



KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES
ADVISORS IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

ADVISORS IN:
Real Estate
Redevelopment
Affordable Housing
Economic Development

SAN FRANCISCO
A. Jerry Keyser
Timothy C. Kelly
Kate Earle Funk
Debbie M. Kern
Reed T. Kawahara
David Doezeza

LOS ANGELES
Kathleen H. Head
James A. Rabe
Gregory D. Soo-Hoo
Kevin E. Engstrom
Julie L. Romey

SAN DIEGO
Paul C. Marra

To: Jeffrey A. Bloom, Deputy City Manager
Economic & Community Development
City of Rancho Cucamonga

From: James Rabe, CRE

Date: March 31, 2016

Subject: Fiscal Analysis – Empire Lakes Project

At your request, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) has prepared a fiscal analysis of the proposed development at the Empire Lakes golf course (Project) and three alternatives considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The fiscal analysis has been prepared to provide the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) a comparison of the likely impacts on the City's General Fund from the development of the proposed project, two alternative developments and the existing golf course. The four alternatives evaluated are:

1. Proposed Project – 3,450 residential units and 220,000 square feet of non-residential uses
2. Lower Density Alternative – 2,650 residential units and 220,000 square feet of non-residential uses
3. Higher Density Alternative – 4,000 residential units and 220,000 square feet of non-residential uses
4. No Project/No Development – continued operation of the existing golf course

The fiscal analysis only considers the ongoing incremental effects on the General Fund. Initial capital requirements and obligations are usually addressed through development impact fees or other project mitigations. This analysis is organized as a memorandum supported by five detailed attachments with the supporting computations:

- I. Proposed Project
- II. Lower Density Alternative
- III. Higher Density Alternative
- IV. No Project Alternative – Existing Golf Course
- V. Methodology and Assumptions

Within the four development alternative attachments the tables are organized:

Table 1 – Fiscal Impact Summary

Table 2 – Recurring Revenues

Table 3 – Fiscal Costs

Table 4 – Assessed Value

Table 5 – Estimated Taxable Retail Expenditures

METHODOLOGY

The approach used in the fiscal analysis is to estimate public revenues based on specific parameters of the alternatives where appropriate (i.e. number and value of residential units, commercial square footage, value and sales per square foot for commercial uses), or based on the projected number of residents or employees for revenues that generally vary by population and/or employment.

Expenditures for police services are estimated based upon service calls for the various land uses. Other City service costs are estimated based on the number of persons served (a combination of residents and employees).

The City's approved budget for 2015 – 2016 was the primary source of information for this analysis, as well as the Development Impact Fee Study Report prepared in 2014.

KMA also reviewed the developer's proposed pricing and rents for the residential units, and compared those prices and rents to the current market. The proposed pricing and rents are reasonable in terms of the current market.

KMA also consulted with City staff regarding specific revenue and expense items:

- If the Project or either of the alternative developments go forward, it will be incorporated into several assessment-type districts (e.g. LMD 3B, 85-PD-R). Discussions with Staff indicate that current assessments are sufficient to cover

operating expenses but do not cover reserves for replacement. In the future the General Fund will be obligated to fund any shortfalls associated with operations or capital expenditures for these districts. Payments made by residential units and commercial space will be incremental to existing payments and will offset future General Fund obligations.

- Discussions with City Staff regarding the Police Department budget indicate that a significant portion of the annual budget is allocated to items that are not related to changes in service calls as a result of the development (e.g. pension obligations). It is assumed that approximately 10% of the police department budget represents a fixed expense, and 90% is a variable expense that is affected by the number of calls for service.
- Most residential projects in the City include homeowners associations and assessment-type districts that undertake and pay for street maintenance and park maintenance. Based on discussions with City staff, it is estimated that 75% of the Public Works budget represent services that are provided by Public Works for areas that are not covered by homeowners associations and assessment districts. It is assumed that the remaining 25% of the Public Works budget represents costs incurred at the general city level that will be affected by the development of the Project or alternative developments.

Fire services are provided through a separate fire district that is funded by a separate allocation of property tax revenues.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

The results of the fiscal analysis are shown in the attached Summary Table and are discussed below. As discussed above the detailed information and calculations are provided in Attachments I thru V.

Proposed Project

The Proposed Project is expected to consist of 3,450 residential units and 220,000 square feet of commercial space. The primary revenue sources are property taxes in-lieu of vehicle license fees (VLF) (\$656,747), sales tax revenues (\$572,499) and incremental assessment payments (\$433,936). The VLF payments come from the State to replace vehicle license fees that are no longer collected by the State. The sales tax revenues include incremental purchases made at the commercial portion of the Project, and resident's taxable purchases made in the City.

Property taxes are not a significant revenue source because the City only receives approximately 4.95% of base property tax revenues and that amount is split approximately 65% to the General Fund and 35% to cover library operations.

Total public revenues are estimated at over \$2.4 million annually.

Police department expenses amount to more than 50% of the costs associated with the project (\$1,191,774). The expenses would be significantly higher if Public Works costs were not expected to be covered by the homeowners associations and assessment-type districts. Total General Fund expenses are estimated at \$1,966,184.

The Proposed Project shows a net surplus of \$473,833. Nearly all of the surplus is associated with the incremental assessment payments that will be levied on the residential units and commercial square footage.

Lower Density Alternative

The Lower Density project is assumed to consist of 2,650 residential units and 220,000 square feet of commercial space. This alternative has a similar number of for-sale units as the Proposed Project and significantly fewer apartment units. As with the Proposed Project, the primary revenue sources are property taxes in-lieu of vehicle license fees (\$605,209), sales tax revenues (\$539,029) and incremental assessment payments (\$317,352).

Total public revenues are estimated at more than \$2.1 million annually.

As with the Proposed Project, police department expenses are the greatest cost to the City. Police expenditures represent 60% of incremental costs. Overall expenses amount to \$1,552,117.

This alternative has a net surplus of \$584,282, the largest surplus of any of the alternatives evaluated. The surplus is driven by the incremental assessment district payments and fewer residents in this alternative.

Higher Density Alternative

The Higher Density project is assumed to consist of 4,000 residential units and 220,000 square feet of commercial space. This alternative has both more for-sale units and more apartment units. However, there are no detached single family units. All of the residential units are multi-family units. As with the Proposed Project, the primary revenue sources are property taxes in-lieu of vehicle license fees (\$713,653), sales tax revenues (\$599,709) and incremental assessment payments (\$514,087).

Total public revenues are estimated at nearly \$2.7 million annually.

As with the Proposed Project, police department expenses are the greatest cost to the City. Police expenditures represent 61% of incremental costs. Overall expenses amount to \$2.24 million.

This alternative has a net surplus of \$436,703. The incremental assessment revenues are greater than the surplus.

No Project Alternative – Existing Golf Course

The existing golf course has a minimal impact on the City's General Fund.

The existing golf course has an assessed valuation of approximately \$4,170,000. Including an allowance for unsecured property, it might have an overall assessed value of \$4.3 million, which generates approximately \$1,000 to the General Fund. Likewise, sales tax revenues from the site are limited, estimated at approximately \$3,500.

Overall it is estimated that the existing golf course provides slightly more than \$9,300 in revenues to the General Fund.

By the same token, the existing golf course does not generate significant costs to the City. Total expenses are approximately \$4,200.

The golf course is estimated to provide a small annual surplus of approximately \$5,100.

CONCLUSIONS

All three of the development alternatives are estimated to have a positive impact on the City's General Fund. The net benefit ranges from approximately \$437,000 for the Higher Density Alternative to approximately \$584,000 for the Lower Density Alternative. The Proposed Project is in between these alternatives.

The primary reason for the surplus is the incremental revenues that the development will provide to the existing assessment-type districts that serve the area. As discussed above, these districts do not (or will not) generate sufficient revenues to cover both operations costs and capital replacement. Any deficiencies will become an obligation of the General Fund. The revenues received from the development will reduce the General Fund obligation.

The existing golf course provides a very small net annual benefit to the General Fund of approximately \$5,100.

SUMMARY TABLE

**FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY - DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

	<u>Proposed Project</u>	<u>Lower Density Alternative</u>	<u>Higher Density Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative</u>
Housing Units	3,450	2,650	4,000	
Nonresidential Square Footage	220,000	220,000	220,000	3,000
Estimate of Development Value	\$917,500,000	\$883,209,300	\$1,041,466,200	\$4,170,000
Estimated Population	8,328	6,558	9,400	
Employment	732	732	732	25
Persons Served	8,693	6,923	9,766	13
<u>Revenues</u>				
City Property Tax Revenue	\$306,000	\$282,000	\$333,000	\$1,000
Real Property Transfer Tax	25,231	23,251	27,418	115
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF	656,747	605,209	713,653	2,985
Sales Tax	572,499	539,029	599,709	3,456
Use Tax	65,437	61,611	68,547	395
Proposition 172 Sales Tax	14,987	14,111	15,699	90
Franchise Fees	256,503	203,505	290,256	514
Busines License	19,036	19,036	19,036	650
Fines & Forfeitures	26,072	20,764	29,289	37
Municipal Utility Transfer	49,663	39,552	55,790	71
Incremental Assessment Revenues	433,936	317,352	514,087	
<u>Other General Revenues</u>	<u>13,907</u>	<u>10,981</u>	<u>15,680</u>	<u>5</u>
Total Revenues	\$2,440,017	\$2,136,399	\$2,682,162	\$9,319
<u>Costs</u>				
Police Department	\$1,191,774	\$936,766	\$1,371,773	\$2,575
Animal Care	100,800	80,300	113,200	100
Community Services	195,900	156,100	220,100	300
Economic & community Development	29,000	23,100	32,600	0
Building & Safety	61,300	48,800	68,800	100
Engineering	71,400	56,800	80,200	100
Planning	6,600	5,300	7,400	0
Public Works	104,000	82,800	116,800	600
<u>General Government</u>	<u>205,410</u>	<u>162,152</u>	<u>234,586</u>	<u>440</u>
Total Costs	\$1,966,184	\$1,552,117	\$2,245,459	\$4,215
Net Benefit (Cost)	\$473,833	\$584,282	\$436,703	\$5,104

