

7. ABILITY TO MEET PROJECTED NEED

7.0 ABILITY TO MEET FAIR SHARE ALLOCATION

State Housing Element law requires an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment. A thorough inventory makes possible an analysis of the residential capacity of a community and indicates both the problems and possibilities for new housing. This Housing Element assesses the realistic capacity based on General Plan and zoning land use designations. The city has and continues to evaluate several scenarios for provision of additional residential units. The analysis for the ability to meet fair share allocation in this Housing Element does not include sites that would require amendments to these plans and the zoning ordinance. This is because the city has adequate capacity to meet and exceed its regional fair share allocation based on existing residential designated parcels.

This Housing Element identifies housing needs beyond the fair share allocations. It contains policies that attempt to meet the needs identified. Section 6 of this document contains the housing needs analysis, and the tables that show that the city has capacity to meet and exceed its regional fair share allocation. Table 50 below summarizes the tables in Section 6 dealing with ability to meet fair share allocation. The table shows that the city has capacity to provide a minimum total of 357 units above its regional fair share allocation.

Income Levels	Projected Units to Show Ability to Meet Fair Share	SACOG's Allocation / Fair Share
Very-Low and Low-income	561	463
Moderate-income	729	621
Above-Moderate- income	1,035	878
Total	2,325	1,962
Sources: SACOG's RHNP; City of Davis Planning and Building Department		

New Residential Developments

The Housing Element contains several policies that require provision of affordable housing when new residential projects are proposed. This is to ensure that affordable housing is provided to the maximum extent possible. The purposes of the affordable housing requirement include provision of "affordable" housing to the impacted segment of the community, (i.e., households of extremely-low, very-low, low and moderate-income). There are some policies in the current Housing Element that were not in the 2001 General Plan Housing Element. Some of these new policies require and encourage permanent affordability for all new affordable housing projects. However, the policies recognized that there might be when permanent affordability is not feasible and at such times, the policies require full recapture of all city subsidies. The intent for

these new policies is to ensure that affordable housing units remain affordable for the longest possible time, and if not possible, that the city subsidies are recovered to assist another very-low, low or moderate-income household. Also, some new policies call for preservation of existing affordable units, including Section 8.

All new residential developments are required to provide a percentage of the units created as affordable units. The General Plan policies requiring inclusionary zoning standards for all new residential projects are summarized below.

- 25 percent of ownership units in new projects will be provided as for-sale and self-help units and made available at affordable levels to very-low, low and moderate-income households, and
- 25 percent of rental units or multifamily projects containing 5 to 19 units will be made available at affordable levels to very-low and low-income households; and 35 percent of rental units or multifamily projects containing 20 or more units will be made available at affordable levels to very-low and low-income households.

The basic assumption for the above policies is that moderate-income households can afford market-rate apartments. This assumption is supported by discussion in this document about rental affordability of various income levels based in family and household incomes. The projected need for housing affordable to moderate-income households could be met by the combination of market-rate apartments, subsidized apartments, or the affordable ownership housing requirements. The affordable housing policies ensure that all segments of the community are provided housing in new residential projects. Other assumptions include 1) the market-rate for-sale units are for the above-moderate income households, 2) the affordable for-sale and self-help units are for very-low, low and moderate-income households, and 3) market-rate rental units are for moderate to above-moderate-income households.

Affordable Housing Task Force

The Affordable Housing Task Force was created in September of 2001 by the City Council with the charge of evaluating housing needs, suggesting changes to the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and reviewing this update to the Housing Element of the General Plan. The Affordable Housing Task Force is currently reviewing for update the Affordable Housing Ordinance. The existing Affordable Housing Ordinance is being reviewed to address concerns that include the following:

- Inclusion of new General Plan policies
- Better ownership housing programs
- Provision of more permanently affordable units
- Prudent use of city, state and federal funds to provide more affordable units

- Preferences for affordable housing developed based on identified needs
- Streamlined and well-defined process for developers relative to entitlement approvals
- Technical amendments to the existing ordinance
- Better tracking of units provided overtime
- Accommodation of the identified various needs of special needs group
- Improve accessibility standards for disabled persons in the affordable housing projects
- Encourage varying types and models of affordable housing to better serve the various income groups

Sections 6 and 9 of this document further address areas of improvement to the existing Affordable Housing Ordinance.

