

EXHIBIT A

Errata/List of Text Changes to the Revised Draft 2009 Housing Element

Changes to Housing Element Policy Document

1. Revise Table H-G, on page H-11 of the Housing Element Policy Document – the attached Table H-G will replace the version in the 4/22/09 Housing Element Policy Document. Revisions relate to (a) adjustment of the estimated realistic unit yields in the Spanish Flat area and (b) provide for a range of units in the Napa Pipe “by right” column. In addition, various edits to other parts of the Policy Document (as well as the Housing Needs Assessment) will be made for consistency with Table H-G, as revised. These will include modifications to Program H-4e regarding Napa Pipe rezoning to say “up to between 152 and 202 owner-occupied or rental dwelling units” will be “by right” with no change to the maximum of 304 units.
2. Policy H-3a, on page H-14 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be revised to read: “...to assess, plan for, and meet the needs of permanent and seasonal farmworkers, including farmworker families and unaccompanied farmworkers.”
3. The description of program H-1b on page H-17 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be revised to read: “To the extent permitted by law, the County modify the Affordable Housing Ordinance to enable non-profit organizations to apply for the use of up to 10 percent of new funds annually to fund projects and programs designed to correct health and safety hazards in owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing that is reserved for low-, very low-, or extremely low-income households.
4. Objective H-2a on page H-17 of the Housing Element Policy document will be revised to read: “The County will seek to facilitate the development of lower income units by working to complete the planning and approvals for the Napa Pipe site, Phase 1 and by prioritizing its Affordable Housing Fund monies to assist affordable housing development on Affordable Housing (:AH) Combination District sites...”
5. The “Affordability Programs” header on page H-17 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be footnoted to clarify that: “For the purposes of Affordability Programs, housing that is affordable to “very low-income” households and/or “lower-income” households may include housing that is affordable to extremely low-income households. Furthermore, it should be understood that various housing unit types encouraged and facilitated by the Special Needs Programs, such as emergency shelters, farmworker housing, transitional housing, and supportive housing typically serve extremely low-income households.
6. The description of Program H-2a, starting on page H-17 of the Housing Element Policy document will be revised to read: “The County shall amend its Affordable Housing Ordinance to prioritize the use of funds for development of Affordable Housing (:AH) Combination District (AHCD) sites, and will continue to work with interested parties to encourage their development of the sites under the AHCD provisions. The County will seek to work with a developer to process a development application on at least one AHCD site during the planning

7. The description of Program H-2f, on page H-18 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be revised to read: “The County will continue its program of exempting all secondary residential units from the Growth Management System and will amend the zoning ordinance to allow second units in the AP zoning district that provide housing for lower-income households.”
8. The timing notation that accompanies the description of Program H-2k, on page H-19 of the Housing Element Policy document will be revised to read: “(Ordinance amendment complete by December 31, 2010)”
9. The description of Program H-3f, on page H-21 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be revised to read: “To the extent permitted by law, the County will amend its Affordable Housing Ordinance to require a preference for local workers, including farmworker households, in affordable housing developments assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies, with a goal of including farmworker households in at least 10 percent of the units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money. The County will monitor the percentage of farmworker households occupying housing units assisted with Affordable Housing Fund money in conjunction with income eligibility monitoring for affordable housing units. (Ordinance amendment complete December 31, 2009, monitoring Ongoing)”
10. The description of Program H-4b, on page H-22 of the Housing Element Policy Document will be revised to read: “...The County will work with the cities to establish a list of criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals for use of Affordable Housing Fund monies, with priority for projects that serve extremely low-income households....”
11. An older version of Table H-H appears starting on page H-26 of the Housing Element Policy Document. The attached version of Table H-H will replace the existing version.