Attachment I
Proposed Project

TABLE I-1

**FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY - PROPOSED PROJECT
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Housing Units		3,450
Nonresidential Square Footage		220,000
Estimate of Development Value		\$917,500,000
Estimated Population		8,328
Employment		732
Persons Served		8,693
<u>Revenues</u>	See Table I-2	
City Property Tax Revenue		\$306,000
Real Property Transfer Tax		25,231
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF		656,747
Sales Tax		572,499
Use Tax		65,437
Proposition 172 Sales Tax		14,987
Franchise Fees		256,503
Business License		19,036
Fines & Forfeitures		26,072
Municipal Utility Transfer		49,663
Incremental Assessment Revenues		433,936
<u>Other General Revenues</u>		<u>13,907</u>
Total Revenues		\$2,440,017
<u>Costs</u>	See Table I-3	
Police Department		\$1,191,774
Animal Care		100,800
Community Services		195,900
Economic & community Development		29,000
Building & Safety		61,300
Engineering		71,400
Planning		6,600
Public Works		104,000
<u>General Government</u>		<u>205,410</u>
Total Costs		\$1,966,184
Net Benefit (Cost)		\$473,833

TABLE I - 2

**RECURRING REVENUE FACTORS - PROPOSED PROJECT
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Population	8,328
Employees	732
Persons Served	8,693
Housing Units	2,200

Category	Rate ³	PAMF Total
Local Taxes		
Local Property Taxes Paid	See Table I-4	\$9,584,000
City Share of Property Tax Rate	See Table I-4	\$306,000
Real Property Transfer Tax	See Table I-4	25,231
Property Tax In-lieu of VLF	\$715.80 per \$million AV	656,747
Retail Sales Tax	See Table I-5	572,499
Use Tax		65,437
Prop 172		14,987
Franchise Fees	See Table V-3	256,503
Busines License	See Table V-3	19,036
Fines & Forfeitures	See Table V-3	26,072
Municipal Utility Transfer	See Table V-3	49,663
Incremental Assessment Revenues	See Table V-6	433,936
<u>Other General Revenues</u>	See Table V-3	<u>13,907</u>
Total		\$2,440,017

TABLE I - 3

FISCAL COST - PROPOSED PROJECT
 EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

Population	8,328
Employment	732
Persons Served	8,693

	Cost Factor	Description	Alternative Cost
<u>Police Department</u>	\$222.91	1 Per Service Call	\$1,191,774
<u>Animal Care</u>	\$11.59	2 Per person served	\$100,800
<u>Community Services</u>	\$22.54	2 Per person served	\$195,900
<u>Economic & community Development</u>	\$3.34	2 Per person served	\$29,000
<u>Building & Safety</u>	\$7.05	2 Per person served	\$61,300
<u>Engineering</u>	\$8.21	2 Per person served	\$71,400
<u>Planning</u>	\$0.76	2 Per person served	\$6,600
<u>Public Works</u>	\$11.96	2 Per person served	\$104,000
<u>General Government</u>	11.7%	2 Overhead Allowance	<u>\$205,410</u>
Total			\$1,966,184

¹ See Table V-4

² See Table V-5

TABLE I - 4

**ASSESSED VALUE - PROPOSED PROJECT
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

<i>Residential Units</i>	Total Units	Assessed Value per / Unit	Total Assessed Value
For Sale - Detached	200	\$375,000	\$75,000,000
For Sale - Attached	1,050	\$310,000	\$325,500,000
Apartments	2,200	\$215,000	\$473,000,000
Total	3,450		\$873,500,000
<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	Total SF	Assessed Value per SF	Total Assessed Value
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	23,000,000
Office	80,000	\$200.00	16,000,000
Total	220,000		\$44,000,000
Total Secured Value			\$917,500,000
Unsecured Valuation		4.46%	\$40,920,500
Total Assessed Valuation			\$958,420,500
Property Tax			
Local Property Tax Rate	1.0000%		\$9,584,000
City Share of Property Tax Revenues	3.1933%		\$306,000
Property Transfer Tax			
Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$873,500,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$43,675,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Residential Transfer Tax			\$24,021
Non-Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$44,000,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$2,200,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Non-residential Transfer Tax			\$1,210
Total Property Transfer Tax			\$25,231

TABLE I-5

**ESTIMATED TAXABLE RETAIL EXPENDITURES
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Resident local taxable sales	See Table V-2	\$33,652,000
Employee local taxable sales	See Table V-1	\$1,097,857

<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	Total SF	Sales per SF	Transfers	
Transit	25,000	\$200		\$5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200	30%	\$16,100,000
Office	80,000	\$25	30%	\$1,400,000
Total				\$22,500,000
Total Taxable Sales				\$57,249,857
Local Sales Tax			1.00%	\$572,499
Use Tax as a % of point of Sales Tax			11.43%	\$65,437
Total Sales and Use Tax				\$637,935

Proposition 172 - Half Cent Sales Tax

Budgeted Proposition 172 sales tax (FY2015 - 16)	\$500,920
Budgeted Sales and Use Tax (2015 - 16)	\$21,322,550
Proposition 172 sales tax per \$1,000 sales and use tax	\$23.49
Projected Sales and Use Tax to City	\$637,935
Projected Proposition 172 Sales Tax to City	\$14,987

Attachment II

Lower Density Alternative

TABLE II - 1

**FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Housing Units	2,650
Nonresidential Square Footage	220,000
Estimate of Development Value	883,209,300
Estimated Population	6,558
Employment	732
Persons Served	6,923

<u>Revenues</u>	See Table II - 2	
City Property Tax Revenue		\$282,000
Real Property Transfer Tax		23,251
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF		605,209
Sales Tax		539,029
Use Tax		61,611
Proposition 172 Sales Tax		14,111
Franchise Fees		203,505
Busines License		19,036
Fines & Forfeitures		20,764
Municipal Utility Transfer		39,552
Incremental Assessment Revenues		317,352
<u>Other General Revenues</u>		<u>10,981</u>
Total Revenues		\$2,136,399

<u>Costs</u>	See Table II - 3	
Police Department		\$936,766
Animal Care		80,300
Community Services		156,100
Economic & community Development		23,100
Building & Safety		48,800
Engineering		56,800
Planning		5,300
Public Works		82,800
<u>General Government</u>		<u>162,152</u>
Total Costs		\$1,552,117
Net Benefit (Cost)		\$584,282

TABLE II - 2

**RECURRING REVENUE FACTORS - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Population	6,558
Employees	732
Persons Served	6,923
Housing Units	2,650

<u>Category</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Retail Total</u>
Local Taxes		
Local Property Taxes	See Table II-4	\$8,832,000
City Share of Property Tax Rate	See Table II-4	\$282,000
Real Property Transfer Tax	See Table II-4	23,251
Property Tax In-lieu of VLF	\$715.80 per \$million AV	605,209
Retail Sales Tax	See Table II-5	539,029
Use Tax	See Table II-5	61,611
Prop 172	See Table II-5	14,111
Franchise Fees	See Table V-3	203,505
Busines License	See Table V-3	19,036
Fines & Forfeitures	See Table V-3	20,764
Municipal Utility Transfer	See Table V-3	39,552
Incremental Assessment Revenues	See Table V-6	317,352
<u>Other General Revenues</u>	See Table V-3	<u>10,981</u>
Total		\$2,136,399

TABLE II - 3

FISCAL COST - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
 EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

Population	6,558		
Employment	732		
Persons Served	6,923	Population plus 50% of employment	
	<u>Cost Factor</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Retail Cost</u>
<u>Police Department</u>	\$222.91	1 Per Service Call	\$936,766
<u>Animal Care</u>	\$11.59	2 Per person served	\$80,300
<u>Community Services</u>	\$22.54	2 Per person served	\$156,100
<u>Economic & community Development</u>	\$3.34	2 Per person served	\$23,100
<u>Building & Safety</u>	\$7.05	2 Per person served	\$48,800
<u>Engineering</u>	\$8.21	2 Per person served	\$56,800
<u>Planning</u>	\$0.76	2 Per person served	\$5,300
<u>Public Works</u>	\$11.96	2 Per person served	\$82,800
<u>General Government</u>	11.7%	2 Overhead allowance	\$162,152
Total			\$1,552,117

¹ See Table V-5

² See Table V-4

TABLE II - 4

**ASSESSED VALUE - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

<i>Residential Units</i>	Total Units	Assessed Value per / Unit	Total Assessed Value
For Sale - Detached	300	\$420,000	\$126,000,000
For Sale - Attached	800	\$360,000	\$288,000,000
Apartments	1,550	\$250,000	\$387,500,000
Total	2,650		\$801,500,000

<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	Total SF	Assessed Value per SF	Total Assessed Value
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	23,000,000
Office	80,000	\$200.00	16,000,000
Total	220,000		\$44,000,000

Total Secured Value			\$845,500,000
Unsecured Valuation		4.46%	\$37,709,300
Total Assessed Valuation			\$883,209,300
Property Tax			
Property Tax Rate	1.0000%		\$8,832,000
City Share of Property Tax Revenues	3.1933%		\$282,000

Property Transfer Tax

Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$801,500,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$40,075,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Residential Transfer Tax			\$22,041
Non-Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$44,000,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$2,200,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Non-residential Transfer Tax			\$1,210
Total Property Transfer Tax			\$23,251

TABLE II - 5

**ESTIMATED TAXABLE SALES - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Resident local taxable sales		See Table V-2		\$30,305,000
Employee local taxable sales		See Table V-1		\$1,097,857
<i>Non-Residential (square f</i>	<u>Total SF</u>	<u>Sales per SF</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	
Transit	25,000	\$200		\$5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200	30%	\$16,100,000
Office	80,000	\$25	30%	\$1,400,000
<u>Total</u>				\$22,500,000
Total Taxable Sales				\$53,902,857
Local Sales Tax			1.00%	\$539,029
Use Tax as a % of point of Sales Tax			11.43%	\$61,611
Total Sales and Use Tax				\$600,640

Proposition 172 - Half Cent Sales Tax

Budgeted Proposition 172 sales tax (FY2015 - 16)	\$500,920
Budgeted Sales and Use Tax (2015 - 16)	\$21,322,550
Proposition 172 sales tax per \$1,000 sales and use tax	\$23.49
Projected Sales and Use Tax to City	\$600,640
Projected Proposition 172 Sales Tax to City	\$14,111

Attachment III
Higher Density Alternative

TABLE III - 1

**FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY - HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Housing Units	4,000
Nonresidential Square Footage	220,000
Estimate of Development Value	\$1,041,466,200
Estimated Population	9,400
Employment	732
Persons Served	9,766

<u>Revenues</u>	See Table III - 2	
City Property Tax Revenue		\$333,000
Real Property Transfer Tax		27,418
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF		713,653
Sales Tax		599,709
Use Tax		68,547
Proposition 172 Sales Tax		15,699
Franchise Fees		290,256
Busines License		19,036
Fines & Forfeitures		29,289
Municipal Utility Transfer		55,790
Incremental Assessment Revenues		514,087
<u>Other General Revenues</u>		<u>15,680</u>