The city is at the forefront of affordable housing provision in the state and possibly in the nation. The city is committed to improving the affordable housing programs already in existence as well as providing better forms of affordable housing programs. The city has recently created a new position to coordinate the Affordable Housing Programs. The question for the city is not whether it will accommodate its regional fair share of affordable housing, but rather how best to maintain, manage, and improve its affordable housing programs. Again, the city has capacity to meet and exceed its regional fair share allocation for this planning period.

7.1 PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR THOSE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Housing Element policies establish programs to meet the needs of special groups identified in Section 6 of this Housing Element. Section 9 of this Housing Element contains various policies and programs with objectives to address the provision of housing for the identified special needs group.

There are special objectives in the Housing Element to ensure and encourage provision of housing for special needs group often neglected during new residential development proposal reviews. This is one of the reasons why the city has inclusionary policies. The Affordable Housing Ordinance facilitates the provision of housing for those with special needs, which usually are very-low and low-income persons.

Table 52 below contains some Housing Element policies and the number of units proposed in the Housing Element to address the identified housing needs of some special need groups. Most special needs group identified fall under very-low and low-income household groups, such as female-headed households with children, low-income minority households, disabled persons, seniors, and large households.

TABLE 52 UNITS PROVIDED/PRESERVED FOR SPECIAL NEEDS GROUP, 2002-07		
Special Needs Group	Objective	Housing Element Policy
Seniors	<u>50 units</u>	Policy HOUSING 1.8 Action c
Disabled Persons	20 units in / near shopping centers <u>10 units - additional</u>	Policy HOUSING 1.4 Standard b Policy HOUSING 1.4 Action c
Very-low, Low-Income Persons and Single Persons	20 units 50 units 150 units 25 units rental assistance 476 Section 8 units preserved 15 shared housing units <u>150 permanent affordable rental units</u>	Policy HOUSING 1.3 Action a Policy HOUSING 2.1 Action c Policy HOUSING 2.1 Action e Policy HOUSING 2.1 Action g Policy HOUSING 2.1 Action I Policy HOUSING 2.1 Action o Policy HOUSING 2.2 Action a
Total:	966 units	
Source: Planning and Building Department		

7.2 PROVISION OF SITES FOR HOUSING (LAND INVENTORY)

Availability of Vacant Land for Development

As stated in Section 6 of this document, there is adequate land designated for residential development in the city to meet and exceed the regional fair share allocation for this planning period. State law (65583(a)(3)) requires the land inventory to identify and categorize specific housing sites by vacant land versus redevelopment land, and to note the current or proposed zoning and available infrastructure.

The city has decided through its 2001 General Plan to grow within the boundaries identified in its 1987 General Plan. This means that no new annexations are envisioned in the General Plan, and all new residential, commercial and industrial development would have to occur within the current city limits. The resultant effect is that all new residential development to meet the city's fair share would have to be generated through infill projects.

However, given that to meet the fair share allocation, localities are allowed to use units built during the interim planning period, the city is able to meet and exceed its fair share allocation. Vacant and under utilized parcels within the city limits are shown on Map 1 below.

On April 2, 2003, the City Council passed and adopted a resolution directing staff to implement an annual city growth parameter, prepare amendments to the General Plan and Phased Allocation Ordinance, and prepare a joint housing strategy with UC Davis. This was part of the city's

efforts to address internal housing needs through 2015, which is beyond the horizon of this planning period. The locations identified to address the internal housing needs of the city are speculative, and therefore are not made part of this document. This is because the city has capacity to meet and exceed its fair share allocation.