Changes to Housing Needs Assessment

1. Additional text will be added at the end of the second full paragraph, on page 5 of the Housing Needs Assessment to indicate: “Housing Element Programs H-2a and H-2l are proposed to increase the effectiveness of the AHCD overlay.”
2. Add a sentence at the end of the second paragraph on p. 6 which says: “Fair Housing Napa Valley in turn conducts educational outreach on a regular basis, reaching out to tenants, property managers, realty groups, and others.”
3. The second paragraph on page 84 of the Housing Needs Assessment will be revised to read: “Spanish Flat – The Spanish Flat Water District (SFWD) serves Spanish Flat with water and sewer service.⁵⁴ All of the Spanish Flat sites in the housing sites inventory, with the exception of Spanish Flat site F, are within the SFWD service area. The SFWD water system is currently

⁵⁵ The SFWD does have rights to additional water supply from Lake Berryessa, so there will not be a problem extending water distribution facilities to the sites. In terms of sewer service, the SFWD does not have sufficient capacity and additional capacity would be required for the new housing development; however, the SFWD treatment facilities are located in close proximity to the Spanish Flat AHCD sites, so infrastructure distribution requirements should be minimal. Program H-21 calls for the County to work with affected agencies and developers to obtain grant funding to assist in infrastructure improvement for AHCD sites such as this, and to ensure that infrastructure improvements are a qualified expense when using Affordable Housing Funds.”

4. In the third paragraph on page 94 of the Housing Needs Assessment, a sentence will be added to indicate: “The standard or “default” parking requirement for multifamily housing projects is two spaces per unit, plus one guest space for every two units.”
5. The text under the header “Processing and Permit Procedures,” beginning on page 95 of the Housing Needs Assessment and continuing to page 97, will be replaced with the text shown in Attachment 1, below.

Processing and Permit Procedures

The Zoning Code sets forth the types of uses allowed in each of the zoning districts in the unincorporated area. Some uses are permitted without a use permit, while other uses require a conditional use permit (CUP), all dependent upon the zoning district and the type of use. Table 33 outlines the site regulations in each zoning district. As demonstrated in the table, single-family residential uses are allowed in most zoning districts in the unincorporated area through a ministerial, non-discretionary process. In the Angwin, Moskowite Corner, and Spanish Flat areas, the Affordable Housing Combination District allows single family and multifamily housing without CUPs and subject only to specified development standards, up to specified densities. In addition, through Housing Element Program H-4e, the County will allow construction of up to 152 multifamily residential units by right on the Napa Pipe property. Napa County has the ability to accommodate its entire outstanding unmet RHNA allocation through housing development that could occur without a CUP. This includes all sites designated as suitable for lower income housing (the AHCD sites plus 152 units permitted by right at Napa Pipe), plus all moderate and above moderate income housing permitted on the AHCD sites, totaling 1,059 units, compared with the County’s remaining RHNA allocation of 428 units.

In general, development proposals are brought to the Planning Department for informal discussions prior to submittal or detailed design. This is not required, though it is encouraged, and staff makes their time available for no cost at this stage of the project. Once plans are solidified and more complete, a formal pre-application meeting is required prior to submittal. Such meetings are scheduled every Thursday afternoon and are generally available for scheduling with only a few days’ notice. Following the pre-application meeting, the application may be filed that day if it is sufficiently complete, or if the applicant provides specific instructions as to what actions must be taken in order to make the project ready for submittal. For housing permitted by right, once all specified requirements have been met, the applicant may apply for a building permit without any other discretionary review.

Following application submittal to the Building Department, the submittal is routed to all other involved Departments (e.g. Environmental Management, Public Works, Fire, and Planning). Each Department is required to provide their comments and conditions, or request additional

information, within 30 days of submittal. Each Department will also work directly with the applicant to resolve issues in the Department's area of expertise. Barring any significant problems with the submittal, building permits will generally be issued within 60–90 days from submittal.

If a project requires a CUP, the process remains much the same, except that CUPs are approved by the Planning Commission unless appealed. Considering the AHCD units and the Napa Pipe units that could be built by right as long as the applicable AHCD standards are met, plus the additional Napa Pipe units that could be built by right (at densities which are suitable for lower income housing development), plus the ability to construct moderate and above-moderate income housing units on available sites by right, Napa County has the ability to accommodate its entire outstanding unmet RHNA allocation through housing development that could occur without CUPs.

Should developers prefer to go through the CUP process to obtain housing approvals, the process is such that the CUP application will not lengthen the entitlement process or act as an undue governmental constraint. This is because a CUP application would be handled concurrent with the environmental review process. After each of the Departments provide comments on the application, the Planning Department conducts CEQA review, provides public notice and schedules a public hearing before the Planning Commission. This accounts for 60 days in the application process, assuming that a negative declaration is prepared. During this time, the CUP application would be processed and the Planning Commission would act on both the CEQA review and the CUP request at the same hearing(s). Therefore, the CUP application would not lengthen the entitlement process, and the process would not be shortened by removal of the CUP requirement. An appeal of a Planning Commission decision on either environmental issues or CUP approval could add up to 3 months to the process, but it could be less.