Total Revenues \$2,682,162

<u>Costs</u>	See Table III - 3	
Police Department		\$1,371,773
Animal Care		\$113,200
Community Services		220,100
Economic & community Development		32,600
Building & Safety		68,800
Engineering		80,200
Planning		7,400
Public Works		116,800
<u>General Government</u>		<u>234,586</u>

Total Costs \$2,245,459

Net Benefit (Cost) \$436,703

TABLE III - 2

**RECURRING REVENUE FACTORS - HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Population	9,400
Employees	732
Persons Served	9,766
Housing Units	4,000

Category	Rate	Auto Center Total
Local Taxes		
City Property Tax Rate	See Table III - 4	\$10,415,000
City Share of Property Tax Rate	See Table III - 4	333,000
Real Property Transfer Tax	See Table III - 4	27,418
Property Tax In-lieu of VLF	\$715.80 per \$million AV	713,653
Retail Sales Tax	See Table III - 5	599,709
Use Tax	See Table III - 5	68,547
Prop 172	See Table III - 5	15,699
Franchise Fees	See Table V - 3	290,256
Busines License	See Table V - 3	19,036
Fines & Forfeitures	See Table V - 3	29,289
Municipal Utility Transfer	See Table V - 3	55,790
Incremental Assessment Revenues	See Table V - 6	514,087
Other General Revenues	See Table V - 3	<u>15,680</u>
Total		\$2,682,162

TABLE III - 3

FISCAL COST - LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

Population	9,400		
Employment	732		
Persons Served	9,766		
	<u>Cost Factor</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Auto Center Cost</u>
<u>Police Department</u>	\$222.91	1 Per Service Call	\$1,371,773
<u>Animal Care</u>	\$11.59	2 Per person served	\$113,200
<u>Community Services</u>	\$22.54	2 Per person served	\$220,100
<u>Economic & community Development</u>	\$3.34	2 Per person served	\$32,600
<u>Building & Safety</u>	\$7.05	2 Per person served	\$68,800
<u>Engineering</u>	\$8.21	2 Per person served	\$80,200
<u>Planning</u>	\$0.76	2 Per person served	\$7,400
<u>Public Works</u>	\$11.96	2 Per person served	\$116,800
<u>General Government</u>	11.7%	2 Overhead Allowance	<u>\$234,586</u>
<hr/>			
Total			\$2,245,459

¹ See Table V - 5

² See Table V - 4

TABLE III - 4

**ASSESSED VALUE - HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

<i>Residential Units</i>	Total Units	Assessed Value per / Unit	Total Assessed Value
For Sale - Detached	0	\$375,000	\$0
For Sale - Attached	1,400	\$300,000	\$420,000,000
Apartments	2,600	\$205,000	\$533,000,000
Total	4,000		\$953,000,000

<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	Total SF	Assessed Value per SF	Total Assessed Value
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	23,000,000
Office	80,000	\$200.00	16,000,000
Total	220,000		\$44,000,000

Total Secured Value			\$997,000,000
Unsecured Valuation		4.46%	\$44,466,200
Total Assessed Valuation			\$1,041,466,200
Property Tax			
Property Tax Rate	1.0000%		\$10,415,000
City Share of Property Tax Revenues	3.1933%		\$333,000
Property Transfer Tax			
Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$953,000,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$47,650,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Residential Transfer Tax			\$26,208
Non-Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$44,000,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$2,200,000
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Non-residential Transfer Tax			\$1,210
Total Property Transfer Tax			\$27,418

TABLE III - 5

**ESTIMATED TAXABLE SALES - HIGHER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Resident local taxable sales		See Table V-2		\$36,373,000
Employee local taxable sales		See Table V-1		\$1,097,857
<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	<u>Total SF</u>	<u>Sales per SF</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	
Transit	25,000	\$200		\$5,000,000
Retail	115,000	\$200	30%	\$16,100,000
Office	80,000	\$25	30%	\$1,400,000
Total				\$22,500,000
Total Taxable Sales				\$59,970,857
Local Sales Tax			1.00%	\$599,709
Use Tax as a % of point of Sales Tax			11.43%	\$68,547
Total Sales and Use Tax				\$668,255

Proposition 172 - Half Cent Sales Tax

Budgeted Proposition 172 sales tax (FY2015 - 16)	\$500,920
Budgeted Sales and Use Tax (2015 - 16)	\$21,322,550
Proposition 172 sales tax per \$1,000 sales and use tax	\$23.49
Projected Sales and Use Tax to City	\$668,255
Projected Proposition 172 Sales Tax to City	\$15,699

Attachment IV

No Project Alternative

Existing Golf Course

TABLE IV-1

**FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY - EXISTING GOLF COURSE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Housing Units		0
Nonresidential Square Footage		3,000
Existing Development Value		\$4,170,000
Estimated Population		0
Employment		25
Persons Served		13
<u>Revenues</u>	See Table IV-2	
City Property Tax Revenue		\$1,000
Real Property Transfer Tax		115
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF		2,985
Sales Tax		3,456
Use Tax		395
Proposition 172 Sales Tax		90
Franchise Fees		514
Business License		650
Fines & Forfeitures		37
Municipal Utility Transfer		71
<u>Other General Revenues</u>		<u>5</u>
Total Revenues		\$9,319
<u>Costs</u>	See Table IV-3	
Police Department		\$2,575
Animal Care		100
Community Services		300
Economic & community Development		0
Building & Safety		100
Engineering		100
Planning		0
Public Works		600
<u>General Government</u>		<u>440</u>
Total Costs		\$4,215
Net Benefit (Cost)		\$5,104

TABLE IV - 2

**RECURRING REVENUE FACTORS - EXISTING GOLF COURSE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Population	0
Employees	25
Persons Served	13
Housing Units	0

<u>Category</u>	<u>Rate ³</u>	<u>PAMF Total</u>
Local Taxes		
Local Property Taxes Paid	See Table IV-4	\$44,000
City Share of Property Tax Rate	See Table IV-4	\$1,000
Real Property Transfer Tax	See Table IV-4	115
Property Tax In-lieu of VLF	\$715.80 per \$million AV	2,985
Retail Sales Tax	See Table IV-5	3,456
Use Tax		395
Prop 172		90
Franchise Fees	See Table V-3	514
Busines License	See Table V-3	650
Fines & Forfeitures	See Table V-3	37
Municipal Utility Transfer	See Table V-3	\$71
<u>Other General Revenues</u>	See Table V-3	<u>5</u>
Total		\$9,319

TABLE IV - 3

**FISCAL COST - EXISTING GOLF COURSE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Population	0
Golf Course Employment	25
Persons Served	13

	Cost Factor	Description	Alternative Cost
<u>Police Department</u>	\$222.91	1 Per Service Call	\$2,575
<u>Animal Care</u>	\$11.59	2 Per person served	\$100
<u>Community Services</u>	\$22.54	2 Per person served	\$300
<u>Economic & community Development</u>	\$3.34	2 Per person served	\$0
<u>Building & Safety</u>	\$7.05	2 Per person served	\$100
<u>Engineering</u>	\$8.21	2 Per person served	\$100
<u>Planning</u>	\$0.76	2 Per person served	\$0
<u>Public Works</u>	\$47.83	2 Per person served	\$600
<u>General Government</u>	11.7%	2 Overhead Allowance	\$440
Total			\$4,215

¹ See Table V-5

² See Table V-4

TABLE IV - 4

**ASSESSED VALUE - EXISTING GOLF COURSE
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

<i>Residential Units</i>	Total Units	Assessed Value per / Unit	Total Assessed Value
For Sale - Detached	0	\$375,000	\$0
For Sale - Attached	0	\$310,000	\$0
Apartments	0	\$215,000	\$0
Total	0		\$0

<i>Non-Residential (square feet)</i>	Total SF	Assessed Value per SF	Total Assessed Value
Existing Golf Course	3,000	\$1,390.00	4,170,000
Retail	0	\$200.00	0
Office	0	\$200.00	0
Total	3,000		\$4,170,000

Total Secured Value			\$4,170,000
Unsecured Valuation		4.46%	\$185,982
Total Assessed Valuation			\$4,355,982

Property Tax			
Local Property Tax Rate	1.0000%		\$44,000
City Share of Property Tax Revenues	3.1933%		\$1,000

Property Transfer Tax

Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$0
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$0
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Residential Transfer Tax			\$0
Non-Residential			
Assessed Valuation			\$4,170,000
Annual turnover			5.00%
Value of Annual Turnover			\$208,500
Tax Rate			0.0550%
Non-residential Transfer Tax			\$115
Total Property Transfer Tax			\$115

TABLE IV-5

**ESTIMATED TAXABLE RETAIL EXPENDITURES
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Resident local taxable sales				\$0
Employee local taxable spending		See Table V-1		\$45,625

<u>Non-Residential (square feet)</u>	<u>Total SF</u>	<u>Sales per SF</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	
Golf Course	3,000	\$100		\$300,000
Retail	0	\$200	30%	\$0
Office	0	\$25	30%	<u>\$0</u>
Total				\$300,000
Total Taxable Sales				\$345,625
Local Sales Tax			1.00%	\$3,456
Use Tax as a % of point of Sales Tax			11.43%	\$395
Total Sales and Use Tax				\$3,851

Proposition 172 - Half Cent Sales Tax

Budgeted Proposition 172 sales tax (FY2015 - 16)	\$500,920
Budgeted Sales and Use Tax (2015 - 16)	\$21,322,550
Proposition 172 sales tax per \$1,000 sales and use tax	\$23.49
Projected Sales and Use Tax to City	\$3,851
Projected Proposition 172 Sales Tax to City	\$90

Attachment V

Methodology and Assumptions

TABLE V-1 ASSUMPTIONS

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

PROPOSED PROJECT

	Total Units	Market Value per / Unit	Residents per Unit ¹	Population	Household Income
Residential Units					
For Sale - Detached	200	\$375,000	3.45	690	\$82,200
For Sale - Attached Apartments	1,050	\$310,000	2.35	2,468	\$76,200
Monthly Rent	2,200	\$215,000	2.35	5,170	\$54,900
Total	3,450	\$1,600		8,328	
	Total SF	Value per SF	SF per Employee	Employees	Employee Taxable Spendin
Non-Residential (square feet)					
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	300	83	
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	350	329	
Office	80,000	\$200.00	250	320	
Total	220,000			732	\$1,097,857

