeds the net remaining RHNA for this planning period in all income categories except for the Extremely Low/Very Low categories. In those categories, there is an unmet need of 438 dwelling units. To accommodate the remaining need for Extremely Low and Very Low income housing, Programs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.9, 1.1.13, and 1.1.16 commit the City to designating 16 acres of HHDR land, working with

the Riverside Housing Authority, housing non-profits, and housing developers to identify specific sites for developing housing suitable for extremely low and very-low income households, including seniors, disabled persons, veterans, farmworkers and the homeless.

A discussion of public facilities and infrastructure needed to serve future development is contained in Section J. Governmental Constraints, and also in Sections 9 through 12 of the Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element. There are currently no known public facility service limitations that would preclude the level of development described in the RHNA, although developers will be required to pay fees or construct public improvements prior to or concurrent with development.

Table 5.33: Progress in Meeting RHNA

Unit Capacity	Income Category				Total Units
	Extremely/ Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
RHNA	409	275	307	721	1,712
1. Units Built Since 1/1/2014					
Single-family units	0	0	0	403	403
Lennar Harvest Village	0	0	0	319	319
2. Redesignation of Country Village Senior Apartments to HHDR	0	178	0	0	178
3. Habitat for Humanity Veteran Housing¹	0	26	0	0	26
Subtotals	0	204	0	722	926
4. Development Potential in Specific Plans					
I-15 Corridor Specific Plan	0	0	0	508	508
Emerald Meadows Ranch SP	0	0	477	719	1,196
Rio Vista SP	0	0	448	1,249	1,697
Paradise Knolls SP	0	0	300	350	650
Subtotals	0	0	1,225	2,826	4,051
5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels					
Ranch Residential (EDR)	0	0	0	4	4
Country Neighborhood (LDR)	0	0	0	43	43
“Rural Community – Low Density Residential” (RC-LDR)	0	0	0	403	403
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	0	0	0	1,344	1,344
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	0	0	0	793	793
High Density Residential (HDR)	0	0	696	0	696
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	0	0	174	0	174
Highest Density Residential (HHDR) ²	424	229	0	0	653
Subtotals	424	229	870	2,587	4,110
Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)	424	433	2,095	6,135	9,087
RHNA Surplus/[Deficit]	15	158	1,788	5,414	7,375

1 Approved in 2016; construction expected in 2017-2018. Cal Vet funded; for Low Income veterans and their families.

2 Assumes 65% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels (653) applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units allocated to meet “Low Income” need.

Redesignation/Rezoning of Sites to Meet RHNA

In the City of Jurupa, residential densities are determined by a parcel's general plan land use designation. As provided in Program HE 1.1.1, the City will amend its General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map, as necessary, to redesignate sites to achieve a total of at least 16 acres of additional HHDR land with compatible zoning. If it is determined that redesignation and rezoning of any of the identified sites is not feasible, the City will identify another site or sites of comparable acreage for the development of housing affordable to lower-income households.

Special Needs Groups

Certain households, because of their special characteristics and needs, may require special accommodations and may have difficulty finding housing due to special needs. Special needs groups include seniors, persons with disabilities, families with children, single-parent households, large households, homeless persons and persons at-risk of homelessness, farm workers, and persons with HIV/AIDS.

Seniors



Figure 5-7: Senior housing, Country Village Apartments, Jurupa Valley

Seniors (persons age 65 and above) are gradually becoming a more substantial segment of a community's population. Americans are living longer and having fuller lives than ever before in our history and are expected to continue to do so. Elderly persons are vulnerable to housing problems due to limited income, prevalence of physical or mental disabilities, limited mobility, and high health care costs. The elderly, particularly those with disabilities, may face increased difficulty in finding housing accommodations. A senior on a fixed income can face great difficulty finding safe and affordable housing. Subsidized housing and federal housing assistance programs are increasingly challenging to secure and often involve a long waiting list.

According to the 2010 Census, about 8% of all residents in Jurupa Valley were age 65 or older, 23% of the City's households included at least one elderly member (*Table 5.1*, page [5-10](#)) and 18% of households were headed by a senior resident. Between 2009 and 2013, a little over 11% of all seniors in Jurupa Valley were living in poverty. The 2009-2013 ACS also estimated that about 16% of Jurupa Valley's elderly population had at least one disability and 25% had two or more disabilities, as shown in *Table 5.34*. This is comparable to the elderly population in the county (16%) and the state (15%) with one disability; and similar to the elderly population

in the county (20%) and the state (22%) that report two or more disabilities.

Table 5.34: Elderly with Disabilities Limiting Independent Living, 2000 and 2009-2013

Disability Status	2000		2009-2013 ²	
	Total ³	% of People 65+	Total ⁴	% of People 65+
With one type of disability	1,356	23.1	1,218	16.0
With two or more types of disability	967	16.5	1,894	24.9
Total with a disability	2,323	39.6	3,112	40.9

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census and 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level

2 Estimated data from 2009-2013 American Community Survey for illustrative purposes only

3 ACS 2009-2013, 65+ year olds: 7,593

4 U.S. Census: 65+ year olds: 5,863

Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 (PCT 26-SF3); ACS 2009-2013 (C18108).

Table 5.35 summarizes the 2007-2011 ACS estimates of median household incomes for senior householders in the various CDPs comprising Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.35: Median Income for Senior-Headed Households (2000 and 2011)

Householder Age	2000	2007-2011 ^{1,2}
Crestmore Heights CDP³		
65-74 years	-	\$71,838
75+ years	-	
Glen Avon CDP		
65-74 years	\$24,202	\$23,281
75+ years	\$15,792	
Mira Loma CDP		
65-74 years	\$26,905	\$43,333
75+ years	\$27,333	
Pedley CDP		
65-74 years	\$32,143	\$43,750
75+ years	\$26,250	
Rubidoux CDP		
65-74 years	\$30,326	\$32,120
75+ years	\$23,555	
Sunnyslope CDP		
65-74 years	\$29,732	\$29,615
75+ years	\$25,480	
Riverside County		
65-74 years	\$33,532	\$39,423
75+ years	\$26,054	
California		
65-74 years	\$37,000	\$41,523
75+ years	\$27,081	

1 Estimated data from 2007-2011 American Community Survey for illustrative purposes only. Data aggregated at the CDP level.

2 The ACS reports median income for households with a householder age 65+ years

3 2000 Census data not available for the Crestmore Heights CDP.

Source: U.S. Census 2000 (P56 - SF3); 2007-2011 ACS (B19049).

Generally, the median income for a senior household was about one-third of that for an average household (*Table 5.16, page 5-40*), except within Crestmore Heights, where the senior household median income was nearly double that of an average household in most of Jurupa Valley. Data from the County’s 2008-2012 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) supports the information presented below. According to CHAS, in Jurupa Valley 70% of elderly, renter-occupied households and 38% of elderly owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden (i.e., total housing costs exceeded 30% of total income). Similarly, in the County, 62% of elderly-renter-occupied households and 36% of elderly-owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden. Furthermore, the majority of elderly-headed households in both Jurupa Valley and Riverside County were homeowners. Many may need financial assistance in making necessary repairs or accessibility improvements.

Table 5.36: Householders by Tenure and Age

Householder Age	2000				2010			
	Owner-Occupied	%	Renter-Occupied	%	Owner-Occupied	%	Renter-Occupied	%
15-24 years	280	1.8	450	6.9	189	1.2	462	5.6
25-34 years	2,088	13.1	1,532	23.6	1,489	9.1	1,835	22.3
35-64 years	11,212	70.5	3,352	51.6	11,743	72.1	4,498	54.6
65-74 years	1,421	8.9	559	8.6	1,757	10.8	799	9.7
75 plus years	911	5.7	606	9.3	1,115	6.8	639	7.8
Total	15,912	100	6,499	100	16,293	100	8,233	100

Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

Source: Bureau of the Census 2000 and 2010 (QT-H2)

Resources

The Riverside County Office on Aging is a planning and advocacy entity that serves as the official Area Agency on Aging (AAA) throughout Riverside County. It is charged to provide leadership in developing a system of care services for older persons and adults with disabilities in the County. Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) are local aging programs that provide information and services on a range of assistance for older adults and those who care for them. Some of the programs and services provided by AAA include:

- Aging and Disability Resource Connection Program
- Care Coordination
- Caregiving
- Care Transitions Intervention (CTI)
- Community Outreach and Education
- Legal Assistance
- Transportation

Some senior programs in the City of Jurupa Valley have been offered in partnership with Jurupa Valley Adopt a Family program, a

community-based 501(c)(3) organization, and Healthy Jurupa Valley. Services and programs provided include assistance to senior households during the holiday seasons, and workshops catering to senior residents; recent workshop topics include returning to work after retirement. Through Healthy Jurupa Valley, seniors are also invited to attend senior health fairs. Additionally, the Jurupa Community Services District Recreation and Parks Department provides a Senior Mentoring Program that focuses on providing enrichment and/or general assistance to senior citizens, including assistance with everyday tasks and exposing seniors to new activities.

Seniors in Jurupa Valley may also benefit from programs offered through the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency (EDA). Through the Senior Home Repair Grant (SHRG) Program, EDA may be able to cover up to \$6,000 of cost of repairs with no loan or payback requirement.

In terms of affordable housing resources, there are 357 affordable rental units in 4 rental properties throughout Jurupa Valley that are restricted for seniors, with renter qualifications not to exceed anywhere from 50% to 80% of median income. In addition to the senior housing developments listed in *Table 5.37*, seniors in the City are also served by 11 state-licensed residential care facilities for the elderly and 15 adult residential facilities with a combined capacity to serve 379 persons. In addition, Country Village Apartments provides 1,238 senior apartments, with rents affordable to low- and moderate income households.

Table 5.37: Senior Housing Development

Name	Address	Units
Mission Village Senior Apartments	8989 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509	102
Country Village Apartments	10250 Country Club Drive Jurupa Valley, CA 91752	1,238
Mission Villas	5870 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509	54
Mission Palms	5875 Mission Boulevard Rubidoux, CA 92509	109
Mission Palms II	3702 La Rue Street Riverside, CA 92509	92
Total		1,595

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015

Persons with Disabilities



Figure 5-8: Dwelling with universal access design

Federal laws define a person with a disability as “any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment.” In general, a physical or mental impairment includes hearing, mobility and visual impairments, chronic alcoholism, chronic mental illness, AIDS, AIDS Related Complex, and mental retardation that substantially limit one or more major life activities. Major life activities include walking, talking, and hearing, seeing, breathing, learning, performing manual tasks, and caring for oneself.

The U.S. Census Bureau classifies disabilities into the following categories:

- **Hearing difficulty:** Deaf or having serious difficulty hearing
- **Vision difficulty:** Blind or having serious difficulty seeing, even when wearing glasses
- **Cognitive difficulty:** Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty remembering, concentrating, or making decisions
- **Ambulatory difficulty:** Having serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs
- **Self-care difficulty:** Having difficulty bathing or dressing
- **Independent living difficulty:** Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor’s office or shopping

According to the 2009-2013 ACS, approximately 11% of the Jurupa Valley population had one or more disabilities. Of the disabilities tallied during that time, as shown in *Table 5.38*, ambulatory and cognitive disabilities were the most prevalent. The City’s elderly population, in particular, seemed to be the most affected by disabilities with about 41% of Jurupa Valley seniors affected by at least one disability.

Table 5.38: Disability Characteristics, Percent of Total Population

Disability by Age and Type	5 to 17 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	Total
Total Persons with a Disability	4.6	9.9	41.0	10.5
Disability Type				
Hearing Difficulty	0.7	1.8	16.4	2.6
Vision Difficulty	1.0	1.5	9.8	2.0
Cognitive Difficulty	2.9	4.1	8.9	3.9
Ambulatory Difficulty	0.8	5.2	27.7	5.6
Self-Care Difficulty	0.6	2.3	11.4	2.5
Independent Living Difficulty*	--	3.7	19.1	3.9

Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level.

*Tallied only for persons 18 years and over

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2009-2013, (S1810).

The City's homeless population also appeared to be disproportionately affected by disabilities and health issues. The County of Riverside's 2015 Point-In-Time Homeless Report found that 29% of Jurupa Valley's homeless had a physical disability, 34% reported a mental illness, 48% had a substance abuse disorder, and 27% reported a chronic health condition. Among those persons who are marginally housed, dual diagnoses have been noted as a problem, i.e., cognitive difficulty connected to chemical dependency/addiction.

The elderly population is expected to grow substantially in the next 20 years. Since seniors have a much higher probability of being disabled, the housing and service needs for persons with disabilities should grow considerably commensurate with senior population growth. Special housing needs for persons with disabilities fall into two general categories: physical design to address mobility impairments; and in-home social, educational, and medical support to address developmental and mental impairments.

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

As defined by state law, "developmental disability" means a severe, chronic disability of an individual who:

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: a) self-care; b) receptive and expressive language; c) learning; d) mobility; e) self-direction; f) capacity for independent living; or g) economic self-sufficiency; and
- Reflects the individual's need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5%. This equates to approximately 1,407 persons in the City of Jurupa Valley, based on the 2010 Census population.

The Inland Regional Center is a community-based, private nonprofit corporation funded by the State of California to serve people with developmental disabilities, as required by the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (aka Lanterman Act). The Lanterman Act is part of California law that sets out the rights and

responsibilities of persons with developmental disabilities. The Inland Regional Center is one of 21 regional centers throughout California and serves individuals and their families who reside within Riverside County. The Regional Center provides diagnoses and assessments of eligibility, and helps plan, access, coordinate, and monitor the services and supports that are needed because of a developmental disability. As of September 2015, the Regional Center had over 3,200 clients living in Jurupa Valley. Among these clients, approximately 74% are residing at home with other family members or guardians. Only about 5% are living independently, and another 12% are in community care facilities.

Resources

A number of non-profit agencies provide supportive services to persons with disabilities living in Jurupa Valley. ARC of Riverside County is a private, non-profit corporation serving adults with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. ARC operates six facilities in Western Riverside County providing services for those in need of full-time programming to ensure the development and maintenance of functional skills required for self-advocacy, community integration, and self-care. In addition, the Community Access Center (CAC), an independent living center located in the City of Riverside, has been providing services to people with disabilities in the County since 1995. CAC provides information, supportive services, and independent living skills training.

Families with Children and Single-Parent Households

According to the 2010 Census, approximately 41% of all households in Jurupa Valley have children under the age of 18, as shown in *Table 5.13* (page [5-38](#)). Single-parent households often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing, as well as accessible daycare, health care, and other supportive services. Due to their generally lower income and higher living expenses such as daycare, single-parent households have limited opportunities for finding affordable, decent, and safe housing.

In 2010, approximately 2,705 single-parent households resided within Jurupa Valley, representing 11% of the City's households. An estimated 62% (1,684 households) of these single-parent households with children under age 18 were headed by females, representing approximately 7% of all households in the City. Of particular concern are single-parent households with lower incomes. The 2011-2013 ACS shows that approximately 33% (727 households) of the City's female-headed households with children had incomes below the poverty level. By comparison, about 13% of all households had incomes below the poverty level.

Resources

Limited household income constrains the ability of single-parent households to afford adequate housing, childcare, health care, and other necessities. Several agencies that serve Jurupa Valley residents offer various programs for families with children. The Jurupa Community Services District's Parks and Recreation Department offers programs and recreational classes for the City's youth, including health fairs, youth sports, special events, help with homework, and volunteer programs. Additional community and family resources are available through Healthy Jurupa Valley, as part of a national Healthy Cities movement to improve the health and quality of life for City residents. Healthy Jurupa Valley efforts are carried out through Action Teams, including the Jurupa Valley Family Resource Network, and include the organization of special community events such as the Healthy Jurupa Valley Extravaganza Health Fair that provides access to community services and children activities.

