



RICHMOND
SHAPING THE NEW 100 YEARS

City of Richmond General Plan 2030 Housing Element



Adopted January 2013

450 civic center plaza, richmond, ca 94804 | www.ci.richmond.ca.us/planning



Housing Element

Prepared By:

City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Department
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804 | 510.620.6706
www.ci.richmond.ca.us/planning

Seifel Consulting, Inc.
220 Main Street | San Francisco, CA 94015 | 415.618.0700
www.seifel.com

Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc.
983 Osos Street | San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 | 805.595.1345
www.lisawiseconsulting.com

Table of Contents

Richmond General Plan 2030 Housing Element

Introduction	1
Role of Housing Element.....	1
Public Participation	2
Outreach through Preparation of the Richmond General Plan 2030	2
Further Outreach after Adoption of the Richmond General Plan 2030	4
Relationship to Other General Plan Elements	7
Organization.....	7
Community Profile	8
Population.....	8
Education and Employment.....	10
Households.....	13
Housing Stock.....	16
Housing Needs	21
Housing Cost, Affordability and Overpayment.....	21
Special Needs Populations	25
Regional Housing Needs Allocation	32
Housing Constraints	35
Governmental Constraints.....	35
Possible City Constraints to Housing for Disabled Persons	53
City Efforts to Remove Housing Constraints.....	54
Non-governmental Constraints.....	55
Housing Resources and Opportunities	57
Adequate Sites: Available Sites for Housing	57
Potential Development Constraints	62
Opportunities for Energy Conservation.....	64
Review of Previous Element	66
Housing Goals, Policies and Actions.....	77

Table of Contents

Richmond General Plan 2030 Housing Element

Table of Tables

Table 5.1 Population Growth.....	9
Table 5.2 Age Distribution.....	9
Table 5.3 Racial Composition.....	9
Table 5.4 Foreign Born and Linguistically Isolated.....	10
Table 5.5 Educational Attainment.....	11
Table 5.6 Employment by Industry.....	11
Table 5.7 Principal Employers (2009-2010).....	12
Table 5.8 Unemployment Rate.....	12
Table 5.9 Job Growth.....	12
Table 5.10 Household Growth.....	14
Table 5.11 Households Tenure.....	14
Table 5.12 Household Composition.....	14
Table 5.13 Overcrowded Households.....	15
Table 5.14 Household Income.....	15
Table 5.15 Median Household Income by Race.....	16
Table 5.16 Household Poverty Status.....	16
Table 5.17 Household Stock by Unit Type.....	19
Table 5.18 Housing Stock by Year Built.....	19
Table 5.19 Vacancy Rate.....	20
Table 5.20 Assisted Rental Housing Development At-Risk of Conversion prior to 2017.....	20
Table 5.21 Qualified Entitles in Contra Costa County.....	20
Table 5.22 Median Sales Price.....	22
Table 5.23 Owner Affordable Housing Costs.....	23
Table 5.24 Median Gross Rents.....	23
Table 5.25 Renter Affordable Housing Costs 2012.....	23
Table 5.26 Gross Rents by Bedroom.....	24
Table 5.27 Overpaying Households.....	24
Table 5.28 Percentage of Low-Income Households Overpaying for Housing.....	24
Table 5.29 Housing Problems for Extremely Low-Income Households.....	25
Table 5.30 Senior Population Growth.....	28
Table 5.31 Senior Population by Age.....	28
Table 5.32 Senior Households.....	29
Table 5.33 Services for the Elderly or Disabled.....	29
Table 5.34 Large Households and Housing Units.....	30
Table 5.35 Female-Headed Households.....	30
Table 5.36 Persons with Disabilities by Employment Status.....	30
Table 5.37 Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type.....	31
Table 5.38 Developmentally Disabled Residents by Age.....	31
Table 5.39 Services and Housing Resources for Homeless Persons and Families in Richmond.....	32
Table 5.40 Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2007 – 2014.....	34
Table 5.41 General Plan Residential Land Use Descriptions.....	43
Table 5.42 Adopted General Plan Residential Land Use Designations and Development Standards.....	44
Table 5.43 Current Single Family Residential Zoning Districts and Development Standards.....	44

Table of Contents

Richmond General Plan 2030 Housing Element

Table of Tables (contd.)

Table 5.44 Current Multifamily Residential Zoning Districts and Development Standards.....	45
Table 5.45 Parking Requirements	46
Table 5.46 Residential Land Uses Permitted by Residential Zoning District	46
Table 5.47 Residential Land Uses Permitted by Commercial Zoning District.....	47
Table 5.48 Residential Land Uses Permitted by All Other Zoning Districts.....	48
Table 5.49 Timeframes for Permit Procedures.....	49
Table 5.50 Required Application Materials	50
Table 5.51 Typical Processing Procedures by Residential Project Type.....	51
Table 5.52 Development Permit Fees	52
Table 5.53 Proportion of Fee in Overall Development Cost for a Typical Residential Development	53
Table 5.54 Total Vacant Residential Sites.....	59
Table 5.55 Comparison of Regional Growth Need and Vacant Sites.....	59
Table 5.56 Units Approved, Permitted And/Or Built Since 2007	60
Table 5.57 Energy Conservation Programs in Richmond	65
Table 5.58 Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 1999-2006 and Units Provided	66
Table 5.59 Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives	67
Table 5.60 Quantified Objectives 2007-2014.....	77

Appendices

- Appendix A. Housing Age and Condition Map
- Appendix B. Priority Development Area Map
- Appendix C. Vacant Land Inventory and Vacant Land Maps
- Appendix D. Richmond Livable Corridors Plan
- Appendix E. Flooding, Sea Level Rise and Tsunami Inundation Maps
- Appendix F. Landslide and Earthquake Faults Maps

Introduction

The State of California has declared that “the availability of housing is of vital statewide importance, and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order.” (State Government Code §65580) Accommodating the housing needs of the State of California is an important goal for the City of Richmond, regional agencies and State agencies. As California’s population continues to grow and pressure on resources increases, Richmond continues to be concerned with providing adequate housing opportunities while maintaining a high standard of living for all residents in the community.

The ethnic and cultural diversity of Richmond residents is a major asset. The City continues to be one of Contra Costa County’s most diverse communities, with 39.5 percent of 2010 residents Latino, 25.9 percent African American, and 13.3 percent Asian. Almost one-third of the community is foreign born.

With the adoption of the Richmond General Plan 2030, the City has established a well-defined long-term plan to address the physical, economic, cultural and social needs of people of all physical abilities, social strata and income levels. Richmond aims to be an inclusive city where the built environment is functional and accessible to all residents, development impacts are shared equitably, and new development is sensitive to a diverse array of social, cultural and environmental contexts. The City values safe housing and neighborhoods with a range of housing types and price levels to accommodate diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and lifestyle choices, and promotes policies to restore its traditional compact neighborhoods.

Role of the Housing Element

The State of California recognizes the vital role local governments play in the availability, adequacy and affordability of housing. As such, State law requires every jurisdiction in California to adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan to guide its physical development; the Housing Element is one of the seven mandated elements of the General Plan. Housing Element law mandates that local governments adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The law recognizes that in order for the private market to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development. As a result, State housing policy rests largely upon the effective implementation of local General Plans and in particular, local Housing Elements. State law also requires the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD) to review local housing elements for compliance and to report its findings to the local government.

Further, California’s Housing Element law requires that each city and county develop local housing programs to meet its “fair share” of existing and future housing needs for all income groups. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is responsible for developing and assigning these regional needs, or “RHNA,” to Bay Area jurisdictions. Consistent with the current RHNA planning period, the Richmond Housing Element is a seven-year plan extending from 2007-2014. Further, State of California Government Code §65583(a)(7) requires “An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs.” The Housing Element must include the following:

- An analysis of population and employment trends;
- An analysis of the City’s fair share of the regional housing needs;
- An analysis of household characteristics;
- An inventory of suitable land for residential development;

- An analysis of governmental and non-governmental constraints on the improvement, maintenance and development of housing;
- An analysis of special housing needs;
- An analysis of opportunities for energy conservation; and
- An analysis of publicly assisted housing developments that may convert to non-assisted housing developments (at-risk housing).

The purpose of these requirements is to develop an understanding of the existing and projected housing needs within the community and to set forth policies that promote preservation, improvement and development of diverse types and costs of housing throughout Richmond.

This Housing Element covers the period from 2007 through 2014 and was prepared in compliance with State General Plan law pertaining to Housing Elements.

Public Participation Requirement

According to State of California Government Code §65583(c), local jurisdictions must “make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort.” Active community participation throughout the update process contributes to a Housing Element that is a more thorough and accurate representation of the City’s needs and desired actions. Public input has played an important role in the formulation of this Housing Element.

Outreach through Preparation of the Richmond General Plan 2030

The initiation of this Housing Element was developed in tandem with the comprehensive update to Richmond’s General Plan. Outreach was conducted through the overall General Plan Update process to identify key housing needs, challenges and successes and to craft a vision for the role of housing access and affordability in the coming years. This process culminated in late 2010, when the Draft Housing Element was submitted to the State HCD for its review. Following receipt of the State HCD letter, the City conducted additional outreach to solicit further community input.

The following set of events and forums describe the community involvement for the development of the Housing Element as part of the preparation of the Richmond General Plan 2030.

Workshops

The General Plan Update process included a series of “town hall” style public workshops and interactive land use alternative charrettes. The City’s outreach for these meetings included bilingual newsletters mailed to all Richmond postal customers on two separate occasions, local newspaper coverage, announcements through churches, and leaflets distributed in neighborhoods by neighborhood councils. In total, over 2,000 community members participated in one or more of 14 workshops.

Public Workshop I – November 8, 2010

This General Plan workshop focused specifically on the Housing Element. The workshop provided a venue for public input as well as an overview of current data, existing housing programs and initiatives, and draft goals and policies. It was important at this workshop to solicit input on the community’s vision related to housing. Approximately 40 attendees participated in the workshop. Participants provided input on the refinement and clarification of draft goals and policies and the following suggestions were made:

- Increase the affordable housing in-lieu fee
- Add an affordable housing overlay zone

- Improve code enforcement
- Further address foreclosures
- Address displacement for units in need of rehabilitation

Focus Groups

To better understand critical issues as seen from multiple viewpoints, the City conducted focus group discussions on a number of issues relevant to the General Plan Update, including affordable housing and real estate development. Advocates, experts and leaders appropriate to each of the focus areas were invited to participate. Participants were asked to identify Richmond’s key assets, issues and opportunities within the context of the overall meeting topic, focusing on how the General Plan could best address challenges and potential improvements. While several focus groups yielded information that was ultimately woven into this Housing Element, the affordable housing and real estate development group discussions were particularly relevant.

Plan Van

To ensure the greatest possible level of public participation, Richmond designed the “Plan Van,” a “rolling workshop” aimed at broadening interest and participation in the General Plan Update process. The overall goal of the Plan Van was to take the General Plan Update to Richmond’s residents and neighborhoods, either alongside special events or on weekend afternoons in prominent public locations. The van was equipped with maps, signs, promotional items, books and other materials intended to inform the public about the General Plan Update as well as solicit community opinions on Richmond’s assets, issues and opportunities. At each stop, participants engaged in a map exercise, identifying locations where they desired specific changes. Overall, participants completed more than 700 comment cards identifying Richmond’s key assets and major issues. The van also stopped at Richmond’s high schools to allow youth to participate in the process and discuss key issues affecting them, including affordability and quality of housing in their neighborhoods.

Website

Since inception of the General Plan Update in February 2006, the project website www.cityofrichmondgeneralplan.org served as a one-stop clearinghouse for information about the update. The website included a document library with up-to-date General Plan Update documents and resources as well as a comment form that generated over 100 questions and suggestions. Due to budget constraints, the third-party-hosted website for the General Plan Update was taken down upon adoption of the General Plan in April 2012. However, all information pertaining to the Housing Element has been moved to the City-hosted webpage www.ci.richmond.ca.us/housingelement.

Written Input

The City also received several emails and letters regarding the Housing Element update. These comments have been taken into account in the preparation of the Housing Element. The letters are available upon request from the Planning and Building Services Department.

Planning Commission Meeting January 20, 2011

City staff presented the draft Housing Element to the Richmond Planning Commission on January 20, 2011. The meeting provided an opportunity to receive initial public feedback and preliminary comments from the Planning Commission on the draft Housing Element.

Further Outreach after Adoption of the Richmond General Plan 2030

In December 2010, the City submitted the Draft Housing Element for review by the State HCD, and in February 2011, the State HCD submitted comments on the document. After the City adopted the General Plan 2030 on April 24, 2012, the City began making further revisions to the Housing Element, incorporating State HCD feedback and soliciting further public participation. The City and Consulting Team held stakeholder interviews and conducted two public workshops in order to continue to gather input for the Revised Draft Housing Element. These meetings and interviews are discussed below.

Community Outreach

Notification for the two public workshops was advertised in the West County Times newspaper each week for the two weeks prior to the public workshop. Project information and links were published on the City's Housing Element webpage and the workshop dates were listed on the Planning Division's Event Calendar online. In addition, the workshops were advertised twice in the City Manager's Weekly Report, during programming breaks on KCRT Cable Television, and through weekly e-mail event invites. Event invites were e-mailed three weeks prior to the first workshop and followed up with weekly reminder emails to:

- City Council members
- Planning Commissioners
- Design Review Board members
- Members of the Richmond Neighborhood Coordinating Council (RNCC)
- Neighborhood Council Presidents
- Other community stakeholders

Stakeholder Interviews

The City invited more than 60 key stakeholders to participate in interview sessions. On May 30, 2012, the City conducted 15 stakeholder interviews with 18 people. These sessions provided an opportunity for stakeholders to provide input on a one-on-one basis. Interviews were conducted in person or on the telephone. The City interviewed the following stakeholders:

- The Mayor
- City Council members
- Planning Commissioners
- Local developers
- Community organizations, including the RNCC, California Apartment Association, Community Housing Development Corporation
- City staff members
- Local nonprofit organizations, including Bay Area Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), Richmond Community Foundation, West Contra Costa County Council of Industries
- Richmond residents
- Local business/property owners
- Other stakeholders

The following ideas and opportunities were identified and discussed during the interviews:

- Increase housing rehabilitation and maintenance
- Revisit inclusionary housing ordinance/in-lieu fees
- Streamline permitting process

- Conduct outreach to improve public awareness and deflect unrealistic expectations
- Develop limited equity housing cooperatives
- Establish a Community Land Trust
- Consider rent control
- Discuss underutilized opportunity sites and different housing types in mixed-use and transit-oriented settings
- Address environmental issues
- Address foreclosed properties
 - Improve City enforcement of SB 1137 (foreclosed properties maintenance)
 - Create a registry of bank-owned foreclosed properties
 - Obtain foreclosed properties and prevent bulk investor buy-ups
 - Institute comprehensive strategic foreclosure prevention and management strategy
 - Create rent control task force on just cause eviction and discuss rent control
 - Address special needs of extremely low-income population and those living on Social Security

The following obstacles were identified and discussed during the interviews:

- Lack of funding and resources
- Issues with the permitting process and procedures
- Perception that City leadership is resistant to change
- Negative public perception that City deters new development

Public Workshops

The City conducted two additional public workshops to solicit input for the Housing Element Update. The meetings included discussion regarding Housing Element requirements, the update process, and areas requiring further attention. All meetings were open to the public and provided opportunity for questions and comments. Translation services were provided for Spanish-speaking participants.

Public Workshop II – June 28, 2012

The workshop was designed to solicit input from community members through coordinated participation in group activities. It also included a presentation on the status of the Housing Element, as well as an overview of current data and information on demographic trends, a preliminary sites analysis, and a review of existing housing programs and initiatives. Seventeen stakeholders participated in the session, including representatives of Contra Costa County Mental Health Commission, North & East Neighborhood Council, Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC), the City’s Design Review Board, Urban Habitat, Richmond Equitable Development Initiative (REDI), California Apartment Association, Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE), Richmond Police Department, Richmond Progressive Alliance (RPA), and Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC).

The workshop discussion focused on the following:

- Establishment of a Community Land Trust, including properties with collective ownership.
- Requirement for the development of on-site affordable units through the inclusionary housing ordinance (and discouraged use of in-lieu fee option).
- Identification of solutions for homelessness beyond shelters, renter protection, and tenant-landlord conflict resolution through the establishment of a rent board.

- Regulation of foreclosures by State Attorney General and/or district attorney.
- Status of AB 2447, establishing the California Neighborhood Revitalization Partnership of 2012.
- Expansion of the rental properties inspection program, which currently applies to multifamily housing with more than three units.

Foreclosures were also identified as a cause for concern, particularly the number of outside investors purchasing foreclosed properties.

In addition to presentations and open community discussion, two exercises were developed to understand community goals and perceptions of potential opportunity sites to accommodate housing needs. The first exercise—the desired outcomes exercise—asked participants to write down an ideal outcome of the Housing Element, either relating to specific Housing Element programs or related to community improvements in a broader sense. The majority of the responses fell into the following categories:

- Provide adequate affordable housing for all income levels and for both rental and ownership residences
- Establish a Community Land Trust
- Support housing rehabilitation
- Expand the rental properties inspection program

Other suggestions included provision of disabled housing, access to healthy food and daily services, walkable and complete neighborhoods, and adequate use of in-lieu fees.

The second exercise was a mapping exercise that asked participants to identify areas within the community that could accommodate Richmond’s housing needs, or that required attention in the Housing Element. Maps labeled with housing inventory sites were placed throughout the room. The participants were asked to point out sites not already identified on the maps and that were:

- Vacant sites, appropriate for new housing development
- Opportunity sites, appropriate for redevelopment
- Rehabilitation sites, areas with housing in need of rehabilitation

Public Workshop III – August 9, 2012

The third and final public workshop was designed as an in-depth round table discussion on seven recurring issue areas. Eight stakeholders participated in the session, including representatives of Lao Family Community, Contra Costa Health Commission, California Apartment Association, ACCE, Virtual Development Company and BWOPA. The seven issue areas discussed were as follows:

- Foreclosed properties
- Community Land Trust
- Just Cause
- Fair Rent/Rent Control
- Inclusionary Ordinance and In-Lieu Fee
- Affordable Housing Incentives
- Rental Rehabilitation

The discussion for each of these topics included potential recommendations for Housing Element actions.

Planning Commission Study Session

The Planning Commission has scheduled a study session for September 20, 2012. Staff will present the Revised Draft Housing Element to the Commission for its review and comment.

Availability of Revised Draft Housing Element

Upon completion of the Revised Draft Housing Element, the document will be made available to the public at the Planning and Building Services Department and the City's branch libraries. In addition, the Revised Draft Housing Element will be placed on the city's website at www.ci.richmond.ca.us/housingelement. The revised draft will also be sent to State HCD for its review and comment. Upon receipt of input from the State HCD, public hearings will be held before the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the adoption process for the Housing Element.

Relationship to Other General Plan Elements

State of California Government Code §65300.5 requires that "...the general plan and elements and parts thereof comprise an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies..." The purpose of requiring internal consistency is to avoid policy conflict and provide a clear policy guide for the future maintenance, improvement and development of housing within the City.

As part of the update of the Housing Element, the other Elements of the Richmond General Plan 2030 were reviewed to ensure consistency with the policies set forth in those elements. The City will maintain consistency between the Housing Element and the other General Plan elements so that policies introduced in one element are consistent with other elements. Whenever any element of the General Plan is amended in the future, the Housing Element will be reviewed and modified, if necessary, to ensure continued consistency among elements.

Organization

The Housing Element is organized into the following sections:

- **Community Profile** presents the current population, employment, household and housing trends in the City.
- **Housing Needs** details the existing housing needs of the City including special needs groups and their housing needs and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for the City.
- **Housing Constraints** includes an assessment of the various government and non-government constraints that may serve as a potential constraint to housing development and improvement in Richmond. It discusses potential city constraints to housing for persons with disabilities and reviews City efforts to remove constraints.
- **Housing Resources and Opportunities** presents an inventory of residential sites, and evaluates the availability of land resources for future housing development. It includes an analysis of potential development constraints of the sites identified for availability for residential development and examines opportunities for energy conservation.
- **Review of Previous Housing Element Performance** presents an analysis of the previous housing element and its effectiveness.
- **Housing Goals, Policies and Actions** represents the commitment of the City of Richmond to address the housing needs of the community, comply with state and federal housing requirements, and to implement the vision of the Richmond General Plan 2030.

Community Profile

This section of the Housing Element presents demographic and socioeconomic data such as population, household characteristics, housing stock conditions, and employment. Analysis of these demographic, housing and employment characteristics provides the background to adequately determine Richmond's present and future housing needs.

Population

Demographic changes such as population growth or changes in age can affect the type and amount of housing that is needed in a community. This section addresses population, age, race and ethnicity, educational attainment, and employment of Richmond residents.

Population Growth

Table 5.1 compares population growth between Richmond and Contra Costa County. Although Richmond has grown at a slower rate than the County as a whole over the last decade, Richmond is expected to grow at a faster pace than the County over the next two decades. In 2000, Richmond's population was 99,216. Between 2000 and 2010, Richmond grew at an average annual rate of 0.4 percent while the County grew at an average annual rate of 1.0 percent. As of 2010, Richmond's population was 103,701. Between 2010 and 2030, Richmond is expected to grow at an average annual rate of 1.2 percent compared to an annual growth rate of 1.0 percent for the County. By 2030, Richmond's total population is expected to reach 132,600.

Age Distribution

Housing need is often affected by the age characteristics of residents in the community. Different age groups have different lifestyles, income levels, and family types that influence housing needs. These housing choices evolve over time, and it is important to examine the changes in the age distribution of Richmond residents in order to identify potential impacts on housing needs.

Table 5.2 compares Richmond's age distribution between 2000 and 2010 compared to Contra Costa County in 2010. Richmond's population is steadily aging. Between 2000 and 2010 Richmond's median age increased from 32.8 to 34.8. Adults age 45 to 64 experienced the greatest change of all age groups, increasing from 21.2 percent of Richmond's population in 2000 to 25.2 percent in 2010, a 24 percent increase. In contrast, children age 5 to 17 decreased from 20 percent of Richmond's population to 17.5 percent during the same period. However, compared to Contra Costa County, Richmond's population in general is younger. Approximately 40 percent of Contra Costa County's population is over 45 years old, compared to only 35 percent of Richmond's population.

Racial and Ethnic Composition

Table 5.3 compares Richmond's racial and ethnic makeup in 2000 and 2010. Richmond continues to be one of Contra Costa County's most diverse communities with increasingly large Latino and Asian populations. In 2000, African Americans accounted for 35.6 percent of Richmond residents while Latinos, Non-Hispanic Whites and Asians accounted for 26.5, 21.2 and 12.2 percent respectively. In 2010, 39.5 percent of Richmond's residents were Latino, 25.9 percent were African American, 17.1 percent were Non-Hispanic White and 13.3 percent were Asian.

Table 5.4 compares Richmond's foreign-born population in 2000 and 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, Richmond's foreign-born population grew by 27.7 percent to 32,885 (32.2 percent of Richmond's total population). **Table 5.4** also identifies the number of households in Richmond that are linguistically isolated. The U.S. Census Bureau defines linguistically isolated households as households where no member over

14 years of age speaks English “very well.” In 2000, 9.2 percent of Richmond’s households were linguistically isolated. Recent immigrants and linguistically isolated households may face greater difficulties in gaining meaningful employment and acquiring adequate housing as they adjust to their new surroundings. As a result, household problems such as overcrowding and overpayment may be more likely.

**Table 5.1
Population Growth**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2030	Annual Growth Rate 2000-2010	Annual Growth Rate 2010-2030
Richmond	99,216	103,701	132,600	0.4%	1.2%
Contra Costa	948,816	1,049,025	1,273,700	1.0%	1.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Census; Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) "Projections 2009: Building Momentum."

**Table 5.2
Age Distribution**

Age Group	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2010		Contra Costa County 2010	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Preschool (under 5)	7,669	7.7%	7,679	7.4%	67,018	6.4%
School Age (5-17)	19,825	20.0%	18,121	17.5%	193,487	18.4%
College Age (18-24)	9,790	9.9%	10,364	10.0%	86,951	8.3%
Adults (25-44)	31,118	31.4%	30,846	29.7%	278,293	26.5%
Middle Age (45-64)	21,008	21.2%	26,109	25.2%	292,838	27.9%
Senior (65+)	9,806	9.9%	10,582	10.2%	130,438	12.4%
Total	99,216		103,701		1,049,025	
Median Age	32.8		34.8		38.5	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Census.

**Table 5.3
Racial Composition**

Race	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2010		Contra Costa 2010	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Hispanic or Latino	26,319	26.5%	40,921	39.5%	255,560	24.4%
Non-Hispanic White	21,081	21.2%	17,769	17.1%	500,923	47.8%
Black or African American	35,279	35.6%	26,872	25.9%	93,604	8.9%
American Indian	351	0.4%	250	0.2%	2,984	0.3%
Asian	12,077	12.2%	13,783	13.3%	148,881	14.2%
Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	476	0.5%	462	0.4%	4,382	0.4%
Other Race	400	0.4%	585	0.6%	3,122	0.3%
Two or More Races	3,233	3.3%	3,059	2.9%	39,569	3.8%
Total	99,216		103,701		1,049,025	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Census.

**Table 5.4
Foreign Born and Linguistically Isolated**

Place of Birth/ Linguistic Isolation	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2006-2010 Estimates		Contra Costa 2006-2010 Estimates	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Native to U.S.	73,965	74.2%	69,379	67.8%	782,896	76%
Foreign Born	25,751	25.8%	32,885	32.2%	241,913	24%
Total	99,716		102,264		1,024,809	
Linguistically Isolated ^a	3,186	9.2%				
Not Linguistically Isolated	31,566	90.8%				
Total Households	34,752					

a. The Census Bureau defines linguistically isolated as households where no member over 14 years of age speaks English “very well.”

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2006-2010 American Community Survey.

Education and Employment

A person’s level of education greatly influences her or his future income and in turn affects the type of housing that person can afford. Evaluation of the types of jobs held by community residents provides insight into potential earning power and the segment of the housing market into which they fall. Information on how a community’s employment base is growing and changing can help identify potential housing demand changes in the future.

Educational Attainment

Table 5.5 compares the level of educational attainment for Richmond residents. Current estimates suggest that a considerable percentage of Richmond residents continue to have less than a high school level of education. It is estimated that between 2000 and 2010, the percentage of Richmond residents 25 years and older with less than a high school diploma decreased slightly from 24.7 to 21.2 percent. Although the decrease suggests some improvement, the percentage of Richmond residents 25 years and older with less than a high school level of education is estimated to be 9.6 percent points higher than Contra Costa County.

Employment

Table 5.6 compares employment for Richmond residents in 2000 and 2010. Estimates indicate most Richmond residents continue to be employed in lower wage sectors such as the service, and production and transportation sectors. The proportion of Richmond residents employed in these sectors between 2000 and 2010 is estimated to have increased from 31.5 to 34 percent. During the same period, Richmond residents employed in the higher wage managerial and professional sector decreased from 33 to 31.7 percent.

Table 5.7 identifies the principal employers in Richmond by number of employees. The principal employers in Richmond are West Contra Costa Unified School District, Chevron Refinery, City of Richmond, Kaiser Permanente, and Sun Power.

Unemployment

Table 5.8 compares the unemployment rates for Richmond and the County between 2000 and June 2012. Although unemployment rates have remained high at both the local and national level since the start of the economic recession in 2007, Richmond’s unemployment rate has been historically higher than the County rate. Between 2007 and 2012, Richmond’s unemployment rate nearly doubled from 7.8 to 15.2 percent. During the same time frame, the County’s unemployment rate also doubled, increasing from 4.7 to 9.4 percent. Richmond’s unemployment rate has ranged between 2.5 and 6.7 percent higher than the County’s rate of unemployment over the past decade.

Job Growth

Table 5.9 compares job growth in Richmond and the County. Prior to the economic recession of 2007, the number of jobs in Richmond was growing at a faster pace than in the County overall. Between 2000 and 2005, Richmond is estimated to have added 1,800 jobs. This accounts for 23.3 percent of the estimated 7,720 total jobs added by the County during the same period. This trend is projected to reemerge as the local and national economy recovers. Between 2010 and 2030, Richmond is projected to add 23,460 jobs, which will represent 16.7 percent of total jobs projected to be added by the County as a whole. The jobs projected to be added countywide are expected to be primarily in health and educational services (25.4 percent), professional and managerial services (14.8 percent) and retail (12.0 percent).

Table 5.5
Educational Attainment

Education Level (Population 25 years and over)	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2008-2010 Estimates		Contra Costa County 2008-2010 Estimates	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Less than 9th grade	6,995	11.2%	7,276	10.9%	40,836	5.9%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	8,451	13.5%	6,875	10.3%	39,451	5.7%
High school graduate	13,672	21.8%	14,885	22.3%	133,581	19.3%
Some college, no degree	15,274	24.4%	14,551	21.8%	155,037	22.4%
Associate degree	4,252	6.8%	4,739	7.1%	56,755	8.2%
Bachelor's degree	8,845	14.1%	12,082	18.1%	172,341	24.9%
Graduate or professional degree	5,173	8.3%	6,341	9.5%	94,130	13.6%
Total	62,662		66,749		692,131	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

Table 5.6
Employment by Industry

Occupation	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2008-2010 Estimates		Contra Costa County 2008-2010 Estimates	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Managerial/Professional	14,088	33.0%	14,633	31.7%	200,430	41.5%
Sales and Office	11,296	26.5%	11,411	24.7%	122,151	25.3%
Service	7,748	18.2%	10,335	22.4%	84,201	17.4%
Production/Transportation	5,690	13.3%	5,387	11.7%	38,362	7.9%
Construction/Maintenance	3,857	9.0%	4,467	9.7%	38,232	7.9%
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	90	0.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Employed Residents	42,679		46,233		483,376	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.7
Principal Employers (2009 – 2010)**

Ranking	Richmond Employer	Employees
1	West Contra Costa Unified School District	2,568
2	Chevron Refinery	1,950
3	City of Richmond	911
4	Kaiser Permanente	600
5	Sun Power	500
6	Pacific Gas & Electric	299
7	U.S. Postal Service	294
8	Richmond Health Center	250
9	Target	245
10	Galaxy Desserts	190

Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Year Ended on June 30, 2010, Richmond Finance Department.