Table 53 below is Table 5 of the 2001 General Plan. It contains residential buildout through 2010, which is the life of the current General Plan. The 2001 General Plan projected buildout units in 2010 did not include some of the infill projects that had been brought forward since its adoption. Approved infill projects since its adoption include the Olive Drive and Cantrill Drive projects, which add additional 351 units. This will bring the buildout total to 25,882 units.

There are some flaws in the 2001 General Plan Table 5. The table notes that by 2010 the city's population will be 62,182 based on the estimated total units at 1.95 vacancy rate and 2.484 persons per household assumptions. The state DOF's January 1, 2002 population and housing projection data for Davis indicated that there were 24,717 total housing units and 63,324 persons.

TABLE 53					
2010 BUILDOUT OF GENERAL PLAN WITHIN CITY - RESIDENTIAL UNITS					
Planning Areas	Low Density	Medium Density	High Density	Total	Notes
Northwest	0	0	0	0	
North Central	1,468	0	365	1,833	a
Northeast	0	0	0	0	
West Davis	2,604	48	2,031	4,683	
Central Davis	3,608	298	3,628	7,534	b
East Davis	2,839	0	1,781	4,620	c
East Davis/Mace	1,142	105	374	1,621	
Core Area	217	6	371	594	d
South Davis	2,269	166	1,783	4,218	
Southeast	0	0	0	0	
Gateway/Olive Drive	203	0	225	428	
City Totals	14,350	623	10,558	25,531	
Notes:					
1. Land use assumptions include:					
a. Covell Center site: no development.					
b. Grande School site: no development.					
c. Simmon Ranch residential designation: 72 low-density units.					
d. Core Area: 80 high-density infill units.					
2. The 2010 population projection is 62,182 assuming a 1.95% vacancy rate and 2.484 persons per household.					
<u>Source:</u> 2001 General Plan Table 5, page 98					

The exact data on the acreage of vacant residential zoned parcels within the city is not known at this time. However, the following are known facts:

- There are limited developable residential parcels in the city.
- There are potential developable residential infill parcels in the city (densification potential due to under-utilization of some parcels).
- There is continued interest in the potential conversion of vacant nonresidential property to residential uses.
- The city has capacity to meet and exceed its regional fair share allocation for this planning period.

Infill Potential

The 2001 General Plan defines "Infill" as urban development or redevelopment on vacant or "underutilized" land within a city's boundaries as an alternative to accommodating growth through expansions of city boundaries. "Underutilized" land is defined as developed or partially developed land, which could be developed in other uses or more dense and intense uses consistent with city policies, surrounding uses and potential impact issues. Infill development projects vary in size from single-family dwellings and multifamily developments on scattered lots to large mixed-use developments covering a city block. The recent state law permitting second units outright in residential districts will contribute to the number of infill units developed in cities, including Davis.

Given that the 2001 General Plan boundaries are the same as the 1987 General Plan, infill development has become an essential strategy for meeting the city's housing needs. The 2001 General Plan contains infill development policies that encourage reasonable densification of the city rather than sprawling. The infill policies also have the advantages of achieving the city's desired smart growth, and also the provision of needed housing beyond the city's fair share allocation.

Table 54 below contains data on developable residential zoned sites within the city and their status. The identified sites in the table are vacant parcels zoned for residential developments. A conservative estimate of 15 units is projected as infill units based on under-utilized parcels. This table indicates that the city has capacity to accommodate approximately 293 single-family residential units, and about 743 multifamily units for a total of 1,037. The 1,037 units exclude units built during the interim planning period and units built from July 1, 2002 to March 1, 2003, which is the baseline date for Table 54. See Map 1 for sites.

Tables 44, 45 and 45A contain unit counts based on the income levels relative to the city's ability to meet its fair share allocation. Unlike Tables 44, 45 and 45A, Table 55 below looks at only infill potential based on vacant and under-utilized parcels. Tables 44, 45 and 45A show that there is a 2,325 unit capacity to meet the regional allocation.