Single-parent households in Jurupa Valley can also benefit from general programs and services for lower-and moderate-income persons, including the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency's (EDA) First Time Homebuyer and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by non-profit organizations in the region such as the Food Bank.

Large Households



Figure 5-9: Large families and multi-generational households

Large households are defined as those with five or more members. These households are usually families with two or more children or families with extended family members such as in-laws or grandparents. It can also include multiple families living in one housing unit to save on housing costs. Large households are a special needs group because the

availability of adequately sized, affordable housing units is often limited. To save for necessities such as food, clothing, and medical care, lower- and moderate-income large households may reside in smaller units, resulting in overcrowding.

As indicated in *Table 5.11* (page [5-37](#)), in 2010, 33% of all households in Jurupa Valley had five or more members. The proportion of large households in Jurupa Valley was higher than in the County (21%). Generally, areas with higher proportions of large households also

tend to have a high proportion of family households and non-White populations, and have higher rates of overcrowding and higher cost burden. Cultural differences can also contribute to overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger households or more open attitudes about intergenerational living, shared costs, and living arrangements, even in small housing units. In addition, recently arrived immigrants may stay with relatives on a temporary basis until they are established.

Table 5.39: Large Households by Tenure, 2010

Number of Persons in Unit	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Total
Five	2,130	1,090	3,220
Six	1,346	700	2,046
Seven or more	1,886	916	2,802
Total Large Households	5,362	2,706	8,068
Total Households	16,293	8,233	24,526
Percent of Total Households	32.9%	32.9%	32.9%

Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.
Source: U.S. Census 2010 (QT-H2)

Resources

Large households in Jurupa Valley can benefit from general programs and services for lower-and moderate-income persons, including The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency’s (EDA) First Time Home Buyer (FTHB) and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by non-profit organizations in the region.

Extremely Low Income Persons

In 2012, approximately 3,100 extremely low-income (ELI) households resided in the City, representing 12.5% of the total households. Most extremely low-income households are renters and experience a high incidence of housing problems, such as overpayment (defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income), overcrowding and substandard housing.

Projected Needs

To calculate the projected housing needs for its lowest income residents, the City assumed 50% of its very low-income RHNA housing need are extremely low-income households. As a result, based on the assigned very low income need of 409 units, the City has a projected need of 205 units for very low income households, and 204 units of extremely low income households. It is reasonable to assume that many of these households will be seeking rental housing and most likely be facing an overpayment, overcrowding or substandard housing conditions. Moreover, very low and extremely low-income households often face other challenges, such as mental

or other disabilities and special needs. To address the range of needs, the City will work with the Riverside County Housing Authority (RHA) and non-profit housing agencies to use public financing tools, CDBG and HOME funds to assist in the production of housing to meet Very Low and Extremely Low Income housing needs. The City will also consider assisting the RHA and non-profits and other entities to meet ELI housing needs through site identification assistance, development incentives, fee waivers, mobile homeowner assistance, and by encouraging innovative housing types, such as mobile home assistance, single-room occupancy (SRO) units (*see Programs HE 1.1.2, .1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.1.15 and 1.1.16*).

Homeless Persons

On January 4, 2012, final regulations went into effect to implement changes to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) definition of homelessness contained in the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act. The definition affects who is eligible for various HUD-funded homeless assistance programs. The new definition includes four broad categories of homelessness:

- People who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, in emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or who are exiting an institution where they temporarily resided.
- People who are losing their primary nighttime residence, which may include a motel or hotel or a doubled-up situation, within 14 days and lack resources or support networks to remain in housing.
- Families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and likely to continue in that state.
- People who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, have no other residence, and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.

This definition demonstrates the diversity of people experiencing homelessness. The numerous locations in which people experiencing homelessness can be found complicate efforts to accurately estimate their total population. For example, an individual living with friends on a temporary basis could be experiencing homelessness, but would be unlikely to be identified in a homeless count.

The most recent point-in-time count conducted in 2015 identified 168 unsheltered homeless individuals in the City of Jurupa Valley. This figure is three times higher than the 2013 estimate and makes up about 11% of the total homeless population for Riverside County, as shown in *Table 5.40*. The point-in-time count is a snapshot of how



Figure 5-10: Jurupa Valley homeless camp

many homeless people are on streets and in emergency and transitional shelters on any given day in Riverside County and Jurupa Valley, although numbers can vary significantly by season.

Table 5.40: Homeless Population in Jurupa Valley and Riverside County, 2011-2015

	Unsheltered	Sheltered	Total
Jurupa Valley			
2015	168	–	168
2013	50	0	50
2011	–	–	–
Riverside County			
2015	1,587	–	1,587
2013	1,888	1,090	2,978
2011	5,090	1,113	6,203

Note: “–”: count not available.

Source: 2011, 2013, and 2015 Riverside County Homeless Point-In-Time Count Report.

Resources

The resources and services described in *Table 5.41* serve low income and special needs populations in Jurupa Valley—not just the homeless. While some of the programs and services identified below are not located within the City’s boundaries, the services they provide are available to persons residing in Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.41: Homeless and Special Needs Housing Resources

Agency/Program	Description	Location
Emergency Shelter		
Path of Life Ministries - Community Shelter Program	An emergency homeless shelter that serves adults by providing temporary housing along with assistance in obtaining important documents, job readiness, computer workshops, counseling, meals, hygiene supplies and various other forms of support. This program provides beds for up to 64 qualified single men and women.	2840 Hulen Place Riverside, CA 92507
Path of Life Ministries - Family Shelter Program	This program is offered to single parents with children, couples with children and single women. Support services focus on rapid re-housing, employment and increased income. It is a dormitory setting with 50 beds.	2530 Third Street Riverside, CA 92507
Path of Life Ministries - Emergency Cold Weather Shelter	The Path of Life Community Emergency Shelter provides an additional 72 beds from December to mid-April. These beds are provided on a night-by-night basis under the federal cold weather shelter initiative in cooperation with the County of Riverside.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506
Community Kitchens		
Calvary Chapel	Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.	5383 Martin Street Jurupa Valley, CA 95168-11092
Eagle Food Ministries	Provides food boxes for individuals and families on Thursdays.	5410 Beach Street Riverside, CA 92509
Manna Ministries	Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.	4318 Pyrite Street Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Rubidoux Missionary Baptist Church	Groceries are provided to families and individuals on the 2nd and 4th Saturday of each month.	2890 Rubidoux Boulevard Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Rubidoux Family Resource Center	Provides groceries and food, and also provides referrals to resources such as thrift stores and clothing	5473 Mission Boulevard Rubidoux, CA

Agency/Program	Description	Location
Transitional Housing		
The Place	Jefferson Transitional Programs (JTP) is a non-profit 501c3 offering vocational, supported living, and educational programs for individuals with chronic mental illness and/or addictions.	3839 Brockton Avenue Riverside, CA 92501
Safe House Transitional Living	A 15-bed apartment complex in downtown Riverside. Services are available to older homeless youth ages 18-22 for up to 18 months. Five apartments are set aside for Permanent Supportive Housing for youth ages 18-24.	9685 Hayes Street Riverside, CA 92503
Permanent Supportive Housing		
Path of Life Ministries	Provides immediate housing to chronically homeless individuals and some families, in scattered privately owned homes and apartments throughout Riverside County.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506
Rental and Support Services		
Path of Life Ministries	Rapid-Rehousing Program: provides assistance for the most immediate housing possible for homeless families with children and provides temporary rental subsidies. Rental Assistance Program: when available, provides one-time rental assistance (up to \$1000.00) to those exiting from homelessness or at risk of becoming homeless.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506
Foothill AIDS Project	Provides housing assistance, including help in locating and paying for emergency, transitional, or permanent housing, funds for paying rent, mortgage, and utility assistance. Referrals are available to other government and private subsidized housing programs and the state's homeless prevention program.	3576 Arlington Avenue, #206 Riverside, CA, 92506
Inland Empire Veterans Stand Down	Reunites homeless veterans with their families and communities through restorative resources and services. Some services provided include VA Claim assistance, legal clinics/seminars, transportation, food, blankets/sleeping bags, and care counseling.	6185 Magnolia Avenue, # 338 Riverside, CA 92506
Disabled American Veterans Charity	Provides free, professional assistance to veterans and their families in obtaining benefits and services.	4351 University Avenue Riverside, CA 92501
Lutheran Social Services	Some emergency services provided include food pantry, grocery packs, clothes, lunches, motel vouchers, eviction prevention, and rental assistance.	3772 Taft Street Riverside, CA 92503

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015

Farm Workers

As traditionally defined, farm workers are persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Permanent farm workers tend to work in fields or processing plants. During harvest periods when workloads increase, the need to supplement the permanent labor force is satisfied with seasonal workers. Often these seasonal workers are migrant workers, defined by the inability to return to their primary residence at the end of the workday. The agricultural workforce in Riverside County does many jobs, including weeding, thinning, planting, pruning, irrigation, tractor work, pesticide applications, harvesting, transportation to the cooler or market, and a variety of jobs at packing and processing facilities, as described in *Table 5.42*.

Table 5.42: Farm Worker Employment Profile, Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area

Occupation Title	Employment	Location Quotient	Mean Hourly Wage	Annual Mean Wage
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations	5,410	1.31	\$10.30	\$21,410
First-Line Supervisors of Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Workers	170	1.00	\$19.78	\$41,150
Agricultural Inspectors	100	0.79	\$24.98	\$51,950
Graders and Sorters, Agricultural Products	340	1.01	\$8.90	\$18,520
Agricultural Equipment Operators	210	0.88	\$11.70	\$24,330
Farmworkers and Laborers, Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse	4,320	1.70	\$9.41	\$19,570

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. May 2014 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Area Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.

Jurupa Valley was once primarily a farming area, with dairies, orchards, row crops, and small farms. With urbanization, most agricultural uses have moved out of the City and therefore, agricultural employment within the City of Jurupa Valley is declining. According to the 2014 American Fact Finder, only about one-tenth of 1% of the City’s civilian workforce (or 390 persons) works in agriculture and related occupations. It follows that few farm workers live and work in the City. While only small, isolated pockets of commercial agricultural remain in the City, cities must also consider housing needs for farmworkers employed in outlying County areas.

It is difficult to estimate the number of farm workers residing in the County or City of Jurupa Valley. The 2012 USDA Census of Farmworkers reported 1,215 farms, employing 13,843 farmworkers in the County. Among these farms, 107 farms reported hiring 3,324 migrant workers. USDA data is only available at the county level. According to 2011-2013 ACS, there were 9,684 agricultural workers living in Riverside County (about 1% of the County’s total labor force).

Farm worker households tend to have high rates of poverty, live disproportionately in housing which is in the poorest condition, have very high rates of overcrowding, have low homeownership rates, and are predominantly members of minority groups. Some immigrant farm workers may have an inherent fear and mistrust of law enforcement and other government authorities based on their experience or perception of the government in their country of origin or on the rumors and experiences of other farm workers. These farm workers may be reluctant to report fair housing issues or violations or contact any other government official for assistance. Furthermore, most federally funded housing programs, including the Housing Choice Voucher program and other subsidy programs, exclude persons who are undocumented. This means that people who are sometimes most in need are unable to obtain housing assistance, and others are unable to find any housing and instead must resort to homeless shelters, to sleeping in their vehicles, or to homeless encampments.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the average annual full-time wage for farm workers and laborers in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA in May 2014 was \$19,570. Within farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, first-line supervisors and agricultural inspectors earned the highest wages. *Table 5.42* presents the location quotient for farming, fishing, and forestry occupations. The location quotient is the ratio of the area concentration of occupational employment to the national average concentration. A location quotient greater than one indicates the occupation has a higher share of employment than average, and a location quotient less than one indicates the occupation is less prevalent in the area than average. The location quotient for agricultural employment in Jurupa Valley shows there is a moderate to high concentration of all types of agricultural occupation in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA. In Jurupa Valley, an estimated 606 residents were employed in the farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, or 11% of the County's population in these occupations.

Resources

A number of service providers in Riverside County provide assistance and services to farmworkers. The Family Resource Center Program at Mecca Family and Farm Workers Service Center (91-275 66th Avenue, Suite 100, Mecca, CA 92254) provides seven core service types: parenting skills, self-sufficiency, community action, child abuse prevention services, information and referral services, education and literacy, and life skills. There are also two farmworker housing projects located in Riverside County: Chapultepec Apartments (62-600 Lincoln St., Mecca, CA 92254; 31 units) and Las Mañanitas (91-200 Avenue 63 Mecca, CA 92254; 128 beds).

Publicly Assisted Housing

The availability and location of publicly assisted housing may be a fair housing concern. If such housing is concentrated in one area of a community or of a region, a household seeking affordable housing is limited to choices within the area. In addition, public/assisted housing and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) assistance should be accessible to qualified households regardless of race/ethnicity, disability, or other protected class status.

Public Housing

The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) owns and operates 38 conventional public housing units in Jurupa Valley and a total of 469 units in Riverside County. Eligible residents must be seniors or disabled, or have an annual gross income at or below 80% of the AMI. As of October 2015, 38 Jurupa Valley households were living in public housing units managed by the HACR, and there were 1,443 Jurupa Valley households on the waiting list for public housing.

However, HACR plans to convert the Public Housing units in Jurupa Valley to Project-Based Vouchers (PBV).

Housing Choice Vouchers Program

HACR administers the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) for Jurupa Valley residents. As of October 2015, 359 Jurupa Valley households were receiving Housing Choice Vouchers. For the distribution of Voucher assistance within the City, HACR has established local preferences such as families who have lost HCVs due to funding cuts, working families, elderly or disabled, and veterans. As of October 2015, 381 households were on the waiting list for the HCV program.

As an extension of the HCV program, HACR assists eligible families who purchase a home by applying their existing HCV towards a monthly mortgage payment. Eligible families may qualify for a maximum period of 10 or 15 years (depending on the mortgage terms).

Other Affordable Housing Developments

Housing developments utilizing federal, state, and/or local programs, including state and local bond programs, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), density bonus, or direct assistance programs, are often restricted for use as low-income housing and provide another source of affordable housing for a jurisdiction. *Table 5.43* summarizes housing developments in Jurupa Valley in which some or all of the units are designated as affordable for low to moderate-income households. Together these projects provide 382 units of affordable housing.

Table 5.43: Non-Public Housing Affordable Units in Jurupa Valley

Property Name	Property Address	Funding Source	Unit Size	Total Affordable Units	Total Project Units	Expiration of Affordability
Mission Villas	5870 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509	LIHTC, Sec 202/811	53 – 1 BR 1 – 2 BR	54	54	2018
Mission Palms	5875 Mission Blvd. Rubidoux, CA 92509	RDA, LIHTC, HOME	88 – 1 BR 20 – 2 BR 1 – 3 BR	109	109	2059
Mission Palms II	3702 La Rue St. Riverside, CA 92509	RDA	73 – 1 BR 18 – 2 BR	91	91	2062
Mission Village Senior Apartments	8989 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509	RDA, LIHTC,	90 – 1 BR 12 – 2 BR	102	102	2066
Habitat for Humanity-CalVet Jurupa Valley Veterans Housing	At the end of Amarillo Street in Glen Avon area	CalVet Habitat, HACR	18 – 3 BR 8 – 4 BR	26	26	2061
Total				382	382	

Notes: These properties were developed prior to the incorporation of Jurupa Valley. Therefore, records on these properties do not use Jurupa Valley as the location but these properties are located in Jurupa Valley.

Abbreviations: HOME: HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HUD); CDBG: Planning Block Grant (HUD); RDA: City Redevelopment Agency; LIHTC: Low Income Housing Tax Credit; HTF: Housing Trust Fund; MHSA; Mental Health Services Act

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 2015.

