

**MOORPARK CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Honorable City Council

FROM: David A. Bobardt, Community Development Director
Prepared by Joseph R. Vacca, Principal Planner



DATE: December 18, 2013 (CC Meeting of 01/15/2013)

SUBJECT: Consider Resolution Adopting a Negative Declaration Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and Approving General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the City's General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

The Housing Element is one of the state-mandated elements of the General Plan. State law requires Housing Elements to be updated periodically to reflect changing housing needs and conditions. At the moment, the cities and counties within the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region are updating their Housing Elements for the 2014-2021 planning period. The City's current Housing Element was adopted by City Council on May 16, 2012.

A draft Housing Element Update for the 2014-2021 planning period was prepared and reviewed by the City Council on October 2, 2013. Following review by the City Council, it was submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review. After a series of discussions between City and HCD staff, along with the submittal of revisions, HCD sent the City a letter on October 21, 2013 (Attachment 1) stating that the draft element update addresses statutory requirements. The Planning Commission reviewed the draft Housing Element Update on December 17, 2013, and unanimously adopted PC Resolution No. 2013-592, recommending adoption of the Housing Element Update. The detailed discussion of the housing element update is provided in the attached Planning Commission staff report (Attachment 2).

One speaker addressed the Planning Commission during the public hearing:

- Dr. David Lopez-Lee, presented a letter submitted by e-mail to the commission earlier in the day by Bernardo Perez, Chair of Moorpark House Farm Workers Group. The letter indicated that while there was support from the Moorpark

House Farm Workers Group for the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, local investment should be included as part of Policies 2.1 and 2.2 related to the identification of parcels suitable for residential development and the ensuring of appropriate services and infrastructure to serve residential development. Also, the letter noted that identified housing site at the southeast end of Majestic Court seems to be burdened with access and infrastructure issues. Staff addressed the Planning Commission on this letter noting that local investment is one possible strategy that would be covered by the policies as written and no changes were needed. Staff also indicated that access to the Majestic Court site has already been acquired. The Planning Commission concurred with staff's response on the questions raised.

For this public hearing before the City Council, a public notice was published in the Ventura County Star on January 4, 2014 and staff emailed the public notice and a digital copy of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update to the persons who had previously inquired about the Housing Element, including:

No.	Contact Person	Agency
1.	Tanya McMahan	Constructing Connections/WorkLife Child Development Resources
2.	Daniela Ramirez	House Farm Workers!
3.	Bernardo Perez	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
4.	Milton E. Radant	Habitat for Humanity Simi Valley
5.	Debra Vernon	Communications and Corporate Responsibility American Water, Western Region
6.	Susan Englund	VC Homeless & Housing Coalition
7.	Eileen McCarthy	California Rural Legal Assistance
8.	Peter Lyons	Director, Planning Division Department of Environmental Services City of Simi Valley
9.	John Prescott	Community Development Director City of Thousand Oaks
10.	Kim Prillhart	Resource Management Agency County of Ventura
11.	Gloria Miguez	Interested citizen

Also, an electronic copy of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update was posted on the City's website on December 11, 2013, and currently remains on the website.

On December 5, 2013, City staff met with Bernardo Perez, Chair of Moorpark House Farm Workers Group, and presented the Draft Housing Element Update. Then on December 12, 2013, City staff attended a Moorpark House Farm Workers Group Meeting and presented the Draft Housing Element Update.

FINDINGS

The following findings are offered for General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, dated January 2014, of the City of Moorpark General Plan:

- A. The Revised Housing Element establishes goals, policies and objectives/programs that address the provision of adequate, safe, and decent housing for all economic segments of the community.
- B. The Revised Housing Element satisfies and is consistent with provisions for Housing Elements as contained within California Government Code Section 65585 of the Government Code regulating requirements for Housing Elements, which mandates that cities submit draft Housing Elements to HCD prior to adoption, and requires HCD to determine whether the draft element substantially complies with the requirements of state law.
- C. The Housing Element Update is consistent with the General Plan and all of its elements because it does not propose or necessitate change to any of the goals, policies, and programs in any of the other elements of the General Plan, and it specifically supports Goals 3 and 4 of the Land Use Element to “provide for a variety of housing types and opportunities for all economic segments of the community,” and “promote upgrading and maintenance of existing housing.”

PROCESSING TIME LIMITS

General Plan Amendments are legislative acts that are not subject to processing time limits under the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4.5), the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Title 7, Division 2), and the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines (Public Resources Code Division 13, and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3). Therefore, there are no statutory processing time limits required for review. However, it should be noted that in order to keep this Housing Element update on an eight-year cycle, it needs to be adopted by the City Council prior to February 12, 2014. Otherwise, another update would be required in four years.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

In accordance with the City’s environmental review procedures adopted by resolution, the Community Development Director (Director) determines the level of review necessary for a project to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Some projects may be exempt from review based upon a specific category listed in CEQA. Other projects may be exempt under a general rule that environmental review is

not necessary where it can be determined that there would be no possibility of significant effect upon the environment. A project which does not qualify for an exemption requires the preparation of an Initial Study to assess the level of potential environmental impacts.

Based upon the results of an Initial Study, the Director may determine that a project will not have a significant effect upon the environment. In such a case, a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared. For many projects, a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration will prove to be sufficient environmental documentation. If the Director determines that a project has the potential for significant adverse impacts and adequate mitigation cannot be readily identified, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared.

The Director has prepared or supervised the preparation of an Initial Study to assess the potential significant impacts of this project. Based upon the Initial Study, the Director has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment in that the Housing Element does not require any re-zoning of property within the City nor does it authorize any specific housing developments. Staff has prepared a Negative Declaration (Attachment 4, Exhibit - A) for City Council review and consideration. The public review period for the draft Negative Declaration was from November 26, 2013 to December 16, 2013. Staff has not received any comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Open the public hearing, accept public testimony and close the public hearing.
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2014-____ for adoption of the Negative Declaration and approval of General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03 for the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. October 21, 2013, letter from California Department of Housing and Community Development stating that the draft element addresses statutory requirements.
2. December 17, 2013, Planning Commission Staff Report, (without exhibits).
3. Letter from Bernardo Perez of Moorpark House Farm Workers Group
4. Draft Resolution with Exhibit A: Negative Declaration and Initial Study General Plan Amendment 2013-03, (2014-2021 Housing Element Update); and, Exhibit B: 2014-2021 Housing Element Update dated January 2014, of the Moorpark General Plan.

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 21, 2013

Mr. David A. Bobardt, Director
Community Development Department
City of Moorpark
799 Moorpark Avenue
Moorpark, CA 93201

Dear Mr. Bobardt:

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

Thank you for submitting the City of Moorpark's draft housing element update received for review on October 4, 2013, along with additional revisions on October 19, 2013. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65585(b), the Department is reporting the results of its review. Communications with Joseph R. Vacca, Principal Planner with the City, and Mr. John Douglas, the City's consultant, facilitated the review.

The draft element with revisions meets the statutory requirements of State housing element law. The draft element with revisions will comply with State housing element law (Article 10.6 of the Government Code) when the draft element and revisions are adopted and submitted to the Department, pursuant to Government Code Section 65585(g).

To remain on an eight year planning cycle the City must adopt its housing element within 120 calendar days from the statutory due date of October 15, 2013 for SCAG localities (Government Code Section 65588(e)(4)). If adopted after this date, the City will be required to revise the housing element every four years until adopting at least two consecutive revisions by the statutory deadline (Government Code Section 65588(e)(4)).

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 and considering and incorporating comments where appropriate.

The City's prior 4th cycle housing element compliance meets one of the threshold requirements of the Housing-Related Parks (HRP) Program. The HRP Program, funded by Proposition 1C, provides grant funds to eligible local governments for every qualifying housing unit housing affordable to lower-income households permitted since 2010. Grant awards can be used to fund park-related capital asset projects. More information about the HRP Program is available at <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrpp/>.

Mr. David A. Bobardt, Director
Page 2

The Department appreciates the City's efforts in preparation of the housing element and looks forward to receiving Moorpark's adopted housing element. If you have any questions or need additional technical assistance, please contact Jess Negrete, of our staff, at (916) 263-7437.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. McDougall', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Paul McDougall
Housing Policy Manager

**MOORPARK PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Honorable Planning Commission

FROM: David A. Bobardt, Community Development Director
Prepared by Joseph R. Vacca, Principal Planner 

DATE: November 14, 2013 (PC Meeting of 12/17/13)

SUBJECT: Consider Resolution Recommending that the City Council Adopt a Negative Declaration and Approve General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update

SUMMARY

The Housing Element is one of the state-mandated elements of the General Plan. State law requires Housing Elements to be updated periodically to reflect changing housing needs and conditions. All cities and counties within the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region are required to update their Housing Elements for the 2014-2021 planning period. On May 16, 2012, the City Council adopted the current Housing Element, covering the 2008-2013 planning period, and on June 20, 2012, California, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), issued a letter finding the element in full compliance with state law.

The guidelines adopted by HCD are also to be considered in the preparation of the Housing Element. Periodic review of the Housing 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. Under state law, the City is required to prepare a Housing Element update for the 2014-2021 planning period. A Draft Housing Element was prepared and reviewed by the City Council on October 2, 2013. Following review by the City Council, the Draft Housing Element was submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review. On October 21, 2013 a letter, (Attachment 1), was received from HCD stating that the draft element addresses statutory requirements. No changes to City land use policy or regulations are proposed in the new draft Housing Element.

Staff is presenting the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update to the Planning Commission for review, to receive public comment, provide direction to staff as appropriate, and to recommend to City Council adoption of General Plan Amendment 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update.

BACKGROUND

State law requires each local government in California to adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan to guide the physical development of the community. The Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements of the General Plan. The Housing Element establishes the framework for working toward the goal of providing a variety of housing units to serve the needs of the community. The updating of the Element is an effort to keep the City's General Plan current by updating the demographic information and housing inventory data. In addition, it serves as an opportunity to review adopted housing programs and identifies the number and type of residential units developed in the City.

According to the Government Code of the State of California, 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 for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The Housing Element is required to include:

- An assessment of housing needs;
- An inventory of resources relevant to the meeting of these needs;
- An analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints to meeting housing needs;
- Goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement and development of housing; and
- A plan of actions to achieve goals and objectives

The Housing Element is unique among the elements of the General Plan in that jurisdictions are required to submit draft elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review prior to adoption, and HCD is required to issue findings regarding whether, in its opinion, the element complies with the requirements of state law. Cities consider the comments of HCD prior to adoption of the Housing Element.

All jurisdictions within the six-county Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region are required to prepare an update to the Housing Element for the 2014-2021 planning period. If the new Housing Element is not adopted by February 12, 2014, the City will be required to prepare future housing element updates on a 4-year cycle rather than an 8-year cycle.

DISCUSSION

As mandated by state law, the Housing Element consists of the following major components:

- Analysis of the City's demographic and housing characteristics and trends;
- Evaluation of land, financial, and administrative resources available to address the City's housing needs and goals;
- Review of potential constraints, both governmental and non-governmental, to meeting the City's housing needs;
- A Housing Action Plan for the 2014–2021 planning period, including housing goals, policies, and programs; and
- A review of the City's accomplishments and progress in implementing the 2008-2014 Housing Element.

The current 2008-2014 Housing Element includes several programs that called for amendments to City plans and zoning regulations in order to accommodate the City's share of regional housing needs and to comply with state law regarding housing for persons with special needs. All of those amendments have been completed.

Since the City's current 2008-2014 Housing Element has been found to be in full compliance with state law, the 2014-2021 update is a fine-tuning process without major changes to City policies. No changes to land use or zoning designations are proposed or required. The following discussion summarizes the proposed changes contained in the attached draft 2014-2021 Housing Element update.

Chapter I: Introduction

- This chapter provides an overview of the element and reflects current data sources and a summary of the public participation process.

Chapter II: Housing Needs Assessment

- This chapter has been extensively revised to reflect current demographic data, trends and special housing needs. Most of the demographic information is based on the 2010 Census or the American Community Survey. This chapter also includes the new Regional Housing Needs Assessment, which describes housing growth needs for the new planning period.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Housing Element law requires a quantification of each jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need as established in the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA). The RHNA is prepared by SCAG in consultation with member jurisdictions and sub-regional councils of governments such as the Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG). The RHNA is based on forecasted population growth during the new planning period, and the number of additional housing units needed to accommodate additional household growth at all income levels.

Each locality's RHNA is distributed among the following four income categories:

**Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs
 Ventura County**

2013 County Median Income = \$89,300	Income Limits	Affordable Rent	Affordable Price (est.)
Very Low (31-50%)	\$44,650	\$1,116	–
Low (51-80%)	\$71,200	\$1,780	\$225,000
Moderate (81-120%)	\$107,150	\$2,679	\$375,000
Above moderate (120%+)	\$107,150+	\$2,679+	\$375,000+

Assumptions:
 -Based on a family of 4
 -30% of gross income for rent or PITI
 -10% down payment, 4.5% interest, 1.25% taxes & insurance, \$200 HOA dues
 Source: Cal. HCD; J.H. Douglas & Associates

The RHNA allocation for Moorpark in the new planning period (2014-2021), is 1,164 units, with the income distribution as shown in the following table. This allocation is consistent with the regional growth forecast and reflects the City's supply of developable land.

**2014-2021 Regional Housing Growth Needs –
 Moorpark**

Very Low*	Low	Moderate	Above Mod	Total
289**	197	216	462	1,164

Source: SCAG 2012
 Notes:
 *Includes the Extremely-Low Category
 **145 of these are assumed to be Extremely-Low units

It is important to note that the RNHA establishes a planning goal, and cities are not required to build or issue permits for the number of housing units allocated through the RHNA process. Rather, cities are required to demonstrate there are adequate sites with appropriate zoning that could accommodate the amount of new housing in the RHNA, if property owners and developers choose to pursue such development opportunities. Under state law, properties with zoning that allows residential development at a density of at least 20 units per acre are considered suitable for lower-income housing.

In the previous planning period, zoning regulations were amended to establish an RPD-20U-N-D zoning district and three properties were rezoned to create additional opportunities for affordable housing as required by the RHNA and state law. Since the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate the new RHNA in all income categories, no additional zoning amendments are anticipated in the new Housing Element.

Chapter III: Resources and Opportunities

- This chapter describes the City's land resources that are available to accommodate the new RHNA, as well as financial and administrative resources, and opportunities to foster energy conservation. The most noteworthy change to this chapter is the state's dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2012.

Chapter IV: Constraints

- This chapter analyzes the City's plans and regulations that guide housing development. The most noteworthy changes in this chapter reflect the completion of several state-mandated Code amendments related to housing for persons with special needs that were included in the implementation programs of the 2008-2013 Housing Element.

Chapter V: Housing Action Plan

- This chapter presents the City's goals, policies and programs for the 2014-2021 period. The most noteworthy changes in this chapter reflect the adoption of zoning amendments related to the RPD-20 district, completion of the state-mandated Code amendments related to housing for persons with special needs, and the elimination or modification of some housing programs that were previously funded by the redevelopment agency.
 - Proposed Program 7: includes a commitment to process a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to revise the City's definitions of "*transitional housing*" and "*supportive housing*" consistent with recently adopted state law (SB 745 of 2013) as part of this Housing Element update process.

Appendix A: Evaluation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element

- This appendix contains a review of the goals, policies and programs from the previous element and identifies the City's accomplishments as well as changes that are appropriate for the new planning period based on changed circumstances.

Appendix B: Residential Land Inventory

- This appendix includes a parcel-specific listing of sites where housing development could occur, and compares the inventory to the City's RHNA allocation.

Appendix C: Public Participation Summary

- This appendix describes opportunities for public involvement in the 2014-2021 Housing Element update.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

On September 26, 2013, staff posted the Preliminary Draft 2014-2021 Housing Element Update on the City website and made a hard copy available at City Hall for access by the public. Prior to scheduling a public meeting before the City Council on October 2, 2013, interested parties submitted requests that they be provided notification of upcoming

meetings on the consideration of the Draft 2014-2021 Housing Element Update. Therefore, on September 27, 2013, staff emailed the October 2, 2013 City Council agenda, and a digital copy of the Preliminary Draft 2014-2021 Housing Element Update to the persons who had previously inquired, as follows:

No.	Contact Person	Agency
1.	Tanya McMahan	Constructing Connections/WorkLife Child Development Resources
2.	Daniela Ramirez	House Farm Workers
3.	Bernardo Perez	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
4.	Milton E. Radant	Habitat for Humanity Simi Valley
5.	Debra Vernon	Communications and Corporate Responsibility American Water, Western Region
6.	Susan Englund	VC Homeless & Housing Coalition
7.	Eileen McCarthy	California Rural Legal Assistance
8.	Peter Lyons	Director, Planning Division Department of Environmental Services City of Simi Valley
9.	John Prescott	Community Development Director City of Thousand Oaks
10.	Kim Prillhart	Resource Management Agency County of Ventura
11.	Gloria Miguez	Interested citizen

As additional requests are received from interested parties, staff will continue to add any contact persons to the data base above in order to ensure notification of interested persons during the upcoming public hearing review process.

For this public hearing, a public notice was published in the Ventura County Star, a newspaper of general circulation for the area, on November 26, 2013, advertising the time and date for the public hearing before the Planning Commission of December 17, 2013. Prior to scheduling the public hearing, interested parties submitted requests that they be provided notification of upcoming meetings on the consideration of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update. Therefore, on November 26, 2013, staff emailed the public notice and a digital copy of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update to the persons who had previously inquired, as follows:

No.	Contact Person	Agency
1.	Tanya McMahan	Constructing Connections/WorkLife Child Development Resources
2.	Daniela Ramirez	House Farm Workers
3.	Bernardo Perez	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
4.	Milton E. Radant	Habitat for Humanity Simi Valley
5.	Debra Vernon	Communications and Corporate Responsibility American Water, Western Region
6.	Susan Englund	VC Homeless & Housing Coalition
7.	Eileen McCarthy	California Rural Legal Assistance
8.	Peter Lyons	Director, Planning Division Department of Environmental Services City of Simi Valley
9.	John Prescott	Community Development Director City of Thousand Oaks
10.	Kim Prillhart	Resource Management Agency County of Ventura
11.	Gloria Miguez	Interested citizen

FINDINGS

The following findings are offered for General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, dated November 2013, of the City of Moorpark General Plan:

- A. The Revised Housing Element establishes goals, policies and objectives/programs that address the provision of adequate, safe, and decent housing for all economic segments of the community.
- B. The Revised Housing Element satisfies and is consistent with provisions for Housing Elements as contained within California Government Code Section 65585 of the Government Code regulating requirements for Housing Elements, which mandates that cities submit draft Housing Elements to the California Housing and Community Development Department, (HCD) prior to adoption, and requires HCD to determine whether the draft element substantially complies with the requirements of state law.
- C. The Revised Housing Element is consistent with the General Plan and all of its Elements.

PROCESSING TIME LIMITS

General Plan Amendments are legislative acts that are not subject to processing time limits under the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4.5), the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Title 7, Division 2), and the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines (Public Resources Code Division 13, and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3). Therefore, there are no statutory processing time limits required for review.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

In accordance with the City's environmental review procedures adopted by resolution, the Community Development Director determines the level of review necessary for a project to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Some projects may be exempt from review based upon a specific category listed in CEQA. Other projects may be exempt under a general rule that environmental review is not necessary where it can be determined that there would be no possibility of significant effect upon the environment. A project which does not qualify for an exemption requires the preparation of an Initial Study to assess the level of potential environmental impacts.

Based upon the results of an Initial Study, the Director may determine that a project will not have a significant effect upon the environment. In such a case, a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared. For many projects, a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration will prove to be sufficient environmental documentation. If the Director determines that a project has the potential for significant adverse impacts and adequate mitigation cannot be readily identified, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared.

The Director has prepared or supervised the preparation of an Initial Study to assess the potential significant impacts of this project. Based upon the Initial Study, the Director has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment in that the Housing Element does not require any re-zoning of property within the City nor does it authorize any specific housing developments. The Director has prepared a Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) for Planning Commission review and consideration before making a recommendation on the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Open the public hearing, accept public testimony and close the public hearing; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. PC-2013-____, recommending the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration and approve General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to adopt the 2014-2012 Housing Element Update.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. October 21, 2013, letter from California Department of Housing and Community Development stating that the draft element addresses statutory requirements.
2. Draft PC Resolution with Exhibit A: 2014-2021 Housing Element Update (November 2013) of the Moorpark General Plan and Exhibit B: Initial Study and Negative Declaration.



HOUSE FARM WORKERS!

A project of the Ag Futures Alliance Farm Worker Housing Task Force

Ms. Diana Gould, Chair
Moorpark Planning Commission
799 Moorpark Avenue
Moorpark, CA 93021
Attention: Mr. David Bobardt, AICP, Community Development Director
RE: Moorpark Housing Element, Draft November 2013

Dear Ms. Gould:

On behalf of the Moorpark House Farm Workers Group (HFWG), I submit the following comments on the Moorpark Housing Element 2014 – 2021, Draft November 2013 version. First, the Moorpark HFWG would like to thank and commend Mr. David Bobardt and Mr. Joseph Vacca for their proactive outreach and response to our interest and participation in the housing element update process. This collaborative approach follows the positive experience in the previous housing element update process. Consequently, our comments address only these two points of the draft plan:

1. Goals and Policies
2. Vacant Land Inventory

Goals and Policies:

- Section V.A. Goals and Policies, (3rd bullet point on page V-1) reads: “Encourage growth through the identification of suitable parcels for residential development, changes in land use patterns, and appropriate recycling of land.”

The Moorpark HFWG recommends adding language so that this goal reads as follows:

“Encourage growth through the identification of ***and local investment in*** suitable parcels for residential development, changes in land use patterns, and appropriate recycling of land.”

- Section V.A.2. Adequate Residential Sites, Goal 2 reads: “Ensure residential sites have appropriate public services, facilities, circulation and other needed infrastructure to support development.”

The Moorpark HFWG recommends adding language so that this goal reads as follows:

“Ensure, ***through local investment that identified*** residential sites have appropriate public services, facilities, circulation and other needed infrastructure to support development.”

Vacant Land Inventory

Table B-3 Vacant Land Inventory (page B-10) identifies a housing site at SE end of Majestic Court (APN 506-0-020-525). The 1.34-acre site has General Plan and Zoning designations of VHR and RPD-20. Both of these can be helpful to the production of housing that would be

affordable to low- and very low-income households. However and admittedly only upon a 'windshield survey' of the site, this particular site seems to be burdened with access and infrastructure issues that could make an affordable housing development economically infeasible.

By adding the suggested language above, the City of Moorpark would be strengthening its policy statements and demonstrating to the broader community its full commitment to promoting the production of housing, particularly affordable housing, needed by our Moorpark community. We recognize that the City Council has final approving authority of the Housing Element, and so we urge the Planning Commission to accept the proposed changes and thus send a strong recommendation for approval to the City Council.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Bernardo Perez
Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-___

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOORPARK, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2013-03, AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN TO ADOPT THE 2014-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public meeting on October 2, 2013, City Council reviewed and considered comments on the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update of the City of Moorpark General Plan and directed staff to submit the Draft Housing Element to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review; and

WHEREAS, following review of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update by the City Council, the Draft Housing Element was submitted to HCD for review; and on October 21, 2013, a letter was received from HCD stating that the draft Housing Element addresses statutory requirements and accepting the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update; and

WHEREAS, the Community Development Director, after preparation of an Initial Study, found that the adoption of the 2014-2021 Housing Element update of the General Plan would not result in any significant environmental effects and directed staff to prepare a Negative Declaration. The proposed Negative Declaration was circulated for public review and comment from November 26, 2013 to December 16, 2013 and no comments were received; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on December 17, 2013, the Planning Commission considered the agenda report and any supplements thereto, including the Negative Declaration and draft Housing Element update, as well as written public comments; opened the public hearing and took and considered public testimony both for and against the proposal to adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update of the City of Moorpark General Plan; and adopted Resolution No. PC-2013-592, recommending that the City Council adopt the proposed Negative Declaration and approve General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on January 15, 2014, the City Council considered the agenda report for General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03 and any supplements thereto, including the Negative Declaration and draft Housing Element update, as well as written public comments; opened the public hearing and took and considered public testimony both for and against the proposal, closed the public hearing and reached a decision on this matter; and

CC ATTACHMENT 4

WHEREAS, the City Council has read, reviewed, and considered the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the project referenced above.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOORPARK DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

- A. The Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared for this project, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, are complete and have been prepared in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the City's CEQA Procedures.
- B. The City Council has reviewed the information in the Initial Study and Negative Declaration in its consideration of this project before making a decision concerning the project and the Negative Declaration.
- C. Based on the Initial Study and the record as a whole, the City Council finds that there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the Housing Element update may have a significant impact on the environment.
- D. The Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City Council.
- E. The record of proceedings, which includes all background information, reports and studies that were used in the development of the draft Housing Element Update and the CEQA documentation, is maintained by the City as part of the official records of the Community Development Department at 799 Moorpark Avenue, Moorpark, CA 93021. The custodian of these records is the Community Development Director.

SECTION 2. ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION: Based on the foregoing, the Negative Declaration prepared in connection with General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, (attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference), is hereby adopted.

SECTION 3. CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL: General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, dated January 2014 (attached as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference), is approved, based upon the following findings:

- A. The Revised Housing Element establishes goals, policies and objectives/programs that address the provision of adequate, safe, and decent housing for all economic segments of the community.

- B. The Revised Housing Element satisfies and is consistent with provisions for Housing Elements as contained within California Government Code Section 65585 of the Government Code regulating requirements for Housing Elements, which mandates that cities submit draft Housing Elements to HCD prior to adoption, and requires HCD to determine whether the draft element substantially complies with the requirements of state law.
- C. The Housing Element Update is consistent with the General Plan and all of its elements because it does not propose or necessitate change to any of the goals, policies, and programs in any of the other elements of the General Plan, and it specifically supports Goals 3 and 4 of the Land Use Element to “provide for a variety of housing types and opportunities for all economic segments of the community,” and “promote upgrading and maintenance of existing housing.”

SECTION 4. CERTIFICATION OF ADOPTION: The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution and shall cause a certified resolution to be filed in the book of original resolutions.

PASSED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of January, 2014.

Janice S. Parvin, Mayor

Maureen Benson, City Clerk

Attachments:

Exhibit A: Initial Study and Negative Declaration – GPA No. 2013-03, Housing Element Update (2014-2021)

Exhibit B: 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, dated January 2014, of the Moorpark General Plan

EXHIBIT A



**NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CITY OF MOORPARK
799 MOORPARK AVENUE
MOORPARK, CA 93021
(805) 517-6200**

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Procedures of the City of Moorpark.