Table 54 indicates that there are potentially additional units to be added through densification of under-utilized parcels not yet identified. Given that there is no exact science to be used to determine when and where these infill units could be built, the potential additional units are not included in Tables 44, 45 and 45A. See Map 2 for sites.

**TABLE 54
DEVELOPABLE RESIDENTIAL ZONED SITES**

Project	Status	SF	MF
Zone Vacant Allocated Single-family Lots	Vacant single-family lots in the city as of March 1, 2003	117	-
El Macero Estates, Allocation effective 01-01-04 (#1 on Map 1)	Vacant approved single-family lots	22	-
312-316 D Street (#2 on Map 1)	Under construction	4	-
Olive Park Apt. (#24 on Map 1)	Under construction	-	123
Cantrill Drive (#4 on Map 1)	Under construction	-	132
Almondwood Apartment (#7 on Map 1)	Under construction		5
Oasis/Willowcreek South (#13 on Map 1)	Entitlements approved	43	45
Walnut Terrace Seniors (#5 on Map 1)	Under Construction	-	30
Second & G, Chen building (# 6 on Map 1)	Under construction	-	4
El Macero Estates 2 land ded (#8 on Map 1)	Approved; seeking financing	-	36
Pacifico final phase (#9 on Map 1)	Under construction	-	5
Bridges at Wildhorse (#10 on Map 1)	Zoned & has all approvals	-	80
2707 Fifth Street (#12 on Map 1)	Zoned & has all approvals	9	-
Kelly Point - conditionally permitted under the zoning (#14 on Map 1)	CUP application is pending	-	42
Oakshade land ded site (#15 on Map 1)	Zoned; no developer selected	-	15
Willowbank 9 Unallocated (#23 on Map 1)	Await final map approval	19	-
Callori on Olive Drive (#3 on Map 1)	Under construction	49	-
Moore Village - Wildhorse Dedicated Affordable land (#11 on Map 1)	Zoned & has all approvals		59
Woodbridge land dedication (#25 on Map 1)	Zoned; no developer selected	-	16
Olive Park land donation (#20 on Map 1)	Zoned; seeking financing	-	43
Cantrill Drive land donation (#21 on Map 1)	Zoned; seeking financing	-	53
Mace Ranch affordable housing site east of Spafford (#26 on Map 1)	Currently zoned Single-family, but could be rezoned to multifamily	15	-
Infill Developments	See Note below	15	55
Total		293	743

Notes:

- SF or Single-family** includes detached and attached units. **MF** refers multi-family units.
- The projects identified in this table are residential zoned infill parcels that can easily be developed with minimal entitlement approval review processes.
- Affordable Sites** - Some affordable housing sites have not obtained needed funds for development. Woodbridge, Oakshade and Mace land dedications await selection of a developer.
- Infill Developments:** 1) Core, 2) Old East, 3) other areas, and 4) R-3 area north of Core are projected at a conservative 70 units combined; 15 single-family and 55 multifamily. There are several under developed sites in the older portion of the city that staff believes would see additional units ranging from second units to intensification based on the density for the districts. The potential for the additions is projected to generate about 70 units during this planning period.

Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department, May 12, 2003

Table 55 below contains known potential infill sites that would require amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, the Specific Plan and the General Plan.