Units at Risk of Converting to Market-Rate Housing

Projects at Risk

State law requires that the City identify, analyze, and propose programs to preserve existing multi-family rental units that are eligible to convert to non-low-income housing uses due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions during the next 10 years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers a 10-year period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2023 (10 years from the statutory deadline of the Housing Element). Consistent with state law, this section identifies publicly assisted housing units in Jurupa Valley, analyzes their potential to convert to market rate housing uses, and analyzes the cost to preserve or replace those units.

Within the at-risk analysis period, only one project is considered to be at-risk of converting to market-rate housing—54-unit Mission Villas senior housing, funded with Section 202 financing and Section 8 project-based rent subsidies. The Section 8 contract for Mission Villas is due to expire on January 31, 2018. However, HUD has prioritized funding for Section 8 renewals for senior housing projects (Section 202), and therefore, this project is at low risk of converting to market-rate housing. There are several public agencies and private non-profits in the West Riverside County area with the capacity to acquire and manage at-risk units or develop new affordable units. In 2017, these include:

1. **Housing Authority of the County of Riverside**
Address: 5555 Arlington Avenue, Riverside, CA 92504
Phone: (951) 351-0700
2. **Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.**
3933 Mission Inn Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501
Phone: (951) 682-6581
3. **Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing**
501 Shatto Place, Suite 403, Los Angeles, CA 90020
Phone: (213) 480-1249
4. **National Community Renaissance**
9421 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Phone: (909) 483-2444
5. **Habitat for Humanity Riverside**
2180 Iowa Avenue, Riverside, CA 92507
Phone: (951) 787-6754
6. **Path of Life Ministries**
1240 Palmyrita Avenue, Suite A, Riverside, CA 92507
Mail: PO Box 1445, Riverside CA
Phone: (951) 786-9048

Preservation and Replacement Options

To preserve the existing affordable housing stock, the City must either preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of project to nonprofit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. For example, CDBG and HOME funds may be used to acquire and rehabilitate the affordable units in exchange for an extended affordability covenant on the assisted units. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units. These options are described below. Due to the City's significant financial constraints, all options would require a collaborative effort between the City and the Riverside County Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agency to pursue.

1. Transfer of Ownership

Transferring ownership of an at-risk project to a nonprofit housing provider is generally one of the least costly ways to ensure that the at-risk units remain affordable for the long term. Transferring property ownership to a nonprofit organization would secure low-income restrictions, and the project would become potentially eligible for a greater range of governmental assistance. Mission Villas is Section 202 senior housing project, which is nonprofit-owned. Therefore, transferring ownership to another nonprofit is not a necessary preservation option.

2. Rental Assistance

Table 5.44 shows rental subsidies required for a typical 25 unit below-market apartment project in Jurupa Valley in 2015. Rental subsidies can be used to maintain affordability of the 54 at-risk affordable units at Mission Villas. All 54 units are one-bedroom assisted living units for seniors. Should the Section 8 contract not be renewed, other funding sources could be used to structure the rent subsidies to reflect the Section 8 program. According to HUD records, the units at Mission Villas are renting at \$676 monthly, significantly below Fair Market Rents for comparable units. Should these units convert to market rate, the tenants should expect to pay at least \$908 per month, resulting in an affordability gap of \$232. As indicated in *Table 5.44*, the total cost of subsidizing the rents of all 54 at-risk units is estimated at \$12,528 per month or \$150,336 annually. Providing this level of subsidies for at least 55 years would require over \$17 million, assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.5% over 55 years. The feasibility of this alternative is highly dependent upon the availability of reliable funding sources necessary to make

rent subsidies and the willingness of property owners to participate in the program.

Table 5.44: Rental Subsidies Required

Unit Size	Total Units	Fair Market Rent ¹	Household Size	Contract Rent ²	Monthly Subsidy per Unit	Total Monthly Subsidy
1-bedroom	25	\$908	1	\$676	\$232	\$12,528

¹ Fair Market Rent (FMR) is determined by HUD, 2015.

² 2015 contract rent for unit at Mission Villas per HUD records.

3. Purchase of Affordability Covenants

Another option to preserve the affordability of the at-risk project is to work with Riverside County’s Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agencies and developers to provide incentives to the property owner to maintain the project as affordable housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, providing a lump-sum payment, and/or supplementing the rents to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the complex has a high level of debt-to-equity ratio. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable. Funding available for purchase of affordability covenants is also limited. Typically, HUD funds cannot be used for this purpose.

4. Construction of Replacement Units

The construction of new low-income housing units is a means of replacing the at-risk units if they are converted to market-rate units and is eligible for HUD funds. The cost of developing housing depends upon a variety of factors, including density, size of the units (i.e., square footage and number of bedrooms), location, land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average construction cost of approximately \$150,000 per unit, it would cost over \$8.1 million (excluding land costs) to construct 54 new assisted units. Including land costs, the total cost to develop replacement units would be higher.

5. Cost Comparisons

The above analysis attempts to estimate the cost of preserving the at-risk units under various options. These cost estimates are general estimates and are intended to demonstrate only the relative magnitude of funding required. Actual costs of preservation would depend on the individual circumstances of the at-risk property and market conditions at the time.

The transferring of ownership of the at-risk units to a nonprofit housing organization is not an effective option, since Mission Villas

is already nonprofit-owned. The annual costs of providing rental subsidies to preserve the 54 assisted units are relatively low (\$150,336); however, long-term provision of rental subsidies for at least 55 years would cost over \$17 million. New construction of 54 replacement units has highest upfront costs (\$8 million, excluding land costs) but the new units would typically be subject to long-term affordability restrictions and high housing quality standards. In evaluating the various options, the City or the responsible housing agency must consider the available funding sources and the willingness of property owners to participate in preservation, among other factors. With the dissolution of redevelopment in California and as a “young” city, Jurupa Valley has virtually no financial capacity to support affordable housing development. The City is struggling to maintain economic stability given the loss of state pass-thru and tax increment funds.

J. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Governmental Constraints

Governmental constraints are policies, standards, requirements, and actions imposed by the government that affect the development and provision of housing. These constraints may include building codes, land use controls, growth management measures, development fees, processing and permit procedures, and site improvement costs. State and federal agencies play a role in the imposition of governmental constraints; however, these agencies are beyond the influence of local government and are therefore not addressed in this analysis.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element of a General Plan designates the general distribution, location, and extent of uses for land planned for housing, business, industry, open space, and public or community facilities. As it applies to housing, the Land Use Element establishes a range of residential land use categories, specifies densities (typically expressed as dwelling units per acre), and suggests the types and locations of housing appropriate in a community. Residential development is implemented through the zoning districts, use classifications, development regulations, and design standards specified in the jurisdiction’s zoning code.

The City of Jurupa Valley adopted the County of Riverside General Plan upon the City’s incorporation in 2011. In 2016, the City began preparing its first General Plan. The Plan is considered “interim” in recognition of the fact that it is a focused General Plan update intended to meet community needs until the City’s budget allows a

more extensive update. A series of eight public workshops on community planning issues and needs were held in January and February of 2015, and the City Council appointed a 31-member General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) that developed a Community Values Statement and identified Community Assets, Issues and Needs during public meetings held between January and December of 2015, and adoption of the General Plan is anticipated in early 2017.

The 2017 General Plan Land Use Element includes designating certain sites for medium, high, and highest density as a part of this process. Several such sites are shown on the 2011 Land Use Element as industrial and are located within existing residential neighborhoods. These changes to the Land Use Element facilitate residential development by removing the need for private developers to seek General Plan Amendments for several specific sites (*Figure LUE-11*), thus removing a potential barrier to housing production. Further, the City's initiative serves as an incentive to attract new multiple-family dwelling projects.

Types of Residential Communities

The governmental factor that most directly influences the types and character of residential communities, as well as market conditions, is the allowable density range of residentially designated land. In general, higher densities allow developers to take advantage of economies of scale, reduce the per-unit cost of land and improvements, and reduce developments costs associated with new housing construction. Reasonable density standards ensure the opportunity for higher-density residential uses to be developed within a community, increasing the feasibility of producing affordable housing, and offer a variety of housing options that meet the needs of the community.

Table 5.45 summarizes the City's 2017 General Plan land use designations that will allow residential uses, as well as their permitted net densities (without density bonus). The 2017 General Plan provides a range of densities for single-family (up to 14 units per acre) and multi-family (14 to 25 units per acre) housing development to accommodate a wide range of housing options. Maximum allowed densities are established for all residential designations, and minimum densities are established to help ensure that land zoned for residential use will be developed as efficiently as possible.

Table 5.45: Jurupa Valley General Plan Residential Land Use Designations, 2016

Designation	Description	Permitted Density (du/acre)	
		Minimum "Target"	Maximum Allowed
Small Farm (Rural Residential - RR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 5 acres. 	--	1 unit per 5 acres
Ranch (Estate Density Residential - EDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 2 acres. 	--	1 unit per 2 acres
Rural Neighborhood (Very Low Density Residential - VLDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of 1 to 2 acres. 	--	1 unit per 1 acre
Country Neighborhood (Low Density Residential (LDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of ½ to 1 acre. 	--	1 unit per ½ acre
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached and attached residences with a density range of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. 	2	5
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached and detached residences with a density range of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre. 	5	8
High Density Residential (HDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached and detached residences, including townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard homes, patio homes, and zero lot line homes. 	8	14
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached residences and all types of multi-family dwellings. 	14	20
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-family dwellings, includes apartments and condominium. Multi-level (3+) structures are allowed. 	25	25
Mixed Use Overlay (MUO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows a mix of residential, commercial, office and other compatible uses. Flexible residential density and development standards are applied to encourage compatible, attractive, high-quality development. 	8	20
*Town Center Overlay (TCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to three historic core areas, namely Rubidoux, Pedley, and Glen Avon. Promotes infill and improvement of established town centers a more urbanized, pedestrian-oriented mix of residential, commercial, office, entertainment, civic, transit, educational, and/or recreational uses, or other uses is encouraged. Special Design Guidelines apply to the Pedley, Rubidoux and Glen Avon Town Centers 	5	25

Source: Draft 2016 Jurupa Valley General Plan.

The Zoning Code is the primary tool for implementing the General Plan Land Use and Housing elements. It is designed to protect and promote public health, safety and welfare, as well as to promote quality design and quality of life. The City of Jurupa Valley's residential zoning districts control both the use and development standards of each residential site or parcel, thereby influencing the location, design, quality, and cost of housing.

Residential Density and Affordable Housing

State housing law requires jurisdictions to provide an analysis showing that land use designations or zones identified for the development of housing for lower income households are sufficient to encourage such development. The law provides two options for preparing the analysis: 1) describe market demand and trends, financial feasibility, and recent development experience; or 2) utilize default density standards deemed adequate to meet the lower income housing need. According to state law, the default density standard for the City of Jurupa Valley is 30 dwelling units per acre.

Based on an analysis of affordable housing development in the Western Riverside County region and on discussions with local affordable housing developers, as outlined in the following section, the City has determined that a base density of 25 du/a (allowed maximum density, not including any applicable density bonus) is appropriate to accommodate the City's Lower Income housing need.

Program HE 1.1.1 commits the City to amending the Land Use Map of the General Plan to add at least 48 acres of HHDR-designated land with appropriate zoning to allow multi-family ownership and rental housing. The HHDR land use designation allows a base density of 25 dwelling units per acre, with additional density possible through state-mandated density bonuses.

Land costs in Jurupa Valley continue to be significantly lower than those of Orange and Los Angeles counties; hence, the number of units per acre necessary to allow an affordable housing development project to achieve economies of scale is smaller than that of many other Southern California cities. A survey of vacant properties for sale in Jurupa Valley on LandWatch.com showed seven properties available and suitable for residential development. Properties ranged in size from 1 to 17 acres and had an average land cost of \$124,559 per acre. By comparison, vacant properties in inland Orange County on mostly smaller, infill sites range from \$.5 million to well over \$1 million per acre.

The City contacted three affordable housing developers within the Riverside/Jurupa Valley area: National Community Renaissance, Jamboree Housing Corporation, and Bridge Housing Corporation. Based on those conversations, it was determined that densities of

25 dwelling units per acre are sufficient to accommodate affordable housing development within the City of Jurupa Valley. According to these developers, the primary determinant of affordability is land cost, followed by the type and cost of construction. They noted that there was a “pivot point” density at or near 25 dwelling units per acre. As density increased beyond this point, podium type development was typically required, significantly increasing the cost of construction. For this reason, these developers believed densities of 25 dwellings per acre or less were more feasible than higher densities in the Riverside/San Bernardino market. They also stressed the importance of project compatibility with surrounding uses in setting project density, because this related directly to the time and cost of development. Consequently, these non-profit developers indicated they would not exclude sites designated at 25 dwelling units per acre in their consideration of sites suitable to develop affordable housing.

Table 5.46: Inland Empire Affordable Housing Project Examples

Jurisdiction	Development Name ¹	Address	Dwelling Units	Acreage	Dwelling Units/Acre
Jurupa Valley	Veterans' Neighborhood ²	North side of Mission Boulevard at Amarillo Street	26	5.5	4.7
Corona	Citrus Circle Apartments (2015)	141-311 So. Buena Vista Avenue	61	2.47	24.7
Corona	C&C Apartments ²	6 th Street at Rimpau Avenue	85	4	21.3
Corona	Corona Community Villas	2680 S. Main Street	75	10	7.5
Temecula	Madera Vista (2017)	44153 Margarita Road	80	5	16
Chino	Ivy at College Park (2014)	5950 Notre Dame Avenue	135	10	13.5
Chino	Ivy II at College Park (2017)	5950 Notre Dame Avenue	200	9	22.2
Highgrove (Riverside Co.)	Highgrove Blossom Apartments (2014)	550 Center Street	89	6.1	14.6

¹ Project completion dates in parentheses.

² Project has City approvals. Construction to begin in 2017.

Variety of Housing Opportunity

The Zoning Code provides for a range of housing types, including single-family, multi-family, second dwelling units, manufactured homes, mobile home parks, licensed community care facilities, employee housing for seasonal or migrant workers as necessary, assisted living facilities, emergency shelters, supportive housing, transitional housing, and single room occupancy (SRO) units. *Table 5.47* summarizes the types of housing allowed by Jurupa Valley’s Zoning Code to ensure a variety of housing opportunities continues to be available.

Table 5.47: Jurupa Valley Permitted Uses by Zone

Zoning District	One-Family Dwelling	Multiple Family Dwelling	Second Units	Congregate Care Facilities	Emergency Shelter	Transitional and Supportive Housing ¹	Farm Worker Housing ²	Employee Housing	SRO	Manufactured Housing/ Mobile-home	Mobile-Home Park	Planned Residential Development
R-R/R-R-O	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-1/R-1A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-2	P	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-2A	P	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-3	P*	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-3A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-T	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-T-R	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	--	P#
R-4	P*	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-6	P	P	P	NP	NP	P	NP	P	P	P	CUP	P#
PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	NP	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	P#
I-P	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	P*	NP	P*	NP	NP
A-1	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	P*	NP	NP	P*	CUP	P#
A-2	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	P*	NP	NP	P*	CUP	P#
W-2	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P#
R-D	P	P*	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
N-A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P*	NP	P#

P = Permitted by Right; CUP = Conditional Use Permit Required; "NP" = Not Permitted; P* = Requires Site Development Permit; P# = Requires PC/CC review; PUD = Allowed with PUD; rezoning required.

Notes: 1 Transitional and Supportive housing subject to same requirements that apply to standard residential uses.