**Table 5.8
Unemployment Rate**

Year	Richmond	Contra Costa County
2000	6.0%	3.5%
2001	6.8%	4.1%
2002	9.5%	5.7%
2003	10.1%	6.1%
2004	9.0%	5.4%
2005	8.1%	4.9%
2006	7.2%	4.3%
2007	7.8%	4.7%
2008	10.2%	6.2%
2009	16.6%	10.3%
2010	17.8%	11.1%
2011	16.7%	10.4%
June 2012	15.2%	9.4%

Source: State Employment Development Department, July 2012.

**Table 5.9
Job Growth**

Jurisdiction	Number of Jobs				Annual Growth Rate 2000-2005	Annual Growth Rate 2010-2030
	2000	2005	2010	2030		
Richmond	39,250	41,050	40,660	64,120	0.9%	2.3%
Contra Costa County	371,310	379,030	376,820	516,910	0.4%	1.6%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) "Projections 2009: Building Momentum."

Households

Household characteristics are important factors when analyzing housing demand and supply, as well as future housing needs. Household type and size, age, composition, and income level all affect the type of housing needed in a community. This section details the various household characteristics affecting housing needs in Richmond.

Household Growth

Table 5.10 compares household growth in Richmond and the County. Prior to the economic recession of 2007, the number of households in Richmond was growing at a slower pace than in the County overall. This trend is expected to reverse as the local and national economy recovers. Richmond added 1,085 households between 2000 and 2005. This accounted for just 4.5 percent of the 24,181 total households added by the County overall during the same time frame. Between 2010 and 2030, Richmond is projected to add 10,380 households. This would represent an estimated gain of 519 households per year over the next 20 years.

Household Tenure

Housing tenure refers to whether a housing unit is owned, rented or vacant. Tenure is an important indicator of the housing climate of a community, reflecting the relative cost of housing opportunities, and the ability of residents to afford housing. Tenure also influences residential mobility, with owner units generally evidencing lower turnover rates than rental housing. **Table 5.11** compares household tenure in Richmond between 2000 and 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, Richmond added 1,468 households. During the same period the rate of homeownership declined by 1.6 percent compared the rate of renters. The rate of homeownership in Richmond is also much lower compared to Contra Costa County. In 2010, 67.1 percent of households in Contra Costa County were homeowners compared to 51.7 percent in Richmond.

Household Composition and Size

Table 5.12 compares household composition and household size in Richmond between 2000 and 2010. The proportions of Richmond's family and non-family households are estimated to have remained stable between 2000 and 2010, with the proportion of family households continuing to be substantially higher than non-family households. In 2010, it is estimated that 66.5 percent of households were composed of families. Of those households, relatively equal proportions consisted of families married with children and married without children. Similar to Richmond's household composition, average household size is also estimated to have remained relatively unchanged from 2.82 persons per household in 2000 to 2.83 in 2010.

Overcrowding

Overcrowding is defined as a situation where there is more than one person per room in an occupied housing unit. Severely overcrowding is defined as more than one and one-half persons per room in an occupied housing unit. Overcrowding can result from a low supply of affordable and adequate housing. Households that are unable to afford larger housing units may be forced to rent or purchase housing that is too small to meet their needs. **Table 5.13** compares overcrowding in Richmond between 2000 and 2010. The percentage of overcrowded households in Richmond is estimated to have declined from 15.3 percent in 2000 to 9.6 percent in 2010. Overcrowding continues to be higher among renter households, which represented 74.2 percent of overcrowded households in 2010.

Household Income

Table 5.14 compares household income levels in Richmond between 2000 and 2010, and presents County estimates. Richmond's median household income is estimated to have continued to lag behind the County overall. In 2000, Richmond's median household income (\$44,210) was 69.4 percent of the County's median of \$63,674. More recently in 2010, Richmond's median income (\$53,738) was estimated to have been 70.7 percent of the County's median income (\$76,046).

Table 5.15 lists Richmond’s median household income in 2010 by race and as a percentage of City and County median household incomes. Estimates show that Richmond’s median household income continues to vary significantly by race. Specifically, household median incomes are estimated to be significantly lower among American Indian, African American and Latino households as a percentage of the City’s and the County’s median household income. In contrast, Asians and Whites are estimated to have median household incomes significantly higher than the City’s overall median household income and slightly lower than the County’s.

Table 5.16 shows the level of poverty in Richmond between 2000 and 2010. The number of persons living in poverty is estimated to have increased from 16 percent in 2000 to 16.3 percent in 2010. Except for adults ages 18 and over, all groups may have experienced an increase in poverty.

**Table 5.10
Household Growth**

Jurisdiction	2000	2005	2010	2030	Annual Growth Rate 2000-2005	Annual Growth Rate 2010-2030
Richmond	34,625	35,710	36,940	47,320	0.6%	1.2%
Contra Costa County	344,129	368,310	392,680	461,330	1.4%	0.8%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) "Projections 2009: Building Momentum."

**Table 5.11
Household Tenure**

Tenure	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2010		Contra Costa County 2010	
	Households	% of Total	Households	% of Total	Households	% of Total
Owner	18,463	53.3%	18,659	51.7%	251,904	67.1%
Renter	16,162	46.7%	17,434	48.3%	123,460	32.9%
Total	34,625		36,093		375,364	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Census.

**Table 5.12
Household Composition**

Type	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2010		Contra Costa County 2010	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Families	23,042	66.5%	24,018	66.5%	265,280	70.7%
Married with Children	6,991	20.2%	6,915	19.2%	93,772	25.0%
Married no Children	7,032	20.3%	7,587	21.0%	105,249	28.0%
Other Families	9,019	26.0%	9,516	26.4%	66,259	17.7%
Non-Families	11,584	33.5%	12,075	33.5%	110,084	29.3%
Singles	9,083	26.2%	9,546	26.4%	85,055	22.7%
Other Non-Families	2,500	7.2%	2,529	7.0%	25,029	6.7%
Avg. Household Size	2.82		2.83		2.77	

Source: 2000 and 2010 Census.

**Table 5.13
Overcrowded Households**

Type of Households	Overcrowded (1.01 to 1.50 persons/room)	Severely Overcrowded (1.51 or more persons/room)	Total	Total Households	
				Number	Percent
2000					
Owner	1,035	813	1,848	18,463	10.0%
Renter	1,476	1,957	3,433	16,162	21.2%
Total	2,511	2,770	5,281	34,625	15.3%
2008-2010					
Owner	613	289	902	17,950	5.0%
Renter	1,642	831	2,473	17,285	14.3%
Total	2,255	1,120	3,375	35,235	9.6%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.14
Household Income**

Income Level	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2008-2010 Estimates		Contra Costa County 2008-2010 Estimates	
	Households	% of Total	Households	% of Total	Households	% of Total
Less than \$10,000	3,489	10.0%	2,494	7.1%	14,960	4.1%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	2,020	5.8%	2,066	5.9%	13,754	3.7%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	3,894	11.2%	3,362	9.5%	25,725	7.0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	3,958	11.4%	2,995	8.5%	26,273	7.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	6,138	17.7%	5,608	15.9%	41,097	11.1%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	6,849	19.7%	6,090	17.3%	60,633	16.4%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	4,251	12.2%	4,529	12.9%	47,330	12.8%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	2,986	8.6%	5,107	14.5%	67,133	18.2%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	701	2.0%	1,673	4.7%	34,353	9.3%
\$200,000 or more	455	1.3%	1,311	3.7%	37,570	10.2%
Total Households	34,741		35,235		368,828	
Median Household Income	44,210		53,738		76,046	

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

Table 5.15
Median Household Income by Race

Race of Household	Median Income	Percent of City Median Income	Percent of County Median Income
All Households	53,738	100.0%	70.7%
Hispanic or Latino	46,963	87.4%	61.8%
Non-Hispanic White	68,141	126.8%	89.6%
Black or African American	43,388	80.7%	57.1%
American Indian	37,000	68.9%	48.7%
Asian	75,853	141.2%	99.7%
Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable	Data Unavailable
Other	53,699	99.9%	70.6%
Two or More Races	55,441	103.2%	72.9%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

Table 5.16
Household Poverty Status

Type	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2008-2010 Estimates	
	Below Poverty Level	% of Total	Below Poverty Level	% of Total
Persons (all ages)	15,763	16.0%	16,546	16.3%
Adults (age 18 and over)	9,597	16.0%	10,349	13.5%
Children (under age 18)	6,166	23.0%	6,197	24.5%
Families	3,141	13.0%	3,191	13.5%
Female-Headed Households	1,658	25.0%	1,776	27.3%
Families with children	2,627	19.0%	2,785	21.7%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

Housing Stock

This section describes the City’s housing stock, including tenure, age, condition, vacancy, and at-risk housing.

Housing Type and Growth

Table 5.17 compares Richmond’s housing stock between 2000 and 2010. Detached single-family homes continue to make up the majority of residential units in Richmond, comprising 56.8 percent of the total estimated housing stock in 2010. Multifamily structures with three to four units were the next most common type, comprising 9.8 percent of Richmond’s housing stock in 2010.

Table 5.17 also compares Richmond’s housing growth between 2000 and 2010. The total number of housing units in Richmond is estimated to have increased by 8.3 percent from 36,044 in 2000 to 40,116 in 2010. This represents an overall increase of 4,072 housing units during the 10-year period and on average, 407 units constructed per year. The largest numerical increase in housing units was in detached single-family homes, which increased by 2,312 units.

Housing Age and Condition

Age is an important factor in the condition of a housing unit. Typically, after 30 years most housing units show signs of deterioration and need reinvestment to maintain its condition. Without proper maintenance, housing that is over 50 years old requires major reinvestment to maintain its quality and appearance.

Homeowners with older units may require assistance to upgrade conditions or such units will become substandard for use by homeowners or renters and many eventually become unsuitable for occupancy. **Table 5.18** lists Richmond’s housing stock by year built. It is estimated that as of 2010, 70.4 percent of Richmond’s housing units were over 30 years old and that 48.5 percent were over 50 years old. As of 2010, the estimated median year for the housing stock built in the City was 1961, which indicates an older housing stock.

In 2008, the City conducted a multi-day field survey of existing conditions in the City’s former Redevelopment Areas. Based on observations conducted during the field survey and analysis of available data, the Redevelopment Areas contained a wide variety of building types, ages and conditions. A substantial number of buildings in the Redevelopment Areas were found to suffer from very extensive or extensive building deficiencies. These buildings exhibit major adverse conditions that would likely be costly to remedy, including dilapidation, dry rot or termite damage, poor alignment or subsidence, structurally unsound foundations, informal or substandard construction, and fire damage. The field survey indicated that buildings exhibiting major adverse conditions were found throughout the Redevelopment Areas. Appendix A includes a map of buildings with major adverse (114 buildings) and multiple adverse (269 buildings) physical conditions identified during the 2008 survey.

Serious building-related code violations are further evidence of unsafe and unhealthy buildings. Building-related code violations provide a snapshot of the interior, as well as exterior, building conditions. Within Richmond, approximately 830 cases were found to be open as of the end of October 2008. Cases that were deemed abated or unfounded were not included in the analysis. Of the open cases, approximately 510 cases or 61 percent were in the Redevelopment Areas. Of these cases, 45 complaints were related to building health and safety issues (compared to 96 for the entire City).

Vacancy Rates

A vacancy rate measures the overall housing availability in a community and is often a good indicator of how efficiently for-sale and rental housing units are meeting the current demand for housing. A vacancy rate of five percent for rental housing and two percent for ownership housing is generally considered healthy and suggests a balance between the demand and supply of housing. A lower vacancy rate may indicate that households are having difficulty in finding housing that is affordable, leading to overcrowding or households having to pay more than they can afford. A low vacancy rate or a particularly ‘tight’ housing market may also lead to high competition for units, raising rental and housing prices substantially.

Vacancy trends in housing are analyzed using a vacancy rate that establishes the relationship between housing supply and demand. If the demand for housing is greater than the available supply, then the vacancy rate is probably low and the price of housing will most likely remain stable.

Table 5.19 compares vacancy rates in Richmond and the County between 2000 and 2010. It is estimated that Richmond continues to have higher vacancy rates than the County overall. Richmond’s vacancy rate is estimated to have increased from 3.9 percent in 2000 to 12.2 percent in 2010 while the County’s increased from 2.9 to 7.7 percent during the same period. The vacancy rate of rental units in Richmond was 1.7 times the vacancy rate of owner occupied units in 2010 compared to the County rate of 1.9 times. Given the housing crisis and economic recession that began in 2007, vacancy rates in Richmond and the County have increased.

At-Risk Housing

California Housing Element law requires all jurisdictions to include a study of all low-income housing units that may at some future time be lost to the affordable inventory by the expiration of some type of affordability restrictions. The law requires that the analysis and study cover a 10-year period, and be divided

into two periods, coinciding with updates of the Housing Element. Three general cases that can result in the conversion of public assisted units:

- Prepayment of HUD mortgages: Section 221(d)(3), Section 202 and Section 236 – A Section 221 (d)(3) is a privately owned project where the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides either below market interest rate loans or market rate loans with a subsidy to the tenants. With Section 236 assistance, HUD provides financing to the owner to reduce the costs for tenants by paying most of the interest on a market rate mortgage. Additional rental subsidy may be provided to the tenant. Section 202 assistance provides a direct loan to nonprofit organizations for project development and rent subsidy for low-income elderly tenants. Section 202 also provides assistance for the development of units for physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, and chronically mentally ill residents.
- Opt-outs and expirations of project-based Section 8 contracts – Section 8 is a federally funded program that provides for subsidies to the owner of a pre-qualified project for the difference between the tenant’s ability to pay and the contract rent. Opt-outs occur when the owner of the project decides to opt-out of the contract with HUD by pre-paying the remainder of the mortgage. Usually, the likelihood of opt-outs increases as the market rents exceed the contract rents.
- Other – Expiration of the low-income use period of various financing sources, such as Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), bond financing, density bonuses, California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME programs and redevelopment funds. Generally, bond financing properties expire according to a qualified project period or when the bonds mature.

The City of Richmond contains a variety of assisted rental units and complexes, which utilize a range of funding mechanisms. A total of 82 of Richmond’s rental housing units are currently considered at very high-risk of converting (See **Table 5.20**). California Housing Partnership Corporation identified an additional 225 units that are considered at low-risk of conversion. These units are all federally-assisted through the Section 8 Program. Staff is currently trying to make contact with a HUD staff person to confirm that these contracts are intended to be renewed. It is possible that any of these complexes may opt out of Section 8 subsidy and return to market rate rent at the time of annual contract expiration. Such conversion could occur during the lifetime of this Housing Element.

The surest way to ensure that no units convert to market rate within the planning period is to acquire and preserve all at-risk units or construct new housing to replace those units. Either of these methods will ensure affordable controls and price restrictions are extended to at-risk households under current federal, state, and local programs. In Richmond, the cost of preserving assisted units is estimated to be less than that required to replace the units through new construction. Preservation of assisted units generally requires subsidizing the difference between market-rate and assisted rents. Since land prices and land availability are generally the limiting factors to development of new affordable housing, it is estimated that subsidizing rents to preserve assisted housing is more feasible and economical than construction.

Cost of Replacement or Preservation

The cost of replacing the very high-risk units identified in **Table 5.20**, based on a market survey of the costs of land and construction, would be approximately \$239,000 for a two-bedroom 720 square-foot unit in 2012, including financing and permit fees. This assumes no profit and sales or marketing fees, since the City would be developing these projects itself and would not need to profit from them. To replace all 82 federally assisted multifamily units at high-risk within the current planning period would cost approximately \$19.6 million. If on the other hand, the City were to acquire all 82 units at market rate and rehabilitate them, the cost would be \$13.3 million assuming a total estimated \$161,990 cost of preserving a unit.

Based on these estimates, the cost of replacement far outweighs the costs associated with acquiring and rehabilitating all at-risk units. A more important factor to consider is that not all units identified as being at-risk are in need of rehabilitation, but may simply require acquisition in order to be preserved as affordable units. This would reduce the amount of money required for preservation. Nonetheless, the cost of acquisition alone is significant enough to discourage plans to acquire all units. The most economical option is to continue the status-quo by providing subsidies to households and helping property owners keep assisted housing affordable for lower income households, while at the same time, acquiring and rehabilitating units when necessary.

Entities Qualified to Preserve At-Risk Units

The State HCD maintains a current list of all qualified entities across the state. A qualified entity is a nonprofit or for-profit organization or individual that agrees to maintain the long-term affordability of affordable housing developments. The qualified entities that the State HCD lists for Contra Costa County are shown in **Table 5.21**.

Table 5.17
Household Stock by Unit Type

Units in Structure	Richmond 2000		Richmond 2008-2010 Estimates		Change	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Single-family detached	20,467	56.8%	22,779	56.8%	2,312	56.8%
Single-family attached	2,928	8.1%	2,304	5.7%	-624	-15.3%
Duplex	1,540	4.3%	2,545	6.3%	1,005	24.7%
3 or 4 units	3,712	10.3%	3,934	9.8%	222	5.5%
5 to 9 units	2,183	6.1%	2,615	6.5%	432	10.6%
10 to 19 units	1,728	4.8%	2,414	6.0%	686	16.8%
20 or more units	3,365	9.3%	3,482	8.7%	117	2.9%
Mobile home	65	0.2%	43	0.1%	-22	-0.5%
Other (RCs, Vans, Boats, etc.)	56	0.2%	0	0.0%	-56	-1.4%
Total	36,044		40,116		4,072	100.0%

Source: 2000 Census, 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

Table 5.18
Housing Stock by Year Built

Year Built	Number	Percentage	Accumulated %
Built 1939 or earlier	4,662	11.6%	11.6%
Built 1940 to 1949	7,879	19.6%	31.3%
Built 1950 to 1959	6,906	17.2%	48.5%
Built 1960 to 1969	5,565	13.9%	62.3%
Built 1970 to 1979	3,223	8.0%	70.4%
Built 1980 to 1989	5,132	12.8%	83.2%
Built 1990 to 1999	2,936	7.3%	90.5%
Built 2000 to 2004	2,052	5.1%	95.6%
Built 2005 or later	1,761	4.4%	100.0%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.19
Vacancy Rate**

Unit Type	2000		2008-2010 Estimates	
	Richmond	County	Richmond	County
Owner	1.2%	0.8%	5.6%	3.3%
Rental	3.1%	2.7%	9.6%	6.3%
Total	3.9%	2.9%	12.2%	7.7%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.20
Assisted Rental Housing Development At-Risk of Conversion prior to 2017**

Project Name	Address	# of Units	Type of Subsidy	Program Type	Current Owner	Earliest Expiration	At Risk Level
Barrett Plaza Townhouses	740 Barrett Ave.	58	Section 8, 236(j)(1)	LMSA	Non-Profit	06/30/2012	Low
Barrett Terrace Apartments	700 Barrett Ave.	115	Section 8, 236(j)(1)	LMSA	Non-Profit	06/30/2012	Low
Community Heritage Apartments	1555 3rd Street	52	Section 8, 202	PRAC/202	Non-Profit	11/30/2012	Low
Deliverance Temple	4312 Potrero Ave.	82	Section 8	LMSA	Limited Dividend	08/31/2012	Very High

Source: California Housing Partnership Corporation, July 2012.

**Table 5.21
Qualified Entities in Contra Costa County**

Entity	City
ACLIC, Inc	Stockton
Affordable Housing Associates	Berkeley
Alameda County Allied Housing Program	Hayward
Anka Behavioral Health	Concord
C. Sandidge and Associates	Pinole
Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc.	Oakland
City of Walnut Creek	Walnut Creek
Community Housing Developers, Inc.	San Jose
Community Housing Development Corp.	Richmond
Community Housing Opportunities Corporation	Davis
Contra Costa Department of Conservation & Development	Martinez
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation	Oakland
East Bay NHS	Richmond
Eden Housing, Inc.	Hayward
Eskaton Properties Inc.	Carmichael
Northern California Land Trust, Inc.	Berkeley
Pacific Community Services, Inc.	Pittsburg
Resources for Community Development	Berkeley
ROEM Development Corporation	Santa Clara
Rubicon Programs, Inc.	Richmond
Rural California Housing Corp	West Sacramento
Sacramento-Yolo Mutual Housing Association	Sacramento
Satellite Housing Inc.	Berkeley
Vallejo Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc	Vallejo

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2012.

Housing Needs

This section of the Housing Element includes data that assists in the determination of the future housing needs for current and future residents of Richmond. It analyzes housing costs, affordability and overpayment; presents information on special needs populations; and describes the region's housing needs and Richmond's Regional "Fair share" allocation.

Housing Cost, Affordability and Overpayment

The affordability of housing in Richmond can be assessed by comparing market rents and sales prices with the amount that households of different income levels can afford to pay for housing. Compared together, this information reveals which households can afford what size and type of housing as well as indicates the type of households that would most likely experience overcrowding or overpayment. According to HUD, the generally accepted definition of housing affordability is for a household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing. Households that pay over 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording other basic necessities.

Cost and Affordability of Ownership Housing

Table 5.22 lists the median sales prices of single-family homes in Richmond in 2000, 2005 and 2012. Prior to the start of the economic downturn in 2007, the residential real estate market experienced a substantial increase in prices resulting from historically low mortgage rates, low inventory of homes available for sale, a steadily growing labor market, and an increasing population. However, as a result of the subsequent mortgage and foreclosure crisis, median home sales prices decreased dramatically throughout the country. In Richmond, the median home sales price is estimated to have decreased 58.3 percent, from \$430,000 in 2005 to approximately \$179,500 in June 2012.

Table 5.23 shows the maximum sales prices that were considered to be affordable to extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households based on income limits published by the State HCD in 2012. The maximum sales price affordable to a very low-income four-person household in 2012 was \$144,979. As shown in **Table 5.22**, the median sales price of a single-family home as of June 2012 was estimated at \$179,500.

This data suggests that the average single-family home in Richmond is becoming increasingly more affordable to very low, low and moderate income households capable of qualifying for mortgages under the stricter lending requirements that have emerged since the mortgage crisis began in 2007. However, this drop in the median sales price is likely overstated by the large number of discounted home foreclosures, which comprise a significant portion of sales in Richmond.

Cost and Affordability of Rental Housing

Table 5.24 lists the median gross rents in Richmond in 2000, 2010 and 2012. The median gross rent is estimated to have increased by 70 percent from \$764 in 2000 to \$1,299 in 2012. This increase coincides with the considerable increase in median sales prices for single-family homes prior to the recession. However, unlike home prices, rents have not decreased during the recession.

Table 5.25 shows the maximum monthly rents that were considered to be affordable to extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households. The maximum affordable rent for a very low-income four-person household in 2012 was \$1,169. As shown in **Table 5.26**, 34.1 percent of all two bedroom rental units rented for less than \$1,000 in 2010. This suggests that a considerable amount of Richmond's rental housing stock continues to be affordable to very low, low and moderate income households.

Overpaying Households

Table 5.27 compares the proportion of Richmond and County households that were estimated to have been overpaying for housing in 2010. A larger percentage of Richmond residents (48.6 percent) were overpaying compared to residents in the County as a whole (44.1 percent). Of all Richmond residents estimated to have been overpaying for housing, 22.5 percent consisted of owner households and 26.1 percent of renter households.

Table 5.28 summarizes the number of low-income households, by tenure, paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing. In 2010, an estimated 82.4 percent of low-income renter households and 60.6 percent of low-income owner households paid more than 30 percent of their income on housing.

Extremely Low-income Housing Needs

Extremely low-income households earn 30 percent or less of median household income. In 2010, the median household income in Richmond was \$53,738. This results in a household income of \$16,121 for a four-person household. As of 2000, 19.7 percent of households (6,830 of 34,625) in Richmond had extremely low incomes. Most extremely low-income households (71.2 percent) were renters and experienced a high incidence of housing problems. A household is said to have a housing problem if it has one or more of the following problems: (1) lacks complete kitchen facilities; (2) lacks complete plumbing facilities; (3) is overcrowded; and/or (4) is cost burdened. A household is cost burdened if monthly housing costs, including utilities, exceed 30 percent of monthly income.

Table 5.29 indicates the number of extremely low-income households that experienced housing problems, or had cost burdens greater than 30 and 50 percent of household income. An estimated 81 percent (3,958) of extremely low-income renter households and 69 percent (1,364) of extremely low-income owner households experienced housing problems. Moreover, 53.8 percent (3,674) of extremely low-income households paid more than 50 percent of their household income toward housing costs, compared to 15.2 percent for all Richmond households.

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for Richmond estimates that 391 very low-income units are needed between 2007 and 2014. The City estimates that 50 percent (allowed per State law methodology) of its very low-income housing allocation is needed for housing affordable to extremely low-income households. Therefore, the City projects that 196 extremely low-income units are needed during this RHNA period.

Table 5.22
Median Sales Price

Year	Median Sales Price	Change	
		Dollars	Average Annual Percent Change
2000	\$187,229		
2005	\$430,000	\$242,771	18.1%
June 2012	\$179,500	-\$250,500	-11.7%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, DataQuick, Trulia Inc 2012.

**Table 5.23
Owner Affordable Housing Costs in 2012**

Household Income Category		Household Size							
		1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person	5-Person	6-Person	7-Person	8-Person
Ext. Low	Max. Sales Price	\$60,938	\$69,621	\$78,304	\$86,987	\$93,965	\$100,942	\$107,920	\$114,897
	Income Limit	\$19,650	\$22,450	\$25,250	\$28,050	\$30,300	\$32,550	\$34,800	\$37,050
Very Low	Max. Sales Price	\$101,563	\$115,983	\$130,558	\$144,979	\$156,608	\$168,237	\$179,866	\$191,496
	Income Limit	\$32,750	\$37,400	\$42,100	\$46,750	\$50,500	\$54,250	\$58,000	\$61,750
Lower	Max. Sales Price	\$141,877	\$162,190	\$182,502	\$202,660	\$218,941	\$235,222	\$251,348	\$267,629
	Income Limit	\$45,750	\$52,300	\$58,850	\$65,350	\$70,600	\$75,850	\$81,050	\$86,300
Median	Max. Sales Price	\$202,970	\$231,966	\$260,961	\$289,957	\$313,216	\$336,319	\$359,578	\$365,780
	Income Limit	\$65,450	\$74,800	\$84,150	\$93,500	\$101,000	\$108,450	\$115,950	\$123,400
Moderate	Max. Sales Price	\$243,595	\$278,328	\$313,216	\$347,948	\$365,780	\$365,780	\$365,780	\$365,780
	Income Limit	\$78,550	\$89,750	\$101,000	\$112,200	\$121,200	\$130,150	\$139,150	\$148,100

Note: Affordable housing sales prices are based on the following assumed variables: FHA Regular Loan, 3.5% downpayment, 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 6.0% annual interest rate.

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, August 2012; Ginnie Mac Homeownership Guide and Calculator, August 2010.

**Table 5.24
Median Gross Rents**

Year	Median	Change	
	Market Rent	Dollars	Percent
2000	\$764		
2010	\$1,136	\$372	4.0%
February 2012	\$1,299	\$163	6.9%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2008-2010 American Community Survey, hotpads.com.

**Table 5.25
Renter Affordable Housing Costs 2012**

Household Income Category		Household Size							
		1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person	5-Person	6-Person	7-Person	8-Person
Ext. Low (30%)	Monthly Rent	\$491	\$561	\$631	\$701	\$758	\$814	\$870	\$926
	Monthly Income	\$1,638	\$1,871	\$2,104	\$2,338	\$2,525	\$2,713	\$2,900	\$3,088
Very Low (50%)	Monthly Rent	\$819	\$935	\$1,053	\$1,169	\$1,263	\$1,356	\$1,450	\$1,544
	Monthly Income	\$2,729	\$3,117	\$3,508	\$3,896	\$4,208	\$4,521	\$4,833	\$5,146
Lower (80%)	Monthly Rent	\$1,144	\$1,308	\$1,471	\$1,634	\$1,765	\$1,896	\$2,026	\$2,158
	Monthly Income	\$3,813	\$4,358	\$4,904	\$5,446	\$5,883	\$6,321	\$6,754	\$7,192
Median (100%)	Monthly Rent	\$1,636	\$1,870	\$2,104	\$2,338	\$2,525	\$2,711	\$2,899	\$3,085
	Monthly Income	\$5,454	\$6,233	\$7,013	\$7,792	\$8,417	\$9,038	\$9,663	\$10,283
Moderate (120%)	Monthly Rent	\$1,964	\$2,244	\$2,525	\$2,805	\$3,030	\$3,254	\$3,479	\$3,703
	Monthly Income	\$6,546	\$7,479	\$8,417	\$9,350	\$10,100	\$10,846	\$11,596	\$12,342

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, Seifel Consulting Inc.

**Table 5.26
Gross Rents by Bedroom**

Rent	1-Bedroom Units		2-Bedroom Units		3 or more Bedroom Units	
	2000	'08-'10	2000	'08-'10	2000	'08-'10
Less than \$200	375	25	295	170	155	0
\$200-\$299	338	260	241	175	82	76
\$300-\$499	481	401	394	325	296	324
\$500-\$749	1,786	322	1,897	310	465	299
\$750-\$999	1,293	1,455	1,645	1,552	832	444
\$1,000 or more	898	1,882	1,780	4,899	1,245	3,355
Total Units	5,171	4,345	6,252	7,431	3,075	4,498

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.27
Overpaying Households**

Household Income	Owner Households		Renter Households		Total	
	Overpaying Households	Percent	Overpaying Households	Percent	Overpaying Households	Percent
Less than \$20,000	1,021	12.9%	3,903	42.4%	4,924	28.7%
\$20,000-\$34,999	859	10.8%	2,389	26.0%	3,248	19.0%
\$35,000-\$49,999	1,421	17.9%	1,978	21.5%	3,399	19.8%
\$50,000 or more	4,639	58.4%	926	10.1%	5,565	32.5%
Total	7,940	100.0%	9,196	100.0%	17,136	100.0%
Percent of Household Type	44.2%		53.2%			
Percent of Total Households						
Richmond	22.5%		26.1%		48.6%	
Contra Costa County	27.2%		17.0%		44.1%	

Note: An overpaying household is a household which pays 30 percent or more of its household income on housing costs.

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey.

**Table 5.28
Percentage of Low-Income Households Overpaying for Housing**

	Low Income Households	Paying 30% or more of HH Income	Percent
Owner-Occupied Units	4,349	2,637	60.6%
Renter-Occupied Units	8,918	7,346	82.4%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates.

Table 5.29
Housing Problems for Extremely Low-income Households

	Renters	Percent Renters	Owners	Percent Owners	Total ELI Households	Percent Total ELI Households
Household Income <=30 percent MFI	4,862	100%	1,968	100%	6,830	100%
Percent with any housing problems	3,958	81.4%	1,364	69.3%	5,321	77.9%
Percent Housing Cost Burden >30 percent	3,758	77.3%	1,309	66.5%	5,067	74.2%
Percent Housing Cost Burden >50 percent	2,674	55.0%	1,000	50.8%	3,674	53.8%

Source: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Databook.