LOWER DENSITY

	Total Units	Market Value per Unit	Residents per Unit	Population	Household Income
Residential Units					
For Sale - Detached	300	\$420,000	3.45	1,035	\$103,300
For Sale - Attached Apartments	800	\$360,000	2.35	1,880	\$88,600
Monthly Rent	1,550	\$250,000	2.35	3,643	\$61,700
Total	2,650	\$1,800		6,558	
	Total SF	Value per SF	SF per Employee	Employees	Employee Taxable Spendin
Non-Residential (square feet)					
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	300	83	
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	350	329	
Office	80,000	\$200.00	250	320	
Total	220,000			732	\$1,097,857

HIGHER DENSITY

	Total Units	Market Value per Unit	Residents per Unit	Population	Household Income
Residential Units					
For Sale - Detached	0	\$375,000	3.45	0	\$92,200
For Sale - Attached Apartments	1,400	\$300,000	2.35	3,290	\$73,800
Monthly Rent	2,600	\$205,000	2.35	6,110	\$51,400
Total	4,000	\$1,500		9,400	
	Total SF	Value per SF	SF per Employee	Employees	Employee Taxable Spendin
Non-Residential (square feet)					
Transit	25,000	\$200.00	300	83	
Retail	115,000	\$200.00	350	329	
Office	80,000	\$200.00	250	320	
Total	220,000			732	\$1,097,857

	FY 2004-05	FY2015-16	Increase
Property Tax in-lieu of VLF			
Property tax vehicle license fees	9,209,981.00	16,474,380.00	7,264,399.00
Assessed Valuation (\$ millions)	12,541,601,225	22,690,238,812	10,148,637,587
VLF Increase per Assessed Valuation			0.0007158
VLF Increase per \$1,000,000 increase in AV			\$715.80

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

¹ Residents per unit based on 2014 Development Impact Fee Study.

Property Tax		
Property Tax Rate	1.0000%	
Gen Fund Share of Property Tax	3.1933%	City allocation is split between General Fund and Library
Unsecured Tax as % of Secured	4.46%	Adopted Budget 2015-16
Use Tax Pct of Point of Sale		
	11.43%	Average 2013 - 2015 per HdL reports
Housing down payment		
Housing Mortgage	15%	KMA assumption
	6.00%	30 Years
Housing payments as % of income		
Taxes & Insurance	33%	Derived from Consumer Expenditure Survey, September 2011
Taxable Sales as % of income	2%	KMA assumption
Resident sales spent locally	30.7%	CA BOE, Economic Perspective, August 2010 for higher family incomes
Rent as a % of income	50%	KMA assumption
	35%	Derived from Consumer Expenditure Survey, September 2011
% retail sales transferred		
Employee taxable spending (day)	30%	KMA assumption
	\$5.00	Derived from ICSC worker spending study
Residential Turnover Rate		
Residential turnover Rate	5.00%	HdL review of residential sales for 2015, rounded to nearest whole percent.
Non-residential turnover Rate	5.00%	KMA assumption

TABLE V-2

**DERIVATION OF RESIDENT SPENDING
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

PROPOSED PROJECT

	Units	Annual Income	Total Income	Taxable Spending
<i>Residential Units</i>				
For Sale - Detached	200	\$92,200	\$18,440,000	\$5,661,080
For Sale - Attached	1,050	\$76,200	\$80,010,000	\$24,563,070
Apartments	<u>2,200</u>	\$54,900	\$120,780,000	<u>\$37,079,460</u>
Total	3,450			\$67,303,610
Percentage Spent Locally				50%
Local Taxable spending				\$33,652,000

LOWER DENSITY PROJECT

	Units	Annual Income	Total Income	Taxable Spending
<i>Residential Units</i>				
For Sale - Detached	300	\$103,300	\$30,990,000	\$9,513,930
For Sale - Attached	800	\$88,500	\$70,800,000	\$21,735,600
Apartments	<u>1,550</u>	\$61,700	\$95,635,000	<u>\$29,359,945</u>
Total	2,650			\$60,609,475
Percentage Spent Locally				50%
Local Taxable spending				\$30,305,000

LOWER DENSITY PROJECT

	Units	Annual Income	Total Income	Taxable Spending
<i>Residential Units</i>				
For Sale - Detached	0	\$92,200	\$0	\$0
For Sale - Attached	1,400	\$73,800	\$103,320,000	\$31,719,240
Apartments	<u>2,600</u>	\$51,400	\$133,640,000	<u>\$41,027,480</u>
Total	4,000			\$72,746,720
Percentage Spent Locally				50%
Local Taxable spending				\$36,373,000

TABLE V-3

FISCAL REVENUE FACTORS
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

Revenue Item	Allocation	Revenue Factor	Proposed	Lower Density	Higher Density	Existing Golf Course
Population			8,328	6,558	9,400	0
Employment			732	732	732	25
Persons Served			8,693	6,923	9,766	13
Housing Units			3,450	2,650	4,000	0
4130 Franchise Fee-Gas & Electric	person served	\$12.90	\$112,112	\$89,286	\$125,943	\$161
4131 Franchise Fee-Resid. Refuse	per capita	\$5.69	47,404	37,328	53,509	0
4132 Franchise Fee-Comm. Refuse	per employee	\$14.10	10,320	10,320	10,320	353
4133 Franchise Fee-Cable	per unit	\$25.12	86,668	66,571	100,485	0
4201 Business Licenses	per employee	\$25.12	18,388	18,388	18,388	628
4231 Business Licenses-P/Y	per employee	\$0.15	113	113	113	4
4232 Business Licenses-Penalties	per employee	\$0.73	535	535	535	18
4301 Vehicle Code Fines	person served	\$0.38	3,343	2,663	3,756	5
4302 Parking Citations	person served	\$1.07	9,331	7,431	10,482	13
4306 Vehicle Release Fees	person served	\$0.82	7,095	5,650	7,970	10
4307 Citation Proof of Corr Fees	person served	\$0.01	45	36	51	0
4308 General Ordinance Fines	person served	\$0.20	1,753	1,396	1,969	3
4309 False Alarm Fees	person served	\$0.18	1,532	1,220	1,721	2
4310 Loud Party Ordinance Fines	person served	\$0.00	4	3	4	0
4313 Other Fines & Forfeitures	person served	\$0.34	2,970	2,366	3,337	4
4419 Other Rental/Lease Income	per capita	\$0.14	1,146	902	1,293	0
4560 Fingerprint Fees	per capita	\$0.24	2,011	1,584	2,270	0
4564 Returned Item Charge	person served	\$0.00	20	16	23	0
4570 Sale of Printed Materials	person served	\$0.07	591	471	664	1
4701 Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Fees	Per capita	\$0.42	3,510	2,764	3,962	0
4710 Homeowners Property Tax Relief	Per capita	\$0.46	3,860	3,039	4,357	0
4905 Contributions/Fundraising	person served	\$0.32	2,769	2,205	3,111	4
8705 Transfer In-Municipal Utility	person served	\$5.71	\$49,663	\$39,552	\$55,790	\$71

Sources: City of Rancho Cucamonga, Adopted Budget 2015-2016 Budget.

TABLE V-4

METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING THE COST OF CITY SERVICES
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

Budget Categories	Rancho Cucamonga Adopted Budget 2015-16 (A)	Less: Fees, Permits, Licenses And Other Funds (B)	Net Expenditures ¹ (C=A-B)	Average Cost Allocation ² (D)	Allocable Expenses (E=CxD)	Average Cost Allocable Per Person Served ³ (F=E / 219,747)
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
City Council	129,070					
City Clerk	1,960					
City Treasurer	12,130					
City Management	1,554,230					
Records Management	482,910					
Administrative Services	6,680,580					
Finance	1,512,520					
Human Resources	752,770					
Information Technology	2,924,800					
Total	\$ 14,050,970					
Police	33,432,190	\$ -	- Case study, See Table V-5			
Animal Care	3,038,880	\$ 491,000	\$ 2,547,880	100%	\$ 2,547,880	\$ 11.59
Community Services	4,952,990	-	4,952,990	100%	4,952,990	22.54
Econ & Comm Development	732,940	-	732,940	100%	732,940	3.34
Building & Safety	2,717,600	\$ 1,169,270	\$ 1,548,330	100%	\$ 1,548,330	7.05
Engineering	2,554,350	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,804,350	100%	\$ 1,804,350	8.21
Planning	2,283,290	2,116,320	166,970	100%	166,970	0.76
Public Works	10,510,310	-	10,510,310	25%	2,627,578	11.96
Subtotal Departments	60,222,550	-	60,222,550			
General Government as Pct of Departments	23.3%					
Estimated marginal cost at 50%	11.7%					
TOTAL	\$ 74,273,520	\$ 4,526,590	\$ 82,486,320		\$ 14,381,038	\$ 65

Sources: City of Rancho Cucamonga, Adopted Budget 2015-2016 Budget.

¹ Expenditures paid by the General Fund after deducting specific revenue sources.

² Discussions with Public Works indicates that approximately 75% of street and park maintenance costs are project specific costs that are borne by the project. Remaining costs are spread citywide.

³ KMA estimate based on City budget and demographic information.

TABLE V-5

**POLICE SERVICE COST ALLOCATIONS
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA**

Police Budget FY 2012 -13	\$25,942,919	90% of actual cost per 2014-15 adopted budget to adjust for fixed portion of police budget
Service Calls 2012	121,958	Development Impact Fee Study, 2014
Estimated Cost per Call (2012)	\$212.72	
CPI Adjustment Jul 2012 to Jul 2015	4.79%	
2015-16 Adjusted cost per call	\$222.91	
Calls by Use from Development Impact Fee Study		
Residential - Detached	1.25 per unit	
Residential - Attached	1.41 per unit	
Commercial / Retail	3.85 per 1,000 SF	
Office	0.89 per 1,000 SF	
	Proposed	Lower Density
For Sale - Detached	200	300
For Sale - Attached	1,050	800
Apartments	2,200	1,550
Retail	115,000	115,000
Office	80,000	80,000
		Higher Density
		0
		1,400
		2,600
		115,000
		80,000
Calls by use		
For Sale - Detached	250	375
For Sale - Attached	1,481	1,128
Apartments	3,102	2,186
Retail	443	443
Office	71	71
Total Calls	5,346	4,202
Total Cost	\$1,191,774	\$936,766
		\$1,371,773

TABLE V-6

INCREMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVENUES
EMPIRE LAKES SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CALIFORNIA

	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Lower Density</u>	<u>Higher Density</u>
Residential Units Fee per Unit	3,450 \$145.73	2,650 \$145.73	4,000 \$145.73
Residential Revenues	\$502,769	\$386,185	\$582,920
Commercial Acreage Fee per Acre	8.50 \$673.96	8.50 \$673.96	8.50 \$673.96
Commercial Revenues	<u>\$5,729</u>	<u>\$5,729</u>	<u>\$5,729</u>
Total New Revenues	\$508,497	\$391,913	\$588,649
Current Revenues from Site	\$74,562	\$74,562	\$74,562
Net New Assessment Revenues	\$433,936	\$317,352	\$514,087

Source: City of Rancho Cucamonga Special Districts Division

Table LU-8: Mixed Use: Foothill Boulevard and Mayten Avenue

Land Use	Percent Range	Acreage Range Average Density (du/acre) Dwelling Unit Range	Estimated "Most Case" Acres/Dwelling Units (du)
Commercial	40%-60%	19.1-28.7 acres	28.7 acres
Office – professional	6%-10%	2.9-4.8 acres	4.8 acres
Public/Quasi-Public – parks/public plazas	4%	1.9 acres	1.9 acres
Residential	26%-50%	12.4-23.9 acres @ 24 - 30 du/acre 298 to 717 du	12.4 acres @ 30 du/acre 372 du
Totals	100%	47.8 acres	47.8 acres

Note:

1. Indicates target density, not a range. Actual density may increase up to 30 du/ac as long as the total of 717 dwelling units is not exceeded.