TABLE 55**POTENTIAL DEVELOPABLE INFILL SITES REQUIRING GENERAL PLAN, SPECIFIC PLAN, AND/OR ZONING AMENDMENTS**

Site/Acres	SF	MF	Comments
Con Agra site - 100 acres (#1 on Map 2)	550	150	Preapplication ; requires General Plan and Zoning amendment
Grande school site - 8.4 acres (#28 on Map 2)	42	-	No Application; requires subdivision map, and General Plan amendment
Davis Manor - 4.969 acres (#29 on Map 2)	-	20	No Application; requires zoning change
Kennedy Place - .998 acres (#30 on Map 2)	12	-	No Application; requires zoning change
Willowbank 9 church two sites 16.48 acres (#31 on Map 2)	60	-	No Application; requires Specific Plan, General Plan, and Zoning amendments
Cowell corridor sites @ Oakshade (8.6-acre), Seiber (4-acre), Willowcreek commercial & light industrial (16.5 acres) (#32 on Map 2)	15	240	No Application; requires Specific Plan, General Plan, and Zoning amendments (i.e., GPA, SPA & rezoning)
Aspen Court - 8.62 acres (#17 on Map 2)	23	-	No Application; requires GPA/rezoning
Da Vinci Court - 2 acres (#18 on Map 2)	-	40	Application pending; requires SPA, GPA and rezoning
Simmons east cemetery - 9.62 (#33 on Map 2)	50	-	No Application; requires rezoning
Old East - No acreage data	-	100	No Application; possibility of rezoning
Mace Ranch interior retail site - 8.5 acres (#27 on Map 2)	85	15	No application; requires GPA, SPA and rezoning
Holt property @ NEC of Mace and Cowell - 1.728 acres (#34 on Map 2)	-	30	No Application; requires GPA and rezoning
Wildhorse school site - 9.01-acre (#35 on Map 2)	90	-	No Application; requires GPA/rezoning
Wildhorse horse ranch - 25-acre (#36 on Map 2)	120	-	No Application; requires GPA/rezoning
Sycamore Lane Apts. - 4.8 acres (#19 on Map 2)	-	10	Application submitted; requires GPA
Sequoia Villas II - 4.1 acres (#16 on Map 2)	20	16	Rezoning application is pending
PG&E service center, 5 th & L 22.47-acre (#37 on Map 2)	150	150	No Application; requires GPA and rezoning
Total Units:	1,217	771	Combined Total: 1,988

Notes:

1. **SF or Single-family** includes detached and attached units. MF refers to Multi-family units.
2. The sites identified in this table are known potential non-residential sites with potential for residential development.
3. Approval of any these sites would require significant discussions at neighborhood levels as well as Planning Commission and City Council.
4. Other potential infill sites not included area 1) 770 Pole Line Road, 2.473-acre First Southern Baptist Church; 2) 514 C Street 0.83-acre Newman Catholic Ctr.; and 3) 421 Russell Blvd., 2.21-acre Davis Community Church

Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department, May 12, 2003

Table 55 above is provided to show that the city has potential developable sites that could be used to meet the regional fair share allocation if the city has no capacity with appropriately zoned parcels to meet its fair share allocation. The listing of the sites does not constitute an approval of

the sites for residential development. Also, it does not mean that the sites are marked by the city for residential development. It simply indicates that the designations of these sites could potentially be amended to allow residential uses.

Infill Potential Studies

In January 1996 the city completed an "Infill Potential Study." The study examined the potential for infill development as an alternative to accommodating growth through expansions to city boundaries. Citywide infill potential was assessed based on 36 potential sites. Five detailed case studies were prepared to examine specific design and economic issues related to infill development feasibility. The study identified the potential for more than 1,000 residential units. The study also indicated that the following factors make financial feasibility difficult for an infill project: high cost of land; large differences in values per square foot between detached and attached single-family homes; the lack of a difference in impact fees based on the size of the unit; the small difference between development fees for infill projects and peripheral growth areas; and parking requirements versus available space.

Since the 1996 study, the city has conducted varying forms of infill analysis for housing provision. The city continues to evaluate prospects for infill development as compared to expansions to city boundaries. The on going "Internal Housing Needs Analysis" is another form of studies geared to address infill potential. A resolution resulting from this Internal Housing Needs Analysis was passed and adopted by the City Council on April 2, 2003. This resolution directs staff to continue evaluation of the implementation of Annual City growth parameter among other tasks. This effort is currently underway.

Residential Development in Non-residential Sites

Residential development on commercial or industrial sites usually requires rezoning and possibly amendments to the General Plan or Specific Plan. The 2001 General Plan states that a residential development or uses would be conditionally allowable in land designated for Neighborhood Retail, Office, and Business Park in the General Plan Land Use Map.