Special Needs Populations

Certain households have more difficulty in finding decent and affordable housing due to special circumstances such as economic status, age, disability, household size and household type. As a result, these households may experience a higher prevalence of overpaying, overcrowding, and other housing problems. Special needs populations in Richmond include seniors, large family households, female-headed households, persons with disabilities, and homeless persons and families.

Senior Persons and Households

Seniors have special needs primarily resulting from physical disabilities and limitations, income, and health care costs. Additionally, senior households also have other needs to preserve their independence including supportive services to maintain their health and safety, in-home support services to perform activities of daily living, conservators to assist with personal care and financial affairs, public administration assistance to manage and resolve estate issues, and networks of care to provide a wide variety of services and daily assistance.

Table 5.30 shows the growth in Richmond’s senior population from 1990 to 2010. Richmond’s senior population is estimated to have increased by 6.8 percent between 1990 and 2010. During that same period however, it is estimated that the proportion of seniors to the rest of Richmond’s population hovered at around ten percent. **Table 5.31** lists Richmond’s 2010 senior population by age and gender. The majority of Richmond seniors (58.2 percent) are female. Seniors over the age of 80, who may require additional care due to their advanced age, represented 25.4 percent of all seniors in 2010. **Table 5.32** compares Richmond’s senior households in 2010 by tenure. Senior households are estimated to have represented 10.2 percent of the total population in 2010. Of those senior households, 73.3 percent were owner occupied. **Table 5.33** describes the services that are available for the elderly or disabled in Richmond.

Large Family Households

Large family households are defined as households of five or more persons. Large family households are considered a special needs group due to the limited availability of affordable and adequately sized housing to accommodate their needs. The more persons in a household, the more rooms are needed to accommodate that household. Specifically, a five-person household would require three or four bedrooms, a six-person household would require four bedrooms, and a seven-person household would require four to six bedrooms.

Table 5.34 compares the number of large households to the type and number of occupied housing units in 2010. Richmond continues to have a sufficient amount of housing units to accommodate the needs of large households. It is estimated that 5,058 households (14 percent of all households) had five or more persons and 16,444 occupied housing units had three or more bedrooms.

Female-Headed Households

Finding affordable, decent, and safe housing is often more difficult for female-headed households. Female-headed households tend to have special needs involving access to daycare or childcare, health care, and other supportive services. In addition, female-headed households with children in particular tend to have lower incomes, which limits their housing options and access to supportive services.

Table 5.35 lists the estimated number of female-headed households in Richmond as well as the proportion of those households that were considered to be under the poverty level as of 2010. An estimated 18.5 percent of households (6,506) were headed by females, with a relatively equal proportion with children and without children. Of the 3,183 families under the poverty level in Richmond, 1,777 (57 percent) were female-headed.

Persons with Disabilities

A disability is defined as a long lasting condition that impairs individual's mobility, ability to work, or ability to care for his or herself. Persons with disabilities include persons having work or employment disabilities, physical disabilities, self-care limitations, sensory disabilities and mental disabilities. Disabled persons have special housing needs because of their fixed income, shortage of affordable and accessible housing, and higher health costs associated with their disability.

Tables 5.36 and **5.37** list the number of Richmond residents with disabilities by employment status and disability type in 2000. Residents with disabilities accounted for 19.7 percent of all Richmond residents in 2000. Employed persons under the age of 65 accounted for 37.2 percent of all Richmond residents with a disability while not-employed persons under the age of 65 accounted for 35 percent. The remaining 22.6 percent of persons with a disability consisted of persons over the age of 65.

Developmentally Disabled Persons

According to Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code a "developmental disability" is defined as a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual which includes mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This term also includes disabling conditions found to be closely related to mental retardation or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with mental retardation, but does not include other handicapping conditions that are solely physical in nature.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment; however, 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 regional centers, developmental centers and community-based facilities. The Regional Center of the East Bay provides point of entry to services for people with developmental disabilities. The center is a private, nonprofit community agency that contracts with local businesses to offer a wide range of services to individuals with developmental disabilities and their families.

Table 5.38 provides a summary of persons with developmental disabilities in Richmond. Persons with developmental disabilities represent less than one percent of the City's population.

There are a number of housing types appropriate for people living with a development disability: rent subsidized homes, licensed and unlicensed single-family homes, inclusionary housing, Section 8 vouchers, special programs for home purchase, HUD housing, and SB 962 homes. The design of housing-accessibility

modifications, the proximity to services and transit, and the availability of group living opportunities represent some of the types of considerations that are important in serving this need group. Incorporating 'barrier-free' design in all, new multifamily housing (as required by State and Federal Fair Housing laws) is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for disabled residents. Special consideration should also be given to the affordability of housing, as people with disabilities may be living on a fixed income.

In order to assist in the housing needs for persons with developmental disabilities, the City will implement programs to provide incentives for residential developments that make 15 percent or more of their total units accessible to persons with disabilities, pursue funding sources for persons with special needs and disabilities, inventory single-room occupancy units (SROs) which provide an important opportunity for housing for persons with disabilities, and continue the City's Deferred Loan Program, We Care Paint Program, and Bob Everett Helping Hand Program which provide free or low-interest funding for home improvements for persons with disabilities.

Homeless Persons and Families

Homeless individuals and families have perhaps the most immediate housing need of any group. They also have one of the most difficult sets of housing needs to meet, due to both the diversity and complexity of the factors that lead to homelessness, and to potential community opposition to the siting of facilities that serve homeless clients. California State law requires that Housing Elements estimate the need for emergency shelter for homeless people.

Between July 2010 and June 2011, the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Policy Group collected unduplicated, continuum-wide statistics from several participating homeless providers in Contra Costa County. Approximately 6,376 people used homeless services in Contra Costa County between July 2010 and July 2011, of which 2,834 people were considered newly identified homeless. Richmond had the highest percentage of homeless in Contra Costa County accounting for 35.5 percent (2,266) of all homeless people in the County. The 2011 HMIS Homeless Demographics Report also estimated that 1,419 households with children and 1,800 children ages 0 to 17 were homeless in Contra Costa County. Based on Richmond's percentage of the total countywide homeless population, it is estimated that 504 households with children, including 639 children ages 0 to 17 were homeless in Richmond between July 2010 and June 2011. While portions of the homeless community are visible, a segment of the population may not be seen on a street corner or receive services from a shelter or other community organization. Some persons and families may live in a car, a motel, or stay on a friend or relative's couch.

Three factors are indicated in the 2004 Ending Homelessness in Ten Years: A County-wide Plan for the Communities of Contra Costa County as the root causes of homelessness:

- low incomes and high housing costs;
- failure to identify at-risk households and link them with preventative services; and
- lack of housing or linkages to support services for those discharged from public institutions.

Table 5.39 lists a variety of resources in and/or available to the homeless in the City of Richmond. These resources provide housing options ranging from emergency shelter to transitional housing and also offer services including meals, jobs training, housing assistance, supportive services, basic life skills, and a variety of services for homeless persons.

Bay Area Rescue Mission (maximum stay of four to six weeks), Brookside Shelter, Richmond House (overnight stay), and Richmond Endeavor (overnight stay) each operate a permanent facility that provides services to the homeless community, including year-round beds, meals, case management, housing and job assistance and other general services. Emergency motel vouchers are available through the Contra Costa

Crisis Center while Greater Richmond Interfaith provides a winter shelter program. Deliverance House operates a transitional housing facility with maximum stays from 12 to 18 months and supportive services, including meals, and job, life and basic skills training. Lodging and meals are also offered by several local churches.

Agricultural Workers

Agricultural workers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through seasonal agricultural work. They have special housing needs because they earn lower incomes than many other workers and move throughout the season from one harvest to the next. The 2008-2010 American Community Survey indicates that of the estimated employed persons in the City of Richmond (46,233 persons), 0.2 percent, or 90 persons, were estimated to have been employed in the farming, fishing, and forestry sector. Because Richmond is not agricultural area, the number of agricultural workers in the City is not expected to increase in the near or long-term future. Therefore, given the extremely limited presence of agricultural workers in the community, the city has no specialized housing programs targeted to this group beyond overall programs for housing affordability and no additional housing is or would be needed for agricultural workers in Richmond.

Table 5.30
Senior Population Growth

Year	Population	% of Total Population	Change	
			Number	Percent
1990	9,912	11.4%		
2000	9,806	9.9%	-106	-1.1%
2010	10,582	10.2%	776	7.9%

Source: 1990, 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census.

Table 5.31
Senior Population by Age

Age	Male			Female		
	Number	Percent	% of Total	Number	Percent	% of Total
65 to 69	1,593	36.0%	1.5%	2,030	33.0%	2.0%
70 to 74	1,129	25.5%	1.1%	1,366	22.2%	1.3%
75 to 79	724	16.4%	0.7%	1,049	17.0%	1.0%
80 to 84	508	11.5%	0.5%	797	12.9%	0.8%
85 years and over	469	10.6%	0.5%	917	14.9%	0.9%
Total	4,423	100.0%	4.3%	6,159	100.0%	5.9%

Source: 2010 U.S. Census.

**Table 5.32
Senior Households**

Age	Number	% of Total
Renter Occupied		
65 to 74	1,157	17.2%
75 to 84	467	6.9%
<u>85 years and over</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>2.6%</u>
Total	1,798	26.7%
Owner Occupied		
65 to 74	2,681	39.9%
75 to 84	1,506	22.4%
<u>85 years and over</u>	<u>742</u>	<u>11.0%</u>
Total	4,929	73.3%
Total Households		
65 to 74	3,838	57.1%
75 to 84	1,973	29.3%
<u>85 years and over</u>	<u>916</u>	<u>13.6%</u>
Total	6,727	100.0%

Source: 2010 U.S. Census.

**Table 5.33
Services for the Elderly or Disabled**

Facility Type	Number	Unit/Beds	Service
Senior Apartments	9	813	Apartment complex for seniors.
Disabled-only Apartments	2	13	Apartment complex for disabled persons. Many senior complexes also allow disabled persons.
Group Homes	4	21	Facilities of any capacity and provide 24-hour non-medical care and supervision to children in a structured environment. Provide social, psychological, and behavioral programs for troubled youths.
Social Rehabilitation Facility	1	16	Provides 24-hour-a-day non-medical care and supervision in a group setting to adults recovering from mental illnesses, who temporarily need assistance, <u>guidance, or counseling.</u>
Adult Residential Facility	18	96	Facilities of any capacity that provide 24-hour non-medical care for adults ages 18 through 59, who are unable to provide for their own daily needs. Adults may be physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, and/or mentally disabled.
Adult Day Care	6	306	Facilities of any capacity that provide programs for frail elderly and developmentally disabled and/or mentally disabled adults in a day care setting.
Residential Care for the Elderly	20	228	Provide care, supervision and assistance with activities of daily living, such as bathing and grooming. They may also provide incidental medical services under special care plans. The facilities provide services to persons 60 years of age and over and persons under 60 with compatible needs. May also be known as assisted living facilities, retirement homes and board and care homes. The facilities can range in size from six beds or less to over 100 beds. The residents in these facilities require varying level of personal care and protective supervision.

State of California Community Care Licensing Division, August 2012.

**Table 5.34
Large Households and Housing Units**

Size	Number	Percent	Beds	Units	Percent
Owner Units			Owner Units		
5-Person	1,251	55.5%	3-Bed	7,453	63.9%
6-Person	540	23.9%	4-Bed	3,716	31.9%
7-Person or more	464	20.6%	5-Bed or More	488	4.2%
Total	2,255	100.0%	Total	11,657	100.0%
Renter Units			Renter Units		
5-Person	1,383	49.3%	3-Bed	3,962	82.8%
6-Person	703	25.1%	4-Bed	646	13.5%
7-Person or more	717	25.6%	5-Bed or More	179	3.7%
Total	2,803	100.0%	Total	4,787	100.0%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey

**Table 5.35
Female-Headed Households**

Householder Type	Number	% of Households
Households	35,235	100.0%
Female-headed households	6,506	18.5%
Female heads with children under 18	3,507	10.0%
Female heads without children under 18	2,999	8.5%
Families	23,635	100.0%
Families under the poverty level	3,183	13.5%
Female-headed family under the poverty level	1,777	7.5%

Source: 2008-2010 American Community Survey

**Table 5.36
Persons with Disabilities by Employment Status**

	Number	Percent
Total Population	99,716	100%
Persons with a Disability	19,666	19.7%
Employed Persons with a Disability (ages 5-64)	7,308	7.3%
Not Employed Persons with a Disability (ages 5-64)	6,888	6.9%
Persons with a Disability (ages 65 and over)	4,449	4.5%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census.

Table 5.37
Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type

Disability	Number	Percent
Total Disabilities	36,114	100%
Total Disabilities for Ages 5-64	26,840	74.3%
Sensory Disability	1,699	4.7%
Physical Disability	4,877	13.5%
Mental Disability	3,734	10.3%
Self-care Disability	1,633	4.5%
Go-outside-home Disability	5,710	15.8%
Employment Disability	9,187	25.4%
Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over	9,274	25.7%
Sensory Disability	1,485	4.1%
Physical Disability	3,056	8.5%
Mental Disability	1,304	3.6%
Self-care Disability	1,220	3.4%
Go-outside-home Disability	2,209	6.1%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census.

Table 5.38
Developmentally Disabled Residents by Age

Zip Code Area	Age					Total
	0-14 Years	15-22 Years	23-54 Years	55-65 Years	65+ Years	
94801	96	46	57	7	1	207
94802	0	0	3	1	0	4
94804	117	0	110	16	0	243
94805	31	0	16	2	0	49
94807	0	0	0	0	0	0
94808	0	0	0	0	0	0
94850	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	244	47	186	26	1	504

Source: Regional Center of the East Bay, October 15, 2012.

**Table 5.39
Services and Housing Resources for Homeless Persons and Families
in Richmond**

Facility	Location	Capacity	Services
Bay Area Rescue Mission	224 Macdonald Avenue, Richmond	50-bed facility year-round, individual and families, maximum stay of four to six weeks	Meals, Case Management, Housing and Jobs Assistance, Referral Services
Brookside Shelter	847 C Brookside Drive, Richmond	Assists approximately 100 adults, and youth aged 14 to 17 when space is available, on a year-round basis	Meals, On-job training, Life Skills Training, Case Management, Referral Services, Housing Assistance
Churches	Various	Varies	Lodging and Meals
Contra Costa Crisis Center Homeless Hotline	Various	Provides Emergency Motel Vouchers	24-Hour Homeless Hotline, Referral to Assistance Organizations
Deliverance House	113 Macdonald Avenue, Richmond	Transitional housing with four beds, women and children (0-8 years) only, 12-18 month maximum stay	Supportive Services, Showers, Laundry Facilities, Meals, Job Training, Living and Basic Skills Training
Greater Richmond Interfaith Program Services	165 22nd Street, Richmond	35-bed winter shelter program (4.5 months) available for families only	Free Meals Year-Round, Showers, Voice Mail, Winter Shelter Program including Meals, Referral Services, Counseling and Care Management, Other Services
Health Housing and Integrated Services, Contra Costa County Health Services	101 Broadway Avenue, Richmond	Capacity to service 75 individual men and women, including a specialized program for those 18-21. Residents are allowed to stay up to 120 days if involved in case management.	24-hour facility that emphasizes case management and wrap-around services. Meals, laundry facilities, mail, and telephones all also provided.
Nevin House, Anka Behavioral Health	3215 Nevin Avenue, Richmond	16-bed residential treatment for homeless mentally ill.	Program serving dually diagnosed adults age 18 and older who need 24-hour therapeutic care.
Richmond Endeavor	501 9th Street, Richmond	Overnight lodging and meals for twelve persons	Multi-Assistance, Showers, Laundry Facilities, Lockers, Food Pantry, Mail, Drop-In Day Room, Computer Training, Job Assistance
Richmond House	735 12th Street and various other locations in Richmond	Three 6-bed facilities	Multi-Assistance, Transitional Housing, Job Assistance

Source: City of Richmond, HomelessShelterDirectory.org.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

California’s Housing Element law (Government Code §65584) requires that each city and county develop local housing programs to meet its “fair share” of existing and future housing needs for all income groups, as determined by the jurisdiction’s Council of Governments. This “fair share” allocation concept seeks to ensure that each jurisdiction accepts responsibility for the housing needs of not only its resident population, but also for the jurisdiction’s projected share of regional housing growth across all income categories. Regional growth needs are defined as the number of units that would have to be added in each jurisdiction to accommodate the forecasted number of households, as well as the number of units that would have to be added to compensate for anticipated demolitions and changes to achieve an “ideal” vacancy rate.

A Regional Housing Needs Plan is mandated by the State of California for regions to address housing issues and needs based on future growth projections for the area. In the nine-county Bay Area, in which Richmond is located, the plan is developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and is called the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the San Francisco Bay Area: 2007-2014. The plan allocates to cities and the unincorporated county their “fair share” or Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of the

region’s projected housing needs. The Regional Housing Needs Plan allocates the RHNA based on household income groupings over the seven-year planning period for each specific jurisdiction’s Housing Element.

In allocating the region’s future housing needs to jurisdictions, ABAG is required to take the following factors into consideration:

- Market demand for housing
- Employment opportunities
- Availability of suitable sites and public facilities
- Commuting patterns
- Type and tenure of housing
- Loss of units in assisted housing developments
- Over-concentration of lower income households
- Geological and topographical constraints

The intent of the RHNA is to ensure that local jurisdictions address not only the needs of their immediate areas, but also fill the housing needs for the entire region. Additionally, a major goal of the RHNA is to assure that every community provides an opportunity for a mix of affordable housing to all economic segments of its population. The RHNA jurisdictional allocations are made to ensure that adequate sites and zoning are provided to address existing and anticipated housing demands during the planning period and that market forces are not inhibited in addressing the housing needs for all facets of a particular community.

Table 5.40 provides the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) target for the planning period 2007 to 2014 (also referred to as “basic construction needs”) for each of the four household income groups for the City of Richmond. Also presented in **Table 5.40** is a summary of units constructed or pending in the City during the 2007-2014 period and the remaining RHNA need.

ABAG’s 2007 through 2014 RHNA allocation for the City of Richmond is 2,826 new housing units. The City of Richmond needs to provide adequate sites for 730 housing units affordable to very low and low-income households, or 25.8 percent of all new housing units. In addition, sites accommodating 2,096 housing units available to moderate and above moderate income households will need to be provided.

Since 2007 a total of 1,216 housing units have been approved, permitted and/or completed in the City of Richmond. Of those units, 227 were for very low and low-income households, 239 for moderate-income households, and 750 for above moderate-income households. The methodology to credit units toward Richmond’s RHNA allocation for very low, low and moderate-income households is based on the type of funding each project received. **Table 5.56**, included the housing Opportunities Section, identifies the housing funding source and units by income level for projects approved, permitted and/or completed since 2007. All of the funding sources ensure affordability.

The city will continue to provide sites for a mix of single-family, multifamily and mixed-use housing, supported by a variety of programs to enhance affordability, to accommodate its RHNA and contribute towards addressing the growing demand for housing in the Bay Area.

**Table 5.40
Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2007 – 2014**

Income Category	New Construction Need		Units Built, Under Construction or Approved since 2007	Remaining Need
	Number	Percent		
Very Low	391	13.8%	74	317
Low	339	12.0%	153	186
Moderate	540	19.1%	239	301
Above Moderate	1,556	55.1%	750	806
Total	2,826	100.0%	1,216	1,610

Source: 2008 ABAG Regional Housing Needs Determination, City of Richmond.

Housing Constraints

The provision of adequate and affordable housing can be constrained by a number of factors. This section discusses and analyzes the various governmental and non-governmental constraints that may serve as potential impediments to housing development and improvement in Richmond.

The production of housing is a complicated process affected by a number of economic, and private and government influences. Among these influences are the availability and cost of land, zoning and other development standards, availability and cost of providing infrastructure and services, the cost and availability of credit, the number of potential consumers with adequate incomes to purchase or rent housing, and the cost and availability of labor and materials. In addition to these measurable influences are subtler, but often less quantifiable factors, such as community attitudes, environmental mitigation requirements and even builder perceptions of the market.

The purpose of this section is to identify those measurable factors that have the greatest impact on the cost and availability of housing.

Governmental Constraints

Actions or policies of numerous governmental agencies, whether involved directly or indirectly in the housing market, can impact the ability of the private sector to provide adequate housing to meet consumer demands.

State agencies and local government compliance with state statutes can complicate the development of housing. Statutes such as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and sections of the Government Code relating to rezoning and general plan amendment procedures can also act to prolong local government review and approval of development proposals. In many instances, compliance with these requirements establishes time constraints that cannot be altered by local governments.

Local governments exercise a number of regulatory and approval powers that directly impact residential development within their respective jurisdictional boundaries. These powers establish the location, intensity and type of units that may or may not be developed. The City's General Plan, zoning regulations, project review and approval procedures, development and processing fees, utility infrastructure, public service capabilities, and development attitudes all play important roles in determining the cost and availability of housing opportunities in Richmond.

Land Use Controls

The City of Richmond determines the number of housing units that can be built per acre through its General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan establishes the location and amount of land allocated to residential development and the intensity of development permitted. The Zoning Ordinance establishes specific site development standards consistent with the General Plan including, but not limited to open space, building orientation, massing, setbacks, and parking requirements.

General Plan Land Use Designations

The City adopted a comprehensive update to its General Plan in April 2012. The Richmond General Plan 2030 promotes mixed-use, high-density, infill development in Richmond's Downtown and along its major commercial and transit corridors. This sustainable land use policy will facilitate increased housing production by allowing for lower development costs and expedited environmental review. It will also improve quality of life for residents because new housing will be located closer to jobs, transportation and amenities such as parks, schools, restaurants, and entertainment. Residential development is permitted in 11 of the

18 General Plan’s land use designations. **Table 5.41** describes each of the General Plan’s residential land use designations and **Table 5.42** lists the permitted housing densities, development intensities and height restrictions for each designation.

Zoning Districts

The City’s current residential zoning districts and associated development standards are shown in **Tables 5.43 and 5.44**. A comprehensive update of the City’s Zoning Ordinance is currently underway to make it consistent with the recently adopted Richmond General Plan 2030. A primary objective of the Update is to replace the suburban and auto-oriented development standards currently in the Zoning Ordinance with those that promote and facilitate mixed-use, higher-density and transit-oriented developments consistent with the Richmond General Plan 2030. The City will revise the Zoning Ordinance in phases and anticipates completing the entire update by 2015. As part of the first phase of the update, the City is currently developing a Form-Based Code (FBC) for three of the City’s major commercial corridors—Macdonald Avenue, 23rd Street and portions of San Pablo Avenue and the surrounding areas. These areas are also identified as Priority Development Areas by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and ABAG. The form-based code will include area-specific architectural standards and development standards that reflect the vision of the Richmond General Plan 2030. The FBC will enable expedited environmental and design review for projects meeting code requirements. The City anticipates adopting the FBC by Fall 2013. Work completed to date can be reviewed and downloaded at www.ci.richmond.ca.us/livablecorridors.

Parking Requirements

The City’s residential parking requirements are based upon unit type and size. As shown in **Table 5.45**, the City typically requires two spaces per residential unit, however, the requirement is reduced for second dwelling units, multifamily units of two bedrooms or less, and uses that serve tenants with low vehicle ownership rates such as senior housing and nursing homes.

Parking located in the front half of a lot or within 25 feet of the side street for corner lots must be covered with a garage, carport, or other roofed structure, except parking spaces for second dwelling units, which may be provided on a parking pad or driveway. Tandem parking may be used to meet residential parking requirements upon approval from the Zoning Administrator or Design Review Board if site conditions make side-by-side parking difficult or infeasible.

The City recognizes that off-street parking requirements add to the cost of housing development. To address this, the Richmond General Plan 2030, includes an implementation action (Land Use Action LU6.A – Parking Requirements) requiring the City to reduce or eliminate parking requirements in the City’s Priority Development Areas (PDAs). As shown on the map in Appendix B, Richmond has four PDAs – North Richmond, Central Richmond, San Pablo Avenue, and South Richmond. These PDAs have enormous infill development potential and can accommodate higher-density mixed-use developments that are less car-dependent due to existing or planned transportation infrastructure. Parking requirements will be reduced or eliminated as part of the comprehensive update to the City’s Zoning Ordinance that is currently underway.

Homeless Shelters and Transitional Housing Facilities

Homeless shelters and transitional housing facilities are currently permitted in the City's residential and commercial zoning districts. As shown in **Tables 5.46** and **5.47**, small homeless shelters and transitional housing facilities (10 or less persons) are allowed by right in all of the City's single-family and multifamily zones and larger facilities (11 or more persons) are conditionally allowed in all of the City's multifamily and commercial zones. The following guidelines are set forth by Zoning Ordinance (Section 15.04.810.040) for the development of homeless shelters and transitional housing facilities. These guidelines are implemented as part of the review for an occupancy permit or conditional use permit. The City intends to amend the Zoning Ordinance to ensure compliance with Senate Bill 2, which requires zoning to facilitate emergency shelters and limits a city's ability to deny emergency shelters and transitional and supportive housing under the Housing Accountability Act (refer to Program H-3.6.2).

Physical Characteristics:

- The facility must have adequate private living space, shower and toilet facilities and secure storage areas for its residents.
- The facility shall have at least one room that has 120 square feet of floor area. Other habitable rooms shall have an area of not less than 70 square feet. When more than two persons occupy a room used for sleeping purposes, the required floor area shall be increased at the rate of 50 square feet for each occupant in excess of two.
- The facility must have either a natural barrier such as a mature hedge or a fence enclosing yard area, especially if the facility is located on a major thoroughfare.
- To ensure that a particular neighborhood does not become impacted with such facilities, the facility must be located in an area that currently has a minimum of social services facilities. In addition, a minimum distance requirement of 300 feet is required between facilities.
- Smoke detectors must be provided in all sleeping rooms.
- Facilities for 10 or fewer persons must have at least two standard off-street parking spaces.
- Facilities for more than 10 persons must have two off-street spaces plus one space for every two employees.

Programmatic Characteristics

- If the facility is proposed for location in an area zoned or developed as a residential area, all intake and screening must be conducted off-site.
- The program must provide accommodations appropriate for a minimum stay of 28 days and maximum stay of 180 days per client.
- The program must identify a transportation system that will provide its clients with a reasonable level of mobility including, but not limited to, access to social services and employment opportunities.
- The program must provide on-site supervision and counseling services (only applicable to transitional housing facilities).
- The program must provide specific mechanisms for residents to contact social services and employment programs (only applicable to transitional housing facilities).
- If a program includes a drug or alcohol abuse counseling component, appropriate state licensing is required.
- The program must include an outline for a 24-hour schedule of residents' activity during their use of the facility.
- The program must include clear and acceptable arrangements for facility residents, such as on-site meal preparation or food provision.

- The program must, where applicable, provide a child care service and ensure that school-aged children are enrolled in school during their stay.
- The program must have an identified administrator and liaison personnel.
- Administrators and operators of the program must demonstrate experience in successfully running social-related facilities.
- The program must provide clear and established operational standards and rules.
- The program must include identified funding mechanisms that are sufficient to ensure compliance with required siting and program criteria.

The information on homeless persons and families and resources for that segment of the population in housing needs section and the analysis of existing requirements related to the development of homeless and transitional shelters above informs the related proposed Housing Element Programs and Objectives. The City has included Action H-3.6.3 (Funding for Emergency, Transitional and Supportive Housing) to support the pursuit of funding for facilities and programs that serve the homeless. The City has also included Action H-3.6.2 (Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Comply with Senate Bill 2) to address the requirements of Chapter 633, Statutes of 2007 (Senate Bill 2) regarding homeless shelters and transitional housing.

Manufactured and Factory-Built Housing

The City allows manufactured housing in any residential district where single-family detached units are permitted. Manufactured housing is subject to the same development standards and design review process as conventional or stick-built structures. While the City permits manufactured housing in residential districts consistent with State requirements, the City's Zoning Ordinance currently does not explicitly identify manufactured housing as an allowed use. As part of the comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Ordinance that is currently underway, the City will explicitly list manufactured housing as an allowed use in all of its single-family and multifamily residential zoning districts. No other changes affecting manufactured or factory-built housing are anticipated as part of the comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Ordinance that is currently underway.

Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Units

Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units, referred to as "rooming and boarding houses" in the City's Zoning Ordinance, are one-room units usually 100-250 square feet in area occupied by a single individual. Generally SRO units have shared kitchen and bathroom facilities and are rented on a weekly or monthly basis. Because SROs typically have unusual site development features or operating characteristics that require special consideration, they are not allowed as a matter of right. As shown in **Tables 5.46** and **5.47**, SROs are conditionally permitted in the MFR-2, MFR-3, MFR-4, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-B, and C-C zoning districts. No other changes related to SRO units are anticipated as part of the comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Ordinance that is currently underway.

Subdivision Standards

The City's subdivision standards are set forth in Chapter 15.08 of the Richmond Municipal Code. These include standards for lots and blocks, public and private streets, storm drains, sanitary sewers, landscaping, signage, street lighting, and requirements for dedications. The City's subdivision standards are very typical and do not unduly constrain housing production. However, these standards will need to be revised in order to implement the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the recently adopted Richmond General Plan 2030. The current standards were meant to re-enforce suburban and auto-oriented development patterns. New standards will be developed to ensure that future infrastructure improvements complement mixed-use, high-density, infill development and support alternative modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling. The new standards will promote more pedestrian and bike-friendly streets by requiring fewer car lanes, wider

sidewalks, mid-block crossings, bulb-outs, dedicated bike lanes, and street furniture for use by pedestrians and bicyclists. The new standards will also increase street connectivity by requiring multiple direct connections between local amenities.

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

Zoning Ordinance Section 15.04.810.060 sets forth requirements for the inclusion of affordable housing in all new housing developments of 10 or more units. Developers can meet the City's inclusionary housing requirement by:

- Making 17 percent or more of housing units available to moderate-income households; or
- Making 15 percent or more of housing units available to low-income households; or
- Making 10 percent or more of housing units available to very low-income households; or
- Making 12.5 percent or more of housing units available to a combination of very low and low-income households; or
- Making 25 percent or more of housing units available to very low or low-income senior households; or
- Paying the in-lieu fee towards the City's very low and low-income affordable housing fund.

Inclusionary housing requirements may increase development costs. However, the City offers developers the following incentives and concessions to offset such costs:

- A density bonus as provided by California Government Code §65915(b) and Chapter 15.04.810.050 of the Richmond Municipal Code.
- Flexibility in development standards.
- Assistance in obtaining available federal and state subsidies.
- Waiver of building permit and other City fees.
- Expedited entitlement review and permit processing.