2 Employee housing for six or fewer persons is treated as a single-family structure and residential use.

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Code, 2016

Single- and Multi-Family Uses

One-family dwellings are permitted uses in most residential zones. Multi-family dwellings are permitted in the R-4 zone, as well as the R-2, R-3, and R-6 zones with the approval of a Site Development Permit. The Site Development Permit process is a discretionary review process that differs from conditional use permit review in that it is strictly concerned with design and the application of conditions to address traffic safety, parking, noise and other standards, not land use or compatibility. Conditions of approval may be imposed that must be met prior to or concurrent with project development. However, Site Development Permits are less costly and processed more quickly than conditional use permits. Site Development Permits for residential projects are typically acted upon by the Planning Director and generally do not require Planning Commission approval, except for special cases such as cellular sites and detached accessory structures.

Accessory or Second Dwelling Units

Second dwelling units are attached or detached dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, cooking, and sanitation. Second dwelling units may be an alternative source of affordable housing for lower income households and seniors. These units typically rent for less than apartments of comparable size.

California law requires local jurisdictions to adopt ordinances that establish the conditions under which second dwelling units are permitted (*California Government Code*, §65852.2). A jurisdiction cannot adopt an ordinance that totally precludes the development of second dwelling units unless the ordinance contains findings acknowledging that allowing second dwelling units may limit housing opportunities of the region and result in adverse impacts on public health, safety, and welfare. In 2017, the City is developing an ordinance to amend its Accessory Dwelling Unit requirements to comply with state law.

An amendment to the state's second unit law in 2003 requires local governments to use a ministerial, rather than discretionary process for approving second dwelling units and allows jurisdictions to count second dwelling units towards meeting their regional housing needs goals. A ministerial process is intended to reduce permit processing periods and development costs, because proposed second dwelling units that comply with local zoning regulations and standards can be approved without a public hearing.

Jurupa Valley permits second units on parcels that have at least 1 acre of usable land and that have a legal, single-family dwelling existing on the site, subject to additional development standards

and the approval of a Second Unit Permit. Second Unit Permits are reviewed by the Planning Director and do not require discretionary review or a hearing.

Manufactured Housing

State law requires local governments to permit manufactured and mobile homes meeting federal safety and construction standards on a permanent foundation (and permanently connected to water and sewer utilities, where available), in all single-family residential zoning districts (§65852.3 of the *California Government Code*).

For purposes of permit issuance, Jurupa Valley permits mobile homes on a foundation system on all lots zoned to permit single-family dwellings. The installation of manufactured homes not on foundations is allowed whenever it is specifically provided for in the various zone classifications, and is subject to the requirements and standards set forth in those zones. A mobile home permitted in the R-R and R-A zones, however, is subject to additional development standards regarding minimum floor area and lot size. These requirements are standard for most California jurisdictions and are similar to those of Riverside County.

Residential Care Facilities

The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (§5115 and §5116 of the *California Welfare and Institutions Code*) declares that mentally and physically disabled persons are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings. The use of property for the care of six or fewer mentally disordered or otherwise handicapped persons is required by law. A state-authorized, certified, or authorized family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a-day basis is considered a residential use to be permitted in all residential zones. No local agency can impose stricter zoning or building and safety standards on these homes (commonly referred to as “group” homes) for six or fewer persons than are required of other permitted residential uses in the zone. The Lanterman Act covers only licensed residential care facilities. California Housing Element law also addresses the provision of transitional and supportive housing, which covers non-licensed housing facilities for persons with disabilities.

The City of Jurupa Valley defines congregate care facilities as “a housing arrangement, developed pursuant to Article XIX of the Zoning Code, where nonmedical care and supervision are provided, including meals and social, recreational, homemaking and security services.” Congregate care facilities are permitted in the R-2 and R-3 zones, with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The City does not currently comply with the Lanterman Act. However, in 2017, Jurupa Valley is developing its first General Plan, to be followed up

with a comprehensive Zoning Code update. As part of this Zoning Code update, the City's provisions for licensed residential care facilities will be amended as needed to ensure consistency with the Lanterman Act.

Emergency Shelters

An emergency shelter is a facility that provides temporary shelter and feeding of indigents or disaster victims, operated by a public or non-profit agency. State law requires jurisdictions to identify adequate sites for housing that will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all income levels, including emergency shelters and transitional housing (§65583(c)(1) of the *California Government Code*). State law (SB 2) requires that local jurisdictions make provisions in their zoning codes to permit emergency shelters by right in at least one zoning district where adequate capacity is available to accommodate at least one year-round shelter. Local jurisdictions may establish standards to regulate the development of emergency shelters.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits emergency shelters in its Industrial Park (I-P) zone, subject to the development standards allowed under SB 2, such as minimum floor area for each client, minimum interior waiting and client intake areas, off-street parking and outdoor lighting requirements, and the requirement for an on-site manager and at least one additional staff member to be present on-site during hours of operation.

The City has a number of large, vacant I-P zoned sites totaling 290 acres. Upon incorporation, the City adopted the Riverside County Zoning Code by reference. The County Zoning Code contains distance requirements for emergency shelters that are above and beyond the basic 300-foot distance between two shelters as permitted by SB 2. As part of the development of the City's first General Plan, and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will remove the distance requirement between emergency shelters and airports. With this amendment, the City's provisions for emergency shelters will fully comply with SB 2.

Transitional and Supportive Housing

State law (SB 2) requires local jurisdictions to address the provisions for transitional and supportive housing. Under Housing Element law, transitional housing means buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and reassignment of the assisted unit to another eligible program participant at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than 6 months from the beginning of the assistance (*California*

Government Code §65582(h)). For example, a multi-family dwelling that is designated as a temporary (typically 6 months to 1 year) residence for abused women and children, pending relocation to more permanent housing.

Supportive housing means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an on-site or off-site service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Target population means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 commencing with §4500 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code*) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people (*California Government Code §§65582(f) and (g)*).

Accordingly, state law establishes transitional and supportive housing as residential uses and therefore, local governments cannot treat these uses differently from other similar types of residential uses (e.g., requiring a use permit when other residential uses of similar function do not require a use permit). The City of Jurupa Valley's Zoning Code does not include provisions for transitional or supportive housing. As part of the development of the City's first General Plan, and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will include provisions for transitional and supportive housing, pursuant to SB 2, as provided in Program HE 3.1.9.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO)

AB 2634 mandates that local jurisdictions address the provision of housing options for extremely low-income households, including Single Room Occupancy units (SRO). SRO units are typically one-room units intended for occupancy by a single individual. It is distinct from a studio or efficiency unit, in that a studio is a one-room unit that must contain a kitchen and a bathroom. Although SRO units are not required to have a kitchen or bathroom, many SROs have one or the other. There are minimum standards for SROs (including a minimum floor area requirement) under the *California Health and Safety Code*.

The City of Jurupa Valley's Zoning Code does not specifically address SROs. As part of the development of the City's first General Plan and accompanying comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will include provisions to address SRO housing.

Farm Worker and Employee Housing

The California Employee Housing Act requires that housing for six or fewer employees be treated as a regular residential use. In general, the *California Health and Safety Code* §17008(a) defines “employee housing” as “any portion of any housing accommodation, or property upon which a housing accommodation is located, if all of the following factors exist:

- (1) The accommodations consist of any living quarters, dwelling, boardinghouse, tent, bunkhouse, maintenance-of-way car, mobilehome, manufactured home, recreational vehicle, travel trailer, or other housing accommodations, maintained in one or more buildings or one or more sites, and the premises upon which they are situated or the area set aside and provided for parking of mobile homes or camping of five or more employees by the employer.
- (2) The accommodations are maintained in connection with any work or place where work is being performed, whether or not rent is involved.”

Section 17005 of the *California Health and Safety Code* identifies the few types of employees excluded, and Section 17008 provides a detailed definition of employee housing. The Employee Housing Act further defines housing for agricultural workers consisting of 36 beds or 12 units be treated as an agricultural use and permitted where agricultural uses are permitted.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits agricultural uses in a number of its residential zones, although there are no large scale agricultural properties or businesses in the City at this time. The Zoning Code does not specifically address farm worker housing in residential zones, but does allow farm worker housing in the City’s agricultural zones (A-1 and A-2) with Site Development Permit approval, and single-family dwellings are permitted by right in these zones. As part of the implementation of the 2017 General Plan and related comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will amend the Zoning Code to address the requirements of the Employee Housing Act.

Development Requirements

Upon incorporation as a city, Jurupa Valley adopted the Riverside County Zoning Code by reference. *Table 5.48* summarizes the City’s residential zoning districts and their development standards, as established in the County Zoning Code adopted by the City. The City will be comprehensively updating its Zoning Code to implement the 2017 General Plan.

Table 5.48: Summary of Residential Zoning Districts Development Standards

Zoning District	Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot			Maximum Building Height (stories/feet)	Minimum Front Yard (feet)	Minimum Interior Side Yard (feet)	Minimum Corner Side Yard (feet)	Minimum Rear Yard (feet)	Lot Coverage
		Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Frontage (feet)						
RR	21,780	80	--	--	40-50	--	--	--	--	--
R-1/ R-1A	7,200	60	100	60	3-story/40	20	10% of lot width	10	10	50%
R-A	20,000	100	150	--	40-50	20	--	--	--	--
R-2	7,200	--	--	--	3-story/40	20	10% of lot width	10	10	60%
R-2A	7,200	--	--	--	2-story/30	20	5	--	10	60%
R-3	7,200	60	100	--	50-75	10	5	10	10	50%
R-3A	9,000	--	--	--	50-75	10	5	10	10	50%
R-4	3,500	40	80	--	40-50	20	5	10	10	--
R-5	None	n/a	n/a	n/a	50-75	50	50	50	50	--
R-6	5,000	--	--	30	35-50	10	--	--	10	--
R-T	3,600/7,200	40/60	100	30/45	40	20	5	5	5	--
PUD	--	--	--	--	--	10	5	10	10	varies

Parking Requirements

Table 5.49 summarizes the residential parking requirements in Jurupa Valley. Parking requirements do not constrain the development of housing directly. However, parking requirements may reduce the amount of available lot areas for residential development. The City determines the required number of parking spaces based on the type and size of the residential unit and has found the required parking spaces to be necessary to accommodate the number of vehicles typically associated with each residence.

Table 5.49: Residential Parking Requirements

Type of Residential Development	Required Parking Spaces (off street)
Single-Family	2 spaces per dwelling
Multi-family	Studio or 1 BR: 1.25 spaces per unit 2 BR: 2.25 spaces per unit 3 BR: 2.75 spaces per unit (add 1 space per employee) PRD: 1.5 spaces per unit
Planned Residential Development	1 BR: 1.5 space per unit; 2 BR or more: 2.5 spaces per unit
Senior Housing	See Single-Family and Multi-Family requirements
Mobile Home Parks	2 spaces per trailer or mobile home space* (add 1 guest space per 8 mobile home spaces)
Second Units	1 BR: 1 space* per unit 2 BR: 2 spaces* per unit

Source: Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, 2015.

* Indicates parking spaces may be tandem.

Density Bonus Ordinance

California Government Code §65915 requires local governments to grant a density bonus of at least 20% (5% for condominiums) and an additional incentive, or financially equivalent incentive(s), to a developer of a residential project that agrees to provide at least:

- 10% of the units for lower income households;
- 5% of the units for very low income households;
- 10% of the condominium units for moderate income households;
- A senior citizen housing development; or
- Qualified donations of land, condominium conversions, and childcare facilities.

The density bonus law also applies to senior housing projects and projects that include a childcare facility. In addition to the density bonus stated above, the statute includes a sliding scale that requires:

- An additional 2.5% density bonus for each additional increase of 1% in the number of Very Low income units above the initial 5% threshold;
- A density increase of 1.5% for each additional 1% increase in the number of Low income units above the initial 10% threshold; and
- A 1% density increase for each 1% increase in the number of Moderate income units above the initial 10% threshold.

These bonuses reach a maximum density bonus of 35% when a project provides 11% very-low income units, 20% low-income units, or 40% moderate income units. In addition to a density bonus, at the discretion of the approving jurisdiction, developers may also be eligible for one of the following concessions or incentives:

- Reductions in site development standards and modifications of zoning and architectural design requirements, including reduced setbacks and parking standards;
- Mixed used zoning that will reduce the cost of the housing, if the non-residential uses are compatible with the housing development and other development in the area; and
- Other regulatory incentives or concessions that result in “identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual cost reductions.”

Jurisdictions may not impose any development (or density) standard that, by itself, would preclude the construction of a project with the density bonus and the incentives or concessions to which the developer is entitled. To achieve compliance with the state density bonus law, jurisdictions must reevaluate their development

standards in relation to the maximum achievable densities for multi-family housing.

Building Codes and Enforcement

Building and safety codes are adopted to preserve public health and safety, and ensure the construction of safe and decent housing. These codes and standards also have the potential to increase the cost of housing construction or maintenance.

The City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2013 California Building Standards Code. Other codes commonly adopted by reference within the region include the California Mechanical Code, the California Plumbing Code, the California or National Electric Code, the Uniform Housing Code, and the California Fire Code. Less common are the California Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings, the Urban-Wildland Interface Code, and the Uniform Code for Building Conservation. The City has not adopted any local amendments that constrain the development, maintenance, or preservation of housing.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Land Use Controls

As previously noted, the City will address the provision of residential care facilities as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.

Reasonable Accommodation

Building and development standards may constrain the ability of persons with disabilities to live in housing units that are suited to their needs. Currently, the City considers requests for reasonable accommodation when requests are made, without a formal application and approval process. As part of the development of the comprehensive Zoning Code update, the City will adopt a formal reasonable accommodation ordinance.

Definition of Family

The City's Zoning Code defines *family* as "an individual or two or more persons related by blood or marriage, or a group of not more than five persons, excluding servants, who are not related by blood or marriage, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit." There are a number of state and federal rules that govern the definition of family, including the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, the California Fair Housing and Employment Act, the California Supreme Court case, *City of Santa Barbara v Adamson* (1980), and the California Constitution privacy clauses that have prompted redefining *family*. Many traditional zoning definitions of *family* required household members to be

related; however, this definition discriminated against disabled persons sharing housing, and also against other unrelated persons living together, even though related individuals with similar household sizes were allowed to live together.

Pursuant to Program HE 3.1.9, this definition will be amended to remove: 1) any reference to the number of persons that can be considered a “family,” and 2) any reference to how members of a “family” are to be related. This amendment will be processed as part of the comprehensive Zoning Code update.

Building Code

As indicated above, the City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2013 California Building Standards Code and routinely adopts updates as they become available. The City has not adopted any special amendments to this Code that would impede housing for persons with disabilities.

Planning and Development Fees

Housing construction imposes certain short- and long-term costs upon local government, such as the cost of providing planning services and inspections. The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon various planning and development fees to recoup costs and ensure that essential services and infrastructure are available when needed. Planning fees for Jurupa Valley are summarized in Table 5.50.

Table 5.50: Planning Fees

Application	Initial Deposit Fee
General Plan Amendment	\$7,479.66
Conditional Use Permit	\$9,646.14+\$5.10 per lot or site
Variance (filed alone)	\$2,625.48
Site Development Permit (Plot Plan)	\$4,791.96
Tentative Tract Map (Single-Family Residential)	\$11,368.92 + \$102 per unit
Tentative Tract Map (Multi-Family Residential)	\$11,368.92 + \$102.00 per lot + \$19.38 per acre
Tentative Parcel Map (without waiver of Final Parcel Map)	\$5,621.22 + \$104.04 per lot
Zone Change	\$3,648.54

Fees vary due to location of the units.

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, January 1, 2012.

Until 1978, property taxes were the primary revenue source for most local governments, supporting municipal operations and, when needed, funding the costs of capital improvements such as streets, drainage, and other public improvements. The passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 limited a local jurisdiction’s ability to raise property taxes and significantly lowered the ad valorem tax rate, increasing reliance on other funding sources to provide infrastructure, public improvements, and public services. More recently,

the loss of redevelopment funds and state vehicle license fees has dramatically affected California cities’ ability to fund public improvements. An alternative funding source widely used among local governments in California is the development impact fee, which is collected for a variety of improvements including street and drainage improvements.