The residential component will provide connections in the form of small interior streets and pedestrian paseos to the commercial and office components of the development. Residential development should also include an active street front instead of blank walls along Mayten Avenue and Malaga Drive, and interior streets to connect the various parts of the development. Isolated and gated residential development that is walled off from adjoining uses would be prohibited.

Nearly two acres of public space in the form of public plazas and fountains will provide people with gathering areas in the commercial component of the development. Additional recreational amenities are also encouraged for the residential component of the development.

Mixed Use: Industrial Area Specific Plan (Sub-Area 18)

This area is bounded on the south by 4th Street, on the east by Milliken Avenue, on the north by the railroad, and on the west by Utica Street (#8 on Figure LU-3). ~~The development is entirely built out. It surrounds an 18 hole golf course and includes the Metrolink Station off Milliken Avenue.~~ The Industrial Area Specific Plan (Empire Lakes) Mixed Use area reflects the mixed land use approved under the Rancho Cucamonga IASP Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan. The intent of the Mixed Use designation is to:

- Promote planning flexibility to achieve more creative and imaginative employment-generating designs
- Integrate a wider range of retail commercial, service commercial, recreation, and office uses within this industrial area of the City
- Allow for the sensitive inclusion of high-density residential development that offers high-quality multi-unit condominiums and apartments for employees desiring housing close to work and transit

~~Table LU-9 specifies the uses and range of development allowed.~~

Table LU-9: Mixed Use: Industrial Area Specific Plan/Subarea 18

Land Use	Percent Range	Acreage Range Average Density (du/acre) Dwelling Units	Estimated "Most Case" Acres/Dwelling Units (du)
Commercial —retail, service commercial, tourist commercial, office (commercial and professional)	15%-25%	34-57 acres	40 acres
Office —professional, medical corporate offices	40%-60%	90-136 acres	110.5 acres
Public/Quasi-Public/Recreation	7.5%	16.5 ac	16.5 acres
Residential	11%-22%	25-50 acres @ 27.75 du/acre ¹ 694 to 1,388 du	50 acres @ 27.75 du/acre ¹ 1,388 du
ROW —Metrolink Parking	4.5%	10.3 ac	10.3 acres
Totals	100%	227 acres	227 acres

Note:

1. — Indicates target density, not a range. Actual density may increase up to 27.75 du/ac as long as the total of 1,388 dwelling units is not exceeded.

Mixed Use: Foothill Boulevard and Deer Creek Channel

This site, located at Foothill Boulevard along Deer Creek Channel (#9 on Figure LU-3), provides an excellent opportunity to integrate commercial and residential uses into a cohesive development. Commercial development will be sited along the Foothill Boulevard frontage, while residential development will be located toward the southern area of the property. Development should provide pedestrian access between uses and direct pedestrian connections to Foothill Boulevard and transit stops. High-density development should step down to detached residential development along the western boundary providing a transition to the adjacent low-density residential development. Public street connections to Hampshire Street and Devon Street in the adjacent residential neighborhood will be discouraged, except for emergency vehicles.

Table LU-10 specifies the uses and range of development allowed.

Table LU-10: Mixed Use: Foothill Boulevard and Deer Creek Channel

Land Use	Percent Range	Acreage Range Average Density (du/acre) Dwelling Unit Range	Estimated "Most Case" Acres/Dwelling Units (du)
Commercial	25%-30%	4.4-5.3 acres	5.3 acres
Residential	70%-75%	12.4-13.3 acres @ 10-14 du/acre ¹ 124 to 186 du	12.4 acres @ 14 du/acre ¹ 174 du
Totals	100%	17.7 acres	17.7 acres

Note:

1. — Indicates target density, not a range. Actual density may increase up to 14 du/ac as long as the total of 186 dwelling units is not exceeded.

INSERT the following text in place of Table LU-9:

The Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area Specific Plan (IASP) Subarea 18 Specific Plan is located north of 4th Street, south of a commuter and freight railway, west of Milliken Avenue, and east of Utica/Cleveland Avenues (#8 on Figure LU-3). The plan provides a more urban, medium-to-high density development pattern with a mix of attached and detached residences, non-residential (office, commercial, etc.) uses, and private and common open space areas. Characteristic of the plan will be its pedestrian-oriented setting and access to various transit options including the Metrolink San Bernardino Line via the Rancho Cucamonga Station located at the northeast corner of the specific plan area. The plan is intended to provide a unique and engaging experience that offers to residents convenient access to areas for work, service/commerce, recreational activities, and public spaces. The plan reflects the mixed land use approved under the Rancho Cucamonga IASP Subarea 18 Specific Plan. The intent of the Mixed Use designation is to:

- Promote planning flexibility to achieve more creative and imaginative employment-generating designs;
- Integrate a wider range of retail commercial, service commercial, recreation, and office uses within this industrial area of the City;
- Allow for the sensitive inclusion of high-density residential development that offers high-quality multi-unit condominiums and apartments for employees desiring housing close to work and transit.

Note: Table to be updated by City

Table LU-15: Build-Out Summary

	Baseline: 2009 ¹			General Plan Build Out: 2030			Change (total only)	Percent Change
	City	SOI ²	Total	City	SOI ²	Total		
Dwelling Units	55,608	91	55,699	62,196	1,057	63,253	7,554	13.6%
Population	179,200	300	179,500	200,400	3,400	203,800	24,300	13.5%
Non-Residential Square Feet	80,030,000	0	80,030,000	99,797,000	0	99,797,000	19,767,000	24.7%
Employment	77,350	0	77,350	103,040	0	103,040	25,690	33.2%

Notes:

1. 2009 Baseline data is based on Existing Land Use Geographical Information Systems land use data.
2. SOI: Rancho Cucamonga Sphere of Influence.

Table LU-16: Land Use Plan Summary-Residential Designations

Land Use Designations	Density Factor ¹	City Area		Sphere of Influence			Totals			
		Acres	Dwelling Units ²	Target Dwelling Units ³	Acres	Dwelling Units ²	Target Dwelling Units ³	Total Acreage	Total Dwelling Units	Total Target Dwelling Units
Residential Designations										
Hillside (0.1-2.0 du/ac)	1.29	133	13 to 268	151	695	70-1,400	831	828	83-1,668	982
Very Low (0.10-2.0 du/ac)	1.29	4,007	401 to 8,029	7,394	-	-	-	4,007	401-8,029	7,394
Low (2.0-4.0 du/ac)	3.25	4,371	9,194 to 18,080	18,050	-	-	-	4,371	9,194-18,080	18,050
Low Medium (4.0-8.0 du/ac)	6.50	1,852	7,739 to 15,100	13,320	-	-	-	1,852	7,739-15,100	13,320
Medium (8.0-14.0 du/ac)	11.75	790	6,270 to 10,837	9,283	-	-	-	790	6,270-10,837	9,283
Medium High (14.0-24.0 du/ac)	20.25	367	5,237 to 8,915	7,432	-	-	-	367	5,237-8,915	7,432
High (24.0-30.0 du/ac)	27.75	44	1,376 to 1,713	1,221	-	-	-	44	1,376-1,713	1,221
Mixed Use ⁴	Varies	276	3,701 to 6,511	5,346	-	-	-	276	3,701-6,511	5,345
Open Space (0.0-0.1 du/ac)	0.10	483	0 to 48	- ⁵	2,496	0-250	228	2,979	0-298	228
RESIDENTIAL SUBTOTAL		12,323	33,931 to 69,501	62,196	3,191	70-1,650	1,057	19,514	34,001-71,151	63,253

Notes:

1. The Density Factor is based upon actual development that has occurred in the City and represents a level midway between 50% and 75% of the range. It is used to calculate the target number of dwelling units. This factor is only applied to vacant developable lands. A different Density Factor was applied to existing development to obtain an accurate baseline number.
2. The range of dwelling units is derived by multiplying the lower and upper threshold of density/intensity range by the number of acres, and rounded to the nearest whole number. This range represents the theoretical potential. Some development will produce densities at or near the top of the range; however, most will not.
3. Target dwelling units is the probable level of development based on historical development patterns, except for Mixed Use Residential, which is based primarily on a target density.
4. Mixed Use allows both residential and non-residential uses.
5. Open Space is generally a non-residential category that permits a very limited number of residential units on privately owned properties. Within the City, Open Space applies to the golf courses and the Pacific Electric Trail. In the northwest quadrant of the City, a few properties are designated Open Space and could yield residential units. However, any such development would be limited to a density of 0.1 units per acre (or one unit per parcel on lots less than 10 acres in size) and would be subject to the slope, drainage, flood zones, and fault zone analysis at a minimum under the Hillside Overlay Ordinance, further limiting any residential development potential.

