



STAFF REPORT

DATE: 02/04/2026

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: City Attorney's Office, LRM Department
Housing and Homeless Solutions, City Manager's Office

2026-53

REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

SUBJECT:

ORDINANCE NO. 3426 MAKING MINOR CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS TO THE MOBILEHOME PARK RENT STABILIZATION PROVISIONS OF THE CORONA MUNICIPAL CODE (CMC CHAPTER 5.47)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This staff report asks the City Council to approve the first reading of Ordinance No. 3426 making the following minor clarifying amendments to Chapter 5.47 of Title 5 of the Corona Municipal Code (Mobilehome Park Rent Stabilization): (1) adding a new definition of "Capital Improvement Details" needed to clarify which capital improvements are subject to a mobilehome owners vote; (2) correction of a typographical error in the section discussing when rent suspensions, refunds or decreases will be implemented following a homeowner petition; and (3) clarification regarding the authorized frequency of CPI rent increases.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

That the City Council introduce by title only and waive full reading for consideration of Ordinance No. 3426, first reading of an ordinance making minor clarifying amendments to the Mobilehome Park Rent Stabilization provisions of the Corona Municipal Code (CMC Chapter 5.47).

BACKGROUND & HISTORY:

On December 3, 2025, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 3422 adding Chapter 5.47 to Title 5 of the Corona Municipal Code establishing Mobilehome Park Rent Stabilization provisions (“RSO”). Since then, staff has been working to implement the RSO, including establishing the administrative process and documentation needed, building a website and standard communication process to facilitate submission of required documentation and payment of fees, as well as working with and addressing questions from park owners and mobilehome owners. From such work and discussions, staff has identified three minor amendments which we believe will clarify the RSO to best address questions and more clearly document the City Council’s intent.

ANALYSIS:

RSO Clarification Provisions

The following clarifications are recommended:

1. New Definition Needed to Clarify Capital Improvements Subject to a Vote

The park owners raised the issue that it was not abundantly clear that, while all capital improvements are subject to a petition process (including replacements or reconstructions of existing improvements or facilities), only certain replacements or substantial reconstructions require a vote of the mobilehome owners.

They pointed to the following language within the petition process that refers to capital improvement vote ballot materials.

“5.47.140 Permissible Rent Increases - Capital Improvement Rent Increases.

(A) **Petition and petition fee.** A Park Owner may submit a Capital Improvement Petition, on a form approved by the Housing Supervisor and accompanied by the Capital Improvement Petition Fee, for a rent increase based on the cost of a completed Capital Improvement. The petition shall include, at a minimum, the information required to be included in the Capital Improvement Vote ballot materials. Supporting documentation shall be filed with the petition and the Park Owner shall produce, at the request of the Housing Supervisor, any records, receipts, reports, or other documents that the Housing Supervisor deems necessary to make a determination concerning the petition. The Capital Improvement Petition shall be made under penalty of perjury, and supporting documents shall be certified or verified as requested by the Housing Supervisor.

For the petition process, staff had used this reference to “the information required to be included in the Capital Improvement Vote ballot materials” because we wanted the same information to be included within the petition materials, but did not intend to leave anyone

with the impression that all capital improvements require a vote of the mobilehome owners. In hindsight, we agree that it can be confusing.

To address this, we created a new definition for “Capital Improvement Details” as follows:

“5.47.020 Definitions.

Capital Improvement Details. The term “Capital Improvement Details” means at least the following information:

(1) Maximum Cost. The estimated maximum cost of the Capital Improvement(s) to be passed through to the Homeowners.

(2) Useful Life. The useful life or average useful life of the Capital Improvement(s) to be used in determining the amortization period for the cost of the Capital Improvement(s).

(3) Rent Increase Interest Allowance. The estimated Rent Increase Interest Allowance to be factored into the amortization period.

(4) Maximum Capital Improvement Rent Increase. Using the information provided for in (1) through (3) above, the estimated maximum Capital Improvement Rent Increase to be charged each month to each Mobilehome Space in the Mobilehome Park.

The RSO now refers to this new definition in the following sections when we reference the desired information:

Section 5.47.020
Capital Improvement Vote

Section 5.47.140
(A) Petition and petition fee
(I) Amortization of rent increase and interest; line item on billing.
(J) Maximum rent increase.

2. Typo in Rent Suspension, Refund or Decrease Through Homeowner Petitions

Staff noted that the following obvious typographical error:

“5.47.120 Permissible Rent Increases - regulations.

(H) Prior Mobilehome RSO compliance required – Homeowners. No Homeowner Petition will be accepted from any Homeowner, and no suspension or refund of, or decrease in, rent will be implemented for any

Mobilehome Spaces within a Mobilehome Park for which the Homeowner is ~~not~~ in arrears on their Homeowner Share of Administrative Fee or where the Homeowner is determined to be out of compliance with this chapter.”

This section is describing when a Homeowner Petition will not be accepted for a suspension, refund, or decrease in rent and when such actions will not be implemented. It is obvious that the intent was not to process or approve such petitions for any mobilehome owner who is in arrears or out of compliance. Accordingly, the proposed ordinance will delete the word “not” from this section.

3. Clarification Regarding Frequency of CPI Rent Increases

The intent of Ordinance 3422 was to insure that rent increases would not be implemented more frequently than once during any twelve (12) month period. The issue was even raised and discussed during the City Council meeting on November 19, 2025. Staff was asked the following: if a rent increase was imposed after the effective date of the ordinance (on or about January 2, 2026) and before April 1, 2026 (establishment of the Base Year Rent for most mobilehome owners), could another CPI Rent Increase be imposed as of July 1, 2026 (upon expiration of the 90 day notice period following establishment of the Base Year Rent for most mobilehome owners)? Staff indicated “no” because the intent was to insure that – once Ordinance 3422 became effective - rent increases would not be implemented more frequently than once during any twelve (12) month period.

Staff has since realized that the following section could have been written more clearly to implement this intent of Ordinance 3422, because the term “CPI Rent Increase” is a defined term for something that only happens on or after July 1, 2026 (upon expiration of the 90 day notice period following establishment of the Base Year Rent for most mobilehome owners). Since similar rent increases could be imposed before the Base Year Rent is established, and since the Base Year Rent could be established in other ways (as provided for in its defined term), this section should represent the intent of Ordinance 3422 as follows:

“5.47.130 Permissible Rent Increases – CPI Rent Increases.

(B) **Limitation on frequency of CPI Rent Increase.** A CPI Rent Increase shall not be imposed by a Park Owner for a Mobilehome Space more frequently than once during any twelve (12) month period, including less than twelve (12) months since any Monthly Base Rent increase imposed prior to the Base Year Rent.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact associated with approval of the recommended action, as the recommended action is clarifying revisions.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

This action is exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which states that a project is exempt from CEQA if the activity is covered by the common sense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. This action involves minor clarifying revisions to the RSO, which will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, no environmental analysis is required.

PREPARED BY: DEAN DERLETH, CITY ATTORNEY/LRM DIRECTOR

REVIEWED BY: JACOB ELLIS, CITY MANAGER

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Exhibit 1 – Ordinance No. 3426 (Redline)
2. Exhibit 2 – Ordinance No. 3426 (Clean)