The City of Jurupa Valley collects development impact fees from developers of new housing units, as well as commercial, office, retail, and industrial development. These fees are used to offset costs primarily associated with traffic impacts and City street improvements. *Table 5.51* summarizes the development impact fees required by the City and by other relevant agencies in 2017 for residential developments. Based on 2016 development applications, development impact fees are in the order of \$15,500 per unit for a market-rate single-family home and \$12,000 per unit for market-rate multi-family apartment projects.

Table 5.51: Residential Development Impact Fees (Per Unit)

Fee Type	Area 1: Jurupa			
	Single-Family		Multi-Family	
Public Facilities Fee	\$1,207		\$1,011	
Fire Facilities Fee	\$705		\$590	
Transportation (Roads, Bridges) Fee	\$1,001		\$ 791	
Transportation (Signals) Fee	\$420		\$378	
Regional Parks	\$563		\$472	
Regional Trails Fee	\$316		\$264	
Libraries Fee	\$341		\$286	
Program Administration Fee	\$60		\$50	
Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF)	Single-family: \$8,873		Multi-family: \$6,231	
Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Fee	Less than 8.0 units per acre: \$1,952/unit Between 8.0-14.0 units per acre: \$1,250/unit Greater than 14.0 units per acre: \$1,015/unit			
Mira Loma Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBD) Fee	Zone A: \$1,667 MF*: \$417	Zone B: \$884 MF*: \$612	Zone D: \$2,681 MF*: \$1,857	Zone E: \$1,644 MF*: \$1,139

Notes: Fees for senior single-family units are reduced by 33%.
Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015

Local Processing and Permit Procedures

Considerable holding costs are associated with delays in processing development applications and plans. At times, these holding costs are passed through to renters and homeowners in the price/rent of housing, thus affecting the affordability. The City of Jurupa Valley’s development review process is designed to accommodate housing development applications of various levels of complexity and requiring different entitlements. Processing times vary with the complexity of the project.

Building permit applications for new single-family houses typically take 3 to 6 months to complete the building permit plancheck

process, sometimes longer depending upon the size of the project. Processing multi-family development applications, which often require general plan amendments, rezoning, and CEQA review, typically requires 6 months to 1 year—depending upon the number of dwellings—to complete discretionary planning review. The City's permit procedures expedite planning and building approvals where possible and are not likely to unduly constrain housing development. The following discussion describes in detail the City's administrative development review procedures (such as Site Development Plan Review) as well as discretionary review and approval processes.

Pre-Application Review

Prospective applicants are encouraged to meet with a City Planner prior to submitting an application. This preliminary meeting will help expedite the development process. Applicants may also request a more detailed, formal pre-application review. This type of review can be helpful for large or more complex projects, and when the applicant desires review by multiple City departments, such as Engineering, Building, and Public Works. Pre-Application Review requires submittal of an application, fee, plans, and background information and can take from 3 to 5 five weeks to process.

Following submittal, the application is routed to all City departments and outside agencies that would review the formal entitlement application. For example, a Tentative Tract Map would be transmitted to utility companies (e.g., Southern California Edison, SoCal Gas), special districts (JCSD/RCSD/ JARPD) and the County of Riverside.

Site Development Permit (SDP)

As previously indicated, the City of Jurupa Valley requires a Site Development Permit for all multi-family residential projects, except those within the R-3 zone. Site Development Permits (SDPs), at a minimum, require submittal of an application, fee, checklist, site plan and other exhibits, and supporting information to the Planning Department. Minor Site Development Permits, such as for accessory structures, are exempt from environmental review and can be acted upon by the Planning Director without a public hearing. SDPs requiring environmental review under CEQA require a public hearing held by the Planning Director. All SDPs require written notice to owners of property located within at least 300 feet of the proposed project boundaries. The time for processing an SDP varies with the complexity of the proposal. However, the review process for a minor SDP that is exempt from CEQA can usually be accomplished within 90 to 120 days.

Land Use Controls Analysis

The City of Jurupa Valley's development approval process is designed to accommodate, not hinder, residential development. For example, developments of single-family homes and manufactured homes on existing, individual lots in any residential zones that meet development standards (setbacks, lot size and coverage, building height, parking) do not require discretionary approval. They require only a building permit - a ministerial process - to allow construction. Similarly, multi-family housing is allowed "by right" in the R-3 Zone (General Residential). In other residential zones, multi-family housing developments require a Site Development Permit (SDP). As described above, the SDP process provides a streamlined, discretionary review process that allows most residential development projects to be evaluated for compliance with General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards. The primary decision-making criteria to approve an SDP are:

1. The development shall conform to all the requirements of the City's County General Plan and with all applicable requirements of City and state law.
2. The development shall protect public health, safety and general welfare, conform to the logical development of the land and be compatible with the surrounding property. Development plans shall consider the location and need for dedication and improvement of necessary streets and sidewalks and consider topographical and drainage condition.
3. Developments of shall conform to the Subdivision Map Act and with all City subdivision requirements.

The City's processing and permit procedures are consistent with state planning and zoning law and are not considered to be an unreasonable constraint on the cost or supply of housing. However, the City will amend the Zoning Code to eliminate the requirement for discretionary review for multi-family development in multi-family residential zones to expedite permit processing for projects that conform to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance development standards. Program HE 3.1.9 calls for the Zoning Ordinance amendments to allow multi-family housing development without discretionary approval, such as a conditional use permit or planned unit development review. This would not preclude design review of multi-family housing projects; however, such review must be ministerial and such review must not trigger environmental review under the Public Resources Code (CEQA). For example, staff, the Planning Commission or City Council could review a project's design merits and call for a project proponent to make design-related modifications, but could not deny a project based on the "residential use" itself if it otherwise met General Plan and Zoning requirements.

Conditional Use Permits (CUP)

A CUP is required for certain limited residential uses that are conditionally permitted in non-residential districts (e.g., General Commercial “C-1/C-P” zone district), such as congregate care residential facilities. CUPs can be approved, approved with conditions, or denied based on specific findings. Typically, the Planning Commission reviews and takes final action on CUPs, and appeals are considered by the City Council, who would then take final action on the matter. Any permit that is granted is subject to such conditions of approval as may be necessary to protect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Conditions of approval may include, but are not limited to, hours of operation, duration, site improvements (e.g., access, parking, landscaping, fencing, signage), off-site improvements (e.g., trails, frontage improvements, street trees), and architectural design. The City’s CUP process typically allows the Planning Commission to consider conditional uses within approximately 90 to 150 days.

Environmental Constraints

Potential environmental constraints to future development in the City include seismic and liquefaction hazards, urban and limited wildland fire hazards, and historical contamination by hazardous materials such as the Stringfellow property in the northern portion of the City. All sites identified in the Sites Inventory that are intended to meet the City’s RHNA needs are not within these areas that have development restrictions due to risk of damage from disasters (such as floods, wildfires, seismic events, or hazardous material contamination).

The sites inventory has land use designations that were determined based on surrounding land uses and has already examined potential environmental constraints. Aside from the typical constraints mentioned above, there are no additional constraints that would impede the development of new housing units in the future on the identified sites.

Seismic Hazards

As stated in the General Plan Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element, the entire City, as well as all of Southern California, is a seismically active region that has been subject to major earthquakes in the past. There are no known active faults in Jurupa Valley. However, the Rialto-Colton, San Jacinto, and Chino Faults are all located close to the City (i.e., within 5 miles). The greatest damage from earthquakes results from ground shaking. Although ground shaking is generally most severe near a quake epicenter, property not immediately adjacent to the epicenter may be subject to extreme damage due to liquefaction. The greatest

potential danger is the collapse of older residential units constructed from unreinforced masonry, and explosions of petroleum and fuel lines. Some parts of the City have a combination of silts and sandy soil types and a relatively high water table that are conducive for liquefaction to occur during intense ground shaking. The State Division of Mines and Geology has designated some areas in the City within a liquefaction zone. Most of these areas are along the Santa Ana River, but the far eastern and southwestern portions of the City are also susceptible to liquefaction. Much of the northern portion of the City, north of the SR 60 freeway, has moderate to very high susceptibility to landslides and soil slumps. There are also areas in the central portion of the City with steeper slopes that may be subject to soil block slides.

Development in much of the City will require geotechnical or soil constraints reports to mitigate the potential undermining of structural integrity during earthquakes or due to geologic or soil limitations.

Flooding

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes maps that identify areas of the City subject to flooding in the event of a major storm. These Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) indicate areas that may be inundated in the event of a 100-year or a 500-year storm. In addition, the maps indicate the base flood elevations at selected intervals of the floodway. The City had been subject to periodic and historic flooding and flood insurance requirements imposed by FEMA until improvements were constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers on the Santa Ana River and other major flood control channels within the City. FEMA Flood Maps show that the City's main flood hazard zone lies in the southern portions of the City near the Santa Ana River, along Pyrite Creek, and in the far northwestern and western portions of the City just east of the I-15 freeway.

Some areas of the City that are designated for future residential development fall within the 100-year floodplain and would be subject to specialized flood construction requirements.

Fire Hazards

The most serious fire threat within the City is building and structure fires. However, like most southern California cities adjacent to wildland areas (e.g., steep hills in the northern portion of the City), the late summer fires that result from the accumulation of this brush have the potential to spread into the City proper. Since the City center is largely developed, there is less potential for wildland fires in the more central portions of the City. Other fire hazards within the City may be associated with heavy industrial uses, older commercial

and residential structures, the presence of hazardous materials, and arson. Only a small portion of the City is located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Zone; and the sites identified to accommodate the City's 2013-2021 RHNA allocation are located outside of the high fire hazard zone and in largely developed urban or suburban areas that are not generally prone to wildland fire hazards.

Noise

Noise generated from mobile sources such as traffic will continue to have the greatest potential impact on land use (e.g., I-15 and SR 60 freeways, Van Buren Boulevard). In addition, noise from rail and aviation sources will also affect some community residents. The General Plan Noise Element describes the existing noise environment using maps that indicate high levels of noise and also contains goals and policies to reduce the effects of noise, if not the actual intensity of noise. Land use policy discourages the placement of noise-sensitive land uses in areas that are subject to high noise levels. The City regulates noise through the Jurupa Valley Ordinance No. 2012-01: Noise Regulations, under the authority of Section 50022.9 of the *California Government Code*.

Each potential development that would occur as a result of the Housing Element and subsequent implementation would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and be required to adhere to the noise regulations set forth in the General Plan, and when applicable, mitigation measures as part of the CEQA documentation process, which would identify potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation measures at the individual project level.

Hazardous Materials

The City contains a number of industrial uses that produce, handle, store, or transport various hazardous materials at various times. However, the use and handling of these materials are governed by a variety of federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and should not pose a significant impediment to development in non-industrial portions of the City.

Portions of the City overlie an historical plume of groundwater contamination from the Stringfellow Class I Site located in Pyrite Canyon in the northern portion of the City at the headwater of Pyrite Creek. The Pyrite Channel runs through the central portion of the City in a northeast-southwest direction toward the Santa Ana River. The Stringfellow site is a major historical regional source of contamination in the Jurupa Valley, and was one of the first designated federal "Superfund" sites. It is listed on many governmental databases regarding hazardous materials (e.g., NPL, CERCLIS, US ENG CONTROLS, ROD, RCRA-SQC, CONCENT, and, PRP

databases). According to the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Stringfellow groundwater contamination plume consists primarily of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and perchlorate; however, the VOCs extend approximately 1 mile from the source area in the down-gradient direction with the remainder of the plume consisting of perchlorate. The presence of perchlorate represents a potential health hazard if the public were to come in contact with the contaminated Stringfellow groundwater plume; however, none of the sites identified to accommodate the City's 2013-2021 RHNA allocation would be directly affected by the Stringfellow groundwater plume.

Infrastructure Constraints

The 2013-2021 Housing Element promotes the production of housing, which in turn may result in population growth. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is responsible for producing socioeconomic projections and developing, refining, and maintaining the SCAG regional and small area forecasting models. These forecast numbers are used to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Air Quality Management Plan, and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations. The U.S. Census as reported by the California Department of Finance estimates the City's 2014 population was 97,774 persons. SCAG projects that the City's population will grow to 103,700 persons by the year 2020 and 126,000 persons by the year 2035.

With the exception of public streets, Jurupa Valley's infrastructure, including parks, flood control, sewer and domestic water treatment and facilities are provided and maintained by the County of Riverside and by community service districts (CSDs), primarily the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). These agencies were asked to provide input and received the 2017 draft and adopted General Plan, including the Housing Element, as required law. In addition, the City refers all pertinent development applications to the CSDs and requires that they be reviewed for adequate infrastructure and service capacity. Applications are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure there is enough capacity to service new developments. The CSDs' development requirements and comments are addressed as part of City approvals of planning applications.

The City has established standard street widths for different road types and *Table 5.52* summarizes these requirements. In addition to requiring improvements to public streets, the City may also require on- and off-site improvements related to water supply, fire

protection, sewage disposal, fences, and electrical and communication facilities.

Table 5.52: Street Design Standards

Street Type	Street Width (feet)	Number of Lanes
Expressway	184 to 220	6 to 8
Urban Arterial	152 min.	6 to 8
Arterial	128 min.	4 to 6
Major	118 min.	4
Secondary	100 min.	4
Collector	74 min.	2
General Local	44-60	2

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (2015).

Water Supply

Jurupa Valley’s domestic water is supplied primarily by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD), the Rubidoux Community Services District and the Santa Ana Water Company. The JCSD service area comprises about 26,000 acres within Jurupa Valley and the eastern portion of the City of Eastvale. The District’s recorded potable water production was 24,285 acre-feet (AF) or 21.7 million gallons per day (MGD) in 2009. Water sources for the JCSD come primarily from the Chino Groundwater Basin and the Chino Basin Desalter Authority, with the remainder made up of transfers from the Rubidoux Community Services District.

In May 2011, the JCSD adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which details the JCSD’s current and future water supply. The UWMP found that with all of its existing and planned supplies, the JCSD can meet 100% of projected demand of growth in the City through 2035 under normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year demand conditions for expected growth (i.e., even with a repeat of a severe drought conditions). It should be noted that on April 1, 2015, the Governor issued Executive Order B-29-15. Key provisions include ordering the State Water Resources Control Board to impose restrictions to achieve a 25% reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. The Governor’s drought declaration also calls upon local urban water suppliers and municipalities to implement their local water shortage contingency plans immediately to avoid or forestall outright restrictions that could become necessary later in the drought season. The JCSD is evaluating the state’s additional emergency drought restrictions to determine its impact on our service area and the community. JCSD is currently in Level 2 (Drought Caution) of its Water Shortage Contingency Plan. JCSD is evaluating whether amendments to the plan are necessary to meet the state’s mandates and to help increase water efficiency. As a result of the Governor’s Executive Order issued on April 1, 2015, the State Water Resources Control

Board's updated Emergency Water Conservation regulations went into effect on May 18, 2015. JCSD and its customers are mandated to meet a total 28% district-wide reduction in potable water usage.

Some properties within the City do not have piped water systems immediately available to them. As development occurs within the City, water supplies and distribution systems may have to be expanded to adequately serve future development.

Established in 1952, Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) was the first community services district to be formed in California. RCSD provides water and wastewater services to over 6,500 homes, with the capacity to serve an additional 3,000 new homes with existing wells and water treatment facilities. Additional services include trash collection and disposal, street lighting, weed abatement and fire prevention programs. The District's water supply and distribution system can produce over 8.0 million gallons of potable water per day from groundwater sources in six wells. The District delivers 2.0 million gallons a day to the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant located in the City of Riverside and supplies a portion of JCSD's water needs. All of RCSD's water production comes from 11 active wells (6 potable and 5 non-potable), with a distribution system consisting of approximately 50 miles of pipeline, four storage reservoirs, and two booster stations. Average day water use for retail customers is approximately 10.8 acre-feet or 3.5 million gallons.

