

# INYO COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT

**Adopted July 1, 1992**  
UPDATED DECEMBER 2001

2004 Updated Housing Element,  
Adopted April 16th, 2004

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

**Chapter One: Introduction**

Purpose of the Element .....	5
Public Participation .....	5
Consistency with the General Plan.....	6

**Chapter Two: Housing Needs**

Population.....	7
Employment .....	9
Household Characteristics	
▫ Household Growth Trends.....	10
▫ Households by Tenure .....	11
▫ Overcrowded Households.....	11
▫ Households Overpaying.....	12
Housing Stock Characteristics	
▫ Housing Units by Type.....	13
▫ Housing Stock Conditions .....	14
Special Housing Needs	
▫ Persons with Disabilities .....	16
▫ Seniors .....	17
▫ Large Families .....	18
▫ Female Headed Households.....	19
▫ Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelter .....	19
▫ Farmworkers .....	20

**Chapter Three: Resources and Constraints**

Regional Housing Need .....	22
Land Inventory .....	24
▫ Analysis of Suitability: Physical and Environmental .....	26
▫ Analysis of Zoning that Facilitates Development for Lower Income .....	27
▫ Availability of Infrastructure to Identified Lands.....	27
▫ Analysis of Redevelopable Sites.....	28
▫ Analysis of Zoning that Facilitates Housing for Farmworkers and Homeless .....	28
▫ Analysis of Realistic Capacity.....	28

Analysis of Governmental Constraints	
▫ Land Use Controls .....	29
▫ Fees and Exactions.....	31
▫ On/Off-site Improvement Standards.....	31
▫ Building Codes and Enforcement.....	32
▫ Local Processing and Permit Procedures.....	32
▫ Constraints on Persons with Disabilities .....	33
Analysis of Non-Governmental Constraints .....	35
▫ Land Costs .....	35
▫ Construction Costs.....	37
▫ Infrastructure Constraints .....	37
▫ Availability of Financing.....	38
▫ Environmental Constraints .....	39
Units At-Risk of Converting to Market Rate Uses .....	39
Energy Conservation.....	40
<b>Chapter Four: Review and Revise</b>	
Program by Program Review of the Previous Housing Element.....	42
<b>Chapter Five: Housing Program</b>	
Goals and Policies .....	46
▫ Maintenance and Preservation of Housing .....	46
▫ Provision of Adequate Sites.....	47
▫ Housing Opportunities.....	47
▫ Home Ownership .....	48
▫ Removal of Constraints on Housing Development .....	49
▫ Accessibility of Housing.....	50
Implementation Measures .....	51
Quantified Objectives.....	56
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1 – Determination of Adequate Sites Illustration	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page Number</u>
Table 1: Population Growth Trends (1970-2003).....	7
Table 2: Inyo County Population (1960-1990).....	8
Table 3: Employment by Industry (2000).....	9
Table 4: Household Growth Trends (1980-2003).....	10
Table 5: Population by Household Type (1990-2000).....	10
Table 6: Households by Tenure (1980 – 2000).....	11
Table 7: Overcrowded Households (2000).....	12
Table 8: Households Overpaying (2000).....	12
Table 9: Housing Units by Type (1990-2000).....	13
Table 10: Housing Units by Age.....	14
Table 11: Housing Units by Tenure by Age (2000).....	15
Table 12: Housing Conditions.....	15
Table 13: Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2000).....	16
Table 14: Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type (2000).....	17
Table 15: Householders by Tenure by Age (2000).....	18
Table 16: Household Size by Tenure (2000).....	18
Table 17: Female Headed Households (2000).....	19
Table 18: Number of Farmworkers (1997).....	21
Table 19: Farmworkers by Days Worked (1997).....	21
Table 20: Regional Housing Needs (2001 to 2008).....	22
Table 21: Residential Development Since 2001.....	22
Table 22: Projects Approved, and Likely to be Constructed and Occupied by 2006.....	23
Table 23: Housing Needs Met by Approved and Pending Applications.....	23
Table 24: Vacant Land Inventory.....	24
Table 25: Unincorporated Inyo County Residential Development Standards.....	30
Table 26: Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District.....	30
Table 27: Inyo County Planning Fee Schedule.....	31
Table 28: Inyo County Land Costs by Area (2003).....	36
Table 29: Housing Implementation Measures and Funding Sources.....	51
Table 30: Quantified Objectives.....	56

# Chapter One: Introduction

---

## ***Purpose of the Element***

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

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

Unlike the other mandatory elements of the General Plan, the Housing Element is subject to detailed statutory requirements regarding its content and must be updated every five years. The housing element is also subject to mandatory review by State Department of Housing and Community Development. This reflects the statutory recognition that the availability of housing is a matter of statewide importance and that cooperation between all levels of government and the private sector is critical to attainment of the State's housing goals.

Inyo County adopted its first Housing Element in 1992. That element was updated in 2001 when the County did a thorough update of its General Plan. The 2001 update anticipated State housing element requirements as adapted to meet the intent of the "Frontier County" provisions of housing element law, but does not meet the current statutory requirements. The Goals, Policies and Implementation Measures included in the 2001 Update have been incorporated into this Element with very minor revisions. This 2004 Housing Element, once adopted by Inyo County and certified by the State, will guide Inyo County's housing policy until the next scheduled update in 2008.

## ***Public Participation***

The Housing Element reflects the values and preferences of Inyo County residents. In the 2001 Inyo County General Plan Update, extensive public outreach shaped the goals, policies and implementation measures included in the updated 2001 Housing Element. Outreach efforts included special needs groups, public and private agencies that own and manage land throughout the County, and tribal governments. In preparing this update to the Element, community meetings were held to ensure the public information gathered in the 2001 General Plan Update process accurately reflects the public opinion and values today. In October 2003, the Board of Supervisors held a workshop to discuss housing issues in the

County and how they relate to the housing issues facing the Eastern Sierra as a region. In early November 2003, a meeting of the Owens Valley Interagency Committee was held to discuss housing issues facing the County and the region. The Inyo County Planning Commission and the Inyo County Board of Supervisors conducted a joint public hearing in which special needs populations, developers, and citizens of all incomes were encouraged to participate. The Board of Supervisors approved and adopted the revised 2004 Housing Element on April 16, 2004 after the public hearing.

### ***Consistency with the General Plan***

The Housing Element is entirely consistent with the goals and policies of the current Inyo County General Plan. As a result of each Element in the General Plan being updated in 2001, there are no General Plan land use designations or regulations that require revision in order to meet the policies and objectives of this element, or provide for the County's fair share of the regional housing need.

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

## Chapter Two: Housing Needs

---

### *Population*

#### Population Growth Trends

An understanding of the demographics of Inyo County - past, present, and future - is essential to the process of updating the Housing Element. According to the Census information, the population of Inyo County in 1990 was 18,281. Table 1 shows population growth trends from 1970 through 2003.

In the 1960s, Inyo County experienced a 4 percent growth rate as the County gained popularity as a destination for recreation activities and retirement. This was the largest population boom in the County since the early 1900s. In the 1970s, the County saw continued, but more limited growth. Population growth slowed in the 1980s, when it increased by only 386 people. Most of this population growth was the result of in-migration of older persons of retirement or near-retirement age.

The 2000 census showed Inyo County as one of the few California jurisdictions that lost population. In the ten year period from 1990-2000, Inyo County's population declined by 390 individuals. However, in the three years since the decennial census, the County has nearly regained that lost population.

**Table 1: Population Growth Trends (1970 - 2003) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Year	Population	Numerical Change	Average Annual Change	
			Number	Percent
1970	12,073			
1980	14,562	2,489	249	2.1%
1990	14,806	244	24	0.2%
2000	14,416	-390	-39	-0.3%
2003	14,734	318	32	0.7%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census, SF3: P1) and (1990 Census, STF3: P1), DOF (Report E-5)

According to the Census information, the population of Inyo County in 1990 was 18,281. Table 2 shows how the total population in 1990 was distributed between the City of Bishop, the only incorporated city in the County, and the unincorporated areas of the County. Between 1960 and 1990, the distribution of the County's population between the unincorporated areas and City of Bishop remained relatively stable, with Bishop's share of the population declining slightly. As the Table shows, in 1990 eighty-one percent of the total County population resided in unincorporated areas, while the balance resided in Bishop city

**Table 2: Inyo County Population (1960-1990)**

Year	Total Population	City of Bishop	%	Unincorporated County	%
1960	11,684	2,875	24.6%	8,809	75.4%
1970	15,571	3,498	22.5%	12,073	77.5%
1980	17,895	3,333	18.6%	14,562	81.4%
1990	18,281	3,475	19.0%	14,806	81.0%
2000	17,945	3,575		14,416	
2003				14,734	

Source: California Department of Finance, Historical Census Population of Counties in California, 1850-1990; Historical Census Population of Places, Towns, and Cities in California, 1850-1990; City/County Population & Housing Estimates, 1990–1998.(Report E-5).

## Employment

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

Out of nearly 6,372 total jobs, the service sector is by far the largest employer in the County at 39 percent, including services both to the local population and to visitors. The next largest category is retail trade at 10.6 percent. Public administration follows with nearly 10 percent of total employment.

Economic projections suggest a continued increase in tourism-related employment and income, and only marginal growth in other private sector industries. The tourism expansion generates a substantial increase in higher paying government jobs, with the effect of increasing per capita income despite the lower pay of other tourism-supported business sectors, such as retail and lodging. Other demographic trends contribute to the upward push in local incomes, such as the continued influx into the County of retirees with independent incomes and lower than average household sizes.