All units provided through the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, rental or for-sale, are required to have a 30-year term of affordability. The affordability term is memorialized in an Inclusionary Housing Agreement recorded at the County for the property. However, for-sale inclusionary units may be resold during the affordability term if the seller deposits the difference between the market-rate and inclusionary price into the City's affordable housing fund. The 30-year of affordability does not transfer to the market-rate unit buyer.

Processing and Permit Procedures

Richmond's Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 15.04 of the Richmond Municipal Code, lists the types of residential land uses that are permitted and conditionally permitted in each of the City's zoning districts. Permitted land uses are allowed as-of-right without discretionary review as long as the proposed land use complies with the development and performance standards set forth in Zoning Ordinance Sections 15.04.830 and 15.04.840. Conditionally permitted land uses require a public hearing and issuance of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The Planning Commission may grant approval of a CUP if the following findings can be made:

1. The location of the proposed conditional use is in accordance with the General Plan of the City of Richmond;
2. The location, size, design and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare of persons residing or working on or adjacent to the proposed conditional use and the surrounding neighborhood;
3. The proposed use complies with all applicable provisions of this chapter; and
4. The site of the proposed use is adequately served by highways, streets and other public service facilities.

The CUP application review fee for residential land uses is currently \$3,876. The Planning Commission’s decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a requested CUP can be appealed to the City Council. The appeal fee is currently \$177. **Tables 5.44, 5.45 and 5.46** summarize the types of residential land uses that are allowed and conditionally allowed in Richmond’s residential, commercial and other zoning districts. The City currently does not have an administrative use permit process for residential land uses. However, the City will consider establishing such a process as part of the Zoning Ordinance Update.

Design review with a public hearing is required for residential building projects over 500 square feet. The Zoning Administrator approves design review permits for single-story residential additions, single-family homes, and duplexes not exceeding 1,200 square feet in size. The City’s Design Review Board approves design review permits for larger single-family and multifamily residential structures. The Design Review Board may grant approval of a Design Review Permit if the following findings can be made:

1. The proposed design is suitable for its purpose, is harmonious with and relates properly to the surrounding neighborhood, contiguous parcels, and the site itself;
2. The location, size, design, and characteristics of the proposed project will be compatible with and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of persons residing in or working in or adjacent to the proposed project;
3. The overall design will be of a quality that will preserve the integrity of and upgrade the existing neighborhood; and
4. The design of the proposed project is in accordance with the General Plan of the City of Richmond and all applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Design Review Board can impose reasonable conditions of approval to ensure projects are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and are not detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. Design review fees for residential projects range from \$1,438 for a single-story single-family residence (1,200 sq. ft. or less) and \$8,549 for a multifamily apartment or condominium project of 11 or more units. The City currently offers a pre-application process for developers wanting to obtain early project design input and expedite the review of large development projects. The pre-application fee is \$4,504 and was widely popular during the development boom. As part of the Zoning Ordinance Update, the City will expand the types of residential building projects eligible for over-the-counter and administrative design review.

Development Review Time Frames

The time required to process a project varies greatly from one project to another and is directly related to the size and complexity of the project, and the number of actions or approvals needed to complete the process. **Table 5.49** identifies the processing timeframes for different types of residential project review. It should be noted that each project does not necessarily require each type of review. For example, small projects that are consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations do not generally require Environmental Impact Reports, General Plan Amendments, Rezones, or Variances. Also, certain review and approval procedures may run concurrently. The City encourages the joint processing of related applications for a single project. As an example, a rezone request may be reviewed in conjunction with the required site plan, a tentative parcel map and any necessary variances. Such procedures save time, money and effort for both the public and private sector and could substantially decrease the costs for the developer.

Required application materials for single family, second dwelling units, subdivisions/condominiums, and multifamily projects are identified in **Table 5.50**. Upon submittal, City staff reviews the application to determine whether it is complete based on submittal requirements established in the City’s Zoning Ordinance and application submittal checklists. Once the application is deemed complete, the project is reviewed by the various City departments to ensure compliance with applicable City codes. The Design Review Board then reviews the project and an environmental review is completed for the project. After the Design Review Board

approves the project, the project has completed the environmental review process and the applicant has paid proper fees to the City, building permits are issued and the project can proceed.

Table 5.51 identifies the typical processing procedures and timeframes for residential projects. Depending on the complexity of the project, a single-family project is typically approved in 5 to 8 weeks from date of plan submission. Multifamily projects take between 1 to 6 months depending on the size of the project. For larger multifamily projects the additional time and public hearing requirements can pose as a constraint to the multifamily development.

Local Permit Processing Fees

Two aspects of local government have been criticized as placing undue burdens on the private sector's ability to build affordable housing: (1) the fees or other exactions required of developers to obtain project approval and (2) the time delays caused by the review and approval process. Critics contend that lengthy review periods increase financial and carrying costs and that fees and exactions increase expenses. These costs are in part passed onto the prospective homebuyer in the form of higher purchase prices or rents.

Fees, land dedications, or improvements are also required in most instances in order to provide an adequate supply of public parkland and to provide necessary public works such as streets, sewers, and storm drains to support the new development. While such costs are charged to the developer, most, if not all additional costs are passed to homebuyers and tenants in the form of higher sales prices or rents. The significance of the necessary public works improvements in determining final costs varies greatly from project to project. The improvements are dependent on the amount of existing improvements and nature of the project.

State law requires that local permit processing fees charged by local governments must not exceed the estimated actual cost of processing the permits. **Table 5.52** shows many of the development fees that would apply to various types of new projects in the City. These are application and permit fees that the City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Department charges for various types of development approvals or reviews.

Table 5.53 estimates city fees and development costs to be collected for a single-family house and a 50-unit multifamily development. City fees include all planning, building, impact, and new utility (water and sewer connection) fees that would be assessed for new construction. The city fees represent about 14.2 percent of total development cost for a single-family unit and 10.1 percent for a multifamily unit, which are similar to other nearby communities. Planning and building fees appear to have a minimal impact on housing costs, while impact and utility fees appear to have a greater impact. Planning and building fees represent 17 percent of all fees charged for a single-family unit and 5 percent for a multifamily unit. Impact fees represent 44 percent of all fees charged for a single-family unit and 59 percent for a multifamily unit. Utility fees represent 39 percent of all fees charged for a single-family unit and 35 percent for a multifamily unit.

Building Codes and Code Enforcement

The City of Richmond, in accordance with the State housing law, establishes certain minimum requirements for residential construction. The City's Planning and Building Services Department administers building codes under the 2010 California Building Code. The City has made several amendments to the City's building code based on the 2010 California Building Code. These amendments are not considered a constraint to housing production, and amendments to the code have been made in order to comply with the minimum building standards of the State of California. The Police Department's Code Enforcement Division works closely with the Planning and Building Services Department, the City of Richmond as Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, the City Manager's Office, and Police Department to keep the city attractive and safe. These efforts include the removal of unsightly and unhealthy nuisances including substandard structures, weeds, junked or abandoned vehicles, and trash. The Code Enforcement Division accomplishes these tasks

through both pro-active and complaint driven enforcement. The following describes the City's standard code enforcement procedure:

1. Residents or City staff submit a complaint to Code Enforcement via telephone or email;
2. A code enforcement officer is assigned and investigates the complaint;
3. A notice of abatement is prepared and filed with the Contra Costa County Recorder's Office;
4. If the property is vacant, an invoice or work order is prepared and the property is abated;
5. If the property is occupied, the City Attorney's Office obtains a forcible entry warrant prior to abatement;
6. The property is re-inspected to determine compliance and need for further action; and
7. If the property owner files an appeal, all abatement activity are ceased until Board of Appeals renders a decision.

Code enforcement in the City continues to have an increasingly positive impact on the maintenance and preservation of affordable and other housing in the City. The City doesn't anticipate future changes that will further constrain housing development.

**Table 5.41
General Plan Residential Land Use Descriptions**

Designation	Description
Hillside Residential	Includes attached and detached single-family housing on subdivided parcels and clustered multi-family residential on developable portions of hillside parcels below the 400-foot elevation. Hillside development should address key environmental challenges and constraints such as steep slopes and soil erosion. Neighborhood mixed-use development is allowed at neighborhood nodes.
Low Density Residential	Includes attached and detached single-family residential development in level to moderately sloped areas. Neighborhood mixed-use development is allowed at neighborhood nodes. Existing multi-family residential structures may remain and may be improved without increasing densities, or may revert to single-family residential uses.
Medium Density Residential	Includes single and multi-family housing types such as one to three-story garden apartments, historic bungalows and cottages on small lots, townhouses and stacked flats. Neighborhood mixed-use development is allowed at neighborhood nodes.
Neighborhood Mixed-Use	Includes residential and neighborhood-serving retail uses such as shops, markets, professional offices, boutiques, barber shops, beauty salons and restaurants. Residential development above ground floor commercial is strongly encouraged. Development is emphasized at neighborhood nodes.
Medium Density Mixed-Use (Residential Emphasis)	Includes mixed-use development with commercial uses encouraged at street-level along corridors. However, residential-only development is allowed and may include condominiums, townhouses or apartments. Commercial-only development is not allowed. Projects with commercial components must also include a residential component. New development is required to have a pedestrian-oriented building design with minimal setbacks and parking located to the sides or rear of buildings.
Medium Density Mixed-Use (Commercial Emphasis)	Includes mixed-use development with commercial or office/light industrial uses encouraged at street-level along corridors*. This classification is distinguished from the Medium-Density Mixed-Use (Residential Emphasis) land use classification in that it allows residential-only or commercial-only development. Residential uses may include condominiums, townhouses or apartments and commercial uses may include small to large-scale retail or office. New development must have a pedestrian-oriented building design with minimal setbacks and parking located to the sides or rear of buildings preferred.
Medium-Intensity Mixed-Use (Community Nodes and Gateways)	Includes mid-rise mixed-use development at key community nodes and gateways with commercial uses strongly encouraged at street-level. Commercial development must have a pedestrian-oriented building design with setbacks allowing for public amenities and parking located behind buildings.
High-Intensity Mixed-Use (Major Activity Center)	Includes mid and high-rise mixed-use development at major activity centers to serve the community and region. Office, retail, entertainment and residential uses are allowed. Areas with this designation are characterized by streets with minimal setbacks, wide sidewalks and public spaces that cater to pedestrians and transit riders. Medium-Intensity Mixed-Use (Commercial Emphasis) is allowed within this land use designation.
Regional Commercial Mixed Use	Includes mid-rise mixed-use development characterized by compact and pedestrian-friendly environments. Office, retail and residential uses are allowed in mid-rise buildings.
Live/Work	Includes lofts and apartments connected to small-scale production spaces as well as office and storefront retail in transitional areas where it can be demonstrated that the use does not conflict with adjacent uses.

Source: Richmond General Plan 2030 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.42
Adopted General Plan Residential Land Use Designations and Development Standards**

General Plan Designation	Density	Intensity	Height
Hillside Residential	Up to 5 du/ac	Not applicable	Up to 35 feet
Low-Density Residential	5 to 15 du/ac	Not applicable	Up to 35 feet
Medium-Density Residential	10 to 40 du/ac	Not applicable	Up to 35 feet
Neighborhood Mixed-Use	10 to 30 du/ac	0.25 to 0.5 FAR	Up to 45 feet
Medium-Density Mixed-Use (Residential Emphasis)	15 to 50 du/ac	Up to 0.5 FAR	Up to 45 feet
Medium-Intensity Mixed-Use (Commercial Emphasis)*	Up to 50 du/ac	0.25 to 2.0 FAR	15 to 55 feet
Medium-Intensity Mixed-Use (Community Nodes & Gateways)	Up to 75 du/ac	0.5 to 2.0 FAR	15 to 55 feet
High-Intensity Mixed-Use (Major Activity Centers)*	Up to 125 du/ac	1.0 to 5.0 FAR	15 to 135 feet
Regional Commercial Mixed-Use	Up to 50 du/ac	0.5 to 2.0 FAR	15 to 55 feet
Live Work	15 to 50 du/ac	0.25 to 0.5 FAR	Up to 55 feet
Agriculture	Up to 0.20 du/ac	Not applicable	Up to 35 feet

* These General Plan Land Use Designations permit commercial-only development; however, pursuant to program H-1.2.2, the City will only approve those commercial-only developments that do not result in an overall loss of the City’s capacity to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the current planning period.

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.43
Current Single-Family Residential Zoning Districts and Development Standards**

Development Standard	Single-Family Residential Zoning Districts		
	SFR-1	SFR-2	SFR-3
Min. Lot Size	11,000 sq. ft.	6,000 sq. ft.	5,000 sq. ft.
Min. Lot Width	70 ft.	60 ft.	50 ft.
Min. Lot Area (per unit)	11,000 sq. ft.	6,000 sq. ft.	3,750 sq. ft.
Height	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.
Front Setback	25% of lot depth (25 ft. max.)	20% of lot depth (20 ft. max.)	20% of lot depth (20 ft. max.)
Side Setback	14% of lot width (3 ft. min./10 ft. max.)	10% of lot width (3 ft. min./5 ft. max.)	10% of lot width (3 ft. min./5 ft. max.)
Rear Setback	25% of lot depth (25 ft. max.)	20% of lot depth (20 ft. max.)	20% of lot depth (20 ft. max.)
Interior Yard Space	16% of lot area	16 to 20% of lot area	16 to 20% of lot area

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.44
Current Multifamily Residential Zoning Districts and Development Standards**

Development Standard	Multifamily Residential Zoning Districts			
	MFR-1	MFR-2*	MFR-3	MFR-4
Min. Lot Size	5,000 sq. ft.**	5,000 sq. ft.**	5,000 sq. ft.**	5,000 sq. ft.**
Min. Lot Width	50 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.
Min. Lot Area (per unit)	1,650 sq. ft.	1,250 sq. ft.	800 sq. ft.	750 sq. ft.
Height	35 ft.	35 ft.	45 ft.***	45 ft.***
Front Setback	15% of lot depth (15 ft. max.)	10% of lot depth (10 ft. min.)	10% of lot depth (10 ft. min.)	10% of lot depth (10 ft. min.)
Side Setback	10% of lot width (3 ft. min/5 ft. max.)	10% of lot width (3 ft. min/5 ft. max.)	10% of lot width (3 ft. min/5 ft. max.)	10% of lot width (3 ft. min/5 ft. max.)
Rear Setback	20% of lot depth (20 ft. max.)			
Private Open Space (per unit)	75 sq. ft.	60 sq. ft.	60 sq. ft.	60 sq. ft.
Common Open Space (per unit)	200 sq. ft.	200 sq. ft.	100 sq. ft.	100 sq. ft.
Additional Open Space (per unit)	100 sq. ft. (common or private)			

*Residential developments permitted in the C-1, C-2, C-3, C-B, and CC zoning districts are subject to the development standards for the MFR-2 district.

** Where a lot has a width of less than fifty feet (50') or an area of less than five-thousand (5,000) square feet and was recorded under one ownership and has not subsequently been merged nor consolidated through recordation with an abutting lot under one ownership, nor provides required interior yard space, parking or other required amenities to an existing dwelling, such lot may be occupied by any use permitted in this section except that: a) any such lot that is thirty-three (33) feet or less in average width shall constitute a residential building site for no more than one single-family dwelling unit; and b) any such lot that is wider than thirty-three (33) feet but less than thirty-seven and one-half (37.5) feet in average width, shall constitute a residential building site for no more than two dwelling units.

***Planning Commission may allow up to 75 feet height limit on larger parcels (7,500 sq. ft. or more) with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.45
Parking Requirements**

Type of Use	Parking Requirement
Single Family	2 spaces per unit
Duplex	2 spaces per unit
Multifamily (3 or more units)	
1 bedroom	1 space per unit
2 bedroom	1.5 spaces per unit
3 or more bedrooms	2 spaces per unit
Guest Parking	1 space per 5 units
Senior Multifamily ^a	1 space per every 2 units, plus 1 space for each employee per main shift
Convalescent Hospital/Nursing Home	1 space for every 3 patient beds
Rooming House	1 space for every 2 bedrooms
Live/Work	Same as for similar commercial/ industrial use, Min. 2 spaces per unit
Second Dwelling Unit	1 space per unit

a. Parking requirements may be modified with conditional use permit approval.
Source: City of Richmond Zoning Ordinance, 2011.

**Table 5.46
Residential Land Uses Permitted by Residential Zoning District**

Residential Land Use	Residential Zoning Districts						
	SFR-1	SFR-2	SFR-3	MFR-1	MFR-2	MFR-3	MFR-4
Single Family	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Second Dwelling Unit	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Duplex			CUP	P	P	P	P
Multifamily Residential				P	P	P	P
Senior Housing					CUP	CUP	CUP
Planned Residential Groups	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Live/Work							
Caretaker's Residence							
Floating Homes							
Congregate Care, Limited*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Congregate Care, General	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Day Care Home, Limited and General*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Day Care Centers	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities**	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities***				CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Recovery Facility, Limited*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Recovery Facility, General	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Correctional and Rehabilitation Facilities							
Bed and Breakfast Inns	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Hotels or Motels						CUP	CUP
Rooming and Boarding Houses****					CUP	CUP	CUP

Note: P = Permitted as-of-right, CUP = Conditional Use Permit required.

*Primary use of the property remains residential

**For 10 persons or fewer only

***For more than 10 persons

****Includes single-room occupancy

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.47
Residential Land Uses Permitted by Commercial Zoning District**

Residential Land Use	Commercial Zoning Districts				
	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-B	C-C
Single Family	P	P	P	P	CUP
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	P
Second Dwelling Unit	P	P	P	P	CUP
Duplex	P	P	P	P	CUP
Multifamily Residential	P	P	P	P	CUP
Senior Housing	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Planned Residential Groups	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Live/Work	P	P	P	P	P
Caretaker's Residence					
Floating Homes					CUP
Congregate Care, Limited*	P	P	CUP	CUP	
Congregate Care, General	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Day Care Home, Limited and General*	P	P	P	CUP	
Day Care Centers	P	P	P	CUP	
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities**					
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities***	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Recovery Facility, Limited*	P	P	P	CUP	
Recovery Facility, General	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Correctional and Rehabilitation Facilities			CUP		
Bed and Breakfast Inns	P	CUP	P	CUP	CUP
Hotels or Motels		CUP	P	CUP	CUP
Rooming and Boarding Houses****	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	

Note: P = Permitted as-of-right, CUP = Conditional Use Permit required.

*Primary use of the property remains residential

**For 10 persons or fewer only

***For more than 10 persons

****Includes single-room occupancy

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.48
Residential Land Uses Permitted by All Other Zoning Districts**

Residential Land Use	All Other Zoning Districts						
	M-1	M-2	M-3	M-4	EA	CRR	PC
Single Family					P		
Manufactured Homes					P		
Second Dwelling Unit					P		
Duplex							
Multifamily Residential							
Senior Housing							
Planned Residential Groups							
Live/Work	P	CUP					
Caretaker's Residence	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Floating Homes							
Congregate Care, Limited*							CUP
Congregate Care, General							CUP
Day Care Home, Limited and General*							CUP
Day Care Centers	P	P					CUP
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities**							
Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing Facilities***							
Recovery Facility, Limited*							
Recovery Facility, General							
Correctional and Rehabilitation Facilities		CUP					CUP
Bed and Breakfast Inns							
Hotels or Motels							
Rooming and Boarding Houses***							

Note: P = Permitted as-of-right, CUP = Conditional Use Permit required.

*Primary use of the property remains residential

**For 10 persons or fewer only

***For more than 10 persons

****Includes single-room occupancy

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.49
Timeframes for Permit Procedures**

Type of Review	Processing Time	Approval Body
Environmental Review		
Categorical Exemption	0 to 7 weeks	S/DRB/PC
Negative Declaration	4 to 6 weeks	DRB/PC
Mitigated Negative Declaration	5 to 8 weeks	DRB/PC/CC
Environmental Impact Report	4 to 6 months	DRB/PC/CC
Amendment and Variance Review		
General Plan Amendment or Rezoning	4 to 6 months	CC
Lot Line Adjustment or Parcel Merger	3 to 4 weeks	S
Variance	6 to 7 weeks	PC
Subdivision Review		
Pre-Application Study Session	3 to 4 weeks	DRB/PC/CC
Tentative Parcel Map	6 to 7 weeks	PC
Tentative Subdivision Map	4 to 6 months	PC
Use Permit Review		
Conditional Use Permit	6 to 7 weeks	PC
Over-the-Counter Design Review		
Solar Panel System	1 day	S
Accessory Structure (250 sq.ft. or less)	1 day	S
Small Addition – 500 sq.ft. or less and under 15 ft. height	1 day	S
Administrative Design Review		
Medium Addition – 501 to 1,200 sq.ft. and under 15 ft. height	3 to 4 weeks	S
Single-Family Unit or Duplex – 501 to 1,200 sq.ft. and under 15 ft. height	3 to 4 weeks	S
Attached Second Dwelling Unit – Not to exceed 30% of existing dwelling unit or 640 sq.ft., whichever is less	3 to 4 weeks	S
Garage Conversion	3 to 4 weeks	S
Design Review Board Review		
Accessory Structure – 251 sq.ft. or more	3 to 5 weeks	DRB
Medium Addition – 501 to 1,200 sq.ft. and over 15 ft. height	4 to 6 weeks	DRB
Large Addition – 1,200 sq.ft. or more	5 to 8 weeks	DRB
Single Family Unit or Duplex – 1,201 sq.ft. or more	5 to 8 weeks	DRB
Detached Second Dwelling Unit – not to exceed 640 sq.ft.	4 to 6 weeks	DRB
Multifamily Project – 3 to 5 units	5 to 8 weeks	DRB
Multifamily Project – 6 to 10 units	8 – 12 weeks	DRB
Multifamily Project – 11 or more units	4 to 6 months	DRB

Notes: S = Planning Staff, DRB = Design Review Board, PC = Planning Commission, CC = City Council

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.50
Required Application Materials**

	Single-Family Unit or Duplex	Second Dwelling Unit	Residential Subdivision or Condominiums	Multifamily Apartments
Application Form	X	X	X	X
Review Fees	X	X	X	X
Project Description	X	X	X	X
Green Building Checklist	X	X	X	X
Title Report			X	X
Phasing Plan			X	X
Subdivision Map			X	
Site Plan(s)	X	X	X	X
Contextual Map			X	X
Site Cross-Sections			X	X
Building Elevations	X	X	X	X
Street Elevation	X		X	X
Building Cross Sections	X	X	X	X
Floor Plans	X	X	X	X
Roof Plans			X	X
Landscape Plans	X		X	X
Preliminary Utility Plan			X	X
Lighting and Photometric Plan			X	X
Tree Survey			X	X
Sign Plans			X	X
Materials Samples Board	X	X	X	X
Color Samples Board	X	X	X	X
Exterior Lighting Board			X	X
Inclusionary Housing Statement			X	X
Soil and Geological Report			X	X
Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan	X		X	X
Stormwater Control Plan and Report			X	X
Photo Exhibit	X	X	X	X

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.51
Typical Processing Procedures by Residential Project Type**

	Single-Family Unit or Duplex	Second Dwelling Unit	Residential Subdivision or Condominiums	Multifamily Apartments
Categorical Exemption	X	X		
Mitigated Negative Declaration			X	X
Application Completeness Review	X	X	X	X
General Plan Consistency Review	X	X	X	X
Zoning Compliance Review	X	X	X	X
Bike Master Plan Consistency Review			X	X
Pedestrian Master Plan Consistency Review			X	X
Park Master Plan Consistency Review			X	X
Five-Year Strategic Business Plan Consistency Review			X	X
Prelim. Building Review			X	X
Prelim. Fire Review			X	X
Prelim. Engineering Review			X	X
Prelim. Wastewater Review			X	X
Prelim. Stormwater Review			X	X
Neighborhood Council Review	X	X	X	X
Notice of Public Hearing	X	X	X	X
Staff Report and Recommendation	X	X	X	X
Design Review Board Review	X	X	X	X
Planning Commission Review			X	X
Appeal Period	X	X	X	X
Estimated Total Processing Time	5 to 8 weeks	3 to 6 weeks	1 to 6 months	1 to 6 months

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

**Table 5.52
Development Permit Fees**

Service	Fee
Environmental Review	
Preliminary CEQA Review	\$148
Negative Declaration	\$9,598
Mitigated Negative Declaration	\$13,290
Environmental Impact Report	\$16,243
Mitigation Monitoring (First Year)	\$7,009
Mitigation Monitoring (Subsequent Years)	\$3,658
Fish and Game Negative Declaration Fee	\$2,152
Amendment Review	
General Plan Amendment	\$14,601
Specific Plan Amendment	\$14,601
Rezoning	\$14,601
Lot Line Adjustment or Parcel Merger	\$2,856
Variance Review	
Residential Related Variance	\$1,627
Subdivision Review	
Pre-Application Study Session	\$4,504
Tentative Parcel Map (Subdivision of 0 to 4)	\$7,539
Tentative Parcel Map (Subdivision of 5 to 25)	\$10,647
Tentative Parcel Map (Subdivision of 26 to 100)	\$13,134
Tentative Parcel Map (Subdivision of 101 to 200)	\$16,087
Tentative Parcel Map (Subdivision of 201 or more lots)	\$18,963
Preliminary Plan	\$1,920
Development Plan	\$2,215
Certificate of Compliance	\$2,154
Street Vacation Review	\$3,286
Conditional Use Permit Review	
Residential Uses	\$3,876
CUP Amendment	\$1,591
Design Review - Over the Counter	
Small Addition (500 sq. ft. or less under 15 ft. height)	\$111
Design Review - Administrative	
Medium Addition (501 to 1,200 sq. ft. under 15 ft)	\$641
Single-Family Unit or Duplex (501 to 1,200 sq. ft. under 15 ft.)	\$1,438
Attached Second Dwelling Unit	\$816
Garage Conversion	\$605
Design Review - Residential	
Medium Addition (501 to 1,200 sq. ft. over 15 ft.)	\$1,253
Large Addition (1,201 sq. ft. or more)	\$1,982

Service	Fee
Design Review - Residential (Contd.)	
Single-Family Unit or Duplex (1,201 sq. ft. or more)	\$2,817
Detached Second Dwelling Unit (less than 640 sq. ft.)	\$1,137
Multifamily Project (3 to 5 units)	\$4,023
Multifamily Project (6 to 10 units)	\$6,188
Multifamily Project (11 or more units)	\$8,549
Building Fees (Building Fees are based on project valuation. Fees listed are based on a typical project valuation of \$200,000.)	
Building Permit	\$2,380
Electrical Permit	\$308
Plumbing Permit	\$257
Mechanical Permit	\$198
Building Plan Check	\$2,237
Landscaping Plan Check	\$138
Engineering Site Review	\$456
Energy Conservation Site Review	\$456
Comprehensive Planning Fee	\$354
Occupancy Certification Program	\$238
Certificate of Occupancy Fee	\$60
CAL Admin Revolving Fund	\$7
Cost to Admin SB 1473	\$1
Strong Motion Instrumentation Program (SMIP) Fee	\$20
Filing "3 or more res adds & all others" Fee	\$226
Fire Department Plan Check	\$360
Impact Fees	
West Contra School District Fees	4.84 per sq. ft.
Subregional Transportation Mitigation Fee - Single Family	\$2,898
Subregional Transportation Mitigation Fee - Multifamily	\$1,838 per unit
Public Facility Impact Fee - Single Family	\$14,081
Public Facility Impact Fee - Multifamily	\$11,348 per unit
Water and Wastewater Connection Fees	
EBMUD Service Connection Fee - Single Family	
Installation Charge	\$5,644
System Capacity Charge	\$15,020
EDMUD Service Connection Fee - Multifamily	
Installation Charge	\$10,000 - \$24,000
System Capacity Charge	\$8,750 per unit
WCWD Service Connection Fee - Single Family	\$2,778
WCWD Service Connection Fee - Multifamily	\$2,000 per unit

Source: City of Richmond Department of Planning and Building Services.

Table 5.53
Proportion of Fee in Overall Development Cost for a Typical Residential Development

Development Cost for a Typical Unit	Single Family	Multifamily
Total Estimated Fees Per Unit	\$61,000	\$32,000
Typical Estimated Cost of Development per Unit	\$430,000	\$318,000
Estimated proportion of fee cost to overall development cost per unit	14.2%	10.1%

Source: City of Richmond.

Possible City Constraints to Housing for Disabled Persons

Senate Bill 520 requires all jurisdictions, as a part of the Housing Element update process, to examine and identify any city policies or procedures that may constrain the development, maintenance or improvement of housing for disabled persons. This examination includes an evaluation of existing land use controls, permit and processing procedures, fees and exactions, and building codes.

The City of Richmond continues to incorporate the Federal Fair Housing Act, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act of 1964, and the 1997 Uniform Building Code and ADA requirements as a part of its building requirements. These three laws address the fair housing practices adhered to by the City, which include practices against housing discrimination towards persons with disabilities.

Congregate care homes are identified in the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Congregate care homes of six or fewer persons are allowed by right, in compliance with state regulations, in all current residential zones. Further, the City does not have any established conditions or use restrictions established for group homes of greater than six persons, however a conditional use permit (CUP) is required for these homes. Any project within the City, which requires a CUP for approval, must be approved by the Planning Commission. This requirement could be considered a constraint to housing development for disabled persons, however, the CUP process is not implemented to constrain housing development of this type, but to ensure that proper staffing and care is provided at these types of facilities. The City does not have any specific guidelines for a congregate care home conditional use permit, other than general conditions of approval required of all projects requiring a CUP. Individual conditions may require specific design features to meet the special ADA needs of its occupants and may be based on the structure such as the installation of emergency and fire alarms and exits, roof shingles meeting or exceeding 30-year performance standards, and roof water drainage. No restrictions are placed on the siting of this type of housing.

The City does not have occupancy standards for unrelated adults. The City does not regulate the siting of special needs housing in the Land Use Element or the Zoning Code. The City continues to have no specific processes to make reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities in the Planning and Building Services Department, however the City will accommodate any reasonable request for assistance.

A minor retrofit of a home to allow for accessibility is an over-the-counter permit process, and any major retrofits may require review by the Building Division. The City continues to have no policies or programs to reduce parking standards for facilities designed for disabled persons.

City Efforts to Remove Housing Constraints

Richmond continues to have no locally imposed restrictions such as “no growth” limitations, growth management plans or annual development quotas on the supply of new housing. Over 33 percent of the land in Richmond continues to be designated for residential land use.