The requirements for CUP approval are clear, straightforward, and do not introduce uncertainty into the approval process. Typical findings for a CUP, including use permits for multifamily housing, include the following: the project is consistent with the General Plan, the use is compatible with surrounding uses, the use does not have a significant adverse effect on any applicable groundwater basin, and addresses basic public health and safety, and general welfare concerns, and meets all zoning requirements for the district, which include height, setbacks, site coverage and parking standards. In addition, through Housing Element Program H-5b, the County will expedite permit processing for projects that provide affordable housing for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households.

Finally, throughout the Housing Element public participation process, which has included housing developer representatives, the County has received no commentary to the effect that the CUP requirement for certain housing developments has or will discourage housing production. Considering these factors, and the County's ability to accommodate its entire RHNA on sites where housing is allowed by right, the County does not believe that the CUP process unduly constrains the production of housing, or adds to the cost of housing.

6. The text under the header "Zoning to Accommodate the Development of Housing Affordable to Lower Income Households," beginning on page 106 of the Housing Needs Assessment and continuing to page 111, will be replaced with the text shown below.

TZoning to Accommodate the Development of Housing Affordable to Lower Income Households

Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3) sets default minimum allowable densities for zoning presumed to accommodate housing affordable for lower-income households. The Government Code classifies jurisdictions in four different categories. Napa County is categorized as a suburban jurisdiction, where the default minimum density necessary to provide affordable housing is at least 20 dwelling units per acre.¹ The previous 2004 Housing Element identified 14 specific sites in the unincorporated area appropriate for multifamily affordable housing that are provided with Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) development options. The AHCD allows up to four dwelling units per acre by right through a ministerial permit process on the Moskowitz Corner and Spanish Flat sites, and twelve dwelling units per acre by right through a ministerial permit process on the Angwin sites. The AHCD option includes specific affordability requirements, assuring the provision of housing units for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. Housing Element program H-4e also calls for the County to rezone a minimum of 20 acres of land at the Napa Pipe site, for a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre, and a minimum of 304 housing units. Of these, a minimum of 152 units would be developable by right, with the balance allowable with a use permit or a development agreement.

Existing Affordable Housing Sites

In the 2004 Housing Element, Napa County found AHCD sites to be feasible locations for very low- and low-income housing production. The Element was subsequently certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. This Housing Element Update also designates the Angwin sites, Moskowitz Corner sites, and Spanish Flat sites as affordable housing sites. As reflected in Table H-1-1 of the Housing Element Policy Document, the following realistic unit potentials are estimated for the Angwin, Moskowitz Corner, and Spanish Flat sites:

Angwin:	110 units
Moskowitz Corner:	100 units
Spanish Flat:	99 units

As mentioned above, the Angwin and Spanish Flat sites (290 total realistic unit capacity) are currently zoned to be developed at densities up to 25 dwelling units per acre, with a use permit. Thus, they exceed the default minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre that is required in order to qualify as sites that are suitable to accommodate very low- and low-income housing production. Since Angwin and Spanish Flat can accommodate 290 additional housing units, Napa County could fulfill its obligation to accommodate its net remaining outstanding RHNA for very low- and low-income households (259 units) through development of these sites.

Nevertheless, in consideration of comments received from HCD on the preliminary Draft Housing Element submitted to HCD for review on October 31, 2008, the County is taking a more conservative approach to estimating its capability to accommodate its RHNA, based on the number of affordable units that would be required if the Angwin, Moskowitz Corner, and Spanish Flat sites are developed under the AHCD development standards, which allow the sites to be developed by right. Napa County believes that these sites, if built at AHCD by right densities of 4 to 12 units per acre, can feasibly accommodate lower-income affordable housing development, as explained below.

¹ Department of Housing and Community Development, Division of Housing Policy Development, "Amendment of State Housing Element Law – AB 2348" June 9, 2005.

Feasibility of Affordable Housing Development on AHCD Sites

The reasoning behind the default minimum densities laid out by California Government Code section 65583.2(c)(3) is that by allowing developers to build at higher densities, affordable housing developers may purchase less land in order to accommodate a given number of housing units. The code section then assumes that this translates into a lower average land cost, per housing unit produced. When combined with other costs for housing development, this lower land cost is then presumed to contribute to an overall lower average cost per unit to produce housing, thus facilitating affordable housing production. The discussion that follows is intended to explain how the relatively low land values in unincorporated Napa County create a situation where affordable housing can feasibly be built in accordance with the AHCD development standards at a range of densities.

First, it is necessary to establish a reasonable assumption for the value of residential land that could be developed for medium or higher density housing in unincorporated Napa County. There are no recent comparable sales of such land in the unincorporated area upon which to base an estimate, so it is necessary to estimate land values based on land sales that have occurred in Napa County cities, where such sales are more frequent. Research on local affordable housing production yielded land cost information for a number of affordable multifamily housing projects, as follows:

- Vineyards Crossing, American Canyon - 145 units affordable to families earning up to 55 percent of median income, which roughly translate to a small percentage of low income households along with very low- and extremely low-income households, at 20 du/ac.²
- Magnolia Park Townhomes and Apartment, City of Napa- 29 units affordable to low- income households, at 16 du/ac.
- Jefferson Street Senior Housing, City of Napa - 78 units affordable low- income senior households, at 40 du/ac.
- Palisades Apartments, Calistoga – 23 units with 14 units affordable to those earning up to 50 percent of area median income, and 9 units affordable to those earning 60 percent of area median income meaning that the units are affordable to a small percentage of low income households along with very low- and extremely low-income households, at 16 du/ac.³
- Saratoga Manor II, Calistoga – 18 units that sold for between \$300,000 and \$325,000 in 2005, at 9 du/ac.⁴ Following is a summary of the projects' per unit land costs:

Project	Location	Density	Land Cost/Acre	Land Cost/Unit
Vineyards Crossing	American Canyon	20 du/ac	\$517,400	\$25,700
Magnolia Park	City of Napa	16	\$1,000,000	\$69,000
Jefferson Street	City of Napa	40	\$330,000 ⁵	\$8,500
Palisades	Calistoga	16	\$664,286 ⁶	\$40,400
Saratoga Manor II	Calistoga	9	\$479,000	\$53,200

² Mid Peninsula Housing Coalition Projects, http://www.midpen-housing.org/main_properties.html. Accessed on August 21, 2008.

³ California Tax Credit Allocation Committee "Project Staff Report Tax-Exempt Bond Project." March 26, 2008.

⁴ Personal Communication. Bob Fiddaman, Calistoga Affordable Housing, Inc. June 20th, 2008.

⁵ Purchased from the County of Napa

⁶ Estimated market value of donated land, as provided by project sponsor. Bob Fiddaman, Calistoga Affordable Housing, Inc. June 20th, 2008.

As shown in the table, the cost of land for each of the five projects, not including the additional on and off site improvements necessary prior to development varies widely, from \$330,000 per acre, to about \$1 million per acre. Because the AHCD sites are located in rural areas, where land values are typically less than in more urbanized areas, it is likely that the land values would more closely approximate the lower-priced values of the land sales for the projects in American Canyon, City of Napa (Jefferson Street), and Calistoga as compared to the cost of the City of Napa Magnolia Park site. Additionally, land values in rural areas tend to be lower than in cities, because the locations in the unincorporated area do not enjoy the same urban amenities as the sites in the cities. For example, according to Napa County Assessor's records, in 2009 a property in the Moskowitz Corner area sold for \$250,000, which included a 2-bedroom, 1,540 square foot home on 0.33 acres of land. This is considerably less than would be expected for a comparably sized home, on a comparably sized lot, in the County's urban areas. Based on this information, land values for AHCD sites should be less than the values reported above for sites located in the cities. Thus, it can be conservatively assumed that the value of the AHCD sites would be no more than \$500,000 per acre.