**Table 3: Employment by Industry (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Industry Type	2000	
	Number	Percent
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining:	237	3.7%
Construction	548	8.6%
Manufacturing	246	3.9%
Wholesale trade	172	2.7%
Retail trade	676	10.6%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:	459	7.2%
Information	108	1.7%
Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing:	139	2.2%
Professional, scientific, management, admin.	342	5.4%
Educational, health and social services:	1,394	21.9%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, and services:	1,083	17.0%
Other services	344	5.4%
Public administration	624	9.8%
TOTAL	6,372	100.0%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census, SF3: P49)

Despite slow population growth, Inyo County has income and earnings sufficient to provide for growth in the local services sector. The viability of this sector will depend on three primary factors: 1) continued employment and income growth in public administration; 2) the availability of retail goods and services targeted toward the over 65 age group and upper

middle income (above \$50,000) consumers; and 3) the availability of housing that is affordable at service sector wages.

## **Household Characteristics**

### **Household Growth Trends**

In 1980, there were 5,654 households in unincorporated Inyo County. According to the 2000 Census, the County had grown to 6,033 households; representing a 6 percent increase over the last twenty years. Household characteristics have remained fairly static over the last ten years. Currently the Department of Finance estimates Inyo County's 2003 population for the unincorporated areas at 14,750 residents, a 3 percent increase in population since the Census 2000. By 2020, the Department of Finance projects that the number of residents in Inyo County will increase by 13 percent to 20,700.

Inyo County's aging population has a significant affect on household characteristics, as household trends for seniors differs from other demographic cohorts. Nineteen percent of the County's population in 2000 was at least 65 years of age. Statewide, only 10.5 percent of the population is at least 65 years old. The high percentage of residents aged 65 and over, suggests that the County is an attractive location for retirees.

**Table 4: Household Growth Trends (1980 - 2003) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Year	Households	Numerical Change	Annual Numerical Change
1980	5,654		
1990	5,884	230	23
2000	6,033	149	15
2003	6,073	40	13

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

**Table 5: Population by Household Type (1990 – 2000) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Household Type	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Population in Households	14,414	97.4%	14,338	99.5%
Family Households	12,550	84.8%	12,138	84.2%
Non-family Households	1,864	12.6%	2,200	15.3%
Population in Group Quarters	392	2.6%	78	0.5%
Institutional	232	1.6%	76	0.5%
Non-institutional	160	1.1%	2	0.0%
<b>TOTAL POPULATION</b>	<b>14,806</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>14,416</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

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

## **Households by Tenure**

According to the 2000 Census, 72.7 percent of the population in unincorporated Inyo County owned their homes. This is an increase of 3 percent since 1980, most likely due to lower interest rates that have made homeownership more accessible.

**Table 6: Households by Tenure (1980 – 2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

	1980		1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner	3,941	69.7%	4,227	71.8%	4,386	72.7%
Renter	1,713	30.3%	1,657	28.2%	1,647	27.3%
TOTAL	5,654	100.0%	5,884	100.0%	6,033	100.0%

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census, SF 3: H7), (1990 Census, SF 3: H8) and 1980 Census

Although there are 9,042 housing units available, only 7,703 were available year-round - 1,339 housing units (15%) are seasonal or second homes. Recent trends indicate that second-home ownership has been on the rise in Inyo County. This trend threatens the availability and affordability of housing to the average resident.

The current homeowner vacancy rate is only 1.8 percent and the rental vacancy rate is 6.9 percent. The homeowner vacancy rate is a direct reflection of the tight real-estate market and lack of private land available for new development. The majority of private land in Inyo County is already developed, and much of the remaining privately owned vacant acreage has infrastructure and/or environmental constraints, which make development costly, and occasionally prohibitive.

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

## **Overcrowded Households**

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

According to the 2000 Census, only 3.9 percent of the total households are in overcrowded situations. This percentage is very low compared to the statewide average of 15.2%. Overcrowding has been declining since 1980 in the unincorporated areas of the County. In

1990, there were 287 overcrowded households. The 2000 census showed only 237 overcrowded households.

**Table 7: Overcrowded Households (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Households	Owners	Renters	TOTAL
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	4,386	1,647	6,033
Total Overcrowded Households	120	117	237
1-1.5 Persons per Room	82	77	159
1.5 or More Persons per Room	38	40	78
Statewide Overcrowding Rates	8.6%	23.9%	15.2%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: H20)			

**Households Overpaying**

Households are considered to be overpaying for housing if payment (rent or mortgage) is 30 percent or greater than the total household income. In 2000, approximately 933 households (16%) were overpaying. Overpayment occurs more frequently in renter households; 25 percent of renter households overpay and 12 percent of owner households overpay. Of the 1,537 households reporting incomes less than \$35,000, nearly half (734) were overpaying in 2000. In 1990, overpaying lower income renter households (815) outnumbered lower income owner households (315) almost three to one. The 2000 Census documents a decrease in this disproportion, as overpaying lower income households are evenly split between renters and owners.

**Table 8: Households Overpaying (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Households	Owners	Renters	TOTAL
Total Households Overpaying	518	415	933
<b>LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS</b>			
Total Households with Income Less than \$35,000	873	644	1,537
Households Overpaying with Less than \$35,000	326	408	734
Source: Census Bureau ( 2000 Census SF 3: H69, H73, H94 and H97)			
*Number of households overpaying based on the number of households (4,152 total: 1,429 renter and 2,723 owner) computed by the Census Bureau			

## Housing Stock Characteristics

### Housing Units by Type

Unincorporated Inyo County contains a variety of housing types, including 4,610 detached single-family residences, 134 attached single-family residences, 2,038 mobilehomes, and 290 multi-family units (see Table 9).

Single-family homes represent the dominant type of housing in the County. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of detached single-family residences increased by 15.6 percent from 3,988 to 4,610. The number of attached single-family residences increased by 78.7 percent from 75 to 134 units. Most of the single-family growth occurred adjacent to the City of Bishop and the northern portion of the County.

The 2000 census reported 2,038 mobilehomes in the unincorporated County, which represents 29 percent of the total unincorporated County's housing stock. Although this number has decreased almost 19 percent since 1990, this is still a significantly high percentage, as mobilehomes account for only 1 percent of the housing stock statewide. Mobilehomes are immensely popular within Inyo County as they have remained affordable, and the construction quality and public acceptance levels have improved. The County also actively rezoned acreage in order to allow mobilehomes, and the Zoning Ordinance allows the placement of mobilehomes on all residentially zoned lots.

Table 9 shows how Inyo County's housing stock has changed since the 1990 Census. A total of 729 units have been added to the unincorporated portion of Inyo County's housing stock, including 681 single-family units, 48 multi-family units.

**Table 9: Housing Units by Type (1990-2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Housing Unit Type	1990		2000		Change	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single Family-Detach	3,988	58.4%	4,610	65.2%	622	15.6%
Single Family-Attach	75	1.1%	134	1.8%	59	78.7%
2-4 units	97	1.4%	145	2.1%	48	49.5%
5 Plus Units	160	2.3%	145	2.1%	-15	-9.4%
Mobilehome *	2,514	36.8%	2,038	28.8%	-476	-18.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,834</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>7,072</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census, SF 3: H30) and (1990 Census, SF: H20)  
 \*Mobilehomes includes "Other" (i.e., RV, Campers)

The decrease of mobilehomes in conjunction with the substantial increase in single-family home development indicates that a majority of these mobilehomes were most likely replaced with single-family development. As previously noted, the current homeowner vacancy rate is only 1.8 percent and the rental vacancy rate is 6.9 percent. These figures indicate that there is an increased demand for more affordable rental housing stock.

The County currently has a variety of policies in place designed to address the need for affordable rental housing. Policies include:

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

**Housing Stock Conditions**

Structures older than 30 years are the accepted standard determining the need for “major rehabilitation.” As of the year 2000, approximately 40 percent of all housing within the unincorporated areas of Inyo County were older than 30 years of age.

**Table 10: Housing Units by Age- Unincorporated Inyo County**

Year Structure Built	Number	Percent
1990 to 2000	839	13.9%
1980 to 1989	1255	20.8%
1970 to 1979	1435	23.7%
1960 to 1969	967	16%
1950 to 1959	593	9.8%
1959 or earlier	944	15.6%
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000		

As illustrated in Table 10, approximately 20 percent more renters than owners inhabit housing which is classified as in need of major rehabilitation. Therefore, policies designed to provide rehabilitation funding should address this particular issue.

**Table 11: Housing Units by Tenure by Age (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Year	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1990 – 2000	648	14.8%	191	11.6%
1980-1989	1,020	23.3%	235	14.3%
1970-1979	1,142	26.0%	293	17.8%
1960-1969	689	15.7%	278	16.9%
1950-1959	389	8.7%	204	12.4%
Pre-1950	498	11.4%	446	27.0%
Total	4,386	100.0%	1,647	100.0%

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

The following assessment of units in need of replacement and rehabilitation is derived from 1990 and 2000 census data, a windshield survey of housing conditions, a recent visual survey, data on age of housing stock, and recent building permits issued for improved property.

Of the County’s housing stock in 2000, 5188 units (86%) were rated in sound condition, 241 units (4%) are in need of minor repairs, 302 units (5%) are in need of moderate repairs, 181 units (3%) are in need of substantial repairs, and 121 units (2%) are considered unsuitable for rehabilitation (dilapidated).

Six areas have been identified as having a significant number of housing units that were classified as dilapidated or in need of substantial repairs, these included: the communities of Darwin, Homewood Canyon, Keeler, Pearsonville, Independence and Lone Pine.

**Table 12: Housing Conditions**

Condition	Number	Percent
Sound	5188	86%
Need Rehabilitation	724	12%
Need Replacement	121	2%
TOTAL	6033	100%

Source: Estimates by local building officials, builders, redevelopment agencies, non-profit agencies and windshield surveys

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

In the northern portion of the County where housing demand is very great and property values are escalating, market forces are contributing to the rehabilitation of housing units. Many homeowners have taken advantage of increased property values and low interest rates to reinvest in their homes.