Wastewater Treatment

The Jurupa Community Services District and the Rubidoux Community Services District provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley. However, some areas in the City, particularly in Old Mira Loma and Sky Country, still rely on private septic systems. JCSD's Sewer System serves the residents of the western portion of the City of Jurupa Valley and the adjacent City of Eastvale. The City of Riverside, the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority, and the Orange County Sanitation District are responsible for treatment of wastewater in the JCSD service area. Wastewater from the project will be conveyed to the City of Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), located in the City of Riverside at 5950 Acorn Street. Currently, the RWQCP treats 40 million gallons per day. A plant-wide expansion, completed in 2015, increased treatment capacity by approximately 46 million gallons per day.

Rubidoux Community Services District's wastewater treatment capacity is 3 million gallons per day; current need is 2 million gallons per day. Total treatment capacity of the two districts is believed adequate to meet wastewater treatment needs for 100% of the City's anticipated housing and population growth. Some properties

in the City are on septic systems and are not connected to a piped sewage collection system. To protect regional water quality objectives, it is likely that future development, even larger individual lots and especially larger residential projects, may be required to connect to piped wastewater collection systems. This will require coordination with the JCSD and the City of Riverside to assure adequate sewage collection, and treatment services will be available as growth occurs in the City.

Market Constraints

Land Prices

Land costs have a demonstrable influence on the cost and availability of affordable housing. Land prices are determined by a number of factors, most important of which are land availability and permitted development density. As land becomes less available, the price of land increases.

According to Lennar Homes, in 2016 unentitled multi-family land in the region typically sells for about \$300,000 per acre. By comparison, unentitled single-family land costs between \$200,000 and \$400,000 per acre. However, land cost is very site-specific; many factors such as location, size, shape, entitlement processes required, and environmental factors can impact land cost significantly. In general, land costs in Riverside County are significantly lower than in more urbanized counties of San Diego, Orange and Los Angeles counties.

Construction Costs

Construction costs are primarily determined by the costs of materials and labor. They are also influenced by market demands and market-based changes in the cost of materials. Construction costs depend on the type of unit being built and the quality of the product being produced. However, construction costs are set by regional and national factors that rarely impede housing development in specific localities.

Financing

Mortgage interest rates have a large influence over the affordability of housing. Higher interest rates increase a homebuyer's monthly payment and decrease the range of housing that a household can afford. Lower interest rates result in lower monthly payments for the homebuyer and can increase the buyer's purchasing ability.

The availability of financing affects a person's ability to purchase or improve a home. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of

the applicants. This applies to all loan applications for home purchases, improvements, and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance.

Table 5.53 summarizes the disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2014 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Jurupa Valley and the County of Riverside. Included is information on loan outcomes (i.e., the number of applications that were approved and originated, denied, withdrawn by the applicant, and incomplete).

Table 5.53: Disposition of Home Loans, 2014

Loan Type	Total Applicants	Percent Approved	Percent Denied	Percent Other
Jurupa Valley				
Government-backed	601	49.6	9.7	9.8
Conventional	484	58.9	14.9	12.0
Refinance	1,747	49.7	20.8	17.3
Home Improvement	178	43.8	34.3	11.2
Total	3,010	50.8	18.4	14.6
Riverside County				
Government-backed	16,681	74.3	12.3	13.4
Conventional	20,774	74.0	12.5	13.4
Refinance	50,825	56.2	22.9	20.9
Home Improvement	5,763	46.6	40.5	12.9
Total	94,043	62.7	19.8	17.5

Source: www.LendingPatterns.com™, 2015.

- 1 "Approved" includes loans approved by the lenders whether or not accepted by the applicant.
- 2 "Other" includes loan applications that were either withdrawn or closed for incompleteness.
- 3 "Total Applicants" also includes pre-approvals and purchased loans.
- 4 A custom geography using the following census tracts was used to estimate lending data for Jurupa Valley: 401.01, 401.02, 402.01, 402.02, 402.03, 402.04, 403.01, 403.02, 403.03, 404.02, 404.03, 404.04, 404.05, 405.01, 405.02, 405.03, 406.03, 406.04, 406.05, and 406.06.

Home Purchase Loans

In 2014, 484 Jurupa Valley households applied for conventional loans to purchase homes, as shown in Table 5.53. Approximately 59% of these applications were approved and 15% were denied. The City’s approval rate was significantly lower than the overall approval rate for Riverside County. By comparison, 74% of conventional home loan applications countywide were approved while 13% were denied.

601 applications were submitted for the purchase of homes in Jurupa Valley through government-backed loans (e.g., FHA, VA) in 2014. Among applications for government-backed home purchase loans in the City, 50% were approved and 10% were denied. Again, the City’s approval rate for this loan type was much lower than that of Riverside County’s. Countywide, the approval rate for government-backed home purchase loans was 74%.

Refinance Loans

The vast majority of loan applications filed by Jurupa Valley residents in 2014 were for home refinance loans (1,747 applications). About 50% of these applications were approved, while 21% were denied. Countywide, 56% of refinancing applications were approved.

Home Improvement Loans

Within the City of Jurupa Valley, home improvement loans were the least likely to be approved. Approximately 34% of home-improvement loan applications were denied and 44% were approved by lending institutions in 2014. The high proportion of denials may be explained by the nature of these loans. Most home improvement loans are second loans and therefore more difficult to qualify for due to high income-to-debt ratio requirements. Countywide, home improvement loan applications had an approval rate (47%) comparable to that of the City's.

Energy Conservation

The City of Jurupa Valley is committed to conserving energy and reducing pollution associated with the production of electricity. The City continues to require compliance with Title 24 of the *California Administrative Code* on the use of energy efficient appliances and insulation. Through compliance with Title 24, new residential development has produced reduced energy demands.

To further its energy conservation objectives, in September 2015, the City adopted an ordinance that establishes an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems. The Jurupa Unified School District improved the energy efficiency of school campuses by implementing a comprehensive organizational behavior-driven energy conservation program in partnership with Energy Education starting in December of 2009.

Southern California Edison, which provides electrical service in Jurupa Valley, offers public information and technical assistance to developers and homeowners regarding energy conservation. Southern California Edison also provides a number of rebate programs for energy efficient new construction and home improvements. Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing is also available in Southern California to help homeowners finance energy efficiency upgrades or renewable energy installations.

###

Attachment A – Housing Site Inventory and Analysis

Housing Resources

State law requires that each jurisdiction’s housing element analyze its housing resources and that each jurisdiction prepare a housing site inventory to show there is sufficient zoned and developable land to accommodate its share of the region’s projected housing need. That analysis is provided below. The analysis shows the City has sufficient approved, pending housing units and sufficient developable, zoned land to meet its 5th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for all income categories except Very Low/Extremely Low Income. To incentivize development of housing for the two most difficult income levels to reach – Very Low and Extremely Low income – the City has adopted programs in the Housing Element, including: amending the General Plan and Zoning Map to designate an additional 16 acres for Highest Density Residential Use (HHDR, 25 du/A) (HE 1.1.1), working with Riverside County Housing Authority to promote affordable housing development in Jurupa Valley (HE 1.1.2), providing new incentives for affordable housing development (HE 1.1.5), updating the City’s density provisions for consistency with state law (HE 1.1.7), establishing a fee assistance program for affordable housing (HE 1.1.7), and pursuing CDBG and HOME funds, or other funding tools, to provide funding assistance for Low and Very Low Income households (HE 1.1.8).

Affordability

In its housing actions and programs, the City is committed to meeting a broad range of household needs and budgets. According to 2008-2012 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, almost one-half (47%) of Jurupa Valley residents’ incomes are at or below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI), compared with 42% in Riverside County residents as a whole. This suggests Jurupa Valley is already accommodating a higher share of affordable Low, Very Low and Extremely Low income housing than many more affluent Southern California areas. In the City of Jurupa Valley, each parcel’s allowed residential density is determined by its General Plan land use designation and not by its zoning. Therefore, the Residential Land Inventory was based on existing and, in some cases, proposed land use designations. Following Housing Element adoption and certification, the City of Jurupa Valley intends to do a comprehensive zoning update following General Plan adoption to ensure consistency with the 2017 General Plan.

In considering market affordability of the approved development projects listed below, the City has applied the following affordability categories, based on state and federal standards. The standards are based on surveys of local AMI and subject to adjustment using household size and other factors:

- **Extremely Low Income** (0-30% AMI)
- **Very Low Income** (31-50% AMI)
- **Low Income** (51-80% AMI)
- **Lower Income** (0-80% AMI): Refers to a range of income levels that includes Extremely Low, Very Low and Low Income households. Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Highest Density Residential (“HHDR” - 20-25 dwelling units/acre or “du/a”) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Lower Income households in Jurupa Valley.

- **Moderate Income** (80-120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of High Density Residential (HDR – 8-14 du/a) or Very High Density Residential (VHDR – 14-20 du/a) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Moderate Income households in Jurupa Valley.
- **Above Moderate Income** (Over 120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years (as further discussed in the Housing Element), it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Medium High Density (MHDR 5-8 du/a (or lower are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Above Moderate Income households in Jurupa Valley).

Progress in Meeting Housing Needs

Table 1 summarizes Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting the 5th Cycle RHNA and its capacity for housing development. Overall, the land use inventory indicates that the City has the existing capacity to accommodate its RHNA in all income categories except Extremely/Very Low Income, with an overall surplus capacity of 7,375 units. There is an unmet need of 409 units to meet the needs of Very Low/Extremely Low Income households. It is expected that these units will primarily be developed as multifamily and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing in areas close to public transit, shopping and services, as further described in the *Land Use Element*. A Residential Land Inventory is included in *Table 7*. The site inventory indicates that adequate sites exist, even beyond those required to meet the 5th Cycle RHNA, to meet housing needs in all income categories except Very Low/Extremely Low Income during the remainder of the planning period.

Opportunities in Meeting Housing Needs

Jurupa Valley is a young and growing city. It has many residential development opportunities and has sufficient capacity to meet its Regional Housing Need Allocation. Housing resources cited to meet RHNA consist of: 1) housing units that have received planning entitlements and/or building permits during the current housing element cycle (October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021), 2) housing units in specific plan areas that were approved prior to the current housing element cycle but not yet built, 3) approved, pending development to be applied as credits toward meeting the RHNA (e.g., Country Village Senior Apartments land use change), and 4) vacant, suitably zoned sites with development potential.

As part of the 2017 General Plan’s implementation, the City will designate vacant and/or underutilized land for HHDR uses to help achieve its Very Low/Extremely Low Income housing RHNA allocation. Program HE 1.1.1 commits the City to amending the General Plan to designate at least 16 additional acres for residential use at HHDR density (25 density units per acre). The City also intends to help meet housing needs by working with the Riverside County Housing Authority and other nonprofit housing agencies and to amend its Zoning Ordinance to facilitate lower income housing.

Table 1 – Progress in Meeting 5th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation

Unit Capacity	Income Category				Total Units
	Extremely/ Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
RHNA	409	275	307	721	1,712
1. Units Built Since 1/1/2014					
Single-family units	0	0	0	403	403
Lennar Harvest Village	0	0	0	319	319
2. Redesignation of Country Village Senior Apartments to HHDR	0	178	0	0	178
3. Habitat for Humanity Veteran Housing¹	0	26	0	0	26
Subtotals	0	204	0	722	926
4. Development Potential in Specific Plans					
I-15 Corridor Specific Plan	0	0	0	508	508
Emerald Meadows Ranch SP	0	0	477	719	1,196
Rio Vista SP	0	0	448	1,249	1,697
Paradise Knolls SP	0	0	300	350	650
Subtotals	0	0	1,225	2,826	4,051
5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels					
Ranch Residential (EDR)	0	0	0	4	4
Country Neighborhood (LDR)	0	0	0	43	43
“Rural Community – Low Density Residential” (RC-LDR)	0	0	0	403	403
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	0	0	0	1,344	1,344
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	0	0	0	793	793
High Density Residential (HDR)	0	0	696	0	696
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	0	0	174	0	174
Highest Density Residential (HHDR) ²	424	229	0	0	653
Subtotals	424	229	870	2,587	4,110
Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)	424	433	2,095	6,135	9,087
RHNA Surplus/[Deficit]	15	158	1,788	5,414	7,375

1 Approved in 2016; construction expected in 2017-2018. Cal Vet funded; for Low Income veterans and their families.

2 Assumes 65% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels (653) applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units allocated to meet “Low Income” need.

Entitled and/or Built Dwelling Units

Since January 1, 2014, the City has issued permits for 403 single-family units. In addition, the City issued permits for 319 single-family units in the Lennar Harvest Village development, for a total of 721 above moderate housing units. Dwelling units approved and not yet built, and built units are summarized in Table 1.

Specific Plans

The County of Riverside (prior to incorporation) and the City have approved several specific plans that include large housing developments. In 2017, all of the specific plans are active; however, construction has not yet begun in the Rio Vista and Paradise Knolls specific plan areas. Other specific plan areas are in various stages of buildout, and all have significant remaining residential development capacity. These areas are described below.

I-15 Corridor Specific Plan

The I-15 Corridor Specific Plan is an approved planned community of over 750 acres consisting of a mix of commercial and single-family detached and attached residential uses. It was adopted by the County of Riverside when Jurupa Valley was still a part of the unincorporated County. Upon buildout, the project will provide a total of 2,400 residential dwelling units — of which 1,100 units will be located within the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. Most of the Jurupa Valley units have already been developed or are to be constructed in 2017/2018; however, there is a remaining capacity of 508 single-family units in Jurupa Valley, *Table 2*.

Table 2: Approved I-15 Corridor Specific Plan

Planning Area	Number of Dwelling Units	Status
Units in Jurupa Valley	1,100	
16, 17, 19	[319]	Completed in 2014 — Lennar Harvest Village
8	[273]	Completed in 2011
10 and 13	508	Remaining units to be developed

Source: City of Jurupa Valley (2015).

Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

The Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan was also adopted prior to Jurupa Valley’s incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential single-family and multifamily uses. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,196 new dwelling units to the City, as shown in *Table 3*. As of June 2017, none of the units have been constructed; however, the project is active and construction is expected to start in 2017-2018.

Table 3: Approved Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

Unit Type	Land Use	Density (du/ac)	Acres	Number of Dwelling Units
Single-Family Detached	Medium Density	4.5	85	379
Single-Family Detached	Medium High Density	6.0	56	340
Single-Family Detached or Attached	High Density	12.0	23	272
Multifamily Residential	Very High Density	16.2	13	205
Total units remaining to be built			177	1,196

Source: Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan, 2005

Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan

The Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan was also adopted prior to Jurupa Valley's incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential single-family and multifamily uses, retail and commercial services, parks and open space covering 918 acres. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,697 new dwelling units consisting of both single-family and multifamily units, as shown in *Table 4*. As of December 2017, none of the units had been constructed; however, the project is active and construction is expected to start in 2018-2019.

Table 4: Approved Rio Vista Specific Plan

Unit Type	Land Use	Density (du/ac)	Acres	Number of Dwelling Units
Single-Family Detached	Low Density	2.4	71	171
Single-Family Detached	Medium Density	2-5	332	1,078
Multifamily Attached	High Density Townhomes/ Condos	8-14	5	60
Multifamily Apartments	Very High Density	14-20	24	388
Total Units Remaining to be Built		--	432	1,697

Source: Rio Vista Specific Plan

Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

Approved in 2016, the Paradise Knolls specific plan created a master planned residential community for the development of 650 dwelling units, plus commercial, recreational and open space uses on about 107 acres in the Pedley Town Center Area. Of about 71 acres to be developed with housing, just over 10 acres (about 15% of the housing area) is planned for Highest Density Residential uses (HHDR). A summary of approved housing types, development densities, acreages and number of units is shown in *Table 5*.