The city has allowed some residential units in non-residential areas without amendments to the General Plan and zoning, such as manager units in storage projects. The General Plan, the Core Specific Plan and Core Zoning Ordinance allow residential developments in the downtown district also. Recently, some mixed-use projects have been approved in the downtown district. Some of these projects have been built, while some are under construction. Some projects with residential units that are under construction include 404 F Street (McCormick Building) and 312-316 D Street (Cheng's Hotel project). There is potential for more mixed-use projects in the Core Area. However, to what extent these projects will be built is unknown at this time.

Availability of Infill Parcels for Residential Development

Tables 54 and 55 above show, there are limited but adequate infill zoned residential sites to meet and exceed the city's regional fair share allocation for this planning period. Table 55 shows that the city has capacity to provide additional infill residential units with amendments to the General

Plan, Specific Plans and Zoning Ordinance. Table 56 below contains remaining vacant parcels' data relative to units available to all income-levels. The table shows that there are approximately 1,043 units to be built on available vacant lots during this planning period.

TABLE 56		
VERY-LOW, LOW AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS UNITS		
Available Units/lots by Income Levels		
	Number of Lots	Number of Units
Very-low Income	-	109 units
Low Income	10 lots	206 units
Moderate Income	22 lot	311 units
Above-Moderate Income	257 lot	128 units
TOTAL	289 units	754 units
<u>Notes:</u> The data here is based on available lots or projects already approved in designated residential districts.		
<u>Source:</u> Planning and Building Department		

Phased Allocation System and Infill Developments

The city's growth management program is implemented through a "rolling" five year Phased Allocation Program. Most of the city's recent residential subdivisions are about to be built out and have full allocations. Only Willowbank Unit 9 subdivision does not have allocation for its 19 units, which includes 8 affordable units. It is anticipated that this subdivision will receive allocation for the 19 units before the end of this planning period.

The following are exceptions to the Phased Allocation requirement:

- 1) allocations granted prior to February 14, 1990;
- 2) all non-residential developments;
- 3) multi-family residential development;
- 4) all types of development within the Core Area including, but not limited to, residential development;
- 5) small urban parcels;
- 6) permanently low and very-low income housing units as defined in the city's adopted affordable housing program or affordable housing; and
- 7) discretionary reserve units.

Table 56 below contains data on the remaining vacant single-family and duplex lots in the city. Table 56 above shows that there are fewer developable single-family residential lots available as compared to multifamily parcels relative to units to be built. It also shows that 83 percent of the multifamily units to be built would serve very-low, low and moderate-income households. Therefore, the Phased Allocation System would not adversely impact the city's ability to meet its fair share.

Availability of Parcels for Residential Redevelopment

For the purpose of this Housing Element redevelopment is defined as re-use of already developed land in a manner that creates additional residential units. This section is divided into two parts: land that is zoned for residential development and land that would require rezoning to allow redevelopment for residential uses.

Land Zoned for Residential Development

Throughout Davis, there are a number of parcels that have been developed at densities lower than the maximum allowed pursuant to the Zoning and General Plan densities. Some of these parcels therefore have the potential for redevelopment at greater densities. Since the 1987 General Plan, the maximum densities for residential districts have been increased. This means that some of these parcels with lower densities could accommodate additional units.

Most of the Residential One and Two Family (R-2) Districts, which allow two single-family units per lot or a duplex per lot, have lots containing single-family units. See map below. There is potential to add units to the lots in the R-2 districts. The number of potential additional units is based on the number of lots that currently contain only one unit and that could meet the zoning standards. There is no data on the number of lots with one unit.

Development at less-than-maximum densities is also found in older multifamily areas. In the Residential Garden Apartment (R-3) district (or Residential High Density designated parcels in the General Plan), there are a number of parcels developed with single-family houses or duplexes or fewer units than are allowed under today's General Plan and zoning densities.