The City continues to take an aggressive role in alleviating governmental constraints to the construction of affordable housing. City building, planning and subdivision fees and fees required by other public entities such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District, East Bay Municipal Utilities District, and BART remain an impediment to the development of affordable housing. In the past, the Planning and Building Services Department has introduced legislation to the City in order to waive fees for affordable housing projects, however, because of the City’s present budget problems, the measure has not been implemented. Land write-down and other types of subsidies have been used to develop recent projects and will continue to be considered for use in order to increase affordability.

In October 2001, the City of Richmond adopted an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance that requires from 10 to 25 percent of units in new developments of 10 or more units to be affordable, or that the developer pay an in-lieu fee.

The 2005 Housing Element indicated that much of the City’s target area neighborhoods are currently zoned at higher densities than existing development reflects. These areas continue to have the capability to accommodate much more intensive uses. While the Zoning Ordinance does regulate the development of housing in Richmond, it in no way deters or poses significant constraints on such development in the City.

Infill Housing Initiative Strategy (IHI)

In 2004, the City developed the Infill Housing Initiative Strategy (IHI) to develop 400-500 housing units on vacant lots and abandoned properties in developed Richmond neighborhoods and make them available for sale to low and moderate-income households. As part of the strategy, the City developed a selection of architectural plans for sub-standard 25-foot wide infill lots. The plans, which adhered to City development standards, were made available to applicants, thus expediting the permitting process for those lots. To further facilitate development of the infill lots, the Richmond City Council approved a \$500,000 community investment agreement with Wells Fargo to assist in acquiring and developing the in-fill units for low-and moderate-income ownership. The investment provided revolving acquisition pre-development funds to allow the City to develop housing on in-fill lots. Prior to the economic recession starting in 2007, the program succeeded in facilitating the construction of 23 affordable units. The City plans to resume the program upon revising its standard architectural plans to meet the 2010 California Building Code.

Rehabilitation and Relocation Assistance

The enforcement of building codes, while resolving code violations, may have a negative impact on preserving a city’s existing affordable housing stock by requiring the relocation of lower income tenants. The City continues to alleviate some of the relocation anxieties initiated by code enforcement and abatement by offering relocation services to tenants and rehabilitation loan assistance to absentee landlords.

Cost Reductions

The City provides cost reductions to developers through the Density Bonus Ordinance when very low and low-income family and senior units are proposed. The Ordinance was recently amended to parallel the State’s most recent requirements. Further cost reductions occur in the form of increased densities and in incentives such as flexibility in site development standards and zoning code requirements.

Reductions in development fees and dedication requirements, public financing, and/or accelerated plan checks may also be used to provide incentives to developers for the construction of affordable housing.

Further cost reductions occur through the more efficient use of land in a Planned Area district. For example, the Planned Area district of the zoning code allows design flexibility through, but not limited to, small lots, cluster developments and mixed unit types.

The City provides cost savings through financing options to lower income households. Activities include, but are not limited to homebuyer assistance, owner rehabilitation loans and emergency loans, the REAL (Richmond Effort to Abate Lead) Program, and rental rehabilitation loans.

Non-governmental Constraints

Cost of Land

The cost of land is one of the most significant contributing factors towards the high cost of housing in the region. Over the last twenty years, a growing population has ensured a continuing demand for land, which in turn, has led to increasing costs.

A search on the internet for land-for-sale records in August 2012 found few vacant residential properties for sale in Richmond. The survey showed that the cost of land fluctuates widely depending on location, with single-family land averaging around \$22 per square foot and commercial parcels zoned for multifamily averaging around \$17 per square foot.

The high cost of land in Richmond is a constraint to the development of lower income housing. Given the situation, developers will have to construct multifamily housing at higher densities and smaller unit sizes to generate economies of scale for the development to be profitable, or obtain public or private subsidies to offset high costs of land.

Cost of Construction

Construction costs include material costs, equipment, as well as labor costs. The high cost of labor in the Bay Area is a major factor for why construction costs are higher in the San Francisco Bay Area than in other parts of the country.

According to the U.S. Census, for building permits issued in 2011, the average estimated construction cost of single-family housing in Richmond was \$215,041 per unit. A search on an internet source (www.building-cost.net), provided by the Craftsman Book Company, provided a slightly lower estimate of \$203,497 for a small three bedroom house of 1,700 square feet. It is important to note that these estimates do not include land costs, financing, permits/fees, developer profit or marketing costs. Based on construction costs alone, a single-family home constructed in Richmond can cost at least \$120 per square foot, depending on the quality of finishes and amenities.

Construction costs for multifamily residential units can vary more than those for single-family homes due to the greater range in which they can be built. A high-end senior complex with senior-friendly amenities will cost much more than an affordable multifamily complex. RS Means Quick Estimator (www.rsmeans.com) estimates construction costs for a low-rise, 7,200 square foot multifamily residential building to be in the range of \$248 and \$345 per square foot. Amenities such as elevators, common open space and landscaped areas can also add to the overall cost.

To reduce construction costs, developers may build at higher densities to increase the economies of scale. In most cases, reduced parking requirements can also make construction more affordable. Developers can also reduce costs by using better, newer construction methodology such as modular construction, off-site manufacturing, and prefabrication. Many of these techniques can help save time, control quality, eliminate waste and labor costs, thereby keeping costs to a minimum.

Availability of Financing

Given the high cost of ownership in the Bay Area, the availability of financing is an important factor in determining whether a potential homeowner can afford to purchase a home. The availability of financing in a community depends on a number of factors, including the type of lending institutions active in the community and the lending practices of those institutions. Through analysis of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data on the disposition of residential loan applications, an assessment can be made of the availability of residential financing within a community.

In general, credit-worthy buyers in Richmond have not had difficulty obtaining loans. Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data for 2009 indicates that Richmond residents were able to obtain approximately the same percentage of loans as residents in surrounding cities. As long as buyers are able to provide the necessary down payment and have middle- or high-incomes, banks and financial institutions have provided credit. In 2008, the federal government raised mortgage limits for loans guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration to \$729,750 in an effort to encourage banks to approve larger mortgages.

Lower income households and buyers without capital or equity, however, still face difficulty obtaining quality financing. Until 2006, prospective buyers had been able to purchase homes with small down payments, or even no money down, borrowing more than the house was worth. After the 2007 housing crisis, sub-prime lending is no longer available. Few lower income households are able to afford a 20 percent down payment for a home.

Housing Resources and Opportunities

This section contains an inventory of adequate sites in Richmond that can be developed to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). It also contains an analysis of potential development constraints for those sites and examines opportunities for energy conservation.

Adequate Sites: Available Sites for Housing

Under State law, the City is required to demonstrate that its land inventory can adequately accommodate its share of the region's projected growth. This is accomplished through an evaluation of vacant and underutilized residential and mixed-use properties with potential for residential development within the timeframe of the Housing Element. Appendix C contains a list of vacant parcels zoned for residential development, as well as city maps indentifying the location of each vacant parcel.

In June 2012 the City conducted a comprehensive review of all vacant sites designated for residential and mixed-use development in Richmond to assess future residential production potential. Parcels that did not meet the minimum lot area requirements outlined in the City's Zoning Ordinance (generally less than 5,000 square feet) and parcels above 400 feet in elevation were excluded. The maximum unit capacity for each vacant parcel was calculated based on the allowable density permitted by each parcel's zoning designation. Realistic unit capacity for residential zones was determined based on an 80 percent buildout factor, which assumes that development standards combined with unique physical and environmental site features may not always lead to 100 percent buildout. Realistic unit capacity for commercial zones was determined based on a 60 percent buildout factor. Although typical mixed-use developments in Richmond have achieved densities of 50 units per acre, the reduced buildout factor accounts for non-residential uses that may occur on mixed-use sites. In addition, the housing element only identified sites determined to have the greatest viability for residential development within the planning period given the size of sites and location, which is smaller than actual development potential in Richmond.

Table 5.54 summarizes vacant land by zoning designation, including acreage, number of parcels, allowable density, maximum unit capacity, and realistic unit capacity. Richmond currently has approximately 246 acres of developable vacant land zoned for residential and mixed-use development within the City limits that can accommodate 2,350 residential units. Of the 2,350 potential residential units, 1,601 units could be developed in single-family and multifamily zoning districts. An additional 749 units could be developed in commercial zoning districts. Multifamily development is allowed by-right in C-1, C-2, C-3, and CB zoning districts, and by conditional use permit in the CC district. Commercial zones permit densities equal to that of the MFR-2 zone or up to 34.8 units per acre.

The MFR-2, MFR-3 and commercial zoning districts have historically been developed at higher densities and with units affordable to lower income households, and thus are areas most likely to accommodate a substantial amount of Richmond's share of the regional housing need for lower income households. As shown in **Table 5.55**, approximately 36 vacant acres are located in high density (greater than 30 du/acre) MFR-3 and commercial zones with a potential unit capacity of 760 units. This exceeds the remaining very low and low-income RHNA allocation of 503 units.

The City recently adopted a comprehensive update to its General Plan in April 2012. The Richmond General Plan 2030 promotes mixed-use, high-density, infill development in Richmond's Downtown and along its major commercial and transit corridors. This sustainable land use policy will facilitate increased housing production by allowing for higher densities, lower development costs and expedited environmental review,

which will significantly expand the City's ability to meet its RHNA in current and future housing element cycles.

In addition to the vacant residential land identified in **Table 5.54**, **Table 5.56** lists recently constructed projects that have produced new residential units since 2007, or are anticipated to result in new single family and multifamily construction during 2007-2014 planning period. Of the 1,216 units approved, permitted or constructed since 2007, 227 were affordable to very low and low-income households.

Richmond Livable Corridors Plan Form-Based Code

The majority of the vacant sites appropriate for housing development are located within the planning area of the Richmond Livable Corridors Plan Form-Based Code (FBC). See Appendix D for a map of the Livable Corridors planning area. The FBC, scheduled for completion and adoption in summer 2013, will implement the General Plan vision, policies and objectives for major commercial corridors including Macdonald Avenue, San Pablo Avenue and 23rd Street.

The FBC will regulate development characteristics and standards including building placement, form, height, frontage, and land use. FBCs seek to foster predictable built results and a high-quality public realm. As an alternative to conventional zoning, they focus on the creation, revitalization, and preservation of vibrant, walkable urban places. They utilize physical form, rather than use, as their primary organizing principle, and provide standards for both private and public realms.

The Richmond Livable Corridors Plan is expected to have 10 zones that will allow for a variety of housing types including single-family homes, second units, multifamily housing, group housing, residential care facilities, transitional/supportive housing, live/work, and work/live. Multifamily housing will be allowed (by-right or with a Minor Use Permit) throughout the planning area.

While the FBC does not regulate density through minimum or maximum units per acre, the FBC will exceed densities allowed under the current zoning and accommodate General Plan densities of up to 125 units per acre. In addition, the FBC will incentive infill residential development through larger buildable areas, increased building heights, mixed-use sites, relaxed parking standards, and streamlined permit review. Specifically, the draft FBC provides for significant increases to maximum building heights for buildings with 25 percent or more affordable or senior units in T6 Core, T5 Main Street, and T4 Main Street zones and the elimination of parking requirements for affordable or senior units in the T4 Neighborhood and T4 Main Street zones. The FBC will also introduce new opportunities for multifamily housing on sites that were formerly reserved for commercial uses.

**Table 5.54
Total Vacant Residential Sites**

Zone		Acres	# of Parcels	Allowable Density (du/acre)	Max Unit Capacity	Realistic Unit Capacity Density ^a
Residential						
SFR-1	Single Family Rural Residential District	24.95	2	4.0	99	79
SFR-2	Single Family Very Low Density Residential District	147.43	38	7.3	1,070	856
SFR-3	Single Family Low Density Residential District	17.20	85	11.6	200	160
SFR-3/EA	Single Family Very Low Density Residential	12.83	12	26.2	336	336
MFR-1	Multifamily Residential District	7.52	38	26.4	199	159
MFR-3	Multifamily High Density Residential District	0.25	2	54.5	13	11
<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>210.18</i>	<i>177</i>		<i>1,917</i>	<i>1,601</i>
Commercial						
C-1	Neighborhood Commercial	3.33	16	34.8	116	70
C-2	General Commercial	20.26	28	34.8	706	424
C-3	General Commercial	5.63	3	34.8	196	118
CB	Central Business District	2.61	16	34.8	91	55
CC	Coastline Commercial District	4.01	3	34.8	140	84
<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>35.84</i>	<i>66</i>		<i>1,249</i>	<i>749</i>
Total		246.02	243		3,166	2,350
<i>Sites suitable to accommodate Richmond's share of regional housing need for lower income households (max density at least 30 du/acre)</i>		<i>36.09</i>	<i>68</i>		<i>1,263</i>	<i>760</i>

a. Based on historical trends and assumption that development standards combined with unique site features may not always lead to 100 percent buildout. Assumes 80 percent realistic unit capacity for residential zones and 60 percent for commercial zones. Note: Some totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: City of Richmond, Lisa Wise Consulting, Seifel Consulting Inc.

**Table 5.55
Comparison of Regional Growth Need and Vacant Sites**

Income Group	Remaining RHNA	Density ^a	Vacant Acres	Units Accommodated on Vacant Parcels
Very Low	317	>30 du/acre	36.09	760
Low	186			
Moderate	301	<30 du/acre	209.93	1,590
Above Moderate	806			
Total	1,610		246.02	2,350

a. Per Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B), sites zoned for densities greater than 30 du/acre are deemed appropriate to accommodate Richmond's share of regional housing need for lower income households.

Source: City of Richmond, Seifel Consulting.

**Table 5.56
Units Approved, Permitted, And/Or Built Since 2007**

Project Name	Status	Total Units	Units by Income Level				Funding Source
			VL	L	M	AM	
12th and Macdonald Mixed-Use	Entitled	237	0	118	119	0	RDA Tax Increment
13th St. Homes	Complete	8				8	
25 Harbour Wy.	Entitled	21				21	
Adams Condos	Complete	4				4	
Adams Condos	Complete	3				3	
Adams IHI	Complete	1				1	
Almonte SDU	Complete	1				1	
Anchor Cove at Marina Bay	Complete	132				132	
Anchor Cove at Marina Bay	Complete	5				5	
Anchorage at Marina Bay	Complete	212				212	
Artisan Cove	Entitled	51				51	
Askarbiuki Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Ayala Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Bains Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Barrera Duplex	Complete	2				2	
Bepler Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Chavez IHI	Complete	1				1	
CHDC Subdivision	Entitled	3				3	
Clear Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Cochrane Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Del Carpio Residence	Complete	1				1	
Diaz Townhouses	Entitled	3				3	
Doellstedt Residence	Complete	1				1	
Easter Hill Housing	Complete	24				24	
EBRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	
Filbert Infill	Completed	8	0	3	5	0	HOME, 2007 RDA Bond, In Lieu
Forsati Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Fran Wy. Condominiums	Complete	12				12	
Garrity Way Apartments	Entitled	127				127	
Grant Reconstruction	Under Construction	1				1	
Guerrero Duplex	Complete	2				2	
Gutierrez	Entitled	1				1	
Gutierrez Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Hernandez Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Hillary Residence	Complete	1				1	
Hollman IHI	Entitled	1				1	
Jay Betts	Complete	2				2	
Jimenez Second Unit	Complete	1				1	
Joaquin MU	Entitled	23				23	
Kowalski Subdivision	Entitled	1				1	
Kozy Kove Subdivision	Entitled	2				2	
Lan Conversion	Complete	1				1	
Lillie Mae Jones Plaza	Complete	26	12	0	14	0	HOME, Section 108, 2007 RDA Bond
Magganas Mixed Use Building	Complete	5				5	
Mancheno IHI	Complete	1				1	
Martinez Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Maydor IHI	Entitled	1				1	
McCabe Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Meyers Second Unit	Complete	1				1	
Miraflores Senior Housing	Entitled	80	18	20	41	1	HOME, Section 108, CALReUse
Munoz Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Nevin Court	Entitled	10				10	
NRLD IHI	Complete	1				1	
NRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	
NRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	
NRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	
NRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	

**Table 5.56
Units Approved, Permitted, And/Or Built Since 2007**

Project Name	Status	Total Units	Units by Income Level				Funding Source
			VL	L	M	AM	
NRLD IHI	Entitled	1				1	
NRLD IHI	Complete	1				1	
Oasis Court	Entitled	8				8	
Ocean Ave. Planned Group	Entitled	2				2	
Onweller Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Pacific Homes	Complete	2				2	
Peng Third Unit	Complete	1				1	
Perez Residence	Complete	1				1	
Ramirez Building	Complete	2				2	
Ramsey Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Raya Second Unit	Complete	1				1	
RNHS	Complete	2				2	
Rodriguez IHI	Complete	1				1	
Romero IHI	Complete	1				1	
Ronseco Residence	Complete	1				1	
Rosbuck IHI	Complete	1				1	
RRP Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Ruiz SDU	Complete	1				1	
Ruiz Second Unit	Complete	1				1	
Sanchez Residence	Complete	1				1	
Santa Fe Condos	Complete	6				6	
Saunders Residence	Complete	1				1	
Soares IHI	Under Construction	1				1	
Soungpanya Duplex	Complete	2				2	
Sunset Court Subdivision	Entitled	8				8	
Townsend Building	Entitled	5				5	
Treadway Condos	Complete	4				4	
Trinity Plaza	Complete	66	32	0	34	0	2004A RDA Bond, Section 108
UHI IHI	Entitled	1				1	
UHI IHI	Entitled	1				1	
Valencia Residence	Entitled	1				1	
Varela Second Dwelling	Complete	1				1	
Vernon Castro	Complete	50	12	12	26	0	In Lieu
Western Dr. Planned Group	Under Construction	2				2	
Yando-Olsen Residence	Complete	1				1	
Total		1,216	74	153	239	750	

Source: City of Richmond.

Potential Development Constraints

Sites identified for residential development in the City were analyzed to determine their relationship to public facilities, services and existing or potential physical and environmental constraints to potential development. As part of the Environmental Impact Report for the Richmond General Plan 2030, the City has adopted program-level mitigation measures to address environmental constraints for future development.

Public Facilities and Services

The short- and long-term development viability of the vacant and underutilized sites in the land inventory is directly linked to the availability and capacity of public facilities and services. The City's Community Facilities and Infrastructure Element, adopted as part of the Richmond's General Plan 2030, addresses the current and future needs for educational and human service facilities in Richmond such as schools, libraries and community centers, as well as infrastructure and public utilities such as streets, water, sewer, waste, communications and electricity. The goals and policies of the Community Facilities and Infrastructure Element seek to improve these facilities and services to meet community needs as the City grows. As an urbanized community, infrastructure is available for virtually all vacant residential and commercial parcels in the City. All of the sites have utilities available or nearby, and only interior distribution services would need to be provided. Infill sites are already fully provided with utilities.

The City maintains about half of the sewer lines within the City's boundaries. The Richmond Municipal Sewer District services an area that encompasses 13.5 square miles, generally described as being bounded by Tulare Street to the north, the City of El Cerrito to the east, Richmond Inner Harbor to the south and Castro Street to the west. The wastewater treatment plant located in Point Richmond at 601 Canal Boulevard treats the wastewater collected by the District. Residents living in the northern half of Richmond are served by West County Wastewater District (WCWD). Residents in the southern section of the Richmond Annex are serviced by Stege Sanitary District (SSD). The City has adequate sewer capacity to serve existing development as well as new residential development needed to serve projected increases in population.

The City's drinking water supply is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), which provides water for 1.3 million customers in Alameda and Contra Costa County. The water supply originates from Mokelumne River watershed in the Sierra Nevada and extends 90 miles to the East Bay. The current system, which includes a recently upgraded treatment facility, has enough capacity to serve more than the City's planned growth.

While all land designated for residential use is served by sewer and water lines, streets, storm drains, telephone, electrical, and gas lines, as an older community, much of the Richmond's infrastructure is aging and will require improvements or replacement over time.

SB 1087, effective January 2006, requires water and sewer providers to grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include units affordable to lower income households. Pursuant to these statutes, upon adoption of its Housing Element, Richmond will immediately deliver the Housing Element to local water and sewer providers, along with a summary of its regional housing needs allocation.

Flooding, Sea Level Rise and Tsunami Inundation

Globally, scientists expect changing temperatures to result in disruption of ecosystems, more frequent and damaging storms accompanied by flooding and land slides, increases in the number and severity of heat waves, extended water shortages as a result of reduced snow pack, increased likelihood of wildfires, and disturbance of wildlife habitats and agricultural activities. Local impacts are not definitive, but Richmond could experience changes to local and regional weather patterns, rising bay water level, changes in salinity and tidal patterns of San Francisco and San Pablo bays, coastal erosion, water restrictions, vegetation changes, and

disrupted species migration patterns and extinctions. However, nearly all of the sites included in the vacant land inventory are not subject to significant flood, sea level rise or tsunami inundation related impacts. Appendix E includes maps from the Richmond General Plan 2030 identifying areas vulnerable to flooding, potential sea level rise and tsunami inundation.

Geology and Seismic Vulnerability

The 400-foot crest of the Sobrante Ridge serves as the elevation transition between the City core's low-lying areas and the San Pablo-Potrero Hills Range. The vegetation and topography of parcels above 400 feet leaves development vulnerable to wildland fires and soil hazards such as landslides. For these reasons, developers are encouraged to concentrate residential development below the 400-foot elevation.

The 1997 Uniform Building Code locates Richmond and the entire Bay Area in Seismic Risk Zone 4, an area expected to experience maximum magnitudes and damage in the event of an earthquake. According to the April 2008 U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet, the probability of at least one major 6.7 magnitude or greater earthquake capable of causing widespread damage striking somewhere in the San Francisco Bay Area before 2037 is 63 percent.

A portion of the North Hayward Fault runs through the eastern portion of Richmond. The State Mining and Geology Board has established a Special Studies Zone in Richmond per the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones Act that was created to delineate zones encompassing all active fault traces. Two major earthquakes have occurred along the fault, in 1836 and 1868, with magnitudes greater than 7.0. This fault is the most hazardous system in the Bay Area, with a likelihood of 31 percent for a magnitude 6.7 or higher earthquake in the next 30 years. Major activity along the fault is likely to cause extensive structural damage in the region.

The San Andreas Fault, California's longest and most active fault, is located approximately 15 miles west of Richmond. A significant earthquake along this fault could result in severe damage in Richmond. The 1906 and 1989 earthquakes were produced by the San Andreas Fault, which has a 21 percent probability of generating another earthquake with a magnitude 6.7 or higher in the next 30 years.

Appendix F includes maps that show areas subject to landslides, known earthquake faults located near Richmond and indicate earthquake probabilities.

Environmental Contamination

Brownfield sites are abandoned or underutilized industrial and commercial sites that may be complicated by the presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. As an older industrial city, Richmond has a higher incidence of these sites, which often require environmental clean up prior to development. This is particularly true for affordable housing development projects, where the economics of land costs often result in these developments being sited in areas that have historically been more likely to be environmentally contaminated due to their closer proximity to industrial areas. Environmental mitigation adds to the cost of development. State mandated regulations call for detailed documentation, analyses and public participation requirements in the determination of environmental impacts and their mitigation. As shown in Appendix C, the vacant land inventory includes 10 environmental brownfield sites, three of which are currently under remediation by the Miraflores Housing Development developer. The remaining seven brownfield parcels account for approximately 463 units in the vacant land inventory. Even with the exclusion of these vacant brownfield parcels, Richmond exceeds the remaining very low and low-income RHNA allocation of 503 units as well as exceeds the total remaining RHNA allocation of 1,610 units, as shown in **Table 5.55** above.

Noise

The City's Public Safety and Noise Element, adopted as part of the Richmond General Plan 2030, identifies and evaluates public health and safety concerns, and aims to reduce noise levels to acceptable standards and reduce, eliminate or mitigate objectionable noise sources in Richmond. The Noise Element identifies motor

vehicles, airports, railroads and BART as primary noise sources in Richmond. Potential mitigation measures include establishment of noise compatible land use standards, development of guidelines to manage noise impacts, enforcement of noise standards, better construction techniques, changes in building orientation and site design layout, and promotion of innovative solutions to create buffers that mitigate noise impacts.

Opportunities for Energy Conservation

State law requires that housing elements discuss opportunities to encourage more energy saving features and materials, and energy efficient systems and design in residential development. This section discusses Richmond's efforts to expand energy conservation practices in residential development.

Energy and Climate Change Element

The Richmond General Plan 2030 includes one of the first energy and climate change elements in the Country. Many of the goals, policies and actions in Richmond's Energy and Climate Change Element relate to energy conservation in residential development. Specifically, Goal EC4 on Sustainable Development aims to reduce energy consumption by promoting sustainable infill development and encouraging the construction of higher-density, mixed-use projects around existing public transit, schools, parks, and neighborhood-serving retail. Richmond has begun a comprehensive update to its Zoning Code in order to make it consistent with the Richmond General Plan 2030. The Zoning Ordinance Update is currently underway and the draft Form Based Code is anticipated to be completed by Fall 2012, considered for adoption by Summer 2013, with the entire update of the Zoning Code anticipated to be completed by the end of 2015.

State Green Building Standards Code

In January 2010, the State Building Standards Commission unanimously adopted the first-in-the-nation mandatory Green Building Standard Code. Referred to as "CALGREEN," the new code became effective on January 1, 2011 and requires all new buildings in the state to be more energy efficient and environmentally responsible. Specifically, every new building constructed in California will need to reduce its water consumption by 20 percent, divert 50 percent of its construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting materials. The City's Planning and Building Services staff has been trained in the administration and enforcement of the CALGREEN code. The City is considering establishing incentives such as fee deferrals, fee reductions, expedited reviews, and other incentives for projects achieving LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) rating levels that exceed CALGREEN requirements.

Residential Energy Efficiency Programs

A variety of local programs summarized in **Table 5.57** are available to Richmond residents seeking to improve the energy efficiency of their existing homes. The City of Richmond continues to promote these programs and services through its website and participation at monthly neighborhood group meetings.

**Table 5.57
Energy Conservation Programs in Richmond**

Program	Provider	Service
R3 - Richmond Recovery Rebate for Energy Upgrade California	City of Richmond	Rebates from various Energy Upgrade California rebate programs including Richmond's R3 program.
R3 - Richmond Recovery Rebate for Solar	City of Richmond; GRID Alternatives	Rebates as well as free solar installations for qualifying homeowners.
Low Income Energy Savings Assistance Program	PG&E	Provides insulation, energy efficient light bulbs, weather sealing, showerheads, faucet aerators, and minor home repairs; replacement of old refrigerators, furnaces and/or water heaters; and discounted PG&E bill to income-qualified renters and homeowners.
Contra Costa County Weatherization Program	Contra Costa County	Provides free weatherization home improvements to income-qualified households.
Green Energy Training Services (GETS)	City of Richmond; Rising Sun Energy Center	Provides workforce development opportunities for Richmond residents and graduates of Richmond's green collar job training program RichmondBUILT. Maximum subsidy of \$5,000 per home to cover energy evaluation and construction work.
California Youth Energy Services	Rising Sun Energy Center	Free energy and water efficiency services, with a focus on hard-to-reach households including non-English speakers, renters and moderate income households.
Home Energy Efficiency Rebates (HEERS) Program	PG&E	Rebates for energy-efficient cooling systems, water heaters and appliances.
Energy Efficiency Rebates for Multifamily Properties (EERMP) Program	PG&E	Rebates for appliances and general improvements for multifamily properties.
Smart AC Program	PG&E	Free programmable digital thermostats that are Energy Star compliant.
Energy Efficient Cool Roof Program	PG&E	Rebates for new roof insulation.
Attic and Wall Insulation Program	PG&E	Rebates for new wall and attic insulation.
Energy Star New Home Program	PG&E	Partnership with builders wanting to ensure their projects exceed State energy-efficiency requirements by at least 15 percent.
California Solar Initiative (CSI)	PG&E	Rebates on fixed and tracking photovoltaic systems.
Gas Winter Savings Program	PG&E	Rebates for customers reducing their gas consumption over a three-year period.
Free Water Audit Program	EBMUD	Free water audits to enhance water conservation.

Source: Pacific Gas & Electric, East Bay Municipal Utility District, City of Richmond.

Review of Previous Element

To develop appropriate programs to address the housing issues and needs identified in the 2007-2014 Housing Element, the City of Richmond has reviewed the housing programs set forth in the 1996-2006 Housing Element and evaluated the effectiveness of these programs in delivering housing services and assistance. The City has also evaluated its progress in implementing the Housing Element.

Appropriateness

The State's housing goals are attained in part by ensuring that each region of the state meets its designated housing unit goals, which are allocated to local counties and cities in the Bay Area by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is one measure of the appropriateness of the City's Housing Element, and is a key benchmark in monitoring its success.

In the 1999-2006 Housing Element, the City set a quantified objective of 2,603 new units. This quantified objective met the ABAG RHNA goals established for the City for that period of time.

In the seven-year period encompassed by the previous housing element, new construction in the City of Richmond resulted in over 6,636 residential units built, 154.9 percent above the overall target. Specific goals and units built for each household income level are presented in **Table 5.58**.

Table 5.58
Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 1999 – 2006 and Units Provided

Income Group	RHNA Requirement		Units Provided
	Number	Percent	
Very Low	471	18.1%	818
Low	273	10.5%	501
Moderate	625	24.0%	604
Above Moderate	1,234	47.4%	4,713
Total	2,603	100%	6,636

Source: 2000 ABAG Regional Housing Needs Determination,
City of Richmond.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of Richmond's Housing Program in meeting regional housing needs can be measured by a level of achievement, which is simply the actual construction divided by the RHNA goal. The City exceeded its total 1999-2006 RHNA allocation by over 150 percent. The City exceeded its very low-income allocation by 74 percent, its low-income allocation by 84 percent, and its above moderate allocation by 282 percent. The City was 21 units shy of meeting its RHNA housing allocation for moderate-income households.