- Public Review Period:** November 26, 2013 to December 16, 2013
- Project Title/Case No.:** General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, Housing Element Update, 2014-2021
- Project Location:** The Housing Element Update will apply citywide.
- Project Description:** General Plan Amendment No. 2013-03, is an Amendment to the General Plan to Adopt the Housing Element Update, (2014-2021).
- Project Type:** Private Project Public Project
- Project Applicant:** City of Moorpark, 799 Moorpark Avenue, Moorpark CA 93021
- Finding:** After preparing an Initial Study for the above-referenced project, it is found that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the City of Moorpark, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. (Initial Study Attached)
- Responsible Agencies:** City of Moorpark
- Trustee Agencies:** None
- Attachments:** Initial Study
- Contact Person:** Joseph R. Vacca
Community Development Department
City of Moorpark
799 Moorpark Avenue
Moorpark, California, 93021
(805) 517-6236

Project Description (continued):

Removing Governmental Constraints

- Density Bonus (Program 16)
- Efficient Project Processing R-P-D zone and Planned Development Permit Process (Program 17)
- Off-Street Parking Requirements (Program 18)

Promoting Equal Housing Opportunities

- Fair Housing Services (Program 19)
- Reasonable Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities (Program 20)
- Child Care Facilities (Program 21)

The major focus of these programs is to improve the quality of the city's housing stock, conserve existing neighborhoods, increase housing affordability, and remove potential constraints to housing for persons with special needs. The Housing Element does not require any re-zoning of property within the City nor does it authorize any specific housing developments.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Moorpark lies in the eastern center of Ventura County, midway between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles. The City is separated from nearby cities (Simi valley, and Thousand Oaks) by agricultural green belts and mountainous open space areas. The Housing Element is a General Plan policy document and encompasses the entire city.

Responsible and Trustee Agencies:

State law requires that the City submit the draft Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review prior to its adoption, and that the City Council consider HCD's comments. A Draft Housing Element Update (2014-2021) was prepared and reviewed by the City Council on October 2, 2013. Following review by the City Council, the Draft Housing Element Update was submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review. On October 21, 2013, a letter was received from HCD stating that the draft element addresses statutory requirements and that the element would comply with state law when adopted. The revised draft Housing Element incorporates minor changes made in response to HCD comments.

The Housing Element does not authorize any specific housing developments. Review of specific development proposals may be required prior to development of new housing. Appropriate public agency review will be determined at the time specific development applications are submitted.


ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less Than Significant With Mitigation," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None				

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation, I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

Prepared by: Joseph R. Vacca 

Reviewed by: 

Date: Nov 21, 2013

Date: 11/21/2013

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	_____	_____	X	_____
2) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	_____	_____	X	_____
3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	_____	_____	X	_____
4) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	_____	_____	X	_____

Response: A1. Through 4.:

The Housing Element identifies a need for 1,164 new housing units during the 2014-2021 planning period. Some new development is expected to occur in urbanized areas as in-fill or redevelopment. This type of development would not be expected to substantially alter the aesthetic character of the site, and in most cases would be expected to improve the aesthetic character of the neighborhood. The Housing Element does not require re-zoning of specific property because the City's zoning already allows for the development of the units identified as necessary to meet the population's needs. As such, the Housing Element does not authorize any specific housing developments. A significant portion of any new development would be expected to occur on land that is currently vacant, and therefore, would result in the conversion of open space to urban use. The development of these properties is already allowed pursuant to the current zoning scheme. Without specific details regarding such future developments, however, it is not possible to determine or analyze potential visual impacts with any precision. All future developments will be required to conform to the General Plan Land Use Element, zoning regulations and development standards, and therefore, would not create a negative aesthetic effect on the City's visual qualities. Any new housing development could create new sources of light and glare due to exterior lighting, lighting of streets and walkways, and interior lighting that could be visible from the outside. The Housing Element, however, does not authorize any new development. In addition, any new housing development would be required to comply with all appropriate development standards to mitigate any potential aesthetic impacts. No significant impacts are expected to occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this general plan amendment and Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, the City of Moorpark may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board- Would the project:

1) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources agency, to non-agricultural use?	_____	_____	_____	X
--	-------	-------	-------	---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
3) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause, rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
4) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
5) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Response: B1. Through 5:
The Housing Element identifies a need for 1,164 new housing units during the 2014-2021 planning period. While some new development would be expected to occur in urbanized areas as in-fill or redevelopment, a significant portion of new development would be expected to occur on land that is currently vacant, and therefore, would result in the conversion of open space to urban use. The Housing Element does not, however, authorize any housing development that would not already be allowed by the City's current zoning scheme. Moreover, none of the sites currently designated for residential development in the Housing Element contain prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, nor are any such sites currently used for farming. Therefore, no significant impacts are expected to occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013), California Dep't of Conservation: Ventura County Important Farmland Map (2000).

Mitigation: None required

C. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
2) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
3) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
4) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
5) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: C1. Through 5.:

The Housing Element update includes policies, programs and guidelines through which the City of Moorpark can continue to meet its fair share of regional housing growth. The Housing Element is a policy document and in this instance, it does not require the re-zoning of any property. The Housing Element does not authorize any housing development that would not already be allowed by the City's current zoning scheme. Therefore, the Housing Element update will not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the Ventura County Air Quality plans nor violate any air quality standard or have a substantial contribution to any air quality violation. Further, because it does not authorize development, adoption of the Housing Element will not have a cumulative net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is not attaining any relevant air quality standard. The Housing Element also will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations nor create objectionable odors. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Long-term air quality impacts are those associated with the emissions produced from project-generated vehicle trips as well as from stationary sources related to the use of natural gas and electricity for heating, cooling, lighting, etc. Without specific details regarding future development, such as unit types and vehicle trips, it is not possible to accurately quantify long-term emissions. The Housing Element update does not authorize any development that is not already allowed. As part of the review process for future development projects, potential air quality impacts will be evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures will be adopted. No significant impacts will occur as a result of the adoption of the Housing Element update, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

1) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
2) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
3) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
4) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
5) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: D1. Through 4.:
The Housing Element identifies a need for 1,164 new housing units during the 2014-2021 planning period. The Housing Element is a policy document that includes an examination of housing statistics, housing need, and identification of housing programs to make sure the city continues to address the City of Moorpark's share of regional housing need. Nonetheless, the Housing Element update does not require the re-zoning of any property to meet the City's housing need nor does it authorize any specific housing development. Thus, the adoption of the City's Housing Element update will not significantly impact biological resources including modifications to habitats of any species identified as sensitive or having special protective status nor will it have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the Housing Element update will not impact federally-protected wetlands nor substantially interfere with the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife species.

Response: D5. Through 6.:
The Moorpark Municipal Code contains tree preservation regulations, which are codified under Chapter 12.12 (Historic Trees, Native Oak Trees and Mature Trees). The ordinance defines "historic, mature and native oak trees," and specific requirements are described for protecting or mitigating their removal. Permits are required for pruning or removal of protected trees, which include historic, mature and native oak trees. The Housing Element update does not require the re-zoning of any property to meet this need nor does it authorize any housing development. Moreover, all future residential developments will be required to comply with the provisions of this ordinance, which will reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary at this time.

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that would be impacted in association with the programs outlined in the Housing Element update. No mitigation measures are necessary at this time. The draft Housing Element also does not conflict with adopted conservation local, regional or state conservation plans. As a result, no further environmental review is necessary.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013), Moorpark Municipal Code Chapter 12.12: Historic Trees, Native Oak Trees and Mature Trees (1988)

Mitigation: None required

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in §15064.5?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: E1. Through 4.:

The Housing Element identifies a need for 1,164 new housing units during the 2014-2021 planning period. Nonetheless, the Housing Element does not require the re-zoning of any property to meet this need nor does it authorize any housing development. Some of the areas on which future development may occur could contain sensitive cultural, archaeological or paleontological resources. As part of the planning and review process for new developments, potential impacts to cultural resources will be evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures will be adopted. Given that the Housing Element update does not authorize new development that is not already allowed by the City's existing zoning scheme, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death Involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	_____	_____	_____	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	_____	_____	_____	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	_____	_____	X
iv) Landslides?	_____	_____	_____	X
2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	_____	_____	_____	X
3) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	_____	_____	_____	X
4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	_____	_____	_____	X
5) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	_____	_____	_____	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: F1. Through 5.:

The City of Moorpark is located in a seismically active region containing active faults. These faults have the potential to expose people or structures to significant impacts as a result of a fault rupture and seismic ground shaking. Parts of the City may contain expansive or unstable soils that have the potential to cause structural damage. In addition, grading associated with future development could result in substantial soil erosion. While it is not possible to determine specific potential impacts related to future developments at this time, some general requirements designed to minimize geological impacts will apply to all new development. These include compliance with the Alquist-Priolo Act, the Uniform Building Code, Title 24 of the California Building Code, and the standards of the Structural Engineers Association of California. Compliance with these building standards is considered the best means of reducing geologic hazards. In addition, as part of the City's planning and development review process, future development projects will be required to evaluate site-specific geotechnical conditions and determine appropriate construction methods to address potential hazards such as liquefaction. The Housing Element does not require the re-zoning of any property nor does it authorize any specific housing development. As such, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013), General

Sources: Plan Safety Element (2001), Uniform Building Code (2010)

Mitigation: None required

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| 1) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ X _____ |
| 2) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ X _____ |

	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact			

Response: G1. Through 2.:

Many of the world's leading scientific experts agree that greenhouse gases (GHGs) generated by human activities affect climate by increasing the "greenhouse effect." The gases concentrate in the Earth's atmosphere and trap heat by blocking some of the long-wave energy the Earth normally radiates back into space. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation); methane from landfill wastes and raising livestock, deforestation activities; and some agricultural practices. These activities are increasing the greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere and could be accelerating global climate change. Long-term environmental consequences in California could potentially include a reduction in water supply from the Sierra Nevada snow pack, which could result in a reduction in imported water, and public health problems due to degraded air quality and more intense summer heat.

In 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 2000 levels by the year 2010, 1990 levels by the year 2020, and to 80 percent less than 1990 levels by year 2050. These reductions will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. To effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources. AB 32 specifies that regulations adopted in response to AB 1493 should be used to address GHG emissions from vehicles. However, AB 32 also includes language stating that if the AB 1493 regulations cannot be implemented, then CARB should develop new regulations to control vehicle GHG emissions under the authorization of AB 32. AB 32 requires that CARB adopt a quantified cap on GHG emissions representing 1990 emissions levels and disclose how it arrives at the cap; institute a schedule to meet the emissions cap; and develop tracking, reporting, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the state achieves reductions in GHG emissions necessary to meet the cap. In 2007, CARB adopted the statewide 2020 emissions cap at 427 million metric tons (MMT) equivalent carbon dioxide (CO₂e) greenhouse gas emissions. CARB estimated that 2020 'business-as-usual' emissions (meaning, emissions of greenhouse gases without consideration of climate change) would be 596 MMTCO₂e; therefore, emissions will need to be reduced by 169 MMTCO₂e (28 percent) statewide to meet the 2020 threshold. AB 32 also includes guidance to institute emissions reductions in an economically efficient manner and conditions to ensure that businesses and consumers are not unfairly affected by the reductions. A numerical threshold to determine the significance of greenhouse gas emissions has not been established by the City or Ventura County Air Pollution Control District.

The Housing Element does not require the re-zoning of any property nor does it authorize any specific housing development. Moreover, any new development must be consistent with the adopted growth forecast and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, it would not cause an increase in greenhouse gas emissions beyond the level currently projected to occur. Therefore, no new significant impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are necessary at this time. Nonetheless, subsequent development applications will be evaluated to assess potential greenhouse gas emissions and appropriate mitigation measures may be required at that time.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| 1) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ x _____ |
| 2) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ x _____ |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3) Emit hazardous emission or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	_____	_____	_____	X
4) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	_____	_____	_____	X
5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	_____	_____	_____	X
6) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	_____	_____	_____	X
7) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	_____	_____	_____	X
8) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	_____	_____	_____	X

Response: H1. Through 8.:
The Housing Element is a policy document that addresses the city's capability to address the community's housing need. The Housing Element does not require the re-zoning of any property to meet the City's housing need nor does it authorize any specific housing development. As a result, the review of the present Housing Element will not create hazards and hazardous materials. The adoption of the draft Housing Element will not create hazards through transporting, using, or disposing hazardous materials. Further, it will not create hazards through the reasonably foreseeable up-set and accidental conditions nor result in hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed elementary school. The approval of the Housing Element will not impact any identified hazardous material sites. There are no airports within the city limits, and the update of the Housing Element will not result in a safety hazard for people working or living in the city. There are no private airstrips in Moorpark, so there would not be any hazards as a result of the Housing Element update. Further, adoption of the Housing Element will not impair implementation of the emergency response plan, nor will it expose people or structures to wildfires. As a result, the adoption of the Housing Element update will not have any significant impacts on hazards and hazardous materials, and no further environmental review is required.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	_____	_____	_____	X
2) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	_____	_____	_____	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact X
3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
4) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
5) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
7) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
8) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
9) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
10) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	_____	_____	_____	_____X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: I1.:

New development could impact water quality through runoff and wastewater discharge. However, the Housing Element does not require the re-zoning of any property nor does it authorize any housing development. Thus, the Housing Element update does not allow for any development that would not already be allowed under the City's current zoning scheme. Moreover, all future developments will be required to comply with applicable federal, state and local water quality requirements such as the Clean Water Act and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. Additionally, through the City's development review process, future projects will be evaluated for potential site-specific water quality and flooding impacts. Development projects will be required to prepare water quality plans and/or incorporate "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) into their construction operations to reduce erosion, siltation and water pollution both during and after construction. Compliance with these regulations would be expected to reduce water quality impacts to a level that is less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element amendment.

Response: I2.: Any new development likely would result in increased water consumption having the potential to deplete groundwater supplies. Additionally, new developments will result in an increased amount of impervious surfaces and the potential to decrease groundwater recharge. These potential impacts related to groundwater supplies and recharge will be analyzed as part of the planning and development review process for future projects. Nonetheless, the Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. Thus, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element amendment.

Response: I3. Through 10.: Future residential developments could result in modification of existing drainage patterns through grading and construction of homes, streets and other facilities. Such changes to drainage patterns could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, as well as greater risk of flooding from increased runoff. However, the Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. In addition, prior to the development of any new project, potential impacts related to alteration of drainage patterns and flood hazards will be analyzed and appropriate conditions will be required. In addition, existing policies require the provision of adequate storm water drainage facilities and prevent residential development within 100-year floodplains. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

1) Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____
3) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X _____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: J1. Through 3.:

The Housing Element update does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. In addition, in accordance with the City's zoning code, future residential development will be either small-scale infill/redevelopment projects or larger-scale master-planned projects on vacant land. As such, these future projects would not have the potential to divide an existing community. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element amendment.

There is no known adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan within the areas of Moorpark that will be considered for future development. No impacts would occur and mitigation measures are necessary at this time.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

K. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

1) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
--	-------	-------	-------	----------------

2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
---	-------	-------	-------	----------------

Response: K1. Through 2.:

According to the City of Moorpark General Plan, no classified or designated mineral deposits of statewide or regional significance have been identified in the city. The State Geologist has not mapped any Mineral Resource Zones in the city, and consequently the State Mining and Geology Board has not designated any regionally significant mineral resource areas in the city. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013), General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element (1986)

Mitigation: None required

L. NOISE – Would the project result in:

1) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
---	-------	-------	-------	----------------

2) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
---	-------	-------	-------	----------------

3) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
--	-------	-------	-------	----------------

4) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
--	-------	-------	-------	----------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
6) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	_____X

Response: L1. Through 4.:
The Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. In addition, even though all future residential developments would be expected to result in short-term construction-related noise impacts, including ground-borne vibration noise that could exceed established standards, required compliance with the City's noise regulations and restrictions on construction hours will help to mitigate these impacts. Although any future development likely would result in an incremental increase in long-term noise levels from increased vehicular traffic, as well as new stationary sources of noise, the Housing Element update does not authorize specific development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. As part of the planning and development review process, all future projects will be subject to site-specific analysis of potential noise impacts and any appropriate mitigation measures will be imposed at that time. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element amendment.

Response: L5. Through 6.:
There are no public airports or private airstrips located within the city. As such, future residential development would not be expected to expose people to excessive aircraft noise levels. The adoption of the Housing Element update will not result in any addition impacts related to airports or aircraft noise. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

1) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
2) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	_____X
3) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	_____X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: M1. Through 3.:
The City is required by state law to accommodate its fair share of regional housing needs. While the Housing Element update establishes policies for the development of housing, it does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. The Housing Element update will not induce additional population growth, but merely addresses the housing needs of the anticipated population. No mitigation measures are required.

It is expected that most new residential development in the City will occur on vacant land and therefore would not displace existing houses or people. However, some redevelopment of existing housing could occur, such as with a project to replace deteriorated structures. In such cases, evaluation of the need for replacement housing and/or relocation assistance would be required. The Housing Element update includes policies and programs to reduce the possibility and effects of displacement. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).
Mitigation: None required

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

1) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
Police protection?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
Schools?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
Parks?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X
Other public facilities?	_____	_____	_____	_____ X

Response: N1.:
The Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. Any new residential development would be expected to increase the demand for public services, but the Housing Element will not create a substantial adverse impact because it does not authorize additional housing. Already, as part of the planning and development review process, all new developments will be evaluated to determine the level of demand for public services and appropriate mitigation measures will be imposed to ensure that adequate service levels are maintained. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).
Mitigation: None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

O. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| 1) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ |
| 2) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ |

Response: O1. Through 2.:

The Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. New residential development would be expected to increase the demand for parks and other recreational facilities. As part of the planning and development review process, all new developments will be evaluated to determine the level of demand for recreational facilities and appropriate mitigation measures will be imposed to ensure that adequate service levels are maintained. The City of Moorpark Park requires that all new residential subdivision developments pay a Quimby Act fee, which is used to acquire and/or improve park facilities, mitigating the impact of additional residents. Since the Housing Element does not authorize new development that is not already allowed, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 1) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 2) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 3) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 4) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 5) Result in inadequate emergency access? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 6) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
| 7) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: P1. Through 7.:

The Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. Any new residential development will be expected to generate increased traffic on the road network and could result in hazardous road conditions, inadequate emergency access, or insufficient parking. The level of new residential development anticipated in the Housing Element (1,164 additional housing units during the 2014-2021 period) would not be expected to have a significant effect on air traffic volume beyond the levels assumed in the regional growth forecast. In addition, the City's zoning scheme already anticipates this growth. As a result, the Housing Element update will not result in any significant impacts, and no mitigation measures are required. Moreover, as part of the planning and development review process, all new developments are evaluated to determine the extent of traffic impacts relative to road capacity, design, emergency access and parking, and appropriate requirements will be imposed to ensure that safe design standards and adequate service levels are maintained. The traffic impact fees that new residential developments are required to pay will help to mitigate the impact of additional traffic through funding of new road improvements. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
2) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
3) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
4) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
5) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
6) Be served by the landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
7) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____

	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Potentially Significant Impact			

Response: Q1. Through 7.:
The Housing Element does not authorize any new development or allow for more development than is currently allowed under the City's zoning scheme. Any new residential development will likely increase the demand for utilities and service systems, including water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, and solid waste disposal, but as part of the planning and development review process, new developments will be evaluated to determine the level of demand for these facilities and appropriate mitigation measures and project-specific requirements will be imposed to ensure that adequate service levels are maintained. Since the City's zoning scheme already anticipates housing growth and the update will not increase the demand for utilities and service systems, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary in connection with this Housing Element update.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Mitigation: None required

R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<p>1) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
<p>2) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effect of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and effects of probable future projects)?</p>	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____
<p>3) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	_____	_____	_____ X _____	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Response: R1.:

Under state law, cities are required to prepare a Housing Element that, among other things, identifies how the jurisdiction's fair share of regional housing growth needs will be accommodated. The City of Moorpark's fair share of the region's new housing need, as established by the Southern California Association of Governments, is 1,164 units for the period 2014-2021. The City's new housing need is distributed among various income levels as shown in Housing Element Table II-27. Since the City's current land use plans and zoning demonstrate adequate capacity to accommodate its need for lower-income households, the Housing Element does not include a commitment to re-zone any land for multi-family residential development. Thus, the Housing Element update will not have any significant impacts. Moreover, prior to approval of any future proposed zoning amendments or development applications, site-specific CEQA analysis will be conducted and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to address any potentially significant impacts.

Response: R2.:

As noted in Item R1., above, the Housing Element identifies a need for 1,164 new residential units during the 2014-2021 period. However, this Housing Element update does not grant any development entitlements nor identify the specific location of sites to be developed. Prior to adoption of any future proposed development or zoning amendments, site-specific CEQA analysis will be conducted and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to address any potentially significant impacts.

Response: R3.:

As noted in Items R1., and R2., above, the Housing Element is a policy document that does not grant development entitlements for any specific sites or projects. Prior to adoption of any proposed zoning amendments, and/or development applications, site-specific CEQA analysis will be conducted and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to address any potentially significant impacts that may be identified.

Sources: GPA 2013-03: Housing Element Update, (Draft 2014-2021, dated November 2013).

Earlier Environmental Documents Used in the Preparation of this Initial Study

None

Additional Project References Used to Prepare This Initial Study

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Community Development Office, City Hall, 799 Moorpark Avenue, Moorpark, CA 93021. Items used are referred to by number in the Response Section of the Initial Study Checklist.

1. The City of Moorpark's General Plan, as amended.
2. The Moorpark Municipal Code, as amended.
3. The City of Moorpark Procedures for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines adopted by Resolution No. 2004-2224
4. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq. and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et. seq.

EXHIBIT B

MOORPARK GENERAL PLAN

Housing ELEMENT
2014-2021



January 2014

Acknowledgements

City Council

Janice S. Parvin, Mayor
Roseann Mikos, Ph.D., Councilmember
Keith F. Millhouse, Councilmember
David Pollock, Councilmember
Mark Van Dam, Councilmember

Planning Commission

Diana Gould, Chair
Daniel Groff, Vice Chair
Kipp Landis, Commissioner
Mark Di Cecco, Commissioner
Bruce Hamous, Commissioner

City Staff

Steven Kueny, City Manager
David Bobardt, AICP, Community Development Director
Joseph Vacca, AICP, Principal Planner

Consulting Assistance:
J.H. Douglas & Associates

Cover photo: Charles Street Terrace (Ventura County Area Housing Authority)

Contents

I.	Introduction	I-1
	A. Setting.....	I-1
	B. State Policy and Authorization	I-2
	C. Public Participation	I-2
	D. Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan.....	I-2
II.	Housing Needs Assessment	II-1
	A. Population Characteristics	II-1
	1. Population Growth Trends.....	II-1
	2. Age.....	II-2
	3. Race and Ethnicity	II-2
	B. Household Characteristics.....	II-3
	1. Household Composition and Size	II-3
	2. Housing Tenure	II-4
	3. Overcrowding	II-4
	4. Household Income	II-5
	5. Overpayment.....	II-6
	6. Current Employment	II-6
	7. Projected Job Growth	II-7
	8. Jobs-Housing Balance	II-8
	C. Housing Stock Characteristics.....	II-9
	1. Housing Type and Growth Trends.....	II-9
	2. Housing Age and Conditions	II-10
	3. Vacancy.....	II-11
	4. Housing Cost.....	II-11
	D. Special Needs	II-14
	1. Persons with Disabilities	II-14
	2. Elderly.....	II-16
	3. Large Households	II-16
	4. Female-Headed Households.....	II-17
	5. Farm Workers	II-17
	6. Student Population.....	II-20
	7. Homeless Persons	II-20
	E. Assisted Housing at Risk of Conversion.....	II-23
	F. Future Growth Needs	II-24
	1. Overview of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment	II-24
	2. 2014-2021 Moorpark Growth Needs	II-24
III.	Resources and Opportunities.....	III-1
	A. Land Resources.....	III-1
	B. Financial and Administrative Resources.....	III-1
	1. State and Federal Resources	III-1
	2. Local Resources	III-3
	3. Local Non-Profit Agencies	III-3
	C. Energy Conservation Opportunities.....	III-5
IV.	Constraints	IV-1
	A. Governmental Constraints	IV-1
	1. Land Use Plans and Regulations.....	IV-1
	2. Development Processing Procedures	IV-12
	3. Development Fees and Improvement Requirements.....	IV-16
	B. Non-Governmental Constraints.....	IV-18
	1. Environmental Constraints	IV-18
	2. Infrastructure Constraints.....	IV-19
	3. Land Costs.....	IV-19

4.	Construction Costs	IV-20
5.	Cost and Availability of Financing	IV-20
C.	Fair Housing	IV-20
V.	Housing Plan	V-1
A.	Goals and Policies	V-1
1.	Housing and Neighborhood Conservation	V-1
2.	Adequate Residential Sites	V-2
3.	Housing Assistance and Special Needs	V-2
4.	Removal of Government Constraints	V-3
5.	Fair and Equal Housing Opportunity	V-3
B.	Housing Programs	V-4

Appendix A – Evaluation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element

Appendix B – Residential Land Inventory

Appendix C – Public Participation Summary

List of Tables

Table II-1	Population Trends 1990-2010	II-1
Table II-2	Age Distribution	II-2
Table II-3	Race/Ethnicity	II-3
Table II-4	Household Composition	II-3
Table II-5	Household Tenure	II-4
Table II-6	Overcrowding	II-4
Table II-7	Median Household Income	II-5
Table II-8	Overpayment by Income Category	II-5
Table II-9	Labor Force Status	II-6
Table II-10	Employment by Occupation	II-7
Table II-11	Projected Job Growth by Occupation, 2008-2018 – Oxnard/Thousand Oaks- Ventura Metropolitan Statistical Area	II-8
Table II-12	Job Location for Moorpark Residents	II-9
Table II-13	Housing by Type	II-9
Table II-14	Age of Housing Stock by Tenure	II-10
Table II-15	Housing Vacancy	II-11
Table II-16	Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs – Ventura County	II-12
Table II-17	Ventura County Median Housing Sales Prices - 2012	II-13
Table II-18	Persons with Disabilities by Age	II-14
Table II-19	Elderly Households by Tenure	II-16
Table II-20	Household Size by Tenure	II-17
Table II-21	Household Type by Tenure	II-17
Table II-22	Ventura County Farm Workers – 2000	II-19
Table II-23	Agricultural Employment – Moorpark vs. Ventura County	II-19
Table II-24	Ventura County Homeless Count: 2012	II-21
Table II-25	Ventura County Homeless Sub-Populations: 2012	II-21
Table II-26	Assisted Housing Developments	II-23
Table II-27	Regional Housing Growth Needs – Moorpark	II-24
Table III-1	Land Inventory Summary	III-1
Table IV-1	Residential land Use Categories	IV-1
Table IV-2	Residential Development Standards	IV-2
Table IV-3	Housing Types Permitted by Zone	IV-5
Table IV-4	Development Review Times	IV-15
Table IV-5	Development Review Fees	IV-17
Table IV-6	Road Improvement Standards	IV-18
Table V-1	Housing Program Implementation Summary	V-9

List of Figures

Figure II-1	Population Growth 1990-2012	II-1
Figure II-2	Agricultural Production Areas – Ventura County	II-18

This page intentionally left blank.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Setting

Nestled among the rolling hills in eastern Ventura County, Moorpark incorporated as a city in 1983. Beginning with the small settlements of Epworth and Fremontville in the late 19th/early 20th centuries, Moorpark has experienced tremendous growth since the 1980s – increasing to a population estimated at 37,576 in 2010. Despite this rapid population growth, Moorpark has retained its country charm reminiscent of a small town.

Moorpark is distinct from other communities in Ventura County. The city has a high percentage of younger families with children. Residents generally tend to have a higher education level than many communities, and one of the highest median household incomes in the county. Due to its predominantly residential nature, Moorpark serves as a bedroom community for larger employment centers throughout Ventura County as well as northwest Los Angeles County, which is readily accessible via the Ventura Freeway (SR-101), the Ronald Reagan Freeway (SR-118) and SR-23.

The City's housing stock offers a range of housing opportunities consistent with the urban-rural nature of Ventura County. The downtown area contains a mix of older single-family neighborhoods, commercial and higher-density development. New residential development nestled in surrounding hillsides offer more rural settings. Strong growth in the Southern California economy during the first half of this decade fostered increased residential development in Specific Plan areas and other areas around the city's perimeter.

Although the strong economy spurred housing development, it also caused a rapid increase in housing prices. Housing prices still remain well in excess of 2000 levels, despite the downturn in the housing market since 2006. These increases place a burden upon lower-income individuals and families, seniors, the disabled, large families, and other persons with special housing needs. Though higher-priced homes ring the downtown area, the city's center contains much of the older housing stock, some of which shows signs of deterioration.

Moorpark faces several challenges over the 2014-2021 Housing Element planning period, including maintaining the diversity and affordability of the housing stock, rehabilitating older housing in the downtown area, fostering economic development, and balancing growth with the needs of existing residents. The City has set forth the following goals for addressing the housing needs facing the community (see Chapter V – Housing Plan):

- Adequate provision of decent, safe, and affordable housing for residents without regard to race, age, sex, marital status, ethnicity, or other arbitrary consideration.
- Adequate provision of housing opportunities by type, tenure, and location with particular attention to the provision of housing for special needs groups.
- Identification of suitable parcels for residential development, and appropriate recycling of land for future housing development.

- Development of a balanced community accessible to employment, transportation, shopping, medical services, and governmental services.

B. State Policy and Authorization

State law requires the preparation of a Housing Element as part of a jurisdiction's General Plan (*Government Code* §65302(c)). The Element is to consist of the identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs, and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. It is also required to identify adequate sites for housing and to make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community (§65583).

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 (§65588).

C. Public Participation

The City provided several opportunities for residents to participate in the Housing Element update and recommend strategies for addressing local needs. Prior to public hearings, the draft Housing Element was made available for review at City Hall, on the City's website, and at public libraries. To ensure a wide distribution, notices were sent to the School District, the Moorpark College Library, and the Post Office. Local non-profit and housing advocate groups were also notified of the availability of the Housing Element. Through these efforts all interested residents and stakeholders had ample opportunity to participate in the development of the Housing Element.

Appendix C contains additional details regarding the City's efforts to encourage participation by all economic segments of the community, as well as a summary of concerns and recommendations expressed during the public review process.

As required by state law, a draft Housing Element was submitted to the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for review. After receiving HCD's comments, a proposed final Housing Element was made available for public review prior to adoption by the City Council.

Annual reviews of the Element have been, and continue to be, accomplished in accordance with state law. Annual reports are placed on the City's website as a resource for the public and interested parties.

D. Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan

The Housing Element is one of the elements of the comprehensive General Plan. Moorpark's General Plan comprises the seven elements mandated by state law, and includes the Land Use Element, the Circulation Element, the Housing Element, the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, the Noise Element, and the Safety

Element. The Housing Element builds upon the other General Plan Elements and is entirely consistent with the policies set forth in those elements.

The City will ensure consistency between General Plan elements so that policies introduced in one element are consistent with those in other elements. At this time, the revised Element does not propose significant change to any other element of the City's adopted General Plan. However, if it becomes apparent over time that changes to another element are needed for internal consistency, such changes will be proposed for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

This page intentionally left blank.

II. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This chapter examines general population and household characteristics and trends, such as age, race and ethnicity, employment, household composition and size, household income, and special needs. Characteristics of the existing housing stock (e.g., number of units and type, tenure, age and condition, costs) are also addressed. Finally, the city's projected housing growth needs based on the 2014-2021 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) are examined.

Data Sources

The Housing Needs Assessment utilizes data from the U.S. Census, the California Department of Finance (DOF), the California Employment Development Department (EDD), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and other relevant sources. These data sources are the most reliable for assessing existing conditions and provide a basis for consistent comparison with historical data and the basis for forecasts.

A. Population Characteristics

1. Population Growth Trends


Compared to the rapid growth of the previous decade 1990-2000, Moorpark has continued to experience population growth although at a slower pace, increasing approximately 10.9% from 2000 to 2012 to an estimated population of 34,826 (see Table II-1 and Figure II-1). The City's 2012 population represents approximately 4.2% of the County's total population of 832,970.

**Table II-1
Population Trends 1990-2010**

	1990	2000	2012	Growth 1990-2000	Growth 2000-2012
Moorpark	25,494	31,415	34,826	23.2%	10.9%
Ventura County	669,016	753,197	832,970	12.6%	10.6%

Source: U.S. Census, California Dept. of Finance Table E-5 (2012)

**Figure II-1
Population Growth 1990-2012**



Sources: U.S. Census 2000, California Department of Finance Table E-1 (2012)

2. Age

Housing needs are influenced by population age characteristics. Different age groups require different accommodations based on lifestyle, family type, income level, and housing preference. Table II-2 provides a comparison of the city and county population by age group in 2010. This table shows that the City's population was slightly younger than the County's, with the "under 20 years" age cohort representing 31% of the City compared to 29% of the County. The median age of Moorpark residents is 1.5 years younger than that of all Ventura County residents (34.7 years vs. 36.2 years).

**Table II-2
Age Distribution**

Age Group	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Persons	%	Persons	%
Under 5 years	2,272	6.6%	55,336	6.7%
5 to 9 years	2,461	7.1%	56,970	6.9%
10 to 14 years	2,803	8.1%	60,390	7.3%
15 to 19 years	3,061	8.9%	64,407	7.8%
20 to 24 years	2,493	7.2%	56,183	6.8%
25 to 29 years	2,137	6.2%	54,253	6.6%
30 to 34 years	2,098	6.1%	51,207	6.2%
35 to 39 years	2,115	6.1%	53,448	6.5%
40 to 44 years	2,475	7.2%	57,635	7.0%
45 to 49 years	3,009	8.7%	62,731	7.6%
50 to 54 years	3,089	9.0%	60,973	7.4%
55 to 59 years	2,335	6.8%	51,164	6.2%
60 to 64 years	1,618	4.7%	42,312	5.1%
65 to 69 years	886	2.6%	29,834	3.6%
70 to 74 years	568	1.7%	21,562	2.6%
75 to 79 years	450	1.3%	17,443	2.1%
80 to 84 years	297	0.9%	13,427	1.6%
85+ years	254	0.7%	14,043	1.7%
Total	34,421	100%	823,318	100%
Median age	34.7		36.2	

Source: 2010 Census Table DP-1

3. Race and Ethnicity

The racial and ethnic composition of the City differs from the County in that a lower proportion of City residents are Hispanic/Latino or other racial/ethnic minorities. Approximately 75.1% of City residents are white, contrasted with 68.7% for the county as a whole. The percentage of Hispanics residing in the City, at 31.4%, is about 9% less than that of the County. Asians, at 6.8%, represent the largest non-Hispanic minority group (Table II-3).

**Table II-3
Race/Ethnicity**

Race/Ethnicity	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Population	% Total	Population	% Total
White	25,860	75.1%	565,804	68.7%
Black	533	1.5%	15,163	1.8%
American Indian	248	0.7%	8,068	1.0%
Asian	2,352	6.8%	55,446	6.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	50	0.1%	1,643	0.2%
Other race	3,727	10.8%	140,253	17.0%
2 or more races	1,651	4.8%	36,941	4.5%
Total	34,421	100.0%	823,318	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino (any race)	10,813	31.4%	331,567	40.3%

Source: 2010 Census, Table DP-1

B. Household Characteristics

1. Household Composition and Size

Household characteristics are important indicators of the type and size of housing needed in a city. The Census defines a "household" as all persons occupying a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood, or unrelated persons sharing a single unit. Persons in group quarters such as dormitories, retirement or convalescent homes, or other group living situations are included in population totals, but are not considered households.

Table II-4 provides a comparison of households by type for Moorpark and Ventura County as a whole, as reported in the 2010 Census. Family households comprised approximately 82% of all households in the City, as compared to 74% for the County. The City had more families with children at home, fewer singles living alone, and a somewhat larger average household size than Ventura County as a whole. These statistics suggest that there is a somewhat greater need for large units in Moorpark than for other areas of the County.

**Table II-4
Household Composition**

Household Type	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Households	%	Households	%
Family households:	8,586	81.9%	197,178	73.9%
Husband-wife family	6,966	66.4%	150,512	56.4%
With own children under 18 years	3,656	34.9%	71,149	26.7%
Male householder, no wife present	507	4.8%	15,134	5.7%
With own children under 18 years	248	2.4%	7,302	2.7%
Female householder, no husband present	1,113	10.6%	31,532	11.8%
With own children under 18 years	542	5.2%	15,632	5.9%
Nonfamily households:	1,898	18.1%	69,742	26.1%
Householder living alone	1,337	12.8%	53,037	19.9%
Households with individuals under 18 years	4,863	46.4%	106,457	39.9%
Households with individuals 65 years and over	1,839	17.5%	69,982	26.2%
Total households	10,484	100%	266,920	1
Average household size	3.28		3.04	

Source: 2010 Census, Table DP-1

2. Housing Tenure

Housing tenure (owner vs. renter) is an important indicator of the housing market. Communities need an adequate supply of units available for rent and for sale in order to accommodate a range of households with varying income, family size and composition, and lifestyle. Table II-5 provides a comparison of the number of owner-occupied and renter-occupied units in the City in 2010 as compared to the County as a whole. It reveals a very high level of homeownership in the City, approximately 14 percentage points higher than the county (76% City vs. 62% County).

**Table II-5
Household Tenure**

Housing Type	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Units	%	Units	%
Occupied housing units	10,484	98%	266,920	95%
Owner-occupied housing units	8,182	76%	174,168	62%
Average household size of owner-occupied units	3.26		3.02	
Renter-occupied housing units	2,302	21%	92,752	33%
Average household size of renter-occupied units	3.36		3.09	
Vacant housing units	254	2%	5	0%
For rent	68	1%	4,664	2%
Rented, not occupied	6	0.1%	324	0.1%
For sale only	85	1%	2,467	1%
Sold, not occupied	16	0.1%	595	0.2%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	15	0%	3,545	1%
All other vacants	64	1%	3,180	1%
Homeowner vacancy rate (%)	1		1.4	
Rental vacancy rate (%)	2.9		4.8	
Total housing units	10,738	100%	281,695	100%

Source: 2010 Census, Table DP-1

3. Overcrowding

Overcrowding is often closely related to household income and the cost of housing. The U.S. Census Bureau considers a household to be overcrowded when there is more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms and kitchens, with severe overcrowding when there are more than 1.5 occupants per room. Table II-6 summarizes overcrowding for the City of Moorpark.

**Table II-6
Overcrowding**

Occupants per Room	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Units	%	Units	%
Owner occupied units	8,509	100%	175,452	100%
1.01 to 1.50	184	2%	4,640	3%
1.51 to 2.00	70	1%	943	1%
2.01 or more	2	0%	235	0.1%
Renter occupied units	1,903	100%	88,853	100%
1.01 to 1.50	59	3%	7,351	8%
1.51 to 2.00	0	0%	2,288	3%
2.01 or more	41	2%	792	1%

Source: Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table B25014

According to recent Census data, overcrowding was more prevalent among renters than for owner-occupied units. Approximately 5% of the City's renter-occupied households were overcrowded compared to only 3% of owner-occupied households.

4. Household Income

Household income is a primary factor affecting housing needs in a community. According to recent Census data, the median household income in Moorpark was \$103,009, 34% higher than the County as a whole (Table II-7).

**Table II-7
Median Household Income**

Jurisdiction	Median Income	% of County Median Income
Moorpark	103,009	134%
Ventura County	76,728	100%

Source: U.S. Census, 2007-2011 ACS, Table DP-3

Extremely Low Income Households

State law requires quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of extremely low-income (ELI) households. Extremely low income is defined as households with incomes less than 30% of area median income. The 2013 area median income for Ventura County was \$89,300 (see Table II-16). For extremely-low-income households, this results in an income of \$26,800 or less for a four-person household. Households with extremely-low-income have a variety of housing needs.

Existing Needs

According to recent Census estimates, approximately 165 extremely-low-income households resided in Moorpark, representing about 2% of all households. All ELI households were reported to be paying more than 30% of their income toward housing costs (Table II-8).

**Table II-8
Overpayment by Income Category**

Income Category	Owners		Renters	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
Extremely low households	125		40	
Households overpaying	125	100%	40	100%
Very low households	815		335	
Households overpaying	575	70.6%	285	85.1%
Low households	660		345	
Households overpaying	520	78.8%	345	100%
Subtotal: All lower-income households	1,600		720	
Subtotal: Households overpaying	1,220	76.3%	670	93.1%
Moderate households	1,170		250	
Households overpaying	840	71.8%	150	60.0%
Above moderate households	5,060		475	
Households overpaying	1,680	33.2%	55	11.6%

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, CHAS, based on the 2006-2008 ACS. Table 15.

Projected Needs

The projected housing need for ELI households is assumed to be 50% of the very-low income regional housing need of 289 units. As a result, the City has a projected need for 145 ELI units during this planning period. The resources and programs to address this need are the same as for low-income housing in general and are discussed throughout the Housing Element, including the Chapter V, Housing Plan. Because the needs of ELI households overlap extensively with other special needs groups, further analysis and resources for these households can be found in Chapter II, Needs Assessment, Section E, Special Needs, and Chapter IV, Constraints, Section A.1.e. Special Needs Housing.

5. Overpayment

According to state housing policy, overpaying occurs when housing costs exceed 30% of gross household income. Table II-8 displays recent estimates for overpayment by income category. About 93% of all lower-income renter households and 76% of all lower-income owner households were overpaying for housing. Extremely-low-income households generally suffer the greatest cost burden.

Although homeowners enjoy income and property tax deductions and other benefits that help to compensate for high housing costs, lower-income homeowners may need to defer maintenance or repairs due to limited funds, which can lead to deterioration. For lower-income renters, severe cost burden can require families to double up resulting in overcrowding and related problems. Employment

Employment is an important factor affecting housing needs within a community. The jobs available in each employment sector and the wages for these jobs affect the type and size of housing residents can afford.

6. Current Employment

Current employment and projected job growth have a significant influence on housing needs during this planning period. Table II-9 shows that the City had a workforce of 18,907 persons, or 73.2% of the working-age population, according to recent Census data. This table shows that the City's population had a higher labor force participation rate than the County as a whole (73.2% City vs. 67.3% County) and had a lower unemployment rate (5.1% City and 7.2% County).

**Table II-9
Labor Force Status**

Labor Force Status	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
Population 16 years and over	25,829	100%	623,606	100%
In labor force	18,907	73.2%	419,563	67.3%
Civilian labor force	18,907	73.2%	415,148	66.6%
Employed	17,944	94.9%	385,262	92.8%
Unemployed	963	5.1%	29,886	7.2%
Armed Forces	0	0%	4,415	0.7%
Not in labor force	6,922	26.8%	204,043	32.7%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2006-2010 American Community Survey, Table DP-3.

According to recent Census data, approximately 42% of the City's working residents were employed in management and professional occupations (Table II-10). A low percentage of workers (18%) were employed in service-related occupations such as waiters and beauticians. Blue-collar occupations such as machine operators, assemblers, farming, transportation, handlers and laborers constituted about 16% of the workforce.

**Table II-10
Employment by Occupation**

Occupation	Moorpark	
	Persons	%
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	17,944	100%
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	7,593	42%
Service occupations	3,203	18%
Sales and office occupations	4,347	24%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	1,359	8%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	1,442	8%

Source: U.S. Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table DP3

7. Projected Job Growth

Future housing needs are affected by the number and type of new jobs created during this planning period. Table II-11 shows projected job growth by occupation for the Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura MSA along with median hourly wages for the period 2008-2018. Total employment in Ventura County is expected to grow by 7.7% between 2008 and 2018. The overall growth is expected to add 26,500 new jobs and bring the County's employment to about 371,000 by 2018.

Residents who are employed in well-paying occupations have less difficulty obtaining adequate housing than residents in lower-paying jobs. Table II-11 illustrates the growth trend in low-wage service jobs such as health care support, food preparation and serving, cleaning and maintenance, sales, and office/administrative support.

**Table II-11
Projected Job Growth by Occupation, 2008-2018 –
Oxnard/Thousand Oaks-Ventura Metropolitan Statistical Area**

NAICS Code	Industry Title	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change	
		2008	2018	Jobs	Percent
	Total Employment	344,900	371,400	26,500	7.7
	Self-Employment (A)	25,500	26,000	500	2.0
	Unpaid Family Workers (B)	800	900	100	12.5
	Private Household Workers (C)	2,200	2,600	400	18.2
	Total Farm	25,100	26,700	1,600	6.4
	Total Nonfarm	291,300	315,200	23,900	8.2
1133,21	Mining and Logging	1,200	1,300	100	8.3
23	Construction	16,700	18,000	1,300	7.8
31-33	Manufacturing	35,900	37,000	1,100	3.1
22,48-49	Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities	6,000	6,500	500	8.3
22	Utilities	1,000	1,200	200	20.0
48-49	Transportation and Warehousing	5,000	5,300	300	6.0
51	Information	5,600	5,700	100	1.8
52-53	Financial Activities	21,100	21,700	600	2.8
54-56	Professional and Business Services	38,300	41,900	3,600	9.4
61-62	Education Services, Health Care, and Social Assistance	31,800	37,200	5,400	17.0
71-72	Leisure and Hospitality	31,500	35,800	4,300	13.7
71	Arts, entertainment, and Recreation	5,100	5,800	700	13.7
72	Accommodation and Food Services	26,500	30,000	3,500	13.2
81	Other Services (excludes 814-Private Household Workers)	10,000	10,800	800	8.0
	Government	43,100	44,900	1,800	4.2
	Federal Government	7,300	7,400	100	1.4
	State and Local Government	35,800	37,500	1,700	4.7

Notes:

(A) Self-Employed persons work for profit or fees in their own business, profession, trade, or farm. Only the unincorporated self-employed are included in this category. The estimated and projected employment numbers include all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.

(B) Unpaid family workers are those persons who work without pay for 15 or more hours per week on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by birth or marriage.

(C) Private Household Workers are employed as domestic workers whose primary activities are to maintain the household.

Industry employment is based on the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program.

Source: California Employment Development Department, March 2009 Benchmark

8. Jobs-Housing Balance

A regional balance of jobs to housing helps to ensure that the demand for housing is reasonably related to supply. When the number of jobs significantly exceeds the housing supply, the rental and for-sale housing markets may become overheated, requiring households to pay a larger percentage of their income for housing. In addition, a tight housing market can result in overcrowding and longer commute times as workers seek more affordable housing in outlying areas. The current jobs-housing objective within the SCAG region is one new housing unit for every 1.5 jobs.¹

¹ SCAG 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan, Land Use & Housing Chapter

According to recent Census data, about 72% of employed Moorpark residents worked in Ventura County, and 24% were employed within the Moorpark City limits (Table II-12).

Table II-12
Job Location for Moorpark Residents

Workplace Location	%
Worked in state of residence	99.8%
Worked in county of residence	71.7%
Worked in place of residence	24.0%
Worked outside county of residence	28.1%
Worked outside state of residence	0.2%

Source: Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table S0801

C. Housing Stock Characteristics

This section presents an evaluation of the characteristics of the community's housing stock and helps in identifying and prioritizing needs. The factors evaluated include the number and type of housing units, recent growth trends, age and condition, tenure, vacancy, housing costs, affordability, and assisted affordable units at-risk of loss due to conversion to market-rate. A housing unit is defined as a house, an apartment, a Mobile Home, or a group of rooms, occupied as separate living quarters, or if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters.

1. Housing Type and Growth Trends

According to recent Census data, the housing stock in Moorpark was comprised mostly of single-family detached homes, which made up about 86% of all units, while multi-family units comprised about 13% of the total. Mobile Homes comprised approximately 1.3% of the City's housing stock. Table II-13 provides a breakdown of the housing stock by type along with growth trends for the City compared to the county as a whole for the period 2000-2012.

Table II-13
Housing by Type

Structure Type	2000		2012		Growth	
	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%
Moorpark						
Single-family	7,832	86%	9,275	86%	1,443	86%
Multi-family	932	10%	1,362	13%	430	26%
Mobile homes	330	3.6%	143	1.3%	-187	-11%
Total units	9,094	100%	10,780	100%	1,686	100%
Ventura County						
Single-family	187,856	75%	213,917	76%	26,061	83%
Multi-family	51,693	21%	57,677	20%	5,984	19%
Mobile homes	12,162	5%	11,329	4%	-833	-3%
Total units	251,711	100%	282,923	100%	31,212	100%

Source: Cal. Dept. of Finance, Tables E-5 & E-8

Between 2000 and 2012, single-family detached homes represented more than two-thirds of all units built in the City. While detached homes also comprised the majority of new construction in the County during this period, it is noteworthy that over one-quarter of all residential development in the City was comprised of multi-family units. Mobile homes experienced a decrease in both the City and the county during this period (-11% City vs. -3% countywide).

2. Housing Age and Conditions

Housing age is often an important indicator of housing condition. Housing units built prior to 1978 before stringent limits on the amount of lead in paint were imposed may have interior or exterior building components coated with lead-based paint. Housing units built before 1970 are the most likely to need rehabilitation and to have lead-based paint in deteriorated condition. Lead-based paint becomes hazardous to children under age six and to pregnant women when it peels off walls or is pulverized by windows and doors opening and closing.

Table II-14 shows the age distribution of the housing stock in Moorpark compared to Ventura County as a whole.

Table II-14
Age of Housing Stock by Tenure

Year Built	Moorpark		Ventura County	
	Units	%	Units	%
Built 2005 or later	313	3%	7,782	3%
Built 2000 to 2004	1,322	12%	21,000	8%
Built 1990 to 1999	1,714	16%	29,852	11%
Built 1980 to 1989	5,108	47%	46,776	17%
Built 1970 to 1979	1,391	13%	65,050	23%
Built 1960 to 1969	420	4%	60,323	22%
Built 1950 to 1959	359	3%	28,761	10%
Built 1940 to 1949	72	1%	9,179	3%
Built 1939 or earlier	159	1%	10,675	4%
Total units	10,858	100%	279,398	100%

Source: Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table DP-4

This table shows that only 9% of the housing units in Moorpark were constructed prior to 1970. These findings suggest that there may be a lesser need for maintenance and rehabilitation, including remediation of lead-based paint, for the City's housing stock than other areas of the County.

The City employs one full-time code compliance technician. Typical issues include property maintenance, illegally parked/inoperative vehicles, overgrown vegetation, and occupancy of non-habitable structures, such as garages and tool sheds. Code compliance activities cover the entire city, however the majority of cases are focused in the central area of Moorpark, where much of the City's older housing stock is located. The Code Compliance Technician also works in conjunction with the Building and Safety Division to enforce the City's building code to ensure that construction is safe and legal,

non-habitable spaces such as garages are not used for occupancy, and smoke detectors are operable.

Based on field experience, Code Compliance and Building Department staff estimate that approximately 8% of all housing units in the downtown area (an estimated total of 500 units) are in need of some type of rehabilitation (e.g., roofing, doors/windows, plumbing, electrical) but none are deteriorated to the point of requiring demolition and replacement. All other residential neighborhoods in the City are less than 30 years old and do not have significant needs for major rehabilitation.

3. Vacancy

Housing vacancy rates as reported by the Department of Finance for 2012 are shown in Table II-15. The table shows that vacancy rates in Moorpark were very low compared to most jurisdictions in Ventura County, with just 2.37% of units available for rent or sale. Rental vacancy rates in the 2% range indicate nearly full occupancy, and contribute to upward pressures on rents.

**Table II-15
Housing Vacancy**

Jurisdiction	Vacancy Rate
Camarillo	4.88%
Fillmore	5.71%
Moorpark	2.37%
Ojai	7.99%
Oxnard	5.64%
Port Hueneme	13.09%
San Buenaventura	5.58%
Santa Paula	4.59%
Simi Valley	2.99%
Thousand Oaks	3.50%
Unincorporated Area	8.76%
County Total	5.25%

Source: Cal. Department of Finance Table E-5, 2012

4. Housing Cost

a. Housing Affordability Criteria

State law establishes five income categories for purposes of housing programs based on the area (i.e., county) median income ("AMI"): extremely-low (30% or less of AMI), very-low (31-50% of AMI), low (51-80% of AMI), moderate (81-120% of AMI) and above moderate (over 120% of AMI). Housing affordability is based on the relationship between household income and housing expenses. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the California Department of Housing and Community Development², housing is considered "affordable" if the monthly payment is

² HCD memo of 4/18/07 (<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k7.pdf>)

no more than 30% of a household's gross income. In some areas (such as Ventura County), these income limits may be increased to adjust for high housing costs.

Table II-16 shows affordable rent levels and estimated affordable purchase prices for housing in Ventura County by income category. Based on state-adopted standards, the maximum affordable monthly rent for extremely-low-income households is \$670, while the maximum affordable rent for very-low-income households is \$1,116. The maximum affordable rent for low-income households is \$1,780, while the maximum for moderate-income households is \$2,679.

Maximum purchase prices are more difficult to determine due to variations in mortgage interest rates and qualifying procedures, down payments, special tax assessments, homeowner association fees, property insurance rates, etc. With this caveat, the maximum home purchase prices by income category shown in Table II-16 have been estimated based on typical conditions.

**Table II-16
Income Categories and Affordable Housing Costs – Ventura County**

2013 County Median Income = \$89,300	Income Limits	Affordable Rent	Affordable Price (est.)
Extremely Low (<30%)	\$26,800	\$670	--
Very Low (31-50%)	\$44,650	\$1,116	--
Low (51-80%)	\$71,200	\$1,780	\$250,000
Moderate (81-120%)	\$107,150	\$2,679	\$400,000
Above moderate (120%+)	\$107,150+	\$2,679+	\$400,000+

Assumptions:
 -Based on a family of 4
 -30% of gross income for rent or PITI
 -10% down payment, 4% interest, 1.25% taxes & insurance, \$200 HOA dues
 Source: Cal. HCD; J.H. Douglas & Associates

b. For-Sale Housing

Median housing sales price statistics for Ventura County during 2012 (Table II-17) show that the median price for single-family detached homes was \$475,000 while the median condo price was \$218,000. For the County as a whole, median prices were \$406,000 and \$242,000 for single-family and condos, respectively. .

**Table II-17
Ventura County Median Housing Sales Prices - 2012**

Jurisdiction	ZIP Code	Single Family Residences			Condominiums		
		SFR	Price	% Change	Condos	Price	% Change
Countywide		7,234	\$406	2.7%	2,469	\$242	3.1%
Camarillo	93010	417	\$420	1.2%	123	\$298	4.4%
Camarillo	93012	331	\$494	4.9%	276	\$268	-2.5%
Fillmore	93015	150	\$261	-3.4%	12	\$153	20.1%
Moorpark	93021	374	\$475	-3.4%	76	\$218	-3.1%
Newbury Park	91320	483	\$528	1.5%	119	\$320	20.6%
Oak Park	91377	156	\$635	1.8%	80	\$328	-7.6%
Oak View	93022	80	\$300	-1.8%	1	\$170	n/a
Ojai	93023	255	\$445	6.0%	17	\$280	3.7%
Oxnard	93030	332	\$313	-2.8%	79	\$240	1.3%
Oxnard	93033	389	\$246	2.3%	87	\$159	-5.6%
Oxnard	93035	336	\$406	-3.2%	210	\$320	-3.5%
Oxnard	93036	317	\$310	3.3%	110	\$202	-5.6%
Piru	93040	9	\$190	-15.6%	0	n/a	n/a
Port Hueneme	93041	103	\$250	-3.8%	209	\$169	-1.7%
Santa Paula	93060	152	\$269	7.7%	44	\$114	18.8%
Simi Valley	93063	549	\$380	1.3%	147	\$215	0.0%
Simi Valley	93065	844	\$390	2.6%	197	\$260	0.0%
Somis	93066	26	\$775	12.2%	0	n/a	n/a
Thousand Oaks	91360	455	\$461	-0.9%	88	\$235	6.8%
Thousand Oaks	91362	367	\$690	0.7%	256	\$330	6.1%
Ventura	93001	251	\$377	14.0%	68	\$209	-3.7%
Ventura	93003	376	\$403	3.2%	178	\$182	3.7%
Ventura	93004	257	\$379	-1.6%	30	\$258	-2.8%
Westlake Village	91361	168	\$885	9.3%	213	\$459	-2.0%

Based on the estimated affordable purchase prices shown in Table II-16, only a very small percentage of single-family homes were affordable to lower-income or moderate-income residents. However, the median condo price indicates that many low- and moderate-income households may be able to find affordable attached units for sale in Moorpark.

c. Rental Housing

An internet search³ of available rental units in large complexes in Moorpark found rents ranging from approximately \$1,400 for a 1-bedroom unit to \$2,300 per month for a 3-bedroom unit.

When market rents are compared to the amounts low-income households can afford to pay (Table II-16), it is clear that very-low- and extremely-low-income households have a difficult time finding housing without overpaying. The gap between market rent and affordable rent at the very-low-income level is about \$700 per month, while the gap at the extremely-low-income level is \$1,100 per month. However, at the low-income and moderate-income levels, households are much more likely to find affordable rentals.

³ <http://www.forrent.com/search-apartments-by-area/CA/Greater-Los-Angeles/Ventura-County/Moorpark.php>

D. Special Needs

Certain groups have greater difficulty in finding decent, affordable housing due to special circumstances. Such circumstances may be related to one's employment and income, family characteristics, disability, or other conditions. As a result, some Moorpark residents may experience a higher prevalence of overpayment, overcrowding, or other housing problems.

State Housing Element law defines "special needs" groups to include persons with disabilities, the elderly, large households, female-headed households with children, homeless people, and farm workers. This section contains a discussion of the housing needs facing each of these groups.

1. Persons with Disabilities

Recent ACS data estimated that approximately 2,609 people in Moorpark, or about 8% of the total population, had some type of disability (see Table II-18). As may be expected, those aged 65 and over had the highest rate of disabilities. Included within these disabilities are persons whose disability hinders their ability to live independently (1.4% of the working age population and 21% of the senior population).

Table II-18
Persons with Disabilities by Age

Disability by Age	Persons	Percent
Total civilian noninstitutionalized population	34,466	-
With any disability	2,609	7.6%
Under Age 5 - total persons	2,281	--
With a hearing difficulty	0	0.0%
With a vision difficulty	0	0.0%
Age 5 to 17 - total persons	7,165	
With a hearing difficulty	81	1.1%
With a vision difficulty	200	2.8%
With a cognitive difficulty	250	3.5%
With an ambulatory difficulty	11	0.2%
With a self-care difficulty	38	0.5%
Age 18 to 64 - total persons	22,281	
With a hearing difficulty	393	1.8%
With a vision difficulty	327	1.5%
With a cognitive difficulty	537	2.4%
With an ambulatory difficulty	445	2.0%
With a self-care difficulty	129	0.6%
With an independent living difficulty	302	1.4%
Age 65 and over* - total persons	2,739	
With a hearing difficulty	291	10.6%
With a vision difficulty	112	4.1%
With a cognitive difficulty	302	11.0%
With an ambulatory difficulty	691	25.2%
With a self-care difficulty	409	14.9%
With an independent living difficulty	574	21.0%

Source: U.S. Census, 2009-2011 ACS Table S1810

Note: Totals may exceed 100% due to multiple disabilities per person

Housing opportunities for persons with disabilities can be expanded through housing assistance programs and providing universal design features such as widened doorways, ramps, lowered countertops, single-level units and ground floor units. During the prior planning period the City amended the Municipal Code to establish procedures to ensure reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities pursuant to *California Government Code* § 65008 and § 65583 (SB 520).

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

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

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 22;
- 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;
- 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 Bureau 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 percent. Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person's living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) currently provides community-based services to approximately 243,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two community-based facilities. Moorpark is served by the Tri-Counties Regional Center⁴ (TCRC) which is based in Santa Barbara and operates a field office in Oxnard. As of 2011 the Center served approximately 11,300 clients and had 280 staff persons. TCRC reported that it assisted 238 Moorpark residents in 2013. Any resident who has a developmental disability that originated before age 18 is eligible for services.

⁴ www.tri-counties.org

Services are offered to people with developmental disabilities based on Individual Program Plans and may include: Adult day programs; advocacy; assessment/consultation; behavior management programs; diagnosis and evaluation; independent living services; infant development programs; information and referrals; mobility training; prenatal diagnosis; residential care; respite care; physical and occupational therapy; transportation; consumer, family vendor training; and vocational training. TCRC also coordinates the state-mandated Early Start program, which provides services for children under age three who have or are at substantial risk of having a developmental disability.

One of the challenges for persons with developmental disabilities is obtaining suitable affordable housing. Many children with developmental disabilities are cared for at home by family members, but as these children move into adulthood their parents or other caregivers may have increasing difficulty providing needed care at home. Suitable supportive housing is in short supply. To address this issue, Program 15 includes a commitment to encourage and facilitate the production of supportive housing for persons with developmental disabilities.

2. Elderly

According to recent Census data, there were 1,240 households in Moorpark where the householder was 65 or older (Table II-19). Approximately 12% of both owner and renter householders were in the 65+ age groups. Many elderly persons are dependent on fixed incomes or are disabled. Elderly householders may be physically unable to maintain their homes or cope with living alone. The housing needs of this group can be addressed through smaller units, second units on lots with existing homes, shared living arrangements, congregate housing and housing assistance programs.

Table II-19
Elderly Households by Tenure

Householder Age	Owner		Renter	
	Households	%	Households	%
Under 65 years	7,492	88%	1,680	88%
65 to 74 years	581	7%	115	6%
75 to 84 years	377	4%	72	4%
85 years and over	59	1%	36	2%
Total households	8,509	100%	1,903	100%

Source: U.S. Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table B25007

3. Large Households

Household size is an indicator of need for large units. Large households are defined as those with five or more members. Large households are considered a special needs group because they require more space and larger bedroom counts. According to recent Census data (Table II-20) there were 934 households in Moorpark with a least five persons, representing approximately 7% of the total households in the City. About 8% of owner-occupied households but only 3% of renter-occupied households had 5+ members. This distribution indicates that, while a portion of the City's households need

large units with four or more bedrooms, this demand is expected to be less than for smaller units.

**Table II-20
Household Size by Tenure**

Householder Age	Owner		Renter	
	Households	%	Households	%
1 person	1,909	20%	1,869	45%
2 persons	3,123	33%	1,357	32%
3 persons	1,400	15%	495	12%
4 persons	2,329	24%	316	8%
5 persons	634	7%	101	2%
6 persons	135	1%	38	1%
7 persons or more	26	0%	0	0%
Total Households	9,556	100%	4,176	100%

Source: U.S. Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table B25009

4. Female-Headed Households

Female-headed households are a special needs group due to comparatively low rates of homeownership, lower incomes and higher poverty rates experienced by this group. According to recent Census estimates (Table II-21) there were approximately 848 female-headed households in Moorpark. Of the total female-headed households in the City, 44% were renter-occupied and 56% were owner-occupied. About 6% of owner households and 19% of renter households had female householders.

**Table II-21
Household Type by Tenure**

Household Type	Owner		Renter	
	Households	%	Households	%
Married couple family	6,165	72%	861	45%
Male householder, no wife present	395	5%	59	3%
Female householder, no husband present	477	6%	371	19%
Non-family households	1,472	17%	612	32%
Total Households	8,509	100%	1,903	100%


Source: U.S. Census 2006-2010 ACS, Table B11012

5. Farm Workers

Unlike most areas of the Southern California metropolitan area, agriculture is still a significant component of the economy in Ventura County, with a total value of over \$1.8 billion in 2011⁵. There is strong public sentiment for retaining agricultural production, as reflected in the SOAR (Save Open-space and Agricultural Resources) initiatives that have been approved by voters. Figure II-2 illustrates the wide variety of crops produced in the county.

⁵ Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner, 2011 Crop Report

**Figure II-2
Agricultural Production Areas – Ventura County**



According to the Ventura County Workforce Investment Board, over the past two decades the number of farm workers continued to increase – there were 5,000 more agricultural jobs in Ventura County in 2003 than there were in 1983. This represents more than 30% growth in an industry that is stagnant in the value of its output. As a result, while agriculture has become a less significant component of the county’s economy, its relative importance as a source of jobs has slipped only a little.

In spite of the increase in agriculture sector jobs, wages have shown no tendency to increase. Quite the opposite has occurred, in fact. The real, inflation-adjusted agricultural worker’s average salary has fallen in 2000 dollars from \$20,503 in 1983 to only \$19,729 in 2003. This is counter to the national trend where real agricultural wages grew by 15% between 1993 and 2002.

Official employment data suggests there are over 20,000 agricultural workers in Ventura County. Agricultural Commissioner Earl McPhail estimates that 17,000 to 24,000 immigrant workers come to the county each year at peak growing seasons. Other estimates of the Ventura County farm population come from the Migrant Health Program, housed in the federal Bureau of Primary Health Care, Health Resources and Services Administration⁶. In their most recent study (2000), MHP researchers estimated the number of farm workers in several categories: total number of farm workers, the number of seasonal farm workers,

⁶ Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Enumeration Profiles Study: California," Alice C. Larsen, Ph.D., Migrant Health Program, Bureau of Primary Health Care, Health Resources and Services Administration. September 2000.

and the number of migrant farm workers (those who establish temporary residences in connection with their work), as well as the total number of people living in farm worker households (Table II-22).

Table II-22
Ventura County Farm Workers – 2000

	Farm Workers	Migrant Farm Workers	Seasonal Workers	Farmer Workers + Other Household Members
Totals	35,181	16,289	18,892	62,605

Source: Bureau of Primary Health Care, Health Resources and Services Administration, 2000

As part of its technical assistance to member jurisdictions for the 2013 Housing Element Cycle, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) compiled a variety of demographic and employment statistics⁷ that included information related to farm workers. According to SCAG's sources, about 14,500 persons in Ventura County are employed in agricultural occupations. Of these, 183 reported Moorpark as their place of residence (1.3% of the County total), and 250 worked in Moorpark (1.7% of the County total) (Table II-23). A variety of factors could explain the difference between Census data and the Bureau of Primary Health Care estimates, including the difference between job location and residence location, the undocumented status of some workers, or their living arrangements.

Table II-23
Agricultural Employment – Moorpark vs. Ventura County

Farm Workers	Workers	% of County Total
Total farm workers in Ventura County ¹	14,487	100%
Farm workers who live in Moorpark ¹	183	1.3%
Farm workers who work in Moorpark ²	250	1.7%

Sources:

1. SCAG based on 2005-2009 ACS

2. SCAG based on 2006-2008 Census Transportation Planning Package

Since the majority of farm laborers in Ventura County are permanent non-migrant and seasonal laborers, the housing needs of farmworkers are primarily addressed through the provision of permanent affordable housing, such as apartments, lower-cost single-family homes, and mobile homes. In compliance with the Employee Housing Act (*Health and Safety Code* §17021.5 and §17021.6), the City amended the Municipal Code to allow farmworker housing for up to 12 units or 36 persons by-right (i.e., without a CUP or other discretionary approval) in zones allowing agricultural uses. The City has also approved non-profit affordable housing developments that respond to the needs of permanent and seasonal farmworkers.

⁷ <http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Pages/Housing-Elements-2012.aspx>

6. Student Population

The City is home to Moorpark Community College with an enrollment of approximately 15,000 students. Moorpark is also located near several regional colleges, including California State University Channel Islands (Camarillo), and California Lutheran University (Thousand Oaks).

Students have special housing needs due to limited income and financial resources. Many students attending part-time in community colleges work full-time jobs, while full time students often work less. In either case, students often earn low income, pay more than half their income for housing, and thus may double up to save income. According to recent Census estimates⁸, 2,767 Moorpark residents were enrolled in college.

The type of housing need depends on the nature of the enrollment. Currently, about 67% of the students are part-time⁹, and many work full-time or part-time within their respective communities. As is the case with most community colleges, no housing is provided by the college. Because the vast majority of students commute from other communities where they work or live, the need for housing is not considered significant. Moorpark College does, however, assist students in finding appropriate housing in the community.

7. Homeless Persons

Homelessness is a continuing national problem that persists within local cities and communities including Ventura County. During the past two decades, an increasing number of single persons have remained homeless year after year and have become the most visible of all homeless persons. Other persons (particularly families) have experienced shorter periods of homelessness. However, they are often replaced by other families and individuals in a seemingly endless cycle of homelessness.

The homeless count conducted by the Ventura County Homeless and Housing Coalition (VCHHC) in January 2012 reported 5 homeless persons in Moorpark, which represents about 0.3% of the county total (Table II-24). The most recent survey by VCHHC identified a number of sub-populations of the homeless, as shown in Table II-25. These include families that might be displaced through evictions, women and children displaced through abusive family life, persons with substance abuse problems, or persons suffering from mental illness.

⁸ 2007-2011 ACS Table DP-2

⁹ http://www.moorparkcollege.edu/college_information/about/index.shtml

Table II-24
Ventura County Homeless Count: 2012

Jurisdiction	Number	% of Total
Camarillo	30	1.6%
Fillmore	16	0.8%
Moorpark	5	0.3%
Ojai	41	2.1%
Oxnard	522	27.0%
Port Hueneme	12	0.6%
Santa Paula	60	3.1%
Simi Valley	284	14.7%
Thousand Oaks	90	4.6%
Ventura	701	36.2%
Unincorporated County	175	9.0%
Total	1,936	100%

Source: County of Ventura 2012 Homeless Count
http://www.vchhc.org/images/PDFs/2012_Ventura_HomelessCount_Report.pdf

Table II-25
Ventura County Homeless Sub-Populations: 2012

Sub-Population	% of Total
Chronic Homeless Persons	56%
Men	75%
Persons with a Developmental Disability	20%
Persons with a Physical Disability	42%
Persons with HIV/AIDS	4%
Persons with Mental Illness	28%
Substance Abusers	26%
Veterans	13%
Victims of Domestic Violence	22%
Women	25%
Youth Ages 18 - 24	7%

Source: 2012 Ventura County Homeless Survey
http://www.vchhc.org/images/PDFs/2012_VenturaSurvey.pdf

Although there are myriad causes of homelessness, according to Ventura County information from 2007, among the most common causes are the following:

- Substance Abuse and Alcohol

The incidence of alcohol and other drug abuse within the homeless population is estimated to be three times higher than the general population (30% vs. 10%). This estimate is closely aligned with national survey statistics. The Ventura County Housing and Homeless Coalition identifies a need in Ventura County for treatment facilities with housing and clinical staff. They also recommend that a treatment facility be established within the county for youth with drug and alcohol addiction.

The State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs licenses residential facilities and/or certified alcohol and drug programs in Ventura County. There are eleven residential facilities and two residential detoxification

facilities in the county. None are located in Moorpark. Facilities available for substance abusers (including homeless substance abusers) are coordinated through the County's Alcohol and Drug Program.

- Domestic Violence

The Ventura County Housing and Homeless Coalition has identified a need for additional shelters for battered women and runaway youth. These individuals also require counseling and assistance to become self-sufficient or return to their families. Victims of household violence can become homeless as a result of escaping abusive living environments. They also suffer physical and psychological trauma as a result of the abuse. Many of these persons (almost exclusively women) are ill-equipped to fend for themselves and their children. Without access to affordable housing, reliable transportation and supportive counseling, they are at a greater disadvantage and create special homeless needs. Common issues faced by battered women are lack of jobs, lack of child care, lack of suitable housing, under-employment, codependent substance abuse, and a need for marketable skills.

- Mental Illness

According to the Turning Point Foundation, persons who are homeless and mentally ill have special needs and are not being served well in traditional homeless shelters. Many are at risk in the community, frequently being victimized and often suffering from physical and mental illnesses due to lack of proper nourishment and shelter. Many of the homeless mentally ill do not avail themselves of services or cannot be served by traditional services due to their untreated psychiatric symptoms, active substance abuse, or histories of abusive behavior.

The incidence of homelessness for the chronically mentally ill is expected to increase in Ventura County due to a shortage of affordable housing and the closing of single occupancy hotels and residential care facilities. National surveys indicate the mentally ill comprise approximately 20% of the homeless population (plus a portion of the 21% of the homeless who are both mentally ill and are suffering from drug and/or alcohol abuse). Local service providers estimate that 33% of the homeless are also mentally ill. Moorpark, as part of the Ventura County service area, receives assistance with the homeless mentally ill from the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department.

Needs of the Homeless Population

While there are no emergency homeless shelters in Moorpark, several homeless shelters and service providers operate in adjacent communities. These include the Conejo Winter Shelter in Thousand Oaks, which is operated by Lutheran Social Services, the winter shelter run by PADS in Simi Valley, and the Samaritan Center in Simi Valley, which operates a drop-in center and supportive services.

As a member of the Ventura County Council of Government's Standing Committee on Homelessness, the City is engaged in addressing homelessness and the needs of the homeless throughout the region. Locally, the City funds Catholic Charities, which

provides eviction prevention services that help very-low-income individuals and families that are at risk of becoming homeless. In addition, the agency provides a variety of services such as food, clothing and referrals to those persons who are homeless. Local service providers also provide eviction prevention services and landlord/tenant counseling to lower-income Moorpark residents.

E. Assisted Housing at Risk of Conversion

This section identifies residential projects in the city that are under an affordability restriction, and identifies those that are at risk of losing their low-income affordability restrictions within the ten-year period 2013-2023. This information is used in establishing quantified objectives for units that can be conserved during this planning period. The inventory of assisted units includes units that have been assisted under any federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), state, local and/or other program.

Table II-26 provides a list of developments within the City of Moorpark that currently participate in a federal, state or local program that provided some form of assistance, either through financial subsidy or a control measure. As seen in the table, none of the units have covenants due to expire prior to 2023. Data compiled by SCAG and the California Housing Partnership confirm that there are no at-risk units in Moorpark.

Table II-26
Assisted Housing Developments

Project	Assisted Units	Program	Covenants Expire
Tafoya Terrace	30	Public housing complex operated by the Ventura County Area Housing Authority, provides affordable rental housing for lower-income seniors.	Permanent
Waterstone	62	6 extremely-low income, 23 very-low income, 21 low-income, and 12 moderate-income rental apartment units within a 312-unit apartment complex as part of Development Agreement with City.	Permanent
Villa Del Arroyo	48	48 spaces within Mobile Home park are reserved for lower-income households. Villa Del Arroyo Mobile Home Estates was purchased through issuance of Mortgage Revenue Bonds, which require 20% of the units to be affordable.	2030
Villa Campesina	62	31 very-low income and 31 low-income for-sale detached units in 62-home "sweat-equity" development. 12 homes still carrying 2nd Mortgages that restrict income of owners.	n/a
Vintage Crest	190	190-unit senior apartment project with 48 units reserved for very-low income senior households, and 142 units reserved for low-income senior households built with an affordable housing bond program	Permanent
Mountain View	15	4 very-low and 11 low income for-sale detached units in a 59-unit housing development.	2033
Moonsong	6	2 very-low and 4 low-income for-sale detached units in a 25-unit housing development.	Permanent
TR Partners	1	1 low-income for-sale detached unit in 8-home development.	Permanent
Canterbury Lane	7	7 low-income attached single-family units	Permanent
Waverly Place	25	25 low-income attached condominium units in 102-unit attached condominium development.	Permanent

F. Future Growth Needs

1. Overview of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is a key tool for local governments to plan for anticipated growth. The RHNA quantifies the anticipated need for housing within each jurisdiction for the period from January 2014 to October 2021. Communities then determine how they will address this need through the process of updating the Housing Elements of their General Plans.

The current RHNA was adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in October 2012. The future need for housing is determined primarily by the forecasted growth in households in a community. Each new household, created by a child moving out of a parent's home, by a family moving to a community for employment, and so forth, creates the need for a housing unit. The housing need for new households is then adjusted to maintain a desirable level of vacancy to promote housing choice and mobility. An adjustment is also made to account for units expected to be lost due to demolition, natural disaster, or conversion to non-housing uses. The sum of these factors – household growth, vacancy need, and replacement need – determines the construction need for a community. Total housing need is then distributed among four income categories¹⁰ on the basis of the County's income distribution, with adjustments to avoid an over-concentration of lower-income households in any community.

2. 2014-2021 Moorpark Growth Needs

The total housing growth need for the City of Moorpark during the 2014-2021 planning period is 1,164 units. This total is distributed by income category as shown in Table II-27.

Table II-27
Regional Housing Growth Needs – Moorpark

Extremely Low*	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
145	144	197	216	462	1,164
12.4%	12.4%	16.9%	18.6%	39.7%	100%

Source: SCAG 2012

*Assumed to be 50% of the VL RHNA need per AB 2634

A discussion of the City's capacity to accommodate this growth need is provided in the land inventory section of Chapter III.

¹⁰ The RHNA does not identify extremely-low-income needs separately. In accordance with *Government Code* §65583.a.1, the extremely-low-income need is assumed to be 50% of the very-low category.

III. RESOURCES AND OPPORTUNITIES

A. Land Resources

Section 65583(a)(3) of the *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." A detailed analysis of approved projects, pending applications, vacant land and potential redevelopment opportunities is provided in Appendix B. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table III-1. The table shows that the city's land inventory, including approved projects, pending applications and the potential development of vacant and underutilized parcels, exceeds the RHNA allocation for all income categories

**Table III-1
Land Inventory Summary**

Site Category	Income Category			Total
	Lower	Mod	Above	
Approved projects (Table B-1)	112	196	776	1,084
Pending projects (Table B-1)	312	48	834	1,194
Potential second units	8			8
Vacant land – residential (Table B-3)	521		52	573
Subtotal	945	244	1,662	2,851
RHNA (2014-2021)	486	216	462	1,164
Adequate capacity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: City of Moorpark Community Development Dept., 2013

A discussion of public facilities and infrastructure needed to serve future development is contained in Section IV.B, Non-Governmental Constraints. There are currently no known 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.

B. Financial and Administrative Resources

1. State and Federal Resources

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Federal funding for housing programs is available through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Since the City is not an entitlement jurisdiction, Moorpark receives its CDBG allocation through the County of Ventura rather than directly from HUD. The CDBG program is very flexible in that the funds can be used for a wide range of activities. Eligible activities include, but are not limited to, acquisition and/or disposition of real estate or property, public facilities and improvements, relocation, rehabilitation and construction (under certain limitations) of housing, homeownership assistance, and clearance activities. The County is the final decision-making body regarding annual CDBG applications and

the City plays an advisory role in recommending which applications to fund. In past CDBG cycles, Moorpark received approximately \$192,000 annually in CDBG funds, 15% of which was allocated to public service projects and the remainder allocated toward public improvement projects. Under the CDBG agreement, the County ensures that an amount within 5% of the City's annual allocation is used for any applications received relevant to Moorpark. In the past, the City's public service allocation has typically been used to fund social service organizations located within the City. The public improvement allocation has been used to fund architectural services for the Ruben Castro Human Services Center, a 25,000-sq.ft. "under one roof" concept that will house various social service agencies at one location.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program was created by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to provide an alternate method of funding low- and moderate-income housing. Each state receives a tax credit allocation, based upon population, toward funding housing that meets program guidelines. The tax credits are then used to leverage private capital for new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Limitations on projects funded under the Tax Credit programs include minimum requirements that a certain percentage of units remain rent-restricted, based upon median income. One tax credit project has been built in Moorpark to date-- the Area Housing Authority's Charles Street Terrace, which was completed in 2012.

Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCC)

This program provides a federal tax credit for income-qualified homebuyers equivalent to 15% of the annual mortgage interest. Generally, the tax savings are calculated as income to help buyers qualify to purchase a home. Using an MCC, first-time buyers can save \$700 to \$2,500 a year on their annual federal income tax bill. The City has participated in the program since 1997. There have been no MCC's issued during this planning period. This is presumably due to the fact that in order to purchase a home in Moorpark, a prospective purchaser's income has to be higher than the income limits allowed by the MCC program. The current goal is to assist 3 households over a 3-year period.¹¹ There may be MCC's issued during the current planning period due to the downturn in the housing market.

Section 8 Rental Assistance

The City maintains membership in the Area Housing Authority of the County of Ventura, which administers the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program. The Housing Assistance Payments Program assists elderly and disabled households by paying the difference between 30% of an eligible household's income and the actual cost of renting a unit. The Housing Authority also operates Tafoya Terrace, a 30-unit affordable senior apartment project in Moorpark and Charles Street Terrace, a 20-unit affordable large family apartment project adjacent to Tafoya Terrace.

¹¹ Ventura County 2005 Consolidated Plan, page 97

While these two apartment developments are available to tenants who receive Section 8 certificates, they are not restricted to only Section 8 tenants.

2. Local Resources

Moorpark Redevelopment Agency

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Moorpark (Redevelopment Agency) has been dissolved by AB x1 26. The City of Moorpark (City) has elected to become the Successor Agency of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Moorpark (Successor Agency) and is tasked with winding down the activities of the former Redevelopment Agency. The City has also elected to assume the housing activities of the former Redevelopment Agency. The Successor Agency has successfully transferred the housing assets to the City with approval from the Oversight Board to the Successor Agency and the Department of Finance (DOF). The City plans to develop the vacant parcels during this planning cycle and use the land proceeds to continue its affordable housing land banking program. The Successor Agency has completed the Long Range Property Management Plan and has submitted it to the DOF for approval.

In-Lieu Fees and the Housing Trust Fund

Since 1997, the City has collected or has agreements in place for the collection of in-lieu fees from developers for the purposes of providing affordable housing pursuant to defined development agreements. The In-Lieu Fees are project-specific and vary based on the terms of the Development Agreement. Annual increases in the fees are tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The revenue collected from developers is placed in the Housing Trust Fund, which is used for the provision and/or maintenance of affordable housing in Moorpark. At the current rates for all approved Development Agreements, the City can expect a total of about \$1.9 million of in-lieu fees, contingent upon buildout of market rate units. The trust fund is currently at about \$3.6 million.

3. Local Non-Profit Agencies

First 5 Moorpark/Simi Valley Neighborhood For Learning (Moorpark Family Resource Center)

The center provides services to families with children aged 0-5. Services provided include family education training on parenting issues; Information, guidance & referrals for children with special needs; Resources for childcare and childcare providers; Medical/dental/vision/nutrition screenings and workshops; Health Services including: Healthy Families/MediCal application assistance; Enrichment for children: Family & Me Art & Music, story times; information & referrals to outside agencies; Book/video lending library; and Adult ESL & literacy classes

Catholic Charities and Moorpark Community Service Center

Catholic Charities is a non-profit organization that provides various social services such as eviction prevention assistance, utility payments, and emergency rental payments. They also run the Moorpark Food Pantry, which collects various donations of perishable and non-perishable food items, clothes, and personal hygiene items to be distributed to the neediest families in the community.

Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation (CEDC)

The Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation (CEDC) is an active affordable housing developer in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties. CEDC also has construction, property management, homeownership, counseling, and community building divisions. CEDC was involved in developing two projects in Moorpark: the 62-unit Villa Campesina project and the 59-unit Mountain View project.

Mercy Charities Housing California (MCHC)

Mercy Charities is a statewide non-profit housing development corporation whose mission is to support and strengthen communities through the provision of quality, affordable, services-enriched housing for lower income individuals and families. MCHC has been active in nearby Oxnard, and has completed construction of three affordable housing projects. There are currently no active projects in Moorpark.

Habitat for Humanity of Ventura County

Habitat for Humanity is a non-profit, Christian organization dedicated to building affordable housing and rehabilitating damaged homes for lower income families. Habitat builds and repairs homes for families with the help of volunteers and homeowner/partner families. Habitat homes are sold to partner families at no profit with affordable, no-interest loans. Volunteers, churches, businesses, and other groups provide most of the labor for the homes. Land for new homes is usually donated by government agencies or individuals. There are currently no active projects in Moorpark.

Many Mansions, Inc.

Many Mansions is a non-profit housing and community development organization founded in 1979 to promote and provide safe, well-managed housing to limited income residents of the Conejo Valley and surrounding communities in Ventura County. Many Mansions develops, owns, and self-manages special needs and permanent affordable housing. The organization also provides resident services, housing counseling, a food bank and homeownership counseling. There are currently no active projects in Moorpark.

Peoples' Self-Help Housing Corporation (PSHHC)

PSHHC is a housing and community development corporation serving San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties. PSHHC provides design, implementation, technical assistance, and property management of low-income

homeownership and rental housing. PSHHC is known to have produced attractive single-family homes at affordable prices in Santa Barbara. PSHHC partnered with Cabrillo and developed the Villa Campesina project consisting of 62 homes in Moorpark.

C. Energy Conservation Opportunities

State law requires all new construction to comply with "energy budget" standards that establish maximum allowable energy use from depletable sources (Title 24 of the *California Administrative Code*). These requirements apply to such design components as structural insulation, air infiltration and leakage control, setback features on thermostats, water heating system insulation (tanks and pipes) and swimming pool covers if a pool is equipped with a fossil fuel or electric heater. State law also requires that a tentative tract map provide for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision, including designing the lot sizes and configurations to permit orienting structures to take advantage of a southern exposure, shade or prevailing breezes.

The 2013 California Green Building Standards Code became effective January 1, 2014, and the City will adopt updates as they become available.

Consistent with Assembly Bill 1881, in January of 2010, the City adopted by reference, the model water efficient landscape ordinance of the State of California, as contained in the *California Code of Regulations* Title 23. Waters, Division 2. Department of Water Resources, Chapter 2.7. Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, Sections 490 through 494, as the water efficient landscape ordinance of the city of Moorpark. The Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, (WELO) has been updated to establish a structure for designing, installing, maintaining and managing water efficient landscapes in new and rehabilitated projects. The ordinance reduces water use to the lowest practical amount and sets an upper limit that shall not be exceeded. It also establishes provisions for water management practices and water waste prevention for established landscapes. The ordinance intends to promote the values and benefits of landscapes while recognizing the need to use water and other resources efficiently.

In 2004, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2004-2169 establishing Design Standards for Solar Energy Systems to ensure that solar energy systems are integrated into the buildings they serve without detracting from the visual character. This Resolution allows issuance of ministerial permits, by-right for the installation of solar panels on residential structures.

Southern California Edison (SCE) and the Southern California Gas Company offer energy conservation programs to residents of Moorpark, including audits of home energy use to reduce electricity consumption, refrigerator rebates, appliance repair and weatherization assistance to qualified low-income households, buyer's guides for appliances and incentives (by the Gas Company) to switch from electric to gas appliances. Direct assistance to low-income households is provided by the Gas Company through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program and by SCE through its Energy Management Assistance Program.

Both companies have programs to encourage energy conservation in new construction. SCE's energy rebate program applies to residential developers as well as individual customers. SCE also offers an Energy STAR new home program, and Sustainable Communities Program offering design assistance and financial incentives for sustainable housing development projects. The Gas Company's Energy Advanced Home Program is offered to residential developers who install energy-efficient gas appliances that exceed California energy standards by at least 15%.

IV. CONSTRAINTS

A. Governmental Constraints

1. Land Use Plans and Regulations

a. General Plan

Each city and county in California must prepare a comprehensive, long-term General Plan to guide its future. The land use element of the General Plan establishes the basic land uses and density of development within the various areas of the city. Under state law, the General Plan elements must be internally consistent and the City's zoning must be consistent with the General Plan. Thus, the land use plan must provide suitable locations and densities to implement the policies of the Housing Element.

**Table IV-1
Residential land Use Categories**

General Plan Land Use Category	Zoning Designation	Purposes of Zone and Permitted Residential Type(s)
Open Space and Agricultural	Open Space (O-S)	Single-family detached home within a large open space area
	Agricultural Exclusive (A-E)	Single-family detached home within a large agricultural area
Rural Residential	Rural-Agricultural (R-A)	Single-family detached home on larger lots designed to maintain a rural setting
	Rural Exclusive (R-E)	Single-family homes on smaller lots designed to maintain a rural setting
	Single-Family Estate (R-O)	Single-family homes or cluster developments in a rural setting
Urban Residential	Single-Family Res. (R-1)	Attached/detached single-family homes in a subdivision setting
	Two-Family Res. (R-2)	Single family detached units, two units, or one duplex per lot
	Residential Planned Development (RPD)	Attached and detached single-family and multi-family units
	Residential Planned Development- 20 units/acre (RPD-20)	Attached single- and multi-family units, 20 units/acre minimum

Sources: Land Use Element, 1992; Moorpark Zoning Code, 2013

The Land Use Element of Moorpark's General Plan sets forth policies for guiding local development. These policies, together with zoning regulations, establish the location and type of residential development that may occur. A comprehensive update to the Land Use Element was adopted in 1992, and several significant amendments have been adopted since that time. These include conversion of about 2,071 acres of rural residential designated land to higher residential densities and open space; including the Country Club Estates, Meridian Hills, Pacific Communities, Birdsall and Essex residential developments. There have been adoptions or substantial amendments of three Specific Plans (Carlsberg, Downtown and Moorpark Highlands) and the approval of a voter-initiated City Urban Restriction Boundary (CURB).

Table IV-1 details the major General Plan and zoning land use categories and types of homes permitted. The Zoning Code allows for a range of residential uses in different settings. The Code was amended in 2013 to establish a new RPD-20 zoning district allowing attached housing by-right at a minimum density of 20 units/acre.

**Table IV-2
Residential Development Standards**

Development Standard Zone	General Plan Land Use Category							
	Agricultural		Rural Residential			Urban Residential		
	O-S	AE	R-A	R-O	R-E	R-1	R-2	R-P-D*, SP, TPD
Building Standards								
Density Maximum dwelling units per gross acre	1 du/10 acres	1 du/40 acres	1.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	15.0	No maximum ⁽¹⁾
Min. Unit Size	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Max. Height	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'	35'
Lot Standards								
Net lot area (in square feet unless noted)	10 acres	40 acres	1 acre	20,000	10,000	6,225	6,500	By permit
Lot Coverage maximum (%)	20	10	35	35	35	50	50	By permit
Lot Width (in feet)	110	110	100	80	80	60	60	By permit
Lot Depth (in feet)	150	150	100	100	100	100	100	By permit
Building Setbacks								
Front yard setback	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'	20'
Side yard setback (interior)	10'	10'	5'	5'	5'	5'	5'	10'
Rear yard setback	15'	15'	15'	15'	15'	15'	15'	0
Park Standard								
Local Standard	5 acres/per 1,000 people or 120% of appraised value of usable parkland							
Parking Standards								
Single Family	2 spaces in a garage for units ≤2,800 sf and 3 spaces in a garage for units >2,800 sf							
Multi-Family Units	1 space per unit covered in a garage or carport for each studio unit; and 1.75 spaces per unit with 1 covered in a garage for each unit with 1 bedroom 2 spaces per unit with 1 covered in a garage or carport for each unit with 2 or more bedrooms, plus ½ space per unit for visitors							
Mobile Homes	2 tandem spaces covered in a garage or carport per unit + ¼ space/unit for visitors							
Second Units	1 space per 1-bedroom unit and 2 spaces per 2-bedroom unit							
Senior housing (age 55+)	0.5 spaces per unit with 0.25 spaces in a garage or carport							

Source: City of Moorpark Zoning Code (current through October 2013)

* RPD permit required for any development that creates five or more separate residential lots in the R-A, R-E, R-O, R-1, and R-2 zones.

1. Density Bonuses can be approved up to 100% with a City Council Approved Density Bonus and Development Agreement

n/a: Residential development standard not specified in the Zoning Code

Note: Residential development is also permitted within the Planned Community (P-C) zone on minimum 100-acre site. As with R-P-D, SP and TPD zones, development standards are "by permit."

b. Zoning

The type, location, density, and scale of residential development is regulated primarily through the Zoning Code. Zoning regulations are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents, as well as implement the policies of the General Plan. The Zoning Code also serves to preserve the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods. Table IV-2 summarizes pertinent development standards for the non-Specific Plan areas of Moorpark. These standards allow maximum densities to be achieved and do not add significantly to development costs.

c. Specific Plan Areas

Moorpark has four Specific Plans areas: Carlsberg, Hitch Ranch, Moorpark Highlands, and the Downtown Specific Plan. These Specific Plans have been designated to compre-

hensively address a variety of unique land uses (e.g. topography, viewshed, and circulation) and provide focused planning and development standards tailored to the unique characteristics or purpose of a particular area.

Carlsberg Specific Plan

The Carlsberg Specific Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1994. This specific plan area encompasses a total of 488.4 acres of land, of which 220.4 acres are designated open space. There are a total of 155.0 acres dedicated to single-family detached residential development ranging in densities between 3.0 units an acre up to 5 units per gross acre. There are 73.0 acres designated for Sub-regional Retail / Commercial / Business Park uses and 7.0 acres of Institutionally designated land. There is also a 9.0 acre nature preserve, a 6.5 acre public park and 17.5 acres of land dedicated for roadway, access purposes. The residential component of this Specific Plan is completely built out.

Hitch Ranch Specific Plan

The Hitch Ranch Specific Plan, in the northwest quadrant of the City, consists of 285.10 acres, of which over half of the acreage is proposed for 755 residential units. The project contains two single-family residential development areas, with lots ranging from 4,000 to 7,000 square feet. The Specific Plan includes a multi-family housing component consisting of a high-density residential area of 32.78 acres with 295 housing units. This project entered into the planning and environmental stage as of 2000. The site planning and project description has been finalized for application processing purposes and the Draft EIR is being completed for circulation and consideration. In 2013, a 23.44-acre portion of this property was rezoned to RPD-20-U.

Moorpark Highlands Specific Plan

The Moorpark Highlands Specific Plan, located in the northern part of the city, consists of approximately 445 acres. Of the total acreage, 40% is designated for residential use at densities ranging from 1.3 to 12.0 units/acre. According to the Specific Plan, approximately 685 single- and multi-family homes will be built in this Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan has been approved by the City Council and development implementation is underway. Twenty-eight low-income affordable units have been provided in this development. All 28 affordable units are currently occupied, and 7 more are under construction.

Downtown Specific Plan

The Downtown Specific Plan contains High Street, Old Town, several residential neighborhoods, and the downtown commercial area. Within this area, residential zones permit up to 6 dwelling units per acre, while the Residential Planned Development zone permits up to 28 units per acre under land consolidation criteria, when in conjunction with the City's density bonus provisions. Housing development that has occurred in the Downtown Specific Plan in recent years has consisted of infill housing projects, including single-family, duplexes, and one senior housing

project. The senior project, known as Tafoya Terrace, is operated by the Area Housing Authority of the County of Ventura. There are 30 units restricted to very-low- and extremely-low-income seniors. Within this Specific Plan area, the Area Housing Authority also built Charles Street Terrace, with 20 apartment units restricted to low- and very-low-income residents.

d. Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types

Housing Element law specifies that jurisdictions must identify adequate sites with appropriate zoning and development standards to encourage the development of housing for all economic segments of the population. Housing types include single-family and multi-family housing opportunities, factory-built housing, Mobile Homes, as well as housing for persons with special needs such as emergency shelters, transitional housing, and farm labor housing.

Moorpark's Zoning Code permits a wide variety of housing types, as discussed below and summarized in Table IV-3. Zone clearance and administrative permits require only the approval of the Director of Community Development. A conditional use permit requires a public hearing and clearance by the Planning Commission. RPD (Residential Planned Development) clearance requires Planning Commission approval. Each of these permit procedures is described in Subsection 4, "Development Permit Procedures."

Multi-Family Housing

Moorpark's Zoning Code provides for multi-family housing in the R-2 and Residential Planned Development (R-P-D) zones, which allow densities up to 30 dwelling units per acre (assuming a density bonus and additional incentives). In addition, the Downtown Specific Plan allows multi-family housing up to 20 units/acre, excluding density bonus, which can only be achieved for a low/very-low or senior housing project. The provision of multi-family housing in these zones facilitates the production of lower-income housing. In 2004, the state legislature passed Assembly Bill 2348, which established 20 units/acre as the "default density" that is assumed to be suitable for lower-income housing in smaller suburban jurisdictions such as Moorpark. Multi-family densities of at least 20 units/acre can be achieved in the R-2 and RPD zones as well as within specific plans.

Municipal Code Chapter 17.36.030 contains development standards for properties within the Residential Planned Development (R-P-D) zone (see Table IV-2). These minimum standards may be modified by up to 20% when the developer agrees to include affordable units in the project.

The framework provided by the General Plan and Zoning Code creates a high degree of flexibility for developers, which also allows the City to provide significant incentives to encourage the provision of affordable housing. As noted in Appendix B, this approach has been very successful in generating low- and moderate-income housing in previous planning periods. Without the "leverage" created by this regulatory flexibility, it is unlikely that affordable housing production would have been as successful.

**Table IV-3
Housing Types Permitted by Zone**

Residential Uses	O-S A-E	Rural Residential			Urban Residential		
		R-A	R-E	R-O	R-1	R-2	R-P-D
Residential Uses							
Single-family	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP
Duplexes/Tri/Quad						AP	AP
Multi-family						AP**	PDP***
Mobile Home Parks		CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Second Units	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC		ZC
Group Housing							
Boarding house	CUP (AE only)	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Transitional/Supportive Housing*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Residential Care Facilities (6 or less)	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC	ZC
Farm Labor Housing	ZC	ZC	ZC				
Special Need Housing							
Affordable or Senior**					AP	AP	AP

Source: City of Moorpark Zoning Code, current through October 2013.

Notes: *Transitional & supportive housing is permitted within all residential zones subject to the same standards and procedures as apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone

** Less than 5 units

***Administrative Permit for projects with 4 or fewer units

ZC= zoning clearance; CUP=conditional use permit; AP=administrative permit; blank = not permitted

Second Units

In compliance with AB 1866, the City has adopted a Second Unit Ordinance which makes permits for second units ministerial (Zoning Clearance only). Second units are permitted on conforming lots of ¼-acre or larger. Maximum unit sizes range from 800 to 1,100 square feet, depending on lot size. Production of second units ranges from one to three units per year.

Mobile Homes and Manufactured Housing

There is often an economy of scale in manufacturing homes in a plant rather than on site, thereby reducing cost. State law precludes local governments from prohibiting the installation of Mobile Homes on permanent foundations on single-family lots. It also declares a Mobile Home park to be a permitted land use on any land planned and zoned for residential use, and prohibits requiring the average density in a new Mobile Home park to be less than that permitted by the Municipal Code.

Moorpark has about 243 Mobile Homes within the community. Mobile Home parks are permitted in all residential zones subject to a CUP from the Planning Commission. The Mobile Home Park Rent Stabilization Program (see Chapter V, Program 11a) limits space rent increases and the Hardship Waiver Program provides a waiver for tenants if a space rent increase results in economic hardship. The City also participates in Mobile Home revenue bond financing to provide for reserved spaces and affordable units for very-low-income households.

Single Room Occupancy

Single room occupancy (SRO) facilities are small studio-type units intended for occupancy by one or two persons and may have shared bathroom or kitchen facilities. The Zoning Code allows SROs by-right in the C-2 zone subject to objective development standards.

e. Special Needs Housing

Persons with special needs include those in residential care facilities, persons with disabilities, farm workers, persons needing emergency shelter or transitional living arrangements, and single room occupancy units. The City's provisions for these housing types are discussed below.

Extremely-Low-Income Households

Many of the persons and households discussed in this section under the topic of special needs fall within the *extremely-low-income* category, which is defined as 30% or less of area median income, or up to \$26,800 per year for a 4-person household in Ventura County (2013).

A variety of City policies and programs described in Chapter V address the needs of extremely-low-income households, including those in need of residential care facilities, persons with disabilities, and farm workers. However, it should be recognized that development of new housing for the lowest income groups typically requires very large public subsidies, and the level of need is greater than can be met due to funding limitations, especially during these times of declining public revenues.

Residential Care Facilities

Residential care facilities refer to any family home, group home, or rehabilitation facility that provides non-medical care to persons in need of personal services, protection, supervision, assistance, guidance, or training essential for daily living. Moorpark complies with the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act by allowing State-authorized, certified, or licensed family care homes, foster homes, or group homes serving six or fewer persons by-right in all residential zones.

Care facilities, including congregate living health facilities, community treatment facilities, hospices, long-term health care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, residential care facilities for persons with chronic life-threatening illness, skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities, social rehabilitation facilities, transitional housing placement facilities, and transitional shelter care facilities are permitted in C-O, C-1, CPD and C-2 zones, subject to approval of a conditional use permit from the Planning Commission.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

The City's building codes require that new residential construction comply with the federal American with Disabilities Act (ADA). ADA provisions include requirements

for a minimum percentage of units in new developments to be fully accessible to the physically disabled. Provisions of fully accessible units may also increase the overall project development costs. However, unlike the Uniform Building Code, enforcement of ADA requirements is not at the discretion of the City, but is mandated under federal law. Compliance with building codes and the ADA may increase the cost of housing production and can also impact the viability of rehabilitation of older properties required to be brought up to current code standards. However, these regulations provide minimum standards that must be complied with in order to ensure the development of safe and accessible housing.

Some aspects of zoning regulations have the potential to act as a constraint on housing for persons with disabilities. Such regulations include how “family” is defined, physical separation or concentration requirements for group homes, site planning requirements, parking standards, and procedures for ensuring reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities.

- **Definition of “Family”.** The Municipal Code defines “family” as “One or more persons living together in a dwelling unit, with common access to, and common use of all living, kitchen, and eating areas within the dwelling unit” consistent with current law.
- **Concentration requirements.** The City imposes no minimum separation requirements for residential care facilities.
- **Parking requirements.** One space per 2 beds plus 1 space for each 500 square feet is required for care facilities.
- **Reasonable accommodation.** The current Zoning Code allows reasonable accommodations by-right, that include construction of uncovered porches, platforms, or landings that do not extend above the floor level of the first floor of the main structure, and these features may extend into required setback areas not more than six feet. Also, construction or installation of safety guard railings required for stairs, landings, porches, and installation of depressed ramps are allowed and may encroach into front, side or rear setback areas, provided they are open and do not exceed 42 inches in height. While a zoning clearance is not required by the Planning Department, issuance of a building permit for construction is required to ensure that construction is in compliance with building codes. In order to ensure that the City’s procedures for reviewing and approving requests for reasonable accommodation do not pose a constraint to persons with disabilities, the Municipal Code was amended in 2013 to establish procedures for reviewing and approving requests for reasonable accommodation consistent with current law.

Farm Worker Housing

The state Employee Housing Act¹² regulates farm worker housing and generally requires that facilities with no more than 36 beds or 12 units be treated as an agricultural land use that is not subject to any conditional use permit that is not

¹² California Health and Safety Code §17021.5 and §17021.6

required of other agricultural uses in the same zone. The Zoning Code allows small farm worker housing projects in conformance with the Employee Housing Act.

Emergency Shelters and Transitional/Supportive Housing

Emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing are part of the Ventura County regional continuum of care to address the needs of the homeless population. Emergency shelters are year-round facilities that provide a safe alternative to the streets, usually for 30 days or less. Transitional housing is longer-term housing, typically up to two years. Transitional housing requires that the resident participate in a structured program to work toward the established goals so that they can move on to permanent housing. Residents are often provided with an array of supportive services to assist them in meeting goals. Supportive housing has no limit on length of stay and is intended to provide housing with support services to persons with disabilities.

In conformance with Senate Bill 2 (*California Government Code* §65583 and §65589.5), the Zoning Code allows emergency shelters by-right subject to objective development standards in the C-2 zone, and also at existing established places of worship in residential zones, provided that the use is established in coordination with an existing permitted religious facility. The C-2 zone comprises approximately 1.05 acres and includes six vacant or underutilized sites that could accommodate at least one year-round shelter. In addition, there are approximately 11 permitted places of worship in Moorpark where shelters could be established.

SB 2 also requires that transitional/supportive housing be treated as a residential use that is subject only to the same requirements and procedures that apply to any other residential use of the same type in the same zone. The Zoning Code was amended in 2013 in compliance with these requirements. As a result of the passage of SB 745 in 2013, the Zoning Code will be amended to revise the definitions of transitional and supportive housing consistent with Government Code §65582 (see Chapter V, Program 7).

f. Off-Street Parking Requirements

The City's parking requirements for residential zones vary by residential type, housing product, and parking needs (see Table IV-2). Two enclosed parking spaces are required for a single-family residence 2,800 square-feet or less and three enclosed spaces are required for a single-family residence over 2,800 square feet. For multi-family housing, one space in a garage or carport is required for a bachelor or studio unit, 1.75 spaces per unit with one space in a garage or carport is required for each one-bedroom unit, and two spaces (one enclosed in a garage or carport) are required for units with two or more bedrooms, plus an additional one-half space for guest parking is required for each unit. Mobile Home parks require two covered parking spaces for each unit plus one-quarter space per unit for guest parking. Second units are required to have one space for a one-bedroom unit and two spaces for a two-bedroom unit. For senior housing projects restricted to residents age 55 or older, 0.5 space is required per unit. The City has reduced parking standards through development agreements to encourage the

production of affordable housing. The City also allows reduced parking consistent with state Density Bonus law (*Government Code* §65915) upon the developer's request.

g. Density Bonus and Inclusionary/In-lieu Fee Program

Moorpark employs a variety of tools that facilitate and encourage the development of affordable housing for all economic segments of the community. The two primary tools are the density bonus program and the inclusionary/in-lieu fee program. These programs are employed alone or in tandem to facilitate and encourage the construction of affordable housing for lower- and moderate-income households.