Table 57 below contains the increased residential densities as contained in the 2001 General Plan. The General Plan permits up to 25 units per gross acre in the High Density designated parcels. The table shows that the 2001 General Plan densities will increase the potential for infill developments. However, the extent to which infill projects will be proposed cannot be determined at this time. This is because a number of factors influence a property owner's decision to develop his or her property at its full potential. The factors include market conditions, availability of financial resources, knowledge or lack of it on the property's full potential, and interests in developing or not developing the property at its full potential. However, the city has made it possible through the granting of greater densities for infill development projects to occur.

TABLE 57	
2001 GENERAL PLAN RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES	
Land Use Designation	Residential Densities
Low Density	3.00 to 5.99 units per gross acre
Medium Density	6.00 to 13.99 units per gross acre
High Density	14.00 to 25.00 units per gross acre
<u>Notes:</u>	
1. The maximum allowable “pre-bonus” density would be 4.79 units per gross acre in the low density category; 11.20 in the medium density category, and 20.00 in the high density category.	
2. The maximum allowable “post-bonus” densities would be 5.99 in the low-density category, 13.99 in the medium density category, and 25.00 in the high density category (assuming a 25% density bonus).	
3. The minimum “pre-bonus” density would be 2.40 units per gross acre in the low-density category. The minimum “post-bonus” density would be 3.00 units per gross acre in the low-density category.	
<u>Source:</u> City of Davis General Plan May 2001	

Non-Residential Land.

Parcels that are not currently developed with residential uses but may have potential for redevelopment as residential include older commercial or industrial parcels. Some parcels are improved with buildings, which are deemed under-utilized. Another possibility includes what may be considered interim commercial uses such as mini-storage projects. Approval of residential development on sites like these would require rezoning and possibly General Plan amendment. Some level of environmental review would be necessary to address potential impacts such as traffic, noise, and aesthetics.

There are other parcels in the city, which are partially developed (i.e., underutilized) but have potential for addition of housing units. This is especially true for some church sites in the city. Table 55 above contains some potential non-residential designated sites and the necessary approvals to add or build residential units on the sites. Again, the listing of these properties does not indicate any intention on the part of the city or the property owners to encourage residential development on the sites. The sites are listed because they are possible residential developable sites with appropriate re-designation approvals.

Thus, there are under-utilized non-residential parcels that could be developed had the city not been able to meet its fair share allocation. There is no reason to believe or not believe that some of these non-residential parcels could not come in with amendment requests in order to allow residential development during this planning period. Should such requests be granted, it would add to the city's ability to meet and continue to exceed its fair share allocation for this planning period.

The last map of this section contains all zoning districts within the city limits. It shows all land uses within the city.

Facilities and Services

There are adequate facilities and services to accommodate the units needed to meet the city's fair share allocation. This is because the available residential zoned land needed to meet the fair share allocation are in subdivisions and/or part of under-utilized parcels within the city that were approved given adequate facilities and services. The city has capacity to meet and exceed its fair share allocation through existing zoned residential parcels and infill projects. The facilities and services, including their standards, are already in place. New residential projects that would involve annexations would have to show how prospective residents would be served. All new residential projects will comply with city already established standards for facilities and services.

The Phased Allocation Ordinance does not permit granting of allocations if there are inadequate facilities and services for any new residential development. The facilities and services needed to accommodate infill developments and the existing zoned residential parcels are already in place as part of the original subdivision approval. The city entitlement approval process for a residential development includes evaluation of the project at its early stage of processing for compliance with city policies, codes and standards, which include provision of adequate facilities and services.

Given that the city will meet and exceed its regional fair share allocation through approved existing residential lots and infill projects, there are no significant issues with facilities and services. The city continues to evaluate new infill projects relative to adequacy of facilities and services needed for the project. The 2001 General Plan EIR analyzed the impacts of infill development relative to facilities and services and identified no significant impacts.