Progress of Richmond's 2005 Housing Goals and Programs

Table 5.59 provides an overview of Richmond's 1999-2006 Housing Element goals, and programs designed to achieve those goals.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 1: Secure or Make Available Sites for Affordable Housing Development (Timing: Ongoing)			
Make available sites for affordable housing construction, particularly for very low- and low-income families through the Land Assembly Program. City intends to develop 25 housing units affordable to lower income households.	The City and its Redevelopment Agency contributed surplus property and financed the acquisition of privately-owned land for the development of 200 units affordable to very low- and low-income residents.	Through public-private partnerships, the City substantially exceeded its objective of building 25 affordable units.	This program will be retained in limited capacity. Drastic cuts in funding and market conditions have virtually eliminated opportunities for land acquisition and new construction. In the short term, the City will focus on the rehabilitation of existing units and the purchase and resale of foreclosed properties as the primary means of providing affordable housing for low-income families.
Program 2: Inclusionary Housing Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Require all residential developments of ten or more housing units to assign a minimum number of units to be affordable to very low-, low- and/or moderate-income households, or pay an in-lieu fee.	The majority of developers elected to pay in-lieu fees as an alternative to providing the affordable units required under the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.	The City successfully increased the overall production of affordable housing in Richmond. However, the City would like to see more affordable units incorporated into market-rate housing projects. Also, local non-governmental organizations have suggested that the City's in-lieu fees should be increased to cover a higher proportion of the actual development cost per unit.	The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance will continue to be implemented. The City will examine other inclusionary housing ordinances in the Bay Area to learn about other incentives that could be used in Richmond to increase affordable housing production within market-rate housing developments. The City will also analyze its in-lieu fee to determine if the fees can be raised without exceeding the average development costs in the region.
Program 3: Affordable Housing Trust Fund (Timing: Ongoing)			
Establish the Contra Costa County Affordable Housing Trust Fund in association with other jurisdictions. The Fund will assist in the construction of housing units affordable to lower income households.	The trust fund has not yet been created due to the downturn in the real estate market. It may become more feasible to do so in coming years as the housing market improves.	The establishment of this program depends on funding availability and interest from other county jurisdictions.	The City will continue to work with other jurisdictions in Contra Costa County to try and establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Program 4: Residential Site Inventory (Timing: Ongoing)			
Use Geographical Information System (GIS), to create a list of land parcels in the City of Richmond that are (a) zoned for residential development, and (b) vacant. The City will maintain the inventory and update it annually to reflect changes in land uses and zoning.	The City Completed the Residential Site Inventory following adoption of the last Housing Element. The inventory lists vacant or underutilized parcels zoned for residential development in Excel and GIS. It provides information about each site's development capacity and known constraints such as environmental brownfields. The inventory is consistent with the recently adopted Richmond General Plan 2030. In September 2004, the City completed a vacant land survey and found approximately 224 vacant acres of land zoned for residential uses, representing a potential 4,161 housing units.	The City has utilized the Residential Site Inventory to identify sites for affordable housing projects. The City would like to make a user-friendly version of the inventory available to developers and the general public.	The City will continue to maintain its Residential Site Inventory. During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will develop a user-friendly version of the inventory and make it available to developers and the general public through the City's website.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 5: City Building Permits & Fees (Timing: By FY 2004/05)			
Expedite and simplify the permitting process for housing development, ensuring that development standards are reasonable.	The City established its One-Stop Permit Center as part of its City Hall renovations in 2009. In 2008, the City implemented a new electronic permit tracking system called "TRAKiT." Project application materials such as project plans, staff reports, and approval letters are currently made available to the public through the online TRAKiT portal. In 2010, the Planning and Building Services Department completed a user fee study and readjusted its fees for its planning review and building permit fees.	Implementation of the One-Stop Permit Center and new TRAKiT system has significantly improved the efficiency of the City's entitlement process. The One-Stop Permit Center requires each relevant department to be located on the same building floor, dramatically improving inter-departmental coordination on all project reviews.	The City will continue to identify opportunities to improve its entitlement process.
Program 6: Affordable Housing Financing (Timing: Ongoing)			
Provide financial support for affordable housing development by: 1) working with local lending institutions to create a shared pool of funds for affordable housing financing and to ease restrictions on underwriting standards; 2) using Redevelopment Agency tax increment and bonding capacity; 3) identifying and applying for state, federal and other funding programs; and 4) supporting the first-time homebuyer program and the renter and owner rehabilitation programs with the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund (LMIHF).	The Redevelopment Agency has provided more than 34 loans to first-time homebuyers as well as low- and moderate-income families. The Redevelopment Agency received approximately \$3 million in CalHOME funds. The Housing Authority has also included a Home Ownership component in the Easter Hill HOPE VI development, which included 82 single family dwellings, 30 percent of which were sold to low-income, first-time homebuyers.	This program has been largely successful. However, the City's ability to utilize tax increment financing and the LMIHF was eliminated with the dissolution of local redevelopment agencies on February 1, 2012.	The City will pursue alternative funding sources for future affordable housing projects in the absence of traditional redevelopment funding tools.
Program 7: Design Review, Planned Area, Tentative Development Plan, and Subdivision Review (Timing: Ongoing)			
Develop a form-based code for key commercial corridors. The code seeks to ensure that future multifamily development is compatible with adjacent single-family neighborhoods. Staff will educate elected and appointed officials and staff on form-based codes.	As part of its outreach efforts, the City has held four workshops to educate residents and appointed city officials about design methods for higher density developments that are compatible with single-family areas. The Planning and Building Services Department made available to the public and appointed officials on the Planning Division's website educational materials such as the PowerPoint presentations and handouts used during the workshops.	Successfully informed workshop participants about form-based codes and how they can be utilized to ensure desired building results in sensitive contexts. There has been very little opposition to the use of form-based codes to guide the future development of higher-density housing next to existing single-family neighborhoods.	The Planning and Building Services Department will continue to provide educational opportunities for residents and appointed officials interested in learning about the City's future form-based code.
Program 8: Housing Coordinating Group (Timing: Ongoing)			
Reestablish the Housing Coordinating Group to improve communication and coordination surrounding housing-related programs and projects within the City in order to: 1) generate maximum results in addressing Richmond's housing needs, and 2) implement Housing Element policies.	Housing policies and the housing element were covered through the Community and Economic Development Group meetings. The group met once a month to discuss projects and conduct a program evaluation.	The group has been an effective way of coordinating the City's various housing programs and services.	The City will continue to coordinate housing programs and services through its monthly senior staff and Five-Year Strategic Business Plan Implementation meetings.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 9: Housing Balance and Variety (Timing: Ongoing)			
Provide a full range of zoning districts that allow for residential development in the Richmond Zoning Ordinance and provides adequate sites for all types of housing in the City to address the needs of every income group.	The City adopted a comprehensive update of its General Plan in April 2012 expanding its capability to provide adequate sites for single family and multifamily housing. The Richmond General Plan 2030 allows significantly higher densities, increasing the feasibility of developing affordable units within market rate projects. The new General Plan also allows greater opportunities for live-work developments – a limited housing type in Richmond that is in growing demand.	The City successfully took advantage of its General Plan Update as an opportunity to significantly increase permitted residential densities throughout the City. Additional initiatives are necessary to identify and remove any potential barriers to the development of other housing types such as manufactured homes, mobile homes, second units, and emergency and transitional housing.	The City will identify and address any barriers to the development of manufactured homes, mobile homes, second units, and emergency and transitional housing as part of its comprehensive zoning update that will be undertaken during the fourth housing element cycle.
Program 10: Contra Costa County Mortgage Credit Certificate Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Assist 10 to 15 income qualified first-time homebuyers to purchase new or existing (resale) homes with income tax credits up to 20 percent of the annual mortgage interest.	The Mortgage Credit Certificates program assisted five homeowners between 2001 and 2006. The City's affordable homeownership counseling service providers assisted more than 20 families.	The program was successful. Through Mortgage Credit Certificates, several families who needed additional funds to qualify to purchase homes are now homeowners.	The City will continue to participate in the County's Mortgage Credit Certificate Program. The City will continue to inform prospective first-time homebuyers of the availability of this program through the first-time homebuyer program process and information about the County's housing website.
Program 11: Lease Purchase Programs (Timing: Ongoing)			
Assist 25 first-time homebuyers in Richmond, especially those with no or poor credit, to purchase a home through a local lease-purchase program. CalHFA and the ABAG Finance Authority provide lease purchase programs under the East Bay Delta Lease-Purchase Program and the California Home Source Lease-Purchase Program, respectively. These programs assist first-time homebuyers to purchase homes by first buying the home for the client and leasing it to them for up to 3 years.	A majority of the households receiving counsel from the City were able to purchase homes and did not need the Lease Purchase Program.	The counseling was successful, however there was not demand for the program.	The program will not be included in the 2007-2014 Housing Element.
Program 12: Default and Delinquency Counseling (Timing: Ongoing)			
Provide comprehensive housing counseling services to Richmond residents, focusing on target area neighborhoods. Services include mortgage default and delinquency counseling for 100 homeowners, counseling for 350 tenants, and 2 homeowner and consumer education workshops per year.	Approximately 120 homeowners and 1,200 renters received the counseling. The City also held 12 workshops.	This program was successful as all program objectives were met.	The City will continue to provide housing counseling services to residents. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds will be invested in fair housing workshops, education and legal representation. CDBG funds will also be used for foreclosure management services.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 13: Conventional Public Housing Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Manage, maintain, and systematically upgrade Richmond Housing Authority (RHA) -owned and managed units including 350 elderly and 365 family units of low-income public housing constructed under HUD's Conventional Public Housing Program.	All public housing developments maintained no less than 96 percent occupancy between 2001 and 2006, surpassing occupancy expectations. RHA property management efforts are reflected in the enhanced curb appeal of the public housing sites and the overall resident satisfaction. RHA conducted Physical Needs Assessments on all sites providing a detailed capital improvement strategy, moving forward. RHA also conducted energy audits and the work items generated from these audits were included in the 5-year capital improvement plan. The Low Income Public Housing Program provided affordable housing to over 1,075 households.	This program was successful as all program objectives were met.	The City will continue to modernize its public housing projects. Ongoing modifications to the program's operating budget will be made on an as needed basis to meet anticipated federal funding cuts.
Program 14: Section 8 Certificate Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Providing rental assistance to the City's very low-income residents. The Housing Authority subsidizes rents of very low-income families through the use of Section 8 Certificates under the Housing Assistance Program of the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development.	The Section 8 Certificate program successfully merged with the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.	Program performance data for this program is no longer available given that the program was discontinued prior to 2001.	This program will be cancelled because the Section 8 Certificate Program no longer exists.
Program 15: Housing Choice Voucher Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Utilizing funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), RHA will continue to provide rental assistance to 1,750 low-income households and maintain 100 percent lease-up average for the allocated program size (formerly the Section 8 Certificate program).	The RHA successfully administered the Program between 2001 and 2006 maximizing the program utilization rate. RHA consistently increased its lease-up improving from 76 percent utilization rate to 98 percent utilization rate over this time period. The Program's wait list was also open during this time period and over 3,000 applications were received. With a 10 percent annual attrition rate, the Program assisted well over 2,625 households between 200 and 2006.	This program was successful, even though HUD did not provide the opportunity to apply for additional vouchers. The objectives were met falling just short of the 100 percent lease-up average ending with an overall 98 percent program utilization rate.	The City will continue to provide rental assistance to residents. Ongoing modifications to the program's operating budget will be made on an as needed basis to meet anticipated federal funding cuts.
Program 16: Tenant Landlord Counseling (Timing: Ongoing)			
Provide legal advice to tenants and landlords related to evictions, security deposits, and discrimination. Continue to fund fair housing workshops, community presentations, and newspaper advertisements.	Approximately 600 renters and landlords received fair housing education and referral. Close to \$400,000 was spent during this period, \$200,000 of which was spent on fair housing activities. Information was provided through workshops, hotline and clinics.	This program was successful as all program objectives were met.	The City will continue to provide fair housing education and referral services to tenants and landlords.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 17: City Compliance with Fair Housing Act Access Requirements (Timing: Ongoing)			
Continue to review and remain consistent with federal Fair Housing Act access requirements and ensure compliance with all state and federal requirements.	The accessibility standards contained in the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) are equivalent and in many cases more restrictive than those in the federal Fair Housing Act (Title VIII of the Civic Rights Act of 1968). The Planning and Building Services Department continues to enforce the accessibility standards in the latest edition of the California Building Code on all residential planning and building permit applications, including those associated with Housing Authority projects.	Overall enforcement of these accessibility standards has been successful. However, many residents and business owners get confused about the thresholds that trigger the various accessibility requirements in remodel projects.	The accessibility standards will continue to be enforced by the Planning and Building Services Department through its regular plan review procedure. During the fourth housing element cycle, the Planning and Building Division will develop user-friendly handout material to educate business owners and residents about the types of improvements that trigger accessibility requirements.
Program 18: Review of Residential Development Applications (Timing: Ongoing)			
Evaluate proposed residential projects for adequacy of transit and other services and General Plan consistency.	The determination of consistency with the General Plan is used as the basis for staff's recommendation to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a proposed development project.	The General Plan consistency determination has been an effective tool in ensuring that the City only approves development projects that help to realize the City's 20-year vision as set forth in the adopted General Plan.	Planning and Building Services Department staff will continue to evaluate proposed projects for their consistency with the overall goals and policies of the City's General Plan. During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will consider requiring other departments to include a General Plan consistency analysis and determination as part of their recommendations to City Council.
Program 19: Second Units Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Encourage second dwelling units in all of the City's residential zones, which may add to the City's affordable housing stock and housing opportunities for senior citizens.	Between 2001 and 2006, the Planning and Building Services Department entitled the construction of 13 second dwelling units. The majority of second dwelling units were developed as detached units located behind existing single-family residences on 5,000 square foot lots. The average size of the second dwelling units developed was 610 square feet.	Residential property owners continue to be very interested in developing second dwelling units on their properties in order to house extended family or earn rental income. However, existing minimum lot size, lot width, and additional parking space requirements limit the production of second dwelling units in the City.	The City will continue to allow second dwelling units in all of its residential zones. During the fourth housing element cycle and as part of its comprehensive zoning update, the City will attempt to reduce minimum lot size, lot width, and additional parking space requirements in order to increase production of second dwelling units in the City.
Program 20: Senior Housing Development (Timing: Ongoing)			
Encourage housing development identified for lower income senior households.	The Macdonald Senior Housing Project, a 66-unit affordable senior rental housing development, was entitled during this period. Because of the affordable nature of the proposed project, the developer was allowed a 35 percent density increase, a reduction in the nominal open space requirement of 200 square feet per unit, and a reduced number of parking spaces for guests.	This program has been successful as it has resulted in an increase of Richmond's senior housing stock.	The City will continue to encourage housing development for lower income seniors. However, current financial conditions have eliminated the City's ability to contribute to predevelopment and development costs associated with the development of affordable senior housing.
Program 21: Housing for Large Families (Timing: Ongoing)			
Encourage the creation of large housing units in multifamily developments to accommodate large families.	Between 2001 and 2006, 12 multifamily projects incorporating three and four bedroom units affordable to lower income households were completed.	This program was successful as program objectives were met.	The City will continue encouraging housing developments for larger families. However, restricted affordable housing development is dependent upon available funding.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 22: Removal of Governmental Constraints to Housing Development for Persons with Disabilities (Timing: Annually)			
Ensure that the City's housing policies and practices do not inhibit housing development accessible to persons with disabilities by identifying and removing policy constraints.	No governmental constraints to housing development for persons with disabilities were identified in any of the annual evaluations performed by Planning and Building Services Department staff.	No additional standards are imposed beyond state and federal requirements. Entitlement fees for this housing type are calculated in the same manner as fees for other housing types.	The City will evaluate all future changes to its zoning ordinance and entitlement procedures to ensure they do not unintentionally constrain housing development for persons with disabilities.
Program 23: Additional Housing for Homeless or Persons in Need of Transitional Housing (Timing: Ongoing)			
Produce and operate emergency and transitional housing through Federal financing from the Emergency Housing and Assistance Program Operation Grants (EHAP), the Emergency Housing and Assistance Program Capital Development (EHAPCD), and the Federal Emergency Shelter Grant Program (FESG).	The Redevelopment Agency collaborated with the County and local non-profits to develop Hope House—a long-term transitional housing project—and the Greater Richmond Interfaith Program (GRIP) Souper Center. GRIP provides emergency shelter and services for homeless individuals and families. Initially the GRIP program will provide up to 40 beds in 23 dorm rooms and have 12 staff offices. The shelter is designed to expand up to 75 beds in those same 23 rooms and operate 365 days per year.	This program was successful as two projects were successfully completed and occupied. The collaboration with the non-profits and service providers ensures the continued success of the program.	The City will continue to produce and operate emergency and transitional housing based on continued funding availability.
Program 24: SRO Unit Rehabilitation (Timing: Ongoing)			
Assist owners of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units to rehabilitate and preserve their properties, including providing rehabilitation loan financing.	The City has not participated in the rehabilitation of Single Room Occupancy buildings since 2005.	Implementation of this program is difficult because the City currently does not have a list of SROs in Richmond and an understanding of their need for rehabilitation and preservation.	The City will begin to develop an inventory of SRO units in Richmond. The inventory will be used to prioritize rehabilitation and preservation needs and to allocate any available funding.
Program 25: Zoning Ordinance Administration (Timing: Ongoing)			
Promote neighborhoods with a mixture of housing at various densities in order to incorporate housing for all income levels into all areas of the City.	The City adopted a comprehensive update of its General Plan in April 2012. The Richmond General Plan 2030 contains a total of 11 land use designations that allow residential development. Together, these designations promote a mixture of housing densities primarily along transit-rich commercial corridors with great infill development potential.	The City successfully took advantage of its General Plan Update as an opportunity to allow a greater mixture of housing densities than was previously permitted.	The City will continue to promote a mixture of housing densities by requiring all housing developments to be consistent with the minimum densities set forth in the Richmond General Plan 2030. During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will initiate a comprehensive update of its zoning ordinance.
Program 26: Zoning Ordinance Evaluation (Timing: Ongoing)			
Evaluate the City's Zoning Ordinance periodically to ensure that it incorporates any new state and Housing Element zoning standards on a timely basis.	In 2006, the City amended its Zoning Ordinance in order to comply with State Senate Bills 1818 and 435 relating to housing density bonuses. The amended Housing Density Bonus Ordinance is codified as Richmond Municipal Code 15.04.810.050.	The City successfully amended its Zoning Ordinance to incorporate changes in the State's housing density bonus law. However, the City has yet to incorporate zoning ordinance changes to comply with second dwelling unit and other housing laws.	During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will amend its Zoning Ordinance in order to comply with changes in second dwelling unit and other housing laws. The Planning and Building Services Department will subscribe to the State Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) publications in order to be better informed about impending changes to State housing law that will require further legislative action by the City.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 27: Richmond General Plan and Housing Element Annual Review (Timing: Ongoing)			
Conduct an annual review of the City's General Plan, including the Housing Element, to incorporate current data and effective housing goals, policies, and programs.	Annual progress reports have not been provided to the Planning Commission, City Council, or the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).	Immediately following the adoption of the last housing element, the Planning and Building Services Department experienced a combination of retirements and staff turnovers and it appears the responsibility for completing the annual progress report was never assigned to a City staff member.	A staff member within the Planning and Building Services Department has now been assigned responsibility for completing the annual progress reports for the Richmond General Plan 2030 and Housing Element. For the Housing Element Annual Progress Report, the Planning and Building Services Department will utilize the forms available on HCD's website and submit the annual progress report on or before the statutory April 1st deadline each year.
Program 28: Central Richmond Revitalization Initiative (Timing: Ongoing)			
Strengthen the economic vitality of Central Richmond, especially along the arterial corridors of Macdonald Avenue and 23rd Street, by providing housing, commercial, transportation and recreational projects.	The Redevelopment Agency has continued to prioritize housing funds for the construction of new quality affordable housing and preservation of existing housing in Central Richmond.	This program has been largely successful. However, the City's ability to utilize tax increment financing to fund revitalization efforts was eliminated with the dissolution of local redevelopment agencies on February 1, 2012.	The City will pursue alternative funding sources for future revitalization efforts in the absence of traditional redevelopment funding tools.
Program 29: North Richmond Revitalization Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Rehabilitate, conserve and develop additional housing in the North Richmond neighborhood. The North Richmond Livable Communities Urban Design and Transportation Plan was adopted specifically to guide street and sidewalk improvements along Filbert Street, Kelsey Street, and Gertrude Avenue that support housing development and preservation.	The Redevelopment Agency committed \$5.1 million toward the completion of Chesley Mutual Housing, a 30-unit permanently affordable multifamily development in North Richmond. The Redevelopment Agency also contributed to the completion of 14 new infill units designated for lower income families in North Richmond. City staff continues to meet and collaborate with existing community development advocates regarding funding and/or development opportunities within North Richmond.	This program has been largely successful. However, the City's ability to utilize tax increment financing to fund revitalization efforts was eliminated with the dissolution of local redevelopment agencies on February 1, 2012.	The City will pursue alternative funding sources for future revitalization efforts in the absence of traditional redevelopment funding tools.
Program 30: Residential In-Fill Development Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Identify vacant parcels in the City and implement strategies that encourage and support residential development by landowners, non-profit developers, or private developers on these sites. Make these housing units available to low- and moderate-income households.	The City completed the Infill Policy and Procedures Manual in May 2006. To date, over 80 single family units have been entitled under the City's Infill Housing Initiative Program. The infill housing units were built primarily in the program's target areas of Central Richmond and North Richmond.	The City's Infill Housing Initiative Program was very effective in developing vacant infill sites for market rate and affordable housing. However, developers stopped participating in the program following the economic downturn that began in 2007. Since then, new editions of the California Building Code have been implemented and the standard construction plans that were developed for the Infill Housing Initiative Program have become outdated.	During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will update the standard construction plans developed for the Infill Housing Initiative Program so that they meet current building code requirements. The standard designs will also be modified to incorporate any design enhancements suggested by the City's Design Review Board and Planning Commission.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 31: Public Housing Modernization (Timing: Ongoing)			
Continue to modernize and meet required capital improvement needs of the Housing Authority's Low Income Public Housing stock. The RHA is systematically modernizing the units within its Conventional Low Rent Public Housing Program, with federal assistance under the Capital Fund Grant Program (CFP) (formerly the Comprehensive Grant Program, or CGP).	<p>Between 2001 and 2006, the Housing Authority expended approximately \$4,139,697 in CGP/CFP funds towards the modernization of the public housing developments. This work included general site improvements, environmental assessments, landscaping, fencing, outdoor lighting, storm drainage improvements, structural foundation work, exterior painting, fire alarm upgrades, roof repairs, ADA/504 site enhancements, elevator maintenance and upgrades, window rehabilitation, energy saving enhancement and other general management improvements.</p> <p>The Easter Hill public housing revitalization project was also undertaken during the same period. The project involved taking down 258 units of obsolete public housing and building back Richmond Village, a 360 unit mixed income development which also included 82 single-family home ownership dwellings, and a 5,000 square-foot community center. This development was supported with a \$35 million HOPE VI grant which leveraged a total of \$139 million in development costs including CFP funding.</p>	This program was successful as all program objectives were met.	The City will continue to modernize its public housing projects. Ongoing modifications to the program's operating budget will be made on an as needed basis to meet anticipated federal funding cuts.
Program 32: Homeowner Rehabilitation Programs (Timing: Ongoing)			
Rehabilitate and update dwelling units occupied by low and moderate income homeowners to meet current building standards using resources from the Home Improvement Loan Program, Deferred Loan Program, Emergency Loan Program, Richmond We Care Paint Program, Ebb Everett Helping Hand Program, and the Richmond Effort to Abate Lead (Project REAL).	The Redevelopment Agency provided over 230 Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation Deferred Loans to low-income households. Over 300 seniors were served through the Richmond We Care Program and more than 375 homes were assisted through the Ebb Everett Helping Hand program.	This program was very successful. Through the Home Improvement Loan Program, the City of Richmond is able to provide funding for additional loans. The City continues to have an annual waitlist of individuals interested in the program.	This program will be retained.
Program 33: Rental Rehabilitation Programs (Timing: Ongoing)			
Rehabilitate and update dwelling units occupied by low and moderate income renters to meet current building standards with resources from the Rental Rehabilitation Loan Program, Project REAL, and the Richmond We Care Paint Program.	The Redevelopment Agency provided approximately ten Rental Rehabilitation Loans for low-income households. The City expects demand for this program to increase as the housing market improves.	The program successfully created a steady revenue stream for program income. Due to decreased funds and changes in the housing market, the City provided fewer rental rehabilitation loans.	The City will continue to provide rehabilitation programs for rental units based on funding availability.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 34: Units At Risk Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
Monitor local assisted housing projects in order to prevent them from converting to non low-income housing uses. The City intends to preserve as many of its 790 at-risk housing units as possible.	The City has taken a proactive approach with local developers and property management teams to identify at-risk units and seek funding to avoid conversion where necessary. The monitoring program is a first line strategy to keep in touch with the status of units and maintain a relationship with development and management partners. The use of Section 8 project-based vouchers when available has been effective to close funding gaps that threaten the conversion of existing affordable units.	This program has been successful in both maintaining affordability and physical rehabilitation of units. Pullman Townhouses is an example of a 199-unit townhouse development that was renovated using HCD funding in 2005.	The City will continue to monitor subsidized affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rate units on an annual basis.
Program 35: Neighborhood Services Liaison (Timing: Ongoing)			
Promote and solicit community resident participation in the Neighborhood Council system and the City-supported Crime Prevention and Community Drug Education programs.	There are currently 38 active neighborhood councils throughout the City. The city formally includes comments and recommendations from neighborhood councils in staff reports for consideration by decision-making bodies including the City's Historic Preservation Commission, Design Review Board, Planning Commission, and City Council. Additionally, the City funds one full-time staff position to work directly with the City's neighborhood councils. This staff person attends all monthly neighborhood coordinating council meetings, distributes information about the City's various programs and services, including the City's crime prevention and drug education programs, and acts as a liaison between the City and the neighborhood councils.	The City's neighborhood councils provide invaluable input about the impacts proposed projects may have in their respective neighborhoods. Funding a full-time staff position to serve as liaison between the City and the neighborhood councils has been an effective way of ensuring that the community continues to be involved in the City's planning and decision-making process.	The City will continue to formally consider input from the neighborhood councils in its planning and decision-making process. The City will also continue to fund a full-time staff position to serve as liaison between the City and the neighborhood councils.
Program 36: City Housing Programs Marketing Program (Timing: Ongoing)			
The City and the Redevelopment Agency developed a marketing plan for its housing programs in 1990. The program includes meeting with all active neighborhood councils to promote its housing assistance programs. Neighborhood meetings are supplemented with mailings, door to door canvassing in select areas, and direct contacts with special ethnic group centers such as the Lao Family Center.	The City collaborates with the local non-profit developers to provide marketing material for the City's housing programs. Several initiatives have been completed to encourage neighborhood participation in the City's foreclosure and predatory lending awareness. City staff still provide material to local organizations to explain its housing services. Outreach material is provided in person and in writing to assist individuals who do not have computer access or literacy.	The program continues to be successful. The City continues to receive daily inquiries regarding existing housing programs.	The City will continue to collaborate with local non-profit developers to provide marketing material for the City's various housing programs and services.

Table 5.59
Progress Toward Meeting 1999-2006 Housing Goals and Objectives

Description/Objective (quantified/qualified)	Result	Evaluation	Continue/Modify/Delete
Program 37: Code Enforcement, Abatement and Relocation (Timing: Ongoing)			
Enforce State-mandated building and construction codes and local requirements related to land use, zoning, health and safety. The City's goal is to preserve and improve the physical, social and economic health of neighborhoods through the removal of unsafe and unsightly housing conditions using code enforcement procedures.	<p>An estimated 1,500 enforcement cases are opened every year to address inadequate housing conditions. The Code Enforcement Division has continued to increase its staffing levels to provide expanded code enforcement especially in the City's more economically depressed neighborhoods.</p> <p>In 2008, the City developed the One Block at a Time (OBAT) Program to combat neighborhood blight. As part of the OBAT Program, the City selects a small neighborhood area for a focused one-day abatement and beautification effort. Together with volunteers, the City assists residents with yard maintenance, tree trimming, trash disposal, graffiti abatement, inoperable vehicle removal, smoke detector installation, paving, and house painting. On average, the City holds four OBAT events per year.</p>	<p>The City's code enforcement activities are conducted on a complaint basis and proactive enforcement is limited due to current budget and staffing levels.</p> <p>Demolition of substandard or dangerous buildings is only used as a last resort when building conditions pose an imminent risk of harm to public health, safety, or welfare and when rehabilitation is economically infeasible. The City provides relocation benefits and assistance whenever tenants are ordered to vacate a substandard or dangerous building in connection with code enforcement and abatement activity.</p>	The City will continue to conduct code enforcement activities, including its One Block at a Time Program, commensurate with on-going budget and staffing levels.
Program 38: Abatement of Substandard Buildings Project (Timing: Ongoing)			
Expedite the rehabilitation or abatement of select, severely substandard occupied rental housing structures in the City's CDBG target areas. Abatement actions are coupled with relocation assistance available to tenants, and rehabilitation loan assistance is offered to the absentee landlords.	The City's Code Enforcement and Building Division continue to abate substandard occupied residential structures throughout the City. Records indicate that none of the City's housing abatement activities have required the relocation or eviction of tenants to date. However, in compliance with Health and Safety Code 1795.8, tenants are entitled to relocation benefits from landlords if certain circumstances are met. The City provides tenants with referrals to Bay Area Legal Aid, a local non-profit legal advocacy service.	Abatement is a crucial part of the City's multi-faceted approach to addressing inadequate housing conditions in the City's neighborhoods. However, the City's abatement activities are conducted on a complaint basis and proactive enforcement is limited due to current budget and staffing levels.	The City will continue to conduct abatement activities commensurate with budget and staffing levels. During the fourth housing element cycle, the Planning and Building Services Department will work with the Code Enforcement Division to develop educational materials to inform residents about substandard building conditions.
Program 39: Reasonable Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities Housing Development (Timing: Ongoing)			
Presently, the City does not have formal procedures to accommodate housing that is intended to serve persons with disabilities. The City will therefore develop a "reasonable accommodation" ordinance to address this issue.	The City has not yet adopted a reasonable accommodation ordinance. However, the Planning and Building Services Department routinely grants requests for reasonable accommodation in compliance with state and federal fair housing laws. The Planning and Building Services Department has granted all reasonable accommodation requests received to date and does not anticipate denying any future requests to comply with state and federal fair housing laws.	Having a codified standard procedure for reasonable accommodation requests would ensure the City reviews and approves requests in a uniform and timely fashion.	During the fourth housing element cycle, the City will examine other reasonable accommodation ordinances in the Bay Area as well as the Department of Housing and Community Development's Model Ordinance for Providing Reasonable Accommodation Under Federal and State Fair Housing Laws. By the end of the fourth housing element cycle, the City will develop and adopt an ordinance setting forth standard procedures for reviewing and granting reasonable accommodation requests.

Housing Goals, Policies and Programs

This section sets forth the City of Richmond’s Housing Element goals, policies and programs intended to facilitate construction, preservation and conservation of affordable housing. These goals, policies and programs have been designed in collaboration with the community, including residents, community groups, developers, and other stakeholders.