**Special Housing Needs**

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

The Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) provided supplemental information about special needs groups and the housing options/social services available in Inyo County. The non-profit organization organizes and operates a number of programs countywide, including low-income housing, emergency shelter, emergency food/commodities, and weatherization programs. As one of Inyo County’s primary social service organizations, IMACA, in conjunction with the Inyo County Planning Department, provided substantial input on the types of programs to be implemented in the County to achieve State housing goals.

Inyo County had two assisted housing projects in its jurisdiction managed by IMACA. Mt. Whitney Apartments is a 33-unit housing project developed with funds from the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rental Housing Program, and Valley Apartments is available to qualifying senior citizens.

IMACA also manages the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program, which provides vouchers to eligible families. The vouchers represent credit that can be applied to rental cost of any housing unit. Currently, there are 29 vouchers allocated to Inyo County residents as a whole. Of these, 14 vouchers are allocated to residents living in the unincorporated areas of Inyo County.

**Persons with Disabilities**

According to the 2000 Census, 2,612 (19.2%) of the population reported a disability, of which about a third are not employed and another third are over the age of 65. The remaining third are employed persons.

**Table 13: Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2000) – Unincorp. Inyo County**

	Number	Percent
Age 5-64, Employed Persons with a Disability	907	6.7%
Age 5-64, Not Employed Persons with a Disability	811	6.0%
Persons Age 65 Plus with a Disability	894	6.6%
Total Persons with a Disability	2,612	19.2%
Total Population (Civilian Non-institutional)	13,589	100.0%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P42)		

Disabilities can hinder access to housing units of conventional design as well as limit the ability to earn adequate income. Although needs can vary widely, disabled persons need special facilities to help them overcome their disability or make their housing units more

convenient. Some of these amenities include wide doorways that can accommodate wheelchairs, special bracing for handrails, lower countertops, and switches and outlets at the proper height to allow easy use. Unfortunately, very few housing units have these features, and consequently, they must be remodeled to serve the disabled. The conversion of a conventionally designed housing unit is usually well beyond the financial capability of most disabled persons.

A substantial portion of this population falls within the Section 8 income limits. Currently IMACA reports that twelve disabled individuals are on the Section 8 Waiting List for rental assistance - 27 percent of the total waiting list.

The County actively implements State standards for the provision of handicapped accessible units in new developments. The County also encourages housing provided for the handicapped to be in close proximity to public transportation and services. Future housing rehabilitation and conservation strategies will target disabled renters and homeowners for unit modifications to improve accessibility.

**Table 14: Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

	Number	Percent
<i>Total Disabilities Tallied</i>	4,456	100.0%
<i>Total Disabilities for Ages 5-64</i>	2,431	54.6%
Sensory Disability	346	7.8%
Physical disability	778	17.5%
Mental disability	437	9.8%
Self-care disability	158	3.6%
Go-outside-home disability	234	5.3%
Employment disability	878	19.7%
<i>Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over</i>	1,625	36.5%
Sensory Disability	423	9.5%
Physical disability	585	13.1%
Mental disability	214	4.8%
Self-care disability	143	3.2%
Go-outside-home disability	260	5.8%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P41)		

### Seniors

The special needs of many senior citizen households result from limited fixed incomes, and physical disabilities and dependence needs; and as a result seniors experience financial difficulty in coping with rising housing costs. The financial capacity for coping with increased housing depends heavily on the owner or renter status of the elderly household. With infrequent and small increases in income, and potentially large increases in housing costs, the senior renter is at a continuing disadvantage compared to the senior owner. In the year 2000; 1,741 seniors resided in Inyo County representing a significant portion of Inyo

County's population - 28.9 percent of the total households. Of this population, only 3.2 percent rent their home, making the at-risk senior population small in comparison to the State average. In addition, the Census data reports a total of 55 seniors were living in institutional group quarters as of 2000.

**Table 15: Householders by Tenure by Age (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Householder Age	Owners	Renters	Total
15-24 years	33	90	123
25-34 years	221	348	569
35-64 years	2,589	1,011	3,600
65-74 years	791	107	898
75 plus years	752	91	843
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,386</b>	<b>1,647</b>	<b>6,033</b>

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: H14 and P87)

One measure of the need for affordable housing is to evaluate the number of seniors on the Section 8 Waiting List for rental assistance. Currently seniors comprise 32 percent of the entire Section 8 Waiting List. The 19% increase of seniors on the Section 8 Waiting List for rental assistance since the previous housing element update indicates the growing demand for affordable senior housing.

One area of great concern relates to rent increases in mobilehome parks. Senior citizens are particularly vulnerable and often cannot afford the cost of moving their mobilehomes to less expensive spaces. For example, the cost of disassembling, moving, and reassembling a doublewide mobilehome can cost several thousand dollars. To troubleshoot this problem, the County is supporting IMACA in addressing senior housing needs through policies and programs supporting rental subsidies, tenant purchase of mobilehome parks, and housing rehabilitation assistance, including weatherization.

### **Large Families**

Large households are defined as households with more than five persons. Inyo County currently has 8.3 percent of households meeting that criterion. In comparison with the 1990 Census, the percentage of large families has decreased 5.1 percent. In circumstances in which the housing market does not meet the unique needs of large families, overcrowding can result. Fortunately, the County's relatively small overcrowding problem does not indicate this trend occurring on a broad scale.

**Table 16: Household Size by Tenure (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

	1-4 persons		5+ Persons		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner	4,095	67.9%	291	4.8%	4,386	72.7%
Renter	1,434	23.8%	213	3.5%	1,647	27.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,529</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>6,033</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: H17)

Three of the 504 large family households in Inyo County are on the Section 8 Waiting List for rental assistance - 11 percent of the total Waiting List. The Housing Element establishes programs such as density bonus incentives for larger units and self-help housing to meet the needs of the County's large families.

### **Female-headed Households**

According to the 2000 Census, 9.4 percent of all households within Inyo County are headed by females - 61 percent of which have children. IMACA reports that a large number of these female-headed households are in need of assistance and are often the households most in need of affordable housing, childcare, job training and rehabilitation funds.

**Table 17: Female Headed Households (2000) - Unincorporated Inyo County**

Householder Type	Number	Percent
Female Headed Householders	565	9.4%
<i>Female Heads with Own Children</i>	346	5.7%
<i>Female Heads without Children</i>	219	3.6%
Total Householders	6,024	100.0%
Female Headed Householders Under the Poverty Level	138	40.2%
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	343	100.0%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P10 and P90)		

The needs of the single, employed parent typically include housing that requires minimal maintenance and is located near employment, schools, transit, shopping and day care. To address the housing needs of female-headed households, the Housing Element provides for expansion of existing affordability programs, such as rent subsidies, and sets forth several new programs, including supporting affordable housing development to increase the supply. Housing opportunities for female-headed households with children are addressed through policies for the provision of affordable childcare, and for the location of family housing sites in close proximity to recreational facilities.

### **Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelter**

There are many social, economic and physical conditions that have led to an overall increase in the homeless populations throughout the State of California. Factors contributing to the rise in homelessness include the general lack of housing affordable to low- and very low-income persons, increases in the number of persons whose incomes fall below the poverty level, reductions in public subsidies to the poor, and the de-institutionalization of the mentally ill.

IMACA indicates that the homeless population peaks during the warm summer months when roughly 30-40 individuals can be found living along the Owens River in the Bishop area, and

another 30-40 individuals in area campgrounds. Half of the homeless are female-headed families. The remaining individuals are singles, with one-fourth being male. Most leave the region for warmer climates as winter months approach. IMACA regularly visits areas with homeless populations in order to distribute various supplies including food, sanitation items, clothing and blankets.

No permanent emergency shelters are available for the homeless in Inyo County. However, IMACA provides motel vouchers for two days maximum to persons in need of temporary emergency shelter. Approximately 6 to 15 persons a month use this program depending on the time of year. In addition, IMACA's eviction prevention program contributes up to \$300 for one month's rent for a household facing eviction. Families are the primary group seeking assistance through this program.

Wild Iris, a service organization for battered women, provides additional services. Counseling, accompaniment to court appearances, and shelter opportunities are the primary services offered by this organization. Wild Iris operates both temporary and extended shelter programs. The temporary shelter program allows women an overnight stay in a motel/hotel. The organization is billed directly for all over-night stays.

Wild Iris also provides the County's only extended temporary shelter opportunities for battered women and their children in the County. Individuals are permitted to stay at the nine-bed facility for 30 days. If this time limit expires, efforts are made to identify alternatives forms of permanent housing. Women that need long-term services are referred to either Ridgecrest or Carson City, both of which have five-year facilities for battered women.

The Housing Element calls for the County to coordinate with local social service providers, primarily IMACA and Wild Iris, to provide services to the homeless. The County will work with IMACA to try to establish a permanent emergency/transitional shelter in its jurisdiction. Transitional housing will be permitted in all the County's residential zones, and emergency housing in the commercial and industrial zones.

### **Farmworkers**

According to the 1997 Census, there are approximately 115 farmworkers in Inyo County, most of which are seasonal workers (i.e., Less than 150 days). The housing needs of farmworkers do not represent a large portion of the County's housing needs and can be addressed through existing programs to identify lands and assist in the development of housing for low- and moderate-income households.

**Table 18: Number of Farmworkers (1997) – Inyo County**

<b>Hired Farm Labor</b>	
Farms	31
Workers	115
<b>Farms with 10 Workers or More</b>	
Farms	1
Workers	Not available
Source: USDA 1997 Census of Farmworkers and COG Plan	

**Table 19: Farmworkers by Days Worked (1997) – Inyo County**

<b>150 Days or More</b>		
	Farms	1
	Workers	30
	<i>Farms with 10 or More Workers</i>	
	Farms	0
	Workers	0
<b>Fewer than 150 Days</b>		
	Farms	24
	Workers	85
	<i>Farms with 10 or More Workers</i>	
	Farms	1
	Workers	Not available
Source: USDA 1997 Census of Farmworkers and COG Plan		

The Housing Element addresses the needs of farmworkers through programs for affordability, including the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rental Housing Program and Section 502 Homeownership Program, as well as programs available through the United States Department of Agriculture.