Table 5: Approved Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

Unit Type	Land Use	Density (du/ac)	Acres	Number of Dwelling Units
Single-Family Detached	Low Density Residential	2	4.4	6
Single-Family Detached	Medium Density Residential	2-5	21.5	96
Single-Family Detached or Attached	Medium High Density Residential	5-8	34.6	248
Multifamily Residential	Highest Density Residential	25	10.4	300
	Non-Residential	--	36.3	
Totals		--	107.2	650

Source: Paradise Knolls Specific Plan, 2016

Residential Land Inventory

As part of the General Plan, a parcel-specific sites inventory of vacant and underutilized sites was conducted using GIS analysis to identify properties with development potential. The results of the inventory are summarized in *Table 6* and the Inventory data is shown in *Table 7*. For this analysis, the following definitions apply:

- **Vacant Parcels:** Undeveloped properties that contain no structures and previously developed properties where only former building foundations remain;
- **Underutilized Parcels:** Parcels that are partially developed with buildings or other real improvements, but that have residential development potential based on their existing or proposed land use designation.
- **Constrained Parcels:** Parcels with constraints that impede development; and
- **Partially Constrained Parcels:** Parcels that have some development potential on areas which are free from development constraints.

Factors Affecting Development Potential

A review of parcels with development potential started with identifying the City's vacant parcels using 2014 aerial photos compiled by ESRI, an international supplier of Geographic Information System (GIS) software, web GIS, and geodatabase data. The vacant parcels were subsequently checked against data compiled by the Riverside County Assessor's Office and a database of various hazards and development constraints compiled for the 2011 update to the Riverside County General Plan. The following factors were considered in determining the potential for each vacant parcel to be developed with housing:

- **Basins/Mines/Quarries:** Flood control channels and basins, mines and quarries remain undeveloped because development would interfere with their current use and potentially subject the community to hazards. Because the existing uses are anticipated to continue on these parcels, all such parcels are classified as Constrained. Further, mining operations typically require buffers to minimize impacts on nearby land uses; therefore, vacant parcels surrounding existing mines/quarries that are owned by mining companies were also classified as Constrained.
- **Conservation Easements and Land Designated as Open Space:** Parcels that are subject to conservation easements held by public or quasi-public organizations, including land held in trust by the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and conservation land acquired under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), are undevelopable. Areas currently designated as open space in the City's General Plan are also considered undevelopable. Therefore, all parcels subject to conservation easements and all areas designated as open spaces are classified as Constrained.
- **Flood Hazards:** Parcels that lie within the City's 100-year flood zones are at risk for damage from flooding. Although flooding risks can be mitigated by raising the elevation of building pads through grading, such efforts are often considered to be cost-prohibitive, especially if most of a parcel is subject to flood hazards. Therefore, most parcels within the 100-year flood zone are classified as Constrained. In recognition of the fact that minor flood risks can often be mitigated in a cost-effective manner, those parcels that have only small portions within the 100-year flood zone are classified as Partially Constrained Parcels, with only the portions of such parcels that lie within the 100-year flood zone identified as Constrained.

- **Airport Hazard Zones:** Some parcels in the City are subject to the airport land use plans for the Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports. All development on parcels within the compatibility zones for those airports is required to comply with the compatibility criteria, including maximum densities/intensities, land use restrictions and other development conditions set forth in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document. In addition, the RCALUCP discourages new residential development within the 60-decibel (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour for both airports unless certain conditions are met. The 2017 General Plan includes a program that requires each development proposal within RCALUCP compatibility zones and subject to discretionary review to be considered by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission prior to approval by the City. Therefore, none of the parcels that are subject to the RALUCP are classified as Constrained. Nevertheless, the vacant parcels within the RCALUCP compatibility zones and/or the 55- and 60-dB noise contours for the Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports are noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in *Table 7*.
- **Landslide Risks:** Landslide risks and previous slide areas (soil block slides and soil slumps) exist in various parts of the City. Landslide risks within the City were categorized into three different categories: moderate, high and very high. In cases where the majority of the parcel is affected by high or very high landslide risks, the entire parcel was classified as Constrained. Where high or very high landslide risks only affected a portion of a parcel, the parcel was classified as Partially Constrained, with only the portion affected by such risks identified as Constrained. Many of these parcels were also classified as Constrained due to the presence of slope constraints (see “Topography/Slope Constraints” below). The presence of moderate landslide risks, soil block slides and soil slumps on the Opportunity Parcels is noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in *Table 7*.
- **Parcel Size:** In order to accommodate economically viable development and meet minimum lot standards, vacant parcels should typically be 0.1 acre or more in size. Therefore, most vacant parcels that are less than 0.1 acre are considered undevelopable and classified as Constrained. Those parcels that are less than 0.1 acre, but located adjacent to one or more parcels held under the same ownership, are classified as Opportunity Parcels because such parcels may be combined to create larger parcels that are easier to develop.
- **Parks/Greenbelts:** For the purposes of this analysis, parcels that function as unimproved parks are considered undevelopable. In addition, it is unlikely that vacant parcels currently maintained as greenbelts within existing developments will be sold and developed. Therefore, all such parcels are classified as Constrained.
- **Potential Hazardous Materials Releases:** Previous hazardous materials releases were considered; however, the specific development constraints associated with each release can only be determined based on additional research regarding the nature and extent of each release. It is also important to note that some or all of the identified releases may have already been remediated. Therefore, only four of the vacant parcels in the City (those known to be the subject of ongoing testing for contamination due to their proximity to the Stringfellow site) were classified as Constrained based on the presence of previous hazardous materials releases. The presence of potential hazardous materials releases on the vacant parcels is noted in the “Factors Affecting Development Potential” column in *Table 7*.
- **Public Parcel Ownership:** Most parcels that are currently owned by public agencies are likely to continue to be held for public purposes, unless the agency that owns the land intends to develop affordable housing or encourage economic development. Therefore, parcels owned by

most public agencies (the California Department of Transportation [Caltrans], the County, the County's former Redevelopment Agency, the County Flood Control District, the County Office of Education, Flabob Airport, the Jurupa Community Services District [CSD], the Jurupa Unified School District, the Rubidoux CSD, the Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority and the State of California) are classified as Constrained. Because parcels owned by the County's Housing Authority and former Redevelopment Agency are likely to be developed with affordable housing or some type of economic generator, such parcels are classified as Opportunity Parcels. Several vacant parcels identified as "tax exempt" by the County Assessor's Office were also classified as Constrained due to the likelihood that such parcels are likely to be future sites for public uses.

- **Topography/Slope Constraints:** Slope constraints apply to many of the vacant parcels in the City. Slopes within the City were placed into four different categories corresponding with the development constraints associated with each category.
 - 0–10% (few or no constraints)
 - 11–25% (moderate constraints)
 - 26–40% (severe constraints)
 - >40% (unsuitable for development)

In cases where the majority of the parcel is affected by slopes that exceed 26 percent, the entire parcel was classified as Constrained. Where slopes in excess of 26 percent only affected a portion of a parcel, the parcel was classified as Partially Constrained, with only the portion affected by slope constraints identified as Constrained. Many of the parcels affected by slope constraints were also classified as Constrained due to the presence of high and very high landslide risks.

- **Utilities:** Parcels that are currently owned by utility service providers are likely to be planned for future utility facilities rather than development. Therefore, parcels owned by utility service providers (i.e., the Empire Water Company, the Metropolitan Water District, Southern California Edison and the Southern California Gas Company) are classified as Constrained.

For the purpose of this inventory, the residential sites identified primarily include the Opportunity Parcels, along with a very limited number of Partially Constrained parcels. However, excluding Constrained and Partially Constrained parcels from the sites inventory does not necessarily prevent these parcels from being developed. Changing real estate market factors or removal of site constraints may make additional parcels available to address future housing needs.

Table 6: Residential Land Inventory Results Summary

General Plan	Zoning	# of Parcels	Residential Density Range (du/ac)	Developable Acres	Assumed Density	Potential Units ³	Potential Affordability Level
Ranch Residential (EDR)	Various	20	0.2-0.5	37.7	0.4	4	Above Moderate Income
Country Neighborhood Residential (LDR)	R-1	13	1.0-2.0	30.0	1.6	43	Above Moderate Income
Rural Community – Low Density Residential (RC-LDR)	R-1	76	1.0-2.0	279.1	1.6	403	Above Moderate Income
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	R-2	52	2.0-5.0	369.1	4.0	1,344	Above Moderate Income
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	R-3	28	5.0-8.0	126.8	6.4	793	Above Moderate Income
High Density Residential (HDR)	R-4	17	8.0-14.0	63.2	11.2	696	Moderate Income
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	R-5	6	14.0-20.0	11.0	16.0	174	Moderate Income
Highest Density Residential (HHDR) ⁴	R-6	11	25.0	26.1	25.0	653	Lower Income
Totals		223		943		4,110	

3 Potential Units differs from straight calculation of acres X assumed density due to reductions for site constraints. The reductions are shown in Table 7.

4 Requires General Plan amendments.

Conclusion: Adequacy of Sites to Meet the 1/1/2014-10/1/2021 RHNA

For the 5th Cycle Housing Element and RHNA, the City has a total regional housing need allocation of 1,712 units. The Residential Land Inventory, *Table 7*, identifies 223 parcels covering 943 acres (this represents less than 1% of the City's total land area), with a development potential of 4,110 dwellings. The locations of these parcels are shown in *Figure 1*. As shown in *Table 1 – Progress in Meeting the 5th Cycle RHNA*, the City has sufficient, developable land to meet housing needs in all income levels except Extremely Low/Very Low Income households, plus a “surplus” to help meet future housing needs. Jurupa Valley's 5th Cycle RHNA identifies a need of 409 units of Extremely Low/Very Low Income housing. As shown in *Table 1*, to meet the RHNA Extremely Low/Very Low housing need, the City needs to designate additional HHDR land to accommodate at least 409 dwelling units of Extremely Low/Very Low income housing. This translates into a need of approximately 16 acres of HHDR land at 25 dwelling units per acre.

Pursuant to Housing Element Program HE 1.1.1, the City intends to redesignate at least 16 acres of HHDR to help meet its RHNA requirement. The Land Use Inventory identifies approximately 26 acres of vacant or underutilized land available for redesignation to HHDR to help meet the City's Lower Income housing needs. The following maps, in *Figure 1* below, show the locations of the sites identified in the inventory with housing development potential.




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1





Figure 1



- LSA**
- City of Jurupa Valley
 - LU Amendment Overlays**
 - Community Development
 - Village Center
 - New or Proposed General Plan Land Use Designations**
 - EDR - Ranch
 - LDR - Country Neighborhood
 - RC-LDR
 - MDR - Medium Density Residential
 - MHDR - Medium High Density Residential
 - HDR - High Density Residential
 - VHDR - Very High Density Residential
 - HHDR - Highest Density Residential

Index Map

1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	

Sheet 9 of 15

0 500 1,000 Feet
 SOURCE: Bing Aerial, 2015, Riverside County 7/2015, 12/2001.
 I:\CM\1502\Reports\GPH\2-15_Proposed_GPLU_Housing_mapbook.mxd (7/3/2017)

Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan
 Potential Housing Sites






Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1




Figure 1

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
176	181180003	2.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	2.0	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
177	181180004	5.3	solid block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	R-1-100	1.4	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
178	181180005	0.4	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	0.4	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
179	181210002	0.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	0.2	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
180	181210014	2.4	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	2.4	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
181	181210015	3.7	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	3.7	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	1
182	181210036	0.9	in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 60-65 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	0.9	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
183	181220037	9.9	in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B2, in 65+ dB CNEL contour	EDR	M-SC	7.0	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	2
185	181230002	2.9	in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	2.5	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
186	181230012	0.3	in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	A-1	0.3	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
187	181361033	1.9	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone B1	EDR	R-4	1.9	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
188	181370001	11.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-65 dB CNEL	EDR	M-SC	1.6	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
189	181370003	3.5	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	R-4	3.5	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	1
196	182333003	2.1	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	R-T	2.1	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
217	186160015	2.2	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	A-1	2.2	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
219	186200019	1.4	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	R-A	1.4	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
220	186200020	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	R-A	1.0	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
221	186200021	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	R-A	1.0	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
222	186200022	1.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	EDR	R-A	1.3	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
223	186230007	7.9	in 100-year flood zone, potential haz mat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C	EDR	R-1-100	0.9	EDR	0.2	0.5	0.4	0
Subtotal		61.5				37.7					4
1	152020005	7.4		LDR	W-1	3.3	LDR	1	2	1.6	5
2	152020007	1.0		LDR	W-1	1.0	LDR	1	2	1.6	1
3	152020008	5.7		LDR	W-1	5.7	LDR	1	2	1.6	9
4	152020010	1.9		LDR	W-1	1.9	LDR	1	2	1.6	3