The policies establish the strategies to achieve the goal. The programs under each policy identify the responsible agencies for program implementation, including the City’s role in implementation; the implementation timeframe; regulatory, financing and subsidy tools anticipated; and specific quantified objectives to be achieved upon accomplishment of the programs.

Over the Housing Element planning period, approximately 2,200 housing units are anticipated to be constructed, rehabilitated and conserved in Richmond. **Table 5.60** shows these units by type of unit produced and by the affordability level of the unit.

Table 5.60
Quantified Objectives 2007-2014

Income Group:	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation and Preservation	Total
Extremely Low	50			
Very Low	100	400	300	1,000
Low	150			
Moderate	200	0	0	200
Above Moderate	1,000	0	0	1,000
Total:	1,500	400	300	2,200

Source: Richmond Planning and Building Services Department.

In addition to requiring an analysis of the needs of extremely low-income households, State Housing Element law also requires the Housing Element to include programs to assist in the creation of housing for this segment of the population. The Housing Element sets forth several programs that help address the needs of extremely low-income households, including:

- H-1.2.3: Residential Sites Inventory;
- H-1.3.2: Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Study;
- H-1.3.5: Density Bonus for Extremely Low-Income Housing;
- H-1.4.3: Second Dwelling Unit Production;
- H-3.1.1: Senior Housing Incentives;
- H-3.5.1: Large-Family Housing Incentives;
- H-3.5.2: Neighborhood Stabilization Program;
- H-3.6.2: Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Comply with Senate Bill 2 (Emergency Shelters Supportive of Housing and Transitional Housing); and
- H-3.6.3: Funding for Emergency, Transitional and Supportive Housing.

Goals

The City’s four housing goals are as follows:

- Goal H-1: A Balanced Supply of Housing**
Promote a balanced supply of housing types, densities, and prices to meet the needs of all income groups.

- Goal H-2: Better Neighborhoods and Quality of Life**
Improve the quality of life for all residents and preserve and enhance Richmond’s residential neighborhoods; specifically promote high quality living environments, address substandard conditions, preserve and modernize public housing, and conserve affordable housing at risk of converting to market rates.

- Goal H-3: Expanded Housing Opportunities for Special Needs Groups**
Promote the expansion of housing opportunities for all special needs groups, including seniors, female-headed households, persons with disabilities, first-time homebuyers, large families, and homeless individuals and families.

- Goal H-4: Equal Housing Access for All**
Strive to achieve equal housing access for all people regardless of race, religion, gender, marital status, age, ancestry, national origin, color, sexual orientation, familial status, source of income, or disability.

Goal H-1: A Balanced Supply of Housing

Promote a balanced supply of housing types, densities and prices to meet the needs of all income groups residing or who want to reside in Richmond.

Policy H-1.1: *Housing Element Implementation*
Coordinate and monitor the implementation of the City’s Housing Element.

Program H-1.1.1: *Housing Element Coordination Group*
Convene quarterly meetings of the Planning and Building Services Department, City Manager’s Office, Housing and Community Development Department, Richmond Housing Authority, and Code Enforcement Division to coordinate implementation of the City’s Housing Element Programs. Summarize the Housing Element Coordinating Group’s (HECG) activities as part of the Housing Element’s Annual Progress Report (APR).

Responsible Agency: Planning & Building Services Department, City Manager’s Department, Housing and Community Development Department, Housing Authority, Code Enforcement Division

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) One HECG meeting per quarter
b) Activity summary in APRs

Program H-1.1.2: *Housing Element Annual Progress Report*
Utilize the forms and definitions adopted by the State HCD to prepare Annual Progress Reports (APR) on the ongoing implementation of the City’s Housing Element Programs. Present the APR to the Housing Element Coordination Group (HECG), Planning Commission, and City Council and formally submit it to the State HCD.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services, Housing and Community Development Department, Housing Authority, Code Enforcement Division, City Manager’s Office

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: a) APRs to Cal HCD by April 1st of each calendar year
b) APRs to HECG, Planning Commission, and City Council by June 1st of each calendar year

Program H-1.1.3:

Findings of Consistency

Continue to require a written finding of consistency with the General Plan goals and policies prior to approving discretionary permits for residential development projects. Consider recommending Zoning Ordinance amendments to also require written findings of consistency with the City's other master planning documents such as the Pedestrian Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, and Parks Master Plan.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Recommendations by 4/1/13

Program H-1.1.4:

Compliance with Changes in State Housing Law

Continually monitor changes in State housing law by subscribing to the State HCD publications. Promptly amend the City's plans and regulations to ensure ongoing compliance with State housing law.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Cal HCD subscription by 4/1/13

b) Amendments within three months of changes to State housing law

Policy H-1.2:

Adequate Supply of Housing Sites

Ensure an adequate supply of housing sites to achieve the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for the 2007-2014 planning period.

Program H-1.2.1:

Minimum Housing Densities

As part of the comprehensive zoning ordinance update, establish minimum residential density requirements for all residential zoning districts and consider establishing floor-to-area ratio and maximum lot coverage provisions for single-family neighborhoods to preserve community character.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Requirements by 8/1/13

Program H-1.2.2: *No Net Loss of Residential Capacity*
Approve only those projects and general plan and zoning map amendments that do not result in an overall loss of the City’s capacity to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for the current planning period.
(Refer to State Government Code §65863)

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-1.2.3: *Residential Sites Inventory*
Continue to maintain and regularly update the City’s Residential Sites Inventory as existing vacant and underutilized sites are developed over time. Develop a user-friendly version of the inventory and make available for use by developers and general public via the City’s Planning and Building Services Department website. Continue to identify additional sites for housing development, especially for extremely low, very low, and low-income households.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and Community Development Department, IT/GIS Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: a) Annual updates
b) User-friendly inventory by 12/31/13

Program H-1.2.4: *Residential Sites Marketing*
Hold an annual workshop to educate the private and non-profit development community about mixed-use housing development opportunities and incentives in Richmond, especially in its Form-Base Code and Priority Development Areas.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: One workshop per year

Policy H-1.3: *Supply of Affordable Housing*
Promote the development of homes that are affordable to extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households in all new residential developments as well as in existing single-family neighborhoods.

Program H-1.3.1: *Inclusionary Housing Ordinance*
Continue to implement the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and examine recent court rulings that may affect its implementation and effectiveness.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Examine court rulings by 4/1/13

Program H-1.3.2:

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Study

Study other inclusionary housing ordinances in the Bay Area to learn about effective practices being used to provide affordable housing, especially housing for extremely low, very low, and low-income households. Review how other cities have modified their inclusionary programs in response to recent court rulings, affordable housing nexus studies, and affordable housing impact fees. Consider recommending amendments to Richmond’s inclusionary housing ordinance based on the study’s findings and input from the community and residential developers. Ensure amendments do not constrain the overall production of housing in Richmond.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 4/1/13
b) Outreach by 11/31/13
c) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-1.3.3:

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Performance

Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance by including the following annual data as part of the Housing Element’s Annual Progress Report (APR):

- Amount of inclusionary housing in-lieu fees collected;
- Balance of the inclusionary housing fee account; and
- Expenditures made with funds from the inclusionary housing fee account.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Data included in APRs

Program H-1.3.4:

Community Land Trust Study

Study existing community land trust (CLT) programs in California and determine whether it is feasible to establish a CLT program in Richmond as a way of providing permanently affordable housing. Consider recommending formation of a CLT program in Richmond based on the study’s findings and input from the community.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 10/1/13
b) Recommendation by 12/31/13

Program H-1.3.5: *Density Bonus for Extremely Low Income Housing*
Amend the City’s Housing Density Bonus Ordinance to also allow density bonuses for developments that provide a percentage of their total units at rents or prices affordable to extremely low income households. Study other housing density bonus ordinances in the Bay Area to determine an appropriate percentage.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Adopt Amendments by 12/31/12

Program H-1.3.6: *Affordable Housing Incentives*
Provide incentives for affordable housing developments that greatly exceed the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requirements for very low, low and moderate-income households. Potential incentives include financial assistance, density bonuses, increased height limits, reduced parking requirements, development impact fee waivers or deferrals, and expedited review.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Incentives by 12/31/12

Policy H-1.4: *Variety of Housing Choices*
Promote a variety of housing types that meet the different lifestyle and life cycle needs of residents including young adults, young couples and single professionals, small and large families, empty-nesters, and older couples.

Program H-1.4.1: *Variety of Housing Types*
As part of the Form-Based Code (FBC) for Macdonald Avenue, 23rd Street, and portions of San Pablo Avenue and the surrounding areas, facilitate and provide incentives for mixed-use housing over retail development and a variety of other housing types and products such as duplexes, triplexes, large apartment buildings, second dwelling units, courtyard housing, live-work units, condominiums, cooperative housing, single-room occupancy units (SROs), retirement/assisted living communities, and manufactured or modular housing. Potential incentives include financial assistance, fee deferrals, density bonuses, reduced parking requirements, and expedited review. The City will ensure that the FBC that is adopted will not result in the loss of capacity of sites identified to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the current planning period.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: a) Draft Form-Based Code by 12/31/12
b) Recommendations by 8/1/13

Program H-1.4.2:

Single-Room Occupancy Unit Inventory

Develop an inventory of existing single-room occupancy units in Richmond. SROs provide an invaluable form of affordable housing for the homeless, lower-income individuals, seniors, and persons with disabilities. Identify funding sources to provide financial assistance for the preservation of existing SROs.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department,
Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Inventory by 12/31/13

Program H-1.4.3:

Second Dwelling Unit Production

Continue to facilitate the production of second dwelling units throughout Richmond's residential neighborhoods and amend the Zoning Ordinance to ensure compliance with State housing law.

Consider the following second dwelling unit initiatives:

- Reducing requirements such as minimum lot size, minimum open space requirements, and minimum parking requirements for second dwelling units built in Form-Base Code Areas;
- Developing a set of pre-approved architectural and building plans for detached second dwelling units for use on typical residential lots in Richmond;
- Developing handout materials to explain the benefits of second dwelling units, the City's application review process and requirements, and the average cost of developing a second dwelling unit in Richmond; and
- Granting development impact fee waivers for property owners who contractually agree to restrict their second dwelling unit for extremely low, very low, and low-income households.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department, Housing and
Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Zoning ordinance amendments to comply with State housing law governing second dwelling units by 4/1/13

Program H-1.4.4:

Garage Conversions

As part of the Form-Based Code (FBC) for Macdonald Avenue, 23rd Street, and portions of San Pablo Avenue and the surrounding areas, consider reducing covered parking requirements and establishing design guidelines to facilitate garage conversions. Ensure that conversions do not deteriorate the architectural character of heritage homes in Richmond’s older residential neighborhoods.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Draft Form-Based Code by 12/31/12
b) Recommendations by 8/1/13

Policy H-1.5:

Reduction of Housing Production Constraints

[Implement measures to remove or reduce constraints to housing production in Richmond.](#)

Program H-1.5.1:

One-Stop Permit Center

Continue to operate the City’s One-Stop Permit Center and develop a customer survey to identify potential improvements that would enhance customer service.

Potential One-Stop Permit Center improvements include:

- Establishing uniform customer service hours for all departments;
- Improving the Center’s wayfinding signage to ensure customers are directed to the appropriate staff;
- Standardizing application forms and submittal checklists for all Center departments;
- Providing cross-training for all Center staff;
- Developing a larger suite of customer handout materials for all departments participating in the Center;
- Establishing a self-service information kiosk for customers; and
- Educating customers about the City’s website and online e-TRAKiT permit and record tracking system.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Survey form by 8/1/13
b) Start surveys by 12/31/13

Program H-1.5.2: *Expanded Ministerial Approvals and Administrative Reviews*
As part of the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update, consider expanding the types of residential projects eligible for ministerial approval and administrative review.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Recommended thresholds by 8/1/13

Program H-1.5.3: *Housing Developer Interviews*
Conduct interviews with representatives from the residential development community to identify different methods to streamline the City's development review and permitting process and while continuing to ensure high-quality and well-designed development.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Interview questions by 8/1/13

b) Start interviews by 12/31/13

Program H-1.5.4: *Fees for Expedited Review*
Consider establishing expedited review fees for all residential development projects and providing free expedited review for projects committing to levels for certification under recognized third-party rating systems such as Build-it-Green and LEED.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Recommendations by 12/31/13

Policy H-1.6: *Funding for Affordable Housing Development*
[Identify and secure funding sources to assist with affordable housing development.](#)

Program H-1.6.1: *Low Moderate Income Housing Assets Fund*
Utilize resources in the City's Low and Moderate Income Housing Assets Fund (Low-Mod Fund) to continue providing affordable housing in Richmond. The Low-Mod Fund was established by the City of Richmond as Successor Agency to the former Redevelopment Agency to allow for the transfer of agency assets prior to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in California. Assets in the Low-Mod Fund include real and personal property, bond proceeds, and rent payments.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: Low-Mod Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-1.6.2:

State and Federal Housing Funds

Continue to aggressively compete for affordable housing funds provided by state and federal agencies such as HUD, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the State HCD. Specifically target funding available for persons with special needs and disabilities.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-1.6.3:

Shared Pool of Funds

Work with local lending institutions to establish a shared pool of funds earmarked for affordable housing and somewhat less restrictive underwriting standards.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-1.6.4:

Shared Equity Program Study

Study existing shared-equity programs in California and determine whether it is feasible to establish a shared-equity program in Richmond as a way of providing more affordable housing. Under a shared-equity program, the City would provide funding to assist families with home purchases. In return for its investment, the City would share the benefits of any appreciation in home price. The City's share of the home's appreciation could be returned to the City in the form of a cash payment that could be used to help another family with a home purchase. The City's share could also stay with the home, reducing the cost of that home for the next family.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 10/1/13
b) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Goal H-2:

Better Neighborhoods and Quality of Life

Improve the quality of life for all residents and preserve and enhance Richmond's residential neighborhoods; specifically promote high quality living environments, address substandard conditions, preserve and modernize public housing, and conserve affordable housing at risk of converting to market rates.

Policy H-2.1:

High-Quality Living Environments

Promote high-quality living environments by requiring exceptional architectural, urban, landscape, and green building design and by focusing residential development in areas that are within walking and biking distance of jobs, shopping, schools, recreation, entertainment, public transportation, and other community amenities.

Program H-2.1.1:

Development Impact Fees

Continue to require residential developers to pay all applicable development impact fees to ensure that existing public infrastructure, services, and amenities are maintained and upgraded to adequately meet the needs of a growing city.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-2.1.2:

Design Guidelines for Quality Housing

As part of the Form-Based Code (FBC) for Macdonald Avenue, 23rd Street, and portions of San Pablo Avenue and the surrounding areas, establish design guidelines and development standards to ensure that near and long-term development and capital improvement projects substantially improve the quality of life for Richmond residents.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Draft Form-Based Code by 12/31/12
b) Recommendations by 8/1/13

Program H-2.1.3:

Residential Design Guidelines for Additions to Heritage Homes

Reinforce and enhance the architectural character of Richmond residential neighborhoods by continuing to implement the City's Residential Design Guidelines for Additions to Heritage Homes. The Guidelines were developed in 2008 and they set forth massing type and architectural style standards for additions to homes built before 1940. The architectural styles covered by the Guidelines are the Richmond Spanish Revival, Richmond Bungalow, Richmond Tudor, and Richmond Minimal Traditional. Additions to homes with these architectural styles must meet the design guidelines to obtain city approval.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-2.1.4:

Front Yard Requirements

As part of the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update, establish minimum landscaping and maximum concrete coverage requirements. Many residents throughout Richmond have replaced a substantial portion of their front yards with impervious concrete surfaces because the current landscaping requirements are not stringent enough. Front yards with a high concrete-to-landscaping ratio are visually unappealing and cumulatively degrade environmental quality by increasing the amount of stormwater run-off pollution.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Draft Form-Based Code by 12/31/12
b) Recommendations by 8/1/13

Program H-2.1.5:

Historic Structures Code

Protect Richmond’s historic resources and districts by continuing to implement the City’s Historic Structures Code. The Code requires that exterior modifications and demolitions of historic resources be evaluated for consistency with the US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Amend the Code to streamline the review process. Ensure that demolitions do not result in a new source of neighborhood blight.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Recommendations by 8/1/13

Policy H-2.2:

Green Building Measures and Practices

Promote the incorporation of green building measures and practices in new residential development projects and existing residential structures.

Program H-2.2.1:

California Green Building Standards

Continue to enforce the State of California’s Green Building Standards (CALGreen Code), which is intended to reduce construction waste, make buildings more efficient in the use of materials and energy, and reduce environmental impacts during and after construction.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-2.2.2: ***Expansion of California Green Building Standards***
Study how other jurisdictions in California have expanded the scope and applicability of the CALGreen Code and consider recommending an ordinance based on this study’s findings and input from the community and residential development community. As part of the study, consider establishing incentives such as fee deferrals, waivers and/or reductions and an expedited review process for projects meeting or exceeding CALGreen requirements.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: a) Study by 4/1/13
 b) Outreach by 11/31/13
 c) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-2.2.3: ***Energy Program Referrals and Funding***
Continue to refer property owners to third-party organizations that provide energy programs like PG&E’s Low Income Energy Savings Assistance Program and Contra Costa County’s Weatherization Program. Continue to seek funding for innovative City-sponsored programs like the Richmond Recovery Rebate for Energy Upgrade California, Richmond Recovery Rebate for Solar, and Green Energy Training Services (GETS).

Responsible Agency: City Manager’s Office
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund, Grant funding
Quantified Objective: Referrals upon request

Policy H-2.3: ***Preservation and Modernization of Public Housing***
[Preserve and systematically modernize Richmond’s public housing developments.](#)

Program H-2.3.1: ***Conventional Public Housing Program***
Continue to successfully administer the City’s Low Income Public Housing Program. Improve property management oversight for all public housing developments throughout Richmond and ensure an occupancy rate of no less than 98 percent. Continue to utilize the Capital Fund Program (CFP) to systematically modernize Richmond’s public housing developments by enhancing their visual appearance and energy efficiency. Conduct a physical needs assessment for all public housing sites and establish a detailed capital improvement strategy as part of the assessment. Prioritize identified improvements as part of the Housing Authority’s annual and five-year capital improvement plans.

Responsible Agency: Richmond Housing Authority
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: HUD Capital Fund Program, alternative sources
Quantified Objective: Modernize 97 public housing units by 12/31/13

Policy H-2.4: *Conservation of At-Risk Affordable Housing Units*
Facilitate the conservation of subsidized housing developments that are at risk of converting to market rate housing.

Program H-2.4.1: *Monitoring Program for At-Risk Affordable Housing Units*
Establish a monitoring program for at-risk housing units in Richmond. As part of the monitoring program, check the conversion risk status on an annual basis and include the information as part of the Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR).

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department,
Planning and Building Services Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: At-risk data in APRs

Program H-2.4.2: *Assistance for At-Risk Affordable Housing Units*
Provide technical assistance to organizations interested in purchasing and maintaining subsidized affordable housing units should property owners express interest in converting them to market rate. Provide education and technical assistance to tenants of units being converted to market rate uses.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Policy H-2.5: *Abatement of Foreclosures, Substandard Housing, and Blight*
Improve the physical, social, and economic health of neighborhoods by addressing foreclosures, substandard housing conditions, and neighborhood blight through an aggressive and balanced program of education, code enforcement, inspections, acquisition, and financial assistance.

Program H-2.5.1: *Online Housing Resource Center*
Continue providing comprehensive information and guidance on the City's website for residents facing foreclosure and those seeking assistance in areas such as home purchases, housing beautification, rehabilitation and seismic retrofits, energy conservation improvements, and locating special needs housing. Identify staff in the Housing and Community Development Department who can provide information about the National Mortgage Settlement Act and the State of California's Foreclosure Reform and Homeowner's Bill of Rights laws (SB 1137 and AB 2314).

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department,
Planning and Building Services Department, Code
Enforcement Division, City Manager's Office

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Updated website and point of contact by 4/1/12

Program H-2.5.2:

Housing Education Workshops and Outreach

In partnership with community-based and non-profit organizations, hold a quarterly bilingual workshop to educate residents about various local housing issues and available resources. Together with community-based and non-profit organizations, seek funding for community outreach workers to reach homeowners and tenants at risk of losing their homes to foreclosure.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department,
Planning and Building Services Department, Code
Enforcement Division, City Manager's Office

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: One public workshop per quarter

Program H-2.5.3:

Vacant Foreclosed Residential Property Ordinance

Consider adopting an ordinance that would require the registration of vacant foreclosed properties to protect residential and commercial areas from blight. Study the City of Los Angeles and City of Oakland ordinances as potential models.

Responsible Agency: Code Enforcement

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 10/1/13
b) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-2.5.4:

Code Enforcement for Residential Neighborhoods

Continue to address foreclosures, substandard housing conditions, and neighborhood blight through aggressive code enforcement. Consider increasing current staffing levels to expand proactive code enforcement efforts in residential neighborhoods, especially in Central and North Richmond. Ensure that foreclosed properties are being properly maintained and fine lenders who do not address code enforcement issues promptly. As part of the Housing Element's Annual Progress Report (APR), include the total number of code enforcement cases opened for foreclosures, substandard housing conditions, and neighborhood blight. Also include the total amount of fines collected for these types of cases in the APR.

Responsible Agency: Code Enforcement

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund, Code Enforcement Fines

Quantified Objective: Code enforcement data in APRs

- Program H-2.5.5: Residential Rental Inspection Program***
 Continue to implement the City’s Residential Rental Inspection Program (RRIP), which requires regular, periodic inspections for property owners of three or more residential rental units. The RRIP exempts units subsidized by the City of Richmond and federal or state government. Newly constructed units are also exempted, but only for a period of five years from the date of construction.
- Responsible Agency: Code Enforcement
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Funding Sources: General Fund, Code Enforcement Fines
 Quantified Objective: Not applicable
- Program H-2.5.6: Soft-Story Building Inventory***
 Continue to maintain the City’s inventory of multi-story buildings with potential earthquake hazards and consider making it readily available to property owners and residents to raise awareness and encourage voluntary health and safety retrofits.
- Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Funding Sources: General Fund, Code Enforcement Fines
 Quantified Objective: Not applicable
- Program H-2.5.7: Soft-Story Building Ordinance***
 Study soft-story building ordinances in California to learn about effective practices being used to incentivize the seismic retrofitting of hazardous multi-story buildings. Consider adopting a soft-story ordinance based on the study’s findings and input from the community and landlords.
- Responsible Agency: Code Enforcement
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Funding Sources: General Fund, Code Enforcement Fines
 Quantified Objective: a) Study by 10/1/13
 b) Recommendations by 12/31/13
- Program H-2.5.8: Neighborhood Stabilization Program***
 Continue to utilize the Neighborhood Stabilization Program to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed residential properties for affordable housing purposes and aggressively pursue additional funding for the program. Partner with local nonprofits to leverage available funds and support legislation, which would provide additional funding such as the proposed California Neighborhood Partnership Act of 2012 (AB 2477).
- Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
 Timeframe: Ongoing
 Funding Sources: NSP, HOME
 Quantified Objective: Acquire and rehabilitate 32 foreclosed units by 6/30/13

Program H-2.5.9: ***Home Improvement Loan Program***
Continue providing the City’s Home Improvement Loan Program (HILP) based on funding availability for the program. The HILP offers low interest loans to low-income homeowners for certain home improvement projects. The maximum home improvement loan amount is currently \$35,000 and interest rates range from zero to three percent over a 15-year term.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California- CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.10: ***Mills Act Historical Property Contracts***
Begin utilizing Mills Act contract agreements to allow qualifying property owners to receive a potential property tax reduction and use the savings to assist with the rehabilitation, restoration, and maintenance of residential buildings designated as historic resources. Include annual Mills Act contract activity as part of the Housing Element’s Annual Progress Report (APR).

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: a) One Mills Act Contract by 12/31/13
b) Data in APRs

Program H-2.5.11: ***Sanitary Sewer Lateral Grant Program***
Continue providing the City’s Sewer Lateral Grant Program to help residents repair or replace private sewer mains and laterals. Under the Program, the City reimburses residents with up to 50 percent of the project costs, or \$3,000, whichever is less.

Responsible Agency: Engineering and Wastewater
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Full utilization of program’s annual budget allocation

Program H-2.5.12: ***Rental Rehabilitation Loan Program***
Continue providing the City’s Rental Rehabilitation Loan Program (RRLP) based on funding availability for the program. The RRLP provides landlords with no-interest loans to upgrade substandard rental housing units for low-income tenants. The program requires landlords to provide a 50 percent match in funds. No minimum monthly payment is required, but program loans must be paid in full within ten years.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California- CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.13: ***Emergency Loan Program***
Continue providing the City’s Emergency Loan Program based on funding availability for the program. The Emergency Loan Program offers low interest loans to homeowners with poor credit and in need of emergency home repairs. The maximum loan amount is \$15,000 and interest rates range from zero to three percent. As part of the program, borrowers are required to obtain credit counseling services.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California- CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.14: ***Richmond Effort to Abate Lead (Project Real)***
Continue to provide the City’s Project Real Program based on funding availability for the program. Project REAL offers free in-home lead paint testing and remediation services to low-income families living in Richmond’s Iron Triangle, Santa Fe, and North Richmond neighborhoods. To be eligible for the program, homes must have been constructed before 1978 and at least one child under the age of six must live in or visit the home frequently. The program also offers free blood lead testing for children under the age of six.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California, CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.15: ***Deferred Loan Program***
Continue providing the City’s Deferred Loan Program based on funding availability for the program. The Deferred Loan Program offers no-interest loans to low-income seniors and disabled homeowners for certain home improvement projects. The maximum home improvement loan amount is currently \$20,000 and borrowers can defer loan payments until their home is refinanced or sold.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California, CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.16: ***Richmond We Care Paint Program***
Continue providing the City’s Richmond We Care Paint Program based on funding availability for the program. The Richmond We Care Paint Program offers free exterior home painting services for seniors and disabled residents.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California, CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.17: *Ebb Everett Helping Hand Program*
Continue to provide the City’s Ebb Everett Helping Hand Program based on funding availability for the program. The Ebb Everett Helping Hand Program offers minor home rehabilitation services for seniors and disabled residents.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: CDBG and State of California, CalHOME
Quantified Objective: Assistance commensurate with demand and funding

Program H-2.5.18: *Foreclosure Loan Fund*
Seek funding for foreclosure loan fund program which would allow residents to buy their homes back as a way of saving their homes from foreclosure. Study the City of Oakland and Community Housing Development Corporation’s programs as potential models.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Policy H-2.6: *Toxic and Contaminated Sites*
[Continue to work with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote the clean-up and reuse of contaminated sites to protect human and environmental health.](#)

Program H-2.6.1: *Site Remediation*
Require property owners to comply with state and federal requirements for site remediation as a condition for approving redevelopment on contaminated sites. In collaboration with other government agencies, utilize the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) Cortesie List to prioritize the remediation of city and non-city-owned property to protect human and environmental health. Seek state and federal funds to implement the necessary level of clean-up.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Goal H-3: Expanded Housing Opportunities for Special Needs Groups

Promote the expansion of housing opportunities for all special needs groups, including seniors, persons with disabilities, single-parent households, first-time homebuyers, large families, and homeless individuals and families.

Policy H-3.1: *Senior Housing Development*
Actively seek to expand the development of affordable housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate-income seniors.

Program H-3.1.1: *Senior Housing Incentives*
Provide incentives for senior housing developments that provide a percentage of their total units at rents or prices affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate-income seniors. Potential incentives include financial assistance, density bonuses, increased height limits, reduced parking requirements, development fee waivers or deferrals, and expedited review.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Incentives by 12/31/12

Program H-3.1.2: *List of Senior Housing in Richmond*
Develop and maintain a comprehensive list of senior housing projects in Richmond and make it readily available to residents through the Online Housing Resource Center.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department, Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: List by 12/31/13

Policy H-3.2: *Accessible Housing Opportunities*
Actively seek to expand housing opportunities for persons with disabilities in new and existing single-family and multifamily developments.

Program H-3.2.1: *Accessible Housing Incentives*
Provide incentives for residential developments that make 15 percent or more of their total units accessible to persons with disabilities. Potential incentives include financial assistance, density bonuses, increased height limits, reduced parking requirements, development impact fee waivers or deferrals, and expedited review.

Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Incentives by 12/31/12

Program H-3.2.2: ***Enforcement of ADA Requirements***
Continue to enforce State handicapped, accessibility, and adaptability standards.
Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-3.2.3: ***Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance***
Develop a reasonable accommodation ordinance using the State HCD Model Ordinance for Providing Reasonable Accommodation under Federal and State Fair Housing Laws. Having a codified standard procedure for reasonable accommodation requests will facilitate uniform and timely reviews.
Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Adopt Ordinance by 12/31/13

Policy H-3.3: ***Child Daycare***
Actively seek to expand child daycare opportunities to assist single-parent and dual-income households, especially those who are extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income.

Program H-3.3.1: ***On-Site Child Daycare Services***
Identify potential incentives for development projects that make a commitment to provide on-site child daycare services for residents and employees.
Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Services Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-3.3.2: ***List of Child Daycare Services in Richmond***
Develop and maintain a comprehensive list of childcare services that are available in Richmond and make it readily available through the Online Housing Resource Center.
Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department, Business Licensing Division
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: List by 12/31/13

Policy H-3.4: *First-Time Homebuyer Opportunities*
Actively seek to expand housing opportunities for extremely low, very low, low and moderate-income first-time homebuyers.

Program H-3.4.1: *Mortgage Credit Certificate Tax Credit Program*
Support and participate in the Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Tax Credit Program administered by the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development and make program information readily available through the Online Housing Resource Center. Also provide information about first-time homebuyer programs administered by local nonprofits such as Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC).

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Policy H-3.5: *Large-Family Housing*
Actively seek to expand housing opportunities for large families that are extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income.

Program H-3.5.1: *Large-Family Housing Incentives*
Provide incentives for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income residential developments that include units with four or more bedrooms. Potential incentives include financial assistance, density bonuses, development impact fee waivers or deferrals, and expedited review.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Incentives by 12/31/12

Program H-3.5.2: *Neighborhood Stabilization Program*
Utilize the Neighborhood Stabilization Program to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed residential properties with four or more bedrooms and make them available to extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: NSP, HOME

Quantified Objective: Acquire and rehabilitate 220 large-family units by 12/31/13

Policy H-3.6: *Emergency, Transitional, and Supportive Housing*
Actively seek to expand emergency, transitional, and supportive housing to address homelessness in Richmond.