The 2004 update of the Inyo County Zoning Code will comply with Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, the Employee Housing Act, to facilitate the provision of employee housing, including farmworkers.

## Chapter Three: Resources and Constraints

### *Regional Housing Need*

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

Inyo County has an identified future housing need of 306 new households between 2001 to 2008, with at least 45 percent of these units to be targeted towards lower income households.

**Table 20: Regional Housing Needs (2001 to 2008) – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Income Group	Number	Percent
Very Low	86	28.1%
Low	54	17.6%
Moderate	51	16.7%
Above Moderate	115	37.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Regional Housing Need Plan

**Table 21: Residential Development Since 2001**

Very Low	Low	Moderate	+ Moderate
22 mobilehomes	37 mobilehomes		43 single-family

Income Group	Required for 2001-2008	Built Since 2001	Requirement for 2004-2008
Very Low	86	22	<b>64</b>
Low	54	37	<b>7</b>
Moderate	51		<b>51</b>
Above Moderate	115	43	<b>72</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>204</b>

A total of 102 homes have been built since 2001. Of these homes, a majority are mobilehomes serving very low- and low-income households. In Inyo County, mobilehomes are the most common means of providing affordable housing. They are affordable and offer a sense of independence and homeownership. Additionally, mobilehomes provide households with the opportunity to use land that is not adjacent to communities, does not have water and sewer services, and is therefore less expensive.

A small portion of the housing needs for the 2004 through 2008 time period will be provided by two recent residential development applications that have been approved in 2003, and are likely to be built and occupied by 2006. One project is a 5-lot subdivision that will serve above moderate households in the Alabama Hills area near Lone Pine. The other project is a 22-unit patio home (detached condominium) development in the Bishop area. Due to the common ownership of land, the home values in this development will serve both moderate- and above moderate-income households.

**Table 22: Projects Approved, and Likely to be Constructed and Occupied by 2006**

Total Projects	Capacity Very Low	Capacity Low	Capacity Moderate	Capacity + Moderate
2	0	0	11	16

The County currently has several pending applications for residential development, including three large subdivisions of 20 acres or more. The projects included in the “Pending Applications Likely to be Approved” column in the Table below are the small subdivisions that have completed a thorough environmental analysis, and are not accompanied by public controversy. The three large subdivision applications are not included in the “Pending Applications Likely to be Approved” figure, and are instead included in the Vacant Land Inventory (Table 24).

**Table 23: Housing Needs Met by Approved and Pending Applications**

Income Group	Requirement for 2004-2008	Approved and Likely to be Constructed	Pending Applications Likely to be Approved	Remaining Housing Need to be Met by Capacity of Identified Vacant Lands
Very Low	64			64
Low	7			7
Moderate	51	11		40
Above Moderate	72	16	25	31
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>204</b>	27	25	<b>142</b>

The remaining housing need identified in the far right column of Table 23 will be provided for on land identified in the vacant land inventory, and land included in pending land releases from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

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

Owens Valley to lessen the impacts of DWP land ownership patterns on the orderly growth of the County and affordability of housing.

The final Agreement provides for the release of 75-acres of land in the County adjacent to communities with access to water and sewer systems. The majority of the properties selected are currently zoned for residential development, and were given General Plan Designations appropriate for residential development, including a 15+ acre parcel located just East of the Bishop City limits. The identified parcels are in the communities of Lone Pine, Independence, Big Pine and Bishop. The County and the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power are currently negotiating a schedule for release, and it is anticipated that the identified parcels will become available for residential development within the five-year planning period. This land is included in the vacant land inventory below.

### **Land Inventory**

This section of the Housing Element evaluates the potential residential development that is likely to occur in Inyo County under the current General Plan and Zoning Code. Table 21 provides a summary of housing development that has been approved in the past year. Table 22 provides a summary of housing development applications that have been received and will likely be approved. And, Table 24 below quantifies the number and type of dwellings that can be constructed on privately owned vacant land. It identifies sites by zoning district, discusses suitability of the sites, and includes the range of parcel sizes, availability of infrastructure and realistic capacity.

A vacant land inventory was conducted to identify residentially zoned properties that are available for residential development. County Assessor Parcel Maps were reviewed by County staff to determine the precise development potential of residential lots. The following discussion describes those areas in the County with significant remaining development potential.

**Table 24: Vacant Land Inventory – Unincorporated Inyo County**

Zoning District	Density Range	# of Parcels	Range of Parcel Sizes	Acreage	Typical Built Density	Services Available	Estimated Realistic Capacity
<b>BISHOP AREA</b>							
R-1	2 units/ac.	66	46@.13-1 ac. 11@1-2 ac. 5@3-6 ac. 2@14 ac. 1@83 ac.	154	2 units/acre	Water and Sewer; and Individual well and septic	150
R-2	7.6 units/ac.	8	7@.21-.24 ac. 2@.3-.6 ac	2.23	1 unit/acre	Water and Sewer	8
RMH	2 units/ac.	29	24@.14-.5 ac. 4@1-2 ac.	10	2 units/acre	Water and Sewer; and Individual well and septic	29

RR	1 unit/ac.	8	2@1-2 ac. 4@5-7.5 ac. 1@40 ac. 1@160 ac.	227	1 unit/acre	Water and Sewer; and Individual well and septic	200
<b>BIG PINE AREA</b>							
RMH	2 units/ac.	20	17@.25-1 ac. 1@5 ac.	15.2 acres	1 unit/5,800 sq ft 1 unit/10,000 sq ft	Water and Sewer	30
RR	1 unit/ac.	6	4@1-5 ac. 2@80 ac.	173 acres	1 unit/2.5 acres 1 unit/5 acres	Individual well and septic	6
R-2	7.6 units/ac.	3	3@.5-1.5 ac.	3 acres	1 unit/6,500 sq ft	Water and Sewer	23
<b>INDEPENDENCE AREA</b>							
R-2	7.6 units/ac.	7	3@1 ac. 4@3-5 ac	4.5 acres	1 unit/6,500 sq ft	Water and Sewer	10
Zoning District	Density Range	# of Parcels	Range of Parcel Sizes	Acreage	Typical Built Density	Services Available	Estimated Realistic Capacity
RR		1	1@10 ac.	10 acres	1 units/2 acre	Individual well and septic	5
<b>LONE PINE AREA</b>							
RMH	2 units/ac.	7	7@.15-.23 ac.	1.08 acres	1 unit/5,800 sq ft	Water and Sewer	8
R-1	2 units/ac.	3	2@.23 ac. 1@13.2 ac.	13.48 acres	1 unit/10,000 sq ft	Water and Sewer	55
<b>OLANCHA, CARTEGO, KEELER, DARWIN AREA</b>							
RMH	2 units/ac.	30	16@.14-1 ac. 9@1-2 ac. 4@2-4 ac.	34.39	1 unit/10,000 sq ft 1 unit/ 5,800 sq ft	Water and Sewer	60
RR	1 unit/ac.	93	51@2-5 ac. 15@5-10 ac. 15@11-30 ac. 9@40-100 ac.	1,466	1 unit/1 AC 1unit/2.5 AC 1 unit/5 AC 1 unit/10 AC	Individual well and septic	220
<b>PEARSONVILLE AREA</b>							
RR-1-MH	1 unit/ac.	1	1@6 ac.	6 Ac	1 unit/Ac	Individual well and septic	6
RR-10-MH	1 unit/10 ac.	6	2@10 ac. 4@ 20+ ac.	226.43 Ac	1 unit/10 Ac	Individual well and septic	7
RR-2.5-MH	1 unit/2.5 ac.	34	6@2.5 ac. 8@2.5-5 ac. 10@5+ac.	219 Ac	1unit/ 2.5 Ac	Individual well and septic	34
RR-5-MH	1 unit/5 ac	5	4@37-70 ac. 1@140 ac.	338 AC	1 unit/5 Ac.	Individual well and septic	60

<b>HOMEWOOD CANYON, TRONA AREA</b>							
RR-5-MH	1 unit/5 ac	93	92@5-60 ac. 1@9+ ac.	476 AC	1 unit/5 Ac.	Individual well and septic	93
RR-10-MH	1 unit/10 ac	4	2@10-20 ac. 2@ 30-40 ac.	108.5 Ac	1 unit/10 Ac	Individual well and septic	5
<b>SHOSHONE, TECOPA, SANDY VALLEY, CHARLESTON VIEW AREA</b>							
RR-5-MH	1 unit/5 c	4	2@5 ac. 2@40+ ac.	130 AC	1 unit/5 Ac.	Individual well and septic	22
RR-2.5-MH	1 unit/2.5 Ac	35	35@2.5 ac.	86 Ac	1unit/ 2.5 Ac	Individual well and septic	35
RR-1.0-MH	1 unit/Ac	20	20@1-2 ac.	28.5 Ac	1 unit/Ac	Individual well and septic	20

### **Under-used Lots**

In addition to the Vacant Land Inventory provided in Table 24, an analysis of under used lots demonstrates substantial potential in the Bishop area for residential development on sites which are currently developed at densities lower than those permitted under zoning. Such “under-used” parcels are typically larger lots developed with a single unit that can accommodate at least one additional unit. As vacant lots become scarcer, development pressures will be shifted to under-used parcels. The Bishop area has the potential to provide nearly 200 units on under-used lots.

#### 1. Analysis of Suitability: Physical and Environmental

There are many physical and environmental attributes of land in Inyo County that can impede development. Of the identified lands indicated in the above Tables describing land inventory, there are both physical and environmental attributes that can inhibit development on the identified lands.

*Physical Attributes* – A majority of the properties listed above have development limitations based on their proximity to existing infrastructure. Most of the undeveloped private land in the County is located in remote or rural communities that do not have water and sewer systems. Of the 483 parcels of vacant land identified, over 300 parcels are not located near existing water and waste system infrastructure. However, each of the community areas listed in the Land Inventory above that do have water and sewer services, have the capacity to accommodate the realistic capacity estimates listed.

The size of the parcels included in the Inventory meet the Code minimum requirements. However, there are pre-existing substandard lots located throughout the County. To help facilitate development on substandard lots, the County allows development to occur as long as the development standards of the Code can be met, i.e. set backs, parking, etc. Non-conforming lots were not included in the Vacant Land Inventory as their development capacity must be analyzed on a case by case basis.

Twenty-seven percent of the parcels included in the Inventory are 1-acre in size or smaller. These small lots that allow for placement of a mobilehome, small single-family home, duplex, or small scale multi-family development. Small lots are available for development by or for lower income households, as smaller lots are often more affordable. These smaller lots are also located near existing infrastructure and community services.

Properties with severe limitations such as snow avalanche hazard zones, are not included in the above land inventory, as their development capacity must be analyzed on a case by case basis.

*See also Non-Governmental Constraints.*

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

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

*See also Non-Governmental Constraints.*

## 2. Analysis of Zoning that Facilitates Development for Lower Income

The County's 2004 Zoning Code update includes zoning provisions that facilitate residential development for lower income households, including state density bonus and second-unit regulations. Additionally, the County allows mobilehomes in all zone districts with the addition of a Mobilehome Overlay.

## 3. Availability of Infrastructure to Identified Lands

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

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

*See also Non-Governmental Constraints.*

#### 4. Analysis of Redevelopable Sites

Inyo County does not have any Redevelopable Sites, as it is comprised of rural communities. Redevelopment is not a tool that is available to the Inyo County at this time.

#### 5. Analysis of Zoning that Facilitates Housing for Farmworkers and Homeless

As indicated in Table 18 there are approximately 115 farmworkers in Inyo County, most of which are seasonal workers (i.e., Less than 150 days). The housing needs of farmworkers do not represent a large portion of the County's housing needs and can be addressed through existing programs to identify lands and assist in the development of housing for low and moderate income households.

The 2004 Zoning Code update reflects the County's desire to allow transitional housing in all residential zones and allows emergency housing in commercial and industrial zones.

#### 6. Analysis of Realistic Capacity

The Estimated Realistic Capacity figure includes deductions for typical physical and environmental attributes that limit the development capacity of property in Inyo County. Based on these careful calculations, the County has a realistic capacity of 1,086 residential units on what is currently vacant, unimproved land. Maximizing the development potential of under-used lots in the Bishop area can accommodate an additional 198 units, for a total realistic capacity of 1,284 additional residential units.

The Bishop area has the highest potential for growth, and also is the most likely area of the County for growth to occur. Two large development applications are currently being processed by the Planning Department that have the potential to provide just over 300 new residential units in the Bishop area. The request the County has made of the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to release 12-17 acres of land just east of the City of Bishop jurisdictional boundary, also has enormous residential development potential.

The Big Pine community is located 15 miles south of Bishop and provides a significant opportunity for higher density residential development in the County. The County will encourage development at the upper end of the density range on the R-2 Zoned sites to achieve up to 23 higher density rental units, and will work to ensure their affordability. Additional dwelling units can be accommodated on privately owned land in Big Pine, as well as land currently owned by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power that is slated for transfer to private ownership.

Housing growth potential is also available in the communities of Big Pine (Rolling Green Terrace), Lone Pine and Independence. Lone Pine has substantial residential growth potential as a result of the 13.2 acres of City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power property slated for transfer to private ownership. This 13.2-acre parcel has the potential to provide 20+ new residential units.

Additional dwelling units will be constructed outside of the four Owens Valley communities in the rural areas of the County. These additional units will also help Inyo County in meeting its moderate and above moderate-income housing needs in the planning period.

In terms of fulfilling the County's remaining need for 64 very low- and 7 low-income units, the County intends to encourage development within the capacity of R-2 and R-3 zones. These zones currently have a 41-unit realistic capacity, and a 25% density bonus would accommodate 51 total units. The remaining 13 very low-income units will be provided through mobilehomes.

## ***Analysis of Governmental Constraints***

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

### **Land Use Controls**

The Land Use Element of the Inyo County General Plan and corresponding zoning provide for a full range of residential types and densities dispersed throughout the County. Residential densities in Inyo County include a wide spectrum, including the following categories:

Rural Residential - RR  
One Family Residences – R-1  
Multiple Residential – R-2  
Multiple Residential – R-3  
Single Residence or Mobilehome Combined – RMH

The Zoning Ordinance contains five residential districts that correspond to the residential densities established in the General Plan, plus the Mobilehome Overlay Zone (MH). The MH Overlay Zone enables the County to permit mobilehomes as a single-family residential dwelling. Development standards for each of the zoning categories is provided in Table 25. Inyo County does not have open space standards for residential development in the zoning ordinance, thereby minimizing the cost of housing development.

**Table 25: Unincorporated Inyo County Residential Development Standards**

Development Standard	RR	R-1	R-2	R-3	RMH
Minimum Density Allowed	1.0 du/ac	2.0 du/ac	7.6 du/ac	7.6 du/ac	2.0 du/ac
Maximum Density Allowed	2.0 du/ac	7.5 du/ac	15 du/ac	24 du/ac	7.5.0 du/ac
Minimum Lot Area	1.0 ac	5,800 sf	N/A	N/A	5,800 sf
Minimum Lot Width	125 ft	50 ft	N/A	N/A	50 ft
Front Yard Setback	50 ft	25 ft	25 ft	25 ft	25 ft
Interior Side Yard Setback	20 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Street Side Yard Setback	20 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Rear Yard Setback	30 ft	20 ft	20 ft	15 ft	20 ft
Maximum Building Height of Primary Structures (3)	2.5 stories	2.5 stories	3 stories	3 stories	2.5 stories
Parking	2 sp/du	2 sp/du	2 sp/du	2 sp/du; 1 guest sp/4 du	2 sp/du

In addition to residential categories, the Zoning Ordinance permits residential development in the County’s commercial districts. A single dwelling unit is allowed in the commercial and industrial zones as an accessory use if occupied by the owner, lessee, caretaker, or watchman of the business. Mobilehome parks are also permitted in the C-5 zone.

**Table 26: Housing Types Permitted by Zoning District**

Housing Types	RR	R-1	R-2	R-3	RMH	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	CBD
Single Family Attached	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Single Family Detached	P	P	P	P	P						
Duplexes			P	P		C	C	C	C	P	P
3 & 4-plexes				P		C	C				P
Multi-family				P		C	C				P
Mobilehomes	P	P	P	P	P					P	
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P	P					P	
Second Units	P	P	P		P						
Emergency Shelters						P	P	P	P	P	
Single Room Occupancy				P		C	C				P
Transitional Housing	P	P	P	P	P						

**Fees and Exactions**

Inyo County charges various fees and assessments to cover the cost of processing permits and providing certain services and utilities. Table 27 summarizes the County’s fee requirements for residential development. These fees are considerably below fees charged in most jurisdictions throughout the State. Fees do not impose an unreasonable burden upon applicants, as Inyo County has one of the lowest fee structures in the State.

**Table 27: Inyo County Planning Fee Schedule**

<b>COUNTY PLANNING FEE SCHEDULE:</b>				
Type of Permit	Application Fee	Environmental Fee	Environmental Processing Fee	Appeal Fee
Conditional Use Permit	\$260	\$50	\$200	\$100
Variance	\$260	\$50	\$150	\$100
Zone Reclassification	Actual Cost	\$100	\$250	N/A
General Plan Amendment	Actual Cost	\$50	\$200	N/A
Specific Plan	Actual Cost	\$100	\$300	N/A
Road Abandonment	\$200	\$50	\$150	N/A
Certificate of Compliance	\$250	\$50	\$200	\$100
Parcel Merger	\$85	N/A	N/A	N/A
Parcel Map	\$250 plus \$25/lot	\$50	\$200	\$100
Tract Map	\$415 plus \$25/lot	\$100	\$300	\$100
Time Extension	\$65	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>COUNTY SURVEYOR FEE SCHEDULE:</b>				
Type of Permit	Fee			
Final Tract Map	\$250 plus \$10 per lot			
Final Parcel Map (no dedications)	\$200 plus \$10 per lot			
Final Parcel Map (with dedications)	\$250 plus \$10 per lot			
<b>COUNTY RECORDER FEE SCHEDULE:</b>				
Action	Fee			
First page recorded	\$5		\$6 for maps	
Each additional page recorded	\$3		\$3 for maps	

**On/Off-site Improvement Standards**

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

The exclusion of costly impact fees effectively reduces the cost of developing housing in Inyo County. More specifically, the County subdivision ordinance requires 60-foot street

widths for local and collector streets, with curbs, gutters and sidewalks (40-foot with a waiver). However, “rolled curbs” are permitted, and the Planning Commission often waives requirements for sidewalks where circumstances warrant, such as in lower density developments. The County also provides flexibility in these requirements for affordable housing projects. Circulation improvements in mobilehome parks are governed by Title 25, which allows for gravel roads and reduced street widths, resulting in lower development costs.

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

### **Building Codes and Enforcement**

Inyo County has adopted the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the Energy Conservation Standards set forth in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. This code is considered to be the minimum necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare. No amendment to the code has either been initiated or approved which directly affects housing standards or processes.

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

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

### **Local Processing and Permit Procedures**

The evaluation and review process required by County procedures contributes to the cost of housing in that holding costs incurred by developers are ultimately manifested in the unit’s selling price. The following describes typical time requirements for project processing in Inyo County:

**Ministerial Building Permit:** The review of a ministerial building permit takes between two days to two weeks. The permit is reviewed by both the Building and Planning Departments before final approval.