Using \$500,000 per acre as a conservative (i.e., the estimate is likely to be high) starting point for the cost of residential land in the unincorporated area, it is then possible to evaluate the impact of the allowable density on feasibility for affordable housing development at the Moskowitz and Spanish Flat sites at 4 du/ac under AHCD standards, and on feasibility for the Angwin sites at 12 du/ac under the AHCD standards. If the Moskowitz Corner or Spanish Flat property costs \$500,000 per acre, and is developed at 4 du/acre, the average land cost per unit would be \$125,000. This cost per unit would be more than the per unit land costs for the Magnolia Park project shown in the table above; however, based on the demonstrated ability of housing developers to build affordable housing units on sites where the per unit land cost is as high as \$69,000 per unit, Napa County believes that if it makes Affordable Housing Fund or other resources available to bring land costs down to an equivalent level, affordable housing development can also be feasible on AHCD sites. In other words, if the County contributes approximately \$56,000 per unit to write down land costs for AHCD development at Moskowitz and/or Spanish Flat, this would bring the land cost per unit to a level that is comparable to the land cost per unit for Magnolia Park. Napa County has committed in Housing Element Program H-2a to amend its Affordable Housing Ordinance to prioritize the use of funds to assist affordable housing development on AHCD sites. This action will help to ensure that the Moskowitz Corner and Spanish Flat sites remain feasible to accommodate lower-income housing production.

With approximately \$8 million in uncommitted Affordable Housing Fund money available at this time, the County has more than sufficient resources to write down land costs to a level comparable to Magnolia Park for 25 lower-income housing units that would be required if the Moskowitz Corner sites are developed under AHCD standards (\$1.4 million) and 25 lower-income units that would be required if the Spanish Flat sites are developed under AHCD standards (an additional \$1.4 million). In fact, this level of land subsidy may not be necessary, for two reasons. First, the concept of the AHCD zoning is to encourage mixed-income housing development, including housing affordable to moderate-income households and market rate housing for above moderate-income households, whereby the profitability of the market rate housing helps to cross-subsidize the more affordable units. Furthermore, the County owns one of the Spanish Flat parcels (Spanish Flat Site B, APN-019-261-035, 6.7 acres), and could potentially make it available in conformance with Housing Element program H-2g at below market value to an affordable housing developer, as a way of further reducing development costs.

For the Angwin sites, the AHCD development standards allow for up to 191 total housing units, at densities up to 12 du/ac. The AHCD standards would require 80 units affordable to lower income households. With an assumed land value of \$500,000 per acre, this would translate to a per unit land cost of about \$42,000 per unit, which would be considerably less than the per unit land cost of the Magnolia Park and Saratoga Manor II affordable housing projects. Based on this information, the County may not need to provide any additional land cost subsidy for AHCD development at the densities permitted by right in Angwin; however, the County would still have a substantial amount of Affordable Housing Fund money available after providing land cost subsidies to AHCD projects in Moskowitz Corner and Spanish Flat, to provide additional assistance for affordable housing development at this site, if appropriate.

For all AHCD sites, the lower density allowed by right may even facilitate some development cost savings, since the lower density would give developers more flexibility in siting and designing their units to economize in the construction process. Additionally, because the County has already completed the environmental review process and established the AHCD zoning that allows by right development for up to 191 units at Angwin, 100 units at Moskowitz Corner, and 99 units at Spanish Flat, the County has already facilitated and reduced costs for the development of these sites, to a large degree. Prospective developers will benefit from the certainty and speed of the ministerial review process for projects on these sites that follow the AHCD guidelines.

Examples of Other Local Affordable Housing Development

The experiences of affordable housing developers in Napa County like Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition, Napa Valley Community Housing (NVCH), and Calistoga Affordable Housing (CAH) indicate that while there generally is a desire to construct affordable housing projects in the incorporated areas of the county, at densities above 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) in order to economize on land costs (e.g., higher densities translate to the need to purchase less land per housing unit), a number of affordable housing projects have been built successfully within Napa County at relatively low densities, that are similar to those proposed for the AHCD sites. In addition to the projects reported above, for which land cost information was available, there are numerous examples of other affordable housing projects that have been developed at relatively low densities, including Whistle Stop Townhomes (8 du/ac), Villa de Adobe apartments (5 du/ac), Pecan Court apartments (16 du/ac), Oran Court apartments (13 du/ac), Schoolhouse Court single family residences (7 du/ac), and Voorhees Circle single family residences and condominiums (7 du/ac). The AHCD parcels, with by right density that varies between 4 and 12 units per acre, are consistent with other successful affordable housing projects developed throughout the County in the incorporated cities and town. The Napa Valley is predominantly a rural agricultural area with limited opportunity for high density development, yet with the combination of local financial support and sensitivity to design, there are numerous examples of successful affordable projects at densities less than 10 du/ac with minimal, if any, opposition to their development.