Program H-3.6.1: *Homelessness Coordination Efforts*
Participate in the Contra Costa HOME Consortium and the Contra Costa Interagency Council on Homelessness (CCICH) to identify and respond to the needs of homeless individuals and families in Richmond and surrounding communities. Prioritize implementation of the strategies and actions identified in the Consortium’s Consolidated Plan and the CCICH 10-Year Homeless Plan.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-3.6.2: *Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Comply with Senate Bill 2 (Emergency Shelters Supportive of Housing and Transitional Housing)*
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to ensure compliance with Senate Bill 2, which requires zoning to facilitate emergency shelters and limits the City’s ability to deny emergency shelters and transitional and supportive housing under the Housing Accountability Act. The Zoning Code can include locational and operational criteria for homeless shelters such as hours of operation, provisions for operations and management, and compliance with County and State health and safety requirements for food, medical and other supportive services provided on-site.

Do the following as part of the Zoning Ordinance amendments:

- Work with HomeBase or other emergency shelter providers to determine the typical size of a working large emergency shelter facility and allow large emergency shelters without a conditional use permit in at least one of the City’s zoning districts;
- Identify sufficient capacity to accommodate the need for emergency shelters and at least one year-round emergency shelter;
- Ensure that proposed permit procedures, development, and management standards are objective and encourage and facilitate the development of or conversion to emergency shelters through clear and unambiguous guidelines for the application review process and the basis for approval;
- Ensure development standards do not exceed those required for residential and commercial uses in the same zoning district;
- Set forth only objective standards such as maximum number of beds, provision of on-site management and security, and limits on length of stay; and
- Provide flexibility to meet the need for emergency shelters through a multi-jurisdictional agreement; and
- Ensure transitional and supportive housing uses are considered a residential use and only subject to those restrictions applying to other residential uses of the same type and in the same zone.

The City will solicit input from local service providers in the preparation and adoption of the amendment to the Zoning Code to ensure that development standards and permit processing will not impede the approval and/or development of emergency and transitional housing.

Responsible Agency: Planning & Building Services Department
Timeframe: Within one year of Housing Element adoption per Government Code §65583(a)(4)
Funding Sources: General Fund
Quantified Objective: Adopt amendments by 12/31/13

Program H-3.6.3:

Funding for Emergency, Transitional, and Supportive Housing

Support nonprofit organizations seeking funding sources for the establishment and operation of emergency, transitional, and supportive housing. Help secure financing that is periodically available under federal programs such as the Emergency Housing and Assistance Program (EHAP) and the Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG).

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Funding Sources: Emergency Housing and Assistance Program (EHAP),
Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG)
Quantified Objective: Engage organizations by 12/31/13

Goal H-4:

Equal Housing Access for All

Strive to achieve equal housing access for all people regardless of race, religion, gender, marital status, age, ancestry, national origin, color, sexual orientation, familial status, source of income, or disability.

Policy H-4.1:

Rent Subsidies for Affordable Housing

Provide rent subsidies that assist extremely low and very low-income families, seniors, and persons with disabilities to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market.

Program H-4.1.1:

Housing Choice Voucher Program

Continue to administer the City's Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program and maximize the program's utilization. Continue monitoring key program performance indicators such as attrition rates, fail-to-lease ratios, and waitlist size. Continue to work with local affordable housing developers to provide project-based vouchers. Respond to any future Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA) and apply for more vouchers. Provide program information as part of the Online Housing Resource Center.

Responsible Agency: Richmond Housing Authority

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: HUD, Annual Contributions Contracts

Quantified Objective: a) 10,500 unit inspections by 12/31/13

b) 10,500 tenant eligibility re-examinations by 12/31/13

c) Timely NOFA responses

Policy H-4.2:

Tenant Protections

Explore reasonable and enforceable regulations that protect tenants from evictions and exorbitant rent increases and refer residents with issues such as foreclosures, landlord-tenant disputes, and unlawful evictions, and housing discrimination to counseling services.

Program H-4.2.1:

Enforcement of Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance

Continue to enforce Richmond's Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance. The Ordinance was adopted in 2009 and provides protections for tenants in good standing from being evicted in the event of transfer of title or foreclosure.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: Not applicable

Program H-4.2.2: ***Expansion of Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance***
Analyze the effectiveness of the City’s existing just cause for eviction ordinance applying to tenants in foreclosed properties. Study other just cause for eviction ordinances in California and evaluate whether to expand the City’s ordinance so that it applies to all rental properties. The study should examine cities with both just cause for eviction protections and rent control ordinances and cities with just cause for eviction protections and no rent control ordinance. Consider recommending amendments to Richmond’s ordinance based on the study’s findings and input from the community and rental property owners.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: Ongoing

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 4/1/13
 b) Outreach by 11/31/13
 c) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-4.2.3: ***Rent Control Ordinance Study***
Study rent control ordinances in California and evaluate whether to adopt a similar ordinance in Richmond to stabilize rents and establish a rent control board. As part of the study, review program components of other cities, the benefits and costs of rent control ordinances and boards, administration and legal requirements, and annual costs. Also analyze potential constraints and opportunities to implementing rent control in Richmond. Consider whether to recommend an ordinance based on this study’s findings and extensive input from the community and rental property owners.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: On-going

Funding Sources: General Fund

Quantified Objective: a) Study by 4/1/13
 b) Outreach by 11/31/13
 c) Recommendations by 12/31/13

Program H-4.2.4: ***Counseling Service Referrals for Foreclosures, Landlord-Tenant Disputes, Unlawful Evictions, and Housing Discrimination***
Continue to refer homeowners, tenants, and landlords to third-party organizations such as Bay Area Legal Aid and 211 Bay Area for assistance with issues such as foreclosures, landlord-tenant disputes, unlawful evictions, and housing discrimination. Provide referral information as part of the Online Housing Resource Center.

Responsible Agency: Housing and Community Development Department

Timeframe: On-going

Funding Sources: General Fund, CDBG

Quantified Objective: Referrals upon request

Appendices

Richmond General Plan 2030
Housing Element

Appendix A. Housing Age and Condition Map

Appendix B. Priority Development Area Map

Appendix C. Vacant Land Inventory and Vacant Land Maps


Appendix D. Richmond Livable Corridors Plan

Appendix E. Flooding, Sea Level Rise and Tsunami Inundation Maps

Appendix F. Landslide and Earthquake Fault Maps

Appendix A:
Housing Age and Condition Map

Location of Buildings Exhibiting Unsafe and/or Unhealthy Conditions




- Buildings with Major Adverse Physical Conditions (114)
- Buildings with Multiple Adverse Physical Conditions (269)

- Merged Project Area
- ▭ City of Richmond

Seifel
CONSULTING INC.

Appendix B:
Priority Development Area Map


Priority Development Areas (PDAs)



Legend

Richmond PDAs

- North Richmond
- Central Richmond / 23rd St Corridor
- 23rd St Corridor
- South Richmond
- Other PDAs
- City and County Boundaries
- Parks and Other Public Areas



Source: ABAG

City of Richmond Geographic Information System (GIS) Data
 Prepared and published by the City of Richmond, 2015.
 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the City of Richmond.

Appendix C:

Vacant Land Inventory and Vacant Land Maps

Vacant Land Inventory
Richmond Housing Element

Number on Map	APN	Zoning	2030 GP Land Use	Livable Corridors Planning Area	Square Feet	Acres	Allowable Density (du/acre)	Max Unit Capacity Allowed	Realistic Unit Capacity ^a	Existing Use	Environmental Constraints	Infrastructure
Single Family Residential												
1	435300009	SFR-1	HR		288,165	6.62	4.0	26	21	Vacant		Yes
2	573020010	SFR-1	HR		798,687	18.34	4.0	73	58	Vacant		Yes
3	435180005	SFR-2	HR		1,165,139	26.75	7.3	194	155	Vacant		Yes
4	435200008	SFR-2	HR		2,928,278	67.22	7.3	488	390	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain, Brownfield Site	Yes
5	435210001	SFR-2	HR		85,973	1.97	7.3	14	11	Vacant		Yes
6	435210005	SFR-2	HR		58,970	1.35	7.3	10	8	Vacant		Yes
7	435210006	SFR-2	HR		266,779	6.12	7.3	44	36	Vacant		Yes
8	435222001	SFR-2	HR		194,300	4.46	7.3	32	26	Vacant		Yes
9	435230008	SFR-2	HR		11,008	0.25	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
10	435230014	SFR-2	HR		7,683	0.18	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
11	435230015	SFR-2	HR		10,584	0.24	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
12	435230021	SFR-2	HR		11,650	0.27	7.3	2	2	Vacant		Yes
13	435230027	SFR-2	HR		9,581	0.22	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
14	435230028	SFR-2	HR		82,265	1.89	7.3	14	11	Vacant		Yes
15	435230030	SFR-2	HR		7,122	0.16	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
16	435230040	SFR-2	HR		12,118	0.28	7.3	2	2	Vacant		Yes
17	435230046	SFR-2	HR		261,715	6.01	7.3	44	35	Vacant		Yes
18	435240001	SFR-2	HR		1,041,344	23.91	7.3	174	139	Vacant		Yes
19	435310049	SFR-2	HR		29,749	0.68	7.3	5	4	Vacant		Yes
20	556101007	SFR-2	HR		10,700	0.25	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
21	556121025	SFR-2	HR		10,030	0.23	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
22	556122001	SFR-2	HR		9,286	0.21	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
23	556122013	SFR-2	HR		7,813	0.18	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
24	556131018	SFR-2	HR		11,480	0.26	7.3	2	2	Vacant		Yes
25	556133010	SFR-2	HR		15,960	0.37	7.3	3	2	Vacant		Yes
26	556134032	SFR-2	HR		10,670	0.24	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
27	556151006	SFR-2	HR		9,791	0.22	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
28	556170016	SFR-2	HR		8,522	0.20	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
29	556170026	SFR-2	HR		21,630	0.50	7.3	4	3	Vacant		Yes
30	556170029	SFR-2	HR		17,880	0.41	7.3	3	2	Vacant		Yes
31	556170032	SFR-2	HR		6,387	0.15	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
32	556170033	SFR-2	HR		9,070	0.21	7.3	2	1	Vacant		Yes
33	558012014	SFR-2	HR		10,060	0.23	7.3	2	1	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
34	558012015	SFR-2	HR		8,733	0.20	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
35	558013001	SFR-2	HR		13,410	0.31	7.3	2	2	Vacant		Yes
36	558020014	SFR-2	HR		7,681	0.18	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
37	558072014	SFR-2	HR		8,911	0.20	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
38	558212010	SFR-2	HR		6,089	0.14	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
39	558232007	SFR-2	HR		27,290	0.63	7.3	5	4	Vacant		Yes
40	558233003	SFR-2	HR		6,271	0.14	7.3	1	1	Vacant		Yes
41	405280002	SFR-3	LR		89,198	2.05	11.6	24	19	Vacant		Yes
42	408054027	SFR-3	LR		5,474	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
43	435171003	SFR-3	LR		21,170	0.49	11.6	6	5	Vacant		Yes
44	508371001	SFR-3	LR		9,153	0.21	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
45	509350009	SFR-3	LR		7,379	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
46	509360011	SFR-3	LR		5,111	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
47	509360032	SFR-3	LR		5,858	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
48	513025001	SFR-3	LR		6,939	0.16	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
49	513081015	SFR-3	LR		5,102	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
50	513082013	SFR-3	LR		9,801	0.23	11.6	3	2	Vacant		Yes
51	513091015	SFR-3	LR		6,753	0.16	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
52	513092029	SFR-3	LR		9,340	0.21	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
53	513141032	SFR-3	LR		6,138	0.14	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
54	513151006	SFR-3	LR		15,920	0.37	11.6	4	3	Vacant		Yes
55	513162013	SFR-3	LR		9,286	0.21	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
56	513234002	SFR-3	LR		6,485	0.15	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
57	513234003	SFR-3	LR		5,358	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
58	513234004	SFR-3	LR		9,150	0.21	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
59	513235008	SFR-3	LR		6,623	0.15	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
60	513238013	SFR-3	RMU		7,292	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
61	513322024	SFR-3	LR		5,037	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
62	516050021	SFR-3	LR		5,057	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
63	523014016	SFR-3	LR		27,240	0.63	11.6	7	6	Vacant		Yes
64	524180002	SFR-3	LR		5,090	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
65	528260010	SFR-3	LR		5,015	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
66	534023002	SFR-3	LR		8,061	0.19	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
67	534023019	SFR-3	LR		5,548	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
68	534024001	SFR-3	LR		33,890	0.78	11.6	9	7	Vacant		Yes
69	534024021	SFR-3	LR		6,020	0.14	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
70	534033006	SFR-3	LR		12,710	0.29	11.6	3	3	Vacant		Yes
71	534101007	SFR-3	LR		8,677	0.20	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
72	534122012	SFR-3	LR		5,016	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
73	534131009	SFR-3	LR		5,680	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
74	534161024	SFR-3	LR		6,961	0.16	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
75	534212005	SFR-3	LR		5,020	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
76	534230021	SFR-3	LR		7,612	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes

Vacant Land Inventory
Richmond Housing Element

Number on Map	APN	Zoning	2030 GP Land Use	Livable Corridors Planning Area	Square Feet	Acres	Allowable Density (du/acre)	Max Unit Capacity Allowed	Realistic Unit Capacity*	Existing Use	Environmental Constraints	Infrastructure
77	534230026	SFR-3	LR		5,074	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
78	538060018	SFR-3	LR	Yes	5,486	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
79	538080001	SFR-3	LR		5,430	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
80	538161018	SFR-3	RMU	Yes	6,036	0.14	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
81	538162002	SFR-3	LR	Yes	8,062	0.19	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
82	538162007	SFR-3	RMU	Yes	5,848	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
83	538181037	SFR-3	RMU	Yes	26,382	0.61	11.6	7	6	Vacant		Yes
84	538190011	SFR-3	LR	Yes	5,960	0.14	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
85	538190027	SFR-3	LR	Yes	9,156	0.21	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
86	538310005	SFR-3	LR	Yes	5,786	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
87	538350043	SFR-3	LR		13,345	0.31	11.6	4	3	Vacant		Yes
88	538360009	SFR-3	LR		6,080	0.14	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
89	544221024	SFR-3	LR		5,044	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
90	544262008	SFR-3	LR		5,347	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
91	544332010	SFR-3	LR		5,026	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
92	544332015	SFR-3	LR		5,088	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
93	544332028	SFR-3	LR		10,190	0.23	11.6	3	2	Vacant		Yes
94	544332030	SFR-3	LR		7,598	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
95	544332034	SFR-3	LR		7,212	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
96	544332036	SFR-3	LR		7,302	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
97	549201005	SFR-3	LR		8,365	0.19	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
98	549203030	SFR-3	LR		12,680	0.29	11.6	3	3	Vacant		Yes
99	550141005	SFR-3	LR		5,662	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
100	550142018	SFR-3	LR		5,510	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
101	550301023	SFR-3	RMU		10,680	0.25	11.6	3	2	Vacant		Yes
102	560440011	SFR-3	LR		5,411	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
103	560440012	SFR-3	LR		5,702	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
104	560440013	SFR-3	LR		5,380	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
105	560440014	SFR-3	LR		5,642	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
106	560440015	SFR-3	LR		5,606	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
107	560440020	SFR-3	LR		5,766	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
108	560440021	SFR-3	LR		5,256	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
109	560440035	SFR-3	LR		5,414	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
110	560440036	SFR-3	LR		5,468	0.13	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
111	560440037	SFR-3	LR		5,649	0.13	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
112	561151007	SFR-3	MR		7,480	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
113	561151009	SFR-3	MR		10,050	0.23	11.6	3	2	Vacant		Yes
114	561151011	SFR-3	MR		6,329	0.15	11.6	2	1	Vacant		Yes
115	561152007	SFR-3	MR		5,007	0.11	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
116	561181031	SFR-3	MR		5,045	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
117	561192013	SFR-3	MR		7,470	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
118	561192018	SFR-3	MR		7,571	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
119	561192029	SFR-3	MR		7,481	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
120	561192030	SFR-3	MR		7,544	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
121	561231001	SFR-3	MR		5,033	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
122	561232015	SFR-3	MR		5,049	0.12	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
123	561251013	SFR-3	MR		7,484	0.17	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
124	561252029	SFR-3	MR		8,776	0.20	11.6	2	2	Vacant		Yes
125	561262003	SFR-3	MR		5,008	0.11	11.6	1	1	Vacant		Yes
126	513321001	SFR-3/EA	MR		168,017	3.86				Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
	513321002	SFR-3/EA	MR		7,482	0.17				Vacant		Yes
	513321003	SFR-3/EA	MR		65,377	1.50				Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
	513330001	SFR-3/EA	MR		40,965	0.94				Vacant		Yes
	513330002	SFR-3/EA	MR		130,906	3.01				Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
	513330003	SFR-3/EA	MR		24,323	0.56	26.2	336	336	Vacant		Yes
	513330005	SFR-3/EA	MR		54,368	1.25				Vacant		Yes
	513330006	SFR-3/EA	MR		19,730	0.45				Vacant		Yes
	513330007	SFR-3/EA	MR		24,272	0.56				Vacant		Yes
	513330013	SFR-3/EA	MR		2,042	0.05				Vacant		Yes
	513330014	SFR-3/EA	MR		9160	0.21				Vacant		Yes
513330016	SFR-3/EA	MR		12,196	0.28				Vacant		Yes	
Subtotal					8,816,746	202.41		1,705	1,431			
Multifamily Residential												
127	501220012	MFR-1	MR	Yes	8,460	0.19	26.4	5	4	Vacant		Yes
128	508020014	MFR-1	MR		11,640	0.27	26.4	7	6	Vacant		Yes
129	508122015	MFR-1	MR		5,317	0.12	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
130	510092001	MFR-1	MR		6,641	0.15	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
131	513174021	MFR-1	CMU		19,109	0.44	26.4	12	9	Vacant		Yes
132	513174023	MFR-1	RMU		7,483	0.17	26.4	5	4	Vacant		Yes
133	513317001	MFR-1	MR		5,781	0.13	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
134	515180010	MFR-1	MR	Yes	5,406	0.12	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
135	529241005	MFR-1	MR		5,084	0.12	26.4	3	2	Vacant		Yes
136	534302001	MFR-1	MR		6,387	0.15	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
137	540210015	MFR-1	MR	Yes	5,545	0.13	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
138	540210022	MFR-1	MR	Yes	5,761	0.13	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
139	540300003	MFR-1	MR	Yes	5,795	0.13	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
140	540380009	MFR-1	MR	Yes	8,238	0.19	26.4	5	4	Vacant		Yes

Vacant Land Inventory
Richmond Housing Element

Number on Map	APN	Zoning	2030 GP Land Use	Livable Corridors Planning Area	Square Feet	Acres	Allowable Density (du/acre)	Max Unit Capacity Allowed	Realistic Unit Capacity ^a	Existing Use	Environmental Constraints	Infrastructure
141	540380019	MFR-1	MR	Yes	8,562	0.20	26.4	5	4	Vacant		Yes
142	544221013	MFR-1	RMU		15,393	0.35	26.4	9	7	Vacant		Yes
143	544240009	MFR-1	CMU		6,177	0.14	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
144	544240014	MFR-1	CMU		5,807	0.13	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
145	544240015	MFR-1	CMU		5,951	0.14	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
146	549131010	MFR-1	MR	Yes	20,590	0.47	26.4	12	10	Vacant		Yes
147	549132001	MFR-1	MR	Yes	7,098	0.16	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
148	549150004	MFR-1	RMU		5,488	0.13	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
149	558071001	MFR-1	LR		10,900	0.25	26.4	7	5	Vacant		Yes
150	558161011	MFR-1	LR		5,236	0.12	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
151	558161012	MFR-1	LR		5,175	0.12	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
152	558161013	MFR-1	LR		5,420	0.12	26.4	3	3	Vacant		Yes
153	558241007	MFR-1	LR		6,119	0.14	26.4	4	3	Vacant		Yes
154	558251013	MFR-1	LR		10,070	0.23	26.4	6	5	Vacant		Yes
155	558251014	MFR-1	LR		10,620	0.24	26.4	6	5	Vacant		Yes
156	558263004	MFR-1	LR		15,500	0.36	26.4	9	8	Vacant		Yes
157	558292035	MFR-1	LR		14,058	0.32	26.4	8	7	Vacant		Yes
158	558330039	MFR-1	LR		5,015	0.12	26.4	3	2	Vacant		Yes
159	558330040	MFR-1	LR		5,000	0.11	26.4	3	2	Vacant		Yes
160	560410002	MFR-1	MR		9,449	0.22	26.4	6	5	Vacant		Yes
161	560410003	MFR-1	MR		6,326	0.15	26.4	4	3	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
162	560410076	MFR-1	MR		10,990	0.25	26.4	7	5	Vacant		Yes
163	560440038	MFR-1	MR		12,026	0.28	26.4	7	6	Vacant		Yes
164	560440040	MFR-1	MR		14,043	0.32	26.4	9	7	Vacant		Yes
165	514110001	MFR-3	HIMU	Yes	5,691	0.13	54.5	7	6	Vacant		Yes
166	514200027	MFR-3	HIMU	Yes	5,072	0.12	54.5	6	5	Vacant		Yes
Subtotal					338,423	7.77		212	170			
Commerical												
167	513062023	C-1	NMU		15,072	0.35	34.8	12	7	Vacant		Yes
168	515350006	C-1	CMU	Yes	5,169	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
169	534142006	C-1	NMU		8,241	0.19	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
170	534171007	C-1	NMU		5,015	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
171	534181024	C-1	NMU		11,080	0.25	34.8	9	5	Vacant		Yes
172	534330020	C-1	NMU		6,060	0.14	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
173	538161011	C-1	RMU	Yes	12,050	0.28	34.8	10	6	Vacant		Yes
174	538181035	C-1	RMU	Yes	5,543	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
175	538220001	C-1	RMU	Yes	5,630	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
176	544262001	C-1	MIMU		10,350	0.24	34.8	8	5	Vacant		Yes
177	544262016	C-1	CMU		26,367	0.61	34.8	21	13	Vacant		Yes
178	544312005	C-1	CMU	Yes	5,361	0.12	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
179	544312006	C-1	CMU	Yes	5,168	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
180	544312007	C-1	CMU	Yes	5,260	0.12	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
181	549110014	C-1	CMU	Yes	5,453	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
182	550301024	C-1	MIMU		13,209	0.30	34.8	11	6	Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
183	414340002	C-2	CMU		170,145	3.91	34.8	136	82	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
184	507251011	C-2	CMU		128,500	2.95	34.8	103	62	Vacant		Yes
185	507251014	C-2	CMU		43,260	0.99	34.8	35	21	Vacant		Yes
186	507251016	C-2	CMU		39,000	0.90	34.8	31	19	Vacant		Yes
187	507261030	C-2	CMU		8,940	0.21	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
188	507261031	C-2	CMU		8,077	0.19	34.8	6	4	Vacant		Yes
189	514032007	C-2	HIMU	Yes	11,123	0.26	34.8	9	5	Vacant		Yes
190	515020027	C-2	CMU	Yes	10,017	0.23	34.8	8	5	Vacant		Yes
191	515180020	C-2	CMU	Yes	3,485	0.08	34.8	3	2	Vacant		Yes
192	515180021	C-2	CMU	Yes	10,682	0.25	34.8	9	5	Vacant		Yes
193	515190010	C-2	HIMU	Yes	8,753	0.20	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
194	515190011	C-2	HIMU	Yes	6,047	0.14	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
195	515190012	C-2	HIMU	Yes	5,442	0.12	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
196	515190014	C-2	HIMU	Yes	5,468	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
197	515190015	C-2	HIMU	Yes	11,570	0.27	34.8	9	6	Vacant		Yes
198	515261010	C-2	HIMU	Yes	5,010	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
199	516202020	C-2	MIMU	Yes	10,168	0.23	34.8	8	5	Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
200	517320017	C-2	CMU	Yes	5,031	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
201	517330008	C-2	CMU	Yes	5,077	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
202	524010003	C-2	CMU	Yes	5,025	0.12	34.8	4	2	Vacant		Yes
203	528080003	C-2	CMU	Yes	9,212	0.21	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
204	528250002	C-2	CMU	Yes	5,838	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
205	528250023	C-2	CMU	Yes	6,133	0.14	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
206	528360027	C-2	CMU	Yes	9,189	0.21	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
207	529170032	C-2	CMU	Yes	9,715	0.22	34.8	8	5	Vacant	Brownfield Site	Yes
208	540290020	C-2	CMU	Yes	8,487	0.19	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
209	561110006	C-2	CMU		172,500	3.96	34.8	138	83	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
210	561110039	C-2	CMU		160,500	3.69	34.8	128	77	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
211	510053032	C-3	RCMU		75,035	1.72	34.8	60	36	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain, Brownfield Site	Yes
212	510053033	C-3	RCMU		32,316	0.74	34.8	26	16	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
213	517280006	C-3	CMU	Yes	138,013	3.17	34.8	110	66	Vacant		Yes
214	514032018	CB	HIMU	Yes	11,309	0.26	34.8	9	5	Vacant		Yes
215	514032019	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,529	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes

Vacant Land Inventory
Richmond Housing Element

Number on Map	APN	Zoning	2030 GP Land Use	Livable Corridors Planning Area	Square Feet	Acres	Allowable Density (du/acre)	Max Unit Capacity Allowed	Realistic Unit Capacity ^a	Existing Use	Environmental Constraints	Infrastructure
216	514060017	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,690	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
217	538132005	CB	HIMU	Yes	6,073	0.14	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
218	538132014	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,353	0.12	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
219	538220004	CB	HIMU	Yes	7,094	0.16	34.8	6	3	Vacant		Yes
220	538220008	CB	HIMU	Yes	14,311	0.33	34.8	11	7	Vacant		Yes
221	538220011	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,610	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
222	538250001	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,573	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
223	538250012	CB	HIMU	Yes	8,298	0.19	34.8	7	4	Vacant		Yes
224	538260001	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,481	0.13	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
225	540071016	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,371	0.12	34.8	4	3	Vacant		Yes
226	540071017	CB	HIMU	Yes	11,035	0.25	34.8	9	5	Vacant		Yes
227	540150002	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,726	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
228	540150006	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,732	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
229	540250004	CB	HIMU	Yes	5,687	0.13	34.8	5	3	Vacant		Yes
230	560340042	CC	MR		83,947	1.93	34.8	67	40	Vacant		Yes
231	560420007	CC	MR		55,529	1.27	34.8	44	27	Vacant	100 Year Floodplain	Yes
232	560420009	CC	MWC		35,219	0.81	34.8	28	17	Vacant		Yes
Subtotal					1,561,354	35.84		1,249	749			
Total					10,716,523	246.02		3,166	2,350			

a. Based on historical trends and assumption that development standards combined with unique site features may not always lead to 100 percent buildout. Assumes 80 percent realistic unit capacity for residential zones and 60 percent for commercial zones.

Source: City of Richmond, Lisa Wise Consulting, Seifel Consulting Inc.

Figure 5.1
Vacant Parcels






Figure 5.2
Vacant Parcels




Appendix D:


Richmond Livable Corridors Plan Form-Based Code



Appendix E:
Flooding, Sea Level Rise and Tsunami Inundation Maps




Note: Larger format maps are available for view or purchase at the Planning and Building Services Department.



Map 8.1
Potential Sea Level Rise


Areas Affected by Potential One Meter Sea Level Rise in 2100

Note: This map is based on Scenarios for Sea Level Rise developed by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) using USGS 2m DSM. BCDC notes that the data is illustrative and depicts a potential inundation scenario in 2100 of one meter; limitations in the geospatial data may effect accuracy; and the data should not be used for planning purposes.



Source: City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Thomas Bros. Maps, US Census, State of California, MG Inc. Thomas Bros. Map data reproduced with permission granted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. THOMAS BROS. MAPS data is copyrighted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. It is unlawful to copy or reproduce all or any part thereof, whether for personal use or resale, without the prior, written permission of THOMAS BROS. MAPS.

Note: Larger format maps are available for view or purchase at the Planning and Building Services Department.



Map 12.5
Tsunami Inundation Area

--- Estimated tsunami highest run-up line.
 - - - - - Inundation indicated by this line may be exceeded.

 Inundation Area


50
10
ACRES

N
0 0.5 1 2
MILES

Source: City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Thomas Bros. Maps, US Census, State of California, MDC Inc., Thomas Bros. Maps. Map data reproduced with permission granted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. THOMAS BROS. MAPS data is copyrighted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. It is unlawful to copy or reproduce all or any part thereof, whether for personal use or resale, without the prior, written permission of THOMAS BROS. MAPS.

Appendix F:
Landslide and Earthquake Fault Maps

Earthquake Faults and Probabilities San Francisco Bay Region




**San Francisco Bay Region
Earthquake Probability**

63%
probability for one or more magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquakes from 2007 to 2036. This result incorporates the probabilities of quakes on faults beyond the boundaries of the map.

- ★ Project Area Location
- Bay Area Faults






Map 12.1
Landslide Potential

- Category 1 - Stable**
Areas of 0 - 5 percent slope that are not underlain by landslide deposits.
- Category 1A - Unstable**
Areas of 0 - 5 percent slope that include tidelands, marshlands, and swamplands that are underlain by moist, unconsolidated muds.
- Category 2 - Generally Stable**
Areas of 5 to 15 percent slope that are not underlain by landslide deposits.
- Category 3 - Generally Stable to Marginally Stable**
Areas of greater than 15 percent slope that are not underlain by landslide deposits or bedrock units susceptible to landsliding.
- Category 4 - Moderately Stable**
Areas of greater than 15 percent slope that are underlain by bedrock units susceptible to landsliding but not underlain by landslide deposits.
- Category 5 - Unstable**
Areas of any slope that are underlain by or immediately adjacent to landslide deposits.
- Small Landslide Deposit**
Generally 200' - 500' feet in longest dimension; shown only where a single deposit is located more than 1,000 feet from the nearest adjacent landslide deposits.

Notes:
This map should be regarded as a general guide to regional slope stability. It is not intended to be a substitute for detailed site investigations, which should precede any final planning decision.

This information is based upon U.S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey Professional Paper 944 Plate 2.



Source: City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Thomas Bros. Maps, US Census, State of California, MG Inc. Thomas Bros. Map data reproduced with permission granted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. THOMAS BROS. MAPS data is copyrighted by THOMAS BROS. MAPS. It is unlawful to copy or reproduce all or any part thereof, whether for personal use or resale, without the prior, written permission of THOMAS BROS. MAPS.

Note: Larger format maps are available for view or purchase at the Planning and Building Services Department.