Moorpark has adopted a Density Bonus Ordinance (Chapter 17.64 of the Zoning Code) that allows a density increase of up to 100% above the otherwise allowable maximum for qualifying projects (see Chapter V, Program No. 16). The increase in the allowable housing units under a density bonus is based on the percentage density increase above that permitted under the existing zoning per state density bonus law (*Government Code* §65915 et seq.) and Chapter 17.64 of the Zoning Code, as follows:

- When one hundred percent (100%) of the units in a housing development project are restricted to be affordable to low- or very-low-income households for the life of the project, a density bonus up to a maximum of one hundred percent (100%) greater density than allowed by the existing zone may be granted by the city council when considering project entitlements. The one hundred percent (100%) maximum density bonus is inclusive of all density bonuses allowed under *Government Code* §65915 et seq., and Chapter 17.64 of the zoning code.
- When at least sixty percent (60%) of the units in a housing development project are restricted to be affordable to low- or very-low-income households for the life of the project, a density bonus up to a maximum of seventy-five percent (75%) greater density than allowed by the existing zone may be granted by the city council when considering project entitlements. The seventy-five percent (75%) maximum density bonus is inclusive of all density bonuses allowed under *Government Code* §65915 et seq., and Chapter 17.64 of the zoning code.
- For density bonuses higher than required by state law, the city council must find that: (a) the project will help to meet a local housing need for family housing as identified by the housing element of the general plan; and (b) the project will be compatible with surrounding development. Density bonuses higher than required by state law may not be granted for an age-restricted senior housing project.

In conjunction with the Density Bonus Ordinance, concessions and/or incentives determined by the city council necessary in order to develop affordable units in lieu of or in addition to density bonuses may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A reduction in development standards by an amount not to exceed twenty percent (20%), or a reduction in architectural design requirements beyond the minimum building standards adopted by the city; and
- Other regulatory incentives or concessions proposed by the developer or the city, which result in identifiable cost reductions.
- The City Council, in granting higher density bonuses under subsections (B)(2) and (B)(3), is not obligated to grant any additional incentives or concessions.

State law (*Government Code* §65915) was amended (SB 1818 of 2004) to increase the maximum permitted density bonus to 35% along with other changes. Therefore, in 2009, the City adopted a Density Bonus Ordinance to update the Zoning Code in compliance with current state law, as outlined above.

The City's *Inclusionary Program* (see Chapter V, Program No. 12) requires that a minimum of 15% of units constructed within the Redevelopment Project Area to be affordable to lower-income households and has a minimum 10% requirement for all Specific Plan projects outside the Project Area. If a developer cannot meet all of the affordable housing requirements, an in lieu fee is paid. In spite of the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, this program is being maintained for projects within the former redevelopment project area.

As an example, the 312-unit Archstone complex was required to build 62 lower-income units (including 25 very-low-income units). Pacific Communities was required to provide 22 low-income units, but opted to pay \$900,000 in fees to cover the very-low-income requirement. In-lieu fees are used to assist in the development, rehabilitation or preservation of affordable housing.

Density bonus can be an effective means, in conjunction with inclusionary requirements, to facilitate affordable housing development. In order to ensure the provision of affordable housing, the City has granted density increases for projects that are required to provide inclusionary units or pay in-lieu fees. As an example, the Archstone project was granted higher densities (16.2 du/acre), reduced parking standards, and reduced setbacks in return for setting aside 20% of the units for lower-income households.

h. Condominium Conversions

In order to reduce the impacts of condominium conversions on residents of rental housing and to maintain a supply of rental housing for low- and moderate-income persons, the City's Municipal Code (Section 16.30.040 to .070) provides for the following:

1. Tenant notifications of the proposed conversion in compliance with Section 66452.8 of the State Subdivision Map Act;
2. A phasing plan to reflect unit sales and tenant relocation agreements;
3. A tenant assistance plan that provides for a 90-day period for the tenant to exercise his or her right of first refusal to purchase a unit pursuant to Section 66427.1(d) of the Subdivision Map Act. The assistance plan also provides for the reimbursement of tenant moving costs;

4. Reservation of a minimum of 20% of the units as affordable, with 10% low-income and 10% very-low-income units guaranteed through a recorded affordable housing agreement between the property owner and city; and
5. A requirement that vacancy rates at the time of the approval of the conversion are below guidelines set forth in the General Plan.

As a result of these requirements, the potential impact of condominium conversions is not a significant constraint on the preservation of affordable rental housing.

i. Building Codes and Enforcement

State law prohibits the imposition of building standards that are not necessitated by local geographic, climatic or topographic conditions and requires that local governments making changes or modifications in building standards must report such changes to the Department of Housing and Community Development and file an expressed finding that the change is needed.

The City's building codes are based upon the 2010 California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical and Electrical Codes with local amendments adopted that address structural calculations. These are considered to be the minimum necessary to protect the public's health, safety and welfare. No additional regulations have been imposed by the city that would unnecessarily add to housing costs.

The City attempts to link its code enforcement and housing preservation efforts, when appropriate, by making property owners aware of available programs to help with repairs, particularly for lower-income residents.

The City of Moorpark's Code Compliance Program (see Chapter V, Program No. 2) was created in part to safeguard the health and safety of tenants living in rental units in Moorpark by ensuring that rental properties in the city are sanitary and conform to current state fire, building and municipal codes. Following receipt of a report on deficiencies of a rental property, the program requires the rental property be subject to inspection focusing on life and health safety issues such as working smoke detectors and working heat and hot water.

j. Growth Controls

Growth management has long been a concern in Ventura County. In 1999, the City adopted the "SOAR" (Save Open Space and Agricultural Resources) Initiative. This Initiative originated from public concern that rapid urban development over the past decade was threatening agricultural, open space, watershed, sensitive wetlands, and riparian areas vital to Ventura County. Voters thus passed an initiative amending the General Plan to direct population growth into incorporated areas where infrastructure is in place.

Until December 31, 2020, the City is required to restrict urban uses to areas within the urban restriction boundary (CURB), which is generally coterminous with the City's Sphere of Influence and corporate limits. The City Council may not approve any general plan amendment, rezoning, specific plan, subdivision map, special use permit, building permit

or other ministerial or discretionary entitlement inconsistent with the General Plan and CURB line established by the SOAR Initiative. Generally, the City Council may not amend the CURB, without voter approval, unless specific procedures and purposes are followed.

If sufficient land resources are not available to address the City's RHNA allocation, the SOAR Initiative allows the City Council to amend the CURB line to comply with state law regarding the provision of housing for all economic segments of the community. In order to invoke this provision, the Council must make the following findings:

- the land is immediately adjacent to existing compatibly developed areas and that adequate services have or will be provided for such development;
- the proposed development will address the highest priority need identified (e.g., the provision of lower income housing to satisfy the RHNA);
- there is no existing residentially-zoned land available within the CURB and it is not reasonably feasible to re-designate land within the CURB for such purposes; and
- no more than 20 acres may be brought within the CURB for this purpose annually.

The SOAR Initiative is not expected to prevent the City from meeting its RHNA requirements for the following reasons: (1) the City has a large reserve of vacant land within its corporate limits; (2) the City makes wide use of development agreements to require inclusionary units or in-lieu fees; and (3) the SOAR initiative has specific amendment procedures to accommodate the lower-income affordability goals of the RHNA.

2. Development Processing Procedures

a. Residential Permit Processing

The City has designed its development review procedures to streamline the permit process while ensuring that residential development proceeds in an orderly manner and contributes to the community. The City utilizes a range of mechanisms to approve residential projects based on the size, complexity, and potential impact. The approach is to allow by-right administrative approval for smaller projects with low potential for land use conflicts, with more complex projects being reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council. The process is summarized below.

- Zoning Clearance - The Zoning Clearance is applied to projects that are allowed by-right. The Zoning Clearance is used to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and meets all applicable requirements of the City's Zoning Code. The Zoning Clearance is a ministerial permit granted by the Director of Community Development without a public hearing. Approval is typically granted within 1-3 days from submittal of a complete application. Examples of projects requiring only Zoning Clearance include Second Dwelling units, Large Family day care homes serving up to 14 children within a single-family residence; a balcony, deck, patio cover; room additions or storage sheds; fences and walls greater

than 6 feet in height and retaining walls greater than 3 feet in height; swimming pools, wading pools and spas; and finally maintenance and minor repair to buildings involving structural alterations.

- Administrative Permit - Some projects may require an Administrative Permit, such as detached single-family housing unit developments or affordable or senior housing projects of less than five total units. These developments typically have a higher level of concern regarding compatibility with adjacent uses and therefore require a greater level of zoning review, requiring approval of an Administrative Permit. The Administrative Permit is granted by the Director of Community Development, without a public hearing. These projects typically qualify for a Categorical Exemption under CEQA. Approval is typically received within one month from submittal of a complete application.
- Conditional Use Permit - A Conditional Use Permit is required for uses such as mobile home parks and boarding houses. Development projects are required to meet site development standards and submit site plans and architecture subject to design review. A public hearing is required. For residential developments, the decision-making body is the Planning Commission, with appeals heard by the City Council. Typical review and approval time is 2.5 to 9 months, depending on project complexity and the level of CEQA review required. Conditions of approval typically include a minimum number of units or tenant spaces to be provided and may include special conditions for parking arrangements.
- Planned Development Permit - Planned Development Permits are required for new residential developments of five or more units and for projects associated with a subdivision of land, zone change, or Development Agreement and may include a General Plan Amendment and are reviewed by the Planning Commission at a public hearing. The standard of review for PDPs is confirming that the project complies with objective development and design standards rather than examining the use itself. Staff typically works with the applicant on the project design to ensure the site planning and architecture is compatible with the surrounding properties and will not negatively affect the safety, health and welfare of adjoining property owners. The focus of this process is confirming project conformance with development standards. The City also offers applicants the option of pre-application meetings to discuss project requirements with staff. These meetings help to expedite the permit process by identifying key issues early in the process, thereby avoiding multiple rounds of review, reducing design costs and increasing development certainty. Typical review and approval time is 3-6 months, depending on project complexity and the level of CEQA review required. Conditions of approval typically ensure compliance with existing development standards in the Municipal Code to address: parking standards, landscaping criteria, trash storage and disposal services, minimum and maximum standards related to varieties of architectural designs of units, setbacks and circulation and access.

The Planned Development Permit process provides flexibility and reduces constraints on development, in that the purpose of this zone is to provide areas

for communities that will be developed utilizing modern land planning and unified design techniques. This provides a flexible regulatory procedure in order to encourage: 1) Coordinated neighborhood design and compatibility with existing or potential development of surrounding areas; 2) An efficient use of land particularly through the clustering of dwelling units and the preservation of the natural features of sites; 3) Variety and innovation in site design, density and housing unit options, including garden apartments, townhouses and single-family dwellings; 4) Lower housing costs through the reduction of street and utility networks; and 5) A more varied, attractive and energy-efficient living environment as well as greater opportunities for recreation than would be possible under other zone classifications. This review process also creates incentives for developers to provide affordable housing and other public benefits in projects by allowing higher densities and modified development standards as part of a development agreement when such commitments are provided. The City's successful track record in generating affordable housing supports the validity of this approach and demonstrates that this process does not unreasonably impact the cost and supply of housing.

b. Efforts to Minimize Development Review Timeframes

State law requires that communities work toward improving the efficiency of their planning and building permit processes by providing "one-stop" processing, thereby eliminating the unnecessary duplication of effort. The Permit Streamlining Act reduces delay by limiting permit processing time to one year and requiring agencies to specify the information needed for an acceptable application.

Early consultation with City staff is encouraged to identify issues as soon as possible and reduce processing time. A "pre-submittal conference" is strongly encouraged so that applicants can become acquainted with the information and fees required by each department and agency. Site and architectural plans are also reviewed for consistency with City standards. This conference allows the applicant to determine the feasibility of the project and make adjustments during the preliminary planning stages to minimize costs.

Simultaneous processing of entitlements (e.g., subdivisions and planned developments permits) is also provided as a means of expediting the review process. These procedures help to ensure that the development review process meets all legal requirements without causing an unwarranted constraint to housing development.

Table IV-4 summarizes the typical time frame for reviewing projects from pre-application development review phase through approval.

**Table IV-4
Development Review Times**

Permits & Review	Typical Processing Time	
	Timeframe	Factors Affecting Time
Pre-Application Review	1 to 4 mos.	Complexity; special study needs
Variance	2 to 6 mos.	Complexity; level of review
Zone Clearance	1 – 3 days	Scale of project
General Plan Amendment	3 – 12 mos.	Complexity; level of review
Administrative Permit	1 month	Completeness of Application
Planned Development	3 to 6 mos.	Scale of project/Completeness
Subdivision Map	6 –12 mos.	Environmental/design issues
Conditional Use Permit	6-9 mos.	Scale of project; environmental
Environmental Review	6-12 mos.	Scale – complexity of project

Source: City of Moorpark, 2009

The timeframe for reviewing and approving permit applications, zone changes, variances, conditional use permits, and other discretionary approvals varies on a case-by-case basis. Developments in Moorpark typically range from a single home, to a large-scale project of 100 homes, to even larger Specific Plan projects. The time needed to review projects depends on the location, potential environmental constraints, the need to ensure adequate provision of infrastructure and public facilities, and the overall impact of large-scale developments on the community.

For larger development projects subject to the residential planned permit, the City allows concurrent processing of a variety of actions (e.g., general plan amendment and zone change) to help expedite the processing of development applications.

The Residential Planned Development (RPD) and Design Review processes are important components in the development approval process. The RPD and design review process work in tandem to facilitate and encourage projects that address the housing needs of the community and also are designed in a manner that preserves and contributes to the quality of the living environment in Moorpark.

The RPD and design review process begins with a joint application submittal to the Community Development Department. City staff meets with the developer to discuss the project and, upon request by the applicant, provides appropriate direction and examples of projects that meet City design standards.

Once the project schematics are completed, staff reviews the application to make sure it is complete, and then prepares a written report assessing the overall design and consistency with the City's development standards. The Planning Commission then reviews the project to ensure it complies with the following findings:

- Is consistent with the intent and provisions of the City's general plan and appropriate zoning chapter;
- Is compatible with the character of surrounding development;
- Would not be obnoxious, harmful, or impair the utility of neighboring property;
- Would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, welfare, and

- Is compatible with the scale, visual character and design of surrounding properties.

The RPD process has resulted, at times, in lower densities for single-family projects, particularly for hillside developments subject to environmental constraints. With respect to multi-family developments, the RPD process has not resulted in lower densities for multi-family projects containing affordable units. For example, multi-family projects built at or above maximum allowable densities include the Archstone, Urban West, Essex and Area Housing Authority Apartments projects.

In the previous planning period, a new RPD-20-U district was established allowing multi-family development by-right at a minimum density of 20 units/acre. Development projects within this district are reviewed through a non-discretionary process intended to confirm that the project is in compliance with objective development standards.

As larger Specific Plan areas and remaining large vacant parcels in the community are gradually built out, the remaining development in Moorpark will shift to smaller infill locations. Rather than conduct design review for large open tracts, focus will shift to neighborhoods, where developments must be compatible with adjacent uses. Therefore, the City will continue to use the RPD and Design Review processes in the development approval process to facilitate and encourage projects that address the housing needs of the community and also are designed in a manner that preserves and contributes to the quality of the living environment in Moorpark and is compatible in scale with existing neighborhoods.

c. Environmental Review

Environmental review is required for all discretionary development projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Most projects in Moorpark are either Categorical Exempt or require only an Initial Study and Negative Declaration. Developments that have the potential of creating significant impacts that cannot be mitigated require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Most residential projects require a Negative Declaration, which takes two to three weeks to complete. Categorical Exempt developments such as second residential units require a minimal amount of time. As a result, state-mandated environmental review does not pose a significant constraint to housing development.

3. Development Fees and Improvement Requirements

State law limits fees charged for development permit processing to the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged. Various fees and assessments are charged by the City and other public agencies to cover the costs of processing permit applications and providing services and facilities such as schools, parks and infrastructure. Almost all of these fees are assessed through a pro rata share system, based on the magnitude of the project's impact or on the extent of the benefit that will be derived.

Moorpark collects fees and exactions from developments to cover the costs of processing permits and providing the necessary services and infrastructure related to

new development. Fees are calculated based on the cost of processing a particular type of case. Table IV-5 summarizes planning, development, and other fees charged for new residential development.

**Table IV-5
Development Review Fees**

Type of Fees	Fees		
	Single-Family*	Multi-Family**	Mobile Home
Planning Fees			
Pre Screening for General Plan Amendment		\$5,800.00	
General Plan Amendment		\$5,200.00	
Residential Planned Development (SF or MF)	\$19,500.00 < 30 units or \$26,000.00 > 30 units		
Tentative Tract Map	\$9,100.00 < 30 units or \$19,500.00 > 30 units		
Administrative Exception (Minor Variance)		\$650.00	
Variance – Existing Single-family Residential		\$5,000.00	
Administrative Permit		\$780.00	
Conditional Use Permit –Residential Uses		\$5,000.00	
Zone Change		\$5,200.00	
Zoning Code Amendment		\$5,200.00	
Development Impact and Building Permit Fees (per unit)			
Roads:			
Area of Contribution Spring/Tierra Rejada Roads	\$9,142.13	\$9,142.13	\$9,142.13
Area of Contribution Gabbert/Casey Roads	\$2,030.00	\$2,030.00	\$2,030.00
Area of Contribution Los Angeles Avenue	\$7,807.00	\$7,807.00	\$7,807.00
Fire Protection Facilities Fee	\$979.46 per unit	\$721.87 per unit	\$587.08 per unit
Police Facilities Fee	\$1,027.00 per unit	\$1,027.00 per unit	\$1,027.00 per unit
Calleguas Water District Fee – Capital Improvement Fee	\$4,649.00 per 1" meter	\$3,727	unknown
Water (Waterworks District #1) – Capital Improvement Fee	\$4,562.00 per 1" meter	\$3,992	unknown
Flood Control – Land Development Fee (Watershed Protection District)	\$600 per unit maximum	\$300	\$600 per unit maximum
Sewer Connection	\$4,386.00 per unit	\$4,386.00 per unit	unknown
Library Facilities Fee	\$925.68 per unit	\$596.91 per unit	\$612.06 per unit
School Fees	\$2.97 per sq. ft.	\$2.97 per sq. ft.	\$2.97 per sq. ft.
Building Permit Fee (including plan check fee)	\$4,467	\$1,308***	N/A
Estimated Total Development Fees (per unit)	\$46,500	\$37,000	\$14,197

N/A = Not applicable

Source: City of Moorpark, 2013

*Assumes construction of a 1,522 square foot home.

**Assumes 4 multi-family units on a half of an acre.

*** Assumed fee using the per unit fee from building permit files for an existing 20 unit MF project

Moorpark's development fees are considered typical for jurisdictions in Ventura County. The City Council has the authority to reduce or waive local fees on a case-by-case basis. For affordable or senior housing, the City Council at its discretion may provide developers with incentives such as the waiving of fees and other concessions that may result in cost reductions. For the development of Villa Campesina, the City reduced development fees for Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation in order to ensure the project's affordability to lower income households.

After the passage of Proposition 13 and its limitation on local governments' property tax revenues, cities and counties have faced increasing difficulty in providing public services and facilities to serve their residents. One of the main consequences of Proposition 13 has been the shift in funding of new infrastructure from general tax revenues to development

impact fees and improvement requirements on land developers. The City requires developers to provide on-site and off-site improvements necessary to serve their projects. Such improvements may include water, sewer and other utility extensions, street construction and traffic control device installation that are reasonably related to the project. Dedication of land or in-lieu fees may also be required of a project for rights-of-way, transit facilities, parks and school sites, consistent with the Subdivision Map Act.

City road standards vary by roadway designation as provided in Table IV-6.

**Table IV-6
Road Improvement Standards**

Roadway Designation	Number of Lanes	Right-of-Way Width	Curb-to Curb Width
6-lane arterial	6	110 - 120'	90 - 104'
4-lane arterial	4	80 - 100'	60 - 80'
Rural collector	2 - 4	70 - 90'	54 - 64'
Local collector	2	50 - 70'	36 - 54'

Source: City of Moorpark General Plan - Circulation Element

A typical local residential street requires a 56-foot right-of-way, with two 18 foot travel lanes, these widths vary based on project location and circulation design needs. The City's road standards are typical for cities in Ventura County and do not act as a constraint to housing development.

The City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) contains a schedule of public improvements including streets, bridges and other facilities needed for the continued build-out of the city. The CIP helps to ensure that construction of public improvements is coordinated with private development.

Although development fees and improvement requirements increase the cost of housing, cities have little choice in establishing such requirements due to the limitations on property taxes and other revenue sources needed to fund public improvements.

B. Non-Governmental Constraints

1. Environmental Constraints

Environmental constraints include physical features such as steep slopes, fault zones, floodplains, sensitive biological habitat, and agricultural lands. In many cases, development of these areas is constrained by state and federal laws (e.g., FEMA floodplain regulations, the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, and the *California Fish and Game Code* and *Alquist-Priolo Act*). The City's land use plans have been designed to protect sensitive areas from development, and also to protect public safety by avoiding development in hazardous areas. While these policies constrain residential development to some extent, they are necessary to support other public policies.

2. Infrastructure Constraints

Adequate infrastructure, services, and public facilities are important components of new development. In order for residential development to not adversely impact the City's service system levels, the City must ensure that various capital improvement plans and adequate financing mechanisms are in place to provide essential services. The following discussion details the adequacy of the city's infrastructure system.

- Streets - The City has mechanisms in place to address capital improvement projects needed to facilitate new development. To provide needed transportation improvements, the City has instituted an area of contribution requirement and appropriate fees to pay for circulation and system improvements. While this provides the City sufficient funds to construct transportation improvements needed to serve new developments, ongoing maintenance costs will be added to the City's budget. In addition, due to upcoming restrictions on the use of TDA funds for maintenance, it is likely that the City would require new developments to have private streets where feasible and consistent with the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Private streets will add to Home Owner Association costs for new developments as the Home Owner Association will be responsible for maintenance.
- Drainage - The major drainage facility in Moorpark is the Arroyo Simi Channel. The Army Corp of Engineers and local Ventura County Watershed Protection District is acquiring right of way to complete projects to reduce the risk of flooding in parts of Moorpark. Until such improvements are completed, developers must provide site improvements necessary to protect the property from flooding.
- Wastewater Treatment - Ventura County Waterworks District No. 1 encompasses 19,500 acres and serves 30,000 customers in Moorpark and contiguous unincorporated areas. The District owns, operates and maintains the Moorpark Wastewater Treatment Plant (MWTP). In 2000, the MWTP was upgraded to increase treatment capacity to 3.0 mgd – 50% higher than the average flow in 1999. The plant expansion is intended to accommodate future development in Moorpark beyond the current planning period.
- Water Supply - Ventura County Waterworks District No. 1 provides domestic water to Moorpark. The District receives water from five groundwater wells, imports the remainder from the Metropolitan Water District and Calleguas Municipal Water District, and treats water at the Jenson Plant in Granada Hills. The District supplies 11,500 acre-feet of water annually, 75% of which is imported. The District foresees sufficient water capacity to meet future housing needs in Moorpark throughout the planning period.

3. Land Costs

Land represents one of the most significant components of the cost of new housing. Land values fluctuate with market conditions, and the recent downturn in the housing market has affected land values negatively. Changes in land prices reflect the cyclical

nature of the residential real estate market. It is expected that economic recovery will occur and land prices will again rise, although the timing is unknown. Per-unit land cost is directly affected by density – higher density allows the cost to be spread across more units, reducing the total price. The City's policies regarding inclusionary housing and density bonus help to reduce land costs, thereby improving affordability.

4. Construction Costs

Construction cost is affected by the price of materials, labor, development standards and general market conditions. The City has no influence over materials and labor costs, and the building codes and development standards in Moorpark are not substantially different than most other cities in Ventura County and the state of California.

5. Cost and Availability of Financing

Moorpark is similar to most other communities with regard to private sector home financing programs. Moorpark participates in a mortgage credit certificate program that offers homebuyers a tax credit and assists in qualifying for a home loan. The City is also a participant in the California Rural Housing Mortgage Finance authority homebuyer fund that provides low-interest loans to first-time homebuyers. Low-interest loans and grants are also offered through the -Tax Increment of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Moorpark or City housing funds for home improvements to help maintain existing housing units.

The recent crisis in the mortgage industry has affected the availability of real estate loans, although for those homebuyers who can qualify, interest rates are at historic lows.

Under state law, it is illegal for real estate lending institutions to discriminate against entire neighborhoods in lending practices because of the physical, social or economic conditions in the area ("redlining"). In monitoring new construction sales, re-sales of existing homes, and permits for remodeling, it would not appear that redlining is occurring in the city.

C. Fair Housing

State law prohibits discrimination in the development process or in real property transactions, and it is the City's policy to uphold the law in this regard. Moorpark participated in a countywide consortium that prepared an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in 2010. Such impediments are typically any action, omission, or decisions that have the effect of restricting housing choice or the availability of housing on the basis of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, disability, marital status, familial status, source of income, sexual orientation, or any other arbitrary factor.

The County contracts with a fair housing agency for these services. Fair housing programs, referral, and counseling for Moorpark residents are provided by the Housing Rights Center and funded through the Entitlement Area CDBG program. The City's support and participation in fair housing activities minimizes the potential for housing discrimination in Moorpark (see Housing Plan, Program No. 18).

V. HOUSING PLAN

Chapters II through IV describe the housing needs, resources and constraints in Moorpark. This Housing Plan sets forth the City's goals, policies, programs, and quantified objectives to address the identified housing needs in Moorpark from 2014 to 2021.

A. Goals and Policies

This section of the Housing Element contains a brief overview of the key issues from the Needs Assessment as well as the goals and policies that Moorpark intends to implement to address these housing needs. In addressing the City's housing needs, the City's overall community goals are as follows:

- Adequate provision of decent, safe and affordable housing for residents without regard to race, age, sex, marital status, ethnicity, disability or other arbitrary considerations.
- Adequate provision of housing opportunities by type, tenure, and location with particular attention to the provision of housing for special needs groups.
- Encourage growth through the identification of suitable parcels for residential development, changes in land use patterns, and appropriate recycling of land.
- Develop a balanced community accessible to employment, transportation, shopping, medical services, and governmental agencies among others.

Within the aforementioned general framework, the City has developed the following goals and policies to encourage the preservation, production, maintenance, and improvement of housing within the Moorpark community.