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
13	159030001	4.2	(LUA-17)	LI	A-1	4.2	LDR	1	2	1.6	6
14	159030002	2.1	(LUA-17)	LI	A-1	2.1	LDR	1	2	1.6	3
15	159030005	3.1	parking and storage uses (LUA-17)	LI	A-1	3.1	LDR	1	2	1.6	4
67	169181018	1.0		LDR	A-1	1.0	LDR	1	2	1.6	1
77	170162014	1.6		LDR	R-1	0.4	LDR	1	2	1.6	0
78	170220012	2.4		LDR	R-1	0.7	LDR	1	2	1.6	1
79	170220013	2.5		LDR	R-1	0.7	LDR	1	2	1.6	1
82	171150008	4.6		LDR	A-1	4.6	LDR	1	2	1.6	7
224	186260018	1.3	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1-80	1.3	LDR	1	2	1.6	2
Subtotal		38.8				30.0					43
6	157041015	1.0	in 100-year flood zone	RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
7	157150001	1.5		RC-LDR	A-1	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
8	157190007	1.1		RC-LDR	A-1-10	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
9	157190008	1.1		RC-LDR	A-1-10	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
10	157190009	1.0		RC-LDR	A-1-10	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
11	157240001	1.5		RC-LDR	A-1	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
12	157250011	14.2	in 100-year flood zone	RC-LDR	R-A	14.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	22
16	159202014	1.0		RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
17	159242011	4.9		RC-LDR	C-1/C-P	1.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
18	159242013	1.3		RC-LDR	C-1/C-P	0.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	0
19	159322004	1.0		RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
22	161082008	2.5		RC-LDR	A-1	2.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	3
23	161260008	1.1		RC-LDR	A-1	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
24	161300015	1.0		RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
25	161332003	2.8		RC-LDR	W-2	2.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
26	162032008	5.3		RC-LDR	R-A-20000	5.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	8
27	162110004	4.9		RC-LDR	A-1-4	4.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
28	162170001	4.7		RC-LDR	R-A-20000	4.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
29	162170040	1.1		RC-LDR	R-A-20000	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
30	162170041	1.1		RC-LDR	R-A-20000	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
31	162200008	4.8	soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1-4	4.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
32	162200009	4.6	in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1-4	4.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
33	162210004	4.9	soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1-4	4.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
34	162210011	4.7	soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1-4	4.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
35	162210012	3.7		RC-LDR	A-1-4	3.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
38	165020004	1.5	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1-1	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
39	165020007	1.5		RC-LDR	A-1-1	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
40	165020010	1.5		RC-LDR	A-1-1	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
41	165060015	2.3	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	A-1-4	2.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	3
42	165070005	2.8		RC-LDR	R-A	2.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
43	165080002	4.2	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	4.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6
44	165080008	4.8	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	A-1-1	4.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
45	165100027	7.1	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	7.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	11
46	165140027	2.7	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	2.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
47	165140028	3.3	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	3.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
48	165140039	4.2	soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-A	4.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6
49	165140042	3.9	soil block slides, moderate landslide risks, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-A	3.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6
50	165140045	9.8	soil block slides, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	A-1-1	9.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	15
51	165150021	3.2	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	3.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
52	165150022	2.2	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	R-1	2.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	3
54	166070018	10.5	soil block slides and slumps	RC-LDR	A-1	10.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	16
55	166070035	3.7		RC-LDR	A-1	3.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
56	166090029	2.9		RC-LDR	A-1	2.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
57	166090030	6.8		RC-LDR	A-1	6.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	10
58	166120001	9.6	soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1	9.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	15
59	166120003	2.6	soil block slides and slumps	RC-LDR	A-1-4	2.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
60	167222015	1.0		RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
68	169290003	2.5	soil block slides	RC-LDR	R-A	2.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
69	169290012	5.0		RC-LDR	A-1	5.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	8
70	169290013	9.1		RC-LDR	A-1	9.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	14
71	169300005	8.3	in 100-year flood zone	RC-LDR	A-1	8.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	13
72	169300006	1.2		RC-LDR	A-1	1.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
73	169300012	21.5	in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides	RC-LDR	R-A	11.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	17
74	169310013	3.2		RC-LDR	A-1	3.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
75	169310040	3.1		RC-LDR	A-1	3.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
84	173050014	1.6	soil block slides	RC-LDR	A-1	1.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
85	173082016	3.5	soil block slides and slumps	RC-LDR	A-1	3.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
86	173090003	4.1	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	W-2	4.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
87	173090008	2.6	soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks	RC-LDR	A-1	2.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
88	173130001	5.0	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	R-1	0.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
89	173160001	1.2		RC-LDR	W-2	1.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
90	173160004	4.9	soil block slides and slumps	RC-LDR	W-2	4.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	7
95	174250001	1.1	soil block slides	RC-LDR	W-2	1.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
96	174250003	1.5		RC-LDR	W-2	1.5	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
97	174260016	2.8	soil block slides	RC-LDR	W-2	2.8	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
98	174340037	3.6		RC-LDR	R-A	3.6	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	5
99	174340040	4.3		RC-LDR	R-A	4.3	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6
201	183080021	8.0		RC-LDR	A-1	8.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	12
202	183080024	3.9		RC-LDR	A-1	3.9	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	6
205	183131010	1.0	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
206	183131011	1.4	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1	1.4	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	2
207	183132013	1.0	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1	1.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	1
209	183220006	8.2	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1	8.2	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	13
210	183230001	3.0	moderate landslide risk	RC-LDR	A-1	3.0	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	4
211	183230002	6.1	moderate landslide risk, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	RC-LDR	A-1	6.1	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	9
212	183310030	6.7		RC-LDR	R-A	6.7	RC-LDR	1	2	1.6	10
Subtotal		298.3				279.0					403
20	160050027	6.9		MDR	R-1	6.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	27
21	160060065	61.1		MDR	R-1	61.1	MDR	2	5	4.0	244
53	166040021	7.2		MDR	R-1	7.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	28
61	169032001	2.0		MDR	C-P-S	1.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	5
				CR	C-P-S	0.7	MDR	2	5	4.0	2
65	169150020	1.7		MDR	R-1	1.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
				MDR	R-1	0.7	MDR	2	5	5.0	3
66	169150021	1.4		MDR	R-1	1.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
76	170030004	3.2		MDR	R-3	3.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	12
80	171040044	2.9	freeway noise	MDR	A-1	2.7	MDR	2	5	4.0	10
81	171082018	1.8		MDR	A-1	1.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	7
83	173020026	1.9		MDR	W-2	1.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	7
91	174150009	3.3		MDR	W-2	3.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	13
92	174150010	13.1		MDR	W-2	5.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	19
93	174150014	26.9	moderate landslide risk	MDR	W-2	26.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	107

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
103	175100003	37.0	soil block slides and slumps	MDR	SP ZONE	35.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	140
				MDR	SP ZONE	0.6	MDR	2	5	4.0	2
106	177020018	6.3	sloping (LUA-21)	LI	R-R	6.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	25
109	177040004	6.9	solid block slides and slumps	MDR	R-1	6.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	27
110	177080030	1.1	moderate landslide risk	MDR	R-1	1.1	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
111	177080031	1.0	moderate landslide risk	MDR	R-1	1.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
113	177130007	8.1		MDR	R-1	8.1	MDR	2	5	4.0	32
114	177142018	2.0		MDR	R-1	2.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	8
118	177231019	1.0		MDR	R-1	1.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	3
120	178070006	12.0	soil block slides and slumps (LUA-11)	LI	M-SC	12.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	48
121	178120001	21.0	soil block slides (LUA-11)	LI	M-SC	21.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	84
123	178191001	5.8	(LUA-11)	LI	R-1	5.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	23
124	178191002	5.0	(LUA-11)	LI	M-SC	5.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	20
125	178191004	3.4	(LUA-11)	LI	M-SC	3.4	MDR	2	5	4.0	13
134	178290009	1.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MDR	SP ZONE	1.6	MDR	2	5	4.0	6
146	178310023	10.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	1.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
147	178310025	2.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MDR	SP ZONE	2.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	8
148	178310026	2.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MDR	SP ZONE	2.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	8
151	178310046	1.4	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	1.4	MDR	2	5	4.0	5
158	179140008	3.8	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	3.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	15
159	179170005	1.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	1.6	MDR	2	5	4.0	6
162	179170016	14.9	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	1.4	MDR	2	5	4.0	5
163	179170018	7.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	6.6	MDR	2	5	4.0	26
164	179270001	9.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	0.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	0
167	179310001	46.7	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	14.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	59
169	179340001	3.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	SP ZONE	2.9	MDR	2	5	4.0	11
184	181220039	19.1	in 100-year flood zone, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, in 55-65 dB CNEL	MDR	R-4	11.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	45
190	182190015	1.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	5
191	182190016	1.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	5
192	182190017	1.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
193	182242009	2.1	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	2.1	MDR	2	5	4.0	8
194	182244006	1.5	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.5	MDR	2	5	4.0	6
198	182350002	7.3	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	MDR	R-3	7.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	29
200	183030045	2.7		MDR	R-A-20000	2.7	MDR	2	5	4.0	10

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
203	183090009	1.0		MDR	A-1	1.0	MDR	2	5	4.0	3
204	183112058	1.2		MDR	R-1	1.2	MDR	2	5	4.0	4
208	183173001	4.4	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MDR	R-1	4.4	MDR	2	5	4.0	17
213	183383024	1.8		MDR	R-1	1.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	7
216	186080011	3.8	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1-80	3.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	15
218	186172001	8.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1-100	5.3	MDR	2	5	4.0	21
112	177110016	21.8	paved, former lumberyard (LUA-15B)	LI	M-SC	21.8	MDR	2	5	4.0	87
Subtotal		427.1				369.1					1,344
36	163400001	17.0	partially in 100-year flood zone, utility easement crosses site, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E (LUA-14)	LI	M-SC	17.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	108
37	163400052	51.0	partially in 100-year flood zone, potential hazmat site, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour (LUA-14)	LI	M-SC	42.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	268
62	169070006	2.5		MHDR	R-2	1.8	MHDR	5	8	6.4	11
63	169080003	1.2		MHDR	A-1	0.2	MHDR	5	8	6.4	0
64	169100057	2.3	owned by (Riverside) County Housing Authority	MHDR	R-3	1.4	MHDR	5	8	6.4	9
100	175080021	11.0		MHDR	SP ZONE	11.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	70
101	175080022	1.0		MHDR	SP ZONE	1.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	6
107	177030010	1.0	soil block slides	MHDR	R-1	1.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	6
108	177030016	23.7	soil block slides	MHDR	R-1	12.8	MHDR	5	8	6.4	81
119	177250029	1.1	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	C-1/C-P	1.1	MHDR	5	8	6.4	7
122	178182018	0.5	partially developed (LUA-7)	HI	N-A	0.5	MHDR	5	8	6.4	3
133	178271001	2.0	soil block slides	MHDR	R-3	2.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	12
135	178290012	1.9	partially developed (LUA-6)	LI	N-A	0.9	MHDR	5	8	6.4	5
142	178310008	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	1.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	6
144	178310011	1.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	1.2	MHDR	5	8	6.4	7
145	178310013	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	1.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	6
149	178310031	4.5	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	4.5	MHDR	5	8	6.4	28
150	178310042	1.4	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	1.4	MHDR	5	8	6.4	9
152	178310051	3.2	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	0.9	MHDR	5	8	6.4	5
156	179082013	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	R-1	1.0	MHDR	5	8	6.4	6
157	179101002	2.1	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	R-2	2.1	MHDR	5	8	6.4	13
160	179170007	4.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	2.6	MHDR	5	8	6.4	16
161	179170008	5.8	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	5.8	MHDR	5	8	6.4	37
165	179270017	3.3	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	2.9	MHDR	5	8	6.4	18
166	179270033	2.5	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MHDR	SP ZONE	2.5	MHDR	5	8	6.4	16

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
168	179330002	1.0	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C	MHDR	A-1	0.6	MHDR	5	8	6.4	4
214	185470001	2.7	owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	R-3	2.7	MHDR	5	8	6.4	17
215	185470002	3.1	owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	R-3	3.1	MHDR	5	8	6.4	19
Subtotal		154.0				126.8					793
94	174150021	27.9	soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks	HDR	R-2	27.9	HDR	--	14	11.2	311
129	178262001	2.1	potential hazmat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	0.4	HDR	--	14	11.2	4
130	178262002	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	0.6	HDR	--	14	11.2	6
131	178262003	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	1.0	HDR	--	14	11.2	10
132	178262004	1.9	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	1.9	HDR	--	14	11.2	20
136	178300003	1.1	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	1.1	HDR	--	14	11.2	12
137	178310001	1.9	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	1.9	HDR	--	14	11.2	20
138	178310004	1.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	0.8	HDR	--	14	11.2	9
139	178310005	3.1	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	0.8	HDR	--	14	11.2	8
140	178310006	6.8	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	1.0	HDR	--	14	11.2	10
141	178310007	4.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	2.5	HDR	--	14	11.2	27
143	178310009	6.9	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	SP ZONE	6.9	HDR	--	14	11.2	77
154	179060006	3.5	soil block slides (LUA-12)	LI	M-SC	3.5	HDR	--	14	11.2	39
155	179060007	6.8	(LUA-12)	LI	M-SC	6.8	HDR	--	14	11.2	76
195	182331007	1.8	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3	1.8	HDR	--	14	11.2	20
197	182342010	2.3	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3	2.3	HDR	--	14	11.2	25
199	182350005	2.0	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	HDR	R-3	2.0	HDR	--	14	11.2	22
Subtotal		75.7				63.2					696
102	175100002	1.0	soil block slides	VLDR	A-1	1.0	VHDR	--	20	16.0	15
104	175100007	2.0	soil block slides	VLDR	A-1	2.0	VHDR	--	20	16.0	31
105	175100008	1.4		VLDR	A-1	1.4	VHDR	--	20	16.0	23
126	178252003	1.9	potential hazmat site, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	VHDR	SP ZONE	0.2	VHDR	--	20	16.0	3
127	178261001	4.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	VHDR	SP ZONE	4.2	VHDR	--	20	16.0	67
128	178261002	2.6	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	VHDR	SP ZONE	2.2	VHDR	--	20	16.0	35
Subtotal		13.5				11.0					174
5	152630027	2.7	in 100-year flood zone	LI	I-P	1.9	HHDR	25	25	25.0	47.5
115	177210002	3.9	building on north end of parcel	MDR	M-SC	3.7	HHDR	25	25	25.0	92.5

Table 7: Residential Site Inventory – Vacant and Underutilized Land

Housing Site No.	APN	Total Acres	Factors Affecting Development Potential	Existing GP Designation ¹	Existing Zoning	Developable Acreage	New or Proposed GP Designation	Minimum Density (du/ac)	Maximum Density (du/ac)	Reduced Density ²	Potential Units
116	177210003	3.9	freeway noise	MDR	M-SC	3.9	HHDR	25	25	25.0	97.5
117	177210005	2.2	freeway noise	MDR	M-SC	2.2	HHDR	25	25	25.0	55
153	179021001	3.0	freeway noise	MDR	R-1	3.0	HHDR	25	25	25.0	75
170	181030010	2.2	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3	2.2	HHDR	25	25	25.0	55
171	181030011	0.8	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	CR	R-VC	0.8	HHDR	25	25	25.0	20
172	181030012	2.7	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3-2500	2.3	HHDR	25	25	25.0	57.5
				CR	R-VC	0.4	HHDR	25	25	25.0	10
173	181041013	1.4	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	C-1/C-P	1.4	HHDR	25	25	25.0	35
174	181041014	1.2	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	C-1/C-P	1.2	HHDR	25	25	25.0	30
175	181041015	3.1	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3-2500	3.1	HHDR	25	25	25.0	77.5
Subtotal		27.1				26.1					653
TOTALS		1,096				943					4,110

Source: LSA Associates, Inc. (2015); Riverside County Assessor (2015); Riverside County Information Technology Geographic Information Systems (2015); City of Jurupa Valley, *Draft Proposed General Plan Land Use Amendments* (2015); City of Jurupa Valley, Staff Reports for Agenda Item No. 3.1, January 13, 2016 and February 10, 2016; and information provided by City staff on June 19 and 29, 2017.

¹Existing General Plan designations just prior to adoption of the 2017 General Plan.

²In all Residential designations except HHDR, Reduced Density is used for estimate purposes. It is assumed to be 20 percent below the maximum density to reflect development constraints, such as lot configuration, dedication requirements and required setbacks. Actual density is likely to be higher with on-site density transfer, density bonus and project design. In the HHDR designation, the minimum 25 du/A is also assumed to be the achieved density.

Note: See following page for a list of land use designations, zoning districts, and overlays.

Abbreviations Used in Table 7:

Non-Residential Land Use Designations:

OS-C = Conservation
OS-CH = Conservation Habitat
OS-W = Water
OS-R = Recreation
OS-MR = Mineral Resources
CR = Commercial Retail
CN = Commercial Neighborhood
CT = Commercial Tourist
CO = Commercial Office
LI = Light Industrial
HI - Heavy Industrial
BP = Business Park
PF = Public/Institutional
Railroad/Utility Corridor

Residential Land Use Designations:

OS-RUR = Rural
RCC = Residential/Commercial Corridor
EDR = Estate Density Residential
VLDR = Very Low Density Residential
LDR = Low Density Residential
RC-LDR = Rural Community-Low Density Residential¹
MDR = Medium Density Residential
MHDR = Medium High Density Residential
HDR = High Density Residential
VHDR = Very High Density Residential
HHDR = Highest Density Residential

Zoning Districts:

R-R = Rural residential
R-1 = One-family dwellings
R-A = Residential agriculture
R-2 = Multiple-family dwellings
R-2A = Limited multiple-family dwellings
R-3 = General residential
R-T = Mobilehome subdivision and mobilehome park
R-4 = Planned residential
R-5 = Open area combining zone/residential development
R-VC = Rubidoux Village Commercial
C-1/C-P = General commercial
C-P-S = Scenic highway commercial
C-O = Commercial office
I-P = Industrial park
M-SC = Manufacturing, service commercial
M-M = Manufacturing, medium
M-H = Manufacturing, heavy
A-1 = Light agriculture
A-2 = Heavy agriculture
W-2 = Controlled development areas
W-1 = Watercourse, watershed and conservation areas
SP ZONE = Specific Plan

Overlays

CDO = Community Development Overlay
TCO = Town Center Overlay
SP = Specific Plan
ELO = Equestrian Lifestyle Overlay
MPO = Mixed Use Overlay
BPO = Business Park Overlay
HO = Historic Overlay