Table LU-17: Land Use Plan Summary-Non-Residential Designations

Land Use Designations	Acres		Square Feet (in thousands) ¹ (City Only)	Probable Square Feet (in thousands) (City Only)	Employment ² (City Only)	Total Acres
	City	SGI				
Non-Residential²						
Office (0.40-1.0 FAR)	86	-	1,497 to 3,746	1,497	3,180	86
Neighborhood Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	164	-	1,785 to 2,500	1,785	3,030	164
Community Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	119	-	1,292 to 1,810	1,292	1,970	119
General Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	470	-	6,555 to 7,165	6,555	10,020	470
Subtotal	839	-	11,128 to 15,221	11,129	18,200	839
Mixed Use (0.25-1.0 FAR) ⁴	626	-	6,498 to 25,996	11,973	20,270	626
Subtotal	626	-	6,498 to 25,996	11,973	20,270	626
Industrial Park (0.40-0.60 FAR)	559	-	9,739 to 14,610	9,739	6,610	559
- Haven Overlay (0.40-1.0 FAR)	215	-	3,745 to 9,365	3,745	7,950	215
General Industrial (0.50-0.60 FAR)	1,974	-	42,983 to 51,592	42,983	29,220	1,974
Heavy Industrial (0.40-0.50 FAR)	891	-	15,523 to 19,405	15,523	15,820	891
Subtotal	3,639	-	72,000 to 94,972	72,000	59,600	3,639
Open Space (0.0-0.10 du/ac)	483	2,496	-	-	-	2,979
Conservation	358	983	-	-	-	1,336
Flood Control/Utility Corridor	1,711	1,758	-	-	-	3,464
Subtotal	2,547	5,232	-	-	7,779	7,779
Civic/Regional (0.40-1.0 FAR)	130	-	2,265 to 5,662	2,265	1,050	130
Schools (0.10-0.20 FAR)	558	-	2,430 to 4,861	2,430	3,920	558
Parks	445	-	-	-	-	445
Subtotal	1,133	-	4,695 to 10,523	4,695	4,970	1,133
NON-RESIDENTIAL SUBTOTAL	8,784	5,232	94,322 to 146,712	95,797	103,040	14,016

Notes:

1. The range of square footage is derived by multiplying the probable lower and upper threshold of intensity range by the number of acres, and rounded to the nearest hundred.
2. Non-residential FAR Range: lower number is the probable FAR on average, but in some cases it may be lower. Higher number is the maximum FAR allowed for any specific project.
3. Employment is calculated by using the Probable Square Feet and employment factors for each non-residential land use designations.
4. Mixed Use allows both residential and non-residential use.

Note: Table to be updated by City

Table LU-18: Build Out Summary by Land Use

Land Use Designations	Acres ¹		Percent of Total		Target Dwelling Units			Probable Non-Residential (City Only)	
	City	SOI	SOI	Total	City	SOI	Total	Square Feet (in thousands)	Employment
Hillside Residential (0.1-2.0 du/ac)	133	695	828	3.1%	151	831	982	-	-
Very Low Residential (0.1-2.0 du/ac)	4,007	-	4,007	15.1%	7,394	-	7,394	-	-
Low Residential (2.0-4.0 du/ac)	4,371	-	4,371	16.5%	18,050	-	18,050	-	-
Low Medium Residential (4.0-8.0 du/ac)	1,852	-	1,852	7.0%	13,320	-	13,320	-	-
Medium Residential (8.0-14.0 du/ac)	790	-	790	3.0%	9,283	-	9,283	-	-
Medium High Residential (14.0-24.0 du/ac)	367	-	367	1.4%	7,432	-	7,432	-	-
High Residential (24.0-30.0 du/ac)	44	-	44	0.2%	1,221	-	1,221	-	-
Mixed Use ²	902	-	902	3.4%	5,345	-	5,345	11,973	20,270
Office (0.40-1.0 FAR)	86	-	86	0.3%	-	-	-	1,497	3,180
Neighborhood Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	164	-	164	0.6%	-	-	-	1,785	3,030
Community Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	119	-	119	0.4%	-	-	-	1,292	1,970
General Commercial (0.25-0.35 FAR)	470	-	470	1.8%	-	-	-	6,555	10,020
Industrial Park (0.40-0.60 FAR)	559	-	559	2.1%	-	-	-	9,739	6,610
- Haven Ave Office Overlay (0.40-1.0 FAR)	215	-	215	0.8%	-	-	-	3,745	7,950
General Industrial (0.50-0.60 FAR)	1,974	-	1,974	7.4%	-	-	-	42,993	29,220
Heavy Industrial (0.40-0.50 FAR)	891	-	891	3.4%	-	-	-	15,523	15,820
Open Space (0.0-0.1 du/ac)	483	2,496	2,979	11.2%	-	226	226	-	-
Conservation	353	983	1,336	5.0%	-	-	-	-	-
Flood Control/Utility Corridor	1,711	1,753	3,464	13.0%	-	-	-	-	-
Civic/Regional (0.40-1.0 FAR)	130	-	130	0.5%	-	-	-	2,265	1,050
Schools (0.10-0.20 FAR)	558	-	558	2.1%	-	-	-	2,430	3,920
Parks	445	-	445	1.7%	-	-	-	-	-
GRAND TOTAL	20,524	5,927	26,551	100.0%	62,196	1,057	63,253	99,797	103,040

Notes:

1. Acres include existing development and undeveloped vacant properties.
2. Mixed Use allows both residential and non-residential uses.

An additional purpose is to capture and reflect the historic significance of this route as part of the legendary Route 66 that linked Los Angeles and Chicago for several critical decades during the twentieth century. Such landmarks as the Sycamore Inn and the Magic Lamp Restaurant symbolize that memorable period in the emergence of Southern California as a mecca for families seeking a better life. The combination of use patterns, development standards, and design guidelines of the plan testify to the area's complex planning issues and the need for creative regulatory devices. Ultimately, the goal of the Specific Plan is to give this critical centerpiece of the City the prominence it deserves.

Industrial Area Specific Plan

The Industrial Area Specific Plan is a particularly significant specific plan due to its successful role in the development of the City's industrial base (which is a critical component of an overall long-term balance of uses). Part of this success can be attributed to the quality standards incorporated into the Specific Plan and the protection those standards afford to business investors in this area. The Specific Plan, encompassing nearly 5,000 acres, has been divided into three zones and 19 subareas. The subareas represent specific land use characteristics and development constraints which can be dealt with on a subarea basis rather than through the application of broadly applied development standards. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to establish specific standards and guidelines that will be used for development throughout the City's industrial area.

Industrial Area Specific Plan Sub-Area 18 Plan (Empire Lakes)

The purpose of the Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan is to provide for a broader mix of land uses than was originally permitted within the Industrial Area Specific Plan. The plan was expanded to include such uses as recreational, hotel/conference center, retail, restaurant, and entertainment, as well as office, research and development, and light industrial uses. ~~These uses are intended to surround the existing 18 hole golf course.~~ A subsequent amendment to further expand the use list included ~~limited~~ multi-unit residential development to maximize potential use of the Metrolink Station near Milliken Avenue.

Adopted Planned Communities

Caryn Planned Community Development Plan

The Caryn Planned Community Development Plan, now completed, lies north of the Victoria planned community. The community's special identity is provided by an elementary school, single-unit residential development, and walking trails that tie the community together.

Terra Vista Community Plan

The Terra Vista Community Plan area is centrally located in Rancho Cucamonga and encompasses 1,321 acres. It is comprised of four distinct neighborhoods, with a greenway serving as the backbone connector. The area is planned for a mix of residential and commercial uses, with a large concentration of commercial and office uses along Foothill Boulevard and Haven Avenue that serves as a community-wide activity center.

Victoria Community Plan

The Victoria Community Plan area encompasses 2,150 acres and provides for a series of residential villages and related support uses, designed around a central spine called Victoria Park Lane. Victoria Community Plan includes the Victoria Arbors Master Plan and the Victoria Gardens Master Plan.

Open Space Resources

Open space is defined as any parcel or area of land that is essentially unimproved and devoted to uses such as natural resource preservation, managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, and public health and safety. Open spaces can be found throughout the City. Natural open spaces are primarily located in the hillsides and Sphere of Influence areas of the City, while urban open spaces, such as developed parks and open plazas can be found in the built areas of the City.

Preservation of open space benefits environmental sustainability and promotes the Healthy RC Initiative. Open space allows the recharge of groundwater basins, which provide a clean source of water for everyday use to the Rancho Cucamonga community. Open space provides plentiful opportunities for recreational activities such as hiking and bird watching as well as areas of scientific and educational value. Preservation of open space serves to protect views and retain a connection to our environmental and cultural history. Open space also provides protection from natural hazards such as flooding and wildland fires. And finally, open space is not just limited to the hillsides; within the urban area, open space provides softening and contrast to the built environment, active and passive recreational opportunities, view corridors, and general enhancement of the overall visual quality of the City.

Established Open Space Areas

Approximately 31 percent, or 8,224 acres, of the Planning Area is devoted to open space, including parks, undeveloped parcels, conservation areas, and flood control utility corridors, as shown in Figure RC-1: Open Space and Conservation Plan. Hillside Residential and Very Low-density Residential areas (two dwelling units or less per acre) also contribute to the rural character within the northern portion of the City and Sphere of Influence area (see Chapter 2, Figure LU-1: Land Use Plan).

Open space in Rancho Cucamonga provides the following benefits:

- **Open Space: Preservation of Natural Resources.** In an effort to protect wildlife and biological resources within Rancho Cucamonga, conservation areas have been established in Rancho Cucamonga's Planning Area. These conservation areas are intended to protect the alluvial fan sage scrub habitat and the wildlife it supports by preserving open space land in its natural state. See the Wildlife Resources section (page RC-26) in this Chapter for more information regarding conservation areas and protection of wildlife resources.
- **Open Space: Managed Protection of Natural Resources.** Open space areas and expansive spreading grounds allow the recharge of groundwater basins, which are a critical resource for the Cucamonga Valley Water District. These areas need to be protected because the Cucamonga Valley Water District obtains a large portion of its water supply from the groundwater basins. Rancho Cucamonga's Sphere of Influence also has limited aggregate resources (sand and gravel), which are found in alluvial fans at the opening of canyons. These are important resources to the construction industry from which Rancho Cucamonga and the region have greatly benefited. However, this resource must be properly managed so that we can protect important habitat areas, allow for appropriate redevelopment, and avoid future land use conflicts. See the Mineral Resources section (page RC-8) in this Chapter for more information.

Section 17.38.070 Rancho Cucamonga IASP Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan

Table 17.38.070-1 Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype provides the correlation of land use by Placetype to the Base Zoning District in the City's Development Code.

Land use classifications/categories, descriptions, and entitlement/permit requirements are per the City's Development Code unless otherwise defined in this section.

Uses Not Specifically Listed

Uses not specifically listed as permitted or conditionally permitted, but deemed by the Planning Director to be similar to a listed permitted or conditionally permitted use, may be allowed subject to a use determination made by the Planning Director.

A. Shopkeeper and Live/Work Units

In order to encourage businesses that create new jobs while ensuring compatibility with residential units, the following requirements have been established.