Additional Land to Be Zoned for By-Right Multifamily Development at 20 Dwelling Units per Acre or More

Rather than relying solely on the AHCD sites to accommodate its RHNA obligations, the County is also committing to rezone 20 acres at the Napa Pipe site for development of multifamily housing at 20 du/ac or more, per Housing Element program H-4e. On this property, a minimum of 152-202 units could be developed by right, while an additional 102-152 units could be developed with a use permit or development agreement, for a total of 304 units. The County is proposing to rezone more than the 15 acres needed to accommodate 304 units at the anticipated density of 20 du/ac to allow flexibility in locating the units on the site.

Summary

Due to the relatively low land values for residential land in the unincorporated area, the special provisions made for affordable housing development through the AHCD zoning, the availability of considerable Affordable Housing Fund money to provide additional assistance if necessary, potential cross-subsidy between market rate units and below market rate units on AHCD sites, and the potential to offer the County-owned Spanish Flat parcel to an affordable housing developer for a below market price, Napa County is confident that the zoning provided on the AHCD sites can accommodate a significant portion the County's RHNA for lower-income households.

Nevertheless, the County will substantially reduce its dependence on the AHCD sites to accommodate its outstanding unmet RHNA for the current planning period, by taking specific actions to entitle a minimum of 20 acres of land on the Napa Pipe site for by right development of a minimum of 152 units of multifamily housing, allowing density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre. The 152 units that could be developed by right at Napa Pipe, plus the 80 lower-income units that could be developed by right at densities up to 12 dwelling units per acre at Angwin under the AHCD regulations would fall just short of the County's remaining unmet RHNA for lower-income units. The County is relying on the lower-density development that would be permitted at the Moskowite Corner and Spanish Flat sites to accommodate just 27 units of its RHNA allocation for lower-income households, or only about 10 percent of its remaining outstanding lower-income RHNA.

Table H-G and Appendix H-1 in the Housing Element Policy Document summarize the accounting for Napa County's ability to accommodate its RHNA obligations for lower-income households, using the conservative estimates of lower-income unit capacity on AHCD sites discussed above, plus the additional lower-income unit capacity that will be provided on the Napa Pipe property during the Housing Element planning period.

7. The fourth sentence in the third paragraph on page 120 of the Housing Needs Assessment will be revised to read: "Furthermore, as explained below, housing market conditions are expected to be conducive to site redevelopment versus maintaining the sites in these marginal commercial uses."
8. The first sentence of the third paragraph on p. 120 will be revised to read: "Therefore, the development capacity figures for Sites C, E and F in the Spanish Flat area assume that these sites would be fully redeveloped. Although the property owners have not expressed an interest in redevelopment within the past year, the County believes that the incentives provided will encourage redevelopment as the market improves."

Table H-G: Summary of RHNA and Sites Capacity

	Household Income Level			TOTAL
	Very Low and Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Original RHNA Allocation (Units)	297	130	224	651
<i>Less Transfers to City of Napa</i>	38	16	28	82
Net Adjusted RHNA	259	114	196	569
Less Units Already Produced				
Single Family Homes	0	0	119	119
Second Units	0	22	0	22
<i>Sub-Total Units Already Produced</i>	0	22	119	141
Net Remaining Outstanding RHNA	259	92	77	428
Unit Capacity on Identified Sites				
SFR Capacity on Vacant Parcels (a)	0	0	315	315
Projected Additional 2nd Units	0	50	0	50
Napa Pipe (b)	152-202	102-152	0	304
Angwin Sites (c)	80	51	60	191
Moskowite Corner Sites (d)	25	25	50	100
Spanish Flat Sites (e) (f)	25	25	49	99
Total Unit Capacity on Identified Sites	282-332	253-303	474	1,059
"Buffer" or Excess Capacity	23 to 73	161 to 211	397	631

Notes:

- (a) Vacant sites available for market rate (above moderate-income) units exceed this number, but the Growth Management System provides for construction of approximately 97 market rate units per year. Napa County staff estimate there are at least 2,000 parcels in the AW district alone where single-family residential units could be built. Actual SFR land capacity will be greater considering additional available sites in other zoning districts. 315 units represents balance of market rate units that could be permitted after accounting for market rate units that could be permitted on AHCD sites. Since these parcels are located in areas not served by public sewer systems, they are not identified on a site-specific basis (Government Code Section 65583.2(b)(6)).
- (b) 20 acres of Napa Pipe site are proposed for rezoning to allow up to 304 units at minimum of 20 du/ac; between 152 and 202 units would be "by right" and the balance would be allowed subject to use permit or development agreement. Proposed for enactment per Housing Element Program H-4e and would permit housing on a portion of the site in Airport compatibility zone E.
- (c) Affordable Housing Combination District (AHCD) requires that Angwin Site A units include the following affordability levels: 10% Very Low, 30% Low and 25% to 30% Moderate; AHCD requires that Angwin Site B units include the following affordability level: 50% Very Low and Low.
- (d) AHCD requires that Moskowite Corner units include the following affordability levels: 25% Very Low and Low, and 25% Moderate.
- (e) AHCD requires that Spanish Flat units include the following affordability levels: 25% Very Low and Low, and 25% Moderate.
- (f) Analysis of realistic unit capacity indicates that while AHCD regulations permit a total of 110 units, the sites can likely yield a maximum of 99 units.

Sources: County of Napa, BAE, 2009.

Table H-H: Summary of Housing Element Programs (Page 1 of 4)

Plan Program	Action Step	Source of Financing	Action Agency	Action Date (a)
1. Rehabilitation				
Program H-1a: Inspect housing in response to complaints and work with property owners to achieve compliance.	Continue current program.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Ongoing
Program H-1b: Low-interest loan program designed to correct health and safety hazards in housing reserved for low- or very low-income households.	Modify the AH Ordinance to use up to 10 percent of new funds annually to fund program.	AH Fund, State, Federal, other funding sources	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-1c: Ensure homes are used as residences rather than tourist accommodations.	Prioritize the abatement of illegal vacation rentals.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Ongoing
2. Affordability				
Program H-2a: Continue to promote and market sites designated with the AH overlay zoning for development.	Provide information and technical assistance for the development of AH sites.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-2b: If development in AH overlay zone does not achieve the densities or the level of affordability associated with the overlay zoning provisions, the County will work to identify new sites to accommodate the shortfall.	Monitor development of AH sites; Identify new AH overlay zones.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	Ongoing
Program H-2c: Increase the inclusionary percentage to 20 percent and allow the payment of in-lieu fees only for housing projects of four or fewer units.	Modify the AH Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-2d: Update the Affordable Housing Ordinance to adjust the commercial housing impact fee.	Modify the AH Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; BOS	2009
Program H-2e: The County will notify the public of available special assistance programs.	Issue notices of funding availability.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Annually
Program H-2f: Continue program of exempting secondary residential units from the GMS and revise policies to allow 2nd units in the AP zoning district.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow 2nd units in the AP zoning district.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-2g: Offer County-owned land, when appropriate, for affordable housing projects.	Complete an inventory of surplus County-owned land; issue RFPs for available sites.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department;	2011, ongoing

Note:

(a) All actions are targeted for completion/implementation by June 30, 2014

Sources: County of Napa, BAE, 2009.

Table H-H: Summary of Housing Element Programs (Page 2 of 4)

Plan Program	Action Step	Source of Financing	Action Agency	Action Date (a)
Program H-2h: Require projects receiving Affordable Housing Fund assistance or any other type of County assistance, as well as those units built as part of the County's inclusionary housing requirement, to apply deed restrictions for a minimum of 40 years of affordability.	Update sample deed restrictions.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	Ongoing
Program H-2i: Continue to use the AH Combination Districts as a tool to provide specific and reasonable standards to stimulate affordable housing development.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance as necessary.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	Ongoing
Program H-2j: Remove the AH Combination District from Monticello Road/Atlas Peak sites.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance and update the General Plan land use map.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-2k: 25 percent increase in units for redevelopment of existing mobilehome parks, pending certain requirements.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2010
Program H-2l: Ensure infrastructure costs are an eligible cost under the Affordable Housing Ordinance; work with water and sewer providers to pursue grant funding to assist with infrastructure improvements	Amend the Affordable Housing Ordinance	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
3. Special Needs Housing				
Program H-3a: Continue program of inspecting migrant farm labor camps. Efforts will be made to seek compliance and not closure of such facilities.	Inspect and promote code compliance of farm labor camps.	County budget	Department of Environmental Health	Annually
Program H-3b: Continue to contract with Greater Napa Fair Housing Center or another capable organization that will conduct fair housing outreach and education, and review and act upon housing discrimination complaints.	County contract will call for education, outreach, and assistance in resolving complaints.	County budget	Greater Napa Fair Housing Center, Napa County, media, Board of Realtors and the Chamber of Commerce	Ongoing
Program H-3c: Contribute funds towards the annual operating costs of local emergency shelters and transitional housing.	Continue to contribute funds.	County budget, the Gasser Foundation, and the Progress Foundation	BOS	Ongoing
Program H-3d: Allow homeless shelters as a permitted use in areas zoned "Industrial."	Amend Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009

Note:

(a) All actions are targeted for completion/implementation by June 30, 2014

Sources: County of Napa, BAE, 2009.

Table H-H: Summary of Housing Element Programs (Page 3 of 4)

Plan Program	Action Step	Source of Financing	Action Agency	Action Date (a)
Program H-3e: Amend zoning ordinance to clarify that transitional and supportive housing facilities subject to the same restrictions as other residential dwellings.	Amend Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-3f: Require a preference for local workers, including farmworkers, in affordable housing developments assisted with Affordable Housing Fund monies.	Amend Affordable Housing Ordinance.	n.a.	Housing Trust Fund Board	2009
Program H-3g: Facilitate public/private partnerships and, when appropriate and available, use Affordable Housing Fund monies to help prevent the loss of privately owned farmworker housing facilities.	Form partnerships and allocate funds to preserve farmworker housing.	Affordable Housing Fund	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Housing Trust Fund Board	Ongoing
Program H-3h: Monitor the unmet need for farm worker housing throughout the harvest season.	Continue current program.	County Budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department;	Annually
Program H-3i: Clarify the Zoning Ordinance to conform to Ca. Health and Safety Codes 17021.5 and 17021.6.	Amend Zoning Ordinance.	County Budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-3j: Remove spacing requirements for medium and large residential care facilities. Relax location requirements for large residential care facilities.	Amend Zoning Ordinance.	County Budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
4. Housing Development				
Program H-4a: Establish local worker preferences in new affordable housing projects and explore application to market rate projects.	Amend Municipal Code.	County budget	BOS	Ongoing
Program H-4b: Continue allocating Affordable Housing Fund monies towards affordable housing developments in the cities, when available and appropriate.	Work with cities to establish a list of funding critia.	Affordable Housing Fund	Housing Trust Fund Board	2010
Program H-4c: Recommend appropriate changes to planning and zoning standards that minimize the conflicts between housing and agriculture as needed.	Continue to monitor for conflicts.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	Ongoing

Note:

(a) All actions are targeted for completion/implementation by June 30, 2014

Sources: County of Napa, BAE, 2009.

Table H-H: Summary of Housing Element Programs (Page 4 of 4)

Plan Program	Action Step	Source of Financing	Action Agency	Action Date (a)
Program H-4d: Amend the zoning ordinance to allow accessory residential units in commercial zones for moderate income and below households in commercial zones where applicable.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-4e: Rezone the Napa Pipe property for a minimum density of 20 du/ac. on at least 20 ac., subject to development and design standards.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance.	Development Application Fee	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2010
Program H-4f: Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow Single Room Occupancy units in all zones that allow multifamily housing.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2010
5. Removal of Government Constraints				
Program H-5a: Continue to provide fee waivers for non-profit affordable housing developers.	Continue current program.	n.a.	BOS	Ongoing
Program H-5b: Expedite permit processing for long-term affordable housing projects .	Fast-track affordable housing applications.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Ongoing
Program H-5c: Exempt affordable housing projects from the 30-acre minimum parcel size requirement for PD zones.	Amend the Zoning Ordinance.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
Program H-5d: The County shall implement and simplify its Growth Management System.	Amend Municipal Code.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department; Planning Commission; BOS	2009
6. Energy and Water Conservation				
Program H-6a: Encourage mixed-use development, where appropriate.	Provide technical assistance to project applicants.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Ongoing
Program H-6b: Continue to provide energy conservation assistance to homeowners, architects, developers, and contractors.	Provide technical assistance to project applicants.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	Ongoing
Program H-6c: Enforce current state-mandated standards governing the use of energy efficient construction, and update building code to incorporate green building standards.	Enforce and update building codes.	County budget	Conservation, Development, and Planning Department	2009

Note:

(a) All actions are targeted for completion/implementation by June 30, 2014

Sources: County of Napa, BAE, 2009.