1. Housing and Neighborhood Conservation

Housing and neighborhood conservation are important to maintaining and improving quality of life. While the majority of housing in Moorpark is relatively new, some of the older residential neighborhoods in the downtown show signs of deterioration. Efforts to improve and revitalize housing must not only address existing conditions, but also focus on preventive repairs to maintain the quality of the housing stock. The policies listed below address the issue of housing and neighborhood conservation.

GOAL 1.0: Assure the quality, safety, and habitability of existing housing and the continued high quality of residential neighborhoods.

Policy 1.1 Continue to monitor and enforce building and property maintenance code standards in residential neighborhoods.

Policy 1.2 Continue to provide City public safety services, infrastructure maintenance, graffiti removal, and other public services to maintain the quality of the housing stock, neighborhoods, and the environment.

- Policy 1.3** Promote increased awareness among property owners and residents of the importance of property maintenance to long-term housing quality.
- Policy 1.4** Continue to promote the repair, revitalization, and rehabilitation of residential structures which have fallen into disrepair.
- Policy 1.5** Support the preservation and maintenance of historically and architecturally significant buildings and neighborhoods.

2. Adequate Residential Sites

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment addresses the need for decent, adequate, and affordable housing to accommodate existing and future housing needs induced from regional growth. In order to further these goals, Moorpark is committed to assisting in the development of adequate housing that is affordable to all economic segments of the population through the following goals and policies:

- GOAL 2: Provide residential sites through land use, zoning and specific plan designations to provide a range of housing opportunities.**
- Policy 2.1** Identify adequate sites which will be made available and zoned at the appropriate densities, to facilitate goals set forth in the 2014-2021 RHNA.
- Policy 2.2** Ensure residential sites have appropriate public services, facilities, circulation, and other needed infrastructure to support development.
- Policy 2.3** Investigate rezoning or redesignation of commercial lots that are no longer economically viable uses to appropriate residential uses.
- Policy 2.4** Promote and encourage mixed-use residential and commercial uses where appropriate as a means to facilitate development.

3. Housing Assistance and Special Needs

Moorpark is home to a number of groups with special housing needs, including seniors, large families, disabled persons, and single parent families, among others. These groups may face greater difficulty in finding decent and affordable housing due to special circumstances. Special circumstances may be related to one's income, family characteristics, disability, or health issues.

- GOAL 3: Expand and protect housing opportunities for lower income households and special needs groups.**
- Policy 3.1** Use public financial resources, to the extent feasible, to support the provision and production of housing for lower-income households and persons and families with special needs.
- Policy 3.2** Provide rental assistance to address existing housing problems and provide homeownership assistance to expand housing opportunities.

- Policy 3.3** Support the conservation of Mobile Home parks, historic neighborhoods, publicly-subsidized housing, and other sources of affordable housing.
- Policy 3.4** Require, in aggregate, 10% of new units to be affordable to lower-income households. Establish priority for usage of in-lieu fee as follows: 1st priority – production of affordable housing; 2nd – subsidy of affordable housing; 3rd – housing rehabilitation; 4th priority – housing assistance; and 5th staffing costs.

4. Removal of Government Constraints

Market factors and government regulations can significantly impact the production and affordability of housing. Although market conditions are often beyond the direct influence of any jurisdiction, efforts can be directed at ensuring the reasonableness of land use controls, development standards, permit-processing, fees and exactions, and governmental requirements to encourage housing production.

GOAL 4: Where appropriate, mitigate unnecessary governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

- Policy 4.1** Periodically review City regulations, ordinances, fees/exactions to ensure they do not unduly constrain the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing.
- Policy 4.2** Offer regulatory incentives and concessions for affordable housing, such as relief from development standards, density bonuses, or fee waivers where deemed to be appropriate.
- Policy 4.3** Provide for streamlined, timely, coordinated, and concurrent processing of residential projects to minimize holding costs and encourage housing production.
- Policy 4.4** Support infill development at suitable locations and provide, where appropriate, incentives to facilitate their development.

5. Fair and Equal Housing Opportunity

Ensuring fair and equal housing opportunity is an important goal. Whether through mediating disputes, investigating bona fide complaints of discrimination, or through the provision of education services, the provision of fair housing services is an important tool to ensure fair and equal access to housing. The following policies are designed to continue implementation of applicable fair housing laws.

GOAL 5: Ensure fair and equal housing opportunity for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, family type, ancestry, national origin, color or other protected status.

- Policy 5.1** Provide fair housing services to residents and assure that residents are aware of their rights and responsibilities with respect to fair housing.
- Policy 5.2** Discourage discrimination in either the sale or rental of housing on the basis of state or federal protected classes.

Policy 5.3 Implement appropriate action items identified in the Ventura County Analysis of Impediments to ensure fair and equal access to housing.

B. Housing Programs

The goals and policies discussed above are implemented through housing programs offered by the City's Community Development Department and Redevelopment Agency.

This section describes the programs that Moorpark will implement to address housing needs within the community. Table V-1 provides a summary of each program, objective, funding source, and agency having responsibility to implement the program.

Housing and Neighborhood Conservation

<p>1. Housing Rehabilitation</p> <p>The Housing Rehabilitation Program provides rehabilitation loans to low-income owner households. Loans up to \$50,000 are provided for owner-occupied housing and \$20,000 for Mobile Home units. Rehab participants pay only a 3% annual interest rate amortized over 10 years for single family units. Mobile Home loans have a 20-year term coupled with conditional forgiveness. The loan is forgiven at the rate of 10% per year from years 11 thru 20.</p>	<p>8-Year Objective:</p> <p>Provide loans for a maximum of 25 single-family units and 10 Mobile Home units. Promote this program on the City website and with flyers at City Hall and other public buildings.</p>
---	--

<p>2. Code Compliance</p> <p>The City currently maintains one full-time code compliance technician to ensure compliance with building and property maintenance codes. The Code Compliance Division receives approximately 90 complaints per month. The Code Compliance Division plays a key role in improving neighborhoods. The Division handles a variety of issues ranging from property maintenance (e.g. illegally parked vehicles, overgrown vegetation) to housing conditions.</p>	<p>8-Year Objective:</p> <p>Continue code compliance activities, including inspections of rental units throughout the City following receipt of reports of non-compliance with existing codes and standards.</p>
--	---

Adequate Residential Sites

<p>3. Sites to Accommodate Fair-Share Housing Needs</p> <p>Vacant or underutilized sites offer opportunities for residential development and achieve lower-income housing goals, as identified by the RHNA. In the past several years, developers have initiated both the conversion of commercial sites for residential use, and the up-zoning of low-density residential sites for higher-density development. Zoning amendments have resulted in development of the Archstone project, Shea Homes Tract 5425, and the CEDC Monte Vista project. Other projects where zoning has been modified to allow for affordable housing opportunities that have not yet been built include the Pacific Communities project, the Essex apartment project, William Lyon Home 17-unit affordable project, Area Housing Authority Apartment project, and the Pardee School Site project. Other projects are under consideration.</p>	<p>8-Year Objective:</p> <p>Ensure no net loss of residential capacity commensurate with the RHNA allocation throughout the planning period.</p>
--	---

The new RPD-20 zoning district was established in the previous planning period to allow owner-occupied and multi-family rental residential development by-right at a density of 20 units/acre.

For projects that require subdivision or lot consolidation prior to development, the City will facilitate this process through expedited or concurrent processing of the required approvals. Since most affordable housing developments occur on sites of 2 to 10 acres, the City will prioritize rezoning and subdivision of sites that can accommodate developments of this size. In order to enhance the likelihood of affordable housing development in these projects, the City will take the following actions:

- Contact affordable housing builders regarding development opportunities in these projects, and convene meetings between the master developer and interested builders, if requested.
- Offer incentives and concessions for affordable housing projects such as expedited processing, reduced development standards, administrative assistance with funding applications such as Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, and fee waivers or reductions if feasible.

4. Downtown Specific Plan

The Downtown Specific Plan, which was adopted in 1998, is designed to encourage a pedestrian-oriented mix of businesses, offices, and residential uses in the Downtown area. The Downtown Specific Plan area is characterized by smaller lots, underutilized lots, older single-family homes, and a downtown commercial core. Because the majority of lots are irregularly shaped, the Zoning Code restricts density for lots of 7,000 square feet to 7 units per acre.

According to the Specific Plan, the Downtown offers significant opportunities for public or private involvement in facilitating mixed use, infill, and affordable housing. The Zoning Code offers incentives to facilitate the Downtown Specific Plan. If parcels are combined or merged, and the City's density bonus provisions are utilized, the maximum density can be increased to 28 units/acre.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to implement the Downtown Specific Plan.

5. Farm Worker Housing

Though most of the region's functional agricultural areas are located outside Moorpark, some farm workers live in the community. Year-round farm laborers are typically housed in older apartments, government-assisted units, and Mobile-Homes. In order to facilitate the provision of additional housing for agricultural workers, the City will continue to permit Farm Worker Housing consistent with the Employee Housing Act (*Health and Safety Code* §17021.5 and §17021.6).

8-Year Objective:

Continue to implement zoning regulations in conformance with the Employee Housing Act.

6. Second Units

A secondary unit is a separate dwelling unit that provides complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons. Second units are currently allowed on lots of 10,890 square feet or greater pursuant to an approved zoning clearance. The unit must meet the minimum development standards for the primary residence unit. Given the limited developable land remaining in Moorpark, continuing to integrate second units in appropriate locations presents an opportunity for the City to accommodate needed rental housing for lower-income persons, students, and seniors. Second unit regulations will be publicized on the website and in flyers posted in City Hall.

8-Year Objective:

The City will continue to permit second units in all residential zones pursuant to an administrative permit. Publicize second unit regulations. The City anticipates that 16 second units will be built during the planning period.

7. Emergency Shelters and Transitional/Supportive Housing

During the previous planning period, the City amended the Zoning Code to permit emergency shelters by-right subject to the same development and management standards that apply to other allowed uses in the C-2 zone, except that other objective, written standards may be established as provided by *Government Code* §65583(a)(4). Emergency shelters are also permitted in conjunction with permitted places of worship in residential zones, provided that the use is established in coordination with an existing permitted religious facility.

The City also permits transitional and supportive housing as a residential use that is subject only to the same requirements and procedures as other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to permit emergency shelters and transitional/supportive housing in conformance with SB 2 throughout the planning period. Process an amendment to the Zoning Code concurrent with adoption of the Housing Element to update the definitions of transitional housing and supportive housing consistent with SB 745 of 2013.

8. Single Room Occupancy (SROs)

In order to encourage additional housing for persons with extremely-low incomes (ELI), the Zoning Code allows Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units by-right (i.e., without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action) in the C-2 zone subject to objective development standards.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to allow SROs by-right in the C-2 zone.

Housing Assistance and Special Needs

9. Section 8 Rental Assistance

The Section 8 program provides rent subsidies to very-low-income households who spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent. Prospective renters secure housing from HUD-registered apartments that accept the certificates. HUD pays to the landlords the difference between what the tenant can afford to pay and the payment standard. Under the Section 8 voucher program, a family can choose more costly housing, if they pay the rent difference. The Area Housing Authority of the County of Ventura administers the Section 8 program on behalf of the City.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to participate in the Section 8 program, advertise program availability, and encourage rental property owners to register their units with the Housing Authority.

10. Mortgage Credit Certificate Program

The City participates in the federal Mortgage Credit Certificate Program operated by Ventura County. The MCC program allows qualified first-time homebuyers to take an annual credit against their federal income taxes of up to 20% of the annual interest paid on the applicant's mortgage. The tax credit allows homebuyers more income to qualify for a mortgage. Therefore, the MCC Program is a way to further leverage homeownership assistance.

8-Year Objective:

Continue participation and advertise program availability.

11. Preservation Programs

a. Mobile Home Park Affordability

The Mobile Home Park Rent Stabilization Program has been non-operational since the purchase of Villa Del Arroyo by Augusta Homes and the closing and relocation of the tenants at Moorpark Mobile Home Park. The City issued bonds to assist Augusta Homes with the purchase of Villa Del Arroyo Mobile Home Park. The bond regulatory agreement at Villa Del Arroyo, requires the park to maintain 48 housing units for very-low-income families. The City hired a consultant to provide regular monitoring of the Regulatory Agreement.

8-Year Objective:

Continue monitoring Villa Del Arroyo's compliance with the requirements of the Regulatory Agreement to ensure that the 48 housing units are occupied by very-low-income families.

b. Resale Refinance Restriction and Option to Purchase Agreements

Resale Refinance Restriction and Option to Purchase Agreements are required by the City for affordable housing units, which are covenants that preserve affordable units in perpetuity. This ensures that after affordable units are created they are not sold or re-sold at market rate prices.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to monitor the status of the Resale Refinance Restriction and Option to Purchase Agreements for affordable units.

12. Inclusionary Program

Through the use of development agreements, the City's inclusionary policies require that 10% to 15% of all units in each development project and 15% to 20% of all units in development projects within the former redevelopment area must be affordable to low- and very-low-income households. In appropriate situations, developers unable to provide units are assessed in-lieu fees based upon the estimated cost of providing affordable units, or acquiring units or build units off-site. This occurs most often with single-family developments in the hillsides. Currently, the City can allocate inclusionary fees for housing rehabilitation, construction, or assistance. To ensure that the City addresses its RHNA affordability requirements for low-income housing, it may become necessary to earmark funding to assist in the development. A policy was developed by the City Council on Oct 2, 2013 prioritizing programs for in-lieu fee expenditures.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to implement fee expenditure priorities as follows:

- 1st priority – affordable housing production;
- 2nd -- subsidy of affordable housing;
- 3rd -- housing rehabilitation; and
- 4th -- housing assistance. Adopt expenditure priorities by end of 2012.

Assist in the development of up to 20 very low-income units by end of 2014.

Continue to monitor in-lieu fees.

13. Land Assemblage/Disposition/Acquisition

The City will continue to encourage the provision of quality, affordable housing through use of land write-downs, direct financial assistance, and/or regulatory incentives. The City will use Housing Trust funds, County CDBG, and other funds to assist in acquiring and assembling property and writing down land costs for the development of new housing. Currently, the City is acquiring various pieces of property in downtown Moorpark for redevelopment purposes and affordable housing opportunities.

8-Year Objective:

Assist in the purchase and assembly of land for housing at least twice during the planning period in order to accommodate the City's fair share of housing needs.

14. Regulatory and Financial Assistance

Regulatory assistance can be used to assist in the development of projects that address local housing needs. In the past, the City has adjusted development standards, increased density, and carried interest cost on land for affordable housing projects. The City will continue to provide regulatory assistance for the development of affordable projects that address identified housing needs, such as special needs groups and the RHNA. Where feasible, the City will prioritize regulatory and financial incentives for extremely-low-income housing.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to provide regulatory assistance for projects that address local housing needs, including priority for extremely-low-income housing, at least twice during the planning period in order to accommodate the City's fair share of housing needs.

15. Assistance to CHDOs

The City will continue to work with local Community Housing Development Organizations to provide affordable housing to meet the needs of lower-income households. In the past, the City assisted the Villa Campesina project, a 62-unit single-family sweat equity development for farm workers and other lower-income households, by reducing development fees. The City also sold property acquired through bond financing to Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation for the Mountain View project, which provides 15 single-family homes for lower-income families and an additional 44 units for moderate-income families.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to work with local CHDOs by providing assistance for the development of affordable housing in Moorpark, including supportive housing for persons with developmental disabilities.

Removal of Government Constraints

16. Density Bonus Program

In 2004 the state legislature amended density bonus law (SB 1818). In 2009, the City amended the General Plan Land Use element and the Zoning Ordinance to go above and beyond State requirements by allowing up to 100% density bonus for affordable housing projects that are 100% affordable to low and very low income households.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to monitor State density bonus law and make changes to local regulations as necessary to stay current with State law.

17. R-P-D Zone Designation and Planned Development Permit Process

The R-P-D Zone designation provides flexibility in the development process to meet specific housing needs. The R-P-D Zone designation offers various densities that can be tailored to the lot, nature of the development, and local housing needs. The R-P-D Zone provides a mechanism for the development of higher-density housing (up to 20 du/ac) and can be coupled with a density bonus, financial and regulatory incentives to provide affordable housing.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to use the R-P-D Zone designation to encourage a variety of housing types to address local needs.

In order to further reduce processing time the Zoning Code was amended in the previous planning period to designate the Planning Commission as the final approval authority (rather than City Council); and to modify the required findings for approval to confirming that the project complies with objective development and design standards.

18. Off-Street Parking Requirements

In order to facilitate the production of affordable housing, a Code amendment was adopted in the prior planning period to allow reduced off-street parking for projects meeting the requirements of state Density Bonus law (*Government Code* §65915) when requested by the developer. In addition, the parking requirement for market rate one-bedroom multi-family units were reduced to 1.75 spaces per unit (including guest parking), one of which must be covered (garage or carport). The City will continue to

8-Year Objective:

Continue to monitor parking conditions in residential developments.

monitor parking conditions to ensure that Code requirements are appropriate to meet the needs of residents.

Equal Housing Opportunity

19. Fair Housing Services

Moorpark, in conjunction with Ventura County, will continue to ensure the provision of fair housing services for its residents. These services will include counseling and information on housing discrimination, landlord-tenant dispute resolution, bilingual housing literature, and testing for housing discrimination. The County contracts with a Fair Housing provider through the CDBG program. To facilitate public awareness of these services, the City will assist in making information available to property owners, apartment managers, tenants, local media, and other service organizations.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to support provision of fair housing services and publicize these services throughout the community using the City website and flyers posted in at least five locations.

20. Reasonable Accommodation

The Municipal Code establishes procedures for reviewing and approving requests for reasonable accommodation by persons with disabilities consistent with current law. The City will continue to implement the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance.

8-Year Objective:

Continue to implement the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance throughout the planning period.

21. Child Care Facilities

The City of Moorpark complies with state regulations allowing childcare facilities to locate in the City and offers density bonuses for qualified childcare facilities per state law. However, recognizing the shortage and necessity of quality and affordable childcare facilities, the City will pursue the following actions: 1) consider incentives for co-locating childcare facilities in affordable housing; 2) give priority to funding for acquisition and rehabilitation projects that include family support and childcare facilities; and 4) continue funding organizations that serve the City of Moorpark children.

Six-Year Objective:

The Zoning Code was reviewed in 2011-12 and no changes were deemed necessary. Continue to consider incentives for co-locating childcare facilities with affordable housing; prioritize funding for projects with family support and childcare; provide funding assistance to support childcare.

**Table V-1
Housing Program Implementation Summary**

Housing Program	Program Objective	Program Action	Funding Source	Responsible Agency	Time-Frame
Housing and Neighborhood Conservation					
1. Housing Rehabilitation Program	Preserve and improve neighborhoods and housing	Provide loans for a maximum of 25 single-family units & 10 Mobile Homes.	Housing Trust Fund	CDD	2014-2021
2. Code Enforcement		Continue code enforcement activities	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
Residential Sites					
3. Sites to Accommodate Fair Share Needs	Provide sufficient sites to address the full range of housing needs identified in the RHNA.	Ensure no net loss of housing capacity.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
4. Downtown Specific Program		Continue to implement the Downtown Specific Plan	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
5. Farmworker Housing		Continue to implement the Code regarding farmworker housing regulations.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
6. Second Units		Continue to allow second units. Publicize second unit regulations.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
7. Emergency Shelters and Transitional/ Supportive Housing		Continue to implement the Municipal Code consistent with SB 2. Process an amendment to the Zoning Code concurrent with adoption of the Housing Element to update the definitions of transitional housing and supportive housing consistent with SB 745 of 2013.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
8. Single Room Occupancy		Continue to implement the Municipal Code to allow SROs.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
Provision of Housing and Housing Assistance					
9. Section 8 Rental Assistance	Facilitate rental opportunities	Continue to participate in the Section 8 program, advertise program availability, and encourage rental property owners to register their units with the Housing Authority.	Section 8 Vouchers /Certificates	Ventura County Housing Authority	2014-2021
10. Mortgage Credit Certificate Program	Facilitate home-ownership opportunities	Continue to participate in program and advertise	Ventura County	RDA	2014-2021
11a. Mobile Home Affordability	Preserve affordability of publicly-assisted housing	Monitor Mobile Home Park affordability.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
11b. Resale Refinance Restrictions & Option to Purchase		Continue to monitor the status of affordable housing restrictions.	Housing Trust Funds	CDD	2014-2021
12. Inclusionary Program	Facilitate the provision of affordable housing	Continue to implement fee expenditure priorities; Use inclusionary funds to assist in the development of VL units.	Department Budget, Housing Trust Funds	CDD	2014-2021

Housing Program	Program Objective	Program Action	Funding Source	Responsible Agency	Time-Frame
13. Land Assemblage /Disposition/ Acquisition	Assembles property to encourage affordable housing	Assist in the purchase and assembly of land for housing	Housing Trust Funds and CDBG	CDD	2014-2021
14. Regulatory and Financial Assistance	Provide assistance to projects that address local housing needs	Continue to provide assistance for projects that address local housing needs.	Housing Trust Funds	CDD	2014-2021
15. Assistance to CHDOs	Addresses local housing needs by working with CHDOs	Continue to work with local CHDOs by providing assistance for affordable housing including supportive housing for persons with developmental disabilities..	Housing Trust Funds	CDD	2014-2021
Removal of Government Constraints					
16. Density Bonus	Encourage development of affordable housing	Continue to facilitate affordable housing development through density bonus and incentives.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
17. R-P-D Zone Designation and Planned Development Permit Process	Provide flexibility in meeting local housing needs, streamline review process.	Continue to use the R-P-D Zone designation to address local housing needs.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
18. Off-Street Parking	Reduce parking requirements for affordable housing.	Continue to allow reduced parking for affordable units.	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
Fair and Equal Housing Opportunity					
19. Fair Housing Services	Provide fair housing services	Continue to provide fair housing services	Department Budget, CDBG funds	CDD	2014-2021
20. Reasonable Accommodation	Reduce potential constraints to persons with special needs	Continue to implement the Municipal Code to ensure reasonable accommodation	Department Budget	CDD	2014-2021
21. Childcare Facilities	Support additional childcare facilities in conjunction with affordable housing.	Consider incentives for co-locating childcare facilities with affordable housing; prioritize funding for projects with family support and childcare; provide funding assistance to support childcare.	Department Budget; CDBG funds	CDD	2014-2021
Summary of Quantified Objectives					
Income Category		New Construction	Rehabilitation	Preservation	
Extremely Low Income		145	5	0 (no at-risk units)	
Very Low Income		144	15		
Low Income		197	15		
Moderate Income		216	0		
Above Moderate Income		462	0		

Appendix A – Evaluation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element

Section 65588(a) of the *Government Code* requires that jurisdictions evaluate the effectiveness of the existing Housing Element, the appropriateness of goals, objectives and policies, and the progress in implementing programs for the previous planning period. This appendix contains a review the housing goals, policies, and programs of the previous Housing Element and evaluates the degree to which these programs have been implemented during the previous planning period, 2008 through 2013. This analysis also includes an assessment of the appropriateness of goals, objectives and policies. The findings from this evaluation have been instrumental in determining the City's 2014-2021 Housing Implementation Program.

Table A-1 summarizes the programs contained in the previous Housing Element along with the source of funding, program objectives, accomplishments, and implications for future policies and actions.

Table A-2 evaluates the appropriateness of previous goals and policies, and identifies any changes that are called for in response to the City's experience during the past planning period.

Table A-3 presents the City's progress in meeting the quantified objectives from the previous Housing Element.