**Tentative Tract Map:** The approval process for a tentative tract map requires 45-90 days with a negative declaration, or 120 days if an EIR is required. The process involves five

steps. First, the tentative tract maps are submitted to the Planning Department and distributed to the Subdivision Committee and other required agencies. Second, the Subdivision Committee reviews the maps and formulates their recommendation. Third, a negative declaration (or environmental impact report) is prepared. Fourth, Planning Staff reviews the issues presented by the Subdivision Committee and environmental documentation, and makes their recommendation to the Planning Commission. And fifth, the Planning Commission hears public testimony on the proposed action and approves/denies the tentative tract map.

**Conditional Use Permit and Variance:** Forty-five to sixty days is a typical time frame needed for the Planning Commission's final action on both a Conditional Use Permit and Variance. The approval process for a conditional use permit and variance is similar to a tentative tract map. After the pre-application discussion with the applicant and review of the initial application, either a negative declaration or EIR is prepared. Planning staff uses this information to formulate their recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission action becomes final after a 15-day appeal period.

The County makes all attempts to expedite permit processing and will initiate a program for priority review of projects with an affordable housing component.

### **Constraints on Persons with Disabilities**

#### 1. Over-arching and General

Inyo County does not currently have a process for individuals with disabilities to make requests for reasonable accommodation with respect to zoning, permit processing, or building laws. The County Building and Safety Division is responsible for ensuring that all building permit applications for new construction meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the California Disabled Accessibility Guidebook (CalDAG). Additionally, any permits for renovation or structure modification requires that the structure be brought into conformance with ADA and CalDAG.

Inyo County has made efforts to remove constraints on housing for persons with disabilities by providing flexibility as to the location of group homes, adult day care homes, and residential care homes and facilities. Group homes are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the RR, R-2 and R-3 zones. Residential care facilities are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the RR, R-2, R-3, C-1, C-2, and C-3 zones. Adult daycare facilities are permitted by right in the C1, C2 and C3 zones, and are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the RR, R-2 and R-3 zones. In compliance with SB 520 the Community Care Facilities Act, residential care facilities for six or fewer persons are allowed by right in all residential zones.

## 2. Zoning and Land Use

In effort to remove any zoning or land use regulations that may inhibit the development of housing and facilities for the disabled, the very recent 2004 update of the Zoning Code reviewed and modified the County's policies to ensure compliance with fair housing law, including occupancy standards.

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

As mentioned above, group homes are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the RR, R-2 and R-3 zones. Group homes, as a use classification within the Zoning Code, are not restricted by the number of persons allowed in a development. Group homes over six persons are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the RR, R-2 and R-3 zones. In addition, the County does not have special siting requirements for special needs housing which may inhibit the development of such housing.

## 3. Permits and Processing

The County of Inyo strives to remove any permitting and processing barriers for persons with disabilities by ensuring that requests to retrofit homes for accessibility comply with ADA and CalDAG, and meet all of the development and building standards in Title 24 parts 2-12.

Although the County does not allow group homes with fewer than six persons by right in single-family zones, the County does not have occupancy standards that would discriminate against six or fewer non-related persons living in single-family residential zones. Inyo County does require a Conditional Use Permit for group homes with greater than six persons in residential zones, or group homes that provide on-site services (residential care facility). However, this Use Permit is required only to ensure the Planning Commission and the public have an opportunity to participate in the siting of the facility, rather than to apply restrictive conditions. Public testimony and comment is considered at the time of approval, just as it is in the approval of other discretionary development permits.

The Conditional Use Permit process is not a barrier to development of housing for persons with disabilities as the Conditional Use Permit fee is very low, and the processing time is only forty-five to sixty days.

#### 4. Building Codes

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

#### Conclusion

The County has over 4,000 residents living with a disability. To better accommodate the needs of this population, and provide for persons with disabilities seeking fair access to housing in the application of its zoning and building regulations, the County will incorporate a reasonable accommodations ordinance into the Zoning Code in this planning period. Such an ordinance will provide a means of requesting exceptions to the zoning and building regulations that may be a barrier to fair housing opportunities.

### ***Analysis of Non-Governmental Constraints***

Limited private land resources and high housing costs in relation to incomes are the most likely constraints to achieving Inyo County's Housing Element objectives. Fees, site improvement costs, processing and permit procedures, building codes, land use controls, availability of public services and environmental considerations are important but do not impose significant constraints to development in Inyo County. These variables are national in scope and widely recognized. The discussion below focuses on these non-governmental and market constraints to housing development.

#### **Land Costs**

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

**Table 28: Inyo County Land Costs by Area**

Location	Average 1992	Range	Average 02/03	Range	Change
Independence, Fort Independence, Aberdeen, Big Pine, Knight Manor, Rolling Green, Lone Pine	\$25,370	\$9,364-\$61,200	\$49,084	\$21,000 - \$123,000	48.31%
Alabama Hills	\$49,040	\$26,520-\$153,000	\$120,967	\$448,000 - \$164,900	59.46%
Wright's 40 Acres	\$79,798	\$45,900-\$156,060	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mustang Mesa, Alta Vista	\$27,100	\$20,400-\$30,600	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dixon Lane, Meadowcreek, Laws	\$50,633	\$18,025-\$66,300	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bishop, Rocking K	\$65,257	\$33,293-\$142,800	\$187,834	\$38,922 - 123,000	65.26%
Starlite	\$49,623	\$41,616-61,200	\$155,000	N/A	67.99%
Wilkerson, Sierra Grande	\$38,587	\$25,500-\$71,910	\$128,460	\$15,000 - \$314,000	69.96%
Aspendell	\$31,582	\$20,400-\$85,000	\$92,750	\$42,000 - 240,000	65.95%
Mountain View	\$25,775	\$25,500-\$26,010	\$69,900	N/A	63.13%
Cartago, Olancha, Sage Flat	\$10,790	\$4,162-\$21,848	\$27,300	\$500 - \$168,000	60.48%
Keeler	\$3,500	Not available	\$9,267	\$6,000 - \$14,000	62.23%
Darwin	\$4,903	\$2,448-\$9,364	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trona area, Homewood Canyon, BLM Tract	\$9,282	\$2,500-\$17,687	\$1,600	\$300 - \$3,935	-480.13%
Shoshone, Tecopa	\$8,041	\$4,590-\$14,280	\$7,500	\$7,000 - \$8,000	-7.21%
Pahrump Valley, Sandy Valley, Stewart Valley, Resting Spring	\$5,100	Not available	\$38,375	\$30,000 - \$43,500	86.71%
Spring Valley	N/A	N/A	\$17,165	\$300 - \$34,000	N/A
Round Valley	N/A	N/A	\$63,514	\$34,000 - \$110,000	N/A

## **Construction Costs**

Construction costs include materials, labor, construction financing and builder profit. These costs will vary depending on structural requirements and by the quality of the construction (such as roofing materials, carpeting, cabinets, bathroom fixtures and other amenities). Because of these factors, it is hard to establish an absolute measure of construction cost. According to sales data provided by Coldwell Banker for sales during 2003, single-family homes of average to good quality are now averaging about \$160 per square foot (compared with roughly \$135 in 2001 and \$50 per square foot in 1995). Custom homes and units with extra structural requirements or amenities can run much higher. Lower costs can be achieved by reducing amenities and using less costly building materials, decreasing construction financing costs, and use of alternative construction methods such as manufactured housing or mobilehomes. Additional savings can be realized through use of mass production methods; this can be of particular benefit when density bonuses are used for the provision of affordable housing.

The single largest cost associated with building a new house is the cost of building materials, comprising between 40 and 50 percent of the sales price of a home. According to the Construction Industry Research Board, overall construction costs rose over 30 percent during the past decade, with rising energy costs a significant contributor. Construction costs for wood frame, single-family homes of average to good quality range from \$45 to \$55 per square foot; custom homes and units with extra amenities run substantially higher. Costs for wood frame, multi-family construction average around \$42 per square foot, exclusive of parking.

Lower housing costs can be achieved with the following factors: a) reduction in amenities and quality of building materials (above a minimum acceptability for health, safety, and adequate performance); b) availability of skilled construction crews who will work for less than union wages; and c) use of manufactured housing (including both mobilehome and modular housing).

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

## **Infrastructure Constraints**

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

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

Mustang Mesa Area

Located 8 miles northwest of Bishop on Highway 395, the Mustang Mesa Area requires new development to install individual wells and septic systems. Because there are potential water contamination problems, all new septic systems must be approved by the County Environmental Health Department after a detailed hydrological analysis is completed.

Wilkerson Area

The Wilkerson Area, five miles south of Bishop and west of Highway 395, has substantial infrastructure constraints. Any new large subdivision proposal will be required to prove that there is an adequate water supply prior to recording final subdivision map, due to high variability in the production of existing wells.

Starlite Estates

Starlite Estates is 7 miles southwest of Bishop. There are 72 lots now existing in the area but no additional subdivisions will be approved until an adequate and dependable water supply is proven.

Darwin

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

Alabama Hills

Alabama Hills serves as a bedroom community of Lone Pine. The community has a high water table and some parcels have access to surface water flow for irrigation. Any small lot subdivision probably will be required to be sewered due to the relatively high water table in the area.

**Availability of Financing**

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

## **Environmental Constraints**

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

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

## ***Units At-Risk of Converting to Market Rate Uses***

All low-income housing units in Inyo County that are at risk of converting to market rate housing units between July 1, 1992 and December 1, 2003 have been evaluated. This inventory includes all multi-family rental units assisted under federal, state, and/or local programs, including HUD programs, State and local bond programs, redevelopment programs, local in-lieu fees, inclusionary, density bonus, or direct assistance programs. The inventory covers all units that are eligible to change to non low-income housing units due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage pre-payment, or expiring use restrictions. The inventory was compiled by interviews with County staff and IMACA, and review of "Inventory of Federally Subsidized Low-Income Rental Units at Risk of Conversion" (California Housing Partnership Corporation), and "The Use of Housing Revenue Bond Proceeds - 1990", (California Debt Advisory Commission).