Shopkeeper Units

Shopkeeper units are units that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. Shopkeeper allows individual occupancy of the non-residential space with separate entries from residence. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit.

Live/Work Units

Live/Work homes provide non-residence space within the home and are defined by the California Building Code and shall be consistent with the City's Development Code 'Live-Work Facility' allowed use description.

Shopkeeper and Live/Work Homes Permitted Uses

The general types of businesses identified below are allowed within Shopkeeper and Live/Work units:

- Artisan shop.
- General office, business and professional.
- General retail/commercial.
- Restaurant, cafe, or bakery.
- Service commercial.
- Other similar uses as permitted by the master development association and Planning Director, other than those prohibited below.

Persons who do not reside in the unit may be employed at the unit provided that an employee parking space has been approved by the master development association.

Characteristics of Shopkeeper and Live/Work Units

Within the Shopkeeper and Live/Work units, the following operational characteristics shall apply:

- Outside storage of materials or stock in trade is prohibited.
- Signage for the business shall comply with the approved sign program.

Manufacturing, Custom Small Scale

Small scale independent craftsman manufacturing or fabrication of custom-made products. These types of business establishments do not utilize raw materials for their finished products, but rather may utilize semi-finished type of manufactured materials for their custom made-to-order products. Activities can be completed wholly on-site and do not include outdoor storage, wholesale distribution, or similar intensive uses. The uses do not produce odors, noise, vibration, or particulates that would adversely affect uses in the same structure or on a same site.

Table 17.38.070-1. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype

Land Use/Zoning District	MH	MH	H	MU	MU	MU	MU
Placetype	VN	CL	UN	T	MU	Rec	MU Overlay*
Residential Uses							
Adult day care home	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Caretaker housing	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Dwelling, multi-family	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Dwelling, second unit ⁽¹⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Dwelling, single-family	P	P	N	N	N	N	N
Dwelling, two-family	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Emergency shelter	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Family day care home, large ⁽¹¹⁾	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Family day care home, small	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Guest house	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Group residential	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Home occupation ⁽²⁾	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Live-work facility	C	C	C	N	P	P	P
Shopkeeper ^(*)	P	P	P	N	P	P	P
Manufactured home ⁽³⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Mobile home park ⁽³⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Residential care facility	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Residential care home	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
Single-room occupancy facility	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Transitional housing	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Agriculture and Animal-Related Uses							
Agricultural uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Animal keeping, domestic pets ⁽⁴⁾	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Animal keeping, exotic animals ⁽⁴⁾	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Animal keeping, insects ⁽⁴⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Animal keeping, livestock animals ⁽⁴⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Animal keeping, poultry ⁽⁴⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Equestrian facility, commercial	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Equestrian facility, hobby	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Recreation, Resource Preservation, Open Space, Education, and Public Assembly Uses							
Assembly use	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
P= Permitted C= Conditional Use Permit N= Not Permitted LWC= Live/Work with a Conditional Use Permit*** Table notes: (*) Uses Permitted in the MU-Overlay Zone override the underlying Placetype where there is a conflict (**) Leasing and New Homes Sales Centers (***) Shopkeeper units are those that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit. (1) See additional second dwelling unit regulations in Chapter 17.100. (2) See additional home occupation regulations in Chapter 17.92. (3) See additional mobile home regulations in Chapter 17.96. (4) See additional animal keeping in Chapter 17.88. (5) Utility facilities and infrastructure involving hazardous or volatile gas and/or liquid pipeline development require approval of a CUP. (6) See additional adult entertainment businesses in Chapter 17.86. Adult-oriented businesses are not permitted west of Haven Avenue. (7) See additional regulations for special regulated uses in the Chapter 17.102. (8) See additional regulations for drive-in and drive-through facilities in Chapter 17.90. (9) Not permitted within 300 feet of residentially zoned property. (10) See additional regulations for wind energy systems and facilities in Chapter 17.76. (11) Family Day Care Home—Large requires approval of A Large Family Day Care Permit, not a Conditional Use Permit. (12) "Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution — Medium" is not permitted on any parcel that is located within, or partly within, five hundred (500) feet of the Foothill Boulevard right-of-way. (13) Permitted in Industrial Park and General Industrial zoning districts when proposed in conjunction with "Commercial (Repurposing) — Industrial". (14) Maximum square footage for a single user shall not exceed 10,000 square feet. (15) The maximum number of rooms for hotels/motels is 200 rooms.							

Table 17.38.070-1. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype

Land Use/Zoning District	MH	MH	H	MU	MU	MU	MU
Placetype	VN	CL	UN	T	MU	Rec	MU Overlay*
Cemetery/mausoleum	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Community center/civic use	C	C	C	C	C	P	C
Community garden	C	C	C	N	N	N	N
Convention center	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Golf course/clubhouse	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indoor amusement/entertainment facility	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Indoor fitness and sports facility - large	N	N	N	C	C	P	C
Indoor fitness and sports facility - small	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Library and museum	C	C	C	P	P	P	P
Outdoor commercial recreation	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Park and public plaza	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Public safety facility	C	C	C	C	C	P	C
Resource-related recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
School, academic (private)	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
School, academic (public)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
School, college/university (private)	N	N	N	N	N	P	N
School, college/university (public)	N	N	N	N	N	P	N
Schools, specialized education and training/studio	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Theaters and auditoriums	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Tutoring center - large ⁽¹²⁾	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Tutoring center - small	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Utility, Transportation, Public Facility, and Communication Uses							
Broadcasting and recording studios	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Park and ride facility	N	N	N	P	N	N	N
Parking facility	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Transit facility	N	N	N	P	N	N	N
Utility facility and infrastructure - fixed based structures ⁽⁵⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Utility facility and infrastructure - pipelines ⁽⁵⁾	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Wind energy system - small ⁽¹⁰⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Retail, Service, and Office Uses							
Adult day care facility	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Adult-oriented business ⁽⁶⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

P= Permitted

C= Conditional Use Permit

N= Not Permitted

LWC= Live/Work with a Conditional Use Permit***

Table notes:

(*) Uses Permitted in the MU-Overlay Zone override the underlying Placetype where there is a conflict

(**) Leasing and New Homes Sales Centers

(***) Shopkeeper units are those that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit.

(1) See additional second dwelling unit regulations in Chapter 17.100.

(2) See additional home occupation regulations in Chapter 17.92.

(3) See additional mobile home regulations in Chapter 17.96.

(4) See additional animal keeping in Chapter 17.88.

(5) Utility facilities and infrastructure involving hazardous or volatile gas and/or liquid pipeline development require approval of a CUP.

(6) See additional adult entertainment businesses in Chapter 17.86. Adult-oriented businesses are not permitted west of Haven Avenue.

(7) See additional regulations for special regulated uses in the Chapter 17.102.

(8) See additional regulations for drive-in and drive-through facilities in Chapter 17.90.

(9) Not permitted within 300 feet of residentially zoned property.

(10) See additional regulations for wind energy systems and facilities in Chapter 17.76.

(11) Family Day Care Home—Large requires approval of A Large Family Day Care Permit, not a Conditional Use Permit.

(12) "Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution — Medium" is not permitted on any parcel that is located within, or partly within, five hundred (500) feet of the Foothill Boulevard right-of-way.

(13) Permitted in Industrial Park and General Industrial zoning districts when proposed in conjunction with "Commercial (Repurposing) — Industrial".

(14) Maximum square footage for a single user shall not exceed 10,000 square feet.

(15) The maximum number of rooms for hotels/motels is 200 rooms.

Table 17.38.070-1. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype

Land Use/Zoning District	MH	MH	H	MU	MU	MU	MU
Placetype	VN	CL	UN	T	MU	Rec	MU Overlay*
Alcoholic beverage sales	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Ambulance service	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Animal sales and grooming	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Art, antique, collectable shop ⁽¹³⁾	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	P	P
Artisan shop ⁽¹³⁾	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	P	P
Bail bonds	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Banks and financial services	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Bar/nightclub	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Bed and breakfast inn	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Building materials store and yard	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Business support services	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Call center	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Card room	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Check cashing business ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Child day care facility/center	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Consignment store	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Convenience store	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Crematory services ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Drive-in and drive-through sales and service ⁽⁸⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Equipment sales and rental	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Feed and tack store	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Furniture, furnishing, and appliance store ⁽¹⁴⁾	N	N	N	C	P	N	P
Garden center/plant nursery ⁽¹⁴⁾	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Grocery store/supermarket ⁽¹⁴⁾	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Gun sales	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Hookah shop	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Home improvement supply store ⁽¹⁴⁾	N	N	N	C	C	N	C
Hotel and motel ⁽¹⁵⁾	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Internet cafe	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Kennel, commercial	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Liquor store	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Maintenance and repair, small equipment	N	N	N	P	P	P	P

P= Permitted
 C= Conditional Use Permit
 N= Not Permitted
 LWC= Live/Work with a Conditional Use Permit***

Table notes:

- (*) Uses Permitted in the MU-Overlay Zone override the underlying Placetype where there is a conflict
- (**) Leasing and New Homes Sales Centers
- (***) Shopkeeper units are those that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit.
- (1) See additional second dwelling unit regulations in Chapter 17.100.
- (2) See additional home occupation regulations in Chapter 17.92.
- (3) See additional mobile home regulations in Chapter 17.96.
- (4) See additional animal keeping in Chapter 17.88.
- (5) Utility facilities and infrastructure involving hazardous or volatile gas and/or liquid pipeline development require approval of a CUP.
- (6) See additional adult entertainment businesses in Chapter 17.86. Adult-oriented businesses are not permitted west of Haven Avenue.
- (7) See additional regulations for special regulated uses in the Chapter 17.102.
- (8) See additional regulations for drive-in and drive-through facilities in Chapter 17.90.
- (9) Not permitted within 300 feet of residentially zoned property.
- (10) See additional regulations for wind energy systems and facilities in Chapter 17.76.
- (11) Family Day Care Home—Large requires approval of A Large Family Day Care Permit, not a Conditional Use Permit.
- (12) "Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution — Medium" is not permitted on any parcel that is located within, or partly within, five hundred (500) feet of the Foothill Boulevard right-of-way.
- (13) Permitted in Industrial Park and General Industrial zoning districts when proposed in conjunction with "Commercial (Repurposing) — Industrial".
- (14) Maximum square footage for a single user shall not exceed 10,000 square feet.
- (15) The maximum number or rooms for hotels/motels is 200 rooms.