**Table A-1
Housing Element Program Effectiveness Evaluation 2008-2013
City of Moorpark**

Housing Program	Program Objective	Program Action	Funding Source	Responsible Agency	Time-Frame	Accomplishments and Objectives for the 2013 Housing Element
Housing and Neighborhood Conservation						
1. Housing Rehabilitation Program	Preserve and improve neighborhoods and housing	Provide loans for a maximum of 25 single-family units & 10 Mobile Homes.	RDA Set-Aside and Housing Trust Fund	RDA	2008-2014	Ongoing – 4 Mobile Home loans during this period; no single family loan applications have been received during this period.
2. Code Compliance		Continue code enforcement activities	Department Budget	CDD	2008-2014	Ongoing
Residential Sites						
3. Sites to Accommodate Fair Share Needs	Provide sufficient sites to address the full range of housing needs identified in the RHNA.	Rezone sites totaling 25.8 acres to allow multi-family development at a density of 20 units/acre.	Department Budget	CDD	2012	3 sites totaling 26.14 acres were rezoned on September 4, 2013 satisfying the requirements of this program (Ordinances #421 & 422). All 3 sites were rezoned to RPD-20U to allow multi-family development at a density of 20 units/acre by-right. All 3 parcels can accommodate more than 16 units and allow exclusively residential use.
4. Downtown Specific Program		Prepare Downtown Specific Plan land inventory	Department Budget	RDA & CDD	2012	Completed with latest Specific Plan update and update to High street area parking requirements (Ordinance #381 adopted 9/2/2009)
5. Farmworker Housing		Comprehensive review of farmworker housing regulations & Municipal Code amendment.	Department Budget	RDA & CDD	2012-13	Completed, Ord #420 (Sept 11, 2013). Farmworker housing with 36 beds or 12 units is permitted by-right in any zone where agriculture is a permitted use.
6. Second Units		Continue to allow second units. Publicize second unit regulations.	Department Budget	CDD	2008-2014	Ongoing
7. Emergency Shelters and Transitional/ Supportive Housing		Amend the Municipal Code consistent with SB 2.	Department Budget	CDD	Within one year of Housing Element adoption	Completed, Ord #415 (Oct 3, 2012)
8. Single Room Occupancy		Amend the Municipal Code to allow SROs.	Department Budget	CDD	Within one year of Housing Element adoption	Completed, Ord #415 – Oct 3, 2012

Housing Program	Program Objective	Program Action	Funding Source	Responsible Agency	Time-Frame	Accomplishments and Objectives for the 2013 Housing Element
Provision of Housing and Housing Assistance						
9. Section 8 Rental Assistance	Facilitate rental opportunities	Continue to participate in the Section 8 program, advertise program availability, and encourage rental property owners to register their units with the Housing Authority.	Section 8 Vouchers /Certificates	Ventura County Housing Authority	2008-2014	Ongoing
10. Mortgage Credit Certificate Program	Facilitate home-ownership opportunities	Continue to participate in program and advertise	Ventura County	RDA	2008-2014	Ongoing, no applications received during this period.
11a. Mobile Home Affordability	Preserve affordability of publicly-assisted housing	Monitor Mobile Home Park affordability.	Department Budget	RDA	2008-2014	Ongoing
11b. Resale Refinance Restrictions & Option to Purchase		Continue to monitor the status of affordable housing restrictions.	RDA Set-Aside, Housing Trust Funds	RDA	2008-2014	Ongoing
12. Inclusionary Program	Facilitate the provision of affordable housing	Adopt fee expenditure priorities; Use inclusionary funds to assist in the development of VL units.	Department Budget, Housing Trust Funds	RDA & CDD	2008-2014	Completed, Updated City Council Policy (Oct 2, 2013)
13. Land Assemblage /Disposition/ Acquisition	Assembles property to encourage affordable housing	Assist in the purchase and assembly of land for housing	RDA Set-Aside, Funds and CDBG	RDA	2008-2014	16 lots have been purchased for potential assemblage during this period.
14. Regulatory and Financial Assistance	Provide assistance to projects that address local housing needs	Continue to provide assistance for projects that address local housing needs.	RDA Set-Aside or Housing Trust Funds	CDD	2008-2014	Ongoing
15. Assistance to CHDOs	Addresses local housing needs by working with CHDOs	Continue to work with local CHDOs by providing assistance for affordable housing.	RDA Set-Aside, Housing Trust Funds	RDA & CDD	2008-2014	Ongoing, no CHDOs have requested assistance during this period.
Removal of Government Constraints						
16. Density Bonus	Encourage development of affordable housing	Continue to facilitate affordable housing development through density bonus and incentives.	Department Budget	CDD	2008-2014	Completed (Ordinance #376 adopted 7/1/2009)
17. R-P-D Zone Designation and Planned Development Permit Process	Provide flexibility in meeting local housing needs, streamline review	Continue to use the R-P-D Zone designation to address local housing needs. Amend the Planned Development	Department Budget	CDD	2008-2014	Completed, Ords #421 and #422 (Sept 11, 2013)

Housing Program	Program Objective	Program Action	Funding Source	Responsible Agency	Time-Frame	Accomplishments and Objectives for the 2013 Housing Element
	process.	Permit review process to designate the Planning Commission as the final approval authority (rather than City Council); and modify the required findings for approval to confirming that the project complies with objective development and design standards.				
18. Off-Street Parking	Reduce parking requirements for affordable housing.	Process a Code amendment to reduce parking requirements.	Department Budget	CDD	2012	Completed, Ord #420 (Sept 11, 2013)
Fair and Equal Housing Opportunity						
19. Fair Housing Services	Provide fair housing services	Continue to provide fair housing services	Department Budget, CDBG funds	CDD	2008-2014	Ongoing
20. Definition of Family	Reduce potential constraints to persons with special needs	Municipal Code amendment	Department Budget	CDD	2010-11	Completed, Ord #415 (Oct 3, 2012)
21. Reasonable Accommodation	Reduce potential constraints to persons with special needs	Municipal Code amendment	Department Budget	CDD	2010-11	Completed, Ord #420 (Sept 11, 2013)
22. Childcare Facilities	Support additional childcare facilities in conjunction with affordable housing.	Review Zoning Code in 2011-12; consider incentives for co-locating childcare facilities with affordable housing; prioritize funding for projects with family support and childcare; provide funding assistance to support childcare.	Department Budget; CDBG funds	CDD	2011-12 and ongoing	Ongoing

**Table A-2
Appropriateness of Housing Element Goals and Policies**

Goal	Policy	Appropriateness
Housing and Neighborhood Conservation		
1	Assure the quality, safety, and habitability of existing housing and the continued high quality of residential neighborhoods.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 1.1 Continue to monitor and enforce building and property maintenance code standards in residential neighborhoods.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 1.2 Continue to provide City public safety services, infrastructure maintenance, graffiti removal, and other public services to maintain the quality of the housing stock, neighborhoods, and the environment.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 1.3 Promote increased awareness among property owners and residents of the importance of property maintenance to long-term housing quality.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 1.4 Continue to promote the repair, revitalization, and rehabilitation of residential structures which have fallen into disrepair.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 1.5 Support the preservation and maintenance of historically and architecturally significant buildings and neighborhoods.	Appropriate - retain
Adequate Residential Sites		
2	Provide residential sites through land use, zoning and specific plan designations to provide a range of housing opportunities commensurate with the city's needs.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 2.1 Identify adequate sites which will be made available and zoned at the appropriate densities, to facilitate goals set forth in the 2014-2021 RHNA.	Retain as revised for the new planning period.
	Policy 2.2 Ensure residential sites have appropriate public services, facilities, circulation, and other needed infrastructure to support development.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 2.3 Investigate rezoning or redesignation of commercial lots that are no longer economically viable uses to appropriate residential uses.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 2.4 Promote and encourage mixed-use residential and commercial uses where appropriate as a means to facilitate development.	Appropriate - retain
Housing Assistance and Special Needs		
3	Expand and protect housing opportunities for lower income households and special needs groups.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 3.1 Use public financial resources, to the extent feasible, to support the provision and production of housing for lower-income households and persons and families with special needs.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 3.2 Provide rental assistance to address existing housing problems and provide homeownership assistance to expand housing opportunities.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 3.3 Support the conservation of Mobile Home parks, historic neighborhoods, publicly-subsidized housing, and other sources of affordable housing.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 3.4 Require, in aggregate, 10% of new units to be affordable to lower-income households. Establish priority for usage of in-lieu fee as follows: 1 st priority – production of affordable housing; 2 nd -- subsidy of affordable housing; 3 rd -- housing rehabilitation; and 4 th priority -- housing assistance.	Appropriate - retain
Removal of Government Constraints		
4	Where appropriate, mitigate unnecessary governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 4.1 Periodically review City regulations, ordinances, fees/exactions to ensure they do not unduly constrain the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 4.2 Offer regulatory incentives and concessions for affordable housing, such as relief from development standards, density bonuses, or fee waivers where deemed to be appropriate.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 4.3 Provide for streamlined, timely, and coordinated processing of residential projects to minimize holding costs and encourage housing production.	Appropriate - retain

Goal	Policy	Appropriateness
	Policy 4.4 Support infill development at suitable locations and provide, where appropriate, incentives to facilitate such development.	Appropriate – retain
Fair and Equal Housing Opportunity		
5	Ensure fair and equal housing opportunity for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, family type, ancestry, national origin, color, disability or other protected status.	Appropriate – retain
	Policy 5.1 Provide fair housing services to residents and assure that residents are aware of their rights and responsibilities with respect to fair housing.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 5.2 Discourage discrimination in either the sale or rental of housing on the basis of state or federal protected classes.	Appropriate - retain
	Policy 5.3 Implement appropriate action items identified in the Ventura County Analysis of Impediments to ensure fair and equal access to housing.	Appropriate - retain

**Table A-3
Progress in Achieving Quantified Objectives 2008-2013**

Program Category	Quantified Objective*	Progress
New Construction		
Very Low (Extremely Low)	363 (181)	16
Low	292	39
Moderate	335	93
Above Moderate	627	456
Total	1,617	603
Rehabilitation		
Very Low (Extremely Low)	20	1 Mobile Home unit
Low	15	3 Mobile Home units
Moderate	-	
Above Moderate	-	
Total	35	
Preservation of Units at Risk of Conversion**		
Very Low	-	-
Low	-	-
Moderate	-	-
Above Moderate	-	-
Total	-	-

Notes:

*Quantified objective and progress for new construction reflect units built 2006-2012, per the previous RHNA

**There were no at-risk units in the previous period

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B

Residential Land Inventory

1. Assumptions and Methodology

The assumptions and methodology for the residential land inventory are provided below and summarized in Tables B-1 through B-3. Affordability assumptions are based on deed restrictions or market conditions (for approved projects) as described in Chapter II (Needs Assessment). Market conditions indicate that attached housing units are likely to be affordable to moderate-income households in Moorpark. Sites without project entitlements as assigned to the lower-income category if the allowable density is 20 units/acre or more, pursuant to state law¹³.

2. Approved Projects

Projects that are approved but not yet completed, are shown in Table B-1. These projects include 51 very-low-income units, 61 low-income units, 196 moderate units, and 776 above-moderate units. Income categories are based on specific project requirements or market conditions, as described in Section 1 above. Given the uncertainty in the current economic climate, it should be recognized that the anticipated development schedule noted for each project is based on City experience with typical development projects. If the recovery in the real estate market proceeds more slowly than expected, the development timeline for some projects may be delayed.

Pending Projects

Pending projects are those with filed applications but no approval has been granted. The status and anticipated characteristics of these projects are described below. The potential units for these projects are summarized in Table B-2. The estimated number of lower-income units is based on the default density of 20 units/acre.

- The “Specific Plan-1 Hitch Ranch” project consists of 283 acres of vacant land located north of the Union Pacific Railroad, west of Walnut Canyon Road (Highway 23), and east of Gabbert Road. An application has been filed for a Zone Change, General Plan Amendment, development agreement, residential planned development permit and a tract map to allow construction of 755 dwelling units, 3 acres of institutional use, and open space. The project is currently undergoing review, an EIR scoping meeting has been held and environmental review is underway. Final entitlement review is expected to occur in 2014, which would allow subdivision maps and building permits to be issued during the current planning period. The site slopes downward from north to south and has available utility connections and services. There are no additional city requirements that would affect the rate of construction or limit the number of housing units that can be constructed at any one time, following approval of entitlements. The estimate of 468 lower-

¹³ Government Code Sec. 65583.2(c)(3)(B) provides that a density of 20 units/acre is deemed to be appropriate for lower-income housing in Moorpark.

income units for this project is based on the rezoning of a 23.44-acre portion of the site that was designated for multi-family development at 20 units/acre in 2013 (see Figure B-1). No specific development project has been submitted to the City for this high-density planning area. The developer has indicated that the entire planning area may be sold to a multi-family builder.


- The "RPD 2005-02 (Chiu)" project consists of a 2+ acre site on the north side of Everett Street, east of Walnut Canyon Road (Highway 23). An application has been filed for a Zone Change, General Plan Amendment, development agreement, residential planned development permit and a condominium tract map to allow construction of a 60-unit condominium building with 125 parking spaces. The city is currently negotiating the development agreement with the applicant and preparation of a Negative Declaration is underway with the public hearings anticipated for a 60-unit condominium project. The site slopes downward from north to south and has available utility connections and services. Final entitlement review is expected to occur in 2014, which would allow building permits to be issued during the current planning period. There are no additional city requirements that would affect the rate of construction or limit the number of housing units that can be constructed at any one time, following approval of entitlements. Although no entitlements have yet been approved for this property, the affordability levels shown in Table B-2 assume that only 20% of the units will be restricted to lower-income households because the developer has expressed the intention of building the entire project as condominiums.
- The "RPD 2007-01 Casey Road - Mansi" project consists of 48.2 acres of vacant land on the north side of Casey Road, west of Walnut Canyon Road, (Highway 23). An application has been filed for a Zone Change, General Plan Amendment, development agreement, residential planned development permit and a tract map to allow construction of 390 senior housing units. The site is moderately sloping on the west and east with a shallow valley in the middle of the site. The application is currently incomplete and CEQA analysis has not yet begun. The property has available utility connections and services. Final entitlement review is expected to occur in 2014, which would allow building permits to be issued during the current planning period. There are no additional city requirements that would affect the rate of construction or limit the number of housing units that can be constructed at any one time, following approval of entitlements.
- The "Pacific Communities" project consists of 37.09 acres on the South Side of Los Angeles Avenue between Leta Yancy Road and Maureen Lane (see Figure B-2). An application has been filed for a Zone Change, General Plan Amendment, development agreement, residential planned development permit and a tract map to allow construction of 157 single-family detached dwellings and 300 attached units with integrated recreation areas for the community. The application is currently incomplete and CEQA analysis has not yet begun. The property is relatively flat and is bound on the southern perimeter by the Arroyo Simi. Remainder lot areas within the Arroyo Simi would be dedicated to the Ventura County Flood Protection District. The property

has available utility connections and services. Final entitlement review is expected to occur in 2014-15, which would allow building permits to be issued during the current planning period. There are no additional city requirements that would affect the rate of construction or limit the number of housing units that can be constructed at any one time, following approval of entitlements. A total of 300 lower-income units are assumed for this project based on a 15-acre planning area that is proposed at a density of 20 units/acre. Only conceptual development plans have been submitted to the City for this high-density planning area, and the anticipated entitlement would allow reconfiguration of the site plan to accommodate different product types. The developer has indicated that the planning area may be sold to a multi-family builder. As noted in Program 3, the City will take proactive steps to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development in this multi-family planning area.

Figure B-1
Conceptual Hitch Ranch Plan



Figure B-2
Conceptual Pacific Communities Plan



3. Vacant Land

The City's inventory of vacant land suitable for residential development is described below and summarized in Table B-3.

- The "Waste Management" property consists of 256 acres of vacant land, comprised of varied topography consisting of a valley ringed by moderately sloped foothills. This property is constrained by limited vehicular access, valuable natural habitat and wildlife corridors and floodways. No entitlement applications have been submitted for this property. The realistic capacity for this site (under current general plan) has been estimated at 6 units based on the 1 unit/40 acres land use designation. The realistic potential for multi-family development is not known at this time, since this area has not been the focus of any development studies. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period.
- The "Rasmussen" property consists of 68 acres of vacant land. The topography consists of mild to moderately sloping land adjacent to a rural large-lot equestrian oriented neighborhood. The realistic capacity for this site (under current Agricultural Exclusive zoning) has been estimated to be 1 unit based on density allowed in the AE zone. A General Plan amendment pre-screening application to increase density has been submitted and is under review. There is estimated to be potential capacity of up to 150 housing units on this property, which will be studied as part of the application review process. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period.
- The "AB Properties-North Village" property consists of 82.8 acres of vacant land. The realistic capacity for this site (under current zoning) has been estimated to be 16 units based on Rural Exclusive-5Acre zoning allowing 1 DU / 5 acres. A General Plan amendment pre-screening application has been approved to allow the processing of a request to increase density to allow up to 50 large-lot single-family homes on this property. Affordable housing would be provided off-site as determined through a development agreement, which is required for this project. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period.
- The "La Perch" property is a 25.73-acre site which has one single-family residence, one second unit and an equestrian boarding facility. The property is sloped and the useable areas are mostly comprised of a moderate slope leading up to a hilltop, with steeper unusable slopes dropping off to the west and north toward Walnut Canyon Road (Highway 23), and east to Spring Road. This property is adjacent to the Moorpark Highlands master planned residential community and is accessible from existing roadways, and has available utility connections and services. The realistic capacity for this site (under current zoning) has been estimated to be 2 units based on the Rural Agricultural-10Acre zoning, allowing 1 DU / 10 acres. No entitlement applications have been submitted for this property. The potential for higher-density development is currently unknown for this site, as no applications have been submitted. However, portions of the site are adjacent the Moorpark

Highlands master planned community which consists of a variety of densities, some of which are detached single-family homes and one neighborhood contains an attached tri-plex. The site appears to be developable at a similar density to that of adjacent single-family detached neighborhoods, with the steeper portions of the site remaining as natural sloped areas. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period.

- The “Old Fire Station Properties” (four contiguous parcels that can be consolidated) total approximately 1.36 acres, are owned by the City of Moorpark, with the intention of consolidation and resale to developers for construction of affordable housing. These properties are mostly undeveloped land except for an old unused fire station office and garage, and a vacant commercial office building. These properties are gently sloping from west to east with a drop in elevation of approximately five feet. These properties have access from Walnut Canyon Road (Highway 23), Charles Street, Walnut Street and Everett Street with available utility connections and services. The current capacity for this site is only 2 units based on current zoning of R-1, Commercial Office and Institutional. However, the anticipated capacity for the project is estimated at 20-25 units based on a density of 20 to 25 units/acre. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period. The site has excellent potential for affordable housing development during the planning period and the City completed a zoning amendment for the site to RPD-20-U in 2013.
- The “Walnut Canyon Road Properties” total 2.37 acres, are owned by the City of Moorpark and are being acquired for potential consolidation and construction of affordable housing units. Several of the parcels are contiguous, and it is anticipated that lots will be consolidated for the clustering of new developments. These properties are accessed from Walnut Canyon Road (Highway 23), with available utility connections and services. The properties are gently sloping towards the west and some lots have large slopes at the western perimeters of the properties. All of these lots have drainage easements along the western perimeter and some have an open drainage channel in these areas. The realistic capacity for this site (under current zoning) has been estimated at 18 units based on the Rural Exclusive zoning of 4 DU/Acre with a 100% density bonus for affordable housing. This could result in approximately 18 affordable housing units being constructed on this site. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development during this planning period. The City is currently in negotiations with a developer on an agreement for an affordable housing project.
- The “Charles Street” properties are 3 properties totaling 0.53 acre owned by the City. Two of the properties are contiguous and the other property is separated by a non-agency owned parcel. These properties are being consolidated for resale to a developer. Two of the properties are relatively flat with the topography having a gradual slope down to High Street. The third property is at a similar grade elevation as High street and is generally flat. All properties are currently unimproved with available utility connections and

services. The realistic capacity for this site (under current zoning) has been estimated to be a total of 6 units based on Residential Planned Development 7-14 DU/Acre zoning. The anticipated density for the project is 20 units/acre. At 100% affordable, this would result in a potential for construction of 10 affordable housing units. There are no known environmental constraints that would preclude development of this property during the current planning period. The City is currently exploring options for affordable housing development and it is feasible that rezoning could occur during the current planning period.

4. Second Units

The Zoning Code allows second units in single-family residential districts, pursuant to state law. A total of nine second unit permits have been issued from 2005 to 2013, or an average of about one unit per year. It is anticipated that second unit development will continue at a similar pace during the 2014-2021 planning period, which would result in 8 additional units. Based on affordability categories (see Chapter II) these units are expected to rent in the Very-Low and Low-income ranges.

5. Land Inventory Summary

The following chart summarizes the City's residential development potential compared to the RHNA allocation for the 2014-2021 planning period. This table demonstrates that the City has sufficient capacity to accommodate the RHNA in all income categories for the planning period.

Site Category	Income Category			Total
	Lower	Mod	Above	
Approved projects (Table B-1)	112	196	776	1,084
Pending projects (Table B-1)	312	48	834	1,194
Potential second units	8			8
Vacant land – residential (Table B-3)	521		52	573
Subtotal	945	244	1,662	2,851
RHNA (2014-2021)	486	216	462	1,164
Adequate capacity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: City of Moorpark Community Development Dept., 2013

**Table B-1
Approved Residential Projects**

Project	General Plan/ Zoning	Acreage	Density	Potential Units by Income Category			Total
				VL/L	Mod	Upper	
Approved projects							
Tract 4928 (Toll Bros.)*	Med.-Low Res./ RPD 1.48U	43	1.5 u/ac			6	6
Tract 5463 (Toll Bros.)	Med.-Low Res./ RPD 1.48U	43	1.1 u/ac			49	49
Tract 5045 Planning Areas 1-4(Pardee)*	Moorpark Highlands SP-2/Specific Plan	81	3.9 u/ac			67	67
Tract 5045 Planning Area 5(Pardee)*	Moorpark Highlands SP-2/Specific Plan	9	12.0 u/ac	0/5	4		9
Tract 5860 Planning Area 7(Pardee)*	Moorpark Highlands SP-2/Specific Plan	21.8	6.1 u/ac	0/7		126	133
Tract 5045 Planning Area 8&9 (Toll Bros.)*	Moorpark Highlands SP-2/Specific Plan	68	1.9 u/ac			132	132
Tract 5133 (Shea Homes)*	Very High Res./ RPD 12U	9	8.5 u/ac		18		21
Tract 5130 (Moorpark 150, LLC)	Med.-Low Res./ RPD 1.63U	72	1.5 u/ac	5**/7**		110	122
Tract 5187 (W. Lyon/Resmark)*	Med.-Low Res./ RPD 1.8U	140	1.8 u/ac			183	183
Tract 5405 (W. Lyon/Resmark)	High Res./ RPD 7U	3	5.7 u/ac	4/4	9		17
Tract 5425 (Shea Homes)	Very High Res./ RPD 12U	15	6.8 u/ac	6/9	5	82	102
Tract 5347 (Birdsall)	Rural High Res./RPD 1U	21	1.0 u/ac	1**/1**		21	23
Essex Moorpark Apartments	Very High Res./ RPD 19U	11	19.0 u/ac	16/24	160		200
Area Housing Authority Apartments	High Res./RPD 7-14U	0.9	22.2 u/ac	19/1			20
Subtotal				51/61	196	776	1,084
Pending projects							
Specific Plan -01 (Hitch Ranch)	Specific Plan	283	2.2 u/ac			287	287***
RPD 2005-02 (Chiu)	Existing: Very High Res./ RPD 7-14U Proposed: 25 u/ac	2	25.0 u/ac	12	48		60
RPD 2007-01 Casey Road (Mansi)	Existing: Rural Low & Med Res./ RE & RE-5ac Proposed: 2.3 u/ac	48	2.3 u/ac			390	390
Tract 5053 (Pacific Communities)	High Res./ RPD 7U	35	7.1 u/ac****	300		157	457
Subtotal				312	48	834	1,194
TOTALS				424	244	1,610	2,278

Notes:

Information is current as of September 2013

No development rights are implied for Pending Projects and Vacant sites. Estimated units and affordability are subject to change.

All VL & Low units are deed-restricted

*Project under construction – No. of units refers to units not completed as of September 2013

** Off-site units to be provided under terms of Development Agreement

*** A 23.44-acre portion of this Specific Plan was rezoned to RPD-20-U in 2013. The entire Specific Plan would allow 755 total units including the portion previously rezoned.


****15-acre portion expected at 20 udu/ac

**Table B-3
Vacant Land Inventory
City of Moorpark**


Site	Existing General Plan/Zoning	Size	Potential Units by Income Category*			Total
			V/L/L	Mod	Upper	
Hitch Ranch (APN 511-0-020-110, 130, 180)	VHR / RPD-20	23.44 acres	468			
SE corner Moorpark Ave/Everett St. (APN 512-0-062-020, 120, 110, 070)	VHR / RPD-20	1.36 acres	27			
SE end of Majestic Court (APN 506-0-020-525)	VHR / RPD-20	1.34 acres	26			
Waste Management (APN 500-0-292-015, 035, & 195; 500-0-281-465, & 545)	Open Space 2 / OS 1 at 10 d.u./acre	192 acres			19	19
Rasmussen (APN 511-0-190-205 & 305)	Rural Low / AE - 1 d.u./40 acres	67.96 acres			1	1
AB Properties-North Village (APN 511-0-190-120)	Rural Low / RE-5 - 1 d. u./5 acres	88.2 acres			17	17
La Perch (APN 513-0-130-025)	Open Space 1 / RA-10 - 1 d.u./10 acres	25.73 acres			2	2
Old Fire Station Property / 782 Moorpark Avenue	Public Inst. / Institutional	30,000 sq.ft.			unknown	unknown
Old Fire Station Property / 798 Moorpark Avenue	Office / C-O	7,500 sq.ft.			unknown	unknown
Old Fire Station Property / 765 Walnut Street	Med. Res. / R-1 – 4 d.u./ acre	15,000 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
Old Fire Station Property / 81 Charles Street	C-2 Gen. Comm. / R-1 – 4 d.u./ acre	7,500 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1063 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,167 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1073 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,225 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1083 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,388 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1095 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,421 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1113 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,421 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1123 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,421 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1293 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	23,436 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
1331 Walnut Canyon Road	Med Res. / RE – 4 d.u./ acre	11,718 sq.ft.			1-2	1-2
450 Charles Street	High Res. / RPD 7-14 d.u./ acre	7,750 sq. ft.			1-2	1-2
460 Charles Street	High Res. / RPD 7-14 d.u./ acre	7,750 sq. ft.			1-2	1-2
484 Charles Street	High Res. / RPD 7-14 d.u./ acre	7,750 sq. ft.			1-2	1-2
TOTALS			521		+/- 52	

*Based on current zoning designations

Figure B-3
RPD-20 Sites



**Figure B-4
Residential land Inventory**



Appendix C Public Participation Summary

This summary of Housing Element public participation efforts describes opportunities for public involvement along with an explanation of how public comments were incorporated into the Housing Element. In addition, prior to the adoption hearings all interested parties were given the opportunity to review proposed revisions.

Public participation is an important component of the planning process, and this update to the Housing Element has provided residents and other interested parties numerous opportunities for review and comment. Public notices of all Housing Element meetings and public hearings were published in the local newspaper in advance of each meeting, as well as posting the notices on the City's website. The draft Housing Element was made available for review at City Hall, posted on the City's website, as well as at the Public Library. The document was also made available to housing advocates and non-profit organizations representing the interests of lower-income persons and those with special housing needs. The following organizations with an interest in housing for lower-income households were included in the notices of all public meetings for this Housing Element update:

Contact Person	Agency
Tanya McMahan	Constructing Connections/WorkLife Child Development Resources
Daniela Ramirez	House Farm Workers
Bernardo Perez	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation
Milton E. Radant	Habitat for Humanity Simi Valley, CA
Debra Vernon	Communications and Corporate Responsibility American Water, Western Region
Susan Englund	VC Homeless & Housing Coalition
Eileen McCarthy	California Rural Legal Assistance
Environmental Services	City of Simi Valley
Community Development Dpt.	City of Thousand Oaks
Resource Management Agency	County of Ventura
Gloria Miguez	Interested Citizen

After receiving comments on the draft Housing Element from the State Housing and Community Development Department, a proposed final Housing Element was prepared and made available for public review prior to adoption by the City Council. The following is a list of public meetings held to review the 2014-2021 Housing Element:

City Council Study Session	October 2, 2013
Planning Commission hearing	December 17, 2013
City Council hearing	January 14, 2014

Table C-1 below summarizes the public comments received during the review of the draft Housing Element along with a description of how those comments have been addressed.

**Table C-1
Housing Element Comments and Responses Summary**

Comment	Response
<p>Dr. David Lopez-Lee, presenting a letter submitted by Bernardo Perez, Chair of House Farm Workers, indicated that while there was support for the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, the letter requested including the words "local investment in" in Goals and Policies that were prepared for the draft Housing Element. Also, the identified housing site at the southeast end of Majestic Court seems to be burdened with access and infrastructure issues.</p>	<p>Staff indicated to the Planning Commission that the additional adjectives of "local investment" may not be necessary since the goals and policies adequately cover the City's commitments in providing identification of suitable parcels for residential development and already ensures residential sites have appropriate services and facilities. Furthermore staff indicated that comments relating to access burdens to the Majestic Court site are not substantiated because an access easement to this property has already been acquired from Shea Homes. The Planning Commission concurred with staff's response on the questions raised.</p>