The inventory conducted indicated that Inyo County had only one assisted housing project in its jurisdiction. Mt. Whitney is a 33 unit housing project developed with funds from the Farmers Home Administration Section 515 Rental Housing Program. The project was constructed in 1987 and is owned by the Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation (LPEDC) and operated by Inyo-Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA). Given

its non-profit ownership and operation, the project was determined to be not at risk of converting to market rate housing in 1992. IMACA confirmed that this is the case in 2003 as well.

## **Energy Conservation**

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

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

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

### **Energy Conservation Programs for Low-Income Households**

IMACA administers Weatherization, Energy Assistance, and a number of Southern California Edison’s energy conservation programs. All of these programs are designed to aid low-income families.

The Weatherization Program provides service to 15 to 20 low- income households each month. Tasks that are performed include caulking windows, insulating the attic and water heaters, and replacing windows. The overall cost for weatherization assistance cannot exceed \$2,000 per unit. IMACA anticipates that all 100 housing units on the waiting list for weatherization services will be upgraded, except those units whose repairs exceed \$2,000.

IMACA also administers the ECIP or Energy Crisis Intervention Program that assists approximately 150 low-income households during the winter and 10-20 households during

the summer with their heating and cooling bills. This includes past due electric and propane bills, new service deposits, propane tank refills, and firewood.

Energy assistance funds are now distributed to residents based on a priority scale due to limited funding. This scale evaluates each group of applications on the following factors: Income; household composition; crisis circumstances; need; and previous energy assistance under the current contract. Assistance monies are allocated on a monthly basis and then broken down to a weekly amount. Once that amount is reached, any eligible clients not yet assisted must be denied for lack of allocated funds.

Energy assistance funds pay for past due electricity or propane bills, wood, or fire pellets. The majority of low-income households receive approximately \$200 annually to pay for electricity or propane. Rather than using electricity or propane, seniors and handicapped individuals seem to use wood for heating, according to IMACA. IMACA distributed 250 cords of wood last year. Each household receives two cords of wood, annually. IMACA estimates that an average household uses three cords of wood a year, if supplies are used frugally. Lastly, very few households (1-2) use pellets for heating purposes.

Southern California Edison has sponsored two additional energy conservation programs. All are geared to helping low-income households. The Light Bulb Program distributes five florescent light bulbs to each low-income household. In 1991, 100 households received florescent light bulbs which are considered to be more energy efficient.

SCE will also give customers whose housing units are outfitted with all electric fixtures a portable space heater, down comforter, and a night light to reduce the overall use of electricity. SCE wants IMACA to distribute these goods to 50 households; half have so far been delivered.

## Chapter Four: Review and Revise

---

The 1992 County of Inyo Housing Element contained goals and policies that directly targeted the County's housing needs. The goals and policies were then translated into a specific housing program that emphasized the following issue areas:

- 1) Conserving and improving the condition of the existing stock of affordable housing
- 2) Assisting in the development of affordable housing
- 3) Provide adequate sites to achieve a diversity of housing
- 4) Removing governmental constraints, as necessary
- 5) Promote equal housing opportunity

The following chapter reviews the 1992 Housing Element programs and documents the County's accomplishments over the last planning period. The progress made under each of the above issue areas is analyzed, as well as the effectiveness and appropriateness of each program. This review serves as the basis for the revised housing program outlined in Chapter Five.

### ***Program by Program Review of the Previous Housing Element***

#### **1) Conservation and Improvement of Existing Housing Stock**

**Program:** Conserving and improving the condition of the existing stock of affordable housing through rehabilitation, mobilehome park resident ownership, Section 8 rental assistance, shared housing and weatherization programs.

**Past Objectives:** Rehabilitation of 50 units, outreach and education regarding State program availability.

**Results:** Achieved successfully. Rehabilitation of units primarily occurred as a result of the Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) home weatherization program, and more aggressive rehabilitation occurred as a result of mobilehome replacement. IMACA continues to effectively administer the Section 8 program and encourages shared housing through a roommate referral service.

**Analysis and Recommendations:** Rehabilitation and/or replacement of the existing housing stock remains a priority as the County has limited private land available for new development. Although these existing programs have been somewhat successful, funding for rehabilitation needs to be available to homeowners to encourage more substantial rehabilitation.

## 2) Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing

**Program:** Support the development of affordable housing by encouraging multi-family residential development, offering density bonuses, coordinating with Tribal Councils, educating the public about State funding programs, supporting IMACA, and pursuing funding opportunities.

**Past Objective:** Code revisions to include density bonus provisions, public outreach and education regarding State funding programs, collaboration and coordination with Tribal Councils, and pursuit of State funding to support affordable housing

**Results:** Majority of objectives achieved successfully. The Inyo County Code includes density bonus provisions for affordable housing. The County applied for and received a Community Development Block Grant, Planning and Technical Assistance Grant and a General Allocation Grant in FY 2003. IMACA continues to pursue funding to support affordable housing, and the County and IMACA continue to make the public aware of funding opportunities available to individuals.

The County has not been successful in coordinating with Tribal Councils in pursuit of affordable housing opportunities, nor has the County seen successful results from encouraging multi-family housing development.

**Analysis and Recommendation:** Assisting in the Development of Affordable Housing in a County with so little private land is an enormous challenge. It requires a dedicated effort to identify appropriate sites, pursue funding and realize construction. To date, the County has not had the capacity to undertake such an aggressive program. As the need for affordable housing continues to become more acute, the housing resources in the Eastern Sierra region are growing, as is the desire to collaborate amongst varied interests. As a result, the County will actively cultivate partnerships with landowners, housing providers and adjoining jurisdictions that can result in new affordable housing.

## 3) Provision of Adequate Sites

**Program:** Provide adequate sites for all housing types for a variety of households through General Plan land use designations and zoning.

**Past Objectives:** Annual update of inventory of sites suitable for residential development, modification of the Zoning Code to facilitate homeless shelters and transitional housing.

**Results:** Achieved successfully. Inyo County updated each of the required elements of its General Plan in 2001, and in 2004, is updating its Zoning Code. In addition to meeting the above requirements, these updates ensure that Inyo County is complying with State law with regard to the location of homeless shelters, group homes and transitional housing.

In addition, the County has actively worked with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and the Bureau of Land Management to identify properties near existing

communities that may be appropriate for conversion to private ownership and subsequent housing development. This effort ensures the availability of adequate sites in the future.

**Analysis and Recommendations:** Ensuring that adequate sites are available to provide a variety of housing types for a diverse population is difficult in a County with so little private land. The 2001 General Plan and 2004 Zoning Code amendments will assist in ensuring adequate sites on existing private land in the County. Adequate sites for the future need to be planned for through continued work with public agency landowners.

#### **4) Removal of Governmental and other Constraints**

**Program:** Remove constraints that may effect housing development, including zoning and infrastructure constraints.

**Past Objectives:** Zoning Code revisions and pursuit of funds for infrastructure development.

**Results:** Achieved successfully. As previously mentioned, the Inyo County Code has been updated to ensure the Zoning Code is in compliance with the State density bonus and second-unit provisions. In effort to remove infrastructure constraints, the County actively pursued and received an infrastructure grant from the State Community Development Block Grant Program. In addition, the County is currently working with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to transfer local water system control to individual community services districts in Lone Pine, Independence, and Big Pine.

**Analysis and Recommendations:** The updated General Plan and Zoning Code are milestone accomplishments for the County and continued revisions, as necessary to reflect County policy and State law, will continue.

The availability of infrastructure for private parcels that do not adjoin an existing community are a development challenge for the County. However, providing costly infrastructure such as water and sewer service to outlying properties may not be in the County's best interest. The 2001 General Plan clearly describes the County's desire to facilitate the development of properties that are adjacent to existing communities and services. To that end, the pursuit of funding to provide infrastructure to outlying properties will not remain a goal, but rather, the County will pursue land exchanges and releases that facilitate development near existing infrastructure.

#### **5) Promote Equal Housing Opportunities**

**Program:** Promote equal housing opportunities by ensuring the public is aware of fair housing laws, and are adhering to them.

**Past Objectives:** Outreach and education, and referral services.

**Results:** Achieved successfully. Inyo County and IMACA make fair housing brochures available to the public at libraries, the IMACA offices and County offices. Fair housing complaints are referred to the Dispute Resolution Center, the Center for Settlement Services, or Indian Legal Services.

**Analysis and Recommendations:** As a successful means of disseminating fair housing information and ensuring compliance, it is important and appropriate that this program continue.

## Chapter Five: Housing Program

---

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

### GOALS AND POLICIES

#### **Maintenance and Preservation of Housing**

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

**Goal 1.0 - To maintain the existing housing stock and eliminate substandard housing conditions in Inyo County.**

#### **Policy 1.1 Housing Rehabilitation Funding**

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

#### **Policy 1.2 Housing Rehabilitation**

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

#### **Policy 1.3 Housing Rehabilitation Code Enforcement**

The County shall ensure sensitive residential code enforcement and provide information on available rehabilitation assistance to bring substandard units into compliance with County Codes.

**Policy 1.4 Housing Rehabilitation Education**

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

**Provision of Adequate Sites**

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

**Goal 2.0 - To provide adequate sites for residential development.**

**Policy 2.1 Vacant and Under-used Land**

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

**Policy 2.2 Transitional and Emergency Housing**

The County shall permit transitional housing in all the County’s residential zones and emergency housing in the County’s commercial and industrial zones.

*For further policies related to Goal 2.0, please see the following Inyo County General Plan Policies:*

*Policy GOV-3.2, “Private Land Increase”*

*Policy GOV-3.3, “Land Release Locations”*

*Policy LU-1.10, “LADWP Land Holdings”*

*Policy LU-1.11, “LADWP Land Releases”*

*Policy LU-1.12, “Other Public Agency Land Holdings”*

*Policy LU-1.13, “Manzanar Land Release”*

**Housing Opportunities**

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

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

**Policy 3.1 Residential Development Variety**

The County shall provide a variety of residential development opportunities in the County including single-family homes, mobilehomes, and apartments to fulfill regional housing needs.

**Policy 3.2 High Density Housing**

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

**Policy 3.3 Second Units**

The County shall continue to allow second units in the County’s residential districts with a floor area of up to 30% of the principal dwelling unit up to a maximum of 1,200 square feet.

**Policy 3.4 Mobilehomes**

The County shall facilitate tenant ownership of mobilehome parks, with the cooperation of mobilehome park owners, to allow tenants to control space rents.

**Policy 3.5 Coordination with Community Housing Development Organizations**

The County shall coordinate with community housing development organizations to facilitate the development of affordable housing to meet the needs of lower income households.

**Policy 3.6 Low-Income Housing Size**

The County shall require housing built for lower income households as part of a density bonus project to have on an average the same number of bedrooms as other market rate units in a housing project.

**Policy 3.7 Accessible Housing**

The County shall encourage the development of residential units that are accessible to persons with disabilities or are adaptable for conversion to residential use by persons with disabilities.

**Policy 3.8 Location of Accessible Housing**

The County shall encourage the development of new housing units designated for the elderly and persons with disabilities to be in close proximity to public transportation and community services.

**Home Ownership**

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

**Goal 4.0 - To provide increased opportunities for home ownership.**

**Policy 4.1 Self-Help Housing**

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

**Policy 4.2 Mobilehomes**

The County shall continue to encourage mobilehomes as an affordable means of homeownership.

**Policy 4.3 Home Financing Assistance**

The County shall provide favorable home purchasing options to low and moderate-income households, such as interest rate write-downs, down payment assistance, and mortgage revenue bond financing through State and Federal programs.

**Removal of Constraints on Housing Development**

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

**Goal 5.0 - To remove governmental constraints on housing development.**

**Policy 5.1 Housing in Commercial Areas**

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

**Policy 5.2 Manufactured Housing**

The County shall continue to allow manufactured housing in all residential zones.

**Policy 5.3 Permit Processing**

The County shall facilitate timely building permit and development plan processing for residential construction.

**Policy 5.4 Expedited Project Review**

The County shall expedite project review of residential developments with an affordable housing component.

**Policy 5.5 Infrastructure**

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

**Policy 5.6 Rezoning**

The County will identify and zone suitable sites, without physical and environmental constraints, and available to encourage and facilitate multifamily development to accommodate the County’s housing needs.

**Accessibility of Housing**

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

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

**Policy 6.1 Equal Opportunity**

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

**Policy 6.2 Reasonable Accommodation**

The County shall adopt a reasonable accommodations ordinance to provide for persons with disabilities seeking fair access to housing in the application of its zoning and building regulations, and provide a means of requesting exceptions that may be a barrier to fair housing opportunities.

## IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Table 29, Housing Implementation Measures, identifies the measures the County should take to implement the goals and policies of this General Plan. The implementation program lists the specific implementation measure, a reference to which General Plan policy it is implementing, who is responsible to implement the program, and the timeframe for implementation. To meet the requirements of State law and HCD, the funding source for each implementation is also listed in Table 29.

**Table 29: Housing Implementation Measures and Funding Sources**

	Implementation Measure and Funding Source	Implem ents Policy	Who is Responsible	04 to 05	05 to 06	06 to 07	07 to 08	On Goi ng
1	The County shall provide rehabilitation assistance to lower income owner- and renter-occupied households to facilitate unit upgrading. The County will initiate a rehabilitation program with the goal of improving 10% of units in need (50 units). <b>Funding: CDBG</b>	1.1	County IMACA		◆			
2	The County shall provide outreach programs to educate the public about available housing rehabilitation assistance.	1.2	County IMACA	◆				
3	The County shall provide technical assistance to mobilehome park residents who want to purchase their mobilehome park. To accomplish this, the County will advertise the program to mobilehome park residents, including conducting meetings with tenants. <b>Funding: HCD</b>	3.4	County IMACA	◆				

4	The County shall extend rental subsidies to lower income families and elderly. The County shall encourage listing of rental units with IMACA. Continued subsidy of 3 County households. Coordinate with HCD to receive ten additional subsidies. <b>Funding: HUD Section 8 Certification and Housing Vouchers</b>	3.1	County IMACA					◆
5	The County shall support IMACA in assisting in locating roommates to share existing housing. This will be accomplished by contributing to funding and assist in program outreach to expand program utilization. <b>Funding: State of California Older Americans Act CDBG</b>	3.1	County IMACA IMAAA					◆
6	The County shall improve the energy efficiency of dwelling units by providing weatherization assistance to a minimum of 50 low-income households, annually. <b>Funding: CDBG</b>	1.1	County IMACA IMAAA So. Cal Edison LADWP					◆
7	The County shall assist low-income households with utility bills by providing assistance to a minimum of 150 households, annually. Augment current program funding <b>Funding: State Department of Economic Opportunity CDBG</b>	3.1	County IMACA					◆
8	The County shall continue to support IMACA reduce housing cost through energy conservation by providing 100 households with light bulbs and provide concessions to 50 “all electric” households, annually. <b>Funding: Southern California Edison</b>	3.1	IMACA So. Cal Edison	◆				

9	<p>The County shall provide for the continued affordability of the County’s low and moderate-income housing stock. The County shall enter into contracts or file affordable covenants/deed restrictions on future affordable projects.</p> <p><b>Funding: Planning Department budget (development fees)</b></p>	3.1	County IMACA					◆
10	<p>The County shall encourage higher density residential development. Conduct outreach to developers and property owners to encourage higher density residential development.</p> <p><b>Funding: Planning Department budget (development fees)</b></p>	3.2	County IMACA	◆				
11	<p>The County shall encourage development of housing for low-income households through provision of density bonus incentives. To do this, the County shall create a handout to inform applicants of opportunities for density increases. The County shall also revise the density bonus program to include incentives for units for larger families.</p> <p><b>Funding: Planning Department budget (development fees)</b></p>	3.2 3.6	County IMACA					◆
12	<p>The County shall provide additional sites for housing development. The County shall coordinate with various Tribal Councils to pursue development of affordable housing units on Indian Reservations.</p> <p><b>Funding: Planning Department budget</b></p>	3.1 3.5	County IMACA Tribal Councils BLM					◆

13	The County shall achieve affordable homeownership housing for lower income households. The County shall contact established self-help housing groups to solicit interest in developing project in County. <b>Funding: Planning Department budget</b>	4.1	County IMACA	◆				
14	The County shall apply for funding to construct new rental housing for lower income households. <b>Funding: Respond to NOFAs for MHP, HOME program</b>	3.2 3.5	County IMACA		◆			
15	The County shall provide expanded affordable housing opportunities. To do this, the County shall facilitate development of one 25-unit very low-income rental project. Form a partnership with IMACA for affordable housing. <b>Funding: Available State, Federal, and local funds (HOME, MHP, CDBG, etc.)</b>	3.1	County IMACA		◆			
16	The County shall finance housing rehabilitation efforts and affordable housing construction. To do this, the County shall complete grant applications for CDBG during fiscal year 2005/06, and HOME in 2004/05. Research available State funds by mid-2005 and pursue as appropriate. <b>Funding: Planning Department budget, HOME, MHP</b>	1.1 3.1	County IMACA		◆	◆		
17	The County shall encourage the development of affordable rental and ownership housing. <b>Funding: Pursue FmHA funds</b>	3.1	County IMACA		◆			

18	The County shall maintain an up-to-date inventory of sites suitable for residential development, and provide this information to residential developers and to the real estate community. <b>Funding: Planning Department budget</b>	2.1	County	◆				
19	The County shall annually update an inventory of suitable residential sites to the development community and solicit development to fulfill the County's share of regional housing needs. <b>Funding: Planning Department budget</b>	2.2 3.1 3.2	County					◆
20	The County shall disseminate information to the public to inform them of CalHFA, RCRC, USDA and other homebuyer assistance programs available through local lenders. <b>Funding: Planning Department Budget, CDBG</b>	4.3	County IMACA					◆
21	The County shall continue to expedite permit processing for affordable housing projects. <b>Funding: Planning Department budget</b>	5.4	County					◆
22	The County shall take positive action to assure unrestricted access to housing. The County will continue to support IMACA to provide fair housing services and assist in program outreach.	6.1	County IMACA					◆
23	The County shall incorporate reasonable accommodations provisions into its Zoning Code to provide a means for persons with disabilities to requesting exceptions zoning and building regulations that may be a barrier to fair housing opportunities.	6.5	County	◆				

24	The County shall identify and rezone to R-3, at least 3 acres of land; and identify and rezone to R-2, at least 2 acres of land to facilitate development of at least 100 housing units affordable to lower income households.	5.6	County		◆			
----	--	-----	--------	--	---	--	--	--

### Quantified Objectives

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

**Table 30: Quantified Objectives**

Income Group	<i>Required</i>	Constructed Units 2001-2003	Approved Projects	Rehabilitation	Conservation	New Construction	TOTAL
Very Low	86	22		75	40	66	181
Low	54	37		75	60	15	150
Moderate	51		11	100		40	201
Above Moderate	115	43	16	100		106	222
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>754</b>

Rehabilitation of existing housing units is critical to maintaining the housing stock of the County. There are 724 units in need of rehabilitation. It is realistic that 350 of those units will be rehabilitated through both public and private activity in the next five years. One hundred units can be conserved through tenant-based assistance, including Section 8 vouchers and certificates, and weatherization programs. Lastly, it is likely that the maximum number of residential units provided by new construction will not exceed 227 units.