Table 17.38.070-1. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype

Land Use/Zoning District	MH	MH	H	MU	MU	MU	MU
Placetype	VN	CL	UN	T	MU	Rec	MU Overlay*
Massage establishment	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Medical marijuana dispensary	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Medical services, extended care	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Medical services, general	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Medical services, hospitals	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Mobile hot food truck	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Mortuary/funeral home	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Office, business and professional(**)	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	P	P
Office, accessory	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Pawnshop ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Personal services	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Restaurant, no liquor service	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Restaurant, beer and wine	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Restaurant, full liquor service	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Retail, accessory	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Retail, general	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	P	P
Retail, warehouse club	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Secondhand dealer	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Shooting range	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Smoke shop ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Specialty food store ⁽¹³⁾	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Tattoo shop ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	N	C	N	C
Thrift store ⁽⁷⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Veterinary facility	N	N	N	C	C	C	C
Automobile and Vehicle Uses							
Auto vehicle dismantling	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auto and vehicle sales and rental	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auto and vehicle sales, auto broker	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auto and vehicle sales, wholesale	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auto and vehicle storage	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auto parts sales	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Car washing and detailing	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

P= Permitted

C= Conditional Use Permit

N= Not Permitted

LWC= Live/Work with a Conditional Use Permit***

Table notes:

(*) Uses Permitted in the MU-Overlay Zone override the underlying Placetype where there is a conflict

(**) Leasing and New Homes Sales Centers

(***) Shopkeeper units are those that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit.

(1) See additional second dwelling unit regulations in Chapter 17.100.

(2) See additional home occupation regulations in Chapter 17.92.

(3) See additional mobile home regulations in Chapter 17.96.

(4) See additional animal keeping in Chapter 17.88.

(5) Utility facilities and infrastructure involving hazardous or volatile gas and/or liquid pipeline development require approval of a CUP.

(6) See additional adult entertainment businesses in Chapter 17.86. Adult-oriented businesses are not permitted west of Haven Avenue.

(7) See additional regulations for special regulated uses in the Chapter 17.102.

(8) See additional regulations for drive-In and drive-through facilities in Chapter 17.90.

(9) Not permitted within 300 feet of residentially zoned property.

(10) See additional regulations for wind energy systems in alternative energy systems and facilities in Chapter 17.76.

(11) Family Day Care Home—Large requires approval of A Large Family Day Care Permit, not a Conditional Use Permit.

(12) "Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution — Medium" is not permitted on any parcel that is located within, or partly within, five hundred (500) feet of the Foothill Boulevard right-of-way.

(13) Permitted in Industrial Park and General Industrial zoning districts when proposed in conjunction with "Commercial (Repurposing) — Industrial".

(14) Maximum square footage for a single user shall not exceed 10,000 square feet.

(15) The maximum number of rooms for hotels/motels is 200 rooms.

Table 17.38.070-1. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements by Placetype

Land Use/Zoning District	MH	MH	H	MU	MU	MU	MU
Placetype	VN	CL	UN	T	MU	Rec	MU Overlay*
Recreational vehicle storage	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Service stations	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Vehicle services, major	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Vehicle services, minor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Industrial, Manufacturing, and Processing Uses							
Fuel storage and distribution	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Manufacturing, custom small-scale	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	N	P
Manufacturing, heavy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Manufacturing, heavy-minimum impact	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Manufacturing, light	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Manufacturing, medium ⁽⁹⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Microbrewery	LWC	LWC	LWC	P	P	N	P
Printing and publishing	N	N	N	P	P	P	P
Recycling facility, collection	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Recycling facility, processing	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Recycling facility, scrap and dismantling facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Research and development	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Storage, personal storage facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Storage warehouse	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Storage yard	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Wholesale, storage, and distribution - heavy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Wholesale, storage, and distribution - light	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Wholesale, storage, and distribution - medium ⁽⁹⁾⁽¹²⁾	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

P= Permitted

C= Conditional Use Permit

N= Not Permitted

LWC= Live/Work with a Conditional Use Permit***

Table notes:

(*) Uses Permitted in the MU-Overlay Zone override the underlying Placetype where there is a conflict

(**) Leasing and New Homes Sales Centers

(***) Shopkeeper units are those that include both residential (R-2 occupancy) and non-residential (B-occupancy) mixed occupancy types as defined by the California Building Code. The non-residential portion of the unit may be leased separately from the residential portion of the unit.

(1) See additional second dwelling unit regulations in Chapter 17.100.

(2) See additional home occupation regulations in Chapter 17.92.

(3) See additional mobile home regulations in Chapter 17.96.

(4) See additional animal keeping in Chapter 17.88.

(5) Utility facilities and infrastructure involving hazardous or volatile gas and/or liquid pipeline development require approval of a CUP.

(6) See additional adult entertainment businesses in Chapter 17.86. Adult-oriented businesses are not permitted west of Haven Avenue.

(7) See additional regulations for special regulated uses in the Chapter 17.102.

(8) See additional regulations for drive-in and drive-through facilities in Chapter 17.90.

(9) Not permitted within 300 feet of residentially zoned property.

(10) See additional regulations for wind energy systems in alternative energy systems and facilities in Chapter 17.76.

(11) Family Day Care Home—Large requires approval of A Large Family Day Care Permit, not a Conditional Use Permit.

(12) "Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution — Medium" is not permitted on any parcel that is located within, or partly within, five hundred (500) feet of the Foothill Boulevard right-of-way.

(13) Permitted in Industrial Park and General Industrial zoning districts when proposed in conjunction with "Commercial (Repurposing) — Industrial".

(14) Maximum square footage for a single user shall not exceed 10,000 square feet.

(15) The maximum number of rooms for hotels/motels is 200 rooms.

Plan. A full copy of all adopted Specific Plan documents (and any adopted amendments thereto) shall be kept in the Planning Department and in the City Clerk's office.

- A. **Etiwanda Specific Plan (ESP).** The Etiwanda Specific Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1983. It encompasses over 3,000 acres located in the northeast corner of the city and is roughly bounded by the I-15 to the southeast, the City's Sphere of Influence to the north, the Victoria Planned Community to the west, and the city's industrial area to the south. Etiwanda can be described as a rural community, characterized by large land parcels, eucalyptus tree rows, remnants of citrus groves and vineyards, stone curbs, and other elements that convey its unique and historic sense of place. The primary purpose of the Specific Plan is to ensure the continued rural character of this portion of the city. Please refer to the adopted Etiwanda Specific Plan maintained by the Planning Department and City Clerk for comprehensive details.
- B. **North Etiwanda Specific Plan (NESP).** The North Etiwanda Specific Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1992. It includes 6,850 acres located just north of the Etiwanda Specific Plan. A portion of the Specific Plan area lies outside the city and outside the Sphere of Influence. Open space is the most prominent feature of the North Etiwanda area, which comprises a gently sloping alluvial fan and chaparral habitat situated on the lower slopes of the foothills. Drainage courses throughout the North Etiwanda area support a variety of tree species, including oak, sycamore, and walnut, among others. A unique feature of the area is a freshwater marsh, approximately 11 acres in size, located in the northwestern portion of the area. Open space is expected to remain a prominent feature even after development occurs. The Specific Plan builds upon the unique character and charm of the Etiwanda Specific Plan area by providing a land use pattern that extends the low-density character of Old Etiwanda into the North Etiwanda area. The primary purpose of the Specific Plan is to preserve rural area with large parcels, dense landscape, and historic properties. Please refer to the adopted North Etiwanda Specific Plan maintained by the Planning Department and City Clerk for comprehensive details.
- C. **Empire Lakes Specific Plan (ELSP).** The Empire Lakes Specific Plan was adopted in 1994. It includes 380 acres within the previously adopted Industrial Specific Plan Area as Sub-Area 18. The primary purpose of this subsequent Specific Plan is to provide for a broader mix of land uses than was originally permitted within the Industrial Area Specific Plan. The plan was expanded to include such uses as recreational, hotel/conference center, retail, restaurant, and entertainment, as well as office, research and development, and light industrial uses. ~~These uses are intended to surround the existing 18-hole golf course.~~ A subsequent amendment to further expand the use list included ~~limited~~ multi-unit residential development to maximize potential use of the Metrolink Station near Milliken Avenue.

Section 17.114.030 Planned Community Descriptions

The Planned Communities listed below have been adopted by the City of Rancho Cucamonga and designated on the Zoning Map as Planned Community (PD) with a specific reference number to each adopted plan. This Section provides a reference to each adopted Planned Community, along with a summary of the unique land use and development standards applicable to each individual Planned Community. A full copy of all adopted Planned Community documents (and any adopted amendments thereto) shall be kept in the Planning Department and in the City Clerk's office.

TABLE 17.36.020-1 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR MIXED USE SITES

Mixed Use Sites	Land Use Mix				Average Density Range
	Residential	Commercial	Office	Public/Quasi Public	
Victoria Gardens/Victoria Arbors	21–36%	20–41%		5–12%	4–14 du/ac
Town Center (Foothill Boulevard and Haven Avenue)	25–35%	10–15%	30–50%	0–10%	14 du/ac
Terra Vista	12–15%		85–87%		30 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard between Hermosa Avenue and Center Avenue	0–62%	0–100%			20 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard between Archibald Avenue and Hellman Avenue	67–70%	30–33%			15–30 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard at Helms Avenue and Hampshire Street	30–40%	60–70%			30 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard and Mayten Avenue	26–50%	40–60%	6–10%	4%	24–30 du/ac
Rancho Cucamonga IASP PA4-11	11–22%	15–25%	40–60%	7.5%	28 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard and Deer Creek Channel	70–75%	25–30%			14 du/ac
Haven Avenue and Church Street Site	0–100%		0–100%		8–14 du/ac
Western Gateway (Bear Gulch Area)	30–50%	50–70%			14 du/ac
Foothill Boulevard and Cucamonga Channel Site	0–100%		0–100%		8–14 du/ac
Historic Alta Loma (Amethyst Site)	0–100%		0–100%	16.3-20.0%	14–24 du/ac
Rancho Cucamonga IASP PA1	72.6-77.5%	0.1-7.4%			19.7-25.7

Section 17.36.030 Development Standards for Commercial and Office Zoning Districts

- A. **Purpose and Applicability.** The purpose of this Section is to establish minimum development standards that are unique to development projects within the Commercial and Office Zoning Districts. Development standards in this Section apply to all land designated on the Zoning Map within the Commercial and Office Zoning Districts.
- B. **Commercial and Office Districts Described.** As identified in Chapter 17.26 (Establishment of Zoning Districts), the city includes six (6) Commercial and Office Zoning Districts: