



City of Escondido Sixth Cycle Housing Element 2021-2029

Adopted by City Council August 11, 2021

Amended by City Council March 22, 2023

Community Development Department

201 North Broadway

Escondido, CA 92025

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| A. Escondido's General Plan Vision | 1 |
| B. Escondido's Housing Element Outline | 1 |
| C. Community Context | 2 |
| D. Public Participation | 3 |
| E. Data Sources and Methodology | 7 |
| F. General Plan Consistency | 7 |
| 2. Housing Needs Assessment | 8 |
| A. Population Characteristics | 8 |
| B. Economic Characteristics | 11 |
| C. Household Characteristics | 15 |
| D. Housing Problems | 19 |
| E. Special Needs Groups | 23 |
| F. Housing Stock Characteristics | 36 |
| G. Housing Cost and Affordability | 42 |
| 3. Affordable Housing | 47 |
| A. Publicly Assisted Housing | 47 |
| B. Preservation of At-Risk Housing | 48 |
| 4. Housing Constraints | 50 |
| A. Market Influences | 50 |
| B. Governmental Constraints | 54 |
| C. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints | 82 |
| 5. Housing Resources | 86 |
| A. Regional Housing Needs Assessment | 86 |
| B. Credits Toward RHNA | 86 |
| C. Development Trends, Yields, and Realistic Capacity for Housing | 87 |
| D. Density and Affordability Levels | 92 |
| E. Methodology for Identifying Sites to Accommodate the RHNA | 93 |
| F. Sites Inventory and Residential Development Potential | 98 |
| G. No Net Loss | 107 |
| H. Ability to Meet RHNA | 108 |
| I. Financial Resources | 109 |
| J. Administrative Capacity | 111 |
| K. Opportunities for Energy Conservation | 111 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| A. State Housing Goals | 113 |
| B. City Housing Goals, Policies, and Programs | 113 |
| C. Summary of Quantified Objectives..... | 137 |
| Appendix A: RHNA Credits | A-1 |
| Appendix B: Sites Inventory | B-1 |
| Appendix C: Public Participation | C-1 |
| Appendix D: Review of Past Accomplishments..... | D-1 |
| Appendix E: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing | E-1 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Population Growth (2000-2020)..... | 8 |
| Table 2: Age Distribution (2010-2018)..... | 10 |
| Table 3: Race and Hispanic Origin (2018)..... | 11 |
| Table 4: Employment Characteristics - (2010-2018)..... | 13 |
| Table 5: Mean Salary by Occupation - San Diego Region (2020) | 14 |
| Table 6: Changes in Household Types (2010 – 2020) | 16 |
| Table 7: Household Size (2018) | 16 |
| Table 8: Median Household Income (2014-2018)..... | 18 |
| Table 9: Income Distribution (2000-2018)..... | 19 |
| Table 10: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households (2017)..... | 20 |
| Table 11: Overcrowded Housing Units (2010-2018)..... | 21 |
| Table 12: Household Cost Burden (2017) | 22 |
| Table 13: Cost Burden by Tenure and Income Level (2017) | 22 |
| Table 14: Special Needs Groups..... | 23 |
| Table 15: Inventory of Services for Special Needs Populations..... | 24 |
| Table 16: Persons Age 65 and Older (2018) | 25 |
| Table 17: Elderly Households by Tenure and Income Level (2017) | 26 |
| Table 18: Disabilities Tallied by Age and Type (2018)..... | 27 |
| Table 19: Large Households (2018) | 29 |
| Table 20: Large Households by Tenure and Income Level (2017) | 30 |
| Table 21: Single Parent Households (2018)..... | 31 |
| Table 22: Extremely-Low-Income Households by Tenure and Type | 32 |
| Table 23: Homelessness in North County Cities (2020) | 34 |
| Table 24: Housing Unit Growth (2000 to 2020) | 37 |
| Table 25: Projected Housing Units (2020-2040)..... | 37 |
| Table 26: Projected Housing Unit by Type (2020-2040)..... | 38 |
| Table 27: Tenure of Occupied Housing Units (2010-2018)..... | 39 |
| Table 28: Household Size by Tenure (2018) | 39 |
| Table 29: Vacancy Rates and Property Age (2019)..... | 40 |
| Table 30: Year Housing Built (2018)..... | 41 |
| Table 31: Substandard Units (2018)..... | 41 |
| Table 32: Changes in Median Home Sale Prices (2020)..... | 42 |
| Table 33: Average Monthly Rent (2019)..... | 44 |
| Table 34: Affordable Housing Cost (2020)..... | 46 |
| Table 35: Inventory of Assisted Rental Housing Projects | 47 |
| Table 36: Disposition of Home Loans (2017)..... | 51 |
| Table 37: Project Development Yield Trends by Zoning..... | 53 |
| Table 38: Assumed Realistic Capacities by Density range | 54 |
| Table 39: Land Use Designations Permitting Residential Use..... | 55 |
| Table 40: Downtown Specific Plan Residential Development Standards..... | 58 |
| Table 41: East Valley Specific Plan Land Use Designations | 59 |
| Table 42: Residential Development Standards..... | 64 |
| Table 43: Escondido Residential Parking Requirements | 66 |
| Table 44: Use Regulations for Residential Zones..... | 67 |
| Table 45: Planning and Development Fees Regional Comparison (2020/21) | 75 |
| Table 46: Total Fee Comparisons (2019-2020)..... | 76 |
| Table 47: Processing Time by Development Type | 79 |
| Table 48: Processing Time by Process / Permit | 81 |
| Table 49: RHNA Allocation by Household Income (2021-2029) | 86 |
| Table 50: Credits Toward RHNA | 87 |
| Table 51: Affordable Housing Yields | 89 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Table 52: Site Capacity Estimation (EVSP) | 91 |
| Table 53: Site Capacity Estimation (Non EVSP) | 92 |
| Table 54: Affordability by Density | 93 |
| Table 55: ADU Affordability Level (2018-2020) | 107 |
| Table 56: Average ADU Affordability Level (2018-2020) | 107 |
| Table 57: Estimated Sixth Cycle ADU Production | 107 |
| Table 58: No Net Loss Buffer Estimate..... | 108 |
| Table 59: Summary of RHNA Status | 109 |
| Table 60: Summary of Quantified Objectives | 137 |
| | |
| Table A- 1: RHNA Credits – Entitled Units..... | A-1 |
| Table A- 2: RHNA Credits - Approved Projects | A-1 |
| Table A- 3: Projects Under Review | A-2 |
| | |
| Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments | D-1 |
| | |
| Table E- 1: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index..... | E-3 |
| Table E- 2: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps..... | E-20 |
| Table E- 3: Opportunity Map Scores by Census Tract..... | E-30 |
| Table E- 4: Opportunity Indicators in Escondido and San Diego County..... | E-33 |
| Table E- 5: Any Housing Problem by Tenure and Race | E-35 |
| Table E- 6: Housing Problems for Elderly and Large Households by Tenure..... | E-35 |
| Table E- 7: Cost Burden by Tenure and Race | E-36 |
| Table E- 8: Cost Burden for Elderly and Large Households by Tenure | E-36 |
| Table E- 9: Location of Sites by TCAC Designation | E-56 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: Age Composition (2018)..... | 10 |
| Figure 2: Households by Income Categories (2013-2017) | 17 |
| Figure 3: Household Income Distribution (2014-2018) | 18 |
| Figure 4: Housing Types (2020) | 38 |
| Figure 5: Median Home Price (2020)..... | 42 |
| Figure 6: Downtown Escondido Specific Plan – Residential Densities | 57 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Appendix B: Listing of Parcels for City of Escondido RHNA | B-2 |
| Appendix B: Map of City of Escondido Housing Sites..... | B-56 |
| Appendix B: Map of City of Escondido Housing Sites – Downtown Sites..... | B-57 |
| Appendix B: Map of City of Escondido Housing Sites – East Valley Sites..... | B-58 |
| Appendix B: Map of City of Escondido Housing Sites – South Centre City Sites | B-59 |
| Figure B-1: Site Typology..... | B-60 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure E-1: Areas of Minority Concentration in Escondido (2018) | E-5 |
| Figure E-2: Predominant Populations- White and Hispanic Majorities..... | E-6 |
| Figure E-3: Change in Racial Composition, 1990-2015..... | E-7 |
| Figure E-4: Distribution of Persons with Disabilities..... | E-9 |
| Figure E-5: Percent Population of Adults Living Alone | E-11 |
| Figure E-6: Percent Population of Adults Living with Spouse | E-11 |
| Figure E-7: Percent Children in Married Households..... | E-12 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Figure E-8: Percent Children in Single Female-Headed Households | E-12 |
| Figure E-9: Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Areas in the County | E-14 |
| Figure E-10: Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Areas in Escondido | E-15 |
| Figure E-11: Distribution of Housing Choice Vouchers in Escondido | E-17 |
| Figure E-12: Affordability Index in Escondido | E-18 |
| Figure E-13: Poverty Status in Escondido | E-19 |
| Figure E-14: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map | E-21 |
| Figure E-15: Mission Park Community..... | E-22 |
| Figure E-16: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) - SD County | E-24 |
| Figure E-17: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) - Escondido..... | E-25 |
| Figure E-18: Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) - Escondido | E-27 |
| Figure E-19: Overpayment by Renter and Owner Households..... | E-38 |
| Figure E-20: Distribution of Overcrowded Households | E-40 |
| Figure E-21: Median Year Structure Built | E-41 |
| Figure E-22: Sensitive Communities | E-42 |
| Figure E-23: RHNA Sites and Minority Population by Census Block Group..... | E-46 |
| Figure E-24: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Minority Population..... | E-47 |
| Figure E-25: RHNA Sites and Population with a Disability by Census Tract | E-48 |
| Figure E-26: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Disability Status..... | E-49 |
| Figure E-27: RHNA Sites and Children in Married-Couple Households by Census Tract | E-50 |
| Figure E-28: RHNA Sites and Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Block Group | E-51 |
| Figure E-29: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Low to Moderate Income..... | E-52 |
| Figure E-30: RHNA Sites and R/ECAP Areas | E-53 |
| Figure E-31: RHNA Sites and TCAC Designation | E-55 |
| Figure E-32: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by TCAC Composite Score | E-55 |
| Figure E-33: RHNA Sites and CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Scores | E-57 |
| Figure E-34: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Cal EnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile | E-58 |

1. Introduction

The Housing Element is a component of the General Plan that assesses the housing needs of all economic segments of the City of Escondido. In addition, the Housing Element defines the goals and policies that will guide the City's approach to resolving those needs and recommends a set of programs that would implement policies over the next few years.

State law requires that all cities adopt a Housing Element and with prescribed details and content. This Housing Element responds to those requirements, and responds to the special characteristics of the City's housing environment. The Element incorporates the most current data readily available at the time of writing and an evaluation of the Housing Element adopted in 2013. Also included are assessments of the current and potential housing actions, and resources of the private sector and all levels of the public sector.

This Escondido Housing Element is prepared for the 2021-2029 update (Sixth cycle) for jurisdictions in the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) region.

The Housing Element's Purpose

The Housing Element is concerned with specifically identifying ways in which the housing needs of existing and future residents can be met. This Housing Element covers the planning period of April 15, 2021 to April 15, 2029, and identifies strategies and programs that focus on:

- Conserving and improving existing affordable housing;
- Providing adequate housing sites for meeting the projected housing demand;
- Assisting in the development of affordable housing;
- Removing governmental and other constraints to housing development; and
- Promoting equal housing opportunities.

A. Escondido's General Plan Vision

The City of Escondido envisions itself becoming the vibrant and dynamic cultural, economic, and recreational hub of inland North San Diego County. This vision calls for an outstanding quality of life with exemplary public services and a safe environment that support a wide-range of housing types; quality educational facilities; desirable workplaces offering diverse employment opportunities; convenient transportation options, and unique cultural/recreational amenities. A lively, active downtown with unique and exciting land uses and a revitalized surrounding urban core are the focus for appropriate higher-intensity infill developments that maximize opportunities for alternative transportation, and strengthen pedestrian linkages. Planning for quality, managed growth ensures the adequate provision of infrastructure, preserves perimeter viewsheds, respects and enhances the character of established single-family neighborhoods, and assures long-term sustainability for Escondido's future. This Housing Element provides policies and programs that will allow the City to achieve this vision.

B. Escondido's Housing Element Outline

The 2021-2029 Escondido Housing Element consists of the following major components:

- Introduction: An overview of the purpose and contents of the Housing Element.
- Housing Needs Assessment: An analysis of the demographic and housing characteristics and trends.
- Housing Constraints: A review of potential market, governmental, and environmental constraints to meeting the identified housing needs.
- Housing Resources: An evaluation of resources available to address housing goals.
- Housing Plan: A strategy to address the identified housing needs given the City's constraints and resources.

An evaluation of the City's achievements in implementing the 2013 Housing Element is also included in the appendix.

C. Community Context

Escondido is located in the North Central portion of San Diego County. Its natural setting, Mediterranean climate, rolling hills, and location at the intersection of two state highways provide a unique and attractive living environment. This setting has a substantial impact on the employment characteristics as well as the City's economic base. These conditions attract growth, which in turn creates a competitive residential atmosphere.

Escondido has experienced significant residential development since 1970. It is crucial that public services expand to meet the needs of the increasing population. These services include sewers, streets, police, fire, schools, and recreation. It is also important to locate housing to be accessible to other functions such as employment, services, shopping, and transportation.

In 2020, the City population was 153,008, an increase of about six percent in the last ten years. During this same period, the housing stock increased by approximately two percent. The growth in population has, in turn, increased diversity within the City. From 2010 to 2020, Escondido became more racially and ethnically diverse. The population of White residents has continued to decrease from 68% in 2000 to 35% in 2020. Meanwhile, the City's population of Hispanic residents has increased from 39% to 52%. The City's Asian population has also increased from four percent in 2000 to seven percent in 2020.

The 2018 American Community Survey (ACS) Five-Year estimates reported an increase in average household size from 3.06 persons per household in 2010 to 3.21 persons in 2018. This trend can be partially attributed to the increase in families with children and the shift in racial and ethnic composition, since many Asian and Hispanic households are typically larger than White households.

Escondido offers a mix of housing types. Single-family homes make up about 57% of the housing stock, the multi-family share is about 36%, and mobile homes comprise the remaining eight percent. Over three-fourths (76%) of Escondido's housing stock is over 30 years old (built before 1990), with approximately 10% of the housing stock being built before 1969 (over 50 years old).

The median price of a single-family home in Escondido is estimated at about \$540,000 as of 2019. Apartment rents range from \$1,490 for a one-bedroom apartment to \$2,273 for a three-bedroom apartment. Lower income households in the City are unable to afford homeownership and affordable rental options are also limited. The City has been actively addressing its housing issues by developing affordable housing, improving the existing housing, and providing assistance to households in need.

D. Public Participation

The City of Escondido envisions itself as a sustainable community through various environmental, economic, health, and social equity initiatives. The ability to increase housing production and preservation is a key factor to a sustainable future. To accomplish this, the Housing Element must provide goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs demonstrating how Escondido will meet its existing and future housing needs for all income levels. Although the City does not build the housing, the Housing Element does create a plan and regulatory framework, which provides opportunities for the private sector to do so, where market conditions determine when and where housing is built. In order to make sure that the City develops a good “housing” strategy, the City needs to identify all types of community-supported solutions.

The City was awarded Senate Bill (“SB”) 2 grant funding in 2020 to develop three different housing studies and plans: a Housing Element Update, a Sector Feasibility Study, and an East Valley Specific Plan. These three housing studies and plans will be linked together, through a common work program theme, called the “Housing and Community Investment Study.” The coordination of the three studies helps identify a comprehensive vision for maintaining, preserving, and developing housing to address Escondido’s quality of life needs. Through the consolidated work program, the City undertook a strategically focused public involvement process to help engage residents, businesses, and other community members in the development of three different housing studies and plans. Since the Housing Element, Sector Feasibility Study, and East Valley Specific Plan are related to each other, consolidating the work program in terms of project management into one project helped ensure that public participation-related activities and tasks were grouped to be more efficient. This in turn led to more effective public outreach and more-informed community engagement.

Components of the Housing and Community Investment Study

The Housing and Community Investment Study (“HCIS”) identifies the City’s housing needs and establishes clear goals and objectives to inform future housing decisions. This important effort will guide Escondido’s future housing policy creation and implementation. It will address things like how best to increase or accommodate affordability, substandard housing rehabilitation, existing demand for new housing, eliminating housing development constraints, and fair housing.

The Housing Element Update identifies:

- Policies for new housing construction, rehabilitation and conservation of the existing affordable housing stock.
- The current Housing Element sets a number of ambitious goals to increase housing production and preservation, ensure neighborhood livability, prevent discrimination, and end homelessness. This foundation has allowed Escondido to advance a progressive set of programs and initiatives to develop and preserve both market-rate and affordable housing. This update presents an opportunity to build on that foundation as we continue to address the housing crisis.

The Sector Feasibility Study identifies:

- Market information about how new development could be financed, and assess if, and to what degree, housing development is financially/economically feasible under rising construction, land, and regulatory costs.

East Valley Specific Plan identifies:

- A comprehensive planning and zoning scheme for an area just east of the former, downtown hospital campus.
- Opportunity sites ready for development. The area map shows the location of potential re-visioning.
- New ways to accommodate streamlined housing with community-supported solutions.

Public Participation of the HCIS

A goal of the HCIS was to ensure that the future housing accommodation strategies embraced the distinct identity and character of Escondido where one can live their entire life with housing for all ages, incomes and abilities. For that purpose, a Public Participation Plan was developed to help create meaningful outreach engagement activities. During the course of the Study, the City worked with development experts, community-based interest groups, stakeholders, and the community at large to achieve the best plan possible through engagement tools including meetings, community workshops, and online engagement. Information about the first and second phase of outreach is available and provided on the City's website (<https://www.escondido.org/hcis.aspx>) and summarized below. Additional information on the City's public participation is detailed in Appendix C.

First Phase of Outreach

The first phase of outreach of the HCIS focused on developing background information and feedback on overarching housing issues and concerns:

- Direct mailers, electronic e-mail blasts, and electronic flyers in English and Spanish
- Planning Commission and City Council meetings and status updates
- July 23, 2020 virtual workshop (English and Spanish services)
- Presentation Videos posted online (English and Spanish recordings)
- For Residents:
 - East Valley Specific Plan downloadable comment forms: English and Spanish
 - East Valley Specific Plan online form to submit comments
 - Housing Element online survey (July 2020 - December 2020): English and Spanish
- For Businesses:
 - East Valley business survey (August 2020 - September 2020): English and Spanish
 - Housing Element online survey (July 2020 - December 2020): English and Spanish

Second Phase of Outreach:

The City explored different strategies to develop more housing to meet state housing requirements and to meet its goals for maintaining community identity. Public feedback in the second phase of outreach was utilized to determine the locations and densities of new housing options.

- Direct mailers, electronic e-mail blasts, and electronic flyers in English and Spanish

- October 7, 2020 virtual workshop (English and Spanish services)
- Presentation Video posted online “Land Use Alternative Workshop” (English and Spanish recordings)

Housing Element Study Sessions

The City conducted two study sessions in March 2021, one before the Planning Commission (March 23) and one before the City Council (March 24) to review the Draft Housing Element.

Consideration of Community Feedback

The joint planning process for the EVSP Specific Plan and Housing Element included the outreach and participation of community members, business stakeholders and interest groups. Overarching comments received from the two rounds of community involvement for the EVSP included:

- Providing affordable to moderate income housing
- Promoting walkability through mixed-use buildings and complete streets concepts
- Enhancing streetscapes and building frontages through design and amenities
- Creating more public open space for the residents and visitors
- Providing affordable housing with appropriate design standards
- Including parks and urban canopy as these are important concepts for an urban setting
- Mindfully establishing parking standards to accommodate future and current needs
- Allowing for community services and other existing uses while facilitating new opportunities

Using community input gathered in the first phase of outreach, three Land Use Alternatives were developed for the City and community to assess and select a Preferred Land Use Alternative. The Preferred Land Use Alternative acts as a base in which the East Valley Specific Plan establishes the land uses, circulation network, design guidelines, and design standards. During the outreach activities, the community was informed that a significant portion of the City’ RHNA would be accommodated in this new growth area. Input gathered through this second outreach effort was folded into the Preferred Land Use Alternative, which is presented in the EVSP.

More generally related to housing across the entire City, the Housing Survey asked residents to rank housing challenges and needs across different categories. Overall, respondents ranked items as follows:

- Greatest housing challenges: housing costs, fair housing services, and neighborhood physical conditions
- Groups with greatest need: young adults, large households, persons formerly experiencing homelessness
- Greatest housing stock need: ADUs, housing for persons experiencing homelessness, housing for persons with disabilities
- Most important housing programs/activities: affordable housing, homelessness, first-time homebuyers.

The City also received oral and written public comments during the Planning Commission meetings on the draft Housing Element. Comments focused on implementing an inclusionary ordinance, minimum density requirements, value recapture requiring affordable housing, and homeownership opportunities for lower income households.

To address concerns related to fair housing, Escondido has included Program 3.4. Escondido will continue the enforcement of the Fair Housing Action Plan and continue to contract with the Legal Aid Society of San Diego to provide fair housing services. Program 3.2, Focus on Neighborhoods, utilizes proactive code enforcement, housing rehabilitation, and capital improvement to improve physical conditions of Escondido neighborhoods.

As part of the Housing and Community Investment Study (HCIS), the City conducted a housing sector feasibility study to evaluate housing construction viability under different affordability scenarios. The Sector Feasibility Study explores all the direct and indirect costs associated with new construction to better understand market conditions and patterns of housing and community development policy, including the benefit/impact of potential inclusionary housing programs. The results of the 2021 study showed that even a 10% inclusionary requirement makes housing construction infeasible at higher residential densities. That is, an inclusionary requirement has been determined, by substantial evidence, to be a potential constraint to new home construction at the default densities deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income households (30 units per acre). It is important to note that most of the sites suitable for near term development in the City are at densities that are at or exceed 30 units per acre. Development expected under the existing regulations and partnerships, or even through the programmed implementation of the 2021-2029 Housing Element, would help the City determine if more affordable housing can be achieved through various zoning incentives or subsidies – or identify such opportunities, and then seek their implementation. However, in response to public comment surrounding inclusionary housing requirements, the City has included Program 2.9, Inclusionary Housing Assessment, to continue research and feasibility on a potential inclusionary housing mechanism for the City.

The East Valley Specific Plan (EVSP) requires minimum densities of 21 units/acre in the EV-U-5 zone and 30 units/acre in the EV-MU zone. The EVSP and Downtown Specific Plan also include a Density Transfer Program, allowing the City to transfer densities from vacant or underutilized sites to other properties in the Plan Area, enabling an increase in density beyond what is allowed under the current density (see Program 1.2). The transferred density will be held in a Density Credit Pool.

The City has included Program 2.2, First-Time Homebuyer Assistance, to assist lower income first-time homebuyers. The program utilizes HOME funds and aims to assist one household annually. The City will also actively pursue funding to expand this program. Program 2.4, Mobile Home Park Conversion, to assist applicants applying for funding from HCD to pursue mobile home park conversion to resident ownership.

Public Review of Draft Housing Element

The Draft Housing Element has been available for public review on City website since March 19, 2021. The City received public comment letters on the draft housing element and overall process, prior to the City Council initial adoption of the document on August 11, 2021. City staff reviewed received comment letters, including those submitted from the San Diego Housing Federation, Escondido Community Housing Coalition, Sierra Club North County Group, and Erik Felix and Laura Harper, as well as from HCD. After the August 2021 City Council adoption, City staff met with each group listed to discuss how their comments may be integrated into the revised housing element document. Meetings with each group occurred between January and February of 2022. On April 15, 2022, the City posted the revised adopted Housing Element for a 30-day review period, prior to resubmittal to HCD. City staff presented the draft changes in a public meeting on May 10, 2022 to the City's Planning Commission and general public.

The City will continue to provide updated versions of the Draft Housing Element for public review.

E. Data Sources and Methodology

In preparing the Housing Element, various sources of information are consulted. The 2000 and 2010 Census provides the basis for population and household characteristics. Unfortunately, the 2020 Census data is not scheduled to be released in time for the preparation of this Housing Element. As of the writing of this Housing Element (February 2021), no 2020 Census data has been released. Therefore, several sources are used to provide reliable updates to the 2010 Census, including the following:

- 2014-2018 American Community Survey by the Census Bureau
- Population and demographic data updated by the State Department of Finance
- Housing market information, such as home sales and rents, from Corelogic and Zillow, among other sources
- Lending patterns from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) database
- Labor statistics from California Employment Development Department

F. General Plan Consistency

According to State planning law, the Housing Element must be consistent with the other General Plan elements. Certain goals and policies of each element may also address issues that are primary subjects of other elements. This integration of issues throughout the General Plan creates a strong basis for the implementation of plans and programs and achievement of community goals. The Housing Element is most closely tied to the Land Use Element as residential development capacities established in the Land Use Element are incorporated into the Housing Element.

The Escondido General Plan includes the following elements:

- Land Use and Community Form
- Mobility and Infrastructure
- Housing
- Community Health and Services
- Community Protection
- Resource Conservation
- Growth Management
- Economic Prosperity

This Housing Element is consistent with the policies and proposals set forth by the updated General Plan, but also incorporates new development opportunities offered by the East Valley Specific Plan. The Safety Element was also updated concurrent with the Housing Element update.

When an element in the General Plan is amended in the future, the Housing Element will be reviewed and modified if necessary to ensure continued consistency among the various elements. The City will ensure that updates to these Elements achieve internal consistency with the Housing Element.

2. Housing Needs Assessment

The City strives to achieve a balanced housing stock that meets the varied needs of all income segments of the community. To understand the City's housing needs, the nature of the existing housing stock and the housing market are comprehensively evaluated. This section of the Housing Element discusses the major components of housing needs in Escondido, including population, household, economic, and housing stock characteristics. Each of these components is presented in a regional context, and, where relevant, in the context of other nearby communities. This assessment serves as the basis for identifying the appropriate goals, policies, and programs for the City to implement during the 2021-2029 Housing Element cycle.

A. Population Characteristics

Understanding the characteristics of a population is vital in the process of planning for the future needs of a community. Population characteristics affect the type and amount of housing need in a community. Issues such as population growth, race/ethnicity, age, and employment trends are factors that combine to influence the type of housing needed and the ability to afford housing. The following section describes and analyzes the various population characteristics and trends that affect housing need.

Population Growth

According to the California Department of Finance population estimates, the City population in 2020 was 153,008, increasing from 133,559 in 2000 and 143,911 in 2010. Between 2010 and 2020, the City population increased by approximately 10,000 people, representing an increase of approximately six percent (Table 1). During the same period, San Diego County population increased by eight percent. The City population as a proportion of the County population has remained the same over the past 30 years (4.6%).

Table 1: Population Growth (2000-2020)

| | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | 2000-2010 | 2010-2020 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Escondido | 133,559 | 143,911 | 153,008 | 7.8% | 6.3% |
| San Diego Region | 2,813,833 | 3,095,313 | 3,343,355 | 10.0% | 8.0% |
| Escondido as a % of the County | 4.7% | 4.6% | 4.6% | -2.0% | -1.6% |

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2000, and 2010; California Department of Finance, 2020.

Age Characteristics

A community's current and future housing needs are determined in part by the age characteristics of residents. Typically, each age group has distinct lifestyles, family types and sizes, ability to earn incomes, and therefore, housing preferences. As people move through each stage of life, housing needs and preferences change. Traditional assumptions are that the young adult population (20 to 34 years old) tends to favor apartments, low to moderate cost townhomes/condominiums, and smaller single-family units.

The adult population (35 to 64 years old) represents the major market for moderate to relatively high cost condominiums and single-family homes. The senior population (65 years and older) tends to generate demand for low to moderate cost apartments and condominiums, group quarters, and mobile homes. In order to create a balanced community, it is important to provide housing options that suit the needs of various age groups.


In 2010, 31% of residents in the City were under the age of 20 years, 23% were young adults between 20 and 34 years, 36% were mature adults between 35 and 64 years, and 10% were elderly persons over 65 years of age (Table 2). According to the 2014-2018 ACS, the age distribution of Escondido residents was as follows: 28% of residents in the City were under the age of 20 years, 25% were between 20 and 34 years, 36% were between 35 and 64 years, and 11.6% were over 65 years of age. Overall, the City's population is aging, with the median age increasing from 32.5 to 33.8 between the 2010 Census and the 2014-2018 ACS. Figure 1 shows that the proportion of population for all age categories under 55 has decreased between 2010 and 2018 (except for 25 to 34 years old) while population over 55 at all age categories has increased (except 75+ years old).

Table 2: Age Distribution (2010-2018)

| Age | 2010 | | 2018 | |
|---------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|
| | Total | % of Total | Total | % of Total |
| Under 5 years | 11,638 | 8.1% | 11,164 | 7.4% |
| 5-9 years | 10,795 | 7.5% | 9,976 | 6.6% |
| 10-14 years | 10,686 | 7.4% | 9,858 | 6.5% |
| 15-19 years | 10,976 | 7.6% | 10,735 | 7.1% |
| 20-24 years | 11,138 | 7.7% | 11,554 | 7.6% |
| 25-29 years | 11,436 | 7.9% | 14,280 | 9.4% |
| 30-34 years | 10,167 | 7.1% | 11,383 | 7.5% |
| 35-39 years | 9,759 | 6.8% | 9,589 | 6.3% |
| 40-44 years | 9,681 | 6.7% | 9,246 | 6.1% |
| 45-49 years | 9,617 | 6.7% | 9,490 | 6.3% |
| 50-54 years | 9,190 | 6.4% | 9,418 | 6.2% |
| 55-59 years | 7,725 | 5.4% | 8,937 | 5.9% |
| 60-64 years | 6,019 | 4.2% | 7,853 | 5.2% |
| 65-69 years | 4,237 | 2.9% | 5,619 | 3.7% |
| 70-74 years | 3,162 | 2.2% | 4,125 | 2.7% |
| 75+ years | 7,685 | 5.3% | 7,888 | 5.2% |
| Total | 143,911 | 100.0% | 151,115 | 100.0% |
| Median Age | 32.5 | | 33.8 | |

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 Census; American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Figure 1: Age Composition (2018)



Race/Ethnicity

Race/ethnicity of the population is important to an analysis of housing needs and conditions for several reasons. The cultural influences of races are often reflective of preferences for housing type, location of housing, associated services, and household composition. For example, the concept of “extended family” can have implications on the definitions of overcrowding and housing conditions. The racial and ethnic composition of a community’s population should also be more carefully examined at the neighborhood level. In general, Hispanic and Asian households exhibit a greater propensity than White households for living in extended families. However, with the rising housing crisis in California, and the recent economic challenges presented by COVID-19, extended family members sharing housing arrangements or adult children moving back with parents have become a trend in many California communities.

Escondido, like many communities throughout California, has experienced gradual changes in the racial and ethnic composition of its population. According to the 2010 Census, White residents (40%) no longer comprised the largest racial/ethnic group in the community. The proportion of White residents continued to decrease, comprising only 36% of the population by 2018. Meanwhile, the City’s Hispanic residents now make up over half (52%) of the City’s population, which is a two percent increase since 2010 (Table 3).

| Table 3: Race and Hispanic Origin (2018) | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Race and Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| Non-Hispanic Races | | |
| White | 53,623 | 35.5% |
| Black or African American | 3,302 | 2.2% |
| American Indian | 553 | 0.4% |
| Asian | 10,032 | 6.6% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 380 | 0.3% |
| Some other race | 299 | 0.2% |
| Two or more races | 4,545 | 3.0% |
| Hispanic | 78,381 | 51.9% |
| Total | 151,115 | 100.0% |
| Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | |

B. Economic Characteristics

Employment has an important impact on housing needs. Incomes associated with different jobs and the number of workers in a household determines the type and size of housing a household can afford. In some cases, the types of jobs themselves can affect housing needs and demand (such as in communities with military installations, college campuses, and large amounts of seasonal agriculture). Employment growth typically leads to strong housing demand, while the reverse is true when employment contracts. In addition, the relationship between the location of housing and the location of employment has an impact upon transportation systems. Escondido is north of the major employment centers in San Diego County and, to a lesser extent, east of other areas in northern San Diego County.

Employment

The San Diego region currently has a smaller share of its employment in manufacturing than California and the nation. The decline in the proportion of jobs in manufacturing has been progressing for more than half a century nationwide. During the 1990s and continuing after 2000, the region's economy continued to diversify away from manufacturing and defense-related industries. Manufacturing's share of total non-farm employment fell from 12.8% in 1990 to 10.3% in 2000 and 9.2% during 2014-2018, following a similar trend for the state and the nation. Conversely, service occupations now comprise about 19.5% of the employment according to the 2014-2018 ACS.

The earnings gap between low- and high-paying jobs has also widened because of unbalanced job growth and the region's capacity for low-paying jobs has increased through public and private investments in low value-added industries, such as tourism, entertainment, and retail trade, without compensating investments for high value-added industries. However, as digital technology continues to improve, fostering online shopping and streaming of entertainment, entertainment and retail jobs may be in jeopardy and are certainly most impacted by the Coronavirus pandemic.

As of September 2020, unemployment rate in Escondido was reported by the State Employment Development Department at 8.5%, below the regional average of 9.0% and the statewide average of 11.0%. The current COVID-19 crisis is expected to have long-lasting impacts on the economy. The "pre-COVID" unemployment rate in Escondido was reported at 4.0% as of March 2020. The impacts of COVID-19 on housing affordability and housing problems (such as cost burden) are expected to worsen, although no data is available yet to substantiate the projections.

Table 4 highlights the difference in employment composition in Escondido versus the region. The table shows that employment in the agriculture and mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation, communication and utilities, wholesale trade, and public administration sectors are higher in Escondido. Compared to the region, Escondido has a lower proportion of higher paying jobs in the finance/real estate insurance, retail trade, and professional services sectors. Of course, it is important to note that this data set largely ignores the growing number of Escondido residents that have a single part-time job, multiple part-time jobs, or have other sources of income such as that from the gig economy, rather than traditional full-time employment.

Table 4: Employment Characteristics - (2010-2018)

| Industry Sector | 2006-2010 ACS | | 2014-2018 ACS | | Median Earnings (Escondido 2018) |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | % of Escondido Employment | % of Region Employment | % of Escondido Employment | % of Region Employment | |
| Agriculture, Mining | 2.0% | 0.7% | 2.3% | 0.9% | \$ 23,727 |
| Construction | 11.1% | 7.2% | 9.3% | 5.9% | \$33,206 |
| Manufacturing | 11.5% | 9.2% | 9.6% | 9.2% | \$ 41,896 |
| Transportation, Communication, Utilities | 2.7% | 2.9% | 3.3% | 2.4% | \$ 36,638 |
| Wholesale Trade | 12.7% | 10.8% | 12.5% | 10.5% | \$24,421 |
| Retail Trade | 2.6% | 3.8% | 3.9% | 4.1% | \$47,267 |
| Finance | 1.9% | 2.5% | 1.6% | 2.2% | \$50,231 |
| Real Estate, Insurance | 5.4% | 7.4% | 4.8% | 6.2% | \$39,682 |
| Professional Services | 12.1% | 14.2% | 14.2% | 15.1% | \$32,035 |
| Education, Health, and Social Services | 16.9% | 19.9% | 17.3% | 21.3% | \$32,783 |
| Arts, Recreation, Entertainment | 11.4% | 10.6% | 11.6% | 11.9% | \$20,236 |
| Other Services | 6.5% | 5.2% | 7.0% | 5.4% | \$20,310 |
| Public Administration | 3.3% | 5.4% | 2.4% | 5.0% | \$59,136 |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | \$30,993 |
| Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2006-2010; American Community Survey, 2014-2018. 2018 Census San Diego County Median Household Income = \$81,500 | | | | | |

Salary/Income

Table 5 displays mean annual wage data for occupations compiled by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) for the San Diego Metropolitan Statistical Area. Table 5 shows that the food preparation and serving, farming, fishing and forestry, personal care, and healthcare support occupations offer the lowest wages.

According to the ACS, approximately 14% of Escondido residents work at educational, health and social services occupations. Education and social services usually generate employment at the moderate income levels. Other major employment sectors for Escondido include arts, recreation and entertainment (17.3%) and wholesale trade (12.5%); both provide generally jobs at lower to moderate scales. Also refer to the next section regarding Escondido household incomes.

Table 5: Mean Salary by Occupation - San Diego Region (2020)

| Occupations | Average Salary |
|---|----------------|
| Management | \$136,531 |
| Legal | \$120,265 |
| Computer and Mathematical | \$104,627 |
| Healthcare Practitioners and Technical | \$102,053 |
| Architecture and Engineering | \$99,949 |
| Life, Physical and Social Science | \$87,579 |
| Business and Financial Operations | \$80,850 |
| Education, Training and Library | \$66,690 |
| Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media | \$61,614 |
| Construction and Extraction | \$60,047 |
| Protective Service | \$58,837 |
| Community and Social Service | \$56,793 |
| Installation, Maintenance and Repair | \$54,945 |
| Sales | \$45,974 |
| Office and Administrative Support | \$45,385 |
| Production | \$43,823 |
| Transportation and Material Moving | \$39,362 |
| Building, Grounds Cleaning, and Maintenance | \$36,248 |
| Healthcare Support | \$35,609 |
| Personal Care and Service | \$34,806 |
| Farming, Fishing and Forestry | \$33,243 |
| Food Preparation and Serving Related | \$31,942 |
| All Occupations | \$61,770 |

Source: California Employment Development Division, Occupational Employment Statistics (OES), Q1, 2020.

C. Household Characteristics

The Census defines a "household" as all persons who occupy a housing unit, which may include single persons living alone, families related through marriage or blood, or unrelated persons sharing living quarters. Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories, or other group living situations are not considered households. Furthermore, the Census classifies households by type according to the gender of the householder and the presence of relatives. Household characteristics such as size, type, income and tenure reveal important information about the housing needs of a community. Different household sizes, types and income levels often prefer different housing options.

According to the 2020 California Department of Finance housing estimates, there were 1,226,879 households (also known as occupied housing units) in San Diego County. Of these, 49,211 households, or approximately four percent, were located in Escondido.

Household Type and Size

Different household types generally have different housing needs. Seniors or young adults usually comprise the majority of the single-person households and tend to reside in apartments, condominiums or smaller single-family homes. Families with children often prefer single-family homes.

Escondido had 43,817 households in 2000. By 2010, this number grew marginally to 44,574, an increase of two percent. The number of households in Escondido increased an additional four percent to 46,338 households by 2018. Table 6 shows that, increasingly, Escondido households are comprised primarily of families. However, the greatest change between 2010 and 2018 was the increase in other 'non-traditional' families, including single parents. Married couples with children and single households living alone experienced numerical and proportional decreases.

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, 72% of the Escondido households were family-households. Of the City's family households, 36% were married couples with children under the age of 18 and 34% were married couples without children. The proportion of other families continued to grow, representing 31% of all family-households.

Approximately 28% of Escondido households were non-family households with the majority of them (72%) being residents living alone. By 2018, the average household size in the City increased to 3.21 and the average family size increased to 3.69.

Table 6: Changes in Household Types (2010 – 2020)

| Household Types | 2010 | | 2020 | | Change 2010-2020 | |
|---|--------------|--------|--------------|--------|---------------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Families | 31,816 | 71.4% | 33,324 | 71.9% | 1,508 | 4.7% |
| Married with Children | 12,419 | 39.0% | 11,819 | 35.5% | -600 | -4.8% |
| Married, no Children | 10,587 | 33.3% | 11,227 | 33.7% | 640 | 6.0% |
| Other Families | 8,810 | 27.7% | 10,278 | 30.8% | 1,468 | 16.7% |
| Non-Families | 12,758 | 28.6% | 13,014 | 28.1% | 256 | 2.0% |
| Single- Living Alone | 9,940 | 77.9% | 9,324 | 71.6% | -616 | -6.2% |
| Other Non-Families | 2,853 | 22.4% | 3,690 | 28.4% | 837 | 29.3% |
| Total Households | 44,574 | 100.0% | 46,338 | 100.0% | 1,764 | 4.0% |
| Average Household Size | 3.06 persons | | 3.21 persons | | 4.9% | |
| Average Family Size | 3.58 persons | | 3.69 persons | | 3.1% | |
| Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2006-2010; American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | | | | | |

Household size is an important market characteristic. Housing demand is shaped by the composition of its household sizes. The small household (one to two persons per household) traditionally prefers units with zero to two bedrooms, while the large household (five or more persons per household) prefers units with at least three bedrooms. Information on Table 7 shows that approximately 18% of Escondido households included five or more persons.

Table 7: Household Size (2018)

| Persons | Owner HHs | Percent | Renter-HHs | Percent | Total HHs | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|------------|---------|-----------|---------|
| One | 3,963 | 16.9% | 5,361 | 23.4% | 9,324 | 20.1% |
| Two | 8,210 | 35.0% | 5,375 | 23.5% | 13,585 | 29.3% |
| Three | 4,070 | 17.4% | 3,736 | 16.3% | 7,806 | 16.8% |
| Four | 3,684 | 15.7% | 3,507 | 15.3% | 7,191 | 15.5% |
| Five | 1,955 | 8.3% | 3,014 | 13.2% | 4,969 | 10.7% |
| Six | 850 | 3.6% | 1,125 | 4.9% | 1,975 | 4.3% |
| Seven or more | 694 | 3.0% | 794 | 3.5% | 1,488 | 3.2% |
| Total | 23,426 | 100.0% | 22,912 | 100.0% | 46,338 | 100.0% |
| HHs = Households | | | | | | |
| Source: Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey 2014-2018. | | | | | | |

Household Income


Household income is directly connected by the ability to afford housing. Income levels influence the range of housing prices within a region and the ability of the population to afford housing. Home ownership rates rise as household income increases. As household income decreases, households tend to pay a disproportionate amount of their income for housing and the number of persons occupying unsound and overcrowded housing increases.

For planning and funding purposes, the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has developed the following income categories based on the Area Median Income (AMI) of a metropolitan area (such as San Diego County):

- Extremely Low: Households earning up to 30% of the AMI
- Very Low: Households earning between 31 – 50% of the AMI
- Low: Households earning between 51 – 80% of the AMI
- Moderate: Households earning between 81 - 120% of the AMI
- Above Moderate: Households earning over 120% of the AMI

Combined, the extremely low, very low, and low income groups are referred to as lower income. Federal programs provide assistance primarily to households in the lower Income category (up to 80% AMI). In 2017, approximately 47% of Escondido households earned moderate or above moderate incomes (Figure 2), while 53% of households had incomes in the lower income levels.¹


Figure 2: Households by Income Categories (2013-2017)



¹ Data was obtained from the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) prepared for HUD by the Census Bureau using 2013-2017 Census data. CHAS data does not provide a breakdown of household income for those with more than 80% AMI as those households are not qualified for federal housing programs.

Household incomes in Escondido tend to be lower than those in the region as a whole. Median household income in the City was \$54,457 in 2009, compared to the San Diego County median household income of \$62,901. The ACS estimates the median household income in Escondido between 2014 and 2018 was \$62,319, compared to \$74,855 in the County. Figure 3 compares household income in Escondido and in the San Diego region between 2014 and 2018. Approximately 60% of Escondido households had incomes over \$49,999, seven percentage points lower than regionwide. Approximately 29% of Escondido households earned \$100,000 or more, compared to 37% in all of San Diego County. Approximately 27% of Escondido residents earned less than \$35,000 annually, compared to 23% region wide.

Figure 3: Household Income Distribution (2014-2018)



Median household income compared to neighboring communities provides a way to measure income in Escondido against other cities. Table 8 compares median income in Escondido to other North County cities and the region. Median household income in the City was one of the lowest in the region, comparable to the City of Vista.

| Table 8: Median Household Income (2014-2018) | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Median HH Income* | Percent Above/Below Regional Median |
| Carlsbad | \$107,172 | 43.2% |
| Encinitas | \$113,175 | 51.2% |
| Escondido | \$62,319 | -16.7% |
| Oceanside | \$68,652 | -8.3% |
| Poway | \$105,732 | 41.2% |
| San Marcos | \$76,619 | 2.4% |
| Vista | \$65,696 | -12.2% |
| San Diego Region | \$74,855 | --- |
| Source: Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | |

Median household income provides only partial insight into a community's income profile. A more detailed breakdown of households by income category can provide more information about the proportion of households in Escondido whose limited incomes may lead them to have a higher incidence of housing

problems such as overpayment (paying more than 30% of income on housing) or overcrowding (having more than one person per room).

Household incomes improved from 2000 to 2010 (Table 9). The percentage of wage earners with annual incomes over \$50,000 increased, while the percentage of those earning less than \$50,000 decreased, through the majority of this increase was due to a 7.2% increase in residents earning \$100,000 or more. Since 2010, while the proportion of households earning over \$100,000 continued to increase, the proportions of households earning below \$15,000 decreased from 10% to eight percent, indicating a decrease in the number of households earning extremely low incomes.

Table 9: Income Distribution (2000-2018)

| Household Income | Income Distribution | | | Percentage Change | |
|--|---------------------|--------|--------|-------------------|-----------|
| | 2000 | 2010 | 2018 | 2000-2010 | 2010-2018 |
| < \$10,000 | 3.8% | 5.5% | 4.9% | 1.7% | -0.6% |
| \$10,000 - \$14,999 | 5.0% | 5.0% | 3.1% | 0.0% | -1.9% |
| \$15,000 - \$24,999 | 11.8% | 10.5% | 9.1% | -1.3% | -1.4% |
| \$25,000 - \$34,999 | 14.3% | 11.4% | 9.6% | -2.9% | -1.8% |
| \$35,000 - \$49,999 | 16.5% | 15.8% | 13.8% | -0.7% | -2.0% |
| \$50,000 - \$74,999 | 22.2% | 19.1% | 18.1% | -3.1% | -1.0% |
| \$75,000 - \$99,999 | 12.3% | 11.4% | 12.9% | -0.9% | 1.5% |
| \$100,000 or more | 14.1% | 21.3% | 28.5% | 7.2% | 7.2% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | -- | -- |
| Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census; 2005-2009 American Community Survey 2005-2009; American Community Survey 2014-2018. | | | | | |

D. Housing Problems

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) developed by the Census for HUD provides detailed information on housing needs by income level for different types of households in Escondido. Detailed CHAS data based on the 2013-2017 American Community Survey is displayed in Table 10. Housing problems considered by CHAS include:

- Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom);
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room);
- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30% of gross income; or
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50% of gross income.

The types of problems vary according to household income, type, and tenure. Some highlights include:

- In general, renter-households had a higher level of housing problems (66%) compared to owner-households (36%).
- Large renter-families had the highest level of housing problems regardless of income level (84%).
- Extremely low income (78%) and very low income households (85%) had the highest incidence of housing problems.

Table 10: Housing Assistance Needs of Lower Income Households (2017)

| Household by Type, Income, and Housing Problem | Renters | | | | Owners | | | Total Households |
|--|---------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| | Elderly | Small Families | Large Families | Total Renters | Elderly | Large Families | Total Owners | |
| Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI) | 1,085 | 2,335 | 720 | 5,465 | 910 | 55 | 1,835 | 7,300 |
| % with any housing problem | 75.1% | 87.4% | 97.9% | 84.1% | 65.9% | 100.0% | 60.5% | 78.2% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 74.2% | 86.5% | 96.5% | 82.8% | 66.5% | 100.0% | 60.8% | 77.3% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 65.0% | 72.6% | 83.3% | 71.0% | 48.4% | 100.0% | 48.2% | 65.3% |
| Very Low Income (31-50% AMI) | 865 | 2,645 | 1,180 | 5,600 | 1,115 | 420 | 2,250 | 7,850 |
| % with any housing problem | 86.1% | 95.7% | 95.3% | 93.4% | 52.0% | 88.1% | 64.9% | 85.2% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 85.0% | 90.2% | 85.6% | 88.5% | 51.6% | 59.5% | 59.1% | 80.1% |
| % with cost burden >50% | 42.2% | 39.5% | 33.1% | 40.0% | 30.0% | 21.4% | 37.8% | 39.4% |
| Low Income (51-80% AMI) | 685 | 2,220 | 1,195 | 5,170 | 1,420 | 635 | 3,495 | 8,665 |
| % with any housing problem | 78.1% | 68.5% | 87.0% | 72.8% | 39.8% | 70.1% | 54.6% | 65.5% |
| % with cost burden >30% | 75.2% | 53.8% | 41.8% | 55.3% | 39.1% | 55.9% | 51.9% | 54.0% |
| % with cost burden > 50% | 24.1% | 7.2% | 7.9% | 9.5% | 16.2% | 13.4% | 19.9% | 13.7% |
| Total Households | 3,495 | 10,285 | 3,865 | 22,695 | 6,960 | 2,865 | 22,485 | 45,180 |
| % with any housing problem | 65.5% | 65.5% | 83.8% | 66.0% | 34.9% | 59.3% | 35.7% | 50.9% |

Note: Data presented in this table are based on special tabulations from sample Census data. The number of households in each category usually deviates slightly from the 100% total due to the need to extrapolate sample data out to total households. Interpretations

of these data should focus on the proportion of households in need of assistance rather than on precise numbers.

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2013-2017.

Overcrowding

Overcrowding is typically defined as a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room. A severely overcrowded household is defined as one with more than 1.5 persons per room. Under State law a housing unit is considered overcrowded if there is less than 120 square feet of livable space (all space except the bath, kitchen and hallways) for the first two people and less than an additional 50 square feet for each additional person. Overcrowding can indicate that a community does not have an adequate supply of affordable housing, especially for large families.

Overcrowding typically occurs when there are not enough adequately sized units within a community, when high housing costs relative to income force too many individuals to share a housing unit than it can adequately accommodate, or when families reside in smaller units than they need to devote income to other necessities, such as food and health care. Overcrowding tends to accelerate the deterioration of housing. Therefore, maintaining a reasonable level of occupancy and alleviating overcrowding are critical to enhancing quality of life.

Table 11 shows that nearly 10% of the households in Escondido were overcrowded in 2010, inclusive of the 12% that were severely overcrowded. Overcrowding was more prevalent among renter-households than owner-households, as rental units are typically smaller in size and renter-households typically have lower incomes. The situation with overcrowding worsened significantly between 2010 and 2018, with over 12% of the City's households being overcrowded. Specifically, over 4% of the households were severely overcrowded. The prevalence of overcrowding among owner-households did not change significantly between 2010 and 2018. However, the prevalence of renter-households increased from 16% to 20% and

severely overcrowded renter-households increased nearly three percent to 7.5% between 2014 and 2018.

| Table 11: Overcrowded Housing Units (2010-2018) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Overcrowding | Owner-Households | | Renter-Households | | Total Households | |
| | Number | % of Owners | Number | % of Renters | Number | % of Total |
| 2010 | | | | | | |
| Total Overcrowded (More than 1.0 persons/room) | 1,073 | 4.4% | 3,236 | 15.9% | 4,309 | 9.7% |
| Severely Overcrowded (More than 1.5 persons/room) | 324 | 1.0% | 841 | 4.1% | 1,075 | 2.4% |
| 2018 | | | | | | |
| Total Overcrowded (More than 1.0 persons/room) | 1,263 | 5.4% | 4,475 | 19.5% | 5,738 | 12.4% |
| Severely Overcrowded (More than 1.5 persons/room) | 285 | 1.2% | 1,725 | 7.5% | 2,010 | 4.3% |
| Source: Bureau of the Census, 2006-2010; American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | | | | | |

Cost Burden

Measuring the portion of a household's gross income that is spent for housing is an indicator of the dynamics of demand and supply. This measurement is often expressed in terms of "cost burden"--households paying an excessive amount of their income for housing, therefore decreasing the amount of disposable income available for other needs. This indicator is an important measurement of local housing market conditions as it reflects the affordability of housing in the community. Federal and state agencies use cost burden indicators to determine the extent and level of funding and support that should be allocated to a community.

Table 12 shows that in 2017, 41% of households in the San Diego region were paying over 30% of their income towards housing costs. In Escondido, nearly 45% of all households were cost burdened. Renters were more likely to experience cost burden than owners; in Escondido 58% of renters were cost burdened, compared to 32% of owners. Escondido had the highest level of cost burdened renters while Encinitas had the lowest level. For owner-households, Vista had the highest level of cost burden and Carlsbad had the lowest level.

Table 12: Household Cost Burden (2017)

| | All HH | | Renters | | Owners | |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Total | % Paying 30%+ | Total | % Paying 30%+ | Total | % Paying 30%+ |
| Carlsbad | 43,280 | 34.6% | 15,130 | 46.1% | 28,150 | 28.4% |
| Encinitas | 24,285 | 35.5% | 8,790 | 45.6% | 15,495 | 29.8% |
| Escondido | 45,175 | 44.8% | 22,685 | 57.5% | 22,490 | 31.9% |
| Oceanside | 61,980 | 42.2% | 27,290 | 55.1% | 34,685 | 32.0% |
| Poway | 15,770 | 33.9% | 4,035 | 48.3% | 11,735 | 28.9% |
| San Marcos | 29,175 | 40.9% | 11,285 | 53.6% | 17,885 | 32.8% |
| Vista | 30,570 | 44.7% | 15,530 | 55.5% | 15,040 | 33.6% |
| San Diego Region | 1,111,740 | 41.3% | 522,595 | 52.0% | 589,145 | 31.7% |

Note: Households do not equal total presented in other tables because housing costs were not computed for all households.

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2013-2017.

Table 13 provides more details on cost burden by income group for Escondido. Approximately 70% of lower income households were cost burdened versus 17% of moderate and above moderate households.

Table 13: Cost Burden by Tenure and Income Level (2017)

| Household Income Group | Total Renters | Total Owners | Total |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Extremely Low ($\leq 30\%$ AMI) | 3,552 | 1,184 | 4,736 |
| Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 3,012 | 919 | 3,931 |
| % Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 84.8% | 77.6% | 83.0% |
| Very Low ($>30\%$ to $\leq 50\%$ AMI) | 4,298 | 1,705 | 6,003 |
| Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 3,451 | 1,023 | 4,478 |
| % Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 80.3% | 60.0% | 74.6% |
| Low ($>50\%$ to $\leq 80\%$ AMI) | 5,077 | 3,782 | 8,859 |
| Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 2,193 | 1,728 | 3,925 |
| % Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 43.2% | 45.7% | 44.3% |
| Moderate & Above ($>80\%$ AMI) | 7,479 | 16,670 | 24,149 |
| Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 524 | 3,134 | 3,671 |
| % Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 7.0% | 18.8% | 15.2% |
| Total | 20,406 | 23,341 | 43,747 |
| Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 9,183 | 6,816 | 15,968 |
| % Cost Burden $>30\%$ | 45.0% | 29.2% | 36.5% |

Note: Totals may not be exact due to rounding; the Census Bureau uses a special rounding scheme for special tabulations such as these; totals may not match other census datasets

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2013-2017

E. Special Needs Groups

Certain segments of the population may have more difficulty in finding decent, affordable housing due to their special needs. Special circumstances may be related to one's employment and income, family characteristics, disability and household characteristics, among other factors. Consequently, certain residents in Escondido may experience higher incidences of housing cost burden, overcrowding, or other housing problems.

The special needs groups analyzed include the elderly, people with disabilities (including persons with developmental disabilities), homeless people, single parents, large households, military personnel, farm workers, and students (Table 14). Many of these groups overlap, for example many farm workers may be homeless, and many elderly people have a disability of some type.

The majority of these special needs groups would be assisted by an increase in affordable housing, especially housing located near public transportation and services. Table 15 provides a list of services and facilities available to assist households/persons with special needs.

| Table 14: Special Needs Groups | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Special Needs Group | # of People or HHs | # Owners | % Owner | # Renters | % Renter | % of Total HHs or Population |
| Households with Seniors | 11,169 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 24.1% |
| Senior Headed Households | 9,915 | 6,919 | 29.5% | 2,996 | 13.1% | 21.4% |
| Seniors Living Alone | 4,255 | 2,201 | 9.4% | 2,054 | 9.0% | 9.2% |
| Persons with Disabilities | 15,626 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10.3% |
| Large Households | 8,432 | 3,499 | 14.9% | 4,933 | 21.5% | 18.2% |
| Single-Parent Households | 5,127 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 11.1% |
| Female-Headed Households | 6,806 | 2,457 | 10.5% | 4,349 | 19.0% | 14.7% |
| Female-Headed Households with children | 3,739 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7.3% |
| People Living in Poverty | 22,270 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 14.7% |
| Farmworkers ¹ | 1,707 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.1% |
| Homeless | 429 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.3% |
| 1. ACS category includes "Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining." | | | | | | |
| Source: Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey, 2014-2018; Regional Housing Task Force on the Homeless 2020. | | | | | | |

Table 15: Inventory of Services for Special Needs Populations

| Services | Program | Details |
|---|--|--|
| Emergency Shelters, Permanent, & Transitional Housing | Hidden Valley House | Provides temporary, emergency shelter for survivors of domestic violence and their children. Offers safety planning, crisis counseling, advocacy services and assistance with obtaining long-term safe housing. |
| | Inland Service Center/ Interfaith Community Services | Haven House Year-Round Shelter provides emergency housing for up to 49 homeless men and women each night. Also offers temporary beds for veterans with or without a housing intervention already in place to assist in their transition from homelessness to permanent housing. Interfaith offers a variety of permanent housing units and programs that provide safe and affordable housing for homeless community members. |
| | Serenity Village | Transitional Housing for women and women with children. |
| | Tikkun House | Provides temporary emergency shelter for homeless mentally or emotionally disturbed women. Case planning, counseling, and advocacy are offered. |
| | Interfaith Community Services | Resources to find affordable housing, transition housing, emergency shelter |
| | Las Casitas Community Housing | Housing education and workshops, low-income housing lists, homebuyer loans and foreclosure prevention. |
| | | |
| Veterans | Aster | 10 beds (short-term recuperative) |
| | Aster Apartments | 28 beds |
| | Fairweather Lodge | 6 mentally ill veterans (permanent supportive housing) |
| | Merle's Place | 44 beds (dormitory) |
| | New Resolve | 44 beds (homeless, veterans) |
| | Raymond's Refuge I & II | 6 beds each for homeless seniors/ disabled (permanent supportive housing) |
| | Veterans Villas | PSH & affordable units owned by VVSD on S Escondido Blvd. (total 54 units in development) |
| Senior/Disability Services | Joslyn Center | Senior support |
| Source: City of Escondido | | |

Seniors

Many senior-headed households have special needs due to their relatively low incomes, disabilities or limitations, and dependency needs. Specifically, people aged 65 years and older often have four main concerns:

- **Housing:** Many seniors live alone and may have difficulty maintaining their homes.
- **Income:** People aged 65 and over are usually retired and living on a limited income.
- **Health care:** Seniors are more likely to have high health care costs.
- **Transportation:** Many of the elderly rely on public transportation; especially those with disabilities.

The limited income of many elderly persons often makes it difficult for them to find affordable housing. In the San Diego region, the elderly spend a higher percentage of their income for food, housing, medical care, and personal care than non-elderly families. Many elderly households need smaller “efficiency” units to make independent living possible and many single elderly persons need some form of housing assistance.

Table 16 shows that 17,632 persons were age 65 and older in Escondido in 2018. This accounted for about 12% of residents, comparable to the percentage found in the region as a whole. In comparison, most surrounding communities had higher proportions of seniors. Among the City’s senior population, 9,915 seniors were heads of households, representing about 21% of the City’s overall households (Table 14). Specifically, 4,255 senior-headed households were seniors living alone.

| Table 16: Persons Age 65 and Older (2018) | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Total | Age 65+ | Percent Age 65+ |
| Carlsbad | 113,670 | 19,151 | 16.8% |
| Encinitas | 62,713 | 11,124 | 17.7% |
| Escondido | 151,115 | 17,632 | 11.6% |
| Oceanside | 175,389 | 27,214 | 15.5% |
| Poway | 49,842 | 8,123 | 16.3% |
| San Marcos | 94,709 | 11,057 | 11.7% |
| Vista | 100,108 | 9,676 | 9.7% |
| San Diego Region | 3,302,833 | 439,595 | 13.3% |
| Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | | |

Table 17 shows elderly households by tenure and income level in 2017. About the same proportion of elderly renter-occupied households and renter-occupied households (65.5% and 66%, respectively) experience a housing problem. Housing problems are defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income, and/or overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Additionally, 64% of elderly renter-occupied households were paying more than 30% of their income for housing compared with 58% of all renter-households. Elderly owner-occupied households, on the other hand, tend to be better off than all households as a group (51%) but only marginally better than all owner-occupied households. About 35% elderly owner-occupied households had any housing problem compared with 36% of all owner-occupied households. It appears that elderly owner-renter households are disproportionately affected by cost burden since about 36% are cost-burdened compared to 31% of all owner-occupied households. Also,

while most elderly owner-households no longer hold a mortgage, some elderly homeowners may not be able to afford the costs of maintenance and repairs.

Table 17: Elderly Households by Tenure and Income Level (2017)

| Household by Type, Income and Housing Problem | Renters | | Owners | | Total Households |
|--|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| | Elderly Renters | Total Renters | Elderly Owners | Total Owners | |
| Household Income <=30% AMI | 1,085 | 5,465 | 910 | 1,835 | 7,300 |
| % with any housing problems | 75.1% | 84.1% | 65.9% | 60.5% | 78.2% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 74.2% | 82.8% | 66.5% | 60.8% | 77.3% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 65.0% | 71.0% | 48.4% | 48.2% | 65.3% |
| Household Income >30 to <=50% AMI | 865 | 5,600 | 1,115 | 2,250 | 7,850 |
| % with any housing problems | 86.1% | 93.4% | 52.0% | 64.9% | 85.2% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 85.0% | 88.5% | 51.6% | 59.1% | 80.1% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 42.2% | 40.0% | 30.0% | 37.8% | 39.4% |
| Household Income >50 to <=80% AMI | 685 | 5,170 | 1,420 | 3,495 | 8,665 |
| % with any housing problems | 78.1% | 72.8% | 39.8% | 54.6% | 65.5% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 75.2% | 55.3% | 39.1% | 51.9% | 54.0% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 24.1% | 9.5% | 16.2% | 19.9% | 13.7% |
| Household Income >80% AMI | 860 | 6,460 | 3,515 | 14,905 | 21,365 |
| % with any housing problems | 22.7% | 21.6% | 19.5% | 23.8% | 23.1% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 19.8% | 11.1% | 19.2% | 19.6% | 17.0% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 5.8% | 1.0% | 2.8% | 1.8% | 1.6% |
| Total Households | 3,495 | 22,695 | 6,960 | 22,485 | 45,180 |
| % with any housing problems | 65.5% | 66.0% | 34.9% | 35.7% | 50.9% |
| % Cost Burden >30 | 63.7% | 57.5% | 34.6% | 31.9% | 44.8% |
| % Cost Burden >50 | 36.8% | 29.4% | 15.9% | 12.0% | 20.7% |

Notes:

Any housing problems: cost burden greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Other housing problems: overcrowding (1.01 or more persons per room) and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

Elderly households: 1 or 2 person household, either person 62 years old or older.

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2013-2017.

Persons with Disabilities

In Escondido and elsewhere, persons with disabilities have a wide range of housing needs, which vary depending on the type and severity of the disability as well as personal preference and lifestyle. Physical, mental, and/or developmental disabilities may prevent a person from working, restrict one's mobility, or make it difficult to care for oneself. "Barrier-free design" housing, accessibility modifications, proximity to services and transit, and group living opportunities represent some of the types of considerations and accommodations that are important in serving this group. Also, some residents suffer from disabilities that require living in a supportive or institutional setting.

According to 2014-2018 ACS data, approximately 10% of Escondido residents had a disability. The ACS also tallied the number of disabilities by type for residents with one or more disabilities. Among the disabilities tallied, cognitive, ambulatory, and independent living difficulties were almost equally prevalent (Table 18).

| Table 18: Disabilities Tallied by Age and Type (2018) | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Disability Type | Under 18 | Age 18 to 64 | Age 65+ | Total |
| With a hearing difficulty | 8.8% | 8.6% | 17.0% | 12.6% |
| With a vision difficulty | 9.3% | 8.5% | 7.6% | 8.2% |
| With a cognitive difficulty | 54.9% | 23.2% | 13.1% | 20.1% |
| With an ambulatory difficulty | 8.8% | 26.4% | 28.7% | 26.5% |
| With a self-care difficulty | 18.2% | 10.5% | 11.1% | 11.2% |
| With an independent living difficulty | 0.0% | 22.8% | 22.4% | 21.4% |
| Total Disabled Persons | 1,724 | 14,811 | 14,879 | 31,414 |
| Note: A person can have multiple disabilities. Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018. | | | | |

Four factors – affordability, design, location, and discrimination – significantly limit the supply of housing available to households of persons with disabilities. The most obvious housing need for persons with disabilities is housing that is adapted to their needs. Most single-family homes are inaccessible to people with mobility and sensory limitations. Housing may not be adaptable to widened doorways and hallways, access ramps, larger bathrooms, lowered countertops, and other features necessary for accessibility.

Location of housing is also an important factor for many persons with disabilities, as they often rely upon public transportation to travel to necessary services and shops. "Barrier free design" housing, accessibility modifications, proximity to services and transit, and group living opportunities are important in serving this group. Incorporating barrier-free design in all new multi-family housing is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for the disabled.

Housing advocacy groups report that people with disabilities are often the victims of discrimination in the home buying market. People with disabilities, whether they work or receive disability income are often perceived to be a greater financial risk than persons without disabilities with identical income amounts. The 2014-2018 ACS reported that 19% of persons with disabilities in Escondido were living below the poverty level. It also estimated that 73% of people with disabilities between the ages of 16 and 64 years in the City were not in the labor force.

A change in State law requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. As defined by federal law, "developmental disability" means a severe, chronic disability of an individual that:

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: self-care; receptive and expressive language; learning; mobility; self-direction; capacity for independent living; or economic self-sufficiency;
- Reflects the individual's need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5%. This equates to 2,295 persons in the City of Escondido with developmental disabilities based on the 2020 California Department of Finance population estimates.

The San Diego Regional Center, which provides services for persons with developmental disabilities, publishes client statistics for its four area offices. The City of Escondido is served by the North County office in San Marcos. As of June 2019, 1,672 residents Escondido residents had received services from the Regional Center.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person's living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

Large Households

Large households are defined as those consisting of five or more members. These households comprise a special need group because of the limited supply of adequately sized and affordable housing units in a community. To save for other basic necessities such as food, clothing and medical care, it is common for lower income large households to reside in smaller units, which frequently results in overcrowding and can accelerate the deterioration of housing.

The City had 8,111 large households in 2000, comprising about 19% of the City's total households. The proportion increased to 21% by the following decade. The 2010 Census data indicated that there were 9,410 households with five or more members. By 2018, the number of large households decreased to 8,432, or 18% of all households in the City. Table 19 compares the number of large households in Escondido to that in the region as a whole. In 2018, 18% of households in Escondido consisted of five or more persons, compared to 12% region wide. Renter-households represented the majority (59%) of all large households.

Table 19: Large Households (2018)

| Jurisdiction | Persons in Household | | | Total Households |
|------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|------------------|
| | 5 | 6 | 7+ | |
| Escondido | 4,969 | 1,975 | 1,488 | 8,432 |
| Percent of Total | 10.7% | 4.3% | 3.2% | 18.2% |
| San Diego Region | 78,930 | 32,607 | 21,051 | 132,588 |
| Percent of Total | 7.1% | 2.9% | 1.9% | 11.8% |

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2014-2018 American Community Survey.

As shown in Table 20, a greater percentage of larger households had housing problems than all households (51%) in 2017. Housing problems can be defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income, and/or overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Renter-occupied large households (as a group) tend to have more housing problems than owner-occupied large households. The majority of renter-occupied large households (84%) had one or more housing problems, while more than half of larger owner-occupied households (59%) had one or more housing problems.

Table 20: Large Households by Tenure and Income Level (2017)

| Household by Type, Income, & Housing Problem | Renters | | Owners | | Total Households |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | Large Related (5 or more members) | Total Renters | Large Related (5 or more members) | Total Owners | |
| Household Income <=30% AMI | 720 | 5,465 | 55 | 1,835 | 7,300 |
| % with any housing problems | 97.9% | 84.1% | 100.0% | 60.5% | 78.2% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 96.5% | 82.8% | 100.0% | 60.8% | 77.3% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 83.3% | 71.0% | 100.0% | 48.2% | 65.3% |
| Household Income >30 to <=50% AMI | 1,180 | 5,600 | 420 | 2,250 | 7,850 |
| % with any housing problems | 95.3% | 93.4% | 88.1% | 64.9% | 85.2% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 85.6% | 88.5% | 59.5% | 59.1% | 80.1% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 33.1% | 40.0% | 21.4% | 37.8% | 39.4% |
| Household Income >50 to <=80% AMI | 1,195 | 5,170 | 635 | 3,495 | 8,665 |
| % with any housing problems | 87.0% | 72.8% | 70.1% | 54.6% | 65.5% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 41.8% | 55.3% | 55.9% | 51.9% | 54.0% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 7.9% | 9.5% | 13.4% | 19.9% | 13.7% |
| Household Income >80% AMI | 770 | 6,460 | 1,755 | 14,905 | 21,365 |
| % with any housing problems | 48.1% | 21.6% | 47.3% | 23.8% | 23.1% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 6.5% | 11.1% | 18.2% | 19.6% | 17.0% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 2.6% | 1.8% | 1.6% |
| Total Households | 3,865 | 22,695 | 2,865 | 22,485 | 45,180 |
| % with any housing problems | 83.8% | 66.0% | 59.3% | 35.7% | 50.9% |
| % Cost Burden >30% | 58.3% | 57.5% | 34.2% | 31.9% | 44.8% |
| % Cost Burden >50% | 28.1% | 29.4% | 9.6% | 12.0% | 20.7% |

Note: Totals may not match other 2014-2018 ACS products due to rounding.

Any housing problems: cost burden greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

Source: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), 2013-2017.

Single Parent Households

Single-parent families, particularly female-headed families with children, often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services. Female-headed families with children are considered a vulnerable group because they must balance the needs of their children with work responsibilities, often while earning limited incomes.

Table 21 shows that in 2018, Escondido had 5,127 single-parent households (11% of all households). Of these, the majority (66%) were female-headed households. In comparison, about eight percent of all County households were single-parent households, but 72% of these households were female-headed households.

Table 21: Single Parent Households (2018)

| | Total HHs | Single Parent HHs | Percent Total HHs | Female Headed HHs | Percent Single Parent HHs | Below Poverty | |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | Female Headed HHs | Percent Female Headed HHs |
| Escondido | 46,338 | 5,127 | 11.1% | 3,379 | 65.9% | 1,454 | 43.0% |
| San Diego Region | 1,118,980 | 92,411 | 8.3% | 66,423 | 71.9% | 22,186 | 33.4% |

HHs = Households
Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Residents Living Below Poverty

Female-headed families are particularly affected by poverty disproportionately. In 2010, 21% of the City's total residents (29,055 persons) were living in poverty. Approximately 34% of female-headed households with children, however, had incomes below the poverty level. In comparison, the 2014-2018 ACS reports that the percent of the City's population living below the poverty level decreased to 15% while percent of female-headed families increased by nine percent to 43%.

Extremely Low-Income Households

Extremely low-income (ELI) is defined as households with income less than 30% of area median income. The area median income in the County is \$92,700. For ELI households, this results in an income of \$31,200 or less for a four-person household or \$24,300 or less for a one-person household (See Table 34). ELI households have a variety of housing situations and needs. For example, most families and individuals receiving public assistance, such as social security insurance (SSI) or disability insurance are considered ELI households.

According to the most recent data from HUD, approximately 7,300 ELI households resided in the City, representing 16% of the total households. Most (78%) ELI households experience a high incidence of housing problems (defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities). Most (75%) ELI households are also renters, and renter ELI households experience housing problems at higher rates than owner ELI households (84% versus 61%, respectively). Elderly households make up almost one third (1,995) of all ELI households. In addition, over 60% of ELI households have a member with a disability.

Table 22: Extremely-Low-Income Households by Tenure and Type

| | Renters | | | | Owners | | | | All ELI HH |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| | Elderly | Small Related | Large Related | Total Renters | Elderly | Small Related | Large Related | Total Owners | |
| ELI Households | 1,085 | 2,335 | 720 | 5,465 | 910 | 550 | 55 | 1,835 | 7,300 |
| % with Any Housing Problem | 75.1% | 87.4% | 97.9% | 84.1% | 65.9% | 39.1% | 100.0% | 60.5% | 78.2% |
| % with Cost Burden >30 | 74.2% | 86.5% | 96.5% | 82.8% | 66.5% | 40.0% | 100.0% | 60.8% | 77.3% |
| % with Cost Burden >50 | 65.0% | 72.6% | 83.3% | 71.0% | 48.4% | 33.6% | 100.0% | 48.2% | 65.3% |
| With Disability | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3,335 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,210 | 4,545 |
| % with Disability | N/A | N/A | N/A | 61.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 65.9% | 62.2% |
| Total HH | 3,495 | 10,285 | 3,865 | 22,695 | 6,960 | 10,535 | 2,865 | 22,485 | 45,180 |
| % of HH ELI | 31.0% | 22.7% | 18.6% | 24.1% | 13.1% | 5.2% | 1.9% | 8.2% | 16.2% |

Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017 ACS Estimates

ELI households will likely seek rental housing and housing that is accessible to elderly residents and/or residents with disabilities. To address the range of needs, the City will promote a variety of housing types by locating ELI housing across the City (in the Downtown, East Valley, and South Centre planning areas), along with other transit-supportive uses and improvements. In addition, the City will facilitate and encourage low-income housing through the following Programs:

- ADUs: Explore tools and incentives to facilitate ADU construction, including on religious properties.
- Supportive Housing: Review and amend their Municipal Code to ensure supportive housing is allowed where residential uses are allowed.
- Affordable Housing Finance Programs: Support the construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing in the community, especially for ELI and special needs households.

In addition, the City has a variety of programs that support existing ELI households:

- Essential Middle Income Rental Housing Program: Acquisition and conversion of existing market-rate apartment communities to rent-restricted units for Low-Income, Median-Income, and Moderate-Income households earning no more than 120% of AMI.
- Mobile Home Park Rent Review: Conduct hearings on rent increases.
- Preservation of at-risk units.

Homeless

Throughout the San Diego region and country, homelessness has become an increasingly important issue. Factors contributing to the rise in homelessness include a lack of housing affordable to low and moderate income persons, increases in the number of persons whose incomes fall below the poverty level, reductions in public subsidies to the poor, and the de-institutionalization of the mentally ill.

State law (Government Code section 65583(7)) mandates that municipalities address the special needs of homeless persons within their jurisdictional boundaries. “Homelessness” as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), describes an individual (not imprisoned or otherwise detained) who:

- Lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and
- Has a primary nighttime residence that is:
 - A supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing for the mentally ill);
 - An institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or
 - A public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.

This definition does not include persons living in substandard housing, (unless it has been officially condemned); persons living in overcrowded housing (for example, doubled up with others), persons being discharged from mental health facilities (unless the person was homeless when entering and is considered to be homeless at discharge), or persons who may be at risk of homelessness (for example, living temporarily with family or friends.)

The Regional Task Force on Homelessness (“RTFH”) is San Diego County’s leading resource for information on issues of homelessness. Established in 1985, the Task Force promotes a regional approach as the best solution to ending homelessness in San Diego County. The Task Force is a public/private effort to build a base of understanding about the multiple causes and conditions of homelessness.

According to the Task Force, the San Diego region’s homeless population can be divided into two general groups: (1) urban homeless, and (2) rural homeless, including farm workers and day laborers who primarily occupy the hillsides, canyons and fields of the northern regions of the county. It is important to recognize that homeless individuals may fall into more than one category (for example, a homeless individual may be a veteran and a substance abuser), making it difficult to accurately quantify and categorize the homeless.

Since the homeless population is very difficult to quantify, Census information on homeless populations is often unreliable, due to the difficulty of efficiently counting a population without permanent residences. The Task Force compiles data from a physical Point-In-Time (“PIT”) count of sheltered (emergency and transitional) and street homeless persons. The 2020 Count was conducted on January 22, 2020, and the results are shown in Table 23 Oceanside and Escondido had the largest homeless populations of the North County cities.

Table 23: Homelessness in North County Cities (2020)

| Jurisdiction | Sheltered | Unsheltered | Total |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Carlsbad | 53 | 94 | 147 |
| Escondido | 165 | 264 | 429 |
| Encinitas | 33 | 47 | 80 |
| Oceanside | 166 | 242 | 408 |
| Poway | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| San Marcos | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Vista | 49 | 51 | 100 |
| San Diego Region | 3,648 | 3,971 | 7,619 |

Source: Regional Housing Task Force on the Homeless (2020).

Military Personnel

The military population's influence on the demand for housing takes two forms: (a) the existing service households trying to find housing; and (b) the former (either retirement or non-retirement separations) service households trying to find housing. The San Diego region is home to a disproportionate share of the State's and the nation's military personnel. According to the one-year 2018-2019 ACS, 54% of California's 150,746 uniformed military personnel were stationed in the San Diego region, and seven percent of the nation's 1.2 million armed forces were located in the region.

The greatest concentration of military personnel to the overall labor force in the region is found in Coronado, home to Naval Air Station North Island. Almost one out of every two members of Coronado's total labor force is in the military. Other areas with relatively high concentrations of military personnel are the City of National City and the unincorporated area. However, the City of San Diego has the largest number of people in the armed forces (32,617), accounting for about 40% of the region's enlisted military personnel. The existing military family housing is scattered across the region, and some communities, such as Escondido, have substantial portions of their housing stock occupied by military families. However, less than one percent of the region's armed forces reside in Escondido.

Student Housing Need

Student housing is considered a factor that affects housing availability. Although students may produce only temporary housing need, the impact upon housing demand and post-study residence is critical in the immediate university areas. San Diego State University, the largest university in the region, has an enrollment of 33,870 students as of the Fall of 2020, but only provides housing for approximately 3,500 students on campus. The University of San Diego houses approximately 3,800 students on campus for a student enrollment of 8,861 (Fall 2020). The University of California at San Diego provides on-campus housing for about 11,000 students for a student enrollment of 37,629 (Fall 2019). Other smaller universities and junior colleges in the County create similar housing problems. For example, the location of California State University San Marcos has had some impact on local housing, due to its location a few miles west of Escondido.

Typically, students are low income and are, therefore, impacted by a lack of affordable housing, especially within easy commuting distance from campus. They often seek shared housing situations to decrease expenses, and can be assisted through roommate referral services offered on and off campus. The lack of affordable housing also influences choices students make after graduation which can have a detrimental effect on the region's economy. The recent graduates provide a specialized pool of skilled

labor that is vital to the region; however, the lack of affordable housing often leads to their departure from the area.

Farm Workers

Farm workers are defined as those households whose wage earners make their living through seasonal agricultural work and who move with the seasons to different farming areas or communities. Permanent residents, who work in agriculture doing similar work, but who live in Escondido the entire year, are included in the City's estimates of households needing assistance due to affordability. However, the undocumented immigrant and migrant worker form a substantial part of the farm worker population. The ability to gather information about this segment of the farm worker population is limited because they are so mobile and reluctant to participate in any survey.

Due to the high cost of housing and low wages, a significant number of migrant farm workers have difficulty finding affordable, safe and sanitary housing. According to the State Employment Development Department, the average farm worker earned a mean annual wage of \$31,729.² This limited income is exacerbated by their tenuous and/or seasonal employment status.

The housing needs of farm workers are difficult to quantify due to the fear of job loss and the fear of authority. Thus, farm workers are given low priority when addressing housing needs, and often receive the least hospitable housing. The San Diego County Regional Task Force on the Homeless estimates that many of the farm workers in the County live in migrant camps throughout the region.

The 2014-2018 ACS provided a few indicators of the potential farm worker population. The ACS revealed that approximately 1,308 individuals in Escondido were employed in the farming, fishing, and forestry industry. More recent estimates for the number of farm workers, however, vary depending upon the different growing seasons. The National Center for Farmworker Health ("NCFH") estimates that there are over 12,000 hired farm workers and nearly 2,000 contract farm workers in San Diego County.³ The numbers can change quickly as more work becomes available. This population remains highly migratory, following the work as it becomes available and even returning home for short periods during the off season. Other estimates of farmworker population come from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). According to the USDA's 2017 Census of Agriculture, 2,202 persons were hired farm labor (full time), 7,982 persons were employed for 150 days or more, and 4,353 were hired for 150 days or less in San Diego County (data is only available at a county level).

The number of encampments located throughout the County has become very difficult to estimate because encampments move frequently and are now much smaller than in the past. It is estimated that there are between 100 and 150 farm worker camps located throughout the San Diego region, primarily in rural areas.⁴ These encampments range in size from a few people to a few hundred and are frequently found in fields, hillsides, canyons, ravines, and riverbeds, often on the edge of their employer's property. Some workers reside in severely overcrowded dwellings, in packing buildings, or in storage sheds. Because camps tend to be in remote locations, this population is often under-counted. Most farm workers and day laborers have moved from living inside the local jurisdiction's boundary lines to just outside them in the unincorporated areas. The City of Escondido recognizes the needs of farm workers and allows housing to be partially provided through provisions in the Zoning Ordinance. The City is one of a few

² State Employment Development Department, Occupational Employment (May 2019) and Wage Data (1st Quarter, 2020).

³ National Center for Farmworker Health, Inc., Migratory and Seasonal Farmworker Population Estimates (2017).

⁴ California Institute for Rural Studies. The Agricultural Worker Health Study, Case Study 2: North San Diego County (July 2002).

which allows, as a permitted use in agricultural and estate residential zones, living quarters for persons employed on the premises in conjunction with authorized agricultural uses.

The City completed the development of nine units for farm workers as part of a 24-unit affordable housing complex for low income households in 2001. The project is located at 1801–1821 South Escondido Boulevard and is called Eucalyptus View Cooperative Apartments. The development provides 24 units of affordable housing to families earning less than 50% of the area median income. The unit mix includes four one-bedroom units, 11 two-bedroom units and eight three-bedroom units. As a limited-equity cooperative, Eucalyptus View provides a form of homeownership. The initial share prices are equivalent to what is typically required for rent and security deposits for a rental unit. Long-term affordability is guaranteed and resale prices are limited to a percentage of annual increases in the equity investment.

F. Housing Stock Characteristics

A community's housing stock is defined as the collection of all housing units located within the jurisdiction. The characteristics of the housing stock, including growth, type, age and condition, tenure, vacancy rates, housing costs, and affordability are important in determining the housing needs for the community. This section details the housing stock characteristics of Escondido to identify how well the current housing stock meets the needs of current and future residents of the City.

Housing Growth

During the 1980s and 1990s, the City's housing stock grew significantly that led to the City implementing several growth management policies that dramatically limited the number of units that could be built each year in order to ensure the provision of adequate facilities and services prior to development of future housing stock. As a result, the rate of housing growth declined sharply between 2000 and 2010, at less than seven percent (Table 24). The decrease in housing production also occurred as a result of the recession. While there were building permits available to be pulled for units in some of the large subdivisions, developers chose not to build due to the decline in the market.

Recovery from the recession had been slow. While several neighboring jurisdictions experienced large increases in their housing stock over the last 20 years, such as Carlsbad and San Marcos, others jurisdictions, including Escondido, experienced only moderate increases. Table 24 shows that between 2010 to 2020, Escondido's housing stock increased only 2.4%, below the countywide average (5.3%) and significantly below the nearby Carlsbad and San Marcos, where housing growth exceeded six percent and 13%, respectively.

Table 24: Housing Unit Growth (2000 to 2020)

| Jurisdiction | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | Percent Change | |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | | | 2000-2010 | 2010-2020 |
| Carlsbad | 33,812 | 44,673 | 47,629 | 32.1% | 6.6% |
| Encinitas | 23,829 | 25,740 | 26,625 | 8.0% | 3.4% |
| Escondido | 45,050 | 48,044 | 49,211 | 6.7% | 2.4% |
| Oceanside | 59,583 | 64,435 | 66,078 | 8.1% | 2.6% |
| Poway | 15,714 | 16,715 | 16,932 | 6.4% | 1.3% |
| San Marcos | 18,862 | 28,641 | 32,460 | 51.8% | 13.3% |
| Vista | 29,814 | 30,986 | 32,874 | 3.9% | 6.1% |
| San Diego Region | 1,040,149 | 1,164,786 | 1,226,879 | 12.0% | 5.3% |

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000 and 2010 Censuses; California Department of Finance, 2020 Population and Housing Estimates.

Projected Housing Units

Table 25 shows that between 2020 and 2030, Escondido is projected to gain 12% in housing stock. Regionwide, approximately ten percent more units will be added to the housing stock. Between 2020 and 2040, Escondido is projected to see an increase of 13% in housing stock and approximately 17% more units will be added in the region.

Table 25: Projected Housing Units (2020-2040)

| Jurisdiction | 2020 (Actual) | 2030 | 2040 | Percent Change | |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2020-2030 | 2020-2040 |
| Carlsbad | 47,629 | 49,629 | 50,491 | 4.2% | 6.0% |
| Encinitas | 26,625 | 26,646 | 27,100 | 0.1% | 1.8% |
| Escondido | 49,211 | 55,322 | 55,826 | 12.4% | 13.4% |
| Oceanside | 66,078 | 69,506 | 70,612 | 5.2% | 6.9% |
| Poway | 16,932 | 17,406 | 17,714 | 2.8% | 4.6% |
| San Marcos | 32,460 | 35,758 | 37,401 | 10.2% | 15.2% |
| Vista | 32,874 | 34,028 | 37,280 | 3.5% | 13.4% |
| San Diego Region | 1,226,879 | 1,348,802 | 1,434,653 | 9.9% | 16.9% |

Source: California Department of Finance, 2020 Population and Housing Estimates & SANDAG Regionwide 2050 Forecast Series 13.

Housing Type

Figure 4 shows that in 2020, the largest percentage (51%) of housing units in Escondido was single-family detached units. Approximately six percent were single-family attached units, 36% were multi-family developments, and eight percent were mobile homes/trailers.

Figure 4: Housing Types (2020)




Table 26 shows that the proportion of both single-family units and mobile homes in Escondido is projected to decrease slightly, while the proportion of multi-family units is expected to increase. However, this figure may be misleading because SANDAG forecasts mobile homes by determining the region's mobile home growth rate and applying it to each jurisdiction.

Table 26: Projected Housing Unit by Type (2020-2040)

| Housing Type | 2020 | % of Total | 2030 (Projected) | % of Total | 2040 (Projected) | % of Total |
|---------------|--------|------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| Single-Family | 27,878 | 56.6% | 28,474 | 51.5% | 28,670 | 51.4% |
| Multi-Family | 17,537 | 35.6% | 23,109 | 41.8% | 23,417 | 41.9% |
| Mobile Homes | 3,796 | 7.7% | 3,739 | 6.8% | 3,739 | 6.7% |
| Total Housing | 49,211 | 100.0% | 55,322 | 100.0% | 55,826 | 100.0% |

Source: California Department of Finance, 2020 Population and Housing Estimates; SANDAG Regionwide Forecast 2050, Series 13.

Housing Availability and Tenure

Housing tenure and vacancy rates are important indicators of the supply and cost of housing. Housing tenure refers to whether a unit is owned or rented. Tenure is an important market characteristic because it is directly related to housing types and turnover rates. The tenure distribution of a community's housing stock can be an indicator of several aspects of the housing market, including the affordability of units, household stability and residential mobility among others. In most communities, tenure distribution generally correlates with household income, composition and age of the householder.

In 2010, among the City's occupied housing units, approximately 52% were owner-occupied, while 48% were renter-occupied (Table 27). According to the 2014-2018 ACS, the home ownership rate in Escondido decreased slightly to 51% of the occupied units. Renter-occupied housing units made up almost 49% of the City's occupied housing stock. Approximately four percent of total housing units were vacant.

Table 27: Tenure of Occupied Housing Units (2010-2018)

| Tenure | 2010 Census | | 2014-2018 ACS | |
|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Owner Occupied | 23,759 | 52.2% | 23,426 | 50.6% |
| Renter Occupied | 21,725 | 47.8% | 22,912 | 49.4% |
| Total | 45,484 | 100.0% | 46,338 | 100.0% |

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2010 Census; American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Renter-occupied households had a slightly higher average household size than owners (Table 28). Approximately 54% of households with four or more persons were renter-households. In 2010, average renter-household size was 3.26 persons compared to 2.99 persons per for the average owner-household. In 2018, average renter-household size increased to 3.28 persons compared to 3.15 persons for the average owner-household, narrowing the discrepancy in average household size based on tenure.

Table 28: Household Size by Tenure (2018)

| | 1-3 Persons | | 4+ Persons | | Total | |
|--------|-------------|---------|------------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Owner | 16,243 | 52.9% | 7,183 | 46.0% | 23,426 | 50.6% |
| Renter | 14,472 | 47.1% | 8,440 | 54.0% | 22,912 | 49.4% |
| Total | 30,715 | 100.0% | 15,623 | 100.0% | 46,338 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Vacancy rates are an important housing indicator because they indicate the degree of choice available. High vacancy rates usually indicate low demand and/or high supply conditions in the housing market. Too high of a vacancy rate can be difficult for owners trying to sell or rent. Low vacancy rates usually indicate high demand and/or low supply conditions in the housing market. Too low of a vacancy rate can force prices up making it more difficult for low and moderate income households to find housing.

Vacancy rates between two to three percent are usually considered healthy for single-family housing; and five to six percent for multi-family housing. However, vacancy rates are not the sole indicator of market conditions. They must be viewed in the context of all the characteristics of the local and regional market.

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, the overall vacancy rate in Escondido was four percent. Specifically, ownership housing had a vacancy rate of one percent while the rental vacancy rate was 3.5%.

Additional vacancy information was obtained for Spring 2019 from the San Diego County Apartment Association (“SDCAA”) and is shown in Table 29. Vacancy rates in Escondido were similar to those in the Northern San Diego County region.

Table 29: Vacancy Rates and Property Age (2019)

| Jurisdiction | Combined Property Ages | | | Over 25 Years | | | 6 to 25 Years | | | Less than 6 Years | | |
|------------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|----------|
| | % Vacant | Total Units | # Vacant | % Vacant | Total Units | # Vacant | % Vacant | Total Units | # Vacant | % Vacant | Total Units | # Vacant |
| Carlsbad | 1.9% | 526 | 10 | 1.9% | 526 | 10 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Del Mar | 6.1% | 246 | 15 | 7.4% | 202 | 15 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Encinitas | 0.0% | 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 10 | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Escondido | 3.9% | 535 | 21 | 2.8% | 250 | 7 | 5.0% | 202 | 10 | -- | -- | -- |
| Oceanside | 3.9% | 487 | 19 | 3.2% | 282 | 9 | 0.0% | 4 | 0 | -- | -- | -- |
| Solana Beach | 1.1% | 176 | 2 | 1.1% | 176 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| N. County Region | 4.0% | 3,730 | 148 | 3.5% | 2,628 | 93 | 4.9% | 206 | 10 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 |
| San Diego City | 4.0% | 9,544 | 378 | 3.6% | 4,374 | 157 | 3.4% | 1,944 | 66 | 11.1% | 1,002 | 111 |
| SD Region | 4.1% | 23,000 | 936 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Source: San Diego County Apartment Association Survey, Spring 2019.

Housing Age and Condition

Housing age can be an important indicator of housing condition within a community. Like any other tangible asset, housing is subject to gradual physical or technological deterioration over time. If not properly and regularly maintained, housing can deteriorate and discourage reinvestment, depress neighboring property values, and eventually impact the quality of life in a neighborhood. Many federal and state programs also use the age of housing as one factor in determining housing rehabilitation needs. Typically, housing over 30 years of age is more likely to have rehabilitation needs that may include new plumbing, roof repairs, foundation work and other repairs. Although the Censuses did not include statistics on housing condition based upon observations, they did include statistics that correlate very closely with substandard housing.

The three factors most commonly used to determine housing conditions are age of housing, overcrowding, and lack of plumbing and kitchen facilities. Table 30 shows that in 2018 approximately 88% of the housing stock was more than 20 years old and 76% was over 30 years old. Table 31 provides estimates of substandard housing conditions in the City.

Table 30: Year Housing Built (2018)

| Year Built | Number | Percent |
|-----------------|--------|---------|
| 2014 or later | 243 | 0.5% |
| 2010-2013 | 672 | 1.4% |
| 2000-2009 | 4,741 | 9.8% |
| 1990-1999 | 6,045 | 12.5% |
| 1980-1989 | 13,327 | 27.6% |
| 1970-1979 | 12,433 | 25.8% |
| 1960-1969 | 6,206 | 12.9% |
| 1950-1959 | 2,872 | 6.0% |
| 1940-1949 | 646 | 1.3% |
| 1939 or earlier | 1,083 | 2.2% |
| Total | 48,268 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Table 31: Substandard Units (2018)

| | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Lacking complete plumbing facilities | 224 | 0.5% |
| Lacking complete kitchen facilities | 387 | 0.8% |
| Total occupied substandard units | 611 | 1.3% |
| Total occupied units: | | 46,338 |

Sources: American Community Survey, 2014-2018.

Housing that is not maintained can discourage reinvestment, depress neighboring property values, and can negatively impact the quality of life in a neighborhood. Improving housing is an important goal of the City. The age of the City's housing stock indicates a potential need for continued code compliance, property maintenance and housing rehabilitation programs to stem housing deterioration.

Because substandard housing can cause serious health and safety issues, physical defects should not be used as the only indicator of substandard housing. The Housing Division considers housing units in compliance with local building codes to be standard units. Any housing unit that does not meet these requirements is considered substandard. Common housing code violations make a unit unsafe and/or unsanitary, including problems with electrical wiring, plumbing, windows, roofs and exterior, and heating and air conditioning systems. The City's Housing Rehabilitation program assists an average of 22 households annually given funding limitations and receives 5-10 calls per month seeking assistance for rehabilitation. The City estimates that in any given year, about 300 units may be considered substandard and requiring rehabilitation. Escondido's substandard units are all suitable for rehabilitation.


G. Housing Cost and Affordability

Housing costs are indicative of housing accessibility to all economic segments of the community. Typically, if housing supply exceeds housing demand, housing costs will fall. If housing demand exceeds housing supply, housing costs will rise. This section summarizes the cost and affordability of the housing stock to Escondido residents.

Homeownership Market

Median home prices in the North County areas of San Diego ranged from \$579,500 in Oceanside to \$1,200,000 in Encinitas (Figure 5). Median home sale prices in Escondido increased 13% between 2019 and 2020 (Table 32). All neighboring communities and the County, other than Encinitas, saw similar increases in median home sale prices.

Figure 5: Median Home Price (2020)



Source: Corelogic.com California Home Sale Activity by City, August 2020.

Table 32: Changes in Median Home Sale Prices (2020)

| Jurisdiction | 2020 | | Percent Change in Median Sale Price 2019-2020 |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| | Number Sold | Price | |
| Carlsbad | 237 | \$898,000 | 10.9% |
| Encinitas | 79 | \$1,200,000 | -7.3% |
| Escondido | 230 | \$610,000 | 13.0% |
| Oceanside | 275 | \$579,500 | 9.3% |
| Poway | 53 | \$850,000 | 21.4% |
| San Marcos | 162 | \$652,500 | 10.6% |
| Vista | 144 | \$590,000 | 13.2% |
| San Diego Region | 4,122 | \$640,000 | 9.4% |

Source: Corelogic.com California Home Sale Activity by City, August 2020.

Rental Market

The primary source of information on rental costs in the San Diego region is the San Diego County Apartment Association (“SDCAA”). SDCAA conducts two surveys of rental properties per year. For the Spring 2019 survey, 6,000 surveys were sent out to rental property owners and managers throughout San Diego County. Responses were received for 23,000 units. Although this survey sampled a broad variety of rental housing, it was not a scientific sampling. Table 33 shows that in the Spring of 2019, average monthly rents in Escondido ranged from \$1,490 for a one-bedroom apartment to \$2,273 for a three-bedroom apartment. Apartment rents tend to be slightly lower in Escondido than those in the County of San Diego.

Table 33: Average Monthly Rent (2019)

| Zip Code | Unit Type | Spring 2019 Units/ Properties Surveyed | Spring 2019 Monthly Rent | Spring 2019 Rent/Sq. Foot | Fall 2018 Monthly Rent | Spring 2018 Monthly Rent |
|---|-----------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Carlsbad 92008, 92009, 92010, 92011 | Studio | 11/3 | \$1,214 | \$3.26 | \$1,099 | \$1,081 |
| | 1 BR | 44/4 | \$1,724 | \$2.60 | \$1,457 | \$1,635 |
| | 2 BR | 457/6 | \$2,546 | \$2.53 | \$2,685 | \$2,448 |
| | 3+ BR | 14/2 | \$2,937 | \$2.36 | -- | \$2,561 |
| Encinitas 92023, 92024 | Studio | 0/0 | -- | -- | -- | \$1,289 |
| | 1 BR | 4/1 | \$1,800 | \$3.27 | \$1,295 | \$1,581 |
| | 2 BR | 5/2 | \$2,100 | \$2.98 | \$2,145 | \$1,840 |
| | 3+ BR | 1/1 | \$1,350 | \$0.96 | \$2,150 | \$2,150 |
| Escondido 92025, 90026, 90027, 90029, 90030, 90033, 90046 | Studio | 0/0 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | 1 BR | 168/4 | \$1,490 | \$2.17 | \$1,462 | \$1,138 |
| | 2 BR | 322/7 | \$1,901 | \$1.82 | \$1,728 | \$1,701 |
| | 3+ BR | 45/9 | \$2,273 | \$1.68 | \$1,784 | \$2,143 |
| Oceanside 92049, 92050, 92051, 92052, 92054, 92056, 92057, 92058 | Studio | 43/4 | \$1,298 | \$3.02 | \$1,620 | \$1,123 |
| | 1 BR | 257/9 | \$1,420 | \$2.46 | \$1,503 | \$1,529 |
| | 2 BR | 184/11 | \$1,817 | \$2.03 | \$1,774 | \$1,844 |
| | 3+ BR | 3/3 | \$1,960 | \$1.38 | \$2,195 | \$1,995 |
| Poway 92064 92074 | Studio | 0/0 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | 1 BR | 12/1 | \$1,695 | \$2.42 | -- | \$1,000 |
| | 2 BR | 40/1 | \$1,885 | \$1.98 | -- | -- |
| | 3+ BR | 0/0 | -- | -- | \$2,350 | -- |
| San Marcos 92069 92073 92076-79 | Studio | 27/1 | \$1,905 | \$3.30 | -- | -- |
| | 1 BR | 39/1 | \$2,030 | \$2.93 | \$1,021 | \$1,387 |
| | 2 BR | 95/3 | \$2,089 | \$2.10 | -- | \$1,586 |
| | 3+ BR | 40/2 | \$2,297 | \$2.06 | \$1,650 | \$1,500 |
| Vista 92081 92083-85 | Studio | 140/3 | \$1,278 | \$2.65 | \$1,313 | \$1,247 |
| | 1 BR | 614/5 | \$1,580 | \$2.15 | \$1,636 | \$1,595 |
| | 2 BR | 679/8 | \$1,775 | \$1.89 | \$1,863 | \$1,799 |
| | 3+ BR | 57/4 | \$2,051 | \$1.74 | \$2,493 | \$1,881 |
| County of San Diego (including City of San Diego) | Studio | 659/56 | \$1,315 | \$3.03 | -- | -- |
| | 1 BR | 8265/221 | \$1,684 | \$2.48 | -- | -- |
| | 2 BR | 12143/301 | \$2,071 | \$2.04 | -- | -- |
| | 3+ BR | 1933/121 | \$2,526 | \$2.01 | -- | -- |

Source: San Diego County Apartment Association Survey, Spring 2019.

Housing Affordability by Income Level

Housing affordability can be inferred by comparing the cost of renting or owning a home in the City with the maximum affordable housing costs for households at different income levels. Taken together, this information can generally show who can afford what size and type of housing and indicate the type of households most likely to experience overcrowding and overpayment.

Table 34 shows the maximum amount that a household can pay for housing each month without incurring a cost burden (over-payment). This amount can be compared to current housing asking prices (Table 32) and market rental rates (Table 33) to determine what types of housing opportunities a household can afford.

Extremely Low Income Households

Extremely low income households earn 30% or less of the County area median income – up to \$24,300 for a one-person household and up to \$34,650 for a five-person household in 2020. Extremely low income households cannot afford market-rate rental or ownership housing in Escondido without assuming a cost burden.

Very Low Income Households

Very low income households earn between 31% and 50% of the County area median income – up to \$40,450 for a one-person household and up to \$57,750 for a five-person household in 2020. Given the costs of ownership housing in Escondido, very low income households would not be able to afford a home in the City. Similarly, very low income renters could not afford appropriately-sized market-rate rental units in the City.

Low Income Households

Low income households earn between 51% and 80% of the County's area median income - up to \$64,700 for a one-person household and up to \$92,400 for a five-person household in 2020. Based on the asking prices of homes for sale in 2020 (Table 32), ownership housing would not be affordable to low income households. As of Spring 2019, most low income households in Escondido would not be able to find adequately sized affordable apartment units (Table 33).

Moderate income Households

Moderate income households earn between 81% and 120% of the County's Area Median Income – up to \$111,250 depending on household size in 2020. Moderate income households in Escondido would have trouble purchasing adequately-sized homes. Appropriately-sized market-rate rental housing is generally affordable to households in this income group.

Table 34: Affordable Housing Cost (2020)

| Annual Income | | Affordable Housing Cost | Utilities, Taxes, and Insurance | | Affordable Price | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|
| | | | Utilities | Taxes/Insurance | Sale | Rent |
| Extremely Low Income (30% of Area Median Income) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$24,300 | \$608 | \$164 | \$213 | \$60,846 | \$444 |
| 3-Person | \$27,750 | \$694 | \$198 | \$243 | \$66,792 | \$496 |
| 4-Person | \$31,200 | \$780 | \$240 | \$273 | \$70,498 | \$541 |
| 5-Person | \$34,650 | \$866 | \$283 | \$303 | \$73,809 | \$583 |
| Very Low Income (50% of Area Median Income) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$40,450 | \$1,011 | \$164 | \$354 | \$130,009 | \$847 |
| 3-Person | \$46,200 | \$1,155 | \$198 | \$404 | \$145,806 | \$958 |
| 4-Person | \$52,000 | \$1,300 | \$240 | \$455 | \$159,576 | \$1,061 |
| 5-Person | \$57,750 | \$1,444 | \$283 | \$505 | \$172,736 | \$1,161 |
| Low Income (80% of Area Median Income) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$64,700 | \$1,618 | \$164 | \$566 | \$233,862 | \$1,454 |
| 3-Person | \$73,950 | \$1,849 | \$198 | \$647 | \$264,647 | \$1,651 |
| 4-Person | \$83,200 | \$2,080 | \$240 | \$728 | \$293,192 | \$1,841 |
| 5-Person | \$92,400 | \$2,310 | \$283 | \$809 | \$321,128 | \$2,027 |
| Median Income (100% of Area Median Income) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$64,900 | \$1,623 | \$164 | \$568 | \$234,719 | \$1,459 |
| 3-Person | \$74,150 | \$1,854 | \$198 | \$649 | \$265,504 | \$1,656 |
| 4-Person | \$83,450 | \$2,086 | \$240 | \$730 | \$294,263 | \$1,847 |
| 5-Person | \$92,700 | \$2,318 | \$283 | \$811 | \$322,413 | \$2,035 |
| Moderate Income (120% of Area Median Income) | | | | | | |
| 1-Person | \$77,900 | \$1,948 | \$164 | \$682 | \$290,392 | \$1,784 |
| 3-Person | \$89,000 | \$2,225 | \$198 | \$779 | \$329,100 | \$2,028 |
| 4-Person | \$100,150 | \$2,504 | \$240 | \$876 | \$365,782 | \$2,264 |
| 5-Person | \$111,250 | \$2,751 | \$283 | \$973 | \$401,855 | \$2,498 |
| Source: CA Dept. of Housing and Community Development (2020) and Veronica Tam & Associates Assumptions: 2020 HCD income limits; 30% gross household income as affordable housing cost; 35% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10% down payment; and 3% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Utilities based on San Diego County Utility Allowance | | | | | | |

3. Affordable Housing

State law requires that the City identify, analyze, and propose programs to preserve existing multi-family rental units that are eligible to convert to non-low-income housing uses due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions during the next ten years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers the period from June 30, 2020 through April 15, 2029. Consistent with State law, this section identifies publicly assisted housing units in Escondido, analyzes their potential to convert to market rate housing uses, and analyzes the cost to preserve or replace those units.

A. Publicly Assisted Housing

The City of Escondido has a large inventory of publicly assisted rental housing affordable to lower and moderate income households. Table 35 provides a summary listing of affordable projects in the City. Overall, 25 projects (totaling 1,659 rental housing units) include affordable units. Specifically, 1,642 units are set aside as housing for lower and moderate income households.

| Table 35: Inventory of Assisted Rental Housing Projects | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name of Project | Total Units | Assisted Units | Funding Source | Type² | Earliest Conversion |
| 15 th Avenue Cooperative 1500 Orange Place | 32 | 32 | T, H | Family | 2037 |
| Aster Street 518-524/526-532 Aster Street | 8 | 8 | R, H | Family | 2034 |
| Aster Street 557-563 Aster Street | 4 | 4 | H | Family | 2072 |
| Avocado Court 215 E El Norte Parkway | 36 | 35 | R, H, T | Family | 2067 |
| Cobblestone Village Apartments 360 E Washington Avenue | 44 | 43 | R, T, C | Family | 2055 |
| Daybreak Grove 1256 E Washington Avenue | 13 | 13 | R, T | Family | 2054 |
| Emerald Garden Townhomes 425 W 11 th Avenue | 16 | 16 | R, H, T | Family | 2053 |
| Escondido Garden Apartments 500 N Midway Drive | 92 | 91 | T | Seniors | 10/31/2038 |
| Eucalyptus View Coop 1805 S. Escondido Blvd | 24 | 24 | H, T | Family | 2041 |
| Juniper Senior Village 215 E Washington Avenue | 61 | 60 | R, T, H, C | Seniors | 2076 |
| Las Ventanas 1404 S Escondido Boulevard | 80 | 80 | R, T | Family | 2063 |
| Manzanita 260 N Midway Drive | 200 | 198 | H, T | Family | 2070 |
| Orange Place Apartments 1611 S Orange Place | 15 | 15 | R, H, T | Family | 2068 |
| Silvercrest Residence 1303 Las Villas Way | 75 | 74 | HUD 202 | Rental | 4/30/2022 |
| Solutions Escondido | 33 | 32 | R, T | Family | 2070 |

Table 35: Inventory of Assisted Rental Housing Projects

| Name of Project | Total Units | Assisted Units | Funding Source | Type ² | Earliest Conversion |
|--|-------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1560 E Escondido Boulevard | | | | | |
| Sonoma Court 508 E Mission Avenue | 61 | 60 | R, H, T | Family | 2054 |
| Summit Rose Apartments 460 E Washington Avenue | 91 | 89 | T | Family | 2070 |
| Sunrise Place 1245 E Grand Avenue | 8 | 8 | R, T | Family | 2054 |
| The Crossings @ Escondido 735 Mission Grove Place | 55 | 54 | R, T | Family | 2065 |
| The Crossings @ Escondido Manor 1150-1166 N Escondido Boulevard | 44 | 43 | R, H, T | Family | 2070 |
| The Terraces 1301 Morning View Drive | 190 | 190 | R, T | Family | 2051 |
| Veterans Villas 1538-1540 S Escondido Blvd | 54 | 53 | R | Veteran | 2075 |
| Via Roble 1553 S Escondido Boulevard | 72 | 71 | R, T, C | Family | 2068 |
| Villa Escondido 511 E Grand Avenue | 112 | 112 | T | Senior | 2041 |
| Village Grove Apartments 600 N Quince Street | 161 | 160 | T | Family | 2054 |
| Windsor Gardens 1600 W Ninth Avenue | 132 | 130 | R, T | Seniors | 2074 |
| R = Redevelopment Funds; H = HOME; C = CDBG; T = Low Income Housing Tax Credit Source: City of Escondido. | | | | | |

B. Preservation of At-Risk Housing

Within the 2021-2031 “at-risk” housing analysis period, only Silvercrest is at low risk of converting to market rate housing. Though Silvercrest’s earliest date of conversion is in 2022, the City considers the risk of conversion low because the project is being managed by a non-profit organization (The Salvation Army), which has the mission to provide permanent affordable housing. Furthermore, HUD has established priority for the renewal of project-based Section 8 assistance for housing for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Preservation and Replacement Options

To maintain the existing affordable housing stock, the City works to preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of units to non-profit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants using other funding sources; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units.

Transfer of Ownership

Transferring ownership of an at-risk project to a non-profit housing provider is generally one of the least costly ways to ensure that the at-risk units remain affordable for the long term. By transferring property ownership to a non-profit organization, low income restrictions can be secured and the project would become potentially eligible for a greater range of governmental assistance. However, Silvercrest is already a nonprofit-owned project; therefore, this option is not necessary. Specifically, because Silvercrest is a nonprofit senior housing project, it is at low risk of converting to market-rate housing.

Rental Assistance

Tenant-based rent subsidies could be used to preserve the affordability of housing. Similar to Section 8 vouchers, the City, through a variety of potential funding sources, could provide rent subsidies to tenants of at-risk units. The level of the subsidy required to preserve the at-risk units is estimated to equal the Fair Market Rent ("FMR") for a unit minus the housing cost affordable by a lower income household.

The 2021 FMR for a one-bedroom unit in Escondido is \$1,540. As shown in Table 34, a very low income one-person household can generally afford about \$850 in rent, leaving an affordability gap of about \$690 (\$51,060 month for the 74 units or \$612,720 annually).

Purchase of Affordability Covenants

Another option to preserve the affordability of the at-risk project is to provide an incentive package to the owner to maintain the project as affordable housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, providing a lump-sum payment, and/or supplementing the rents to market levels. The feasibility and cost of this option depends on whether the complex is too highly leveraged and interest on the owner's part to utilize the incentives found in this option.

Construction of Replacement Units

The construction of new low income housing units is a means of replacing the at-risk units should they be converted to market-rate units. The cost of developing housing depends upon a variety of factors, including density, size of the units (i.e., square footage and number of bedrooms), location, land costs, and type of construction. With an estimated construction/land cost of \$350,000 per unit, the 75-unit Silvercrest would cost \$26.3 million to replace.

Resources for Preservation

Owners of government-assisted developments cannot terminate subsidy contracts, prepay a federally assisted mortgage, or discontinue use restrictions without first providing an exclusive "notice of opportunity to submit an offer to purchase" to potential purchasers using HCD's list of Qualified entities. The List of current Qualified Entities is maintained and updated by HCD and is subject to change – (<https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/preserving-existing-affordable-housing.shtml>). Current entities on the list include:

- Innovative Housing Opportunities
- Nexus for Affordable Housing
- TELACU
- San Diego County Department of Housing and Community Development Services
- Housing Development Partners of San Diego

4. Housing Constraints

Constraints to the provision of housing affect the development of new housing and the maintenance of existing units for all income levels. Governmental and non-governmental constraints in Escondido are similar to those in other jurisdictions in the region and are discussed below. One of the most, if not the most, significant and difficult constraints to housing in Escondido and elsewhere in the San Diego region is the high cost of land. This section describes various market, governmental, and environmental constraints on the development of housing that meets the needs of all economic segments of Escondido population.

A. Market Influences

Market constraints significantly affect the cost of housing in Escondido and can pose barriers to housing production and affordability. These constraints include the availability and cost of land for residential development, the demand for housing, financing and lending, construction costs, development fees, and neighborhood opposition which can make it expensive for developers to build affordable housing. The following highlights the primary market factors that affect the production of housing in Escondido.

Land and Construction Costs

Raw land and improvements costs comprise approximately 40% of the total development costs of a residential dwelling. Land prices in Escondido have risen significantly in recent years. However, land costs in Escondido are generally less when compared to land costs in many other areas of San Diego County. Furthermore, raw land values must be considered in relation to costs rising from the provision of adequate facilities and services, and the City's efforts to encourage redevelopment and rehabilitation will help lower costs where facilities and services are already provided.

The lack of vacant land for residential construction, especially land available for higher density residential development, has served to keep the cost of land high. Based on listings at Zillow.com, land near the downtown areas ranges from \$335,000 per acre to up to \$1.8 million per acre.⁵ Land outside of the urban core ranged from \$80,000 to \$155,000 per acre (and larger lots were available ranging from 1.5 to 5 acres).

Basic construction costs for residential developments have rapidly increased, and together with land prices, have increased the cost of housing, making homeownership unattainable for many households. These costs are relatively constant over the region. The basic components of labor and material do not fluctuate much by area. Site preparation costs can be substantial, but the variations are more a function of the site, than of the jurisdiction. The Freeman Construction Inc. Custom Home Building Home Guide in San Diego County estimates that site costs can range from \$75,000 to \$150,000⁶.

One indicator of construction costs is Building Valuation Data compiled by the International Code Council (ICC). The unit costs compiled by the ICC include structural, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical work, in addition to interior finish and normal site preparation. The data are national and do not take into account regional differences, nor include the price of the land upon which the building

⁵ Land size available at urban/downtown center at time of survey was less than one acre.

⁶ <https://tfgonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/custom-home-building-cost-guide-in-san-diego-county-by-freemans-construction-inc.pdf>

is built. In 2020, according to the latest Building Valuation Data release, the national average for development costs per square foot for apartments and single-family homes in 2020 are as follows:

- Type I or II, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$148.82 to \$168.94 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-2 Residential Multifamily: \$113.38 to \$118.57 per sq. ft.
- Type V Wood Frame, R-3 Residential One and Two Family Dwelling: \$123.68 to \$131.34 per sq. ft.
- R-4 Residential Care/Assisted Living Facilities generally range between \$143.75 to \$199.81 per sq. ft.

Local estimates from the ProMatcher 2018 Cost Report estimated building costs in 2018 as ranging from \$128.71 - \$191.11 per square foot in Escondido.⁷

The City has no influence over materials and labor costs, and the building codes in Escondido are not substantially different than most other cities in San Diego County. In recent years, construction costs for materials and labor have increased at a slightly higher pace than the general rate of inflation according to the Construction Industry Research Board.

Availability of Financing

The availability of financing affects a person's ability to purchase or improve a home. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act ("HMDA"), lending institutions must disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of the applicants involving home purchases, improvements and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance.

The disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2017 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Escondido is summarized in Table 36. Included is information on loan applications that were approved and originated, approved but not accepted by the applicant, denied, and withdrawn by the applicant or incomplete. Overall, home purchase financing is available but home improvement financing is more limited.

Table 36: Disposition of Home Loans (2017)

| Loan Type | Total Applicants | Originated | Approved Not Accepted | Denied | Withdrawn/ Other |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------------|
| Conventional - Purchase | 2,335 | 67.1% | 4.1% | 9.8% | 19.0% |
| Government-Backed - Purchase | 1,131 | 71.4% | 3.8% | 9.7% | 15.1% |
| Home Improvement | 545 | 52.3% | 2.8% | 27.0% | 18.0% |
| Refinance | 4,414 | 52.5% | 2.6% | 18.3% | 26.6% |
| Total | 8,426 | 59.0% | 3.2% | 15.3% | 22.4% |

Source: Lendingpattern.com

"Percent Other" includes withdrawn or incomplete applications

Impacts of COVID-19

With the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, over 26 million unemployment insurance claims were filed between March 15 and April 18 at the start of stay-at-home orders as reported by the US

⁷ Price range takes into account building a new home labor. Does include permitting, pouring the foundation, standard building materials, basic finishes, and cleanup. Cost does not include purchasing the land, blueprints, premium upgrades (granite countertops, spray foam insulation, etc.), modular homes, deep foundations, and deck construction. Reported by: ProMatcher Research Team. <https://home-builders.promatcher.com/cost/san-diego-ca-home-builders-costs-prices.aspx>

Department of Labor. In response Congress passed major relief bills including the \$2 trillion CARES Act, which includes benefits and expanded eligibility for unemployment insurance, forgivable small-business loans, economic relief payments sent directly to most US households, aid to state and local governments, and increased funding for housing assistance and other safety net programs.

The Census Bureau along with other governmental agencies partnered to design the Household Pulse Survey to publish data in as close to real time as possible during the COVID-19 pandemic. The survey provides vital insights on how American households are affected and coping during the pandemic. The Census Bureau expects to collect data for 90 days and release data weekly. One such way the Census Bureau is measuring household experiences during the coronavirus pandemic is through the Household Pulse Survey. Household Pulse Survey results have been reported for State and Metropolitan Area geographies but data for the San Diego Metropolitan Area only has not been reported. Results for the Week 23 Survey (Week of January 20 to February 1, 2021) showed that 56.3% (16.8 million) of adults in California reported that they or someone in their household had experienced a loss of employment income since March 13, 2020. About 10.3 million adult respondents (34.7%) also expected themselves or someone in their household to lose employment income in the next 4 weeks.

In the San Diego region, multiple reports have been completed by the SANDAG to show the impacts of COVID-19. On October 15, 2020 SANDAG published the “COVID-19 Impacts on The San Diego Regional Economy” report showing a six-month economic analysis since the Stay at Home Order. According to this report, an estimated 176,000 workers were unemployed due to COVID-19 in the San Diego region with lower income workers more likely to be out of work compared to middle and high income workers. Pre-COVID, the region had just over 50,000 unemployed workers. The report also identified the Tourism, Retail, and Education sectors as disproportionately affected by COVID-19. These sectors lost an estimated 141,000 workers, representing 80% of those unemployed due to COVID-19 in the region. Females in the Education sector and Hispanic workers were also found to be more likely to lose their jobs in the Tourism sector during this period.

SANDAG also reported on June 16, 2020 that Black and Hispanic communities had been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 throughout the County. These minorities account for a significant portion of essential workers who continued to go to work, and those who became unemployed in Tourism and “non-essential” Retail sectors due to the pandemic. Black and Hispanic populations were four times as likely to live in areas that had been impacted by COVID-19 and unemployment than White population and twice as likely when compared to the Asian population. Overall, the southern part of the County is also most affected by both the highest unemployment rates and highest percentage of COVID-19 cases in the region. Before the pandemic, areas in the southern region now most affected by the pandemic also reported household income of less than \$45,000 and a large share of families with children. The report classified ZIP codes with high unemployment rates and high percentages of COVID-19 cases as “hardest hit” areas.

As of June 1, 2020, Escondido was identified among the hardest hit ZIP codes. Of the ZIP codes reported, South Escondido ranked 16th in unemployment level and 24th in COVID-19 cases and East Escondido ranked 25th in unemployment level and 39th in COVID-19 cases. As of July 25, 2020 (the most recent data), Escondido remained among the hardest hit zip codes.

Timing and Density

Non-governmental market constraints can also include timing between project approval and requests for building permits. In most cases, this may be due to developers’ inability to secure financing for

construction. In Escondido, the average time between project approval/entitlement and request for building permit is typically two to six months.

Requests to develop below the maximum or target densities may also be indicators of non-governmental constraints. The Fifth Cycle Housing Element assumed that Housing Element sites would develop at approximately 75% of the maximum allowed in the Downtown Specific Plan Area and 70% in all other sites. A review of residential and mixed-use projects proposed, approved, and constructed over the Fifth Cycle Housing Element found that projects averaged 80% maximum density in the Downtown Area (SP 9) and all other zonings averaged 90%, which is higher than as assumed in the Fifth Cycle sites inventory (Table 37).

| Table 37: Project Development Yield Trends by Zoning | | |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Zoning | Max Density Allowed | Average Yield % of Max |
| RE-30 | 1.5 | 102% |
| PD-R-1.9 | 1.9 | 99% |
| RE-20 | 2.2 | 82% |
| R-1-10 | 4.3 | 67% |
| R-1-7 | 6.2 | 66% |
| R-1-6 | 7.3 | 66% |
| R-1-X | 7.3 | 40% |
| R-2-12 | 12 | 111% |
| R-3-18 | 18 | 140% |
| U-3 (GPA) - Was RE-20 | 18 | 98% |
| S-P | 24-30 | 123% |
| SP-9 (Downtown) | 75-100 | 80% |
| Average Yield % of all Projects | | 88% |

In the Sixth Cycle Housing Element, the realistic capacity assumptions were adjusted to show the proposed East Valley Specific Plan Land Use target production points (Table 38). While there have been no residential projects under the EVSP yet, it is expected that projects will reach at least the target production point density to avoid paying fees. For areas outside of the EVSP, the realized densities averaged 88% of the maximum allowable density (see Table 37 above) and averaged 90% in lower density zones and 80% in higher density zones (Table 37 and Table 38). While recent production trends indicate that site capacity could reasonably be estimated at 88% of the maximum density allowed by zoning, some developments will likely be built at lower densities, so conservative assumptions were used. Additional discussion of development trends can be found under the Housing Resources Section (Development Trends, Yields, and Realistic Capacity for Housing).

Table 38: Assumed Realistic Capacities by Density range

| Density Range | Assumed Realistic Density (% of Max) | Average Realized Density (Fifth Cycle) |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| EVSP | | |
| 21-30 (Urban IV/V) | 83% ¹ | N/A |
| 20-80 (Mixed-use) | 56% ² | N/A |
| Non-EVSP | | |
| 0-45 | 75% | 90% ³ |
| 46-100 | 62.5% | 80% ⁴ |
| ¹ Based on 25 du/ac target production point (i.e. with a TPP of 25 du/ac, developments achieve at least 83% max density allowed) ² Based on 45 du/ac target production point ³ Based on average of past projects with density range 0-30 (see Table 37) ⁴ Based on average of past projects with density range 75-100 (see Table 37) | | |

B. Governmental Constraints

Aside from market factors, housing affordability is also affected by factors in the public sector. Local policies and regulations can impact the price and availability of housing and, the provision of affordable housing. Land use controls, site improvement requirements, fees and exactions, permit processing procedures, among other issues may constrain the maintenance, development and improvement of housing. This section discusses potential governmental constraints in Escondido and efforts to address them.

Land Use Controls

The Land Use Element sets forth City policies for guiding local land use development. These policies, together with existing zoning regulations, establish the amount and distribution of land allocated for different uses. The City completed a comprehensive update to its General Plan in 2012. The General Plan update was focused around smart growth opportunities – adding new residential and employment capacity in areas well served by infrastructure and transit. The update also examined different land use policies and opportunities for growth, added a new high-density residential category, and removed development constraints. Most future residential growth will continue to be focused in the Downtown Specific Plan and south Centre City Parkway Specific Plan areas. The General Plan also calls for the update of the East Valley Specific Plan (“EVSP”) for the area immediately adjacent to the downtown. In mid-2020, the City initiated the preparation of the EVSP, which is anticipated to complete in Spring 2022 and provide approximately 6,000 units that were not previously allocated in the General Plan.

Residential Land Use Designations

The land use policies of the City have a direct impact upon the provision of housing for all economic sectors of the community. The General Plan designates substantial areas of land for residential development, and the Zoning code permits a wide variety of residential uses, ranging from multi-family housing to large estates. Table 39 lists the residential land use designations in the General Plan. Higher-density multi-family designations were assigned minimum densities during the General Plan update.

Table 39: Land Use Designations Permitting Residential Use

| Land Use Category | Zoning District | Max. Density (du/acre) | Character |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Rural I | R-A | 1 unit/4, 8, 20 acres | To promote a rural living environment in areas of agricultural production, rugged terrain, and environmentally constrained lands that are remote from urban development. |
| Rural II | R-A | 1 unit/2, 4, 20 acres | To promote a rural living environment in areas of agricultural production or rugged terrain that is relatively remote from urban development. |
| Estate I | R-E | 1 unit/1, 2, 4, 20 acre | To promote a large lot, single-family development in areas bordering Rural lands. This classification is typified by development along Mary Lane, North Broadway and around Felicita Park. |
| Estate II | R-E | Up to 2.0 | To promote single-family urban development on relatively large lots. This classification typified by development at Lomas Serenas, Rancho Verde, and along Citrus Avenue around San Pasqual Valley Road. |
| Suburban | R-1 | Up to 3.3 | This residential classification is characterized by single-family homes. The density is appropriate where the traditional neighborhood character of detached single-family units prevails. This classification is typified by development at Summercreek and areas southeast of Bear Valley Parkway along Citrus Avenue and along the south side of Avenida del Diablo. |
| Urban I | R-1 | Up to 5.5 | Detached single-family homes, characteristic of much of Escondido, constitute this medium density category. Typical R-1 development is found along Country Club Lane and between Ash and Citrus north of Washington. |
| Urban II | R-2 | Up to 12 | This residential classification allows living accommodations, ranging from conventional single-family units to mobile homes. Development at this level of intensity normally would be semidetached or attached units, and include duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. Typical Urban II development is found on North Broadway between Lincoln and Sheridan Avenues, and Citrus Avenue between Valley Parkway and the Flood Control Channel. |
| Urban III | R-3 | Up to 18 | This residential category is typified by low-rise townhouses and apartment buildings. Typical projects at this density can be found near Centre City Parkway at El Norte, east Grand Avenue, and near Washington and Fig. |
| Urban IV | R-4 | Up to 24 | This residential category is predominantly characterized by apartment buildings about three stories in height. Representative development at this density is found south of 9th Avenue west of I15. |
| Urban V | R-5 | Up to 30 | This residential category is characterized by high-density, multi-family developments. |

Source: Land Use Element, City of Escondido General Plan

Specific Plans

The City of Escondido has adopted a number of specific plans, which offer a range of housing types, densities, and mix of uses. The City anticipates that much of its new residential growth will occur in the following areas:

- Downtown Specific Plan (Revised February 10, 2021)
- South Centre City Area Plan (April 4, 2018)
- East Valley Specific Plan (Revised September 22, 2004, and 2021)

Downtown Area Specific Plan

The Downtown Specific Plan area encompasses approximately 460 acres extending from I-15 and West Valley Parkway to Palomar Hospital, between Washington and Fifth Avenues. The Specific Plan Area includes the City's urban core along Grand Avenue where Escondido was incorporated in 1888. The Downtown Specific Plan provides a comprehensive plan for land use, development regulations, development incentives, design guidelines and other related actions aimed at implementing the following strategic goals for Downtown Escondido:


- An economically viable Downtown with an appropriate mix of retail, office, residential, entertainment and cultural uses.
- A local and regional destination for specialty shopping, dining, nightlife, employment, culture, and the arts.
- A vibrant and exciting environment with land uses that foster an "18-hour" atmosphere, in addition to areas that provide mixed-use, office employment and high-density residential opportunities.
- Development and signage that strengthen the character of Downtown and are architecturally compatible with the existing urban fabric.
- Street-level and human-scale design elements in new and remodeled developments that improve pedestrian orientation.
- Preserved historically significant sites and structures that enhance the character of Downtown.
- Pedestrian-oriented, ground-floor, specialty retail and restaurant uses on Grand Avenue that reinforce and expand its unique character.
- Higher residential densities in key locations that support Downtown non-residential uses. A pedestrian environment that provides connections, convenient access and opportunities for alternative modes of transportation.
- Embellished landscaping, public art, comfortable street furniture and décor that improves walkability and pedestrian connections.
- Maximized parking opportunities.

The Downtown Specific Plan includes seven distinct land use districts that allow for residential development or mixed-use development with substantial residential components:

- Historic Downtown District (HD)
- Park View District (PV)

- Centre City Urban District (CCU)
- Gateway Transit District (GT)
- Mercado District (M)
- Southern Gateway District (SG)
- Creekside Neighborhood District (CN)

Figure 6: Downtown Escondido Specific Plan – Residential Densities



Residential development above 45 units per acre can be accommodated in most of the Downtown Specific Plan area, with a substantial area allowing up to 75 units per acre and 100 units per acre. There are some areas where residential is not allowed and others where a ground-floor commercial or office component is required.

In 2019, the City adopted a “Downtown Density Transfer Program,” which allows for the transfer of residential density from underutilized properties to properties that are being redeveloped. This program allows property owners to re-assign or transfer units to other properties via a city-administered density credit pool. The City holds the density credits until a redeveloping property acquires the density. In effect, the density transfer program prevents the loss of potential units when a property is redeveloped in support of achieving a full-build out in the Downtown area. Two entitled projects are utilizing the density transfer program. The project (ADM 20-0085) noted in Table A-3 is also contemplating the use of this program. There have also been requests to expand this program to other parts of the City.

The Downtown Specific Plan also establishes development standards that differ from the rest of the City. Table 40 summarizes the standards specific to the City’s downtown area.

Table 40: Downtown Specific Plan Residential Development Standards

| District | Maximum Building Height (ft.) | Setbacks (ft.) | | | | Min. Lot Size | Max. Building Coverage | Allows Mixed-use? |
|----------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| | | Front | Side Street | Side Yard | Rear Yard | | | |
| HD | 45-120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | None | None | Y |
| PV | 35-85 | | 10 | | 5 | | | |
| CCU | 75 | | 10 | | | | | |
| GT | 60-75 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| M | 60-75 | | 0 | | | | | |
| SG | 35-75 | | 0 | | | | | |
| CN | 75 | | 10 | 5 | 10 | | | |

South Centre City Specific Plan

The South Centre City Specific Plan was adopted in 2018 to implement policy direction from the 2012 General Plan update that focused on implementing smart growth goals into four target growth areas. The plan contains eight districts, each with different development regulations and standards.

For residential land use, the plan seeks to maximize affordable housing opportunities and provide opportunities for a balanced mix of housing types through a variety of incentives and programs. The Plan provides for a Mixed-Use (MU) designation that permits the integration of residential, commercial, and professional office uses in a single project.

The plan allows for high-density residential of up to 24 units per acre in the 9th Avenue Overlay, and up to 30 dwelling units per acre in the Escondido Boulevard Mixed-Use Overlay and the Southern Entry Mixed-Use Overlay zones.

East Valley Specific Plan

The East Valley Specific Plan (“EVSP”) covers areas along East Valley Parkway. The existing land use pattern reflects prior decisions and uses along East Valley Boulevard are almost exclusively commercial in nature; there is no existing housing within the commercial area. The 2012 General Plan Update calls for the amendment of the area plan to re-assess the land use plan, in particular to introduce high-density housing to the area. The EVSP is expected to be adopted concurrent with the Housing Element. Table 41 provides a summary of the land use designations in the proposed EVSP.

Table 41: East Valley Specific Plan Land Use Designations

| Land Use | Applicable Zoning | Description | Min. Density/ FAR | Max. Density/ FAR | Target Production Point | Appr. Yield |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Urban IV/V | R-5-30 | Assumes 24 du/ac. Multi-family residential units, townhomes, apartments, flats, and condominiums. 15,000 sf/ac retail and office uses are permitted | 21 du/ac | 30 du/ac | 25 du/ac | 1,495 units 453,789 sf of commercial |
| General Commercial | C-G | Local-serving commercial, automobile service, eating/drinking establishments, entertainment facilities, retail, office, service establishments, etc. Intended for other commercial uses not suitable for residential zones. | 0.25 FAR | 1.0 FAR | 0.5 FAR | 0 units 59,014 sf of commercial |
| Mixed-Use | M-U | Vertical or horizontal mixed-use. Multi-family residential units, appropriate along major thoroughfares, proximate to shopping centers, entertainment, community facilities and employment opportunities. | 20 du/ac 1.5 FAR | 80 du/ac 3.0 FAR | 45 du/ac | 4,669 units 703,338 sf of commercial |
| Park Overlay Zone | POZ | Active and passive parks as well as land to protect, maintain, and enhance the community's natural resources and include detention basins and creek corridors. Development Impact Fees contribute to park space in these areas. | --- | --- | --- | 10 acres minimum of parkland and open space |

Growth Management Controls

The City has two growth management measures that impact the pace and capacity of residential growth:

- *Ordinance 94-16*
- *Proposition S*

Ordinance 94-16

This ordinance is a Citywide Facilities Management Plan that came into effect on May 18, 1994 and replaced all prior growth management ordinances. While facilities are generally available citywide, the North Broadway Region of Influence has had critical infrastructure deficiencies with respect to drainage and water storage capacity. The region is located in the northeast part of Escondido. Should adequate facilities not be available within the region, the ordinance allows development of projects subject to the approval of a development agreement. The agreement must ensure that the project either provides facilities necessary to upgrade existing deficiencies or financially participates toward their solution.

The North Broadway Deficiency Area is identified by the Citywide Facilities Plan as having critical infrastructure deficiencies. New land use development projects need to either provide facilities necessary to upgrade the deficiencies or cumulatively (i.e. financially) participate towards their solution. Ordinance 94-16 helps new land use development projects address off-site cumulative CEQA issues as part of the entitlement process, which helps expedite CEQA review and streamline housing projects. The developer contribution of a \$12,500 per unit helps new projects participate in the costs of drainage and water storage requirements. Over the decade or so, there have been three

large projects that have been constructed within this area, including 179 homes in Hidden Valley Ranch, 70 in Pradera, and 40 in Zenner (189 total homes). This demonstrates that the Ordinance 94-16 fee is not a constraint to housing development.

A subsequent ordinance (95-11) also allows development of a single-family residence on an existing vacant lot of record, zoned for residential use, where the lot was created prior to June 6, 1990, within the Region of Influence. A supplemental deposit is required at the time of Building Permit issuance to ensure facility impacts are addressed.

Proposition S

Proposition S was adopted by voters 1998 and requires voter approval of specified future changes to the Escondido General Plan. General Plan changes, subject to Proposition S, include increasing residential densities, changing or increasing the residential land use categories, or changing any residential designation to a commercial or industrial designation on any property designated as Rural, Estate, Suburban, or Urban. Thus, voter approval is required for amendments that would increase residential densities, but also deters the loss of residential land when associated with an amendment to commercial or industrial. Furthermore, Proposition S states, “Nothing in this initiative shall be constructed to:

- Interfere with rights to obtain density bonuses or other entitlements available under affordable housing laws, or Proposition S
- Limit right or entitlements available under affordable housing laws.”

Prop S applies to the intensification of land uses in residential areas of the City. Specifically, under Policy E 2.3: “Permitted land uses in the residential areas of the City shall be intensified only when the voters approve such changes.”

The intent of Prop S is to focus on current residential zones, rather than rezones from nonresidential to residential. A rezone from a non-residential zone to a residential zone does not trigger Prop S. Therefore, Prop S does not act as a cap on the number of housing units constructed or permits that can be approved either annually or for some other time period. It also does not limit the population of the City.

The City may amend the existing EVSP without a vote of the public and can therefore accommodate additional units within the East Valley Area for the 2021-2029 RHNA planning period. Outside of the East Valley Area, this Housing Element examines the residential development capacity under the existing General Plan, zoning, and specific plans, and has demonstrated adequate capacity to accommodate the City’s RHNA for the sixth cycle Housing Element planning period.

The City recognizes that Proposition S may serve to constrain housing development in the long term, beyond 2028. Therefore, the City initiated a comprehensive General Plan update in 2008 to address land use distribution, preservation of neighborhoods, and identification of appropriate growth centers within the community. The updated General Plan was approved by the City Council on May 23, 2012. Portions of the updated General Plan were placed on the November 2012 ballot and approved by Escondido residents.

The General Plan update preserved most existing land use policies in much of the City’s residential neighborhoods, but did provide opportunities for employment and residential intensification. The maximum allowed density of a mixed-use development along South Escondido Boulevard was increased from 24 to 30 units per acre, which resulted in increased capacity in the City.

The approval of the General Plan update by the voters increased the City's capacity for residential growth over the long term. Recognizing Proposition S as a potential constraint, the Housing Element includes a program to monitor the impact of this growth management measure.

Overlay Zones and Other Districts

Mixed-use Overlay Zone

As part of the 2012 General Plan update, new areas for mixed-use development were designated in areas with high potential for commercial and residential development.

Flood Plain Overlay Zone

The Flood Plain (FP) overlay zone establishes land use regulations in areas with properties situated within designated flood plains of rivers, creeks, streams and water courses in order to protect the public health, safety and welfare and to minimize losses to property and life due to flooding and periodic inundation. The City restricts or prohibits uses in this zone which are dangerous to health, safety or property in times of flood or cause excessive increases in flood heights or velocities. The City also requires uses vulnerable to floods to be protected against flood damage at the time of initial construction.

Planned Development (P-D) Zone

The purpose of the Planned Development (P-D) zone is to provide a more flexible regulatory procedure by which the basic public purposes of the Escondido general plan and the Escondido zoning code may be accomplished. The P-D zone serves to encourage creative approaches to the use of land through variation in the siting of buildings and the appropriate mixing of several land uses, activities and dwelling types.

For planned developments in which residential uses are proposed on parcels of land in the R-3, R-4, and R-5 zones, area plans, and in specific plan areas with a maximum specified multifamily residential density, no planned development will be approved at a density below 70% of the maximum permitted density of the underlying multifamily zone, area plan or specific plan multi-family designation. Residential planned developments in this zone are also encouraged to depart from standard subdivision and housing design by providing a variety of lot sizes and housing types, provided that the overall residential density yield conforms with the City's policies.

Old Escondido Neighborhood Historic District

The boundaries of this District are Fifth Avenue on the north, Chestnut Street on the east, Thirteenth Avenue on the south and South Escondido Boulevard on the west (excluding properties fronting on Escondido Boulevard) and including north side of Fifth Avenue from Juniper to Date. The purpose and intent of the Old Escondido Neighborhood historic district is to preserve the single-family residential character of the neighborhood and the historic/cultural resources of the neighborhood as well as emphasize orientation towards pedestrian activities. The historic nature of this district precludes the properties on it for higher density residential re-use.

Density Bonus and Residential Incentive Ordinance

Government Code section 65915 et. seq. requires an agency to provide developers with a density bonus and other incentives or concessions for the production of lower income housing units or for the donation of land within the development if the developer agrees to construct a specified percentage of units for very low, low, and/or moderate income households or qualifying residents. Density bonus is a California state requirement and as such not subject to the discretion of local governance bodies – land use development requests that meet the law's requirements are entitled to the Density Bonus, as of right. The City adopted its Density Bonus and Residential Incentive Ordinance in the 1990s. In 2018, the California Legislature approved four bills that expanded the density bonus to a wider range of housing projects and strengthened procedures to make the density bonus more workable for developers. The current ordinance (Chapter 33, Article 67), last updated May 2020, allows a minimum density bonus and deviations from the Zoning Code for affordable or senior housing in accordance with the State Density Bonus Law (California Government Code Sections 65915 – 65918) and reflects the State Legislature's commitment to incentivizing housing development in California. Since parking and setbacks can be reduced, a developer could feasibly increase the number of units or bedrooms without increasing the size of the site. The City's Density Bonus and Residential Incentive Ordinance is useful in the acquisition and rehabilitation of developments made affordable to low income residents in the higher multi-family zones. For example, the ordinance was utilized to increase the number of bedrooms in the acquisition and rehabilitation of the 15th Avenue Cooperative and Sonoma Court, affordable housing projects. Furthermore, the South Centre City Specific Plan has an added provision to allow three or more units to be a qualifying project under Density Bonus Law.

Current State law requires jurisdictions to provide density bonuses and development incentives to all developers who propose to construct affordable housing on a sliding scale, where the amount of density bonus and number of incentives vary according to the amount of affordable housing units provided. Specifically, State law requires the provision of certain incentives for residential development projects that set aside a certain portion of total units to be affordable to lower and moderate income households. Under State law, a development of more than five units is eligible to receive density bonuses if it meets at least one of the following:

- At least 5% of the housing units are restricted to very low income residents.
- At least 10% of the housing units are restricted to lower income residents.
- At least 10% of the housing units in a for-sale common interest development are restricted to moderate income residents.
- 100% of the housing units (other than manager's units) are restricted to very low, lower and moderate income residents (with a maximum of 20% moderate).
- At least 10% of the housing units are for transitional foster youth, disabled veterans or homeless persons, with rents restricted at the very low income level.
- At least 20% of the housing units are for low income college students in housing dedicated for full-time students at accredited colleges.
- The project donates at least one acre of land to the city or county for very low income units, and the land has the appropriate general plan designation, zoning, permits and approvals, and access to public facilities needed for such housing.
- The project is a senior citizen housing development (no affordable units required).

- The project is a mobile home park age-restricted to senior citizens (no affordable units required).

AB 2345 was passed in September 2020, amending the Density Bonus Law to increase the maximum density bonus from 35% to 50%. To be eligible for the maximum bonus, a project must set aside at least (i) 15% of total units for very low income households, (ii) 24% of total units for low income households, or (iii) 44% of for-sale units for moderate income households. Levels of bonus density between 35% and 50% are granted on a sliding scale. Cities must update their density bonus ordinances to codify these new bonus requirements. This Housing Element includes a program to update the City's Density Bonus provisions to be consistent with the most recent changes in State Density Bonus Law.

The Density Bonus and Residential Incentives Ordinance encourages development of housing for lower income and senior households. Other processes in the Zoning Ordinance help in the development of housing for the higher income households as well as the lower income households. Escondido has an income distribution that skews toward the lower income compared to the region. As a means to diversify the City's socioeconomic profile, the City retains certain amount of large-lot zoning to accommodate the housing needs and preferences of moderate and higher income households. This strategy is aimed at satisfying high-tech businesses desiring to locate in Escondido. Planned Developments, Specific Plans and Administrative Adjustments are also available to assist in the development and rehabilitation of housing for all economic sectors of the community.

These processes are particularly helpful where properties may be constrained. Specific Plans and Planned Developments allow for clustering of smaller lots into buildable areas, while preserving unique or environmentally sensitive areas such as ridgelines, stream courses and steep slopes. Planned Developments and Specific Plans are useful for large scale developments, while administrative adjustments are more useful on a small scale basis where deviations from the code may enable the development on a constrained site or an addition to an existing single-family home or apartment complex.

Residential Development Standards

Citywide, outside the specific plan areas, the City regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development primarily through the Zoning Code. The following summarizes the City's existing residential zoning districts:

- *Residential Agricultural (R-A) – 1 unit per 5 to 10 acres:* This zone is designed to protect agricultural uses from encroachment by urban uses until residential, commercial or industrial uses in such areas become necessary or desired. The densities in this zone are based on the minimum lot sizes of 5 to 10 acres.
- *Residential Estates (R-E) – 0.2 to 2 units per acre:* This zone is to provide an area exclusively for single-family dwellings in a rural setting. Provisions are made for the maintenance of limited agricultural pursuits as well as those uses necessary and incidental to single family living. The densities in this zone are based on the minimum lot sizes of 20,000 square feet to 210,000 square feet.
- *Single-Family Residential (R-1) – 1.74 to 7.26 units per acre:* This zone is to encourage and promote a suitable environment for family life by providing a district for the establishment of one-family, detached dwellings, exclusively. The densities in this zone are based on the minimum lot sizes of 6,000 square feet to 25,000 square feet.

- **Mobile Home Residential (R-T):** This zone is established to encourage and promote a suitable environment for family life by providing a district for one-family detached mobile homes.
- **Light Multiple Residential (R-2) – 12 units per acre:** This zone is established to provide low height, low density residential areas in close proximity to single-family residential neighborhoods.
- **Medium Multiple Residential (R-3) – 18 units per acre:** This zone, is established to provide medium density, low-height residential areas for two, three and multifamily dwelling units.
- **Heavy Multiple Residential (R-4) – 24 units per acre:** This zone is established to provide an area for a suitable environment for family life for those wishing to live in apartments near the city's center.
- **Very High Multi-Family Residential (R-5) - 30 units per acre:** This zone is established to provide a multi-family setting for family life in higher-height, very high-density dwelling units in close proximity to other multi-family neighborhoods and near the city's center.

Development standards specific to each zone district are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents as well as implement the policies of the General Plan. These standards also serve to preserve the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods. Specific residential development standards are summarized in Table 42.

Generally, development standards can limit the number of units that may be constructed on a particular piece of property. These include density, minimum lot and unit sizes, height, and open space requirements. Limiting the number of units that can be constructed will increase the per-unit land costs and can, all other factors being equal, result in higher development costs that may impact housing affordability.

Table 42: Residential Development Standards

| Zoning District | Maximum Building Height (ft.) | Minimum Net Lot Area (sq. ft.) | Minimum Lot Width (ft.) | Setbacks (ft.) | | | Maximum Lot Coverage | Floor Area Ratio |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------|------|----------------------|------------------|
| | | | | Front | Rear | Side | | |
| R-A | 35 | 217,800 | 150 | 25 | 20 | 10 | 20% | 0.3 |
| R-E | 35 | 20,000 | 100 | 25 | 20 | 10 | 30% | 0.4 |
| R-1 | 35 | 6,000 | 60 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 40% | 0.5 |
| R-T | -- | 4,500 | 55 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 60% | -- |
| R-2 | 25 | 6,000 | 60 | 15 | 15 | 5 | -- | 0.6 |
| R-3 | 35 | 6,000 | 60 | 15 | 10 | 5 | -- | 0.7 |
| R-4 | 75 | 6,000 | 50 | 15 | 10 | 5 | -- | 0.8 |
| R-5 | 75 | 6,000 | 50 | 15 | 10 | 5 | -- | 0.9 |

Source: City of Escondido Zoning Ordinance, 2020.

Setback Requirements

Setback requirements can encourage or discourage development. As seen on Table 42, the City's residential setback requirements are minimal. The City also offers adjustments to requirements (up to 25%) with the approval of the Community Development director. Even further reductions to setback requirements for landscaping and parking are available to affordable or senior housing proposals, pursuant to the Residential Incentive Ordinance.

Building and Parcel Requirements

Building and parcel requirements for residential development can also encourage or discourage development. While development standards are necessary in order to preserve the character of that particular zone, those that are too restrictive can increase development costs and inhibit or reduce the achievable number of permitted dwelling units.

Building and parcel requirements in the City are not overly restrictive and offer the flexibility needed to encourage development. Minimum parcel sizes vary, depending on the zone, and are minimal in the multi-family zones. Minimum unit sizes are closely tied to the minimum standards required by the State for health and safety purposes. Lot coverage and floor area ratios are high enough to have little or no constraint on development proposals. And usable open space requirements are low and can be lowered further for affordable and senior housing development proposals. Building and parcel requirements in the Downtown and South Centre City Parkway areas are even less restrictive than those of the single-family and multi-family zones.

Zone Changes and General Plan Amendments

Residential zone changes that propose density increases consistent with the General Plan do not require an initiative or a referendum. Pursuant to proposition S, General Plan amendments involving an increase in residential densities or change from residential to commercial or industrial require a majority vote by the people.

Proposition S specifies that General Plan amendments or specific plans cannot be adjusted without a vote of the people, if changes increase residential density, alter or increase the General Plan's residential land use categories, or change any Rural, Estate, Suburban or Urban residential designation to a commercial or industrial designation. Thus, voter approval is required for amendments that would increase residential densities, but also deters the loss of residential land when associated with an amendment to commercial or industrial.

The General Plan update was approved by the City Council on May 23, 2012 and portions involved voter approval decided at the November 2012 election; Escondido residents approved the changes to the General Plan. The updated General Plan provides for increased residential development capacity through mixed-use development, primarily along South Escondido Boulevard. Most other residential areas retain their current General Plan and zoning designations. Furthermore, Proposition S states, "Nothing in this initiative shall be construed to:

- Interfere with rights to obtain density bonuses or other entitlements available under affordable housing laws, or
- Limit right or entitlements available under affordable housing laws."

Additionally, few residential subdivisions have been denied, and current zoning allows multi-family development by right with ministerial processing only.

Parking Standards

High numbers of parking spaces required per dwelling unit can negatively impact the feasibility of providing affordable housing by reducing the achievable number of dwelling units per acre and increasing development costs. The cost and amount of required parking has a high impact on the cost of housing. Typically, the concern for high parking standards relates mostly to multi-family, affordable, or senior housing. Escondido's requirements for single-family and multi-family residential

are summarized in Table 43. In some instances, tandem spaces are permitted and in others, guest parking may be provided on-street.

| Table 43: Escondido Residential Parking Requirements | |
|--|--|
| Type of Residential Development | Required Parking Spaces Per Unit |
| Single-Family or Two-Family Residence | Two (2) car garage or carport spaces |
| Accessory Dwelling Unit | Zero (0) parking spaces |
| Multiple-Family Dwelling* | |
| Efficiency Unit | One (1) parking space |
| One-Bedroom Unit | One and one-half (1.5) parking space |
| Two-Bedroom Unit | One and three-quarter (1.75) parking space |
| Three or More Bedrooms | Two (2) parking spaces |
| Senior housing | Two (2) plus three (3) for every four (4) efficiency units or one bedroom units. Units with two (2) or more bedrooms require one and one-half (1.5) spaces per unit. |
| Source: City of Escondido Zoning Ordinance, 2020 | |
| * One space is required for each four (4) units required for guest parking | |

Escondido's Density Bonus and Residential Incentive Ordinance allows parking reductions for affordable and senior development at the following ratios: one space/one-bedroom unit; 1.2 spaces/two-bedroom unit, and 1.5 spaces/three-bedroom unit. These standards are lower than even the State-mandated parking standards for density bonus projects. Additionally, on-street resident parking for affordable or senior units can be substituted for required off-street parking at a ratio of one-to-one on non-Circulation Element streets. Requirements to cover spaces can also be waived.

Provision for a Variety of Housing Opportunities

Housing element law specifies that jurisdictions must identify adequate sites to be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards to encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all economic segments of the population. This includes single-family homes, multi-family housing, second units, mobile homes, emergency shelters, and housing for persons with disabilities. Table 44 below summarizes the various housing types permitted within the City's zoning districts.

Table 44: Use Regulations for Residential Zones

| Use | R-A | R-E | R-1 | R-T | R-2 | R-3 | R-4 | H-P | C-G | Mixed-use Overlay |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|
| Single-Family Dwelling | P | P | P | -- | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- |
| Accessory Dwelling Unit | P | P | P | -- | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-Family Dwelling | -- | -- | -- | -- | P | P | P | -- | -- | P |
| Mobile Home Park | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | -- | -- | -- |
| Manufactured Housing | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Care Facility (6 or fewer) | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | C | C | P |
| Care Facility (7 or more) | C | C | C | -- | C | C | C | C | C | P |
| Senior Housing | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | P |
| Transitional (6 or fewer) | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P/C | P/C | P |
| Transitional (7 or more) | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | P/C | P/C | P |
| Disabled (6 or fewer) | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | -- | -- | P |
| Disabled (7 or more) | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | -- | -- | P |
| Single Room Occupancy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | C |
| Farm Worker Housing | P | P | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P = Permitted Use C = Conditional Use Source: City of Escondido Zoning Code, 2020 | | | | | | | | | | |

Single-Family Dwelling

“Single-family dwellings” are defined in the Zoning Code as detached or semi-detached buildings. Single-family dwellings are permitted in all residential zones, except the R-T zone. As part of the General Plan update, the City established a 70% minimum density for R-3, R-4, and R-5 zoning districts, effectively discouraging single-family homes to be developed on properties designated for multi-family uses. This change promotes the efficient use of the City’s residential land and mitigates neighborhood compatibility issues.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Accessory dwelling units (“ADUs”) and junior accessory dwelling units (“JADUs”) are attached or detached dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities for one or more persons including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, cooking and sanitation. ADUs may be an alternative source of affordable housing for lower-income households and seniors. Recent state laws, including AB 68, AB 587, AB 670, AB 881, AB 671 and SB 13 in 2019 and AB 3182 in 2020, require cities to use a ministerial process to consider accessory dwelling units in an effort to facilitate the production of affordable housing state-wide. Accessory units must be permitted in all residential and mixed-use zones where a residential unit already exists.

Recent ordinances by the City of Escondido have updated the zoning provisions related to ADUs and JADUs. In 2020, and subsequently in 2021, the City amended the Zoning Code to comply with AB 68, AB 587, AB 670, AB 671, AB 881, AB 3182 and SB 13 to reflect changes to Government Code section 65852.2 and section 65852.22. The City of Escondido permits ADUs and JADUs in area zoned to allow single-family or multi-family residential use, subject to the approval of an ADU permit. ADUs must

also comply with the development standards of the underlying zone, except where precluded by state law. Other requirements for accessory dwelling units include:

- The owner of the property must reside on the parcel on which a JADU is located.
- No limit on the number of bedrooms is allowed.
- A setback requirement of not more than four feet for detached accessory dwelling units.
- Any development standards that regulate the size of the ADU must permit at least an 850 square foot ADU to be constructed.
- The accessory unit shall respect the residential scale and design character of existing homes.

Additionally, the zoning code has a provision that states that the section “shall be interpreted liberally in favor of accessory dwelling unit construction,” which further removes constraints on ADU production in case of ambiguities in the standards. The City does not require any parking for ADUs or JADUs. Copies of Ordinance No. 2020-31R and 2021-10 were transmitted to HCD in accordance with Government Code 65852.2(h)(1).

Multi-Family Dwelling

According to the State Department of Finance, multiple-family housing makes up approximately 36% of the 2020 housing stock in Escondido (Table 26). The Zoning Code provides for multi-family developments in the higher density residential zones (R-2, R-3, and R-4, R-5) and in specific plans. The maximum density for the R-5 zone is 30 units per acre.

Mobile Home Parks and Manufactured Housing

Manufactured housing and mobile homes can be an affordable housing option for low and moderate income households. Mobile homes represent about eight percent of the City’s housing stock as of January 2020. A mobile home built after June 15, 1976, certified under the National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Act of 1974, and built on a permanent foundation may be located in any residential zone where a conventional single-family detached dwelling is permitted subject to the same restrictions on density and to the same property development regulations. Manufactured/mobile homes are permitted in all of the City’s lower density residential zones (R-A, R-E, R-1 and R-T). In today’s construction methods, manufactured housing can also apply to multi-family housing construction. The Zoning Code will be amended to permit manufactured homes meeting the California Building Code standards to be permitted where residential uses are permitted.

Residential Care Facilities

Residential care facilities licensed or supervised by a Federal, State, or local health/welfare agency provide 24-hour non-medical care of unrelated persons who are handicapped and in need of personal services, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of the individual in a family-like environment. The Community Care Facilities Act (California Health and Safety Code) and Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (California Welfare and Institution Code) require that State-licensed residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons (including foster care) be treated as a regular residential use and therefore must be permitted by right in all residential zones allowing residential uses. These facilities cannot be subject to more stringent development standards, fees, or other standards than the same type of housing single-family homes in the same district.

The City amended its Zoning Code, in accordance with the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act of the California Welfare and Institutions Code and the Health and Safety Code in 2004. The amendment clarifies that the use of property for the care of six or fewer disabled persons is a “residential use” for the purposes of zoning. A State-authorized, certified or authorized family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer disabled persons or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a day basis is considered a residential use that is permitted in all residential zones. The amendment also clarifies that in Commercial and Hospital Professional zones, licensed residential care facilities serving any number of residents are permitted by right, and in residential zones (except the R-T zone), licensed residential care facilities serving more than six persons are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit. The CUP process may be considered a constraint to housing for persons with disabilities.

Emergency Shelters

Senate Bill 2, enacted in October 2007, requires local governments to identify one or more zoning categories that allow emergency shelters (year-round shelters for the homeless) without discretionary review. The statute permits the City to apply limited conditions to the approval of ministerial permits for emergency shelters. The identified zone must have sufficient capacity to accommodate at least one year-round shelter and accommodate the City’s share of the regional unsheltered homeless population. The San Diego Regional Task Force on the Homeless “We All Count 2020” found that Escondido’s homeless population is estimated to be 429 individuals, 264 of those individuals are unsheltered.

In 2013, the City amended its zoning code to add an Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone subject to the following standards:

- Each shelter shall be located within an entirely enclosed, permanent structure.
- Each shelter may have a maximum 50 beds to serve a maximum of 50 clients.
- The maximum length of stay at any one time for any person shall be six months in any 12-month period.
- Parking shall be two spaces per facility plus one space for each employee.
- There shall be no camping or sleeping in vehicles on site.
- An emergency shelter shall be located at least 300 feet from another shelter.
- Each shelter shall conform to the requirements of the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.
- The emergency shelter operator shall submit a written management plan.

The zone allows for year-round emergency shelters and can accommodate the City’s unsheltered homeless population. Emergency shelters are allowed without discretionary approval in the overlay zone. The zone is approximately 69 acres and encompasses 64 parcels zoned for M-1 and M-2 (light industrial), which are currently occupied by mostly light industrial, commercial, and warehousing uses. Some buildings in the area are antiquated, with deferred maintenance issues, and were developed below the allowable intensity. Therefore, development of emergency shelters in this area can occur either as new construction on one of the underutilized properties, or as adaptive reuse of an existing vacant building (or just a portion of the building). The overlay zone is appropriate for emergency shelters since it contains underutilized properties and is located near the Nordahl Road transit station and the new Palomar Hospital.

In 2020, the City amended the Zoning Code to comply with AB 139, which sets parking standards based primarily on staffing level only. Ordinance 2020-31R amended the Zoning Code to require two spaces per facility plus one space for each employee. This standard is slightly inconsistent with AB

139. Furthermore, the City will amend the Zoning Code to revise the separation requirement to a maximum of 300 feet pursuant to SB 2 (2007).

Transitional and Supportive Housing

California Health and Safety Code (Section 50675.2) defines “transitional housing” and “transitional housing development” as buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that call for the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at some predetermined future point in time, which shall be no less than six months.

Residents of transitional housing are usually connected to supportive services designed to assist the homeless in achieving greater economic independence and a permanent, stable living situation. Transitional housing can take several forms, including group quarters with beds, single-family homes, and multi-family apartments and typically offers case management and support services to help return people to independent living (often six months to two years).

Supportive housing links the provision of housing and social services for the homeless, people with disabilities, and a variety of other special needs populations. California Health and Safety Code (Section 50675.2) defines “supportive housing” as housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by low income adults with disabilities, and that is linked to on-site or off-site services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Target population includes adults with low incomes having one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health conditions, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5, commencing with Section 4500, of the Welfare and Institutions Code) and may, among other populations, include families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, or homeless people.

Escondido’s Zoning Code makes provisions for transitional and permanent supportive housing. Transitional and supportive housing that is operated as regular housing developments (i.e. no state care license) is permitted by-right in all residential zones, regardless of size or on-site services. Transitional and supportive housing that is operated as group quarters with six or fewer persons is permitted by right in all residential zones. Transitional and supportive housing that is operated as a group quarters with seven or more persons is conditionally allowed in all residential zones except the R-T zone (Mobile Home Park Zone). Potential conditions for approval of large residential care facilities (for more than six persons) as transitional/supportive housing may include hours of operation, security, loading requirements, noise regulations, and restrictions on loitering. Conditions would be similar to those for other similar uses and would not serve to constrain the development of such facilities. SB 745 (2014) specifies that transitional housing and supportive housing should be considered a residential use of property, and subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone. This would extend residential uses as permitted in mixed-use and nonresidential zones. Pursuant to AB 2162 (2018), supportive housing meeting certain criteria must be permitted by right where residential uses are permitted, including mixed-use and nonresidential zones. Escondido’s Zoning Code does not permit mixed-use development outside of specific plan areas; these plans do not explicitly identify transitional and supportive housing as separate from residential uses. The City will review SB 745 and AB 2162 and ensure compliance.

Senior Housing

The Zoning Code permits senior housing (for persons aged 55 or over) as regular housing across the City. Senior Housing is allowed by right in all residential zones.

Single Room Occupancy Units (SROs)

Single Room Occupancy (“SRO”) units are one-room units intended for occupancy by a single individual. They are distinct from a studio or efficiency unit, in that a studio is a one-room unit that must contain a kitchen and bathroom. Although SRO units are not required to have a kitchen or bathroom, many SROs have one or the other and could be equivalent to an efficiency unit. The zoning code officially classifies SROs as “a living or efficiency unit, as defined by California Health and Safety Code section 17958.1, intended or designed to be used as a primary residence for a period of more than thirty (30) consecutive days.” The City adopted a hotel conversion ordinance in 2021 which permits for SRO development through a hotel conversion permit and accompanying CUP, if required, such as in some districts of the South Centre City Specific Plan.

Farm Worker Housing

Pursuant to the State Employee Housing Act (Section 17000 of the Health and Safety Code), employee housing for agricultural workers consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units or spaces designed for use by a single-family or household is permitted by right in an agricultural land use designation. For properties that permit agricultural uses by right, a local jurisdiction may not treat employee housing that meets the above criteria any differently than an agricultural use. Furthermore, any employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure within a residential land use designation, according to the Employee Housing Act. Employee housing for six or fewer persons is permitted wherever a single-family residence is permitted. To comply with State law no conditional use permit or variance is required.

The City’s Zoning Code allows, as a permitted use in open space (O-S), agricultural and estate residential zones (R-A and R-E), living quarters for persons employed on the premises in conjunction with authorized agricultural uses. The City will review the Zoning Code to ensure compliance with the Employee Housing Act.

Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Low Barrier Navigation Centers (“LBNC”s) are service-enriched shelters that are focused on moving individuals into more permanent housing. Low Barrier Navigation Centers provide temporary housing while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to shelter, public benefits, and health services. Under the Housing for Homeless Act (2019), local governments are required to allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers by right in areas zoned for mixed-uses and nonresidential zones that permit multi-family uses.

The City amended the Zoning Code with Ordinance 2020-31R to address the provision of LBNC in CG, CN and CP zones where there are mixed-use overlay areas that are zoned for mixed-use and nonresidential zones permitting multi-family uses.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Both the federal Fair Housing Amendment Act (“FHAA”) and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act direct local governments to make reasonable accommodations (that is, modifications or

exceptions) in their zoning laws and other land use regulations when such accommodations may be necessary to afford disabled persons an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. The City conducted an analysis of the zoning ordinance, permitting procedures, development standards, and building codes to identify potential constraints for housing for persons with disabilities. The City's policies and regulations regarding housing for persons with disabilities are described below.

Land Use Controls

Under State Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (also known as the Lanterman Act), small licensed residential care facilities for six or fewer persons must be treated as regular residential uses and permitted by right in all residential districts. In accordance with State law (Lanterman Developmental Disability Services Act, AB 846, compiled of divisions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.7 of the Welfare and Institutions Code and Title 14 of the Government Code), Escondido allows residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons within all residential zones. Residential care facilities serving more than six persons are conditionally permitted in all residential zones except the mobile-home park zone (R-T). The City does not have a local requirement for proximity between two special needs housing sites.

The City's Zoning Code provides for transitional/supportive housing as residential care facilities only. The Zoning Code will be amended to address the provision of these housing types pursuant to State laws (see discussions above).

Definition of Family

Local governments may restrict access to housing for households failing to qualify as a "family" by the definition specified in the Zoning Code. Specifically, an overly restrictive definition of "family" that limits the number of and differentiates between related and unrelated individuals living together could illegally limit the development and siting of group homes for persons with disabilities, but not for housing families that are similarly sized or situated.

The City of Escondido Zoning Code defines a "family" as "one or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or a group including unrelated individuals living together as a relatively permanent, bona fide, housekeeping unit." The City's definition of family does not restrict access to housing.

Building Codes

The Building and Safety Division actively enforces the California Building Code provisions that regulate the access and adaptability of buildings to accommodate persons with disabilities. No unique restrictions are in place that would constrain the development of housing for persons with disabilities. Government Code Section 12955.1 requires that 10% of the total dwelling units in multi-family buildings without elevators consisting of three or more rental units or four or more condominium units subject to the following building standards for persons with disabilities:

- The primary entry to the dwelling unit shall be on an accessible route unless exempted by site impracticality tests.
- At least one powder room or bathroom shall be located on the primary entry level served by an accessible route.
- All rooms or spaces located on the primary entry level shall be served by an accessible route. Rooms and spaces located on the primary entry level and subject to this chapter may include

but are not limited to kitchens, powder rooms, bathrooms, living rooms, bedrooms, or hallways.

- Common use areas shall be accessible.
- If common tenant parking is provided, accessible parking spaces is required.

Reasonable Accommodation

Both the Federal Fair Housing Act and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act direct local governments to make reasonable accommodations (i.e. modifications or exceptions) in their zoning laws and other land use regulations when such accommodations may be necessary to afford disabled persons an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. For example, it may be reasonable to accommodate requests to waive a setback requirement or other standard of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that homes are accessible for the mobility impaired. Whether a particular modification is reasonable depends on the circumstances.

The City adopted an amendment to the Zoning Code establishing a formal reasonable accommodations procedure in 2001. The Zoning Code gives authority to the Director of Community Development (or his/her designee) to make decisions regarding reasonable accommodation requests. There is no fee imposed on the request for reasonable accommodation. However, if the project for which the request is being made also requires some other planning permit or approval, then the applicant must file the request together and submit the required fees associated with the related permits.

In determining the reasonableness of a requested accommodation, the Director will consider the following factors:

- Whether the housing which is the subject of the request for reasonable accommodation will be used by an individual protected under the Acts;
- Whether fulfillment of the request is necessary to make specific housing available to an individual protected under the Acts;
- Whether the accommodation will impose an unreasonable financial or administrative burden on the City;
- Whether the accommodation will require a fundamental alteration of the zoning or building laws, policies and/or procedures of the City;
- Whether the accommodation will have any potential impact on surrounding uses;
- Physical attributes of the property and structures; and
- Any other factor deemed relevant to the determination according to the Acts, as amended.

The requirement to be compatible with surrounding uses may be considered subjective and potentially constraining development of housing for persons with disabilities.

Permits and Processing

A request for a retrofit of property to increase accessibility would be handled through the building permit process, if the retrofit is of a nature to be governed by the building code. Group homes, with fewer than six persons, are permitted by right in the residential zones. Modifications to the structure would be made through the building permit process, if the modifications proposed are under building code jurisdiction.

Depending on the zone classification of the property, a group home for more than six persons requires either a plot plan or a Conditional Use Permit. There is no standard list of conditions; each site would be reviewed and conditions assigned based on the specifics of the site and proposed project. A plot plan does not require a public hearing. A Conditional Use Permit requires a public hearing by the Planning Commission.

Development Conditions and Fees

Residential developers are subject to a variety of fees and exactions to process permits and provide necessary services and facilities as allowed by State law. In general, these development fees can be a constraint to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing because the additional cost borne by developers contributes to overall increased housing unit cost. However, the fees are necessary to maintain adequate public services and facilities in the City in concert with adopted Quality of Life Standard thresholds set forth in the General Plan. These fees have not been found to act as a constraint to the development of housing in Escondido.

Planning processing costs are covered in part by applicant fees. Development impact fees are charged to a new development to pay for the local infrastructure needed to serve it. Within the San Diego region, all 18 of the local jurisdictions and the County charge development impact fees. Impact fees can be charged for a variety of public facilities, including utilities, parks, open space, fire stations, libraries, and transportation improvements such as streets, highways, and transit.

Development impact fees enable the City to shift at least part of the capital-financing burden to new development, and synchronize new development with the installation of these new public facilities. Escondido's impact fees fall within the average when compared to those of the other jurisdictions. Additionally, the City conducts a periodic review of the fees to insure they reflect the current impacts and necessary improvements for the standard level of service.

Table 45 summarizes the most common planning and development impact fees for the City of Escondido and other North County cities located along the State Route 78 corridor. In general, the City's fees are comparable to developments in other North San Diego communities. Table 46 compares the estimated total fees for typical projects based on a fee survey conducted by the Building Industry Association of San Diego. As shown, fees in Escondido fall within the middle to low end of the spectrum compared to other communities in the region. The fee amounts reported below for the City of Escondido include inflationary adjustments, adopted pursuant to R2020-125 on October 28, 2020, effective on February 22, 2021.

To facilitate residential development in the current economic climate, the City revised its Development Fee Deferral Policy in June 2012. This revision expanded the existing policy to allow residential developers (for projects of five or more units) to defer payment of development fees until occupancy, not to exceed one year from building permit issuance.

Table 45: Planning and Development Fees Regional Comparison (2020/21)

| Jurisdiction | Escondido* | | Carlsbad* | | Oceanside* | | Vista | | San Marcos | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Residential Unit Type (cost per unit) | Single Family | Multi-family | Single Family | Multi-family | Single Family | Multi-family | Single Family | Multi-family | Single Family | Multi-family |
| Planning Fees | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design Review/ Development Review | \$524.97 - \$846.97 | | varies | | \$7,000 - \$10,000 | | \$953.26 | | \$2,470 | \$3,430 |
| Major Use Permit/ Conditional Use Permit | \$6,972.97 | | \$4,913 | | \$5,000 | | \$8,064.36 | | \$3,476 | |
| Tentative Parcel Map | \$3,970.97 | | \$3,678 - \$4,169 | | \$3,000 | | \$4,740.73 | | \$2,090 | |
| Tentative Subdivision Map | \$6,128.87 - \$12,652.57 | | \$8,193 | | \$8,000 | | \$7,292.45 (5-15 lots) \$10,042.96 (15+ lots) | | \$2,690 + \$50/lot | |
| Environmental Review-Initial Study/Addendum | \$2,565.00 | | \$2,753+ | | \$5,000 | | \$6,930.91+ | | \$200.00 | |
| General Plan Amendment | \$5,968.18 - \$6,954.45 | | \$4,677 - \$6,747 | | \$10,000 - \$15,000 | | \$10,617.25 | | \$2,500 | |
| Impact/Capacity Fees | | | | | | | | | | |
| Facilities Fee | \$4,969 | \$4,969 | \$15,423 | \$9,039 | \$2,621 | \$2,621 | \$1,218 | \$1,218 | N/A | N/A |
| Parks Fee | \$6,986 | \$6,663 | \$7,649 | \$6,190 | \$4,431 | \$4,431 | \$8,086.54 | \$8,035.77 | \$6,251 | |
| Traffic Impact Fee | \$4,191 | \$2,095 | \$7,500 | \$6,000 | \$1,032 | \$582 | \$5,667.86 | \$4,534.29 | \$6,747 | \$4,048 |
| Drainage Fee | \$1,136 | \$469 | \$2,054 | \$3,589 | \$2,054 | \$976 | varies | | \$3,625 – \$28,261/acre | |
| Other Fees | \$15,430 | \$9,148 | \$16,324 | \$12,398 | \$46,330 | \$8,718 | \$5,739.67- \$6,824.48 | \$4,131.46- \$4,890.83 | \$30,083 | \$15,816 |
| Total per Unit | \$32,712 | \$23,344 | \$49,243 | \$33,986 | \$56,468 | \$17,328 | varies | varies | varies | varies |
| Source: City of Escondido (Updated February 23, 2021), City of Carlsbad, City of Oceanside, City of Vista Fees (July 2021), City of San Marcos Adopted 2021-2029 Housing Element. *The cities of Escondido, Carlsbad, and Oceanside are “full service” cities, whereas Vista and San Marco are not. According to the Institute of Local Governments (2016), a “full service” city is responsible for providing all or most of city services, such as law enforcement, fire suppression, land use planning, parks and recreation, water and wastewater services, solid waste collection, and public works. Note: City of Oceanside’s discretionary fee costs are base deposit amounts, and vary depending on total amount of time billed toward a project and may exceed initial deposit amount ⁸ . | | | | | | | | | | |

⁸ City of Oceanside, Planning Fee Schedule, and City of Oceanside Development Services Department and Economic and Community Development Department Policy No. 201101/Policy and Procedure for Development Deposit Account Administration.

Table 46: Total Fee Comparisons (2019-2020)

| Jurisdictions | Per Unit Permit and Impact Fees | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | Single Family | Townhome (Type V Construction) | Condominium (Type III Construction) | Apartment (Type V Construction) |
| Carlsbad | \$42,616.78 | \$23,012.02 | \$17,086.21 | \$16,762.04 |
| Chula Vista | \$57,167.97 | \$42,481.32 | \$38,577.18 | \$38,596.86 |
| Encinitas | \$22,932.15 | \$15,984.48 | --- | \$15,233.65 |
| Escondido | \$37,044.15 | \$31,185.86 | \$29,360.35 | \$29,360.35 |
| Imperial Beach | \$15,161.22 | \$11,262.71 | \$9,832.14 | \$21,010.37 |
| La Mesa | \$27,442.49 | \$19,242.63 | \$14,248.72 | \$12,906.75 |
| Lemon Grove | \$13,563.65 | \$6,259.63 | \$4,870.52 | \$5,106.55 |
| National City | \$15,025.99 | \$5,655.93 | \$4,175.54 | \$4,175.54 |
| Oceanside | \$68,235.30 | \$25,089.74 | \$17,254.33 | \$17,178.01 |
| Poway | \$26,528.05 | \$21,194.22 | \$2,059.13 | \$20,898.17 |
| San Diego | \$155,367.00 | \$103,121.73 | \$95,731.81 | \$97,461.70 |
| San Marcos | \$30,761.34 | \$25,588.10 | \$23,410.80 | \$14,184.14 |
| Santee | \$78,142.00 | \$67,667.00 | \$64,247.00 | \$57,827.00 |
| San Diego County | \$21,797.00 | \$12,793.00 | \$10,900.00 | \$11,156.00 |
| Vista | \$27,546.37 | \$20,804.79 | \$23,176.90 | \$18,608.86 |

Source: BIA 2019-2020 Fees Study for San Diego County; City of Santee Fee Schedule FY2020-21; Padre Dam Municipal Water District Sewer and Water Capacity Fee Schedule 2021; Santee Elementary School District Developer Fees 2021; Grossmont Union High School District Developer Fees 2021

In 2020, the City conducted a Fiscal Impact Assessment that determined that the cost to serve new residential development generally exceeds the revenue generated from that development. In order to ensure that new residents within the City continue to receive the services at their current level, a Community Facilities District (“CFD”) has been created as one potential mechanism to fund municipal services associated with new residential development. A CFD is special tax levied annually on the property tax bill. Also known as a Mello-Roos, this tax can be used to fund improvements required to support the development of new homes or the ongoing costs to serve new development. In accordance with Resolution No. 2020-44, adopted on May 13, 2020; Ordinance No. 2020-10, adopted on June 3, 2020; and Ordinance No. 2020-24, adopted on October 21, 2020; and as otherwise authorized by the City’s longstanding General Plan policies and authority under State law, new residential development is expected to fund all on-going operational costs of providing municipal services required for the project. Such funding may occur through either an agreement to voluntarily form or annex into a CFD or the establishment of another lawful funding mechanism to offset the impacts to public services associated with the project. With respect to the CFD, for new residential units within the City limits, the FY20/21 adopted special tax rates range from \$536 to \$783 per dwelling unit.

Although Resolution No. 2020-44, Ordinance No. 2020-10, and Ordinance No. 2020-24 were enacted to protect the health and safety of citizens and further the general welfare, the City will periodically re-examine the aforementioned policies to determine whether, under certain conditions, if they directly or indirectly constitute a barrier to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels. As previously mentioned, this 2021-2029 Housing Element was prepared under

the cover of a Housing and Community Investment Study, which among other things identifies all relevant land use controls and their impacts on the cost and supply of housing, including the CFD policies. A Sector Feasibility Study was prepared and shows that the cumulative impacts of standards and policies, including the policy that contemplates new residential development funding the on-going costs of municipal services required by such development, does not impede the ability to achieve maximum allowable densities. Such an examination may reveal that certain policies have a disproportionate or negative impact on the development of particular housing types (e.g., multi-family) or on housing developed for low or moderate income households. However, affordable housing projects and other organizations that meet the requirements of Revenue and Taxation Code section 214 may qualify for a Property Tax Welfare Exemption.

The City will continue to monitor whether ordinances, policies, or practices related to development conditions and fees, such as those covered in this section or those newly contemplated during this housing element cycle, have the effect of unduly constraining the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing, including but not limited to excluding housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

Transparency in Development Process

To increase transparency and certainty in the development application process as required by law (AB 1483), the City has a variety of tools available for developers. The City's Planning Division website has links to the City's zoning ordinance, zoning parcel look-up tool, and other resources (<https://www.escondido.org/planning.aspx>). Direct links are also provided below:

- Zoning Ordinance: <http://www.qcode.us/codes/escondido/view.php?topic=33>
- Parcel look-up tool: <https://www.escondido.org/parcel-lookup.aspx>
- Planning Fee schedule:
<https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/Planning/FeeSchedule2021-22Revised12.21.21.pdf>

On- and Off-Site Improvements

Infrastructure is already in place in multi-family areas. Development standards vary depending on the land use pattern in the area. Street width requirements (curb to curb) are 36 feet for public and 28 feet for private rural residential streets, 42 for local collectors, 64 for collectors and 82 for major roads. Full curb and gutter are required, with the standard five-foot wide sidewalk per ADA requirements.

Water and sewer capacity must be adequate to meet normal and emergency situations with a water capacity to provide a minimum of 540 gallons of water per day per household and a sewage capacity to treat a minimum of 250 gallons per day for each residence. The City is also required to comply to NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) storm water standards with structural and non-structural methods, such as the use of detention basins, catch basin and filters, and drains.

Requirements for on- and off-site improvements vary depending on the presence of existing improvements, as well as the size and nature of the proposed development. In general, the City requires the following improvements and facilities for new developments:

- *Grade Improvements:* The City requires developers to grade and improve all land dedicated or to be dedicated for streets or easements, bicycle ways and all private streets and private easements involved in a Final Map or Parcel Map in such manner and with such improvements as are necessary in accordance with the Escondido City standards.
- *Sewers:* The City requires developers to install sewers or sewage disposal systems in accordance with the Private Sewage Disposal Systems ordinance.

- *Water Supply:* The City requires developers to provide proof satisfactory to the City Engineer that there exists an adequate potable water supply available to each lot or parcel and that the developer will install or agree to install water supply facilities to the satisfaction of the City Engineer provided that the City Engineer may require such other system or size of water supply pipe as recommended by the water facility serving the project.
- *Fire hydrants:* The City requires developers to install as required by the City Engineer, fire hydrants and connections, which hydrants and connections shall be of a type approved by the Escondido Fire Chief.
- *Public Sewer system:* When the City Engineer determines that, by reason of the size and shape of the proposed lots, the nature of the terrain to be subdivided, the soil condition of the lots and the development of the area in the vicinity of the proposed subdivision, a public sewer system serving the lots will be required to preserve the public health, or if there is a public sewer main within two hundred (200) feet of the property boundary, the developer shall be required to install or agree to install a public sewer system serving said lots as a condition precedent to the approval of any Final or Parcel Map.
- *Undergrounding Utilities:* All new and existing utilities distribution facilities, including cable television lines and other communication facilities within the boundaries of any new subdivision or within any property abutting a proposed new subdivision, shall be placed underground pursuant to the requirements of Escondido Municipal Code.
- *Flood Control:* The developer is required to install all flood control and drainage improvements in conformance with the drainage policies of the General Plan, the Drainage Master Plan, the Engineering Division Policy for Drainage Studies, and City design standards.
- *Street Trees:* The developer is required to install street trees as required by Escondido City standards pursuant to the landscape standards of the Zoning Code.
- *Traffic Control Signals:* The developer is required to install such traffic control signals as may be required by the City Engineer, Planning Commission or City Council.

Building Codes and Enforcement

The City of Escondido has adopted the 2019 California Building Code. The City has also adopted the 2019 Green Building Standards Code. No amendments have been made that diminish the ability to accommodate persons with disabilities. There are no locally amended universal design elements; the universal design provisions of the California Building Code are enforced. Exceptions or methods of alternative compliance to the requirements of the California Building Code are contained in the code. The City has no local ability to waive the provisions of the State building codes. However, a mechanism within the building code allows for an appeal process to challenge interpretations of the building code requirements.

The Code Enforcement Division, which is a section of the Community Development Department, enforces applicable building codes. Code enforcement is reactive and prioritized based on risks to health and safety. However, code enforcement remains complaint-based and investigates complaints to determine appropriate steps for correction. Code Enforcement also refers households that may qualify for assistance to the City's rehabilitation programs.

Permits and Processing Times

Government Code section 65943 states that local governments have 30 days after an application for a housing development project is submitted to inform the applicant whether or not the application is

complete. If the local government does not inform the applicant of any deficiencies within that 30-day period, the application will be "deemed complete", even if it is deficient. If the application is determined to be incomplete, the local government shall provide the applicant with an exhaustive list of items that were not complete pursuant to the local government's submittal requirement checklist. Information not included in the initial list of deficiencies in the application cannot be requested in subsequent reviews of the application.

The processing time needed to obtain development permits and required approvals is commonly cited by the development community as a prime contributor to the high cost of housing. Depending on the magnitude and complexity of the development proposal, the time that elapses from application submittal to project approval may vary considerably.

The Community Development Department is currently preparing a development processing guide with the newcomer to the permit process in mind. It details the steps involved in obtaining a zoning or building permit(s) – from preliminary review through final approval. This information will help people who have had little or no experience with the building permit process. Experienced building professionals will also find information about the required amount of processing time useful for their scheduling and/or seek streamlining opportunities.

Processing Times

Factors that can affect the length of development review on a proposed project include: completeness of the development application submittal, responsiveness of developers to staff comments and requests for information, and projects that are not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), require rezoning or general plan amendment, or are subject to a public hearing before the Planning Commission or City Council.

Certainty and consistency in permit processing procedures and reasonable processing times is important to ensure that the development review/approval process does not discourage developers of housing or add excessive costs (including carrying costs on property) that would make the project economically infeasible. The City is committed to maintaining comparatively short processing times. Total processing times vary by project, but most residential projects are approved in six months. Table 47 provides a detailed summary of the typical processing procedures and timelines of various types of projects in the City.

| Table 47: Processing Time by Development Type | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Project Type | Reviewing Body | Public Hearing Required | Appeal Body (if any) | Estimated Total Processing Time |
| Single-Family Subdivision | Planning Commission | Yes | City Council | 3-6 months |
| Multiple-Family | Staff/ Administrative | No | Planning Commission | 12-20 weeks |
| Multiple-Family (with subdivisions) | Planning Commission and City Council | Yes | None | 4-6 months |
| Mixed-use | Planning Commission and City Council | Yes | None | 4-6 months |

For apartment projects, processing periods normally require an administrative review and take approximately 12 to 20 weeks from the time of submittal of a complete application to the time of construction. Below are the required steps in the following order:

- Submit Plot Plan Application
- Environmental and Plot Plan Review
- Building and Grading Permits Construction Plans Submittal
- Resubmit Construction Plans as needed.
- Permits Issued

Other residential development proposals require administrative, Planning Commission, or City Council approval as shown below:

Administrative Approval

Staff review – up to 10 weeks:

- Lot Line Adjustments
- Certificates of Compliance
- Parcel Maps
- Administrative Adjustments
- Accessory Dwelling Units

Planning Commission Approval

Public hearing – up to 16 weeks including environmental review:

- Conditional Use Permits
- Grading Exemptions (for grading exceeding requirements)
- Precise Development Plans
- Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Variances

City Council Approval/with Planning Commission Recommendation

Public hearing – up to 26 weeks including environmental review:

- Zone Changes (rezones and pre-zones)
- General Plan Amendments
- Extensions of Time for Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Planned Developments
- Specific Plans
- Condominium Permits
- Habitat Loss Permits
- Development Agreements

City Council Approval/with Planning Commission Recommendation

The processing time for the most common residential development applications are summarized in Table 48. These applications are often processed concurrently. The City continues to explore ways to streamline

the processing of applications and reduce fees for redevelopment/ rehabilitation of affordable, fair market and mixed-use housing. The City also explores ways to encourage development of housing for middle- and high-income households in order to promote a balanced community. The City conducted an evaluation to streamline processes and processing times. Specifically, the City consolidated the Design Review Board into the Planning Commission. In so doing, the City eliminated one step in the review process, thereby shortening the timeframe of review.

Table 48: Processing Time by Process / Permit

| Process/Application | Time |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Conditional Use Permit | 3-6 months |
| Design Review | 0 weeks (concurrent review) |
| General Plan Amendment | 4-6 months if no public vote is needed |
| Environmental Impact Reports | 9-12 months |
| Plan Check/ Building Permits | 15-20 working days for plan check, or longer depending on resubmitted plan checks and how fast architect responds to corrections |
| Variance | 3-6 months |
| Zone Change | 4-6 months |

Source: City of Escondido Planning Department, 2020.

Design Review Process

The design review process is regulated by Municipal Code Chapter 33, Article 64. The purpose of design review is to preserve the natural charm, integrity and quality of the built environment, by regulating the design and appearance of development in order to ensure compatibility with existing development and ensure that new development is consistent with or exceeds the high quality of the development projects currently located in the City.

Design review takes the following into account: site development, circulation, grading, setbacks, exterior appearance of buildings, structures, signs, lighting, street furniture, landscaping and other outdoor appurtenances. The review of plans is done either by City staff or by the Planning Commission in conjunction with other discretionary reviews. Depending on the project approval, Planning staff review the projects for compliance with the design review standards and provides recommendations to the Planning Director regarding administrative projects that require design review, or the Planning Commission. In order to gain approval, the following findings must be made:

- The proposed site plan has been designed in a manner which is compatible with the natural and urban characteristics of the site and the surrounding neighborhood.
- The bulk, scale, and architectural design of the proposed structure is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- The project incorporates landscaping, irrigation and screening which is drought tolerant, appropriate for the site, and in compliance with the landscape standards established by the city.
- All grading related to the project conforms to design standards set by Article 55 (grading and erosion control).
- The project incorporates applicable design review standards contained in the Zoning Code and other applicable ordinances into the site layout and building design.

- The project is consistent with the goals and objectives on the General Plan.

These findings are reasonable and do not constrain housing development in the City. Typical revisions required by staff or the planning commission include: changes to landscape materials; building elevation details / enhancements / articulation; changes to colors; and minor site plan adjustments. Usually, these changes can be accommodated without increasing the costs of development.

Decisions of the Director may be appealed to the Planning Commission by filing a written request to the Planning Division within ten days following the final decision of the Director. Decisions of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council.

Conditional Use Permit

A conditional use permit is a zoning instrument used primarily to review the location, site development or conduct of certain land uses. These are uses which generally have a distinct impact on the area in which they are located, or are capable of creating special problems for bordering properties unless given special attention. The Planning Commission has the authority to grant, conditionally grant or deny a conditional use permit application, with one exception: The decision on whether or not to issue a conditional use permit for residential care facilities for the handicapped lies with the Director of Planning and Building. In order to be approved, the Planning Commission must make the following findings:

- A conditional use permit will be granted upon sound principles of land use and in response to services required by the community.
- A conditional use permit will not be granted if it will cause deterioration of bordering land uses or create special problems for the area in which it is located.
- A conditional use permit must be considered in relationship to its effect on the community or neighborhood plan for the area in which it is to be located.

Planning Commission decisions can be appealed to the City Council. Most residential uses are permitted by right in residential zones. Therefore, the CUP process does not serve to constrain housing development.

C. Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints

A community's environmental setting affects the feasibility and cost of developing housing. Environmental issues range from the availability of water to the suitability of land for development due to potential exposure to seismic, flooding, wildfire and other hazards. If not properly recognized and accommodated in residential design, these environmental features could potentially endanger lives and property. This section summarizes these potential constraints on residential development in Escondido.

Soil, Steep Slopes, and Seismic Safety

Regulation of development in areas of steep slopes is directly related to public safety and health, as the degree of slope is related to flood control problems, erosion control, landslides, and fire hazard. These problems become particularly acute on slopes greater than 25%. Accordingly, many communities, including the County, map slopes greater than 25%, recognizing them as potentially hazardous areas. Similarly, many of the soil compositions that comprise the Escondido Planning Area present difficulties for development in that they cannot support roadways or foundations, are unacceptable for septic systems, and are highly erodible.

The historical seismicity of the San Diego region is low compared to the rest of Southern California. This may be due to San Diego's location on a more stable block or it may only reflect a period of historical record which is too short to be meaningful. San Diego County has experienced strong shaking and damage from several earthquakes, but none of the recent ones have been particularly destructive.

All of the faults which could affect San Diego County are part of the San Andreas system of faults. The portion of California west of San Andreas fault is part of the Pacific plate and is moving north with respect to the rest of the continent which is part of the North American plate. This movement is distributed among several faults in addition to the main San Andreas Fault. In and near San Diego County these other faults include the San Jacinto, Coyote Creek, Earthquake Valley, Agua Caliente, Elsinore, Rose Canyon, San Miguel (Mexico), Agua Blanca (Mexico), and Coronado Banks (off shore).

The largest fault in the San Diego region, the San Andreas Fault, is at least 800 miles long and is located 27 miles east of Borrego in the Coachella Valley. There is increasing concern that the 85-mile section from north of San Bernardino to the Salton Sea is overdue to rupture, having been "locked" for the last 200 years. Such an event could cause an 8.3 magnitude earthquake - the size of the 1906 San Francisco quake. An 8.3 event on the San Andreas would subject San Diego County of shaking of intensity VII to VIII, enough to cause considerable damage.

East of San Diego the closest active fault is the Elsinore Fault, which passes through the town of Elsinore, along the south side of Palomar Mountain, through Lake Henshaw, Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, down Banner Canyon east of Julian, and out in the desert near Vallecitos. The Elsinore Fault apparently joins the Laguna Salada Fault on the east side of the Sierra Cocopah in Baja California. The Elsinore Fault is probably capable of generating an earthquake of magnitude 7.4. Depending upon which segment moved, considerable damage might occur in Escondido, Ramona, Julian, Borrego, and Jacumba. Portions of all of the roads to the east would probably be temporarily closed by landslides.

The Community Protection and Safety Element of the City's General Plan includes goals, policies, and actions that are designed to reduce the risks of hazards related to soil, steep slopes, and seismic activity, such as the strict enforcement of standards from the Uniform Building Code and the requiring of specific geotechnical reports.

Flood Hazards

There are sections of the City that would be subject to inundation in the event of a 100-year storm. These areas include northern portions of Reidy Creek north of Rincon Avenue, an area alongside Escondido Creek west of Hale Avenue, along Kit Carson Park Creek north of Via Rancho Parkway, an area straddling Midway Drive north of the Escondido Channel, and an area straddling Valley Parkway between Ash and Citrus.

The Community Protection Element of the City's General Plan includes policies to designate appropriate land uses to minimize flood related damages and to ensure proper creek and channel maintenance to ensure their water-carrying capacity.

The City maintains floodplain standards to minimize flood risks to existing and proposed developments. Projects built in the floodplain area may be subject to additional findings and risk mitigation, but the floodplain standards do not prohibit or constrain housing developments located within the floodplain. The City has recently approved a 145-unit affordable housing project (Quince

Street Senior Apartments) that was partially built within the floodplain. The recent project example demonstrates that flood hazards do not create actual constraints on development.

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials represent a potential threat to those who are working with the materials and those who could be affected by its improper or accidental disposal. The cleanup of hazardous wastes from the past and the handling and disposal of newly generated wastes will affect people many generations from now. Site contamination may impair the City's ability to implement this Plan by increasing the costs of development, requiring certain land use restrictions, and causing delays while necessary cleanups are implemented. The policies presented in the Community Protection Element of the City's General Plan are intended to protect the public from existing and future hazardous contamination problems.

Ridgeline and Hillside Conservation

One characteristic that distinguishes Escondido from other communities in the region is its location in a series of valleys that are surrounded by visually distinctive hillsides and ridgelines. The varied topography has been identified as one of Escondido's most important assets – one that has helped create the City's distinct identity. To protect these assets, the City outlined a series of policies in its Resource Conservation Element that are geared toward controlling development on the hillsides and along the ridgelines.

Water Supply

Water supply for the City stems primarily from two sources: local water, derived from precipitation, and stored in Lakes Henshaw and Wohlford, and imported water transmitted by the San Diego County Water Authority. A master plan, administered by the City ensures the adequacy of these facilities to meet the demands imposed by development projected over the General Plan horizon. Continued urban development will place increasing demands on these supplies. Potential limitations on the availability of supplies require the need to combine long-term planning for water supply with long-term planning for community development in Escondido. Limited areas of the City are provided water service by the Rincon del Diablo Water District.

The 2012 Water Master Plan was prepared at the same time and under the same assumptions as the 2012 Escondido General Plan Update, which identified new growth within the same East Valley area as that contemplated for the East Valley Specific Plan. The General Plan Update considered a range of 3,350 to 5,825 new residential units that would be added to the General Plan's build-out projection of approximately 67,900 dwelling units. The plan describes a number of capital improvement projects over the next thirty years, including water recycling, demand management measures, and conservation rebates to ensure the availability of water to meet the City's projected build-out.

Wastewater Capacity

Escondido's wastewater is treated at the Hale Avenue wastewater treatment plant, conveyed over land, and discharged through an ocean outfall. A Master Plan, administered by the City, ensures the adequacy of these facilities to meet the demands imposed by development projected over the General Plan horizon. Significantly, the availability of sewer service distinguishes between urban

development and rural development. Thus, the extension of services and the availability of capacity will influence how much and where Escondido grows.

The Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for General Plan Update concludes that existing wastewater treatment capacity is not adequate to accommodate the growth anticipated under the General Plan Update, which would add over 9,400 units by 2035. The Escondido Water and Wastewater Division (EWWD) updated its sewer master plan to ensure adequate sewage treatment capacity to serve the projected buildout population of the updated General Plan. Wastewater demands in the Escondido service area, resulting from the 2021-2029 Housing Element sites inventory, has already been studied and accommodated by the 2012 Wastewater Master Plan. Adequate sewage treatment capacity is projected to accommodate the growth allowed under the current General Plan and Sixth Cycle Housing Element.

Priority for Water and Sewer Services

Much of the new housing growth is expected to occur within the EVSP area. Adequate water and sewer services are available to accommodate the City’s projected Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Nevertheless, Senate Bill 1087 (enacted 2006) requires that water and sewer providers develop written policies that grant priority to proposed development that includes housing affordable to lower-income households. The legislation also prohibits water and sewer providers from denying or conditioning the approval of development that includes housing affordable to lower income households, unless specific written findings are made. As the water and sewer service provider, the City will include a policy in this Housing Element to prioritize services. The City will also provide a copy of the adopted Housing Element to the Rincon del Diablo Water District, which serves portions of the City, within 30 days of adoption. The City will continue to coordinate with Rincon to ensure priority service provision to affordable housing developments.

5. Housing Resources

A. Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (“RHNA”) allocates to each city and county in California a “fair share” of the region’s projected housing needs by household income group. The major goal of the RHNA is to ensure a fair distribution of housing among cities and counties within their respective regions, so that every community provides an opportunity for a mix of housing for all economic segments.

The San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) adopted its RHNA in July 2020 for the Sixth Cycle Housing Element, which covers an eight-year planning period (April 2021 through April 2029) and addresses housing issues that are related to future growth in the region. The housing allocation targets are not building requirements, but goals for each community to accommodate through appropriate planning policies and land use regulations. Allocation targets are intended to ensure that adequate sites and zoning are made available to address anticipated housing demand during the planning period.

Escondido’s share of regional future housing needs is a total of 9,607 new units for the period of April 15, 2021, to April 15, 2029; it is the third highest allocation in the SANDAG region. This allocation is divided into various income categories, as shown in Table 49. The RHNA was distributed to jurisdictions in the region using a formula that accounted for access to public transit and employment. The RHNA also includes a fair share adjustment, which allocates future need by each income category in a way that meets the State mandate to reduce the overconcentration of lower-income households in one community.

Table 49: RHNA Allocation by Household Income (2021-2029)

| Above Moderate | Moderate | Low | Very Low | Total |
|----------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| 4,967 | 1,527 | 1,249 | 1,864 | 9,607 |

Note: The City has a RHNA allocation of 1,864 very low income units (inclusive of extremely low income units). Pursuant to State law (AB 2634), the City must project the number of extremely low income housing needs based on Census income distribution or assume 50% of the very low income units as extremely low. Therefore, the City’s very low income RHNA is split into 932 extremely low and 932 very low income units. However, for the purpose of identifying adequate sites for the RHNA, no separating accounting is required.

B. Credits Toward RHNA

Housing units that are approved, under construction, or developed with building permits issued after June 30, 2020, can be credited toward this Sixth Cycle RHNA. Table 50 summarizes these particular units. Many of these units were achieved through recycling of existing lower-intensity uses in the Downtown and South Centre City Specific Plan areas; some are in single-family subdivisions in more suburban/rural areas of the City.

Table 50: Credits Toward RHNA

| Credits toward RHNA | Above Moderate | Moderate Income | Low Income | Total |
|---|----------------|-----------------|------------|-------|
| Approved | 1,002 | 90 | 155 | 1,247 |
| Entitled or Under Construction (permitted after July 1, 2020) | 355 | 0 | 0 | 355 |
| Projects in Review | 649 | 0 | 371 | 1,020 |
| Total | 2,006 | 90 | 526 | 2,622 |

Entitled Units

A project converting a vacant golf course began construction prior to July 1, 2020. The project is entitled for 380 total units, and in May 2020 received building permits for 25 units, including model homes. A total of entitled 355 units remain unpermitted as of July 1, 2020, but have since obtained permits or will obtain permits and will begin construction during the Sixth Cycle RHNA planning period. All of these units are expected to be affordable to above moderate-income households (see Table A-1 in Appendix A).

Approved Units

Projects that were approved but had not been issued building permits prior to July 1, 2020, are included in the RHNA as credits. The list of approved projects is included in Table A-2 in Appendix A: RHNA Credits. In total, the City has approved 1,247 units (1,002 above moderate units, 90 moderate income units, and 155 low income units) units, which are expected to be constructed during the Sixth Cycle planning period.

Units Undergoing Entitlement

In addition to projects that have already been approved, the City is currently processing entitlements for another 1,020 units, including 371 units expected to be affordable for low income households. The City anticipates that these units will be approved and constructed during the Sixth Cycle planning period. The list of projects undergoing review is included in Table A-3 in Appendix A: RHNA Credits. Regardless of planned densities, these projects are counted toward the RHNA based on the income/affordability levels proposed by the projects.

C. Development Trends, Yields, and Realistic Capacity for Housing

Much of the future development in Escondido is expected to occur within Downtown Escondido and in the South Centre City and East Valley areas. The Downtown, South Centre City, and East Valley areas of Escondido are characterized by a variety of underutilized commercial development and lower-intensity residential uses. Recognizing the need for additional housing and commercial employment opportunities, the City Council has adopted or is preparing specific plans for each of these areas to attract investment and encourage the production of housing for all income levels. Recently constructed or approved projects demonstrate the potential and likelihood that these areas will continue to see increased levels of housing production at and--with density bonuses for inclusion of affordable housing--above the maximum density allowed under zoning.

Very High-Density (75-100 du/ac)

Escondido's Downtown Specific Plan was amended in 2012 to allow for residential densities of up to 75 and 100 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) through a majority of the planning area. In recent years, developers have pursued various projects in very high-density areas, including projects that incorporated commercial/mixed-use components as well as affordable and market-rate housing. A review of 14 recent projects found that developments in areas allowing 75 and 100 du/ac had an average residential yield of 80% of the maximum allowed. These trends clearly illustrate that the very high-density residential and mixed-use zoning in Escondido's Downtown are actively incentivizing residential production at a variety of income levels.

While some of these recent projects were exclusively residential, the City identified nine different mixed-use projects built or proposed on sites with densities of 75 or 100 du/ac. These sites had an average yield of 69% of the maximum. Additionally, one of these projects is a statistical outlier, as it was a small commercial project that included a single unit. Generally, mixed-use developments have trended towards larger projects, and with the single outlier excluded, achieved an average yield of 77% of the maximum allowed on very-high-density sites. The City Council has authorized the Community Development Department to remove mandatory ground floor commercial requirements from the Downtown Specific Plan. This action is anticipated to be completed in 2021. While the City is already experiencing high development yields in mixed-use projects and zones, the greater zoning flexibility will provide additional opportunities for residential development in Downtown, and likely increase densities beyond historic trends.

Medium-High-Density (12-45 du/ac)

The City allows for housing at 12 to 45 du/ac throughout most of the South Centre City Specific Plan, portions of the Downtown Specific Plan, and in R-2 through R-5 zones throughout the City. Developments at these densities have consisted of mixed-use apartment complexes, affordable housing, and compact townhomes. A review of 15 recent and proposed projects illustrates that many developments are taking advantage of density bonuses and are achieving densities greater than the maximum permitted by the underlying zoning. On average, projects in this density range have been built close to or above the maximum allowed.

The single mixed-use project located in a zone allowing up to 30 du/ac achieved a density of 90% of the maximum allowed by zoning. While the City does not typically require mixed-use development at these densities, and is removing ground floor commercial requirements from the Downtown Specific Plan, the single mixed-use project illustrates that mixed-uses at these densities is feasible and likely to yield close to the maximum residential units allowed.

Lower Density Residential (0-11 du/ac)

The City has approved or is processing a number of lower-density, single-family subdivisions. A review of 24 of these projects found that these properties are developing at approximately 79% of the maximum allowable densities.

Affordable Housing Development

Escondido has seen substantial growth in the affordable housing stock of its Downtown area in recent years, with multiple developments taking advantage of density bonuses to construct additional lower income housing. A review of the recent and proposed affordable housing projects shows that affordable housing developments average approximately 114% of the maximum units allowed by the

underlying zoning. This average is skewed down by a single, low-density suburban development that is affordable to seniors, which yielded only 62% of the maximum allowed. Multi-family projects with affordable housing have an average yield of 124% of the maximum allowed by zoning, and have been constructed in zones allowing between 12 and 100 du/ac. Furthermore, affordable housing has been constructed on non-vacant lands, with previous uses including warehouses, small medical facilities, single-family homes, and arterial commercial centers.

Based on recent affordable housing development in the City, it is reasonably expected that new affordable housing will continue to utilize density bonuses and construct more units than the base zone would otherwise permit.

Table 51: Affordable Housing Yields

| Project | Description | Size (Acres) | Zoning Density | Yield % |
|---|--|--------------|----------------|---------|
| SUB 20-0002 - Habitat for Humanity | 10 condos at 245 E. El Norte | 0.57 | 12 | 147% |
| ADM 20-0136 - 664 N. Fig Street | 15 apartment units | 0.59 | 18 | 140% |
| PHG 15-0009 - Solutions for Change Housing | 33 affordable units & 1,120 SF commercial | 0.79 | 30 | 140% |
| PHG 14-0020 - Veterans Village | 48 new units (54 total) + 1,500 SF commercial on 1.8 ac. | 1.76 | 30 | 91% |
| ADM 20-0070 - 337 E. Valley Pkwy | 50-unit affordable housing | 0.57 | 75 | 118% |
| Touchstone – Ivy | 4 story, 95 new units | 1.04 | 75 | 122% |
| PHG13-0010 - Meadowbrook | 66-unit senior units | 24.38 | 4.36 | 62% |
| PHG 17-0028 - Quince Senior Housing | 145-unit affordable senior housing | 1.48 | 100 | 98% |
| Source: Escondido Major Development Project Processing List, August 2020. | | | | |

Small Lot Development and Lot Consolidation

State law requires that sites used to accommodate lower incomes be between 0.5 and 10 acres. Escondido's Downtown core generally consists of smaller lots that do not meet the 0.5-acre minimum. Many of the smaller lots meet the intent of the HCD eligibility guidelines. The density allows projects of 15 or more units on each site, which enables incorporation of affordable housing. The very high densities also create a strong incentive to consolidate smaller parcels. Escondido has many small parcels and consolidation for redevelopment is very common. Lot consolidation is not a significant impediment to housing development in the region or Escondido. It occurs as part of the normal course of the land development process and is common to a significant percentage of development projects. It occurs as part of the market conditions without incentive or subsidy as demonstrated by the projects described below.

The City has seen multiple examples of developers assembling and consolidating smaller lots to create a larger overall project site. The Touchstone - Ivy project at 343 E. 2nd Avenue, which is being developed for fully affordable housing, involved the assemblage of six different parcels that were previously developed for a large medical office building (Escondido Surgery Center). The building construction was expensive frame on podium over parking and the site had a very low land-to-improvement ratio of 0.37, demonstrating that the permitted residential density can make consolidation and development of expensive non-vacant sites viable, when the existing uses are no longer viable. The 1.0-acre site has since been purchased by an affordable housing developer that is proposing 95 affordable units (95 du/ac). The Iwashita Apartments at 322 South Escondido Boulevard involves the consolidation of seven lots with different ownership to construct the 180-unit

6-story mixed-use apartment complex on a total of 1.28 acres (134 du/ac). The existing lots are between 0.16 acre and 0.32 acre, with previous uses including used car sales, single-family homes, and small medical offices, with land to improvement ratios above 1. Another project at 829 South Escondido Boulevard involves redevelopment of a 1-story small strip commercial building complex on three lots, with sizes ranging from 0.16 acre to 0.32 acre, being consolidated to allow for a 21-unit apartment complex on 0.66 acres (32 du/ac), with several of the units reserved for lower income housing. The three parcels have land to improvement ratios both above and below one (depending on the parcel), illustrating that properties with low existing improvements and high net unit potential are exhibiting trends of redevelopment.

The City has seen many other examples of parcels that have been consolidated to provide a larger site for a housing development. Veterans Village, along South Escondido Blvd. and W. 15th Avenue consolidated six parcels, including several smaller than 0.5 acres, to build 54-unit affordable apartments on 1.8 acres (30 du/ac) for veterans and their families. Another affordable housing project, Valley Seniors Village at the corner of Valley Parkway and Ivy Street (337 E. Valley Parkway), aggregated five extremely small lots (each less than 0.2 acres) to provide a 0.41-acre site for a 50 unit affordable-housing project (119 du/ac). Finally, four existing single-family home lots are proposed to be consolidated to create a 1.0-acre site for a 44-unit (44 du/ac) apartment complex at the corner of South Escondido Boulevard and Vermont Avenue in the South Centre City Specific Plan. These recent and proposed projects provide direct evidence that lot consolidation is common and feasible in Escondido and is not a significant constraint, even when providing affordable housing. Lot consolidation for parcels smaller than 0.5 acres has been used frequently and contributed to multiple affordable housing projects. Therefore, the City expects this trend to continue throughout the sixth cycle and is accounting for lot-consolidation when projecting for the number of potential low-income sites within the sites inventory.

These examples of consolidation of small lots into larger sites for redevelopment are common and the characteristics of the parcels in these examples are typical of the proposed RHNA sites in terms of location, existing or prior land uses, lot size, land-to-improvement ratios, and permitted development density. Additional examples of these RHNA site typologies and recent redevelopment projects with similar characteristics are provided in Appendix B, Sites Inventory. The list of sites includes land use, improvement to land value ratios, age of structures, and the number of units that could be added to a property to help demonstrate the viability of each parcel.

State law requires that sites used to accommodate lower-income RHNA units be between 0.5 and 10 acres. Based on the recent trends of lot consolidation for housing projects, including affordable projects, the City considered adjacent parcels with a cumulative size above 0.5 acres as able to accommodate lower-income units. All properties included for lower-income units either have individual sizes between 0.5 and 10 acres, or cumulative/consolidated sizes between 0.5 and 10 acres. Sites that otherwise would be eligible for lower-income units but that did not meet the size requirement were deemed appropriate for moderate income households. Escondido currently facilitates and expedites lot consolidation through a ministerial process for basic lot consolidation. The City continues to encourage consolidation of lots to facilitate mixed-use and affordable development (see Program 1.1). The City is proposing a program to evaluate incentives to help identify, promote and facilitate lot consolidation and development on small lots.

Realistic Capacity and Development Likelihood Calculations

Based on the recent Specific Plan Amendments spurring housing development in the Downtown, South Centre City, and semi-rural areas, there is a strong likelihood that developers will continue to

invest in Escondido during the Sixth Cycle planning period. While recent project trends demonstrate the feasibility and likelihood that developers will continue to build at and above the allowed density, the City recognizes that some projects may not be constructed to their maximum potential, or otherwise may not be constructed during the planning period. In response, the City has adjusted its assumptions with respect to the realistic and expected development potential. As explained below, the methodology for projecting the development potential and likely project yields for the proposed East Valley Specific Plan (“EVSP”) differ from those used for the South Centre City and Downtown Specific Plan areas.

East Valley Specific Plan

The EVSP contains mechanisms to ensure that developers build close to the site’s maximum potential. For the mixed-use and urban residential districts, the plan sets both minimum densities and a target production point (“TPP”). Applicants are encouraged to meet and exceed the TPP; in cases where they develop below the TPP, the applicant is required to pay an in-lieu fee. Based on the EVSP’s strong incentives for developing at and above the TPP, site capacity in the EVSP was calculated by multiplying the TPP density by the site acreage, and did not include any additional downward adjustments. The TPP densities shown in Table 52 were utilized when calculating residential potential in the East Valley plan area.

It is important to note that the EVSP also is establishing a Density Transfer Program (“DTP”) to enable the City to transfer densities from undeveloped or underutilized properties (i.e. sending areas) within the EVSP to developing properties (i.e. receiving areas). The program would increase the probability that the anticipated number of dwelling units in the EVSP area could actually be achieved by allowing a developing property to increase its density beyond what current zoning would permit when other properties have underdeveloped to less than the maximum density. The transfer density would be held in a Density Credit Pool until assigned to a particular development project. The EVSP DTP establishes a creative land use strategy reflective of changing needs, resources, and conditions to maintain flexible land use management and to encourage the full build-out of the East Valley area. The EVSP DTP is an optional program - and would allow property owners to re-assign or transfer units only if they wanted to. That is, if a property owner chooses to not maximize their development rights and build-out their site to its full potential, the EVSP DTP allows for the transfer or remaining and unused housing density to another, future project in the EVSP area.

Table 52: Site Capacity Estimation (EVSP)

| Land Use Designation | Applicable Zoning | Minimum Density (du/ac) | Maximum Density (du/ac) | Target Production Point |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Urban IV/V | R-5-30 | 21 | 30 | 25 |
| Mixed-use | M-U | 20 | 80 | 45 |

Note: Nonresidential zones of the EVSP were not considered for housing production.

Source: EVSP Draft Land-Use Scenarios

Areas Outside of the East Valley Specific Plan

RHNA sites located outside the EVSP area are not subject to a TPP, so an alternative method of determining site capacity and development likelihood was used. As noted above, project trends generally indicate that housing throughout the City is being built near the maximum allowed density, and for affordable projects, above the maximum allowed density. While recent production trends indicate that site capacity could reasonably be estimated at the maximum density allowed by zoning,

some developments will likely be built at lower densities. Additionally, some of the identified sites may not be developed during the Sixth Cycle planning period, further necessitating a downward adjustment for the realistic capacity. Due to these considerations, the City is estimating that properties with densities of 0 to 45 du/ac will be built to 75% of their maximum allowed, while properties with densities between 46 and 100 du/ac may achieve 62.5% of the maximum allowed by the underlying regulations. Recent trends suggest that this assumption is highly conservative, and significantly underestimates the number of units that are likely to be constructed on these very high-density sites during the planning period.

| Table 53: Site Capacity Estimation (Non EVSP) | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Density Range (du/ac) | Assumed Capacity Factor |
| 0-45 | 75% |
| 46-100 | 62.5% |

Property Yield Calculation

The acreage of the property is multiplied by the allowed density and the yield factor to establish the likely number of units that the site could accommodate. This “estimated yield” was then rounded to the nearest integer. The number of existing units (based on 2020 Assessor data) is subtracted from the likely yield to get the number of “net new units” per parcel.

$$\text{Estimated Yield} = \text{size (acreage)} * \text{density} \left(\frac{\text{du}}{\text{ac}} \right) * \text{Assumed Capacity Factor}$$

$$\text{Rounded Yield} = \text{Estimated Yield rounded to nearest whole number}$$

$$\text{Net Units} = \text{Rounded Yield} - \text{Existing Units}$$

D. Density and Affordability Levels

State law (Assembly Bill 2342/Government Code 65583.2) uses allowed density as a proxy for income/affordability for the sites inventory. Depending on the size and urbanization of the jurisdiction, different default densities are presumed to support lower-income units. Escondido is classified as a “jurisdiction in a metropolitan county,” which has a default density threshold of 30 du/ac for lower-income units.

Generally, single-family homes (0-11 du/ac) are presumed to be affordable to above moderate income households, while townhomes and garden-style apartments (12-29 du/ac) are presumed to be affordable to moderate income households. Properties with densities at 30 du/ac or greater are presumed to be suitable for both low and very low income units per AB 2342. Higher-density properties are also anticipated to be able to support both moderate- and above moderate-income households. All lower-income sites identified in the sites inventory have allowed densities of 30 du/ac or greater.

Table 54: Affordability by Density

| Income | Density Range (du/ac) |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| Above Moderate | 0-11 |
| Moderate | 12-29 |
| Low | 30+ |
| Very Low | 30+ |

E. Methodology for Identifying Sites to Accommodate the RHNA

The City of Escondido has few vacant parcels suitable for residential development, particularly in areas proposed for higher-density housing. The City's comprehensive General Plan update in 2012, along with updates to the Downtown and South Centre City Specific Plans, focus new residential growth into Escondido's downtown and urbanized core, an area with excellent access to transit, services, employment, and amenities. Due to the complexity of assessing the City's nearly 29,000 parcels for redevelopment suitability and likelihood, a comprehensive GIS-based analysis was used to identify underutilized sites across the City that are considered likely to redevelop within the Sixth Cycle. Sites that were included are generally free of environmental constraints and have existing structures and uses that will likely be replaced and redeveloped for housing. Such conditions include large parking areas, older buildings, marginally operating businesses, nonconforming uses, and a capacity for a substantial increase in dwelling units.

General Assumptions

Constraints

Properties with constraints that may preclude development, such as on-site historic structures or being on conserved lands or agricultural preserves, were removed from consideration for the sites inventory.

The City also evaluated the potential for Floodplains to act as a constraint on housing production, particularly in Downtown Escondido and the EVSP. The City currently allows the same development in its 100-Year Floodplain as is allowed in the underlying zoning. While housing projects in the floodplain may require different engineering and construction methods, recent projects have demonstrated that this was not a constraint. For example, the Quince Street Senior Housing, a 145-unit affordable housing project, achieved a density of 100 du/ac in the floodplain. Based on the City's standards and recent projects, no additional capacity deduction was implemented in the 100-year floodplain.

Sites within the 100-year floodway (the main channel of flowing water as opposed to the floodplain) are excluded from the sites inventory.

Major Developments and Building Permits

Any parcels that are/were part of a major development or had new commercial or residential building permits issued since 2013 were removed from consideration, as the recent construction would be presumed to be a constraint on near-term redevelopment.

Existing Land Use

The existing use of a property can create a significant constraint for redevelopment. The City used SANDAG Series 14 Land-Use information to determine the existing use of a property. Sites with the following existing land uses were removed from consideration for the sites inventory:

- Cemetery
- Elementary Schools
- Police/Fire Station
- Jr. College
- Jr. High School
- Dumps/Landfills
- Lakes/Reservoir/Large Pond
- Landscape Open Space (often HOA Lots)
- Mobile Home Park
- Multi-Family Residential
- Open-Space Parks/Preserves
- Other Group Quarter Facilities (Congregate Homes/Dorms/etc.)
- Other Transportation Features
- Other University/College
- Railroad Right of Way
- Residential Under Construction
- Road Right of Way
- School Under Construction
- Senior High School

Methods for Identifying Suitable Underutilized/Non-Vacant Sites

The vast majority of the sites with General Plan land use designations and zoning for high-density residential development are in older, urbanized areas that are largely developed or used to some degree. There are very few vacant sites in such areas. The following section summarizes the three primary criteria used for identifying suitable underutilized, or non-vacant, sites. Each of the three criteria (land-to-improvement ratio, building age, and net new unit ratio) was established at a level that is adequate to qualify a site as underutilized. However, due to the very large number of potentially eligible sites, a minimum of two of the three criteria were used to identify the best sites. This resulted in a total of 888 sites with a total potential of 9,463 units. It is noted that 45% of the sites and 55% of the potential units meet all three of the criteria.

Beyond these criteria for determining underutilized sites, additional site selection criteria and factors were also considered that make the sites excellent candidates for development within the next eight years. The additional criterial include:

- Sites within ½ mile of a transit stop (92%, 8,739 units)
- Sites within ¼ mile of services, employment, and community facilities (86%, 8,112 units)
- Sites within a specific plan that includes high density zoning, infrastructure, programs, incentives, and plans and commitments that support housing and improved quality of life (87%, 8,208 units)
- Location within areas exhibiting redevelopment, recycling of non-vacant sites, and construction of new market rate, affordable housing, and mixed-use development (87%, 8,208 units)
- Low-moderate density lots with capacity to add new units without displacing existing units (14%, 1,365 units)

Land to Improvement Value Ratio

Based on County Assessor provided data, the land to improvement ratio for each parcel was calculated by dividing the assessed land value by the assessed improvement value. A high ratio (1.0 or above) illustrates that the land is more valuable than the improvements on the land, and that the site is likely appropriate for redevelopment due to the low relative value of existing structures. Properties with land to improvement ratios above 1.0 are considered underutilized and were presumed to have improvements that would not constrain the site for the redevelopment of housing and were included in the inventory. A review of several recent projects (discussed in the Development Trends section above) showed that many properties that were recently redeveloped had land to improvement ratios above 1. While the recent history is not comprehensive, it does illustrate that using the land to improvement value ratio can identify sites that are likely to be redeveloped during the planning period. A land to improvement ratio of 1.0 or greater is a conservatively high factor. It is noted that several recent redevelopment projects included ratios below 1.0. One had a ratio of only 0.37, indicating relatively expensive building improvements. Yet, the value of the development potential permitted by the zoning and promoted by the specific plan still made a relatively expensive site viable for residential development. Furthermore, while the building structures may be valuable, given the current trends of retail and office uses, many of these properties are not generating adequate revenues from rents or business to sustain long-term operations.

In many instances, the land to improvement value of a property does not fully capture the site conditions indicating suitability for redevelopment. As noted above, a minimum of two of the three criteria were used to select the best sites. Therefore, sites with land to improvement ratios less than 1.0 were only included if both of the following conditions are met:

- Existing structures are more than 30 years old (building age); and
- The assumed project yield (new net units ratio), after deductions of 37.5% for mixed-use or 25% for residential, are at least five times the number of existing units on the site.

Properties that had no residential units and land to improvement ratios less than 1.0 were included provided the structures were more than 30 years old and the net new units ratio is above 5, based on the assumption that the permitted residential density will continue to provide a strong incentive for redevelopment. These requirements are described further below.

Building Age

Building age is a strong factor in determining whether a site is underutilized or otherwise ripe for redevelopment. This is particularly true when combined with the land to improvement ratio and/or the net new unit ratio. County Assessor data was used to identify the age of structures throughout the City. Existing improvements that are at least 30 years old indicate that a site may be suitable for redevelopment. As the natural lifespan of the building ends, the original capital investment has been recovered and maintenance costs increase dramatically. Approximately 50% of the buildings in the inventory are over 50 years old (built before 1970). Almost 70% are over 40 years old (built before 1980).

Additionally, most of the City's recent development occurred on buildings that were built prior to 1990. For example, the Touchstone Ivy apartments were constructed on a building built in 1986. The warehouses that were redeveloped for senior affordable housing (Quince Street Senior Homes) were constructed in the early 1960s.

Other existing single-family and commercial buildings at 322 S. Escondido Boulevard and 829. South Escondido Boulevard (proposed housing projects) were built from the 1920s to 1960s. Another building that is a part of the 829 S. Escondido Boulevard project was built in 1990, illustrating that even buildings constructed more recently are suitable and likely to be developed, provided that the underlying zoning allows enough capacity for profitable residential development. Only 6% of the potential units are on sites with buildings less than 30 years old. As noted previously, such sites have a net new unit ratio of 5.0 or greater and a land to improvement ratio of 1.0 or greater, which indicate that the sites are physically underutilized and underutilized relative to the zoning capacity.

Net New Units Ratio

The most important determinant of whether a site is underutilized and likely to be redeveloped is the potential return on investment as determined by the development potential of the property. One measure of this is the ratio of the potential new units divided by the existing units on the site, or the net new unit ratio. This represents the amount of development that could be added to an existing development site, or the net increase if the existing improvements were to be replaced.

In this case, the net new unit ratio was based on the assumed project yield (after deductions of 37.5% for mixed use or 25% for residential from the maximum allowed by zoning) for zones that allow more than 45 dwelling units per acre. A ratio of 1.0 (doubling existing units) to 2.0 (tripling existing units) is often adequate to entice redevelopment of smaller projects. A simple example is a single-family home on a lot that can be subdivided or developed with one new home, or replaced with a duplex, triplex or fourplex (net new factors of 1, 2 and 3, respectively). Other cities in the San Diego region found substantial evidence to support redevelopment at net new unit ratios of just 0.25 to 1.0. The 25% remaining capacity threshold was determined to be a conservative alternative to the standard assumption that sites with 15% remaining capacity are likely to be realized over a longer 20–30-year planning period. The more aggressive minimum ratio of 1.0 was based on a doubling of the number of existing units.

Due to the large number of potential sites, Escondido chose a very high and conservative net new unit ratio of 5.0 or greater to identify and select the best sites. It should be noted that the calculation of the net new unit ratio for Escondido sites was based on the assumed project yield after the 25% or 37.5% reductions from the maximum potential yield based on zoning. A factor of 5.0 is equivalent to a 6.7 or 8.0 when calculated using the maximum potential units (or remaining capacity), as is typical and used for the examples above. Therefore, the resulting Escondido minimum values are 6.7 to 32 times greater and more conservative than those used by other cities in the region.

As noted above, existing multi-family sites and condominium ownership (homeowners associations) were excluded from consideration. So, the non-vacant sites include only older single-family homes and commercial sites that are underutilized and have high development potential.

Properties with no residential units (commercial, mixed-use, industrial) were also included due to high demand for residential and the potential for recycling existing commercial uses. These types of properties, including existing buildings with substantial vacancies, are underutilized in comparison to the intended and permitted intensity and density allowed by zoning. The underlying potential of these prospective new units is anticipated to act as a catalyst for housing development.

Much of the City's recent development has occurred on underutilized commercial properties. The very high permitted densities provide a very strong profit motive to add or redevelop with new housing. Recycling of residential sites is also occurring on single-family properties throughout the Downtown

and Southern Centre City Specific Plans. For example, a project at 350 West 10th Street is converting two single-family homes into an 8-unit apartment building (a net new unit ratio of 3.0). The 322 S. Escondido project proposes 180 units on a site that contains 4 single family homes and commercial building. Another project at 664 N. Fig Street proposes 15 apartments on a single-family lot. These projects, demonstrate the validity of using this ratio in combination with building ages to identify underutilized parcels that are likely to be redeveloped during the 6th Cycle. As noted above, sites with existing multi-family and condominiums were excluded from consideration. The proposed RHNA sites are similar to and in the same areas that are currently recycling both commercial and residential non-vacant sites.

Exclusion of sites with environmental or land use constraints, the use of several layers and multiple and conservative selection criteria such as the net new unit ratio of 5.0 (the equivalent of 6.7 to 8.0 due to the prior use of the 25% to 37.5% yield reductions) result in selection of sites that are expected to be developed within the next 8-year planning period.

Adjacent Parcels

Individually, some specific parcels may not be considered underutilized or likely to redevelop in the near future. However, contiguous parcels that are considered together may present a stronger redevelopment potential; these may include individual parcels that contain viable uses but serve to connect the vacant and underutilized properties. Section C above describes several projects that have been proposed or approved for small, contiguous lots in the Downtown and South Centre City areas. For this reason, some adjacent properties that may not individually meet the criteria listed above were included in the sites inventory.

Appendix B, Sites Inventory list includes improvement to land value ratios, age of structures, land use, and the number of units that could be added to a property to help demonstrate the viability of each parcel. As discussed above, each parcel that was included meets criteria indicating that it is physically underutilized (land to improvement ratio above 1.0) or underutilized relative to the zoning (net new unit ratio ≥ 5.0 ; or a structure that is at least 30 years old). These conditions provide evidence that the properties are likely to be redeveloped for housing during the planning period. All RHNA sites include at least two of these three characteristics of underutilized sites. Many include all three. The Sites Inventory list also identifies additional supporting factors (described above) that make the sites appropriate and attractive for housing development.

Infrastructure

The City of Escondido operates water and wastewater utilities throughout the City, except for a few areas that are served by Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District. The City actively participates in regional water management and maintains active capital improvement programs to improve water and wastewater infrastructure throughout the City.

The sites selected all have access to existing water and sewer infrastructure. In some areas, the City's existing infrastructure may need to be upgraded to accommodate the projected housing units specified in the sites inventory. The City will continue to update and evaluate infrastructure needs and include the appropriate infrastructure programs in the relevant capital improvement plan.

The City is served by San Diego Gas & Electric ("SDG&E") and a variety of telecom providers. SDG&E service and broadband internet access are available across the City and for all sites identified in the inventory.

Ownership

Properties that are owned by the common interests (e.g., homeowners associations) were removed based on the “Owner Name” assessor’s data. Parcels owned by the City of Escondido, special districts, and SDG&E were also removed from consideration.⁹

F. Sites Inventory and Residential Development Potential

The City is planning to accommodate new housing primarily through infill development on non-vacant sites. Prioritizing infill and densification, particularly in the City’s Downtown and transit rich neighborhoods, will minimize sprawl and focus new development in an efficient and environmentally sensitive manner. This is consistent with and part of the 2021 Climate Action Plan strategy. Overall, the City is accommodating 94% (8,902 units) of its RHNA capacity on non-vacant sites, and 6% (561 units) on vacant sites. Of the lower-income capacity met through identified sites, only 1.4% (135 units) of the lower-income capacity is met through vacant sites.

The City also identified 653 units of lower-income housing that can be accommodated by approved projects, pending projects, and ADUs. Combined with the units located on vacant sites, the City can accommodate 25% (788 units) of its lower income RHNA (3,113 units) on sites without existing uses.

As these vacant or approved units do not exceed 50% of the lower-income RHNA, the City, based on substantial evidence, makes the required finding that the non-vacant sites are likely to be redeveloped for housing during the planning period.

Downtown Specific Plan Area

In 1992, the City identified Downtown Escondido as an area in need of concentrated revitalization efforts and adopted the Downtown Revitalization Area Specific Plan. The plan has undergone several revisions and was last updated in 2012. The 2012 amendment rezoned a majority of Escondido’s Downtown to accommodate high-density residential and mixed-uses. While some properties in downtown Escondido are reserved for commercial development, residential and mixed-use development at densities of 45 to 100 du/ac are allowed throughout most of the specific planning area.

Through the incentives and flexibility offered by the Downtown Specific Plan, the City has experienced a steady pace of redevelopment activities in the area, such as aging commercial developments, older single-family or small multifamily homes, or parking lots being recycled into higher intensity developments. These projects are frequently built to the maximum allowable density, demonstrating the feasibility of achieving the substantial residential production envisioned by the City.

Overall, vacant and underutilized properties in the Downtown Area can accommodate 5,092 new units. This estimate is based on the highly conservative yield adjustments (e.g., 62.5% to 75% of the maximum) shown in Table 53.

Non-Vacant Redevelopment Site Typologies

The Downtown Specific Plan area includes approximately 275 parcels and 65 consolidated non-vacant inventory sites. The Downtown area contains several subareas that each include a variety of building patterns and typologies described below. The typology of each site is identified in the sites inventory list. The list also identifies the land-to-improvement value ratios, age of structures, land use,

⁹ Vacant parcel 230-141-01-00 owned by the City of Escondido is included.

and the number of units that could be added to a property to help demonstrate the viability of each parcel. See Figure B-1 following Appendix B, Sites Inventory for examples of existing non-vacant sites exhibiting characteristics of recent multifamily redevelopment in the area. Figure B includes images of over 50 examples from the sites inventory including strip commercial, office/medical, single-family residential, industrial/warehouse, and church uses. It also includes examples of eight recent redevelopment projects on sites with similar characteristics as the inventory sites including uses, age of structures, land-to-improvement assessed value ratios, zoning, density, and development potential.

North of Escondido Creek

The area generally north of Escondido Creek and between North Escondido Boulevard and North Broadway includes about 35 parcels and eight consolidated inventory sites. Existing uses include neighborhood strip shopping centers with large parking lots, small and free-stranding arterial strip commercial buildings on small lots, a few small medical and professional office buildings, and a few light industrial buildings. Uses include medical office, auto parts, service and tire stores, grocery stores, vacant office buildings, a Goodwill donation center, fast food restaurants, and a laundromat. This entire area is zoned for the City's highest density residential and mixed-use at densities up to 100 dwelling units per acre. Most of the parcels in this area are contiguous and create excellent individual and consolidated development sites. This area is expected to experience significant residential and mixed-use redevelopment over the next eight years. Two recent 4- and 6-story multifamily residential communities (Alcove and Latitude 33) directly west of the main block of sites demonstrate the trend for redevelopment in the area on sites with similar characteristics.

South of Escondido Creek

The area south of Escondido Creek and West Valley Parkway includes approximately 65 parcels and 14 consolidated sites that include a mix of older strip commercial buildings, a block of auto sales, parts and repair uses, and several blocks of a mix of older small single-family homes interspersed with vacant land and parking lots. Several of office and larger buildings are vacant. The area is designated for 75 dwelling units per acre. The new Touchstone Ivy multi-family project reflects the trend toward new multifamily in the area and demonstrates the high likelihood that the proposed sites will be redeveloped within the next eight years.

West of Former Palomar Medical Center

The 9-block area immediately west of the Palomar Medical Center includes approximately 80 parcels and 16 consolidated sites. The area is characterized by small mostly one-story buildings. There are a few two-story buildings. Most are set close to the sidewalk and are adjacent to each other where parking in front of the buildings is on-street and private parking is provided behind the buildings. Some have no parking at all which limits their marketability and development potential. There are two 1-story larger floorplate buildings on the western end of the area. Both are vacant. There are four new residential development projects including the Touchstone Ivy, Touchstone Aspire, and a mixed use project including 50 units of affordable housing. This area exhibits the same characteristics as the nearby redevelopment sites. It is ripe for redevelopment within the next eight years with high-density mixed-use development that takes advantage of the 75 dwelling units per acre permitted density and redevelopment vision of the Downtown Specific Plan.

Southern Downtown Specific Plan

The 15-block area that forms the southern portion of the Downtown Specific Plan is located between East 2nd Avenue and 5th Avenue and Centre City Parkway and Ivy Street. The area includes approximately 75 parcels and 22 consolidated sites. Approximately half of the sites are designated for 45 dwelling units per acre. These sites are located between Broadway and Ivy and 2nd and 5th Avenues. The buildings in this area are primarily one-story medical/professional office buildings and older single-family homes, and large parking lots. The other half of the inventory sites are zone for 75 dwelling units per acre (between 2nd and 3rd Avenues) and 100 dwelling units per acre (between Centre City Parkway and Maple Avenue). The area includes single-family dwellings, the Escondido Lumber Yard, a one-story office complex, a used-car dealership, a vacant office building and parking lot, a mortuary, and several older, small, one-story medical office buildings. There is a larger floorplate, 2-story office building, a very large parking lot, and three single family buildings between Juniper and Ivy street near the former Palomar Medical Center that make a very attractive redevelopment site. This site and most of the other office buildings are exhibiting increased vacancies and most have for lease signs. This complex is directly south of a new multifamily project on Ivy Street. The site was occupied by one of the larger and more expensive buildings in the area – the Escondido Surgery Center was a multi-story podium building with a 2-level parking structure that covered three-quarters of the block. Redevelopment of this site demonstrates the strength and feasibility of redevelopment of even higher cost sites. The loss of the Palomar Medical Center is expected to greatly diminish the near-term and long-term market and viability for the clusters of outpatient and small medical office support services in the area. The uses in this area are expected to redevelop over the next eight years as a result of the very strong demand for residential development, the significantly increased very high-density development potential and the weakening market and demand for medical and professional office space.

Escondido Transit Center

The Escondido Transit Center and surrounding area includes 18 parcels and consolidated 4 sites. The inventory sites include mostly one-story office buildings, and several older warehouse buildings and large parking lots. There is a 3-story office building that is also included because the very large surface parking lot makes it a very attractive large site for mixed-use infill or redevelopment. This area has been upzoned to 100 dwelling units per acre and has attracted recent redevelopment activity. The 5-story Rowan apartment homes community was recently developed on the site of a relatively large 2-story office building. The 145-unit Quince Street affordable Senior Housing project was recently approved. The inventory sites have the same favorable characteristics as those that are recently redeveloped and are expected to be developed in the next eight years. The Transit Center is a great asset to support the high-density development but is also a prime candidate for infill development. North County Transit District proposed a concept plan for developing the site with 400+ multi-family units, retail, office, and parking. Formal plans have not been submitted. The permitted densities would support structured parking that would make large portions of the site available for truly transit-oriented residential and mixed-use.

South Centre City Specific Plan Area

The South Centre City Parkway Specific Plan covers a length of approximately 2.25 miles between 5th Avenue and Centre City Parkway and Verda Avenue. South Centre City is characterized by a variety of aging, underutilized, and small-scale commercial development, interspersed with older single-family residential uses. As a part of the City's comprehensive General Plan update in 2012, four smart growth "target areas" were identified in the South Centre City region: the South Quince Street Area, South Escondido Boulevard Area, Felicita Avenue Area, and Centre City Parkway Area. These target areas were aggregated in the 2018 South Centre City Parkway Specific Plan, which established a comprehensive planning vision for the district. The plan established many districts and subareas suitable for higher-density residential and mixed-uses. Since the adoption of the plan, the City has seen multiple residential projects from duplexes and small garden-style apartments to high-density, mixed-income projects proposed and constructed along this corridor—evidence that the recently up-zoned land has catalyzed residential development as planned.

The City identified properties within the South Centre City Parkway Specific Plan area where the conditions of existing uses are conducive to future redevelopment. Such conditions include large parking areas, older buildings, marginally operating businesses, nonconforming uses, and capacity for additional units. Overall, the properties in South Centre City Parkway Specific Plan area are projected to accommodate 931 new units.

Non-Vacant Redevelopment Site Typologies

The South Centre City Specific Plan area includes approximately 150 parcels and 39 consolidated non-vacant inventory sites. The majority (116 parcels) are zoned for 30 dwelling units per acre. The 26 parcels along 9th Avenue are zoned for 24 dwelling units per acre, the 11 inventory sites along 5th Avenue are zoned for 100 units per acre. These sites are characterized by one of the four typologies described below. The typology of each site is identified in the sites inventory list. The list also identifies the land-to-improvement value ratios, age of structures, land use, and the number of units that could be added to a property to help demonstrate the viability of each parcel. See Figure B-1 following Appendix B, Sites Inventory for examples of existing non-vacant sites exhibiting characteristics of recent multifamily redevelopment in the area.

Old Single-Family Homes in High-Density Zone

Approximately half (68 parcels and 20 consolidated sites) of the total proposed inventory in the South Center City Specific Plan area include older, small one-story single-family homes that are zoned for high-density residential. Many of the homes are nearing the end of their useful service life. The large increase in development potential and the recent examples of redevelopment for high-density residential on similar properties in the area is a very strong demonstration and incentive for redevelopment of these properties in the next eight-year period.

Small Strip Commercial Buildings

The sites inventory includes approximately 55 sites that are characterized by small strip commercial buildings. Most of the commercial buildings in the South Center City specific plan area are old, small one-story single-family homes that have been converted decades ago to small commercial shops. Some were likely built as small commercial shops but have not been significantly improved for decades. Many are in poor condition. There is a high proportion of vacancies. Sites in the southern portion of the district include many more vacancies and buildings that are in poor condition. Several new multi-family developments in the vicinity along Escondido Boulevard demonstrate the

redevelopment trend and feasibility. The large increase in development potential and the recent examples of redevelopment for high-density residential on similar properties in the area is a very strong demonstration and incentive for redevelopment of these properties.

Small Medical/Professional Office Buildings/Complexes

There are about 14 sites with small one-story free-standing medical and professional or personal service office buildings in the South Center City Specific Plan. Some are converted single-family homes and are on streets that still contain older one-story single-family homes. Most are located along the southern portions of South Escondido Boulevard and are zoned for 30 units per acre. The proposed sites along 5th Avenue are near several new 3- and 4-story office and mixed-use buildings that demonstrate the redevelopment potential of these sites with very similar characteristics. The large increase in development potential of 30 to 100 units per acre and the recent examples of redevelopment for high-density residential on similar properties in the area is a very strong demonstration and incentive for redevelopment of these properties.

Automotive (Gas Stations, Repair, Sales, Storage, Car wash)

There are about 14 automotive related sites that are in prime locations for residential and mixed-use redevelopment. Several of the proposed RHNA sites include small, older automotive uses including convenience stores, service stations, small repair shops, or towing/storage yards. These sites have small and generally very low value simple shell buildings. Several are located in the northern section of the district off 9th Avenue near Centre City Parkway. Permitted densities range from 24 to 100 dwelling units per acre. All are located within a few blocks of recent multi-family development projects. The large increase in development potential and the recent examples of redevelopment for high-density residential on similar properties in the area is a very strong demonstration and incentive for redevelopment of these properties within the next eight years.

East Valley Specific Plan Area

The East Valley area of Escondido is directly east of downtown, centered on Valley Boulevard, and generally bounded by Escondido Creek to the north, Harding Street to the east, East Grand and East 2nd Street to the south, and North Hickory, South Hickory, and North Fig Street to the west. Due to previous zoning that largely precluded residential uses, existing uses consist primarily of strip commercial, big box retailers, and small medical and professional office uses. Many of the small medical and professional office buildings are former single-family homes that were converted to commercial use. The area is still frequently interspersed with older, small single-family homes.

The EVSP is a policy and regulatory document being prepared to identify the future vision, goals, and policies and establish area-specific regulations to facilitate, guide, and incentivize the fulfillment of that vision. The overall purpose of the EVSP is to guide redevelopment of the underutilized residential and commercial land of low-intensity general retail, office, restaurants, and small-scale service businesses into a new neighborhood with a mix of residential, commercial, public, and open space uses. It would accommodate increased housing density along with other transit-supportive uses and improvements.

Through the plan, the City will redesignate and rezone most of the 191-acre area (127 acres excluding rights-of-way) from the current commercial and office uses to mixed-use and high-density residential through the Mixed-Use and Urban Residential IV/V districts.

The new zoning will require that residential components be included in all redevelopments at the minimum densities illustrated in Table 52 and described below.

The Draft EVSP Land Use Plan shows limited and targeted areas for general commercial and mixed-use along both sides of the East Valley Parkway, and urban residential areas to the north and south of the mixed-use corridor. Two park overlay zones are proposed over the urban residential zones on the eastern half of the EVSP area. The development program includes:

1. General Commercial – approximately 7 acres and 60,000 square feet of exclusively commercial uses, including local-serving commercial, automobile service, eating/drinking establishments, entertainment facilities, retail, office, and service establishments intended for other commercial uses not suitable for residential zones.
2. Mixed-Use – approximately 70 acres with residential densities between 30 and 80 du/ac, averaging 45 du/ac for an estimated 4,600 units, and an estimated 700,000 square feet of retail, office, and medical office space. Multifamily residential units, appropriate along major thoroughfares, would be proximate to shopping centers and commercial (retail/entertainment, community facilities and employment office/medical office) opportunities.
3. Urban Residential IV/V – approximately 50 acres of residential and mixed-use yielding approximately 1,500 dwelling units (multifamily residential units, town homes, apartments, flats, and condominiums) between 21 and 30 du/ac and averaging 25 du/ac. This area is also projected to contain approximately 450,000 square feet of retail, office, and medical office space at 15,000 square feet/acre.
4. Park Overlay Zone – two overlay zones over portions of the Urban Residential and Mixed-Use areas are intended to yield a minimum of 10 acres of active and passive parks as well as land to protect, maintain, and enhance the community's natural resources and include detention basins and creek corridors.

Only three intersections within the plan area are required to provide commercial frontage. These are along East Valley Parkway at Ash Street, Date Street, and Fig street. Because of the minimum density requirement, properties within these two districts will recycle as residential or mixed-use.

Non-Vacant Redevelopment Site Typologies

There are just over 200 parcels and 47 non-vacant inventory consolidated sites within the East Valley Specific Plan area. They are characterized as one of the following typologies described further below – aging arterial strip commercial, and older, low-scale medical and professional office buildings. The typology of each site is identified in the sites inventory list. The list also identifies the land-to-improvement ratios, age of structures, land use, and the number of units that could be added to a property to help demonstrate the viability of each parcel. See Figure B-1 following Appendix B, Sites Inventory for examples of existing non-vacant sites exhibiting characteristics of recent multifamily redevelopment in the area.

Large and Small Arterial Strip Commercial

There are approximately 17 sites and 70 parcels located along the Valley Parkway arterial that meet the very restrictive eligible site selection criteria including parcel size, land to improvement ratio, minimum residential potential yields, and existing structures more than 30 years old.

The proposed sites east of North Ash Street include typical strip commercial centers on larger lots (five plus acres). These sites have large, underutilized parking lots between the street and older one-story buildings, and some free-standing buildings often used for banks and restaurants, with little

evidence of renovation or refurbishment. Uses include discount stores and small local independent shops. Sites that abut the Escondido Creek appear to have less activity and vitality than other commercial sites that are not isolated from the adjacent and surrounding communities. These sites are ripe for redevelopment with the addition of infill within the underutilized parking areas or in conjunction with the replacement of one or more of the strip or free-standing buildings with residential and mixed-use buildings. The continuing decline in demand for retail space and the increasing demand and extremely strong housing market make redevelopment of these sites likely during the next eight-year planning period. These sites exhibit the characteristics of similar sites in the area that have or are currently undergoing redevelopment.

The Valley Parkway area west of North Ash Street includes considerably older (1920s to 1960s), almost exclusively small one-story individual commercial buildings and small multi-tenant buildings on small lots. Sites include individual driveways and reflect a 50-foot-wide lot pattern of lots. These small lots exhibit the characteristics of other sites consolidated for new redevelopment sites. The area includes some older single-family homes. Uses include a mix of local service uses such as nail salons, pawn shops, small local fast food, and older medical and professional offices in small stand-alone buildings. Many of the buildings are in poor condition and lack maintenance. There are few new buildings or signs of any rehabilitation, capital investment, or renovation. Many buildings are vacant. The existing weak market and continuing decline in demand for these retail spaces and the increasing demand and extremely strong housing market make redevelopment of these sites likely during the next eight-year planning period. These sites exhibit the characteristics of similar sites in the area that have or are currently undergoing redevelopment.

Small Medical/Professional Office Buildings/Complexes

The 15-block area east of the former Palomar Medical Center includes approximately 29 sites and 100 parcels that meet the very restrictive selection criteria including parcel size, land to improvement ratio, minimum residential potential yields, and existing structures more than 30 years old. The area is characterized by older, underutilized 1-2 story medical offices and small complexes with frequent vacancies and for lease signs. Many of the buildings are converted single-family residences. Occasional single-family homes remain within and amongst the small medical, dental, and professional offices. These uses have developed around the Palomar Medical Center which has been decommissioned and is being redeveloped as a residential community. The loss of this facility will remove a major source of business for these small offices. Vacancies and relocations have already increased and become more apparent. It is likely that many of these uses will decline and relocate over time to be nearer to other medical centers. The combined loss of the Palomar Medical center, the proposed redevelopment plan and rezoning of the East Valley Specific Plan and the extremely strong demand for housing will result in the very high likelihood that these sites will experience significant redevelopment in the next eight-year period. These sites exhibit the characteristics of similar sites in the area that have or are currently undergoing redevelopment.

Overall, the City is anticipating approximately 6,100 residential units once the planning area is built out. Recognizing that not all of the upzoned properties are underutilized or likely to develop within the planning period, only 2,185 units are being counted towards the Sixth Cycle sites inventory. However, even though this analysis supports a realistic, residential-capacity assumption for the 2021-2029 Housing Element cycle, the City will proactively monitor housing production in the planning area and determine to the extent that the EVSP inventory can accommodate a larger portion of its share of the regional housing need by income level during future planning periods, pursuant to Government Code section 65584. Furthermore, future inventories will consider the impact of the TPP and EVSP DTP on development yields when calculating realistic development capacity.

General Retail and Office Trends Support More Residential and Mixed-Use

Most cities have more commercial space than can be readily supported. While not limited to California, many cities have over-zoned, and in many cases overbuilt commercial space as a means of capturing sales tax revenue. The excess space has been a problem for decades resulting in vacancies, soft markets, low rents, and often physical decline of the properties. This decline in the demand for retail space has been further accelerated and exacerbated for over 10 years with the increasing popularity and market share of on-line retail sales. On-line sales and services have been expanding into areas thought impossible just a couple of years ago. This includes even the sale of cars and homes entirely on-line.

There is a strong and growing trend as a result. Many malls, big box centers, and community shopping centers are being reconfigured, reoriented, and redeveloped to include residential, entertainment, open space and recreation that increases overall population and occupancy on the properties around the clock. This provides support for the commercial uses and increases the overall utilization and profit. Many of the big box retail stores are being converted to fulfillment centers where online purchase orders are pre-packed and the customer simply picks up their goods. No shopping occurs within the spaces. Developers have recognized this trend for years. While some malls and shopping centers will remain and be upgraded, developers and investors are not planning on building new 100% commercial developments. Most are planning for only mixed-use projects. Recycling of similar properties is occurring throughout the region. Redevelopment of commercial properties do not always involve the discontinuation of existing uses. Many sites have large, underutilized surface parking lots that can be repurposed for additional infill development.

These long-term trends have been accelerated and amplified by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to pushing more retail sales to online, the stay-at-home quarantine and office closures have proven the feasibility and efficiency of remote working. This has shuttered many office buildings temporarily. Many companies have gone entirely virtual and have permanently relinquished office spaces. While some recovery is expected in the office markets, most companies are expecting and planning for reduced in-office occupancy. This has and is expected to increase vacancies and exacerbate the retail/office markets that were already in decline. Together, these trends provide increased opportunity and likelihood that many of the existing commercial and office properties throughout Escondido will be converted to residential use in the near and foreseeable future.

Lower Density/ Non-Specific Plan Residential Areas

Other parts of the City can accommodate units for moderate-income and above moderate-income households. There are over 300 sites in the inventory with densities up to 24 units per acre. the vast majority (285) of these potential units are located on underutilized single-family (205), vacant and underdeveloped (72), and agricultural uses (10). About 1,281 units are anticipated for these lower-density regions of the City.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Since recent changes to state accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”) law, Escondido has seen a large increase in the number of ADUs constructed each year. Since 2017, the City has also tracked ADU rental prices based on information provided on applications, allowing for ADUs to be projected by income for the Sixth Cycle based on the average production. The City permitted 25 ADUs in 2018 and 25 ADUs in 2019.

The 2018 and 2019 trends do not reflect the current interest and production rates of ADUs in Escondido. During 2020, the City approved 60 ADUs out of 74 applications. From January 1 to May 7, 2021, the City had 33 ADU applications, approved 36 ADUs, and issued building permits for 28 ADUs. Based on a linear, pro-rated trend, the City is expected to issue 80 ADU permits in 2021.

Based on the significant upward trend in ADU production since 2018 and the number of permits already issued in 2021, the City anticipates continued growth in ADUs in the Sixth planning cycle. Based on the 2020 production and recent trends, a highly conservative production rate of 45 units per year was projected for the eight years in the Sixth Cycle, yielding a total of 360 ADUs that can be counted toward the RHNA. As the City is considering adopting other incentives to encourage and promote ADUs, including allowing ADUs on religious properties and creating pre-approved plans, it can be reasonably expected that the City would permit more than 45 ADUs per year during the Sixth Cycle. The City is also including a strong ADU production monitoring program as a Housing Element implementation action. The City will continue to evaluate ADU production throughout the planning period and implement additional programs or adjust the RHNA assumptions, as necessary.

The City surveyed the applicants for the intended use and estimated rent levels for the ADU applications. Based on this survey results, the City was able to determine the income/affordability levels of the ADUs.

Table 55: ADU Affordability Level (2018-2020)

| Year | Total ADUs | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Above Moderate | % Very Low | % Low | % Moderate | % Above Moderate |
|------|-----------------|----------|-----|----------|----------------|------------|-------|------------|------------------|
| 2018 | 23 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 17% | 22% | 61% | 0% |
| 2019 | 40 | 9 | 3 | 18 | 10 | 23% | 8% | 45% | 25% |
| 2020 | 74 ¹ | 14 | 13 | 13 | 44 | 19% | 17% | 17% | 47% |

1. Affordability percentages calculated for ADU applications. 60 ADUs were approved in 2020.

Table 56: Average ADU Affordability Level (2018-2020)

| Income Category | Average Production |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Very Low | 19.7% |
| Low | 15.4% |
| Moderate | 41.0% |
| Above Moderate | 23.9% |

Table 57: Estimated Sixth Cycle ADU Production

| Title | Units |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Units per year | 45 |
| Total Units (8 Year Cycle) | 360 |
| Very Low-Income Units | 71 |
| Low Income Units | 56 |
| Moderate Income | 147 |
| Above Moderate Income | 86 |

G. No Net Loss

It is recommended that the EVSP also include capacity to accommodate additional units above the RHNA requirement, pursuant to Senate Bill 166, also known as “No Net Loss.” No net loss states that cities may not reduce potential housing capacity below the remaining RHNA requirements (RHNA – units built) through the planning period. To ensure that the City maintains adequate sites through the Sixth Cycle, it is generally recommended that cities include additional units above the RHNA. Table 58 illustrates the RHNA requirement with a 10% buffer above the RHNA.

Table 58: No Net Loss Buffer Estimate

| | Above Moderate | Moderate | Low | Very Low | Totals |
|---|----------------|----------|-----|----------|--------|
| RHNA Allocation | 4,967 | 1,527 | | 3,113 | 9,607 |
| 10% No Net Loss Buffer | 497 | 153 | | 311 | 961 |
| Total Required Units (RHNA + No Net Loss Buffer) | 5,464 | 1,680 | | 3,424 | 10,568 |

Density Transfer Programs

The City maintains density transfer programs within the Downtown and East Valley Specific Plans. The programs allow the transfer of residential density from properties that are not built to their maximum density or are unlikely to develop to properties with development proposals. The City maintains an active inventory of unused density "credits" that can be transferred to other properties for no charge or cost if requested by a developer. The City's density transfer program could be used in tandem with state density bonus laws to further increase the residential capacity of a project.

The program ensures that capacity in the Downtown and East Valley will never be lost if a property is developed with fewer residential units allowed by the zoning.

Low Assumed Yields

As documented, most recent developments in the City achieve the maximum density allowed by the zoning. Despite the promising project trends, the City intentionally estimated the potential of units at 62.5% and 75% of the maximum allowed. This deduction further protects the City against net loss requirements.

H. Ability to Meet RHNA

Overall, the City has the ability to accommodate at least 9,463 units on vacant and underutilized sites across the City. Of that total, 8,127 units are located in zones that allow at least 30 du/ac, indicating that they may accommodate lower-income units. Additionally, 5,821 of these high-density units are located on sites or on adjacent sites with cumulative areas between 0.5 and 10 acres, indicating that they may be counted toward the lower income capacity. While these sites meet the criteria for lower-income households, the City is assuming that 2,051 above-moderate units and 3,770 lower-income units could be accommodated on these high-density, correctly sized sites.

The EVSP area is anticipated to accommodate 688 above moderate units, 221 moderate income units, and 1,276 lower-income units. Even without the EVSP, the City would have adequate sites for the lower-income RHNA units through the other two specific plans. However, the City would have a small shortfall for above moderate- and moderate-income units until the EVSP is adopted. The above-moderate shortfall is 124 units, and the moderate-income shortfall is 44 units. With the adoption of the EVSP (anticipated by the end of 2021), the City would have adequate sites across all income levels. Table 59 summarizes the City's RHNA status.

Table 59: Summary of RHNA Status

| Site Category | Above Moderate | Moderate | Low | Very Low | Total |
|--|----------------|----------|-------|----------|--------|
| RHNA | 4,967 | 1,527 | 1,249 | 1,864 | 9,607 |
| Units on Identified Sites | 3,439 | 1,467 | 0 | 4,557 | 9,463 |
| Downtown Specific Plan | 1,537 | 740 | 0 | 2,815 | 5,092 |
| South Centre Specific Plan | 258 | 207 | 0 | 466 | 931 |
| East Valley Specific Plan | 688 | 221 | 0 | 1,276 | 2,185 |
| Non-Specific Plan | 956 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 1,255 |
| Approved and Under Construction Projects | 1,357 | 90 | 155 | 0 | 1,602 |
| Projects Undergoing Entitlement | 649 | 0 | 371 | 0 | 1,020 |
| Accessory Dwelling Units | 86 | 147 | 56 | 71 | 360 |
| Total Identified Capacity | 5,531 | 1,704 | 582 | 4,628 | 12,445 |
| Surplus/(Shortfall) without EVSP | (124) | (44) | 821 | | 653 |

I. Financial Resources

Affordable housing for lower and moderate income households requires the creative layering of multiple funding sources. Key funding sources available for the construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing include:

Community Development Block Grants

The Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) program was initiated by the Housing and Community Development Act (“HCDA”) of 1974. The primary objective of the program is to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and economic opportunities, principally for persons of low incomes (up to 80% AMI). CDBG funds can be used for a wide array of activities, including:

- Housing rehabilitation;
- Lead-based paint screening and abatement;
- Acquisition of buildings and land;
- Construction or rehabilitation of public facilities and infrastructure; and
- Public services for low income persons and persons with special needs.

The City of Escondido is an entitlement jurisdiction for CDBG funding and receives approximately \$1.8 million annually. The City uses CDBG funds to provide residential rehabilitation assistance and a variety of supportive services for lower income residents and those with special needs.

HOME Investment Partnership Program

The HOME Investment Partnership Program (“HOME”) provides federal funds for the development and rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing for households with incomes not exceeding 80% of area median income. The program gives local governments the flexibility to fund a

wide range of affordable housing activities through housing partnerships with private industry and non-profit organizations. HOME funds can be used for activities that promote affordable rental housing and homeownership by low income households.

Escondido is an entitlement jurisdiction that receives HOME funds directly from HUD. Each year, the City receives approximately \$600,000 in HOME funds. The City uses HOME funds to support affordable housing development through Community Housing Development Corporations (CHDOs) and pursue acquisition/rehabilitation of multi-family rental housing.

Emergency Solutions Grant

The Emergency Solutions Grant program (“ESG”) provides funds for a variety of activities to address homelessness. The ESG program provides grant funding to:

- Engage homeless individuals and families living on the street;
- Rapidly re-house homeless individuals and families;
- Help operate and provide essential services in emergency shelters for homeless individuals and families; and
- Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless.

Escondido is an entitlement jurisdiction that receives ESG funds directly from HUD. Each year, the City receives approximately \$160,000 in ESG funds.

SB2/LEAP Grants

In 2017, Governor Brown signed a 15-bill housing package aimed at addressing the State’s housing shortage and high housing costs. Specifically, it included the Building Homes and Jobs Act (SB 2, 2017), which establishes a \$75 recording fee on real estate documents to increase the supply of affordable homes in California. Because the number of real estate transactions recorded in each county will vary from year to year, the revenues collected will fluctuate.

The first year of SB 2 funds are available as planning grants to local jurisdictions. The City of Escondido received \$310,000 for planning efforts to facilitate housing production. For the second year and onward, 70% of the funding will be allocated to local governments for affordable housing purposes. A large portion of year two allocations will be distributed using the same formula used to allocate federal Community Development Block Grants (“CDBG”). As an entitlement jurisdiction in the CDBG program, Escondido is eligible to receive funding under the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (“PLHA”) component of SB 2, estimated at \$5,057,466 over five years. SB2 PLHA funds can be used to:

- Increase the supply of housing for households at or below 60% of AMI
- Increase assistance to affordable owner-occupied workforce housing
- Assist persons experiencing or at risk of homelessness
- Facilitate housing affordability, particularly for lower and moderate income households
- Promote projects and programs to meet the local government’s unmet share of regional housing needs allocation

Another source of funding to help local jurisdictions to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that will facilitate housing construction is the Local Early Action

Planning (LEAP) grants. The City received \$500,000 in LEAP grants in 2020. However, this is a one-time-only program.

California Community Housing Agency

On January 13, 2021, the City Council became a member of the California Community Housing Agency (“CalCHA”). Through its Essential Middle-Income Rental Housing Program (“Program”), CalCHA issues government bonds for the acquisition of existing market-rate apartment communities through the issuance and sale of its own governmental purpose bonds.

J. Administrative Capacity

Escondido collaborates with a number of nonprofit organizations to expand affordable housing opportunities for residents including:

- Community HousingWorks: 16-unit 15th Avenue Coop; 36-unit Avocado Court; 13-unit Daybreak Cove; 24-unit Eucalyptus View; 200-unit Manzanita Apartments; 32-unit Orange Place Cooperative; and 8-unit Sunrise Place
- National Core: 44-unit Cobblestone Street Apartments; and 61-unit Juniper Senior Village
- Urban Housing Communities: 55-unit Crossings @ Escondido; and 44-unit Crossings @ Escondido Manor.

The City will continue to work with these and other qualified non-profit affordable housing developers to create affordable housing through new construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation.

K. Opportunities for Energy Conservation

Sustainability is a key community goal reflected throughout the General Plan. Escondido is largely built-out with limited vacant land available for new development. Updated General Plan policies will guide citizens, developers, city staff, and decision-makers over the next decades to facilitate the community’s long-term vision. The plan’s smart growth principles represent a shift in focus from “how to develop vacant land” to “how to reinvest in existing neighborhoods.”

Escondido’s smart growth principles preserve and enhance single-family development patterns in established neighborhoods, maintain residential densities in outlying areas to accommodate growth, and guide additional employment and residential growth toward downtown and urbanized sectors along key transportation corridors.

A land use strategy of the General Plan is to promote mixed-use developments, with the goal of integrating employment, retail, entertainment, and community amenities within close proximity to create vibrant urban areas. Successfully integrating residential, employment, entertainment, shopping, and services in a mixed-use overlay is effective in reducing reliance on the automobile as residents are able to conveniently access facilities and services.

General Plan Conservation Goals and Policies

In addition to policies contained in this Housing Element, the Land Use and Community Form Element and Resource Conservation Element contain the following policies that promote energy conservation:

Community Character Policy 1.8

Require development projects to locate and design buildings, construct energy and water efficient infrastructure, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, enhance community livability and economic vitality, and implement other practices contributing to sustainable resources.

Community Character Policy 1.9

Require that development in downtown, at transit stations, and other key districts accommodate a mix of land uses and configure uses to promote walkability, bicycling, and transit uses, reducing the need for the automobile.

Air Quality and Climate Protection Policy 7.2

Reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions through the following measures including, but not limited to:

- a) Implementing land use patterns that reduce automobile dependence (compact, mixed-use, pedestrian, and transit-oriented development, etc.);
- b) Reducing the number of vehicular miles traveled through implementation of Transportation Demand Management programs, jobs-housing balance, and similar techniques;
- c) Supporting public transportation improvements;
- d) Encouraging the use of alternative modes of transportation by expanding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks and facilities;
- e) Participating in the development of park-and-ride facilities;
- f) Maintaining and updating the City's traffic signal synchronization plan;
- g) Promoting local agriculture;
- h) Promoting the use of drought-tolerant landscaping; and
- i) Encouraging the use of non-polluting alternative energy systems.

Building Code Enforcement

Building Energy Standards for Residential Development (Title 24), establishes energy budgets or maximum energy use levels. Title 24 standards supersede local regulations, and State law mandates Title 24 requirements through implementation by local jurisdictions. The City will continue strict enforcement of local and state energy regulations for new residential construction and continue providing residents with information on energy efficiency.

6. Housing Plan

The Housing Plan identifies the City's housing goals, policies, and implementing programs. The overall strategy is to present a diverse and balanced array of policies that cover four overall areas of concern: construction, rehabilitation, conservation, and administration. The goals and policies of the Housing Element are organized into concise goal and policy directives.

A. State Housing Goals

California legislature sets the context and findings for housing goals as part of the State's housing laws (Government Code §65580):

- The availability of housing is of vital statewide importance, and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every Californian, including farmworkers, is a priority of the highest order.
- The early attainment of this goal requires the cooperative participation of government and the private sector in an effort to expand housing opportunities and accommodate the housing needs of Californians of all economic levels.
- The provision of housing affordable to low and moderate income households requires the cooperation of all levels of government.
- Local and State governments have a responsibility to use the powers vested in them to facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

The Legislature recognizes that in carrying out this responsibility, each local government also has the responsibility to consider economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the general plan and to cooperate with other local governments and the State in addressing regional housing needs.

B. City Housing Goals, Policies, and Programs

A complete list of the General Plan Goals is located in the Vision and Purpose. Specific goals and policies related to housing provided below are intended to guide development to meet present and future needs, achieve a vibrant community, and enhance the character of Escondido.

GOAL 1: Plan for quality, managed, and sustainable growth

Housing Policy 1.1: Expand the stock of all housing while preserving the health, safety, and welfare of residents, and maintaining the fiscal stability of the City.

Housing Policy 1.2: Housing projects shall fund all or a portion of public facilities and costs for providing municipal services directly related to the need created by the development. The amount must be proportional to the cost of the service or improvement to offset the impacts to public facilities, services, and operations.

Housing Policy 1.3: Pursue a balance of jobs to housing.

Housing Policy 1.4: Channel residential growth to areas where the concurrent provision of services and facilities, including schools, parks, fire and police protection, and street improvements can be assured.

Housing Policy 1.5: Encourage a compact, efficient urban form that conserves land and other natural and environmental resources, and that promotes transit, supports nearby commercial establishments, and takes advantage of infrastructure improvements installed to accommodate their intended intensities.

Housing Policy 1.6: Encourage creative residential developments and partnerships that result in desirable amenities and contribute to infrastructure needs.

Housing Policy 1.7: Incorporate smart growth principles in new residential subdivisions, multi-family projects, and Mixed-Use Overlay areas.

Housing Policy 1.8: Create climate safe and decent housing options by supporting more comfortable and resilient homes and buildings to proactively adapt to changing weather-related emergencies and climate hazard events.

Housing Policy 1.9: Improve affordability by promoting sustainable housing practices that incorporate ‘whole system’ approach to siting, designing, and constructing housing that is integrated into the building site, consumes less water and improves water quality, reduces the use of energy and other resources, and minimizes its impact on the surrounding environment.

Housing Policy 1.10: Prioritize the provision of water and sewer services for proposed housing developments that help address the lower income housing needs.

Housing Policy 1.11: Pursue State grants, such as the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Grant and Permanent Local Housing Allocation funding to support affordable housing projects, and/or ways to incorporate a mix of affordability levels, in new projects near transit for climate resiliency.

Program 1.1: Sites Inventory and No Net Loss/Replacement Housing Monitoring

Action: For the 2021-2029 Housing Element planning period, the City of Escondido has been allocated a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (“RHNA”) of 9,607 units (1,864 very low income; 1,249 low income; 1,527 moderate income, and 4,967 above moderate income units). The City could meet a portion of its RHNA with units entitled and in the pipeline, as well as anticipated Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADUs”).

The City will continue to support construction of new housing for homeownership and rental units on vacant and nonvacant sites identified in the sites inventory. The majority of the future residential development will occur within three specific plan areas: Downtown Specific Plan; South Centre City Specific Plan; and the new East Valley Specific Plan. Scattered sites in lower density neighborhoods also provide opportunities for some additional housing. The East Valley Specific Plan (EVSP) is anticipated to be adopted in 2022. Until the adoption of the EVSP, the City would have a shortfall in adequate sites for 124 above moderate income units and 44 moderate income units. With the adoption of the EVSP (anticipated in 2022), the City will ensure at least 36 acres will be rezoned to Urban Residential IV/IV (21 du/ac minimum), or 25 acres of Mixed-Use (30 du/ac minimum) or any combination of the two designations to fully accommodate the shortfall of 124 above moderate income units and 44 moderate income units. Specifically, these zones will permit multi-family by right (without discretionary action) and meet the requirements of Government Code 65583.2, including, but not limited to a minimum density of 20 units per acre, minimum site size to permit at least 16 units on site, and allow ownership and rental housing by right in which at least 20% of the units are affordable to lower income households.

To ensure that the City monitor its compliance with SB 166 (No Net Loss) and AB 1397 (Replacement Requirement), the City will develop a procedure in 2021 to track:

- Unit count and income/affordability assumed on parcels included in the sites inventory.
- Actual units constructed and income/affordability when parcels are developed.
- Demolition of existing residential units, especially those that have been deed restricted or occupied by lower income households.
- Net change in capacity and summary of remaining capacity in meeting remaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation ("RHNA").

Anticipated Impact: New housing opportunities for homeownership and rental for all households.

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Adopt East Valley Specific Plan in 2022.
- Provide the sites inventory on City website and update the inventory at least semi-annually.
- Develop procedure for monitoring No Net Loss by the end of 2022.
- Amend the Zoning Code in 2022 to require replacement of existing units deed restricted or occupied by lower income households as a condition of project approval, consistent with the requirements of State Density Bonus law replacement requirements, pursuant to AB 1397.

Program 1.2: Density Transfer Programs

Action: The City maintains density transfer programs within the Downtown and East Valley Specific Plans. The programs allow the transfer of residential density from properties that are not built to their targeted density. The City maintains an active inventory of unused density "credits" that can be transferred to other properties for no charge if requested by a developer. The City's density transfer program could be used in tandem with state density bonus laws to further increase the residential capacity of a project. The programs ensure that capacity in the Downtown and East Valley will never be lost if a property is developed with fewer residential units allowed by the zoning.

Anticipated Impact: Efficient use of land resources

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Establish density transfer program for East Valley Specific Plan in 2022, after adoption of the Specific Plan anticipated in 2022.
- Explore an in-lieu fee in 2022 for developing below the targeted densities (Target Production Point, or TPP).

Program 1.3: By-Right Approval of Projects with 20% Affordable Units on “Reuse” Sites and Sites Rezoned

Pursuant to AB 1397 passed in 2017, the City will amend the Zoning Code to require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20% of the units as housing affordable to lower income households, on sites being used to meet the Sixth cycle RHNA that represent the following:

- “Reuse sites” previously identified in the Fourth and Fifth Cycles Housing Element; and
- Sites that are to be rezoned after the April 15, 2021 statutory deadline of the Housing Element through the adoption of the East Valley Specific Plan.

Appendix B provides a listing of parcels for the City’s RHNA.

Anticipated Impacts: Facilitate housing development for lower income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule: Within one year of the adoption of the Housing Element

Program 1.4: City-Owned Sites

Action: The City maintains an inventory of City-owned properties. These parcels are periodically assessed for their potential redevelopment or development for residential use. The objective is to use City-ownership as an incentive for affordable housing development. To the extent feasible, the City will pursue projects that include housing for extremely low income households and those with special needs such as seniors and persons with disabilities.

Anticipated Impacts: Sites for affordable housing

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning and Housing

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Annually review the inventory of city-owned properties and determine if any should be made available for affordable housing development.
- Annually utilize an RFP process to solicit affordable housing proposals on properties identified for affordable housing development.
- Within one year of Housing Element adoption, identify all sites included in the Residential Lands Inventory that are City-owned and actively explore opportunities to facilitate development of such properties, subject to following the requirements of the Surplus Land Act.
- Within one year of the Housing Element adoption, review the City’s policies to comply with the Surplus Land Act and update in accordance with State law.

Program 1.5: Lot Consolidation

Action: Consolidation of small lots allows a development to utilize the land more efficiently, achieve economies of scale, and offer opportunity for improved site design and amenities. The City

encourages the consolidation of small lots to facilitate the development of mixed-use and multi-family developments, particularly for affordable housing by:

- Maintaining an inventory of sites on the City's website.
- Assisting developers in identification of parcels with lot consolidation potential.
- Continuing to utilize a ministerial process for lot consolidation unless other discretionary reviews are required as part of the project.

To ensure consolidation of small lots continues to provide a realistic avenue to utilize small sites more efficiently for residential development, the City will:

- Implement incentives to facilitate lot consolidation by the end of 2023, which may include reduced/waived fees, expedited process, graduated density based on consolidated lot size, flexibility in parking standards/requirements, or other feasible options.
- Identify sites where potential consolidation can happen based on current site usage and ownership and update the sites inventory on the City's website with this information.

Once incentives are implemented, the City will also monitor lot consolidation trends by conducting the following:

- No later than July 1, 2026, staff will review all ministerial lot consolidation applications for the years 2021 through 2025, to ensure incentives are adequate and appropriate to facilitate development of small lots.
- As part of this review, staff will assess:
 - Whether incentives have increased lot consolidation within the City compared to the 4 years prior to 2021. In the event total numbers have not increased by 50%, the City will reassess whether to incorporate additional incentives for lot consolidation.
 - The median processing time of ministerial applications to determine how the process timeframe may be improved.
 - Whether applications resulted in follow up development or are in the same state as when the applications were acted upon. For those that have more than one-year post approval, staff will survey those applicants to determine, if any, impediments to development.

Within six-months after review of the lot consolidation applications concludes, staff will present decision makers with recommendations to adjust/increase incentives and/or utilize alternative actions to further facilitate development on small sites.

Anticipated Impacts: Efficient use of land resources

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning and Housing

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Develop incentives to facilitate lot consolidation no later than the end of 2023.
- Monitor the trend of lot consolidation in 2024 to ensure incentives are adequate and appropriate to facilitate development of small lots, and adjust incentives or utilize other mechanisms as appropriate.

Program 1.6: Density Bonus

Action: City staff completed an amendment to the Zoning Code in 2020 to modify Density Bonus provisions to comply with State law at the time. The State has since passed a bill that made further changes to the State Density Bonus law. AB 2345 (Increase Maximum Allowable Density) - Revised the requirements for receiving concessions and incentives, and the maximum density bonus provided.

Anticipated Impacts: Facilitate affordable housing development

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- In 2022, the City will review and as necessary amend its Zoning Ordinance to ensure compliance with State law.

Program 1.7: Removal of Constraints to Development

Action: The City will facilitate development by removing potential constraints to development.

Ground-Floor Commercial Uses Only: Portions of the Downtown Specific Plan have nonresidential zones where residential densities are permitted or allowed. However, the zoning requires ground floor uses 1) in a storefront location are limited to retail-serving uses only; or 2) residential uses are permitted only above or behind a primary use. However, it may be difficult to market and develop a property with these blanket ground floor commercial requirements because there is a finite economic market available to support providing additional commercial services. Mixed-use thrives when it is focused in a compact area, not over lengthy corridors, as is currently mandated in these specific plans. For mixed-use projects, the City will amend zoning regulations to require ground floor commercial uses only at key locations or preference areas based on context or planning objectives rather than as a blanket requirement to ensure future projects are feasible and the desired community character is preserved. Key locations will be determined by City Council.

Design Review Findings for Residential Projects: The City requires design review approval for most proposed developments. Unless exempt, residential projects are reviewed for design quality. However, the City does not have a set of design guidelines that involves no personal or subjective judgement by the City or its staff. In response to concerns that such a process could pose a constraint to housing, the City will evaluate its design review process for its potential to be subjectively applied to deny a residential development. As noted in the Constraints Analysis, there is no history that a residential project was denied solely on design review. Regardless, the City will develop a set of uniformly verifiable design criterion for new residential projects. New residential projects would need to meet or satisfy three findings, namely, that a project: 1) is consistent with the General Plan, a Specific Plan or the Zoning Code/Municipal Code; 2) is substantially consistent with the Design Review Guidelines; and 3) would not adversely affect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. As such, after program implementation the City would have uniformly verifiable design criterion available and knowledgeable by the development applicant and the public official prior to design review submittal.

Streamlined Review (SB 35): The City will establish a streamlined, ministerial review process for qualifying multi-family residential projects consistent with SB 35.

Water and Sewer Priority (SB 1087): Consistent with State law, the City will establish a written procedure to provide affordable housing with priority for water and sewer services.

Anticipated Impacts: Facilitate housing development

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning and Utilities

Financing: Departmental budget, SB 2/LEAP Planning Grants

Schedule:

- In 2021-2022, the City will review and amend its Zoning Code to remove constraints to development: relating to the requirement of ground floor retail in specific mixed-use districts; establish objective design criteria; establish a procedure to process qualifying projects under SB 35; and establish a written procedure to provide affordable housing with priority for water and sewer services.

Program 1.8: Monitoring of Growth Management Measure

Action: Periodically monitor and evaluate Proposition S for its impacts on the cost, supply and timing of housing, including seeking input from residential developers and affordable housing stakeholders in reviewing the effects of Proposition S. The review will analyze the ability to accommodate the City's RHNA, constraints on the supply and affordability of housing. Based on the outcomes of the evaluation and consideration of stakeholder input, the City will establish appropriate action to mitigate the impacts, including conducting a series of workshops/discussions to educate the community regarding State law requirements and the need for a balanced community.

Anticipated Impacts: Increased public awareness of the City's housing needs and obligations under State law

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Monitor the City's progress toward the RHNA and review Proposition S as a potential constraint annually.
- Prior to the 7th cycle housing element update, the City will conduct an assessment to determine whether Proposition S is adversely impacting housing production and fair housing within the City.

GOAL 2: Provide a range of housing opportunities for all income groups and households with special needs

Housing Policy 2.1: Plan for adequate development potential to accommodate the regional share of housing for all income groups and promote equal access to resources and amenities.

Housing Policy 2.2: Encourage new development to provide a range of housing by type, size, location, price, and tenure to provide a greater array of housing types.

Housing Policy 2.3: Increase homeownership in the City through education, availability, and affordability.

Housing Policy 2.4: Apply criteria demonstrating appropriateness for converting mobile home parks to ownership or alternative uses.

Housing Policy 2.5: Work to eliminate all forms of housing discrimination.

Program 2.1: Accessory Dwelling Units

Action: Escondido's Zoning Code permits ADUs in all residential and mixed-use zones where a residential unit already exists. Accessory dwelling units must also comply with the development standards of the underlying zone, except where precluded by State law. Additionally, the zoning code has a provision that states that the section "shall be interpreted liberally in favor of accessory dwelling unit construction," which further removes constraints on ADU production in case of ambiguities in the standards.

Anticipated Impacts: Additional housing opportunities for lower and moderate income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget, LEAP grant

Schedule:

- Continue to promote ADU as an affordable housing and income source for property owners and provide ADU resources on the City website, with the goal of facilitating 360 ADUs over eight years.
- In 2022, review the ADU ordinance for compliance with State law, including objective design standard requirements and amend the ordinance as necessary and appropriate.
- Amend the ADU ordinance in 2022 to allow ADUs on churches and places of worship, and other premises with social organizations as the principal land use. The ADU ordinance modification would consider the following:
 - Allowing an ADU up to 1,000 square feet to be built (and follow other similar standards) on the same property as a church, place of worship or other social organizations, regardless of the zoning for the property.
 - Potentially allowing more than one ADU to be built on site.
 - Imposing deed restrictions on the ADUs.
- Continue to offer the City's incentives to facilitate ADU development:
 - Removed parking requirement; and

- Removed owner-occupancy requirement beyond the State-established sunset year of 2025.
- Develop eight to nine pre-approved ADU floor and architectural plans by 2022.
- Monitor the trend of ADU construction annually, including affordability, in the City through the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports. If trends indicate a potential shortfall in meeting the estimated 360 ADUs, or by affordability, strengthen the City's efforts to incentivize ADU construction and reassess and revise the City's overall sites strategies for the RHNA within six months through adjusting ADU capacity assumptions consistent with actual permitted units, identifying additional sites to increase the City's No Net Loss Buffer to the extent necessary to fully accommodate the RHNA (see also Program 1.1 for monitoring of no net loss) and rezoning if necessary.
 - In the event ADU trends fall short of projections detailed, as determined through the annual housing element review process, staff will research and present to decision makers the framework for an ADU density bonus ordinance, which would allow for an additional ADU on a qualifying lot if the bonus unit is restricted for affordable housing purposes.

Program 2.2: First-Time Homebuyer Assistance

Action: The biggest hurdle faced by first-time homebuyers is usually coming up with enough money for the closing costs and down payment. The City's Homebuyer Entry Loan Program ("HELP") provides Eligible homebuyers a low-interest loan limited to five percent of the purchase price that can be used toward the down payment and/or for closing costs. Eligible homebuyers must provide an additional one percent of the purchase price toward closing costs and/or down payment. Affordability restrictions of 10 years will apply to the property. The property may not be rented out while the City loan is outstanding. Repayment of the City's loan is deferred until sale, transfer, refinance, additional liens to the property, or no longer live in the home as principal residence.

Anticipated Impacts: Additional housing opportunities for lower income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: HOME

Schedule:

- Assist one household annually with HELP (for eight households over the Housing Element planning period).
- Beginning in 2022, explore funding availability annually and pursue additional funding to expand the program scope and eligible households.

Program 2.3: Essential Middle Income Rental Housing Program

Action: On January 13, 2021, the City Council became a member of the California Community Housing Agency ("CalCHA"). Through its Essential Middle-Income Rental Housing Program ("Program"), CalCHA issues government bonds for the acquisition of existing market-rate apartment communities through the issuance and sale of its own governmental purpose bonds. As a governmental entity, CalCHA is granted a 100% property tax exemption for each property it acquires. These complexes are then converted to rent-restricted units for Low-Income, Median-Income, and Moderate-Income households earning no more than 120% of AMI. Under the Program, no existing

tenants are displaced. Rents on affordable units created through this Program would be capped at a maximum of 35% of the applicable percentage of AMI, and annually rent increase percentages are also capped at a maximum of four percent, which is well below the limits allowed with AB1482. All new tenants would need to income-qualify.

Anticipated Impacts: Additional housing opportunities for lower and moderate-income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: Government bonds

Schedule:

- Identify rental properties for potential acquisition and conversion to affordable housing under the CalCHA program.

Program 2.4: Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV)

Action: This program ensures that households earning less than 50% of the Area Median Income would spend less than 30% of income for rent. This program is administered by the San Diego County Housing Authority on behalf of the City via a participation agreement.

Anticipated Impacts: Rental Assistance for extremely low /very low income households – 1,000 households with Housing Choice Vouchers; 30 senior/disabled households for rent subsidies

Responsible Agencies: Housing Authority of the County of San Diego (“HACSD”)

Financing: HUD Section 8 Vouchers

Schedule:

- Continue to provide information on and refer eligible households to the Housing Choice Voucher.
- Annually assist about 30 very low income households with rent subsidies at apartment complexes and mobile home parks.
- Continue to market programs on City website and at public counters.

Program 2.5: Mobile Home Park Conversion

Action: The City has adopted a procedure by ordinance to assist occupants involved in the conversion of mobile home parks to resident ownership or alternative uses.

Anticipated Impacts: Housing stabilization and home ownership opportunities for lower and moderate income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning and Housing

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Annually promote the option of mobile home park conversion to mobile home park tenants.
- As needed, provide technical assistance to mobile home park tenants and assist in the application for funding from HCD to pursue mobile home park conversion to resident ownership.

Program 2.6: Mobile Home Rent Review

Action: The City passed, by initiative, an ordinance to review proposed increases in rents in mobile home parks. The Rent Review Board considers such requests with the objective of maintaining affordability of the units.

Anticipated Impacts: Stabilized rents for mobile home residents, many of whom are lower income

Responsible Agencies: Community Development/Housing; Rent Review Board

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule: Ongoing

Program 2.7: Special Needs Housing

Action: The City will review and revise the Zoning Code to address the provision of special needs housing.

Transitional and Supportive Housing: SB 745 (2014) specifies that transitional housing and supportive housing should be considered a residential use of property, and subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone. Furthermore, pursuant to AB 2162, supportive housing meeting certain criteria must be permitted by right where residential uses are permitted, including mixed-use and nonresidential zones. The City may not impose minimum parking requirements on projects located within a half mile from transit. Escondido's Zoning Code does not permit mixed-use development outside of specific plan areas; these plans do not explicitly identify transitional and supportive housing as separate from residential uses. The City will review SB 745 and AB 2162 and revise the Zoning Code as necessary to ensure compliance.

Emergency Shelters: The City established an Emergency Shelter Overlay where emergency shelter is a permitted use by right in M-1 and M-2 zones, consistent with SB 2 (2007). In 2020 the City also amended the ES Overlay to establish parking standards based on staffing level plus two parking spaces. AB 139 allows the parking standards to be set solely based on staffing level. Furthermore, the Overlay establishes a separation requirement of at least 300 feet. This requirement is not consistent with SB 2, which allows a separation requirement from another shelter at a maximum separation of 300 feet. The City will amend the Zoning Code to revise the separation requirement and parking standard consistent with State law.

Employee Housing: Pursuant to the State Employee Housing Act (Section 17000 of the Health and Safety Code), employee housing for agricultural workers consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units or spaces designed for use by a single-family or household is permitted by right in an agricultural land use designation. For properties that permit agricultural uses by right, a local jurisdiction may not treat employee housing that meets the above criteria any differently than an agricultural use. Furthermore, any employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure within a residential land use designation, according to the Employee Housing Act. Employee housing for six or fewer persons is permitted wherever a single-family residence is permitted. Currently the Zoning Code does not address these requirements explicitly.

Reasonable Accommodation for Persons with Disabilities: The City grants requests for reasonable accommodation if specific findings can be made. The finding related to compatibility with surrounding uses may be considered subjective and therefore a constraint to housing for persons

with disabilities. The City will amend the Zoning Code to review and revise the findings for reasonable accommodation.

Residential Care Facilities for Seven or More Persons: These uses are conditionally permitted in residential zones. This process may be considered a constraint to housing for persons with disabilities.

Manufactured Homes: The City's Zoning Code permits manufactured homes in single-family residential zones only, not in all zones that permit single-family homes. Furthermore, modern construction methods have also expanded to produce manufactured multi-family housing. The City will amend the Zoning Code to permit manufacture housing meeting the California Building Code standards in zones where residential uses are permitted.

Anticipated Impacts: Increased housing opportunities for households with special needs

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Planning

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- Review and revise the Zoning Code as necessary in 2022 to remove constraints to special needs housing, specifically to:
 - Comply with SB 745 and AB 2162 for transitional and supportive housing.
 - Comply with SB 2 separation requirement.
 - Comply with Employee Housing Act.
 - Ensure findings for reasonable accommodation requests are objective.
 - Permit residential care facilities for seven or more persons as similar uses in the same zone.
 - Permit manufactured housing meeting building code standards in zones where residential uses are permitted.

Program 2.8: Affordable Housing Development

Action: The City will continue to pursue a variety of funding sources to support the construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing in the community, especially funding opportunities that benefit extremely low income households and those with special needs (including elderly, disabled/developmentally disabled, homeless/at-risk homeless, and farmworkers). Funding sources may include federal, state, local, and other private housing programs, including but not limited to:

- Low Income Housing Tax Credits ("LIHTC")
- CalCHA bonds
- California Housing Finance Agency
- CalHome
- SB2 Permanent Local Housing Allocation
- HOME Investment Partnership Program

- Recycled RDA Funds

The City will facilitate affordable housing development for lower income (including extremely low income) and special needs housing by:

- Promoting the use of density bonus (Program 1.6);
- Providing technical assistance, pre-application consultation, and expedited review;
- Providing financial assistance, as funding permits; and/or
- Leveraging with City-owned sites (Program 1.4).

Anticipated Impacts: Acquisition, rehabilitation, preservation, or construction of affordable housing for lower and moderate income households.

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- At least once a year explore funding availability under various programs and pursue funding if appropriate, with the goal of facilitating the development of 570 lower income units over eight years.
- Annually conduct outreach to developers for affordable housing opportunities.

Program 2.9: Inclusionary Housing Assessment

Action: The City will assess all San Diego County jurisdictions to determine whether they are implementing an inclusionary housing ordinance (IHO) and provide a comparative analysis of those with IHOs to the City's Housing Subcommittee for review. City staff will conduct research to provide the Housing Subcommittee with information on other inclusionary mechanisms (other than onsite capture of affordable units) for potential application within the City. In addition to the compilation of research for presentation to and review by the City's Housing Subcommittee, annually beginning in 2023, through the 2021-2029 planning period, the City will assess the number of affordable units processed for development within the sixth cycle thus far. In the event approved, submitted, and/or constructed affordable units are not numerically on track with projected affordable units based on two consecutive years of data, the City will undertake a subsequent Residential Sector Feasibility Study to determine whether market conditions have changed and would support an inclusionary mechanism based on an on-site affordable housing obligation.

The findings of the subsequent Residential Feasibility Study will be presented to the City Council. In the event the City Council adopts an inclusionary mechanism, other than an on-site affordable housing obligation, prior to a subsequent Residential Sector Feasibility Study, the subsequent Residential Sector Feasibility Study will still occur as described to determine whether onsite capture is feasible.

Alternative inclusionary mechanisms to be researched and presented to the City's Housing Subcommittee meeting will include, but are not limited to:

- Citywide inclusionary housing in-lieu fee;
- Land value recapture;
- Inclusionary overlay zones;

Anticipated Impacts: Education of City Officials and general public on inclusionary housing mechanisms; potential adoption on an inclusionary housing ordinance.

Responsible Agency: Community Development

Financing: Departmental budget, grant funding, unknown

Schedule:

- By the June 1, 2022, staff will present the City's Housing Subcommittee with a list of all San Diego County jurisdictions that details whether they maintain an adopted inclusionary housing ordinance, and the extent of such ordinance.
- By June 1, 2022, staff will provide the City's Housing Subcommittee with research on alternative inclusionary housing mechanisms not evaluated within the Residential Feasibility Sector Study (2021).
- Beginning January 1, 2023, staff will assess the number of affordable units processed annually for development since the start of the sixth cycle planning period. In the event two consecutive annual reviews show that processing of affordable units is not on track to meet projected goals, a sector feasibility study will occur to reassess an affordable housing obligation.

In the event two consecutive annual reviews do not trigger the need for a sector feasibility study, then the following will occur:

- By April 15, 2025 (mid-cycle) the number of affordable units processed for development is less than half of the projected value anticipated in this document, staff will conduct an updated Residential Feasibility Sector Study to reevaluate the economic feasibility for the City to adopt an on-site affordable housing obligation.
- If no direction is provided by City officials on the threshold values, the future study will reassess based on what was assessed under the 2021 Residential Feasibility Sector Study.

Program 2.10: SB 9 Ordinance

Action: As of January 1, 2022, Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) allows an owner to subdivide an existing single-family residential lot and build two homes or create a duplex on each lot. The City will create and adopt a specific ordinance for the purposes of complying with and implementing SB 9 citywide.

Anticipated Impacts: Increase housing opportunities and densities throughout the City's low density residential zones.

Responsible Agency: Community Development and Engineering

Financing: Departmental budget

Schedule:

- By June 1, 2022, the City will amend Chapters 32 (Subdivisions) and 33 (Zoning) of the City's Municipal Code for compliance with SB 9.
- Beginning in 2023, monitor the trend of SB 9 development annually, including affordability, in the City through the Housing Element Annual Progress Reports. City staff will assess the following metrics associated with the citywide SB 9 ordinance:

- Where the majority of SB 9 subdivisions are occurring within the City (through spatial analysis)
- The number and type of development (i.e., number of units developed per lot and unit type)
- Whether the owner of record at the time of development retained a property developed under SB 9 past the State's 3-year requirement (note: this metric will not be available for the first 3 years of monitoring).
- An estimate of affordability level of developed units resulting from SB 9 applications based on information provided by the property owner.

GOAL 3: Enhance the quality of the city's housing stock and preserve the integrity of neighborhood character

Housing Policy 3.1: Maintain and enhance the existing housing stock as a source of low- and moderate-cost housing and as a conservation measure.

Housing Policy 3.2: Work to eliminate substandard housing through continued enforcement of the Health and Safety Code and the provision of programs which facilitate the maintenance and rehabilitation of housing.

Housing Policy 3.3: Utilize code enforcement measures and incentive programs as necessary to ensure that building and safety regulations are met and to promote property maintenance.

Program 3.1: Housing Rehabilitation

Action: Maintaining and improving the City's housing stock is an important goal of the City's overall affordable housing strategy. With limited local funding, the City pursued CalHOME funds to implement an owner-occupied rehabilitation program for single-family and mobile homes. This program has expired. The City continues to explore funding availability under various programs and to pursue funding, if appropriate.

The City also uses HOME and recycled RDA funds to work with developers to rehabilitate multi-family rental housing affordable to low-income households. The City will prioritize funding for rental housing that benefits extremely low income households and those with special needs, such as the elderly and disabled (including the developmentally disabled).

Anticipated Impact: Improved housing conditions for lower income households

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: HOME and Recycled RDA funds

Schedule:

- Rehabilitate four rental units annually (32 units over eight years).
- Pursue additional funding to reinstate the owner-occupied rehabilitation program and expand the rental rehabilitation program, including an acquisition/rehabilitation component.

Program 3.2: Focus on Neighborhoods

Action: Through various local and State funds, the City makes funds and other resources available for the improvement of neighborhoods. Through proactive code compliance, housing rehabilitation, and capital improvements, the City targets at improving the quality of life one neighborhood at a time. In addition, land use policies or ordinances are reviewed to explore means of providing community revitalization.

Anticipated Impacts: A place-based strategy for neighborhood improvements and the opportunity for significant community impact both in physical improvement and improvement in quality of life for neighborhood residents.

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: CDBG; General Fund

Schedule:

- Allocate funding for neighborhood services and improvements through the CDBG Annual Action Plan process.
- Prioritize neighborhood focus in PINs, Environmental Justice Communities, Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14, and any other areas with a concentration of lower-income households while ensuring anti-displacement measures are implemented to reduce or eliminate the potential for displacement and gentrification.
 - Utilize CDBG funds for the purpose of tenant rental assistance to a minimum of 50 families and 100 unique individuals annually through the planning period to reduce displacement within priority neighborhoods.
- Implement General Plan policies from the Mobility and Infrastructure, and Community Health and Services Elements surrounding safe routes to schools programming (Pedestrian Network Policy 3.9), and pursue agreements with Escondido school districts to enable city residents to joint use school facilities for recreational purposes (Parks and Recreation Policy 2.12).
 - Complete construction of, at minimum, four projects that ensure Safe Routes to Schools during the planning period, such as infill of missing sidewalks, bike lanes, and modification to traffic signals.
 - Complete, at minimum, one shared use agreement with the Escondido school districts during the planning period.

Program 3.3: Preservation of at-Risk Housing

Action: Within the 2021-2031 “at-risk” housing analysis period, only Silvercrest is at low risk of converting to market-rate housing. The 75-unit project is at risk due to an expiring Section 8 contract. However, Silvercrest is a nonprofit-owned senior housing development; such projects receive priority from HUD for funding renewal.

Anticipated Impacts: Continued affordability of subsidized housing developments

Responsible Agency: Community Development/Housing

Financing: HOME, CalCHA, and other State and federal funds

Schedule:

- Annually, track the status of Silvercrest and other affordable housing developments with the intention of working with owners to extend affordability periods.
- Work to extend affordability covenants on Silvercrest beginning in 2022, and for other affordable housing projects 2 years prior to their end date.
- Contact qualified entities and other affordable housing developers to solicit their participation in extending affordability covenants on existing affordable housing projects 2 years prior to a covenant's contractual end date.
- If a Notice of Intent is filed by any affordable housing project to convert to market-rate, ensure the project complies with the expanded noticing (three-year, one-year, and six-month) as required by State law.
- Support the applications by nonprofits in their pursuit for funding to preserve affordable housing projects.
- If necessary, refer existing tenants to waiting lists of affordable developments as soon as possible to allow time for the waiting period and for relocation.

Program 3.4: Fair Housing

Action: The City will undertake a series of actions to affirmatively further fair housing as outlined under schedule below.

Anticipated Impacts: Continued enforcement of the Fair Housing Action Plan which will reduce or prevent discrimination in housing, disputes between landlords and tenants, and mitigate disparities in access to housing resources and opportunities in the community

Responsible Agencies: Community Development/Housing

Financing: CDBG

Schedule:

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|---|--|---|
| Discrimination in the Private Market Limited Outreach Capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private discrimination • Lack of education and enforcement of fair housing laws • Limited media marketing – only City website • Meetings in same sites/same times | <p>I. Annually through the funding allocation process, allocate resources to retain qualified fair housing service provider(s) to provide fair housing outreach, education, complaint investigation, testing, and legal services, as well as tenant/landlord counseling and mediation services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist at least 200 persons annually. • Encourage the fair housing service provider to issue press releases to local media on outcomes of fair housing complaints and litigation. <p>The City will ensure the qualified fair housing provider conducts, at minimum, the following services contractually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct random testing on a regular basis (a minimum 10 tests per year) to identify issues, trends, and problem properties. Adjust the random testing program to reflect new 2020 Census data and emerging trends in the City. |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually, provide training and technical assistance to City staff regarding fair housing law, reasonable accommodations, and current fair housing events. • Annually, participate in the San Diego Regional Alliance for Fair Housing (SDRAFFH) regional housing fair as a means of providing education to the public on fair housing issues. • Participate in SDRAFFH quarterly meetings on fair housing regulation and discussion. • Attend an April City Council meeting to accept the City's Fair Housing Month Proclamation and provide education to the City Council. <p>II. In 2022, develop an expanded fair housing outreach program via a multi-media and multi-lingual approach, with increased efforts in the Downtown and EVSP areas. The outreach program will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development, production, and distribution of fair housing brochures and/or pamphlets regarding fair housing law and regulatory issues; seminars; workshops; events; and educational forums. • Development and maintenance of a toll free phone system to receive fair housing complaints, to resolve or refer such complaints to the appropriate source for resolution, and to maintain and provide to the City complete statistical record on all complaints and their resolution. <p>III. In 2022, revise the scope of services by the fair housing service provider--Legal Aid Society of San Diego (LASSD), to conduct at least two fair housing workshops within Escondido, with targeted outreach to residents in the Downtown and EVSP areas, as well as within Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14.</p> |
| Segregation Patterns Housing Mobility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical patterns of minority concentration • Location of affordable housing • Land use and zoning laws (high density and mobile park designations in these areas) • Lack of recruitment of landlords in high opportunity areas for HCV use | <p>I. Beginning in 2022, increase outreach and education on the use of HCV to both tenants and landlords, including the new State source of income protection (SB 329 and SB 222) by holding at least one educational event annually during the planning period to landlords and residents on the use of HCV and fair housing topics. Target additional outreach efforts in Downtown and EVSP areas, and high-resource/low density areas; especially in areas where ADUs and SB 9 development have been constructed to promote the use of HCVs in lower density areas, with a goal of reaching at least 50 individuals annually in each target area.</p> |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually, staff will conduct spatial analysis to determine where ADU and SB 9 construction is generally aggregating within the City and sphere of influence. Specifically, the City will assess whether such development/construction is occurring within identified RCAAs, and high-resource/lower density areas. In the event such development/construction is decreasing annually within identified RCAAs, and high-resource/lower density areas, the City will increase targeted education for ADUs, SB 9 development, and HCVs within these identified areas to reach an additional 50 individuals annually, in order to expand the availability of affordable housing in resource-rich areas. |
| <p>Disparate Access to Opportunities</p> <p>Location of RHNA Units in Low Resource Areas</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Racially concentrated areas of affluence in outskirts of City Location of affordable housing Lower quality schools in central census tracts Lower environmental quality in central census tracts | <p>I. Expand housing opportunities to other parts of the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursue adoption of the EVSP in 2022 and implementation to expand locational and housing type choices through zone changes within the EVSP plan area that will allow for an addition of up to 2,185 new dwelling units, and through the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF), which will utilize in-lieu fees associated with lower production densities to finance affordable housing off-site. The AHTF will be finalized and created within 18 months of the EVSP adoption. The City commits to utilizing AHTF funds, in tandem with other affordable housing funds (e.g., PLHA, SB 2) and/or private development, to fund/construct a minimum of 100 deed restricted affordable units over the planning period. In 2022, develop an Affirmative Marketing Plan (AFM). The primary purpose of affirmative marketing is to reduce patterns of segregation and encourage integration in housing by promoting housing choices and opportunities regardless of one's protected characteristics, such as race, color, religion, national origin, or disability. The City commits to annually monitor all developments with affordable units for adherence to the AFM requirements. The City will conduct educational outreach on the AFM as part of the expanded fair housing outreach program (<i>Discrimination in</i> |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <p><u>the Private Market/Limited Outreach Capacity - Meaningful Action II</u>), to the Downtown and EVSP areas, and Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2022, amend the ADU ordinance to allow ADUs on churches and places of worship, and other premises with social organizations as the principal land use (see Program 2.1). There are several religious institutions throughout the City located within high resource/lower density areas. Once the Zoning Code is amended, City staff will conduct biannual outreach and education workshops to religious facilities and social organizations to solicit interest and provide technical assistance on this process. City staff will contact all religious facilities and social organizations with active business licenses within the City as annual outreach to educate entities on this process to facilitate a goal of 21 new ADUs over the planning period. <p>II. Conduct neighborhood improvements pursuant to the City's Capital Improvement Plan, CDBG Consolidated Plan, and future Active Transportation Plan (scheduled for 2023). The City will pursue the following public improvement projects located in the Downtown, EVSP, and within Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14:</p> <p>Downtown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian Signal Crossings at Tulip Street and Quince Street Grand Avenue Streetscape Improvements between Maple and Juniper, including a roundabout at Broadway and Grand <p>EVSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creek Trail Crossing Improvements between Hickory and Harding (Harding to Fig overlaps with Tract 202.13) <p>Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creek Trail Crossing Improvements between Juniper and Fig Restroom and Lighting Improvements at Grape Day Park Aquatics Center at Grape Day Park |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | <p>III. March 10, 2021 by Resolution No. 2021-37, the City created a mapping tool, called a Social Equity and Healthy Index Map to use data from the State OEHHA CalEnviroScreen to designate priority investment neighborhoods ("PINs") to measure the degree to which climate change would impact different geographical areas and to evaluate levels of access to opportunity within a census tract. The following programs will be acted on by the City to address AFFH.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By end of 2022 develop an Environmental Justice Element to redress social equity disparities by prioritizing and targeting CAP and Environmental Justice implementation projects into the most vulnerable areas as defined by the "2020 Social Equity and Health Index Map," Environmental Justice Communities (EJ Communities) identified within the Environmental Justice Element. Projects identified include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing urban heating and increasing carbon sequestration through planting and maintenance of 1,010, low water and/or native street trees by end of 2030; • Promote physical activity through installation of a fitness court at Washington Park by end of 2023. • Promote physical activity through installation of a skate park at Westside Park by end of 2025. • Promote physical activity by completing all phases of the Citywide Access Improvements Project by the end of the planning period, which includes sidewalk infill in East, Central, and Downtown Escondido—all areas located within PINs. 2. Focus planning and intervention programs in PINs, EJ Communities, and within Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14, which currently experience social or environmental injustice and/or bear a disproportionate burden of potential public health impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By December 31, 2022, begin the process of establishing a Clean Energy Equity Plan (completion by January 1, 2025) to improve equitable access to clean and sustainable energy in PINs and EJ Communities. As part of the Clean Energy Equity Plan, at minimum, the four following programs will be created: |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. An education program that engages with at least 50 residents annually within PINs and EJ Communities, at minimum, in English and Spanish, to educate residents on EV and solar regulation and resources (i.e., charging resources, rebate resources) in order to increase solar and EV ownership, EV car-sharing, and installation of EV chargers in existing multi-family projects. Staff will monitor solar and EV charging station installations through building permits at all multi-family projects and mobile homes annually. B. A local home retrofit program for alternative fuel water heaters to reinvest in PINs and EJ Communities, with a focus on the oldest housing stock, with a goal to retrofit 15 water heaters annually. Staff will monitor alternatively fueled water heater retrofits through building permits annually. C. A micro-grid feasibility study to identify clean energy development and access. The City commits to implement an action program based on the feasibility study's results within PINs and EJ Communities. D. Educate at least 50 homeowners and tenants of multi-family housing annually about weatherization projects and the cost savings gained from energy efficient homes through training programs offered in English and Spanish. <p>2. Through the entire duration of the 2021-2029 planning period, when evaluating programs, projects, and infrastructure in at risk areas and PINs, EJ Communities, and within Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14, prioritize efforts on decreasing the urban heat island effect, especially in areas with populations most vulnerable to heat, through strategies like revegetation, tree preservation, new plantings, depaving and porous pavement, green infrastructure, and site specific development design. Projects identified include:</p> |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|---|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No later than December 31, 2025, adopt an Urban Forestry Program, which would include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. A complete assessment of existing conditions and calculate canopy coverage percentage for PINs and EJ Communities in order to: create a tree planting and replacement plan to achieve coverage within PINs and EJ Communities of at least 35% in residential areas and 15% in nonresidential areas. The planting and replacement plan will strategically facilitate the completion of the 1,010 tree planting project. By 2025, complete all phases of the Escondido Creek Trail project, which will promote physical activity and public facilities through new pedestrian pathways and at grade road crossings resulting in an addition of 2.5 acres of parkland within PIN and EJ Communities. <p>IV. By 2023, the City commits to equity prioritizations when creating development agreements. A Development Agreement is a voluntary legal agreement, approved by the City Council, between the City and a developer involving a development project. Generally, Development Agreements involve negotiations in which developers obtain increased certainty in return for providing more considerations of public benefit than would normally be required. Specifically, the City commits to prioritizing at least three development agreement benefits in the PINs, Environmental Justice Communities, and Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14 during the planning period. Examples of development agreement benefits include new public amenities such as park infrastructure, and improved public facilities such as sidewalk infill.</p> |
| Disproportionate Housing Needs Anti-Displacement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median rent increase The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes Lack of renter protections Median income of residents | <p>I. Expand affordable and improve housing opportunities in Downtown and other areas with concentrated low income households by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Zoning Code in 2022 to require replacement of existing units deed restricted or occupied by lower income households as a condition of project approval (see Program 1.1). Amend Zoning Code in 2022 to require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20% of the units as housing affordable to lower |

| Fair Housing Issue | Contributing Factor | Meaningful Actions |
|--------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displacement of residents due to economic pressures | <p>income households, on reuse and rezone sites (see Program 1.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursue at least one affordable housing project under the CalCHA program in Downtown over the HE planning period (see Program 2.4). Prioritize funding for rehabilitation and deed restriction of multi-family rental housing in Downtown, with the goal of achieving 16 units (see Program 3.1) The City commits to evaluate the state of tenant protections (if any) and modify tenant protections within the City by conducting the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present to City Council findings on such protections and recommend for adoption appropriate tenant protection policies, such as Right to Return, Just Cause for Eviction, and any other policies as directed by City Council by end of 2024. Evaluate South Centre City Specific Plan and Downtown Specific Plan policies and standards for adequacy and efficacy in protecting existing city residents from displacement. Based on findings of this evaluation, revise the specific plans to reduce displacement risk by end of 2024. Hold at least one educational workshop annually throughout the planning period on tenant protections, access to homeownership information, and foreclosure protections/education in each plan area referenced above, as well as within PINs, Environmental Justice Communities, and Census Tracts 202.13 and 202.14. By December 31, 2024, the City commits to revise and/or remove policies that can contribute to displacement, including crime free ordinances, and other ordinances/policies that may result in penalization of landlords and/or eviction of tenants. By July 1, 2024, establish partnerships with at least two community-based organizations to help build capacity in local communities through biannual ongoing education about displacement issues and support for community organizing, including education on community benefits agreements. |

C. Summary of Quantified Objectives

The following summarizes the program objectives of the City's Housing Plan described above.

| Table 60: Summary of Quantified Objectives | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Extremely Low | Very Low | Low | Moderate | Above Moderate | Total |
| RHNA | 1,864 | | 1,249 | 1,527 | 4,967 | 9,607 |
| New Construction | | | | | | |
| Approved/Pipeline Projects | 0 | 0 | 616 | 0 | 2006 | 2,622 |
| ADUs | 71 | | 56 | 147 | 86 | 360 |
| Future Projects ¹ | 435 | | 135 | 635 | 1,400 | 2,605 |
| Rehabilitation | 8 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Conservation | | | | | | |
| Preservation of At-Risk Housing ² | 37 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Housing Choice Vouchers | 700 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Notes: | | | | | | |
| 1. Future projects are estimated at 25% of the remaining very low and low income RHNA (after accounting for approved and pipeline projects as well as ADUs) and 50% of the remaining moderate and above moderate income RHNA. | | | | | | |
| 2. 75-unit Silvercrest | | | | | | |

Appendix A: RHNA Credits

This appendix provides detailed information on projects entitled, approved, or under review that could be credited against the City's RHNA. Affordable unit counts are based on plan entitlements, and agreements between the City and developer.

A. Entitled Units

Table A-1: RHNA Credits – Entitled Units

| Project | Description | Market Rate Units |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Escondido Country Club - The Villages | 380 single-family homes entitled, recreational amenities, and urban farm; 25 units permitted prior to July 1, 2020 | 355 units remaining to be permitted after July 1, 2020 |

B. Approved Projects

Table A-2: RHNA Credits - Approved Projects

| Project | Description | Market Rate Units | Affordable Units |
|---|--|-------------------|------------------|
| SUB 13-0008 - 15th | 4 SFR lots on 0.95 ac. | 4 | |
| SUB 13-0002 - Oak Creek "KB Homes" | 65 SFR lots on 41.39 ac. | 65 | |
| SUB 13-0007 - Amanda Estates | 21 SFR lots on 11.2 ac. | 21 | |
| TPM 2006-08 - E. Mission | 3 SFR lots on 0.88 ac. | 3 | |
| Tract 848 - Idaho Ave | 9 SFR lots on 3.55 ac. | 9 | |
| SUB 08-0030 - Reed Rd | 4 SFR lots on 14.37 ac. | 4 | |
| TPM 2004-16 - Tulip | 3 SFR on 1.03 ac. | 3 | |
| Tract 951 - Jacks Creek | 12 SFR lots on 3.31 ac. | 12 | |
| SUB 13-0005 - El Norte | 6 SFR lots on 1.15 ac. | 6 | |
| Tract 934 - 1207 N. Gamble St. | 5 SFR lots on 1.19 ac. | 5 | |
| SUB 15-0002 - Wohlford, 661 Bear Valley Pkwy | 55 SFR lots on 40.9 ac. | 55 | |
| Tract 933/TM SUB14-0010 - Moser | 16 SFR lots on 6.4 ac. (revised submittal) | 16 | |
| Tract 878 - Lion Valley | 11 SFR lots on 2.3 ac. | 11 | |
| Tract 890 - Midway Dr. SUB15-0010. | Tract 890 - Midway Dr. SUB15-0010. | 10 | |
| TM SUB 13-0001 Cranston | 6 SFR lots on 7.41 ac. | 6 | |
| Tract 895 - Boyle. SUB15-0030 | 8 SFR lots on 5.42 ac. | 8 | |
| Del Prado- North & South (Woody's site); SUB 15-0023 & SUB15-0022 | Mixed-use residential - 113 units | 113 | |
| LaCaze (Grand Ave)(PHG 17-0019) | Mixed-use | 15 | |
| TM 220 S. Citrus (SUB 17-0013) | 8 SFR lots | 8 | |
| TPM 2003-07 - W. Lincoln | 4 units on 0.45 ac. | 4 | |
| TPM 2006-06 Farr Ave | 4 SFR lots on 0.93 ac. | 4 | |

Table A-2: RHNA Credits - Approved Projects

| Project | Description | Market Rate Units | Affordable Units |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| SUB 15-0005 – Birch | 3 SFR lots on 0.95 ac. | 3 | |
| ADM 16-0138 – Apartments | 10 units above parking | 10 | |
| SUB 17-0007 North Avenue Estates | 34 homes | 34 | |
| PHG 17-0028 Quince Senior Housing | 145-unit affordable senior housing | 0 | 145 |
| PPH Redevelopment. SUB18-0011. | 510 units. | 420 | 90 (moderate income senior units) ¹ |
| 510 W. 2nd. ADM 18-0126 Mixed-Use | 12,000 SF with residential (5 units) | 5 | |
| 209 N. Tulip. SUB18-0017. | 4-Lot TPM | 4 | |
| SUB 18-0007, 1361 Valle Lindo | TPM on 6.64 acres | 13 | |
| ADM 18-0003, 316 E. Pennsylvania | Mixed-use, 1 residential unit | 1 | |
| PHG 18-0021, 555 W. Grand | 32 Condo units and mixed-use | 32 | |
| TR 920 2355 E. Lincoln Avenue | 98 SFR on 74 acres "Henry Ranch" | 98 | |
| SUB 20-0002, Habitat for Humanity | 10 condos at 245 E. El Norte | 0 | 10 |

Source: Escondido Major Development Project Processing List, August, 2020.

¹ The PPH Redevelopment Project included 90 senior units, designed for moderate income levels. These units are not deed restricted, but are to be affordable by design.

C. Projects Under Review

Table A- 3: Projects Under Review

| Project | Description | Market Rate Units | Affordable Units |
|--|--|-------------------|------------------|
| SUB 09-0005 – 1221 N. Gamble St. | 3 SFR lots on 0.64 ac. | 3 | 0 |
| SUB 15-0019 – Safari Highlands | Specific Plan for 550 SFR lots on 1,100 ac. | 550 | 0 |
| Touchstone – Ivy | 4 story, 95 new units. Purchased by affordable housing developer (MAAC). | 0 | 95 |
| SUB 15-0025, 701 San Pasqual Valley Road | 18-lot TM and PD on 7 acres | 18 | 0 |
| ADM 19-0092, 1860 S. Escondido Vermont Apts. | 44 apartments | 40 | 4 |
| ADM 20-0085, 322 S. Escondido | 172 units | 0 | 172 |
| ADM 20-0011, 118 S. Orange | 3 units | 3 | 0 |
| PHG 20-0036, 829 S. Escondido Blvd. | 70 residential units (density bonus) | 35 | 35 |
| ADM 20-0070, 337 E. Valley Pkwy | 50 unit affordable housing | 0 | 50 |
| ADM 20-0136 664 N. Fig Street | 15 affordable apartment units | 0 | 15 |

Source: Escondido Major Development Project Processing List, August, 2020.

Anticipated affordability levels based on information submitted by project applicants.

Appendix B: Sites Inventory

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 1871817500 | 517539 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | A | 5.2 | 3.57 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Single Family Detached | 72 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 1871817700 | 697501 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | A | 5.2 | 1.58 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 90 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | | | | | Yes |
| 1873706500 | 697623 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 5.73 | 0 | 19 | | | 19 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 1900802700 | 5261706 | Yes | Yes | R1 | RA-5 | 0.2 | R | 41.0 | 33.39 | 0 | 5 | | | 5 | Orchard or Vineyard | N/A | | No Existing Units | 4.4 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2241007300 | 5335971 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-40 | 1.089 | D | 45.0 | 3.25 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Spaced Rural Residential | 61 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.6 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241008400 | 363056 | | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 3.72 | 0 | 6 | | | 6 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241008500 | 5335968 | | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 20.14 | 1 | 32 | | | 32 | Spaced Rural Residential | 48 | >30 Years | 32.0 | 4.8 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241052400 | 5338663 | | | E2 | PD-R-1.6 | 1.6 | | - | 18.49 | 0 | 22 | | | 22 | Orchard or Vineyard | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241410200 | 137988 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | C | 19.2 | 8.62 | 1 | 13 | | | 13 | Spaced Rural Residential | 60 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 2.6 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241410900 | 697957 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | C | 19.2 | 3.72 | 0 | 6 | | | 6 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241412300 | 691318 | | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | C | 19.2 | 4.50 | 4 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 47 | >30 Years | 0.8 | 2.7 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241412500 | 5120531 | | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | C | 19.2 | 1.94 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | Spaced Rural Residential | 43 | >30 Years | 0.5 | 2.9 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241423200 | 137982 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | E | 3.0 | 1.65 | 3 | 2 | | | 2 | Spaced Rural Residential | 45 | >30 Years | 0.7 | 2.0 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241433000 | 697930 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 7.11 | 2 | 10 | | | 10 | Spaced Rural Residential | 55 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.0 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241433200 | 5046469 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 2.41 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241433300 | 5046468 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 5.48 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | 42 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241435000 | 5335895 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | D | 45.0 | 2.92 | 0 | 5 | | | 5 | Orchard or Vineyard | 1990 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 2241513500 | 715042 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | B | 17.2 | 1.51 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Field Crops | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241514100 | 715040 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | B | 17.2 | 2.86 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Spaced Rural Residential | 37 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.4 | | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2241514800 | 5229082 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | B | 17.2 | 1.14 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241515000 | 715037 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | B | 17.2 | 1.32 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241515100 | 5229084 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | B | 17.2 | 10.39 | 0 | 17 | | | 17 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2241711900 | 630364 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.58 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2242401600 | 697812 | Yes | | R2 | RE-80 | 0.54 | | - | 16.06 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2242806400 | 5265291 | | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.83 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 78 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250103800 | 245934 | Yes | | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | J | 21.0 | 9.14 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Spaced Rural Residential | 74 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.4 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2250200500 | 245920 | Yes | | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | J | 21.0 | 5.72 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Spaced Rural Residential | 55 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250201400 | 5116360 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | J | 21.0 | 6.16 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Spaced Rural Residential | Between 1967 and 1986 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.9 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250305600 | 5207000 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.27 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 37 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250421100 | 701222 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 0.96 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 1962 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250422600 | 701247 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 1.02 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250422700 | 701248 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 1.04 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2250422800 | 701321 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 1.01 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250423000 | 73617 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 1.90 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250423100 | 245913 | | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | K | 10.9 | 4.99 | 1 | 7 | | | 7 | Spaced Rural Residential | 70 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 2.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250700600 | 177189 | | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.77 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2250700900 | 177338 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.96 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2250830500 | 702324 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.89 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2251606100 | 701893 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 1.43 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Spaced Rural Residential | 79 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2251606300 | 5290544 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.23 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2252700500 | 33009 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | Q | 5.9 | 1.18 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 80 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2252702300 | 701901 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | Q | 5.9 | 1.02 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2252704900 | 5246125 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | P | 5.7 | 3.11 | 1 | 9 | | | 9 | Spaced Rural Residential | 72 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2252705800 | 5246120 | | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | P | 5.7 | 2.61 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | 55 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2252706300 | 5386426 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | Q | 5.9 | 3.70 | 2 | 10 | | | 10 | Spaced Rural Residential | 64 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2254804300 | 5257259 | | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.26 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2255937100 | 151367 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.58 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2256106201 | 275007 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 1.49 | 4 | 4 | | | 4 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 45 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2256620100 | 388847 | | | S | PD-R-3.3 | 3.3 | | - | 6.59 | 1 | 15 | | | 15 | Spaced Rural Residential | 91 | >30 Years | 15.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2256708000 | 5116867 | | | S | PD-R-3.3 | 3.3 | | - | 1.70 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 91 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | | | | | Yes |
| 2257201500 | 5116892 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 2.07 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 97 | | 6.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2262100700 | 100572 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.87 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 36.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2263301500 | 5394478 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 4.36 | 0 | 14 | | | 14 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263302400 | 701911 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 2.03 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263302500 | 216688 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 1.05 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Spaced Rural Residential | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2263303800 | 180902 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | F | 7.3 | 2.64 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263304000 | 701757 | Yes | | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 5.03 | 0 | 16 | | | 16 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2263305600 | 5265603 | | | U1 | PD-R-5.5 | 5.5 | F | 7.3 | 4.69 | 1 | 18 | | | 18 | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 18.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2263401700 | 180883 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.22 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 57 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 5.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263601300 | 701616 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | H | 2.3 | 0.96 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263601400 | 701542 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | H | 2.3 | 1.30 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263700600 | 701546 | Yes | | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 2.47 | 0 | 8 | | | 8 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263700900 | 701859 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 2.63 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | 60 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 0.9 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263701100 | 701863 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 5.08 | 0 | 17 | | | 17 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263701400 | 701697 | | | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 0.81 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Religious Facility | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263702500 | 552735 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 2.83 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | 78 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 0.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2263702800 | 701854 | Yes | Yes | SPA 13 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | G | 30.3 | 3.98 | 1 | 12 | | | 12 | Spaced Rural Residential | 42 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2268204900 | 180901 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.00 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 32 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 4.9 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2270312300 | 177212 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.29 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 32 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.0 | | | | | Yes |
| 2271013600 | 700900 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 3.44 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2271020300 | 138012 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.80 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271440400 | 703105 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | N | 3.7 | 1.06 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271440500 | 703074 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | N | 3.7 | 0.66 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271440700 | 274957 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | N | 3.7 | 2.01 | 5 | 6 | | | 6 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 60 | >30 Years | 1.2 | 1.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2271442000 | 190464 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.69 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2271442300 | 190467 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.70 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271700100 | 300334 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | X | 1.5 | 0.48 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 44 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271700900 | 151317 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.29 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 69 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 4.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271701800 | 300351 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | X | 1.5 | 0.49 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2271701900 | 300335 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | X | 1.5 | 0.51 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2271802700 | 702300 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 2.08 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2273041200 | 151108 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | | - | 0.53 | 1 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 90 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | | |
| 2273202600 | 702429 | | Yes | S | R-1-15 | 2.904 | | - | 0.36 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2273300100 | 702123 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.96 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Spaced Rural Residential | 78 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2273407800 | 73590 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.90 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Single Family Detached | 61 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2273552400 | 274955 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | O | 1.2 | 0.72 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2273553000 | 703064 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | O | 1.2 | 0.49 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2274104200 | 177283 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 1.76 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2274201000 | 151533 | Yes | | S | R-1-15 | 2.904 | I | 32.9 | 2.68 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Spaced Rural Residential | 67 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2274201100 | 701862 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | I | 32.9 | 6.83 | 0 | 11 | | | 11 | Orchard or Vineyard | N/A | | No Existing Units | 3.5 | | | | | Yes |
| 2274301500 | 73525 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | I | 32.9 | 0.93 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Spaced Rural Residential | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2274302000 | 701555 | Yes | Yes | M | RE-210/R-1-15 | 0.207 | I | 32.9 | 22.50 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Orchard or Vineyard | N/A | | No Existing Units | 6.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 2274304800 | 1554202 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.19 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2275206600 | 137959 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 1.03 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 1908 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2275207200 | 151571 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.73 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280505100 | 180876 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | L | 2.1 | 1.10 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 79 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2280505200 | 703096 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | L | 2.1 | 1.03 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2280505500 | 5050617 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | M | 1.8 | 0.95 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 86 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2280506400 | 180878 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | M | 1.8 | 0.87 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280601000 | 275052 | | | U2 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.64 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280601200 | 275054 | | | U2 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.77 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280602200 | 79040 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 2.71 | 1 | 10 | | | 10 | Single Family Detached | 62 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 0.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280603000 | 79041 | | | U2 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.66 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 76 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280710100 | 704880 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.79 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.9 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280732300 | 1543930 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.55 | 0 | 5 | | 5 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2280800500 | 275035 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Z | 1.3 | 0.41 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280800600 | 275036 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Z | 1.3 | 0.44 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 31 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 11.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280801300 | 275040 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.33 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 32 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 5.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280801700 | 704522 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Z | 1.3 | 0.44 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2280801900 | 704592 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.28 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 45 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2285004900 | 704808 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-8 | 5.445 | | - | 0.80 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290101800 | 704553 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.29 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290305800 | 100421 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 1.13 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290401300 | 177216 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.41 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290610600 | 203247 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.88 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290610900 | 203250 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.89 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 35 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290620100 | 203239 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.89 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 76 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290620800 | 203251 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.93 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290710800 | 203274 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.92 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2290913800 | 193073 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.55 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 37 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291024800 | 704702 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.35 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291210300 | 275156 | | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Y | 1.2 | 0.53 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 46 | >30 Years | 1.5 | 1.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2291210500 | 275157 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Y | 1.2 | 0.40 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291210600 | 275158 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | Y | 1.2 | 0.30 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 1950s | >30 Years | 2.0 | 4.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291421200 | 203234 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AA | 0.5 | 0.22 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 61 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291421300 | 33093 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AA | 0.5 | 0.23 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 25 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 5.7 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2291604200 | 5344397 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 2 | | 2 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2291720300 | 705194 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AC | 0.7 | 0.34 | 0 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291722000 | 705461 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.37 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 68 | >30 Years | 22.0 | 7.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291723000 | 705538 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.42 | 1 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Arterial Commercial | 71 | >30 Years | 25.0 | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291723200 | 705494 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.51 | 1 | 31 | 20 | | 11 | Arterial Commercial | 72 | >30 Years | 31.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291723500 | 705477 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.35 | 1 | 21 | 14 | | 7 | Office (Low-Rise) | 80 | >30 Years | 21.0 | 0.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291723600 | 705475 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.36 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1980 | >30 Years | 22.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291724000 | 705511 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AD | 2.3 | 0.32 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Service Station | 61 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 6.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291802100 | 5283137 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.47 | 1 | 28 | 18 | | 10 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 88 | >30 Years | 28.0 | 2.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291802200 | 5283136 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | GT | 8.1 | 0.87 | 0 | 55 | 35 | | 20 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 1961 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291803200 | 705153 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | GT | 8.1 | 4.07 | 1 | 253 | 163 | | 90 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 62 | >30 Years | 253.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291803400 | 705134 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | GT | 8.1 | 2.72 | 1 | 169 | 109 | | 60 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 61 | >30 Years | 169.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291803500 | 705438 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | GT | 8.1 | 0.13 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 61 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293050100 | 100542 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AF | 1.0 | 0.27 | 3 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | 4.7 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2291806400 | 100533 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 3.80 | 1 | 237 | 153 | | 84 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 84 | >30 Years | 237.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291806500 | 100534 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.94 | 1 | 58 | 37 | | 21 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 84 | >30 Years | 58.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291806900 | 100535 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.47 | 1 | 28 | 18 | | 10 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 88 | >30 Years | 28.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291807000 | 151123 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 85 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291807800 | 100536 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 1.05 | 1 | 64 | 41 | | 23 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 84 | >30 Years | 64.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291807900 | 100537 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.49 | 1 | 30 | 19 | | 11 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 87 | >30 Years | 30.0 | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291808000 | 100547 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 0.42 | 1 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 87 | >30 Years | 25.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291808400 | 100539 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AE | 9.0 | 1.04 | 1 | 64 | 41 | | 23 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 84 | >30 Years | 64.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2291809100 | 705498 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | GT | 8.1 | 0.33 | 1 | 20 | 13 | | 7 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 80 | >30 Years | 20.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2292103900 | 5110570 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.58 | 1 | 35 | 23 | | 12 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | Post 1995 | | 35.0 | 2.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2292200300 | 255000 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AG | 0.5 | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2292200700 | 255002 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.23 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2292204100 | 339954 | Yes | Yes | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.38 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2292204200 | 255004 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AG | 0.5 | 0.28 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 1950s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2292300900 | 229286 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AB | 1.0 | 0.21 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2292301000 | 229287 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AB | 1.0 | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292301100 | 229288 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AB | 1.0 | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292301200 | 229289 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AB | 1.0 | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292301300 | 229290 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AB | 1.0 | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292410900 | 229305 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.63 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Other Public Services | 79 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292602100 | 151126 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.24 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 5.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2292721000 | 302219 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 2.13 | 0 | 133 | 86 | | 47 | Arterial Commercial | 1999 | | No Existing Units | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293010400 | 254983 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AL | 0.2 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Single Family Detached | 1913 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293010500 | 254984 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AL | 0.2 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 1915 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293011200 | 254986 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293020100 | 254987 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AO | 0.2 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 23 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293020600 | 705619 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AN | 0.4 | 0.20 | 2 | 7 | | 7 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 59 | >30 Years | 3.5 | 2.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293020700 | 418553 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AN | 0.4 | 0.18 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Single Family Detached | 2016 | | 7.0 | 1.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293021000 | 418555 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.10 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 1913 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293021600 | 131707 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AO | 0.2 | 0.07 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 45 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2293031000 | 100409 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AM | 0.7 | 0.26 | 0 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293041400 | 705479 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AH | 0.8 | 0.17 | 0 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 38.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293041500 | 705470 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AH | 0.8 | 0.16 | 0 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 38.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293041600 | 100400 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AH | 0.8 | 0.19 | 0 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | Pre 1950 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293041700 | 100401 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AH | 0.8 | 0.29 | 0 | 18 | 12 | | 6 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 20.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293042500 | 100410 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 77 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293042700 | 131706 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AK | 0.5 | 0.10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 1917 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 12.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293042900 | 705478 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AI | 1.1 | 0.29 | 0 | 18 | 12 | | 6 | Arterial Commercial | 1960 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293043900 | 418552 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AI | 1.1 | 0.17 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 2.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293044000 | 418560 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AK | 0.5 | 0.23 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Single Family Detached | 25 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 3.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293044100 | 1565497 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AK | 0.5 | 0.21 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 6.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2293044200 | 705219 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AI | 1.1 | 0.61 | 0 | 38 | 25 | | 13 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1984 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293050300 | 5110602 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AF | 1.0 | 0.19 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 58 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293051300 | 5110603 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AF | 1.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 88 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 2.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293101600 | 345263 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Arterial Commercial | 77 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 5.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102000 | 345264 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AV | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 3.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102200 | 345266 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AW | 1.0 | 0.32 | 0 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102300 | 345288 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AW | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 42 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 11.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102400 | 345289 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AW | 1.0 | 0.18 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 32 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102500 | 345290 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AW | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293102600 | 345291 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AW | 1.0 | 0.17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293103000 | 345292 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AX | 0.6 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | Pre 1964 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293103100 | 345293 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AX | 0.6 | 0.44 | 0 | 21 | 14 | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 1953-1964 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 3.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293104500 | 345267 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AV | 0.5 | 0.33 | 3 | 13 | | 13 | | Arterial Commercial | 1960s to 1970s | >30 Years | 4.3 | 2.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293104600 | 254991 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.61 | 1 | 28 | 18 | | 10 | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 28.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293108300 | 151080 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AJ | 0.8 | 0.27 | 1 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Office (Low-Rise) | 86 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293108400 | 151081 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AJ | 0.8 | 0.37 | 1 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Office (Low-Rise) | 74 | >30 Years | 16.0 | 2.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293108900 | 151076 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AJ | 0.8 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 2005 | | 6.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2293201300 | 705435 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | | - | 0.36 | 1 | 15 | | 15 | | Other Health Care | 90 | >30 Years | 15.0 | 4.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293311600 | 124874 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AR | 3.5 | 2.57 | 1 | 160 | 103 | | 57 | Warehousing | 84 | >30 Years | 160.0 | 0.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293311700 | 124875 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AR | 3.5 | 0.92 | 1 | 57 | 37 | | 20 | Office (Low-Rise) | 76 | >30 Years | 57.0 | 0.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293610500 | 705676 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AT | 1.0 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 14.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293610600 | 345272 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AT | 1.0 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 14.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293610900 | 345273 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AT | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 45 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293611100 | 5241396 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AT | 1.0 | 0.42 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Religious Facility | 44 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293611200 | 5241395 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AT | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620100 | 705657 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 14.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620200 | 705649 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 14.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620300 | 705640 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 14.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620400 | 705631 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Park - Active | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620500 | 705623 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Park - Active | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620600 | 345277 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 10.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293620700 | 345278 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | AU | 1.1 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 6.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293820700 | 705814 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BK | 1.4 | 0.09 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293820900 | 256041 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BK | 1.4 | 0.25 | 0 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Office (Low-Rise) | Pre 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293821300 | 5246864 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BK | 1.4 | 0.19 | 1 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 48 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 3.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293821400 | 5246865 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BK | 1.4 | 0.11 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 23 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2293920300 | 705629 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 11.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293920400 | 345269 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 66 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921000 | 705663 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1970s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 22.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921100 | 705664 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1970s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 22.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921200 | 705668 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.09 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1970s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 22.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921300 | 705672 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.23 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921700 | 345270 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 64 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293921800 | 705652 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.24 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 59 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2293921900 | 87424 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.25 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293922000 | 705645 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Automobile Dealership | 1959 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 6.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293922100 | 705635 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BM | 1.3 | 0.17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Automobile Dealership | 1959 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 90.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293922200 | 705597 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 64 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293922300 | 345271 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.31 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 0.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293922400 | 345268 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BL | 1.3 | 0.33 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 67 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294011400 | 213781 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AS | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Industrial Park | 65 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294011500 | 213782 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AS | 1.1 | 0.49 | 0 | 30 | 19 | | 11 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294011600 | 213783 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AS | 1.1 | 0.50 | 1 | 31 | 20 | | 11 | Office (Low-Rise) | 81 | >30 Years | 31.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294011700 | 124877 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.47 | 0 | 30 | | 30 | | Industrial Park | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294120500 | 213747 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 62 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294211200 | 213760 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294211400 | 213761 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CB | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 21 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294211500 | 213762 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CB | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 35 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294211600 | 213763 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CB | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2294211700 | 213764 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CB | 0.3 | 0.09 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294211900 | 213766 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CA | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 1952 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294212400 | 213767 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CA | 0.3 | 0.23 | 1 | 10 | | 10 | | Arterial Commercial | 52 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294220800 | 213449 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.24 | 1 | 10 | | 10 | | Arterial Commercial | 39 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 2.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294221000 | 213450 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1918 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 2.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294221800 | 100414 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.21 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Arterial Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 21.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294222600 | 100413 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.52 | 1 | 23 | 15 | | 8 | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | 23.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294310100 | 256044 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CG | 0.3 | 0.14 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 46 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294310300 | 705848 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CG | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 77 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294310700 | 705810 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CH | 0.2 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Arterial Commercial | 35 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294310800 | 705801 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CH | 0.2 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 48 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311000 | 213430 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 45 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311100 | 213431 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311500 | 213432 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 46 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311700 | 213434 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CI | 0.2 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311800 | 256046 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CI | 0.2 | 0.17 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Arterial Commercial | 1960s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294311900 | 213435 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 52 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2294312000 | 213750 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1940 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294312100 | 213436 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CJ | 1.0 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 40 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294320700 | 705722 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CK | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 58 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294320800 | 705709 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CK | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 60 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294321600 | 213494 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CM | 0.2 | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 81 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294321800 | 213495 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CL | 0.4 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 1950s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294321900 | 213496 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CL | 0.4 | 0.07 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294322000 | 213497 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CL | 0.4 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 63 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294322100 | 213498 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CL | 0.4 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294322800 | 213503 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CM | 0.2 | 0.17 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 65 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294322900 | 5044115 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.33 | 1 | 14 | | 14 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 73 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 2.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294410500 | 705606 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.32 | 1 | 14 | | 14 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294410800 | 705574 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.32 | 0 | 15 | | 15 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1950s-1960s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294420100 | 87443 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 34 | >30 Years | 4.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294420200 | 705638 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.17 | 3 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1934 | >30 Years | 1.7 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294420300 | 705653 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.18 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1973 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294420400 | 87428 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.25 | 4 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294420900 | 705705 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.09 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1951 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294421000 | 213514 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.14 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 55 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294421600 | 213515 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.17 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 51 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2294421700 | 705651 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.53 | 1 | 24 | 15 | | 9 | Arterial Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | 24.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294421800 | 213511 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CN | 1.5 | 0.39 | 1 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Office (Low-Rise) | 73 | >30 Years | 17.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294610400 | 213505 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DM | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294610500 | 213506 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DM | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 50 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294611200 | 213507 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DN | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 24.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294611300 | 23245 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DN | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | Pre 1978 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 16.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294611600 | 255143 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DN | 1.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294611800 | 213509 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DM | 1.0 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294612000 | 705847 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DM | 1.0 | 0.25 | 0 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Parking Lot - Surface | 1976 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294612100 | 213510 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DM | 1.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Other School | 76 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294612200 | 705908 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DN | 1.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294620400 | 705795 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1990 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294622000 | 705783 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294622400 | 213513 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.32 | 1 | 14 | | 14 | | Other Health Care | 73 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294710100 | 255138 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DO | 1.0 | 0.12 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294711400 | 255139 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DO | 1.0 | 0.10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 1918 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 17.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294711500 | 26684 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DO | 1.0 | 0.25 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | Pre 1950s | >30 Years | 11.0 | 4.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294711600 | 255140 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DO | 1.0 | 0.49 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 22.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294720400 | 706089 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DP | 0.4 | 0.10 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 37 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2294720500 | 706070 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DP | 0.4 | 0.08 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294720600 | 706045 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DP | 0.4 | 0.21 | 4 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 35 | >30 Years | 0.8 | 1.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294721000 | 255099 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DR | 1.0 | 0.28 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294721100 | 255100 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DR | 1.0 | 0.68 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Arterial Commercial | 71 | >30 Years | 22.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294910600 | 23248 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DL | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294910700 | 23249 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DL | 0.7 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294910800 | 23250 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DL | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 31 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294910900 | 23251 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DL | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295010100 | 255117 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DQ | 0.4 | 0.15 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 48 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295010200 | 28232 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DQ | 0.4 | 0.09 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295010500 | 706172 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DQ | 0.4 | 0.13 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1983 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295010700 | 706196 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | | - | 0.08 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295010900 | 29664 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | | - | 0.18 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2295122100 | 706052 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.17 | 0 | 2 | | 2 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2300101000 | 274948 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.33 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2300101700 | 704226 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.45 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2300108000 | 704079 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.37 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2300412000 | 180424 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.21 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2300520700 | 151287 | Yes | Yes | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.47 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Single Family Detached | 36 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 7.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2300811300 | 704580 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | | - | 0.15 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 42.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300820200 | 151297 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | BB | 0.4 | 0.14 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 64 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300822700 | 151298 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | BB | 0.4 | 0.26 | 0 | 7 | | 7 | | Service Station | 1979 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300910800 | 5336893 | | | Mixed Use | C-P | 80 | AY | 2.7 | 0.81 | 0 | 36 | 23 | | 13 | Government Office/Civic Center | 1953-1964 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300910900 | 5334378 | | | Mixed Use | C-P | 80 | AY | 2.7 | 1.84 | 0 | 83 | 54 | | 29 | Government Office/Civic Center | 1967-1978 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921000 | 87476 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BD | 1.1 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 3.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921100 | 705098 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BD | 1.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921200 | 87477 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BD | 1.1 | 0.31 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Other Health Care | 80 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921300 | 87478 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BD | 1.1 | 0.41 | 1 | 18 | 12 | | 6 | Other Health Care | 60 | >30 Years | 18.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921400 | 193134 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BD | 1.1 | 0.09 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 78 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921500 | 705066 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BC | 0.6 | 0.10 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300921900 | 705080 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BC | 0.6 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 2.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300922600 | 705068 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BC | 0.6 | 0.13 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300922700 | 705052 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BC | 0.6 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Health Care | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300930100 | 87479 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.11 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 63 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300930200 | 87480 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.11 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 53 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 6.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2300930300 | 87481 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.11 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 62 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300930400 | 87482 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.13 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300930500 | 87483 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.14 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 62 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300930600 | 87484 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BP | 0.7 | 0.14 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 62 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940200 | 87461 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BO | 0.1 | 0.03 | 0 | 1 | | 1 | | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940300 | 87462 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BO | 0.1 | 0.03 | 0 | 1 | | 1 | | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940400 | 87463 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BO | 0.1 | 0.06 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 3.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940600 | 87465 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | | - | 0.07 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940800 | 705471 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BN | 0.1 | 0.04 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | Arterial Commercial | 54 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2300940900 | 87466 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BN | 0.1 | 0.06 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301010800 | 215295 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.20 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301011100 | 229315 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.24 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301020300 | 151130 | Yes | Yes | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.18 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.9 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301040300 | 180148 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AZ | 0.7 | 0.19 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301040400 | 151185 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AZ | 0.7 | 0.28 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301040500 | 151186 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | AZ | 0.7 | 0.19 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301042800 | 87468 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.28 | 1 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 78 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301042900 | 180151 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.52 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Other Health Care | 86 | >30 Years | 22.0 | 0.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301043500 | 87469 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.14 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1978 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301043600 | 705053 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1978 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301043700 | 705047 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.14 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301043800 | 87470 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BE | 1.7 | 0.44 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301110700 | 87471 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BQ | 1.2 | 0.31 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 7.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301110800 | 87472 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BQ | 1.2 | 0.29 | 1 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 1.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301111000 | 87474 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BQ | 1.2 | 0.63 | 1 | 27 | 17 | | 10 | Arterial Commercial | 84 | >30 Years | 27.0 | 0.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301120600 | 87499 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.17 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 53 | >30 Years | 6.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301120700 | 120003 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.14 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 4.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301121400 | 705089 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.12 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301121500 | 705093 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.13 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1947 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301121700 | 705088 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.13 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301121800 | 705081 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.12 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301121900 | 705045 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.24 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | Between 1967 and 1978 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 3.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301122000 | 87500 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BR | 1.6 | 0.59 | 1 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Arterial Commercial | 79 | >30 Years | 25.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301210300 | 87487 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BS | 0.9 | 0.18 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 58 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 3.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301210500 | 87488 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BS | 0.9 | 0.19 | 5 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | 0.6 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301210600 | 88522 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BS | 0.9 | 0.17 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301210700 | 120005 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BT | 0.7 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 3.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331501500 | 183553 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | | 0.22 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 1978-81 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301210800 | 345303 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BT | 0.7 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301210900 | 345304 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BT | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 81 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301211000 | 345305 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BT | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 85 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301211600 | 87489 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | | - | 0.18 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Arterial Commercial | 76 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301211700 | 87490 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BS | 0.9 | 0.19 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 81 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301220800 | 704958 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BV | 0.4 | 0.31 | 1 | 13 | | 13 | | Arterial Commercial | 68 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 0.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301221000 | 345323 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BU | 0.4 | 0.22 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 65 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301221100 | 345324 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BU | 0.4 | 0.22 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 9.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301221300 | 345326 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | | - | 0.21 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Single Family Detached | 25 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301221500 | 73554 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BV | 0.4 | 0.12 | 0 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 1968 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301311900 | 119997 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.14 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301312000 | 119998 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.15 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301312600 | 87501 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BF | 0.7 | 0.45 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301312800 | 158712 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BF | 0.7 | 0.24 | 2 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 4.5 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301313000 | 119999 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.20 | 1 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 2.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301313100 | 87503 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.28 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | Pre 1980 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 4.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301313800 | 151292 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | BA | 0.5 | 0.23 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301314000 | 151293 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | BA | 0.5 | 0.23 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301314200 | 87504 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.32 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 89 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 0.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301314400 | 87505 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BG | 1.4 | 0.33 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 1989 | >30 Years | 14.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301321300 | 87491 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 55 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 4.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301321400 | 87492 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.12 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301321500 | 87493 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.12 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 72 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301321600 | 87494 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.25 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301324200 | 704809 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.19 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2301325700 | 88518 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.97 | 1 | 42 | 27 | | 15 | Arterial Commercial | 88 | >30 Years | 42.0 | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301325800 | 704950 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.33 | 0 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301325900 | 5261738 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BH | 2.1 | 0.12 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 1974 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301333100 | 73558 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BI | 0.7 | 0.37 | 1 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Parking Lot - Surface | 2008 | | 16.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301333300 | 73559 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BI | 0.7 | 0.34 | 0 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 77 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301333900 | 151115 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | | - | 5.01 | 1 | 124 | 80 | | 44 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 79 | >30 Years | 124.0 | 0.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301410200 | 5394680 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BJ | 6.1 | 5.20 | 2 | 232 | 150 | | 82 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 87 | >30 Years | 116.0 | 0.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301410400 | 5394674 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BJ | 6.1 | 0.72 | 1 | 31 | 20 | | 11 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 74 | >30 Years | 31.0 | 7.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301410500 | 5394668 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BJ | 6.1 | 0.22 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 75 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301410800 | 5394678 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | | - | 0.55 | 0 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Neighborhood Shopping Center | 78 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301610300 | 345297 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CP | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301610400 | 345298 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CP | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 80 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301610600 | 345300 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CO | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 35 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301610700 | 345301 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CO | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 7.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301620100 | 180142 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DC | 2.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 65 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 5.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301621000 | 213483 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DC | 2.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 18.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301621300 | 705565 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DD | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1976 | >30 Years | 3.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301621500 | 705558 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DD | 0.5 | 0.15 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Other Health Care | 1976 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301621600 | 213487 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DC | 2.0 | 0.57 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Other Health Care | 73 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 0.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301621701 | 705509 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DC | 2.0 | 0.49 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Health Care | 85 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301640100 | 345282 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.49 | 1 | 29 | | 29 | | Other Health Care | 70 | >30 Years | 29.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301710600 | 345318 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CQ | 1.0 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 3.0 | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301710900 | 327174 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.48 | 1 | 11 | | 11 | | Other Health Care | 73 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 1.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301711200 | 327177 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2301711500 | 345321 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CQ | 1.0 | 0.81 | 0 | 20 | 13 | | 7 | Other Health Care | 69 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301720600 | 345314 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CR | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301720700 | 345315 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CR | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 14.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301721000 | 327196 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CS | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 45 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 43.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301721900 | 345316 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.66 | 1 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Other Health Care | 74 | >30 Years | 15.0 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301722100 | 158715 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CS | 1.0 | 0.82 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Other Health Care | 78 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 0.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301810100 | 180141 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DB | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Other Health Care | 80 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301810200 | 327179 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DB | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 10.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301810500 | 705486 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DA | 0.7 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 1950s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301810600 | 327182 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DA | 0.7 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301810900 | 180143 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 0 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 3.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301811100 | 213539 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.14 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 88 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301811200 | 213540 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.32 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Other Health Care | 69 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301811300 | 213541 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 79 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301811400 | 213542 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301811600 | 705506 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DE | 1.3 | 0.15 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 1989 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301811700 | 158705 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DA | 0.7 | 0.31 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Health Care | 75 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301820400 | 327199 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301820900 | 213526 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1980 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 6.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301821000 | 213527 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 51 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301821100 | 213528 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1980 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 6.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301821200 | 213529 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301822100 | 327202 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.12 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301822400 | 327203 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 67 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301822600 | 213530 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CZ | 1.6 | 0.64 | 0 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Other Health Care | 80 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911000 | 327219 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CV | 0.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 5.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911100 | 327220 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CV | 0.6 | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911200 | 327221 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CV | 0.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911300 | 705132 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CV | 0.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911500 | 327223 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CT | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 62 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2301911700 | 119962 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CT | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301911800 | 327224 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CT | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920100 | 345327 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 89 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920300 | 345329 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | BZ | 0.9 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 70 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920400 | 345330 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | BZ | 0.9 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 1970s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920500 | 73555 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-P | 30 | BZ | 0.9 | 0.33 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 80 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920600 | 705030 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-P | 30 | BZ | 0.9 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301920900 | 327204 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301921100 | 327206 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 6.9 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301921400 | 327209 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301921900 | 705026 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-P | 30 | BZ | 0.9 | 0.11 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302010100 | 705221 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302010500 | 327226 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 75 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302011200 | 213473 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CW | 0.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302011600 | 213475 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 84 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302011900 | 705454 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CW | 0.6 | 0.47 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Public Services | 86 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 0.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302020300 | 327212 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2302100500 | 704998 | | | Mixed Use | H-P | 80 | | - | 0.23 | 0 | 11 | | 11 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2302100800 | 704964 | | | Mixed Use | H-P | 80 | BX | 0.6 | 0.28 | 0 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302100900 | 704961 | | | Mixed Use | H-P | 80 | BX | 0.6 | 0.33 | 0 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302102100 | 705032 | | | Mixed Use | H-P | 80 | BY | 1.0 | 0.29 | 0 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302102300 | 345295 | | | Mixed Use | H-P | 80 | | - | 0.69 | 1 | 30 | 19 | | 11 | Other Health Care | 62 | >30 Years | 30.0 | 0.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302102600 | 705036 | | | Mixed Use | C-P | 80 | BY | 1.0 | 0.69 | 1 | 30 | 19 | | 11 | Other Health Care | 75 | >30 Years | 30.0 | 1.4 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302303900 | 5050686 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BW | 8.2 | 4.06 | 1 | 182 | 117 | | 65 | Community Shopping Center | 1993; Large Parking Area | | 182.0 | 9.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302304500 | 5282755 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BW | 8.2 | 3.99 | 1 | 179 | 115 | | 64 | Community Shopping Center | 1993; Large Parking Area | | 179.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302304700 | 5282757 | | | Mixed Use | C-G | 80 | BW | 8.2 | 0.11 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Community Shopping Center | 1993; Large Parking Area | | No Existing Units | No Improvement Value | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302510100 | 215348 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Other Health Care | 65 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302510300 | 213520 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DJ | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302510700 | 213521 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DJ | 1.0 | 0.21 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 72 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302510800 | 193259 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DJ | 1.0 | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302511100 | 23237 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DK | 0.5 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 1950s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302511400 | 215349 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DK | 0.5 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 54 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302511500 | 215350 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DK | 0.5 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 10.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302511600 | 213522 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DJ | 1.0 | 0.47 | 1 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Health Care | 69 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 0.7 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2302511800 | 705710 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.42 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1981 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 10.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302520200 | 213489 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DI | 0.3 | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Other Health Care | 1981 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302520300 | 213490 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DI | 0.3 | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1991 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302520700 | 213492 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DH | 0.9 | 0.15 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 0 | Other Health Care | 1970s | >30 Years | 0.3 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302521200 | 23223 | Yes | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DH | 0.9 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 11.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302521500 | 193261 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.24 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 77 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302522000 | 705621 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DH | 0.9 | 0.45 | 0 | 11 | 7 | | 4 | Other Health Care | 64 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302910800 | 213547 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DG | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 1970s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302910900 | 213548 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DG | 1.1 | 0.15 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Health Care | 75 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302920100 | 705557 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DF | 0.3 | 0.16 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302920200 | 213531 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DF | 0.3 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Other Health Care | 80 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2302920700 | 213536 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CY | 0.3 | 0.12 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 4.3 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2303310300 | 213478 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CX | 0.8 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 90 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2303310400 | 213479 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CX | 0.8 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 73 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.0 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2303310500 | 213480 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CX | 0.8 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 74 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.5 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2303311700 | 5051886 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | CX | 0.8 | 0.32 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 90 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2303320400 | 213560 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 34 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.2 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2303802200 | 213589 | | Yes | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.79 | 1 | 10 | | 10 | | Single Family Detached | 1940s | >30 Years | 10.0 | 6.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2305104400 | 705947 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.85 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2305202800 | 705990 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 3.06 | 2 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 47 | >30 Years | 1.5 | 1.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2310213700 | 151097 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.48 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2310222200 | 130125 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | V | 1.0 | 0.33 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 30 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2310222400 | 130127 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | V | 1.0 | 0.66 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 6.5 | | | | | Yes |
| 2310225500 | 130128 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.45 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.8 | | | | | Yes |
| 2310401300 | 87706 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | U | 5.2 | 3.75 | 1 | 33 | | 33 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 40 | >30 Years | 33.0 | 11.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310401500 | 87707 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | U | 5.2 | 0.43 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 42 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310401600 | 703839 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | U | 5.2 | 1.04 | 0 | 9 | | 9 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1942 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310401700 | 516090 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-10 | 10 | T | 1.2 | 0.48 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 1967 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310401800 | 516091 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-10 | 10 | T | 1.2 | 0.34 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310401900 | 516092 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-10 | 10 | T | 1.2 | 0.39 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 5.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310502800 | 151414 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | S | 1.5 | 0.68 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310502900 | 151415 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | S | 1.5 | 0.78 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2310703600 | 299622 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 1.33 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 65 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.9 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310703900 | 704934 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.27 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2310710600 | 704629 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 1.20 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 49 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 8.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2311005800 | 159175 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.85 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 1960s | >30 Years | 2.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2311006500 | 87397 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.89 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2311007900 | 5246933 | | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.34 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 64 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2311011600 | 159221 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.79 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2311200100 | 87742 | | | U2 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.65 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 59 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2311321200 | 109956 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.90 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2311402000 | 703825 | Yes | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 4.21 | 1 | 6 | | | 6 | Spaced Rural Residential | 45 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2312021500 | 705523 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 4.79 | 1 | 7 | | | 7 | Spaced Rural Residential | 1960s | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2313310700 | 151334 | Yes | | U3 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.37 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 49 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2313311600 | 151350 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | W | 2.5 | 0.34 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 69 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 5.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2313311700 | 151351 | | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | W | 2.5 | 2.20 | 24 | 6 | | 6 | | Multi-Family Residential Without Units | 65 | >30 Years | 0.3 | 1.0 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2313502600 | 159170 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GR | 3.8 | 1.67 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 3.2 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2313504300 | 1565063 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GR | 3.8 | 2.17 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Religious Facility | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2313601900 | 567239 | Yes | Yes | S | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.29 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 65 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2314503200 | 159148 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.38 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 36 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2314700200 | 109834 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.01 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.9 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2314700600 | 109815 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GS | 4.3 | 2.56 | 1 | 7 | | | 7 | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2314701700 | 109931 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.90 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2314702800 | 704166 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GS | 4.3 | 1.70 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Single Family Detached | 79 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2314704100 | 109820 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.26 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 59 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2320913500 | 5043968 | | Yes | SPA 9 | FCC | 100 | AP | 8.7 | 0.69 | 0 | 43 | 28 | | 15 | Rail Station/Transit Center | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2321000800 | 355755 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AP | 8.7 | 2.97 | 0 | 185 | 119 | | 66 | Rail Station/Transit Center | 1989 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2321001100 | 706225 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AP | 8.7 | 3.10 | 0 | 194 | 125 | | 69 | Rail Station/Transit Center | 1989 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2321001900 | 706237 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AP | 8.7 | 1.93 | 0 | 121 | 78 | | 43 | Rail Station/Transit Center | 1989 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2321002000 | 124873 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AQ | 2.7 | 1.21 | 1 | 75 | 48 | | 27 | Office (Low-Rise) | 84 | >30 Years | 75.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2321002100 | 213778 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AQ | 2.7 | 1.47 | 0 | 92 | 59 | | 33 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1984 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 133.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2321100600 | 213742 | Yes | | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.29 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 1930s | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2321101700 | 706401 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 1.07 | 1 | 66 | 43 | | 23 | Industrial Park | 79 | >30 Years | 66.0 | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2321701200 | 213801 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.92 | 1 | 5 | | | 5 | Spaced Rural Residential | 22 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 4.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2322702700 | 732651 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | | - | 0.78 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2323202900 | 387922 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.29 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2323402000 | 32715 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.54 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | pre 1950 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2323403500 | 406395 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 2.10 | 1 | 9 | | | 9 | Single Family Detached | 69 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 0.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2325121000 | 618417 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.28 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 79 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2325121300 | 256631 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GA | 10.1 | 5.44 | 1 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | 34 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 2.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2325121500 | 708168 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GA | 10.1 | 1.31 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2325121600 | 708165 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GA | 10.1 | 1.10 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2325121700 | 708172 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GA | 10.1 | 1.23 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2325121800 | 708183 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GA | 10.1 | 1.00 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2330220200 | 706356 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.17 | 0 | 11 | | 11 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | Yes |
| 2330220500 | 213786 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 10 | | 10 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 62 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 1.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2330220700 | 213788 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.29 | 1 | 17 | | 17 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 60 | >30 Years | 17.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2331502100 | 706378 | Yes | | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | EI | 2.8 | 0.68 | 0 | 32 | 21 | | 11 | Religious Facility | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | | |
| 2330521400 | 706307 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 1.25 | 1 | 77 | 50 | | 27 | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | 77.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330611200 | 288610 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CC | 0.3 | 0.10 | 0 | 5 | | 5 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330611300 | 25215 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CC | 0.3 | 0.22 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330612600 | 213755 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.71 | 1 | 32 | 21 | | 11 | Arterial Commercial | 77 | >30 Years | 32.0 | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330620100 | 213769 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.33 | 1 | 14 | | 14 | | Other University or College | 83 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330620400 | 213772 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CD | 0.3 | 0.09 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330620500 | 213773 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CD | 0.3 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330620600 | 213774 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CD | 0.3 | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1952 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 3.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2330620700 | 213775 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CD | 0.3 | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 2.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330621001 | 706064 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 1.26 | 1 | 58 | 37 | | 21 | Arterial Commercial | 54 | >30 Years | 58.0 | 0.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330621100 | 213776 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.07 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 40 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330710300 | 26798 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EB | 1.0 | 0.15 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1965 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 15.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330711700 | 26799 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EB | 1.0 | 0.24 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330711800 | 26800 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EB | 1.0 | 0.24 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 83 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 2.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330711900 | 706291 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EB | 1.0 | 0.32 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Other Transportati on | 1983 | >30 Years | 19.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330720601 | 706141 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.31 | 1 | 14 | | 14 | | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 20.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330720800 | 101011 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | EA | 0.5 | 0.31 | 0 | 14 | | 14 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 41 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330720900 | 706195 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | EA | 0.5 | 0.15 | 0 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 1941 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810100 | 101010 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CE | 0.5 | 0.17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1965 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810200 | 213459 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CE | 0.5 | 0.09 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810500 | 213461 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810700 | 213463 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CF | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 51 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810800 | 213464 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CF | 0.3 | 0.09 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330810900 | 213465 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CF | 0.3 | 0.07 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 39 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330811700 | 706030 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.66 | 0 | 31 | 20 | | 11 | Arterial Commercial | 1980 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330812300 | 213467 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 50 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2330812400 | 213468 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CE | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 39 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330812500 | 213469 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | CE | 0.5 | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 55 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330820500 | 213439 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.08 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330821100 | 213445 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.09 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330821400 | 705910 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.08 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1953-1964 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330821600 | 705942 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1947 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330822400 | 213448 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.25 | 1 | 11 | | 11 | | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | 11.0 | 0.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330920100 | 23203 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DS | 0.5 | 0.17 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 75 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330920200 | 706029 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DS | 0.5 | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 1975 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330920300 | 23204 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | DS | 0.5 | 0.16 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330920800 | 255141 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 7 | | 7 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 50 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2330920900 | 255142 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.32 | 2 | 13 | | 13 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 59 | >30 Years | 6.5 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331210200 | 355798 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 2.70 | 0 | 169 | 109 | | 60 | Industrial Park | 71 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331220700 | 28355 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Single Family Detached | 28 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331320600 | 28364 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.15 | 2 | 8 | | 8 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 25 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331320700 | 29767 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EG | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331320800 | 29768 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EG | 1.0 | 0.17 | 0 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331320900 | 29769 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EG | 1.0 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1970s | >30 Years | 9.0 | 2.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331321300 | 29770 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EG | 1.0 | 0.50 | 0 | 31 | 20 | | 11 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.9 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2331410100 | 26793 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EC | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 4.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410200 | 26794 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EC | 0.3 | 0.17 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410400 | 26801 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | ED | 0.8 | 0.17 | 3 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 50 | >30 Years | 2.3 | 4.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410500 | 26796 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | ED | 0.8 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 86 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 0.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410600 | 26797 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | ED | 0.8 | 0.16 | 0 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 1986 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410800 | 28344 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EE | 0.3 | 0.16 | 2 | 8 | | 8 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 59 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 3.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331410900 | 28345 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EE | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331411300 | 28349 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EF | 0.5 | 0.16 | 2 | 8 | | 8 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 41 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331411400 | 183530 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EF | 0.5 | 0.08 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1964 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331411500 | 183531 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EF | 0.5 | 0.21 | 3 | 10 | | 10 | | Mixed Use | 1950s | >30 Years | 3.3 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331411600 | 183532 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | ED | 0.8 | 0.31 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Service Station | 80 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 2.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331420600 | 288620 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | - | 0.18 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Mixed Use | 50 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331500600 | 183552 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EH | 0.4 | 0.09 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Arterial Commercial | 1978-80 | >30 Years | 5.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331500900 | 29816 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EH | 0.4 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Arterial Commercial | 1978-80 | >30 Years | 9.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331501000 | 29817 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EH | 0.4 | 0.16 | 2 | 8 | | 8 | | Arterial Commercial | 1978-80 | >30 Years | 4.0 | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331502000 | 706404 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | EI | 2.8 | 1.40 | 0 | 66 | 43 | | 23 | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331502200 | 706400 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EI | 2.8 | 0.70 | 1 | 43 | 28 | | 15 | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331620100 | 101015 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DZ | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 1960s | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2331621200 | 28191 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DY | 0.4 | 0.16 | 0 | 6 | | 6 | | Single Family Detached | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331621300 | 28192 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DY | 0.4 | 0.16 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | 1.5 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331621500 | 101017 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DY | 0.4 | 0.11 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331622100 | 706199 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DZ | 0.5 | 0.33 | 0 | 11 | | 11 | | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | 76.8 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331720300 | 28193 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DX | 1.2 | 0.15 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 36 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 4.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331721700 | 706256 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DX | 1.2 | 0.75 | 1 | 24 | 15 | | 9 | Parking Lot - Surface | 1920s - 1950s | >30 Years | 24.0 | 2.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331721800 | 101019 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DX | 1.2 | 0.32 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Office (Low-Rise) | 84 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331810200 | 5116683 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DT | 1.0 | 0.16 | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1961 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331810300 | 5116391 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DT | 1.0 | 0.20 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1960s | >30 Years | 6.0 | 5.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331810600 | 5116386 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DT | 1.0 | 0.10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 13.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331810800 | 5116376 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DT | 1.0 | 0.11 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Office (Low-Rise) | 83 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331810900 | 5116373 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DU | 0.4 | 0.11 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 68 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331811000 | 5116371 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DU | 0.4 | 0.13 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 41 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 4.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331811200 | 5116368 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DU | 0.4 | 0.13 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331811800 | 5116366 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | | - | 0.64 | 1 | 20 | 13 | | 7 | Office (Low-Rise) | 73 | >30 Years | 20.0 | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331811900 | 5116388 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DT | 1.0 | 0.46 | 0 | 15 | 10 | | 5 | Office (Low-Rise) | 74 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331820300 | 28229 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DV | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 1960s | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331820400 | 28230 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DV | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331820800 | 29667 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DW | 0.4 | 0.16 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 60 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 4.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2331820900 | 29668 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 45 | DW | 0.4 | 0.24 | 0 | 8 | | 8 | | Office (Low-Rise) | 60 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2332120600 | 29772 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | | 9 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 79 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332121000 | 30558 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EM | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332121100 | 30559 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EM | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.3 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332121200 | 30560 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EM | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 23 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332121300 | 29773 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EJ | 0.6 | 0.30 | 0 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 65 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 2.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332121400 | 29774 | Yes | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EJ | 0.6 | 0.32 | 0 | 20 | 13 | | 7 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 88 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332220300 | 30563 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EN | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332220400 | 30564 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EN | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 60 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332220700 | 331531 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EO | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 38 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.3 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332220900 | 31276 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EO | 0.3 | 0.17 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 26 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310200 | 29819 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 43 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 4.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310300 | 29820 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 3.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310400 | 29821 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.17 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 5.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310500 | 29822 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 8.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2332310600 | 29823 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.17 | 1 | 10 | 6 | | 4 | Single Family Detached | 80 | >30 Years | 10.0 | 5.2 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310700 | 183546 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1957 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332310800 | 183547 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EK | 1.1 | 0.16 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 1.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332320100 | 183548 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EL | 1.0 | 0.18 | 2 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 53 | >30 Years | 4.5 | 3.4 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332320200 | 29824 | Yes | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EL | 1.0 | 0.17 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 4.0 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332321500 | 30581 | Yes | Yes | GC | C-G | 24 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 7.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2332321900 | 29827 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | EL | 1.0 | 0.64 | 1 | 39 | 25 | | 14 | Arterial Commercial | 81 | >30 Years | 39.0 | 0.5 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332410200 | 30531 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 5.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332410400 | 30533 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.15 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 30 | >30 Years | 0.5 | 6.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2332411600 | 31287 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 42 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.3 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333321100 | 32747 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.17 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | N/A | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333321200 | 32748 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.16 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 76 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333321300 | 32749 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.18 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 79 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333321400 | 32750 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.16 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 8.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333321500 | 32751 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.17 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 38 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333322000 | 32752 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EU | 1.4 | 0.51 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 2.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333420400 | 31282 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EP | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 80 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2333420500 | 31283 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EP | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 44 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333511400 | 32742 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.35 | 0 | 6 | | 6 | | Arterial Commercial | 1975 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 3.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333511500 | 32740 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.20 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 53 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2291721300 | 705213 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AC | 0.7 | 0.37 | 0 | 23 | 15 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.6 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333521200 | 706725 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | ET | 0.6 | 0.10 | 0 | 2 | | 2 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 2001 | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333521400 | 32733 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | ET | 0.6 | 0.16 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 79 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333610300 | | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EQ | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Parking Lot - Surface | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333610400 | 31288 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EQ | 0.5 | 0.32 | 4 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 55 | >30 Years | 0.8 | 1.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333610700 | 32027 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 23 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333611000 | 32030 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | ER | 0.3 | 0.16 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 26 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333611100 | 32031 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | ER | 0.3 | 0.16 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 56 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333710100 | 331546 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 55 | >30 Years | 0.3 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333710400 | 32034 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2333711600 | 32724 | Yes | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | ES | 0.7 | 0.49 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Arterial Commercial | 84 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 0.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2333711700 | 32725 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | ES | 0.7 | 0.17 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 87 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2334802300 | 128051 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | FA | 4.7 | 3.92 | 1 | 12 | | | 12 | Spaced Rural Residential | 22 | >30 Years | 12.0 | 3.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2334802400 | 282843 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | FA | 4.7 | 0.78 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 72 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.9 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2334904200 | 706175 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.57 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 76 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2335010400 | 32727 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2335010600 | 32729 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2335110900 | 33932 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | | |
| 2335111100 | 33934 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 59 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.4 | | South Centre City | Yes | | |
| 2335946300 | 5292994 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | FH | 1.2 | 0.74 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2335946400 | 707110 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | FH | 1.2 | 0.41 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336002200 | 243205 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.60 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336003000 | 255084 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FI | 0.6 | 0.29 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 51 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336003200 | 255094 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FI | 0.6 | 0.29 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 51 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336112400 | 340692 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | FJ | 3.6 | 1.49 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | Spaced Rural Residential | 46 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.9 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336125600 | 5216072 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | FB | 0.9 | 0.46 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 1935 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2336125900 | 706651 | | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | FB | 0.9 | 0.48 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336231100 | 127966 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 1.06 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 70 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2336301900 | 706365 | Yes | | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | | - | 0.50 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2343002600 | 707279 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FM | 0.9 | 0.47 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 79 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.5 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2343002800 | 707309 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FM | 0.9 | 0.45 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 36 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2343900200 | 243206 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 1.02 | 1 | 8 | | 8 | | Religious Facility | 57 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 0.8 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2350711800 | 707106 | | | U3 | R-2-15 | 15 | GB | 0.9 | 0.42 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 34 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 1.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 2350712200 | 707081 | | | U3 | R-2-15 | 15 | GB | 0.9 | 0.28 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 1970s | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.8 | | | | | Yes |
| 2350712300 | 707091 | Yes | | U3 | R-2-15 | 15 | GB | 0.9 | 0.24 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Residential Without Units | 1920 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2350720800 | 732682 | Yes | Yes | U4 | R-4-24 | 24 | | - | 0.96 | 1 | 16 | | 16 | | Single Family Detached | 40 | >30 Years | 16.0 | 2.0 | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2350810900 | 732452 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 4.73 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2350822900 | 732453 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.51 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | Spaced Rural Residential | 52 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.6 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2350900400 | 32679 | Yes | | U4 | R-4-24 | 24 | GE | 0.7 | 0.32 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2350900500 | 32680 | Yes | | U4 | R-4-24 | 24 | GE | 0.7 | 0.34 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Single Family Detached | 57 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2351102200 | 5041606 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 9.00 | 2 | 13 | | | 13 | Spaced Rural Residential | 36 | >30 Years | 6.5 | 6.8 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2351502100 | 708546 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-12 | 3.63 | | - | 0.84 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2351902500 | 708378 | | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.46 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Religious Facility | 1994-5 | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2351902600 | 280458 | Yes | | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 3.29 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Spaced Rural Residential | 68 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2352700300 | 708415 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GF | 6.1 | 4.15 | 0 | 14 | | | 14 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2352700600 | 708341 | Yes | Yes | S | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GF | 6.1 | 1.97 | 0 | 6 | | | 6 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2353003400 | 5243762 | | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | GG | 2.0 | 1.09 | 2 | 3 | | | 3 | Orchard or Vineyard | Pre 1950s | >30 Years | 1.5 | 6.2 | | | | | Yes |
| 2353003500 | 5243764 | | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | GG | 2.0 | 0.94 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Orchard or Vineyard | Pre 1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 14.0 | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| 2353501100 | 707282 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | GC | 0.9 | 0.50 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 79 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2353505100 | 732707 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GD | 2.9 | 2.03 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2353505300 | 707337 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GD | 2.9 | 0.84 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2353505500 | 732706 | | | U1 | R-1-6 | 7.26 | GC | 0.9 | 0.39 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2360320100 | 359647 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.16 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 1970s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.0 | | South Centre City | Yes | | Yes |
| 2360320300 | 32754 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EV | 0.3 | 0.17 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 72 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | | Yes |
| 2360320400 | 32755 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EV | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | | Yes |
| 2360510100 | 32743 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.32 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Arterial Commercial | 57 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | | Yes |
| 2360510400 | 32746 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EW | 0.5 | 0.16 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | | Yes |
| 2360512000 | 707058 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EW | 0.5 | 0.35 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Service Station | Post 1995 | | 5.0 | 6.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2360520900 | 33545 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EX | 0.3 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 80 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 9.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2360521000 | 33546 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EX | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 1978-80 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2360521300 | 707054 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.15 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2360521400 | 32736 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.43 | 1 | 7 | | 7 | | Arterial Commercial | 66 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 5.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2360620700 | 331539 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EY | 0.9 | 0.19 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 39 | >30 Years | 0.5 | 4.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2360620800 | 5253437 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | EY | 0.9 | 0.23 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 39 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 8.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2360620900 | 34068 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EY | 0.9 | 0.17 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 53 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 2.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2360621000 | 34069 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EY | 0.9 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2360621100 | 34070 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EY | 0.9 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 39 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2360711500 | 406404 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.57 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 90 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2361110300 | 331516 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.12 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 56 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361110700 | 331520 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FD | 0.8 | 0.25 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 4.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361110800 | 331521 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FD | 0.8 | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361110900 | 331522 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FD | 0.8 | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361111000 | 34691 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FD | 0.8 | 0.28 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 38 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 5.4 | | South Centre City | Yes | | |
| 2361120200 | 33938 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.13 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361120500 | 331525 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.13 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361120800 | 33940 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EZ | 0.4 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361121300 | 183574 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | EZ | 0.4 | 0.23 | 0 | 5 | | 5 | | Arterial Commercial | 1983 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361122000 | 183581 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.14 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361122600 | 331528 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.23 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 72 | >30 Years | 1.5 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361201500 | 183584 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FC | 1.2 | 0.36 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Single Family Detached | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361201600 | 183585 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FC | 1.2 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 40 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 29.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361201700 | 183586 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FC | 1.2 | 0.24 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361201800 | 183587 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FC | 1.2 | 0.23 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 50 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 7.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2361201900 | 183588 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FC | 1.2 | 0.19 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 25 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361202100 | 183590 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FE | 1.6 | 0.20 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 1960s | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361202200 | 183591 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FE | 1.6 | 0.21 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 67 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 4.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361202600 | 5210866 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FE | 1.6 | 0.87 | 13 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 50 | >30 Years | 0.5 | 4.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361202700 | 5210870 | Yes | Yes | GC | C-G | 24 | FE | 1.6 | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 30 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2361202800 | 5210869 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FE | 1.6 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 69 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361301600 | 34087 | Yes | Yes | U3 | R-3-18 | 18 | | - | 0.31 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 5.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2361620600 | 35511 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361710300 | 331551 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.44 | 0 | 10 | | 10 | | Religious Facility | 52 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361710700 | 35513 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FK | 0.2 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361711500 | 331558 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FK | 0.2 | 0.07 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Detached | 82 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720200 | 331560 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.17 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 52 | >30 Years | 1.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720400 | 34751 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720500 | 34752 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 48 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 9.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720600 | 183605 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.31 | 3 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 78 | >30 Years | 1.3 | 1.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720700 | 183606 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.89 | 1 | 19 | 12 | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 56 | >30 Years | 19.0 | 1.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361720900 | 331562 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | Single Family Multiple-Units | 54 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 2.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2361721300 | 183607 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.18 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 23 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 6.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361721400 | 707258 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361721500 | 183594 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 1.00 | 0 | 23 | 15 | | 8 | Arterial Commercial | 1960s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 12.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361722000 | 331564 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 5.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361722500 | 35520 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.19 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 45 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361722600 | 183608 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FF | 3.2 | 0.15 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 1940s-1950s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 4.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361801800 | 183610 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FG | 0.8 | 0.27 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 53 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 2.3 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361801900 | 183611 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FG | 0.8 | 0.25 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361802000 | 34745 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FG | 0.8 | 0.19 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 46 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.1 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2361802200 | 707190 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FG | 0.8 | 0.13 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362001800 | 708509 | Yes | | S | R-1-12 | 3.63 | | - | 0.94 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 40 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 11.2 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362002100 | 35877 | Yes | | S | R-1-12 | 3.63 | | - | 0.92 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 38 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 12.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362005200 | 5007201 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | GI | 1.4 | 0.92 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 1967 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362005300 | 708430 | | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | GI | 1.4 | 0.45 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 1967 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362231400 | 5042121 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.13 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | Pre 1950 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362231700 | 183521 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FO | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Arterial Commercial | 66 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.4 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362233400 | 707554 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FO | 0.3 | 0.15 | 0 | 3 | | 3 | | Arterial Commercial | 1966 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2362236700 | 707338 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FL | 0.4 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | | 4 | | Arterial Commercial | 1988 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.6 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362237500 | 183600 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FL | 0.4 | 0.25 | 1 | 5 | | 5 | | Arterial Commercial | 88 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 1.2 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362237600 | 5237135 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 24 | | - | 0.18 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 41 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2362237800 | 183599 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.29 | 2 | 5 | | 5 | | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 38 | >30 Years | 2.5 | 1.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362400400 | 708624 | | | S | R-1-12 | 3.63 | | - | 0.75 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Religious Facility | 1958 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362520300 | 5008417 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FQ | 0.8 | 0.42 | 1 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 73 | >30 Years | 8.0 | 1.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362520400 | 183497 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FQ | 0.8 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 89 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362520500 | 183498 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FQ | 0.8 | 0.17 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 55 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362520700 | 183500 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FT | 0.5 | 0.36 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | 7.0 | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362520800 | 708332 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FT | 0.5 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Arterial Commercial | 1979 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362521500 | 183503 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FX | 1.2 | 0.86 | 2 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 54 | >30 Years | 8.5 | 9.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362523800 | 708565 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FW | 1.1 | 0.81 | 1 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Office (Low-Rise) | 77 | >30 Years | 17.0 | 0.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362523900 | 708622 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FW | 1.1 | 0.27 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Office (Low-Rise) | 78 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 0.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2301620600 | 5053001 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | H-P | 30 | DC | 2.0 | 0.26 | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Other Health Care | 79 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.8 | Yes | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362524200 | 183504 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FX | 1.2 | 0.29 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 1950s | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.8 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |



| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2362600200 | 5008418 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FR | 1.0 | 0.61 | 1 | 13 | 8 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 49 | >30 Years | 13.0 | 3.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362600400 | 183507 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FU | 1.0 | 0.37 | 1 | 7 | | | 7 | Arterial Commercial | 46 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 6.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2293050200 | 5110600 | | | SPA 9 | S-P | 100 | AF | 1.0 | 0.22 | 0 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.1 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362603800 | 183513 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FV | 1.3 | 0.24 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 8.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2294310200 | 5110617 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | | | 0.02 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 0 | Arterial Commercial | 1940s | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362603900 | 183514 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FV | 1.3 | 0.25 | 1 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 53 | >30 Years | 5.0 | 4.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362604800 | 183516 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FR | 1.0 | 0.42 | 0 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1999 | | No Existing Units | 2.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362606100 | 152107 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.36 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362606400 | 288598 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FS | 0.7 | 0.35 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.0 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362606500 | 288599 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FS | 0.7 | 0.32 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 3.5 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362607700 | 288609 | Yes | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.33 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2362607900 | 183518 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FV | 1.3 | 0.78 | 1 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Arterial Commercial | 80 | >30 Years | 17.0 | 0.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2362610400 | 190944 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.50 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Single Family Detached | 1980 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 2.3 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363010300 | 150860 | Yes | | S | R-1-12 | 3.63 | | - | 0.98 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 24 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.7 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363011500 | 150870 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 2.59 | 1 | 57 | 37 | | 20 | Spaced Rural Residential | 35 | >30 Years | 57.0 | 160.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363022200 | 708755 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 1.67 | 1 | 37 | 24 | | 13 | Arterial Commercial | 49 | >30 Years | 37.0 | 8.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363111700 | 393370 | | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 1.00 | 1 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Arterial Commercial | 75 | >30 Years | 22.0 | 2.3 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2363112800 | 183564 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FZ | 0.6 | 0.29 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 70 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363113200 | 183565 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FZ | 0.6 | 0.30 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 60 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363130100 | 393373 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FY | 0.6 | 0.35 | 1 | 7 | 5 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 79 | >30 Years | 7.0 | 0.4 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363130200 | 708511 | Yes | Yes | GC | C-G | 24 | FY | 0.6 | 0.26 | 1 | 4 | | 4 | | Parking Lot - Surface | 1979 | >30 Years | 4.0 | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363321200 | 300213 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-7 | 6.22 | | - | 0.59 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 58 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363323400 | 708947 | Yes | Yes | PO | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GK | 1.8 | 0.90 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A; Horse Ring | | No Existing Units | 8.0 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363323500 | 708939 | Yes | | PO | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GK | 1.8 | 0.88 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A; Horse Ring | | No Existing Units | 6.1 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363333200 | 300198 | Yes | Yes | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | GL | 7.5 | 2.81 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Spaced Rural Residential | 50 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 4.0 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363334100 | 709029 | Yes | Yes | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.94 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363334500 | 709323 | Yes | Yes | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | GL | 7.5 | 4.73 | 0 | 8 | | | 8 | Spaced Rural Residential | N/A; storage sheds | | No Existing Units | 38.4 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363343500 | 709326 | Yes | Yes | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.05 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363355300 | 708901 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 0.95 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363601500 | 709401 | Yes | Yes | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | GM | 6.6 | 2.64 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363603200 | 709377 | Yes | | PO | RE-20 | 2.178 | GM | 6.6 | 3.92 | 0 | 6 | | | 6 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2363900200 | 5079082 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GO | 3.8 | 0.30 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Arterial Commercial | 47 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 4.1 | | South Centre City | Yes | | |
| 2363900300 | 183569 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GO | 3.8 | 0.33 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Single Family Detached | 47 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 2.5 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363901200 | 183570 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GO | 3.8 | 0.45 | 1 | 9 | 6 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 45 | >30 Years | 9.0 | 4.7 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363905200 | 5210876 | Yes | | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GO | 3.8 | 1.08 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 41 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 26.1 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2363905300 | 5210874 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GO | 3.8 | 0.85 | 1 | 18 | 12 | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 28 | >30 Years | 18.0 | 25.6 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2363905400 | 5210875 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GO | 3.8 | 0.81 | 0 | 18 | 12 | | 6 | Arterial Commercial | Pre 1947 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 12.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2364500200 | 35509 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.30 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | | Single Family Detached | 52 | >30 Years | 2.0 | 1.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2364500500 | 35460 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.40 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | Single Family Detached | 50 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 4.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2364501200 | 707227 | | | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | | - | 0.81 | 1 | 6 | | 6 | | Single Family Detached | 36 | >30 Years | 6.0 | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2364601600 | 183523 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FN | 2.2 | 1.05 | 1 | 23 | 15 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 85 | >30 Years | 23.0 | 1.2 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2364602400 | 152105 | Yes | Yes | U2 | R-2-12 | 12 | FP | 0.9 | 0.29 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | Single Family Multiple-Units | 47 | >30 Years | 0.5 | 3.6 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2364602600 | 183525 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FP | 0.9 | 0.14 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 2002 | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2364602700 | 183526 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FP | 0.9 | 0.17 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 2002 | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2364606000 | 5253563 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FP | 0.9 | 0.33 | 1 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 2002 | | 6.0 | 1.0 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2364606300 | 183527 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | FN | 2.2 | 1.16 | 1 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Other Retail Trade and Strip Commercial | 89 | >30 Years | 25.0 | 0.9 | Yes | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2370204600 | 707327 | | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 9.05 | 0 | 15 | | | 15 | Religious Facility | N/A; Parking | | No Existing Units | 1.8 | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2371411900 | 5370248 | Yes | | E1 | PD-R-1.02 | 1.02 | | - | 2.71 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2380730600 | 709423 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | GJ | 34.4 | 9.79 | 0 | 8 | | | 8 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |


| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2380733800 | 709457 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | GJ | 34.4 | 4.83 | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2380734900 | 709295 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | GJ | 34.4 | 6.61 | 0 | 5 | | | 5 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2380735500 | 709304 | Yes | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | GJ | 34.4 | 4.00 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2380735700 | 203372 | Yes | | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | GJ | 34.4 | 9.14 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2381012300 | 709381 | | | PO | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 8.75 | 0 | 7 | | | 7 | Religious Facility | Post 1995 | | No Existing Units | 1.2 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2381302400 | 709483 | Yes | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.77 | 1 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Single Family Detached | 55 | >30 Years | 16.0 | 0.7 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381303000 | 709468 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GN | 4.0 | 1.14 | 1 | 25 | 16 | | 9 | Arterial Commercial | 88 | >30 Years | 25.0 | 0.5 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381303100 | 709512 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GN | 4.0 | 1.05 | 0 | 24 | 15 | | 9 | Arterial Commercial | 1988 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381303500 | 709389 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GN | 4.0 | 0.71 | 0 | 16 | 10 | | 6 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381303700 | 709420 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GN | 4.0 | 0.81 | 1 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Arterial Commercial | 85 | >30 Years | 17.0 | 0.7 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381303800 | 709452 | Yes | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GN | 4.0 | 0.34 | 0 | 8 | 5 | | 3 | Arterial Commercial | 1985 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381411600 | 5376096 | Yes | Yes | U1 | R-1-10 | 4.356 | GP | 2.9 | 1.27 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Single Family Detached | 53 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 3.7 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2381411800 | 5376006 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | GP | 2.9 | 1.65 | 1 | 36 | 23 | | 13 | Arterial Commercial | 63 | >30 Years | 36.0 | 1.4 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381413300 | 5376012 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.77 | 0 | 17 | 11 | | 6 | Arterial Commercial | 74 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 1.3 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381413700 | 5376044 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.97 | 0 | 22 | 14 | | 8 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1990 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381520600 | 709788 | Yes | | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.53 | 0 | 12 | 8 | | 4 | Arterial Commercial | 1948 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2381521500 | 183559 | | Yes | SPA 15 | S-P | 30 | | - | 0.68 | 1 | 14 | 9 | | 5 | Arterial Commercial | 71 | >30 Years | 14.0 | 2.7 | | South Centre City | Yes | Yes | |
| 2383606800 | 709649 | | Yes | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 5.90 | 0 | 5 | | | 5 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | Yes | Yes |

| Assessor Parcel Number | Parcel ID | Fourth Cycle Site | Fifth Cycle Site | General Plan | Zoning | Density | Con-solidated Site ID | Con-solidated Area | Site Area (Acres) | Existing Dwelling Units | Total New RHNA Units | New Lower Income Units | New Moderate Income Units | New Above Moderate Units | SANDAG Land Use | Year Built | Building Age > 30 Years | Net New Units Ratio | Land to Improvement Ratio | Near Transit (1/2 mile of stop) | Specific Plan Area with Infrastructure, Improvement Plans, Incentives | Area Undergoing Redevelopment and Affordable Housing | Access to Services, Employment, Community Facilities (1/4 mile) | Low-Moderate Density Lots with Capacity to Add Mod to >Mod Income Units w/o Displacing Existing Units |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 2384701500 | 565280 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.28 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 82 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 1.1 | | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2390511000 | 709396 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 1.02 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2391312900 | 709815 | | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | GQ | 9.0 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2400103000 | 700646 | | Yes | R1 | RA-5 | 0.2 | | - | 4.49 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Orchard or Vineyard | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | | Yes |
| 2400104100 | 5266551 | | Yes | R1 | RA-5 | 0.2 | R | 41.0 | 7.59 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2401009000 | 1554380 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 0.96 | 0 | 2 | | | 2 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | 1962 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | No Improvements | Yes | | | Yes | Yes |
| 2402001100 | 189629 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 2.60 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | Spaced Rural Residential | 58 | >30 Years | 3.0 | 2.1 | | | | | Yes |
| 2402001900 | 704041 | Yes | Yes | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 11.54 | 0 | 19 | | | 19 | Intensive Agriculture | N/A | | No Existing Units | 10.6 | | | | | Yes |
| 2301410100 | 5394690 | | | Urban Residential I IV/V | C-G | 30 | | - | 4.26 | 0 | 106 | 68 | | 38 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | East Valley Specific Plan | Yes | | |
| 2402101800 | 705502 | Yes | | E2 | RE-20 | 2.178 | | - | 1.67 | 0 | 3 | | | 3 | Vacant and Undeveloped Land | N/A | | No Existing Units | No Improvements | | | | | Yes |
| 2702611900 | 183789 | | | E1 | RE-40 | 1.089 | | - | 5.64 | 1 | 4 | | | 4 | Spaced Rural Residential | 60 | >30 Years | 4.0 | 9.3 | | | | | Yes |
| 7601695400 | 5241467 | | Yes | SPA 9 | S-P | 75 | BK | 1.4 | 0.72 | 0 | 34 | 22 | | 12 | Office (Low-Rise) | 1991 | >30 Years | No Existing Units | 0.7 | Yes | Downtown SPA | Yes | Yes | |



Above Moderate Moderate Lower Consolidated Sites

CITY OF ESCONDIDO HOUSING ELEMENT
Housing Sites



0 0.030.05 0.1 0.15 0.2
Miles

Above Moderate



Moderate

Lower

Consolidated Sites


CITY OF ESCONDIDO HOUSING ELEMENT
Housing Sites

DOWNTOWN



Above Moderate Moderate Lower Consolidated Sites

CITY OF ESCONDIDO HOUSING ELEMENT
Housing Sites





Strip Commercial

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| 611 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 23009409, BN | 711 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 23009303, BP | 1040 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 23013216, BH | 1073 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 23012106, BS |
| | | | |
| 131 S Broadway, APN: 23306210 | 218 E Grand Ave, APN: 22943121, CJ | 548 N Broadway, APB: 22930416, AH | 1873 S Escondido Blvd, APN: 23626079, FV |
| | | | |
| 1733 S Escondido Blvd, 23625203, FQ | 899 S Pine St, 23335114 | 450 W 9th Ave, 23335213, ET | 1208 S Escondido Blvd, 23612026, FE |
| | | | |
| 1630 S Escondido Blvd, 23646016, FN | 1630 S Escondido Blvd, 23646063, FN | 970 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 2301313100, BG | 845 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 2301111000 |











Office/Medical

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
| 312 S Juniper St, APN: 22947210, DR | 625 E Grand Ave, APN: 23025116, DJ | 425 W 5 th Ave, APN: 22321214, EJ | 1733 S Escondido Blvd, APN: 23625203, FQ |
|  |  |  |  |
| 806 E Grand Ave, APN: 2301811000, DE | 1002 Grand Ave, APN: 2301822600, CS | 255 N Ash St, APN: 2301920500, BZ | 200 N Ash, APN: 2302102600, BY |
|  |  |  |  |
| 901 E Ohio Ave, APN: 2301822400 | 910 E Ohio Ave, APN: 2301722100, CS | 161 N Date St, APN: 2301811700, DA | 925 N Pennsylvania, APN: 2301721900 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 462 N Elm St, APN: 2301042900, BE | 457 N Elm St, APN: 2300921700, BC | 560 E Valley Pkwy, APN: 2293201300 | 342 S Broadway, APN: 2331621500, DY |



Single Family Residential

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
| 327 W 5 th Ave, EK, APN: 23323105 | 420 W 11 th , EY, APN: 23606208 | 1900 Sunset Dr, FY, APN: 23631301 | 501 E 9 th Ave, EW, APN: 23605120 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 350 N Juniper St SFH active project site, 22931012 | 419 N Cedar St, APN: 2301311900, BG | 419 N Cedar St, APN: 2301311900, BG | 1231 S Orange St, APN: 2361110900, FD |



Industrial/Warehouse




451 Pine/310 S Quince St, APN: 23312102



220 N Quince St, APN: 22933110



800 W Grand Ave, APN: 2321101700



310 S Quince St, APN: 23312102



520 W Valley Pkwy, APN: 2293311600, AR



523W Valley Pkwy, APN: 2294011700



Churches

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | |
| 444 S Escondido Blvd; APN: 23315022, EI; before and after church demolition | | 1873 S Escondido Blvd, APN: 23625215, FX | 611 E Valley Pkwy, BN, APN: 23009409 |
| | | | |
| 1331 S Orange St, APN: 23617103 | 950 E Ohio Ave, 23018206 | 0 Encino Dr, APN: 23702046 | |



Recent Projects Before and After



Quince Street Senior Housing, 220 N Quince St., APN: 22933110
Industrial Warehouse Processing to Affordable Senior Housing
145-unit (100 du/ac) 100% Affordable High Density Multi-family overcame Low (0.72) Land-to-Improvement Ratio
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio not applicable as no existing residential on-site.



300 S Escondido Blvd; APN: 23314214
Strip Commercial, Restaurant, Retail to High Density Residential Mixed Use
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio not applicable as no existing residential on-site Assessor records used for the purposes of Land-to-Improvement Ratio are unavailable




Casa Mercado, 235 S. Pine Street and surrounding properties
APNs (233-032-07, 233-032-08, 233-032-10, 233-032-11, 233-032-12, 233-032-13, 233-032-14, 233-032-17, 233-032-18, 233-032-19, 233-032-21) 2 Single-Family homes, Restaurant, Corner Market, Hardware and Industrial to Multifamily
Consolidated 11 parcels all < 0.5 acres with 5 separate owners
120 units (51.5 du/ac) on vacant and developed parcels.
Existing building age on developed parcels > 30 years. Net new units ratio of 59. Land-to-Improvement Ratio varied across 11 parcels, with a minimum of 0.69



Warmington Residential, 2204 S Escondido Blvd,
Multiple APNs (236-390-02, 236-390-03, 236-390-52, 236-390-53, 236-390-54) Welding business and Single-family home to Multi-family
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio of 61. Overcame Low (0.37) Land-to-Improvement Ratio



Del Prado, 2329 S. Centre City Pkwy
Multiple APNs (238-130-11, 238-130-26, 238-130-27, 238-130-35, 238-130-36) Woody's Restaurant and Single Family Home to 113-unit
Multifamily Consolidated 5 lots with 3 owners, including a parcel less than 0.5 acres
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio of 112. Overcame Low (0.37) Land-to-Improvement Ratio



Palomar Heights, 555 E. Valley Pkwy
Multiple APNs (22944201, 22944202, 22944203, 22944204, 22944218, 22945005, 22945006, 23016301, 23016302, 23016303, 23016304, 23016305)
Former Hospital Site to Mixed Use Residential
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio not applicable as no existing residential on-site
Assessor records used for the purposes of Land-to-Improvement Ratio are unavailable



Touchstone Ivy, 343 E. 2nd Ave.

Multiple APNs (22947108, 22947109, 22947110, 22947111, 22947112, 22947113)

Former Large Medical Office Building (Escondido Surgery Center)

95-unit (95 du/ac), 100% affordable, High Density Multi-family overcame Very Low (0.37) Land-to-Improvement Ratio

Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio not applicable as no existing residential on-site



Veteran's Village, 1556 S. Escondido Blvd
Multiple APNs (2364605900, 2364600400, 2364600500, 2364600900)
Multiple 5-15 Unit Residential, 1-story strip retail, commercial, Vacant Commercial
54-unit affordable for veteran families, 30 du/ac, 1.37 Land-to-Improvement Ratio
Existing building age > 30 years. Net new units ratio of 8

Appendix C: Public Participation

| East Valley FAQs | |
|--|---|
| Question | Answer |
| Old Palomar Hospital | |
| What is the Old Palomar Hospital Project? | Integral Communities has submitted an application for the redevelopment of the former Palomar Hospital site and surrounding properties in downtown Escondido. The application includes a request for a Specific Plan Amendment, Master and Precise Development Plan, Tentative Map, General Plan Amendment (Circulation Element), and Development Agreement to construct a multi-family mixed-use (commercial/residential) project. The current proposal shows 258 apartment units (for-rent), 90 senior apartment units (for-rent), and 162 row-homes and villas (for-sale), with accessory residential amenities and up to 12,000 square feet of commercial/office space on approximately 13.8 acres at the east end of downtown. |
| How does the Old Palomar Hospital Project relate to the East Valley Specific Plan Project? | The project is just outside of the Western boundary of the East Valley Specific Plan Area. If the project is developed it will bring a number of different housing opportunities to the area. |
| Where can I learn more? | https://www.escondido.org/palomarheights.aspx |
| City-wide Housing Element | |
| What is the City-wide Housing Element? | The demand for new housing continues to increase. To address current and future housing needs, The City is working on a new framework to build more housing. This framework will guide Escondido's future housing policy and shape how the City grows. The Housing and Community Investment Study identifies the City's housing needs and establishes clear goals and objectives to inform future housing decisions. The City needs to determine where future housing should be located and what it should look like once built. And we need your help. The Housing and Community Investment Study will allow the public, stakeholders, developers, decision-makers, and staff to work together to address things like how best to increase or accommodate affordability, substandard housing rehabilitation, existing demand for new housing, eliminating housing development constraints, and promote fair housing. |
| Housing and Community Investment Study | |
| What is the Housing and Community Investment Study? | The City is developing three different housing studies and plans: a Housing Element Update, a Sector Feasibility Study, and an East Valley Specific Plan. These three housing studies and plans will be linked together, through a common work program theme, called the "Housing and Community Investment Study." |
| What does the Housing Element Update identify? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where new housing should go. • Policies for rehabilitation and conservation of the existing affordable housing stock. • The current Housing Element sets a number of ambitious goals to increase housing production and preservation, ensure neighborhood livability, prevent discrimination, and end homelessness. |
| What does the Sector Feasibility Study identify? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine what Information and assess if, and to what degree, housing development is financially/economically feasible under rising construction, land, and regulatory costs. |

| East Valley FAQs | |
|---|---|
| Question | Answer |
| What does the East Valley Specific Plan identify? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive planning and zoning scheme for the East Valley area. • Locations that would be appropriate for future housing and what that housing should look like. • New ways to accommodate streamlined housing with community-supported solutions. |
| What will Public Participation Look Like? | The success of this Study requires community engagement and input. There will be multiple opportunities to participate throughout the process. A goal of the Housing and Community Investment Study is to ensure that the future housing strategies embrace the distinct identity and character of Escondido where one can live their entire life with housing for all ages, incomes and abilities. During the course of the Study, the City will work with development experts, community-based interest groups, stakeholders, and the community at large to achieve the best plan possible through engagement tools including meetings, community workshops, and online engagement. |
| Where can I learn more? | Visit the Project Website at https://www.escondido.org/hcis.aspx |
| Escondido Creek Trail | |
| What is the Escondido Creek Trail Project? | <p>The City of Escondido has been awarded \$8.5 million from the California Parks Department to fund the Escondido Creek Trail Expansion and Renovation Project. These funds, made available through the Prop 68 Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Program, will bring to life the community's vision for revitalizing the Escondido Creek Trail and turning it into a premier linear park.</p> <p>The Escondido Creek Trail Expansion and Renovation project would improve approximately 4.5 miles of the existing Escondido Creek Trail (between Harmony Grove Road and Midway Drive) and add approximately 0.4 miles of new bicycle path (between Harmony Grove Road and the Citracado Parkway extension) to the linear park. This project will create a double-sided trail on approximately 1.7 miles; on one side will be the existing Class I bicycle path, on the other will be a new DG trail.</p> <p>Opening the closed side of the Creek Trail, removing asphalt and building a firm surface path, and adding recreation features will add approximately 1.7 miles of new trail and 2.5 acres of parkland, in the heart of Escondido's severely/disadvantaged community area. Expanding into this space will separate users in a way that will enhance the use for both. Bicycles and skateboarders will be able to travel at their desired rate of speed without worrying about small children wandering in the path. Pedestrians and joggers will have a path that is better designed for their physical needs and will have amenities such as adult fitness equipment, children's play pockets and pocket gardens.</p> |
| What are the Creek Channel improvements and how do they relate to the East Valley Specific Plan Area? | <p>The improvements within the East Valley Specific Plan Area will be between Broadway and Rose Street will be more extensive and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vinyl chain link fencing (6' +/-) replacing existing and adding new fence along the top of the channel • Upgraded fencing (6') for first 100 feet from each roadway intersection (tubular steel) • Trail gateways, monuments and signage • Decorative murals on some of the concrete flood channel walls • Trash/recycling receptacles, dog waste bag stations, water filling stations, benches and up to 21 activity stations (fitness, adventure play, skate features) • Over 1.5 acres of landscaping and up to 50 trees with irrigation • Cantilevered trees/viewing areas |
| Where can I learn more? | https://www.escondido.org/ECT.aspx |

| East Valley FAQs | |
|---|---|
| Question | Answer |
| Other | |
| What is the City currently doing for businesses needing assistance due to COVID-19? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary Business Recovery strategy – allow businesses for outdoor dining permitting procedures and waived certain permits to provide relief |
| What do I need to pay in order to build my project? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City recently implemented a City-wide Community Facilities District (CFD) for new projects for future maintenance so that revenue is neutral. This website has more information: https://www.escondido.org/community-facilities-districts.aspx |



City of Escondido

Incorporated in 1888, Escondido is a full-service, general-law city, under the Council-Manager form of government, with five council members. For more information visit: escondido.org

escondido.org

[More info...](#)

[Subscribe](#)

Activity



Community Meeting to Discuss Housing in the East Valley!

City of Escondido Communications Officer from City of Escondido - 20 Jul

The City was recently awarded grant funding to develop three different housing studies and plans: a Housing Element Update, a Sector Feasibility Study, and an East Valley Specific Plan.

These three housing studies and plans will be linked together, through a common work program theme, called the "Housing and Community Investment Study."

There is an online Community Meeting this Thursday, July 23 from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m. to discuss the East Valley Specific Plan. Find out more at: <https://www.escondido.org/hcis.aspx>



HCIS - City of Escondido
[ESCONDIDO.ORG](http://escondido.org)

City of Escondido Housing Survey

We Want to Hear from You!

Survey Introduction

As part of the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study, the City is updating housing goals and policies as part of the General Plan Housing Element. The Housing Element includes actions that the City is planning to address for both current and projected housing needs. The City is looking for input from the community about housing needs so that the City Council can use this input to update current housing objectives and prioritize housing funds over the next several years. Please take a few minutes to complete a short survey to assist with this effort.

All survey responses are anonymous and results from the survey when presented, will be presented as a total.

1. Are you: (Please select all that apply.)
 - a. An Escondido Resident
 - b. An Escondido Rental Residential Property Owner (Landlord)
 - c. An Escondido Business Owner
 - d. A representative of a service agency serving Escondido residents
 - e. Homeless
 - f. Other

RENTERS ONLY

2. How long have you lived in Escondido?
 - a. Less than 5 years.
 - b. 5 - 10 years
 - c. More than 10 years
3. Please check all that apply to you:
 - a. ☐ I am a Senior (65 years or over)
 - b. ☐ I am a Person with Disabilities
 - c. ☐ I live in a large household (five or more persons renting in your home)
 - d. ☐ Veteran
 - e. ☐ Single-person household
 - f. ☐ Not applicable to me.
4. How well is the property you rent being maintained?
 - a. Very well maintained. Property maintenance and repair needs are addressed quickly.
 - b. Well maintained. Property maintenance and repair needs are addressed.
 - c. Not well maintained. Property maintenance and repair needs sometimes are not performed.
 - d. Poorly maintained. Property maintenance and repair needs usually are not performed.
 - e. Not maintained. Property maintenance and repair needs are not performed.

HOMEOWNERS ONLY

5. About how much do you spend annually on property maintenance, repair, or improvement work?
 - a. None
 - b. Under \$1,000
 - c. \$1,000 - \$5,000
 - d. \$5,001 – \$10,000
 - e. Over \$10,000
 - f. I Don't Know
6. What, if any, major housing repair or improvement work do you have planned over the next five years (check all that apply)?
 - a. ☐ Roof Replacement
 - b. ☐ Water Heater / Furnace Replacement
 - c. ☐ Interior Remodel (e.g. bathroom or kitchen remodel)
 - d. ☐ Exterior Remodel (e.g. window or siding replacement)
 - e. ☐ Solar Panel Installation
 - f. ☐ Home Expansion
 - g. ☐ Other (Please List): _____
7. Within the last three years, have you tried obtaining a home equity loan to pay for housing repairs?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If Yes, were you successful in acquiring a loan?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 - b. No

LANDLORDS ONLY

8. What type of rental properties do you own (check all that apply)?
 - a. ☐ Single-family home(s)
 - b. ☐ Duplex, Tri-plex, or Condominium(s)


- c. ☐ Apartment complex with fewer than 5 units
 - d. ☐ Apartment complex with 5 to 20 units
 - e. ☐ Apartment complex with more than 20 units
9. On average, about how much do you spend annually on property maintenance, repair, or improvement work **per unit**?
- a. None
 - b. Under \$1,000
 - c. \$1,000 - \$5,000
 - d. \$5,001 - \$10,000
 - e. Over \$10,000
10. What, if any, major housing repair or improvement work is planned over the next five years (check all that apply)?
- a. ☐ Roof Replacement
 - b. ☐ Water Heater / Furnace Replacement
 - c. ☐ Drainage/landscape irrigation repair
 - d. ☐ Interior Remodel (e.g. bathroom or kitchen remodel)
 - e. ☐ Exterior Remodel (e.g. window or siding replacement)
 - f. ☐ Other (Please List): _____
11. How much do you anticipate on spending for these house repairs and improvements?
- a. None
 - b. Under \$1,000
 - c. \$1,000 - \$5,000
 - d. \$5,001 - \$10,000
 - e. Over \$10,000
12. Within the last three years, have you tried obtaining financing to pay for repairs or improvements?
- a. Yes
 - i. If Yes, were you successful in acquiring a loan?
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No
 - b. No

ALL Respondents

1. What is your age?
- a. Under 18
 - b. 18-24
 - c. 25-34
 - d. 35-44
 - e. 45-54
 - f. 55-64
 - g. 65+
2. Please provide your zip code:
- a. 92025
 - b. 92026
 - c. 92027
 - d. 92029
 - e. 92030
 - f. 92033
 - g. 92046
3. Please rank the following housing challenges in Escondido. Please use each number once. (1 = Biggest problem; 7 = Not a problem)
- a. ☐ High Housing Cost
 - b. ☐ Supply of New Housing For Sale
 - c. ☐ Supply of New Housing to Rent
 - d. ☐ Housing Condition and Property Maintenance
 - e. ☐ Neighborhood Physical Condition (such as streetlights, sidewalks, etc.)
 - f. ☐ Fair Housing Services
 - g. ☐ Other (Please List): _____
4. Please rank the following groups by order of their need for housing and related services in the community. Please use each number once. (1= Greatest Need; 8 = Least Need)
- a. ☐ Seniors
 - b. ☐ Large Households (five or more members)
 - c. ☐ Persons with Disabilities
 - d. ☐ Young Adults
 - e. ☐ Veterans
 - f. ☐ Military Personnel/Military Families
 - g. ☐ Former Homeless

- h. ☐ Other (Please List): _____
5. How adequate is Escondido's supply of the following housing types?
(Yes = Adequate Supply; No = Not Adequate Supply)
- a. ☐ Single family homes
 - b. ☐ Townhomes and condominiums
 - c. ☐ Rental apartments
 - d. ☐ Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU or "Granny Flat")
 - e. ☐ Senior housing
 - f. ☐ Housing for persons with disabilities
 - g. ☐ Housing for the Homeless
 - h. ☐ Other (Please List): _____
6. What types of housing programs and activities do you feel the City should concentrate on over the next eight years? Please rank by order of importance. Please use each number once. (1 = Most Important; 10 = Least Important)
- a. ☐ Housing Rehabilitation Assistance for Homeowners
 - b. ☐ Rental Housing Rehabilitation
 - c. ☐ Code Enforcement
 - d. ☐ Affordable Housing Development
 - e. ☐ First Time Homebuyer Assistance
 - f. ☐ Accessible Units for Persons with Disabilities
 - g. ☐ Housing for Seniors
 - h. ☐ Housing for the Homeless
 - i. ☐ Housing Discrimination and Tenant/Landlord Dispute Resolution
 - j. ☐ Other (Please List): _____

Thank You!






YOU ARE INVITED TO:
**Community Meeting to Discuss
Housing in the East Valley!**

Escondido is dedicated to creating a sustainable and livable community for all. To achieve this, the City of Escondido is preparing a city-wide housing plan. The City is exploring a strategy to develop more housing in important areas to meet state housing requirements and to meet our own goals for maintaining community character and strong neighborhoods. The East Valley is one of those target areas.

This community meeting will introduce this plan and ask for your input on the future of housing in Escondido and we will talk about key opportunities and constraints for East Valley.

We would like your opinion! Join us to work together and develop strategies that address current and future housing needs.


Meeting Information:

 **July 23, 2020**
 **6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.**
 **Online**

For more information, please visit: www.Escondido.org/hcis.aspx



For any additional information or questions, please contact Darren Parker at: dparker@escondido.org



SE LE INVITA A PARTICIPAR EN:

Una cita comunitaria para hablar de vivienda en el Valle del Este!

Escondido está dedicado de crear una comunidad sostenible y habitable para todos. La ciudad de Escondido está preparando un plan de vivienda para la ciudad entera. La ciudad está explorando una estrategia para tener más viviendas en áreas importantes para cumplir con los requisitos estatales de vivienda, así como nuestros propios objetivos para mantener el carácter de la comunidad y los vecindarios fuertes. El Valle del Este es una de esas áreas.

Esta cita comunitaria sería nuestra oportunidad para presentar el plan y le pedirá su opinión sobre el futuro de la vivienda en Escondido, concentrando en las oportunidades importantes y limitaciones del Valle del Este.

¡Nos gustaría su opinión! Este invitado para esta discusión de las necesidades de vivienda de hoy hasta el futuro.

Información de la cita:

📅 July 23, 2020
🕒 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
📍 Online

Para más información, visita: www.Escondido.org/hcls.aspx



Para más información o preguntas, favor de comunicarse con Darren Parker en: dparker@escondido.org



**We
Want Your
Opinion!**

ESCONDIDO
City of Choice

YOU ARE INVITED TO:
**Community Meeting to Discuss
Housing Alternatives in East Valley!**

Escondido is dedicated to creating a sustainable and livable community for all. To achieve this, the City of Escondido is preparing a city-wide housing plan. The City is exploring a strategy to develop more housing in important areas to meet state housing requirements and to meet our own goals for maintaining community character and strong neighborhoods. East Valley is one of those target areas.

This community meeting will discuss three land use alternatives proposed for the East Valley area with a focus on housing. Meeting participants will be asked for their input on the alternatives presented and what aspects they envision and prefer for the future of East Valley.


We would like your opinion! Join us to work together and develop strategies that address current and future housing needs. Sign-up to let us know you'll be attending this workshop. Registration is encouraged but not required: <https://www.escondido.org/workshop-registration.aspx>.

Meeting Information:
📅 October 7, 2020
🕒 6:00 p.m.
📍 Online

For more information, please visit: www.Escondido.org/hcis.aspx

 @cityofescondido
 @cityofescondido
 @Escondido_CA
 Nextdoor
City of Escondido

 For any additional information or questions, please contact Darren Parker at: d.parker@escondido.org



ESTAS INVITADO A: ¡Reunión comunitaria para discutir Alternativas de vivienda en East Valley!




Escondido se dedica a crear una comunidad sostenible y habitable para todos. Para lograr esto, la Ciudad de Escondido está preparando un plan de vivienda para toda la ciudad. La Ciudad está explorando una estrategia para desarrollar más viviendas en áreas importantes para cumplir con los requisitos de vivienda del estado y cumplir con nuestras propias metas para mantener el carácter de la carácter comunitario y vecindarios sólidos. East Valley es una de esas áreas.

Esta reunión comunitaria discutirá tres alternativas de uso de la tierra propuestas para el área de East Valley con un enfoque en la vivienda. Se pedirá a los participantes de la reunión su opinión sobre las alternativas presentadas y qué aspectos prevén y prefieren para el futuro de East Valley.

¡Nos gustaría tu opinión! Únase a nosotros para trabajar juntos y desarrollar estrategias que aborden las necesidades de viviendas actuales y futuras. Regístrese para informarnos que asistirá a este taller.

Se recomienda registrarse, pero no es obligatoria: <https://www.escondido.org/workshop-registration.aspx>.

Información de reunión:

-  Octubre 7, 2020
-  6:00 p.m.
-  Conectado en línea

Para mayor información, por favor visite: www.Escondido.org/hcis.aspx



Para cualquier información adicional o preguntas, comuníquese con Darren Parker al dparker@escondido.org

Appendix D: Review of Past Accomplishments

The City worked diligently to address the housing needs of special needs groups. Some of the accomplishments are highlighted below:

- Completed the construction of Veteran's Village
- Re-established a housing rehabilitation program for mobile homes; many mobile home owners are seniors with limited incomes.
- Provided rental subsidies to 30 senior/disabled households in mobile homes and apartments using City funds while they were waiting for HUD Section 8 assistance.
- Conducted mobile home park rent hearings to ensure requests for rent increases were reasonable.
- Amended the Zoning Code to permit senior housing by right where housing is permitted

Table D- 1 summarizes the City's accomplishments in implementing the fifth cycle Housing Element.

| Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
| 1.1 Project Development Create an increased supply of affordable housing units for lower income households, including households with extremely low incomes. Every effort will be made to accomplish this through redevelopment and acquisition/rehabilitation. | Increase supply of rental units for extremely low, very low, and low income residents by 300 units. | <p>Within the HE period, the City contracted with Community Housing Works, Interfaith Community Services, and Solutions for Change to develop affordable rental projects consisting of acquisition/rehabilitation of existing units (CHW and Interfaith) and new construction (Solutions). The following projects were completed throughout the planning period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CHW Project: Completed 11 HOME affordable units out of 200 total affordable units in the project in April 2017. ▪ Interfaith Project: Rehabilitated an existing 4-unit project in 2018. ▪ Solutions Project: Completed construction of a new affordable rental project consisting of 33 units (32 affordable) in July 2017. ▪ Veteran's Village of San Diego: Completed a 54-unit (including 48 units of new construction and 53 total affordable units) development serving homeless veterans in 2019. <p>Including three previous projects during the HE period (11 ownership units by SDHFH in 2015, 35 new rental units by CHW in 2013 and 44 rehabilitated units by UHC in 2015), a total of 147 affordable housing units have been created via local funding since 2013.</p> | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>1.2 Lot Consolidation</p> <p>Encourage consolidation of small lots to utilize land more efficiently and facilitate the development of mixed-use and affordable multi-family developments.</p> | <p>Facilitate development as envisioned in the General Plan.</p> | <p>The City utilizes a ministerial process for basic lot consolidation. The City continues to encourage consolidation of lots to facilitate mixed-use and affordable development (see Program 1.1).</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>1.3 Infill New Construction Support</p> <p>new construction of homeownership and rental units and redevelopment/revitalization on infill sites. The city also encourages recycling and revitalizing of sites for a variety of housing types and income levels.</p> | <p>Create new housing opportunities for homeownership and rental for low and moderate income households.</p> | <p>The majority of the affordable residential projects completed during the period have been on infill sites. The following projects were developed on infill sites during the planning period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Veteran's Village (10 funded units out of 53 affordable): Completed in 2019 on infill land on South Escondido Boulevard. ▪ Solutions for Change affordable rental project (32 out of 33 units affordable): Completed in 2017 on an infill site on South Escondido Boulevard. ▪ Interfaith Community Services Aster Street Rehabilitation project (4 affordable units): Completed in 2018. ▪ CHW rehabilitation project (11 out of 200 units HOME affordable): Completed in 2017 on Midway Drive. ▪ SDHFH Project (11 units): Completed in 2015 on an infill site. ▪ CHW Project (35 units): Completed in 2013 on an infill site. ▪ UHC Project (44 units): Completed in 2015 on an infill site. | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>1.4 City-Owned Sites</p> <p>Facilitate the redevelopment/development of affordable housing on City-owned sites.</p> | <p>Use City-ownership as a potential inducement for rehabilitation of more affordable housing.</p> | <p>The Housing and Neighborhood Services Division, the Engineering Services Department, the City's Real Property Agent, and other City staff continue to review City-owned properties when they become available as potential sites for redevelopment as affordable housing.</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>1.5 Density Bonus</p> <p>Amend Density Bonus Ordinance to be consistent with State law.</p> | <p>Encourage additional housing opportunities for low and moderate income households.</p> | <p>City staff completed an amendment to the Zoning Code in 2017 to modify Density Bonus provisions so they are in conformance with state law. The City will continue to maintain consistency with State density bonus law, including amending the Zoning Code as necessary. Several projects are currently in the pipeline or have been recently</p> | <p>The Zoning Code was amended in compliance with State law. A modified version of this Program will be included in the</p> |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | completed using Density Bonus provisions, providing additional affordable units. | Housing Element Update. |
| 2.1 Housing Rehabilitation – Renter Occupied Continue to explore potential rental rehabilitation programs. | Increase opportunities for rental rehabilitation for lower income households (25 units). | Funding from a CalHOME grant allowed the City to re-establish an owner-occupied rehabilitation program for low-income households in single-family residences and mobile homes in 2015. The program ended in 2017. City staff continues to explore funding opportunities for a new renter-occupied rehabilitation program. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |
| 2.2 Acquisition/ Rehabilitation Continue to explore ways to encourage the recycling of deteriorated and older structures for affordable housing opportunities. | Increase affordable housing opportunities for lower income households (200 units). | Recycling of existing, dilapidated structures continues to be a priority in Escondido. An RFP in 2014 for affordable housing developers resulted in the following affordable rehabilitation developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 acquisition/rehabilitation units in a 200-unit development completed in 2017, 44-unit rehabilitation project completed in 2015. An RFP in 2017 resulted in a 4-unit affordable rehabilitation project completed in 2018. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |
| 2.3 Focus on Neighborhoods Collaborate with departments to channel resources and efforts into improvement of neighborhood quality of life, including code enforcement, housing rehabilitation and capital improvements. | Increase the concentration of City resources to individual neighborhoods and the opportunity for significant community impact both in physical improvement and improvement in quality of life for neighborhood residents. Continue collaboration efforts through funding resources, policies and community outreach. | In 2019, there were 18 recognized neighborhood groups in the City. Project NEAT continues to utilize Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) funding to assist residents in solving their own neighborhood problems at a neighborhood (rather than a Code Enforcement) level, such as maintenance, graffiti, trash. The Neighborhood Transformation Project (“NTP”) is one effort to join neighborhoods with City Departments to combine resources (funding and sweat equity) in targeted areas to include neighborhood cleanups and public improvements. The City continues a focused approach in neighborhoods using additional strategies to improve neighborhoods by involving residents. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>2.4 Preservation of At-Risk Housing</p> <p>Continue to explore means to continue housing affordability for lower income households that would be impacted by the conversion of subsidized projects to market rate housing.</p> | <p>Continue affordability of subsidized housing developments. If owner wishes to sell, contact potential buyers who would want to extend affordability, and if unsuccessful, follow up with Section 8 and relocation potential.</p> | <p>The City continues to monitor at-risk units, particularly those identified in the Housing Element. This effort is ongoing. The City worked with Community Housing Works to preserve the affordability of 200 units in Cypress Cove (now Manzanita Apartments) while extending affordability of 11 of the units using HOME funds in 2017. In 2018-2019 the City helped preserve 6 affordable, transitional units at 1203 South Maple Street (Las Casitas) by committing CHDO funds for rehabilitation of the project. Community Housing Works is approximately 9 years into the affordability period on an acquisition/rehab project and is preserving affordability by rehabilitating a number of structural problems not addressed originally (roof, termites, rot). No at-risk units were lost in 2017, 2018 or 2019.</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>3.1 First-Time Homebuyer/Home Entry Loan Program ("HELP")</p> <p>Provide low interest loans to lower income households for closing costs and down payment, of lesser of 5% of purchase price or \$25,000, using federal HOME funds.</p> | <p>Increase homeownership opportunities for lower income households (150 households).</p> | <p>In December 2017 Housing and Neighborhood Services staff met with local real estate professionals to discuss possible impediments to issuing First-time homebuyer loans and possible solutions. The City continues to try to improve the success of the loan program. No HELP loans were funded during 2016, 2017, 2018 or 2019. 4 loans were funded during 2015, 2 during 2014 and 3 during 2013, for a total of 9 first-time homebuyer loans during the period.</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>3.2 First-Time Homebuyer /Mortgage Credit Certificates</p> <p>Provide mortgage credit certificates to first-time homebuyers to reduce federal income taxes and more easily qualify for a loan.</p> | <p>Increase homeownership opportunities for low and moderate income households (20 households).</p> | <p>Although MCCs remain available to Escondido residents, a local MCC administrator no longer exists and MCCs are not reported locally after 2014.</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>3.3 Rental Subsidy</p> <p>Provide households with affordable rents through rent subsidy programs for households with incomes not exceeding</p> | <p>Provide rental subsidy to 110 very low-income senior/disabled households in mobile home</p> | <p>During 2019, 1,040 Escondido households were assisted with a Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8 voucher), administered through the Housing Authority of San Diego County. An additional 2,032 households are on the wait list in Escondido. At the end of 2019, 23 senior/disabled households in mobile home parks and an</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|---|--|---|---|
| 50% of the Area Median Income. | parks and apartments. Support Rental Assist 1,200 very-low income households with Housing Choice Vouchers through collaboration with Housing Authority of San Diego County. | additional 7 in apartments, for a total of 30, were receiving a monthly rental subsidy from the City of Escondido while waiting for HUD Section 8 eligibility. Eligibility for the Rental Subsidy Program was tightened in 2012 due to the loss of redevelopment funds and the number of monthly subsidies has slowly declined. | |
| 3.4 Mobile Home Park Conversion Provide technical assistance to mobile home resident groups in the conversion of existing parks to resident ownership. | Continue mobile home resident ownership opportunities for lower income residents. Continue to work with City policies and procedures to assist in conversions. | The City continues to provide technical assistance to mobile home parks considering conversions to resident ownership. No recent conversions have been requested. The City has been advised on the purchase of an existing mobile homes park and the potential change of use, although the owner is not currently moving forward. The City continues to manage the remaining City-owned spaces in Escondido Views (4 lots) and Mountain Shadows (22 lots) mobile home parks. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |
| 3.5 Mobile Home Rent Review Rent review via the Rent Review Board of applications for increases in mobile home parks. | Stabilize rents for mobile home residents, many of whom are lower income. | During 2019, 5 short-form rent review hearings and no long-form rent review hearings were held. Average monthly increases approved for short form applications ranged from \$9.88 to \$18.41. Throughout the planning period (2015-2019), a total of 39 short-form rent review hearings and one long-form rent review hearings were held. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |
| 3.6 Fair Housing Actively engage in furthering fair housing for all residents through specific education outreach and monitoring activities. | Continue enforcement of the Fair Housing Plan which will prevent discrimination in housing and disputes between landlords and tenants. | In 2019 the City contracted with the Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc. to provide Fair Housing Services to Escondido residents, including handling reports of discrimination, and providing counseling and mediation in landlord/tenant disputes. City staff continues to disperse information at public counters, review potential impediments to fair housing, and meet with other jurisdictions to discuss and address regional issues. The City of Escondido has been working collaboratively with other jurisdictions in the San Diego County region to address Fair Housing reporting in compliance with HUD's current requirements. | This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element. |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>4.1 Emergency Shelters</p> <p>Amend the Zoning Code to permit emergency shelters by right, consistent with State law.</p> | <p>Ensure Zoning Code is consistent with state law. Provide of shelter for families /individuals with special needs.</p> | <p>The City's Emergency Shelter Overlay, in compliance with State law, was approved by the City Council in October 2013. Staff re-evaluated the size and location of the Overlay in 2015, but left the language unchanged. The City is in compliance with State law. A year round shelter operated by Interfaith Community Services currently operates outside the Overlay area.</p> | <p>This program is completed.</p> |
| <p>4.2 Transitional/ Supportive Housing</p> <p>Amend the zoning code to differentiate transitional/supportive housing operated as group quarters versus a regular housing development. Uses will be permitted where housing is otherwise permitted.</p> | <p>Increase housing opportunities for special needs persons.</p> | <p>An amendment to the Zoning Code to define transitional and supportive housing as specified in State law, and to permit both where residential units are otherwise permitted, was completed in June 2017.</p> | <p>The Zoning Code amendment was completed during this planning period. A modified version of this program is included in the 2021 Housing Element.</p> |
| <p>4.3 Senior Housing Ordinance</p> <p>Amend the Zoning Code to permit senior housing by right where housing is permitted.</p> | <p>Increase housing opportunities for seniors.</p> | <p>An amendment to the Zoning Code to permit senior housing by right where housing is permitted, was completed in June 2017.</p> | <p>The Zoning Code amendment was completed during this planning period.</p> |
| <p>4.4 Monitoring of Growth Management Measure</p> <p>Periodically monitor and evaluate Proposition S for its impacts on the cost, supply and timing of affordable housing. Analyze the ability to accommodate the city's regional housing need, constraints on supply and affordability of housing.</p> | <p>Increase public awareness of the City's housing needs and obligations under state law.</p> | <p>The City's Housing Element shows that the City's RHNA can be accommodated. In 2018 it does not appear that the existence of Proposition "S" discouraged or prevented construction of market or affordable units. The City will continue to monitor RHNA progress annually to determine whether growth management policies impact the City's ability to accommodate its affordable housing need.</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element</p> |
| <p>5.1 Affordable Housing Financing</p> | <p>Acquisition, rehabilitation, preservation or</p> | <p>Staff continues to pursue all available opportunities to utilize additional funding sources for potential projects and programs, including tax</p> | <p>This program is included in the 2021 Housing Element</p> |

Table D- 1: Review of Past Accomplishments

| 2013 Housing Element | Objective | Accomplishment | Continued Appropriateness |
|--|--|---|--|
| Continue to pursue a variety of funding sources to support affordable housing in the community. | construction of affordable housing for lower and moderate income households. | credits, grants and collaboration with non-profit providers. | |
| <p>5.2 Housing Information and Referral</p> <p>Update public information in many formats identifying the City's housing programs and provide opportunities to market those programs.</p> | Create more effective and targeted housing programs, especially for lower income households. | <p>Housing program and project information is updated as needed and is distributed via a variety of avenues, such as the City website, brochures, mailers and referral cards, and at the senior center and City Hall. Staff continues to seek additional ways to distribute information to the public. The City website was most recently overhauled at the beginning of 2018, resulting in an easier to read and use source of housing, fair housing and other information for the public. Updates to the website are ongoing as needed. In 2019, the City established the Communications and Community Services Department, which includes a Communications Officer who disseminates information through various media sources. This results in a broader reach of program information.</p> | <p>The City's website is updated periodically as a routine practice. This is removed from the Housing Element as a specific program.</p> |



Appendix E: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

In January 2017, Assembly Bill 686 (AB 686) introduced an obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (“AFFH”) into California state law. AB 686 defined “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat[ing] discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. The Bill added an assessment of fair housing to the Housing Element which includes the following components: a summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the City’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity; an analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities, an assessment of contributing factors, and an identification of fair housing goals and actions.

A. Assessment of Fair Housing Issues

Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach

The City of Escondido is committed to furthering fair housing efforts by promoting fair and equal housing opportunities for its residents. It has committed to highlighting the Fair Housing Law, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), by continuing to address discrimination in the community and to support programs that will educate the public about the right to equal housing opportunities.

The City of Escondido provides fair housing services to its residents through Legal Aid Society San Diego (LASSD). LASSD, a fair housing provider, is contracted annually with CDBG funds as part of the City’s Fair Housing Program. LASSD provides fair housing services to guarantee equal housing opportunity to Escondido residents. The LASSD provides the following fair housing related services:

- Tenant-Landlord mediation
- Fair housing counseling and dispute mediation
- Educational fair housing seminars for tenants and landlords (English and Spanish and other languages upon request)
- Services to tenants, landlords and apartment managers
- Real estate and rental practice discrimination audits
- Legal services and advocacy
- Enforcement of fair housing laws through conciliation, litigation, or administration referrals.

Walk-in services are offered at three LASSD office locations in San Diego County- Southeast, Midtown, and North County. However, these offices are located in the City of San Diego and Oceanside. For this reason, LASSD has established a Fair Housing Hotline to ensure its Fair Housing services are readily available to the community and that a resident may promptly report any act of housing discrimination that may have occurred.



Between FY 2014 and FY 2020, LASSD served 861 Escondido residents, accounting for 4% of LASSD's clients served across San Diego County. LASSD filed 156 fair housing complaints by Escondido residents, accounting for about 8.5% of the cases filed by LASSD for the entire County. LASSD also provided the results of Fair Housing Tests during this period in the 2020 Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (2020 Regional AI). Escondido tested for discrimination based on disability, familial status, sexual orientation, and race at 53 sites and showed disparate treatment (discrimination) at eight sites (15% of sites). Five sites showed unequal treatment when testing for disability (reasonable accommodation) and three showed unequal treatment on the basis of sexual orientation. The rate of differential treatment testing results in Escondido is similar to the County trend. Of the 465 test sites across San Diego County, 55 (12%) showed disparate treatment.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") also maintains a record of all housing discrimination complaints filed in local jurisdictions. These grievances can be filed on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, religion, familial status and retaliation. From October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2018, 13 fair housing complaints in Escondido were filed with HUD, accounting for 3% of cases in the County. Overall, disability-related discrimination was the most commonly reported—reported in nine cases (70% of cases). Complaints concerning national origin (one complaint), race (three complaints), and retaliation (two complaints) were also reported. During the same time period, a total of 414 cases were filed across San Diego County. Like in Escondido, disability was the basis for discrimination in over half of the cases (281 cases).

The 2020 Regional AI found that enforcement services were inadequate in the region. However, between 2014-2020, 53 sites in Escondido were tested for discrimination. The City will work with LASSD to ensure continued consistent testing. The 2020 Regional AI also found that outreach services were also inadequate in the region as residents may find it hard to navigate the service system and identify the appropriate agency to contact. The City of Escondido has a dedicated fair housing page in the City website (<https://www.escondido.org/fair-housing.aspx>). The fair housing webpage advertises upcoming fair housing workshops and hosts LASSD fair housing informational brochures posted in English, Spanish, and Arabic.

Fair Housing Issue

Discrimination and limited outreach capacity. Disability is the most commonly reported basis of discrimination in Escondido and the County. Housing & Neighborhood Services posts information about the fair housing provider and meetings on a dedicated page ~~ion~~ on their website and works with the Communications Department to add information to the weekly manager's report/email blasts and City-wide newsletters. However, additional avenues of outreach may be necessary to reach the groups that may not be as connected digitally.

Contributing factors:

- Private discrimination
- Lack of education and enforcement of fair housing laws
- Limited media marketing
- Meetings in same sites/same times



Segregation and Integration

Race and Ethnicity

Ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, as it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences and mobility. Dissimilarity indices can be used to measure the extent to which a distribution of any two groups differs across block groups. Racial and ethnic dissimilarity trends for Escondido and San Diego-Carlsbad Region are shown in Table E-1. The following shows how HUD views various levels of the index:

- <40: Low Segregation
- 40-54: Moderate Segregation
- >55: High Segregation

From 1990 to 2020, block groups in Escondido have become increasingly segregated. Non-white and White residents have the highest dissimilarity indices, indication a high degree of segregation between Whites and minority races. Hispanic segregation from Whites scored as “moderate segregation” and had the highest score between race/ethnic comparisons.

Nevertheless, Escondido showed a lower extent of segregation in comparison to the San Diego-Carlsbad region as a whole where the dissimilarity indices for Non-White/White, Black/White, Hispanic/White, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White were all categorized as moderately segregation (compared to only Hispanic/Whites being considered moderately segregated in Escondido).

| Table E-1: Racial/Ethnic Dissimilarity Index | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | 1990 Trend | 2000 Trend | 2010 Trend | Current |
| Escondido | | | | |
| Non-White/White | 30.7 | 36.5 | 35.2 | 38.4 |
| Black/White | 23.5 | 27.1 | 27.2 | 34.1 |
| Hispanic/White | 35.0 | 42.0 | 40.2 | 42.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander/White | 15.9 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 19.3 |
| San Diego County | | | | |
| Non-White/White | 43.4 | 45.2 | 42.9 | 46.4 |
| Black/White | 58.0 | 53.8 | 48.4 | 54.1 |
| Hispanic/White | 45.2 | 50.6 | 49.6 | 51.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander/White | 48.1 | 46.8 | 44.4 | 49.8 |

Source: HUD Dissimilarity Index, 2020,

The 2020 Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice used a minority population metric to show the integration and segregation of races. The 2020 AI defined block groups with a proportion of minority households that is greater than the overall San Diego County minority average of 54.2% as areas of minority concentration.



Figure E-1 shows that the highest concentration of minorities in Escondido is found in the center of the City. Most of the block groups on the outskirts of the City have minority concentrations below 54.2%.

HCD's AFFH mapping tool also provides data on predominant populations by race by tract. These metrics show tracts where races are the majority, and the gaps in proportion between tracts. In Escondido, only non-Hispanic White and Hispanic populations were predominant in certain tracts of the City (Figure E-2). Hispanic population is predominant in the center of the City, while White population is predominant in the outskirts. The predominantly Hispanic population is located in the urban downtown area of the City, which is also part of District 1.

Historically, minority populations have been found in the center of the City but have expanded in the last 25 years. According to the National Latino Research Center¹⁰, the City refers to the Hispanic community bordered by Lincoln Avenue to the north, Ash Street to the east, Valley Parkway to the south and Centre City Parkway to the west in the center of the city as the Mission Park community. The Urban Displacement projects mapping tool in Figure E-3 show the expansion of majority Hispanic population in the center to the east, as well as a diversification of population in the tracts in adjacent to the majority Hispanic tracts, changing from majority non-Hispanic White to no majority.

¹⁰ "Mission Park Community Survey Escondido, California." Survey Report prepared by National Latino Research Center and California State University, San Marcos. June 2006.



Figure E-1: Areas of Minority Concentration in Escondido (2018)






Figure E-2: Predominant Populations- White and Hispanic Majorities








Figure E-3: Change in Racial Composition, 1990-2015



Source: Urban Displacement Project, <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/map/socal/#>





Persons with Disabilities

According to the 2020 Regional AI, housing choices for special needs groups, especially persons with disabilities, are limited in the region. In San Diego County, about 10% of the population has a disability. Escondido has a population of persons with disabilities comparable to the County (10.5%) but higher than its neighboring cities of San Marcos (8%), Vista (7.6%), and Poway (10%). Figure E-4 shows that in the North County region, San Marcos, Oceanside, Carlsbad, and Hidden Meadows have the highest concentration of persons with disabilities, with the population with a disability ranging between 10 and 20% per tract. Within Escondido, tracts in the northwestern and southeastern areas of the City have the highest concentration of persons with disabilities.



Figure E-4: Distribution of Persons with Disabilities





Familial Status

Familial status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, whether the child is biologically related to the head of household, and the marital status of the head of households. According to the AFFH data tool (Figure E-5), there is a tract with a high concentration of population of adults living alone in the City, which is the same tract with 20-30% of population with a disability. Adults living with their spouse are predominantly concentrated in tracts outside of the City, where the population of adults living with their spouse is over 40%, in comparison to the 20 to 40% population located in the center tracts of the City (Figure E-6).

Families with children may face housing discrimination by landlords who fear that children will cause property damage. Some landlords may have cultural biases against children of the opposite sex sharing a bedroom. Differential treatments such as limiting the number of children in a complex, or confining children to a specific location, are also fair housing concerns. Single parent households are also protected by fair housing law. The 2020 AI reported that 36% of Escondido households were families with children, and 7.6% of households were single-female-headed households with children. The proportion of single female-headed households with children is higher than the neighboring cities of San Marcos (5.7%), Vista (7.2%), and Poway (4.6%), and the County overall (6%). According to the HCD AFFH map in Figure E-7, children in married households are most concentrated in the outside tracts of the City and are most concentrated along the City limits. The percent of children in married households in these tract ranges between 60 and over 80%. By contrast, children in single female-headed households are concentrated in the center of the City (Figure E-8). Female-headed households with children require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services.



Figure E-5: Percent Population of Adults Living Alone




Figure E-6: Percent Population of Adults Living with Spouse






Figure E-7: Percent Children in Married Households





Figure E-8: Percent Children in Single Female-Headed Households





Income Level

Identifying low or moderate income (LMI) geographies and individuals is important to overcome patterns of segregation. Figure E-9 shows the LMI areas in the County by Census block group. HUD defines a LMI area as a Census tract or block group where over 51% of the population is LMI (based on HUD income definition of up to 80% of the AMI). LMI areas are concentrated in three very general areas in the County. In the North County area, LMI areas are seen at Camp Pendleton and in the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido, in a pattern generally following State Route 78. In the southern portion of the County, clusters of LMI areas are seen in the central and southern areas of the City of San Diego and continuing down to the U.S./Mexico border, including the City of Imperial Beach. The City of Escondido has a variety of population income distribution (Figure E-10). The census tracts in the center of the City have the highest concentration of LMI population (from 50 to up to 100%). The census tracts on the outskirts of town have lower concentration of LMI population.

Figure E-9: Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Areas in the County







Figure E-10: Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Areas in Escondido



5/4/2021, 4:17:42 PM

1:144,448

City/Town Boundaries

(A) Low to Moderate Income Population (HUD) - Tract

< 25%

25% - 50%

50% - 75%

75% - 100%

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community, Esri, HERE, NPS

Esri, HERE, NPS | PlaceWorks 2021, HUD 2019 | PlaceWorks 2021, ESRI, U.S. Census | PlaceWorks 2021, TCAC 2020 | PlaceWorks 2021, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

CA HCD



Housing Choice Vouchers

The Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) provides rental assistance to very low income households who obtain housing in the private rental market. The HCV program's success depends upon the ability of participants to search for and find suitable housing in the private rental market. The program encourages participants to avoid high-poverty neighborhoods, and encourages the recruitment of landlords with rental properties in lower-poverty neighborhoods. Figure E-11 shows that housing choice voucher use is concentrated in the central census tracts of the City near its downtown area, where 5 to 15% of the tract renters are HCV participants. These census tracts with the HCV participants also have among the lowest Housing Affordability Index in the area and the highest concentration of population living in poverty (Figure E-12 and Figure E-13). This means HCV participants are finding housing in the most affordable areas of the City. However, these affordable areas are also the areas with the concentration of special needs households (persons with disabilities, children in female-headed households, low and moderate income households), and low resources according to the TCAC Opportunity Maps.

Figure E-11: Distribution of Housing Choice Vouchers in Escondido








Figure E-12: Affordability Index in Escondido



SanGIS, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS | PlaceWorks 2021, HUD 2019 | PlaceWorks 2021, Esri, U.S. Census | PlaceWorks 2021, TCAC 2020 | PlaceWorks



Figure E-13: Poverty Status in Escondido



SanGIS, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

SanGIS, Bureau of Land Management, Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, EPA, NPS | PlaceWorks 2021, HUD 2019 | PlaceWorks 2021, ESRI, U.S. Census | PlaceWorks 2021, TCAD 2020 | PlaceWorks 2021, U.S.



Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs)

To assist in this analysis of Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP), the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task force to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD).” The Task force has created Opportunity Maps to identify resource levels across the State “to accompany new policies aimed at increasing access to high opportunity areas for families with children in housing financed with 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)”. These opportunity maps are made from composite scores of three different domains made up of a set of indicators. Table E-2 shows the full list of indicators. The opportunity maps include a measure or “filter” to identify areas with poverty and racial segregation. To identify these areas, census tracts were first filtered by poverty and then by a measure of racial segregation. The criteria for these filters were:

- Poverty: Tracts with at least 30% of population under federal poverty line
- Racial Segregation: Tracts with location quotient higher than 1.25 for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, or all people of color in comparison to the County

| Table E-2: Domains and List of Indicators for Opportunity Maps | |
|---|--|
| Domain | Indicator |
| Economic | Poverty Adult education Employment Job proximity Median home value |
| Environmental | CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution Indicators and values |
| Education | Math proficiency Reading proficiency High School graduation rates Student poverty rates |
| Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for the 2020 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020 | |

According to the California Fair Housing Task Force’s 2021 opportunity maps, there are two census tracts (202.14 and 202.13) or areas of high racial segregation and poverty in Escondido (Figure E-14). These two tracts are adjacent and are located southeast of the intersection of North Centre Parkway and Lincoln Avenue in the center of the City. Parts of high segregation and high poverty were also identified as the Mission Park community in a 2006 report by the National Latino Research Center (Figure E-15). The Mission Park community is discussed in detailed in the Local Knowledge section). Regionally, areas with high segregation and poverty are located in Oceanside in the North County and in the Southern County, specifically in Chula Vista, National City, and the City of San Diego.



Figure E-14: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map





Figure E-15: Mission Park Community



Note: The term "Mission Park" is not readily recognized by community residents. Coined by the city, it demarcates a locale in the center of the City. It is bordered by Lincoln Avenue to the north, Ash Street to the east, Valley Parkway to the south and Centre City Parkway to the west.

Source: National Latino Research Center and Cal State San Marcos.

https://www.csusm.edu/nlrc/documents/2006/missionpark_community_survey_2006.pdf



In an effort to identify racially/ethnically-concentrated areas of poverty (RECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-White population (greater than 50 percent) and has a poverty rate that exceeds 40 percent or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower. In San Diego County, there are RECAPs scattered in small sections of El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, and Chula Vista (Figure E-16). A census tract in the center of the City of Escondido is considered a R/ECAPs (Figure E-17).

Figure E-16: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) - San Diego County








Figure E-17: Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAPs) - Escondido



5/4/2021, 5:28:16 PM

City/Town Boundaries



Esri, HERE, Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

Esri, HERE | PlaceWorks 2021, HUD 2019 | PlaceWorks 2021, ESRI, U.S. Census | PlaceWorks 2021, TCAC 2020 | PlaceWorks 2021, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 2020 | CA HCD



Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence

While racially concentrated areas of poverty and segregation (RECAPs) have long been the focus of fair housing policies, racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) must also be analyzed to ensure housing is integrated, a key to fair housing choice. According to a policy paper published by HUD, RCAA is defined as affluent, White communities.¹¹ According to HUD's policy paper, Whites are the most racially segregated group in the United States and in the same way neighborhood disadvantage is associated with concentrated poverty and high concentrations of people of color, conversely, distinct advantages are associated with residence in affluent, White communities.



While HCD has created its own metric for RCAAs, at the time of this writing the map on the AFFH tool is not available. Thus, the definition of RCAAs used in this analysis uses the definition by the scholars at the University of Minnesota Humphrey School of Public Affairs cited in HCD's memo.¹² RCAAs are defined as census tracts where 1) 80% or more of the population is White, and 2) the median household income is \$125,000 or greater (slightly more than double the national the median household income in 2016). As shown in Figure E-18, there are two block groups in the southern tip of the City (in yellow) with more than 80% non-Hispanic white population. The median income in one of these block groups is more than \$125,000 (and between \$87,000 and \$125,000 in the other). At a City level, block groups with higher non-White population (lower non-minority concentrations shown in map), also tended to have higher median incomes.

¹¹ Goetz, Edward G., Damiano, A., & Williams, R. A. (2019) Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation.' Published by the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research (21,1, 99-123).

¹² Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements (April 2021 Update)



Figure E-18: Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Affluence (RCAAs) - Escondido





Fair Housing Issue

Patterns of segregation: Minorities, low income households, children in female-headed households, housing choice voucher use, and persons with disabilities are concentrated in the downtown areas (center census tracts of the City). These census tracts also had high poverty rates. A census tract (202.13) within this segregated area (in the downtown) is also considered a R/ECAP. By contrast, census tracts in the outer edges of the City have a concentration of whites and higher median incomes.

Escondido has developed from a rural community to a city with a dense urban center surrounded by suburban and rural uses. The central portion of Escondido offers a mixed use development comprised primarily of retail and housing uses, ranging from single family housing to some of the highest density multi-family housing in the City. Central Escondido includes the City's historic downtown and Old Escondido Historic District, medical facilities, and schools. North Central Escondido also includes the Mission Park Area which has a pattern of residential overcrowding, prevalence of poverty and cost-burdened households, and a concentration of Hispanic households.

Central Escondido is the closest neighborhood to the Escondido Transit Center which is a multi-modal transit hub, including light rail and a bus system. Recent projects have been designed to enhance community engagement and improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, including location specific (safe routes to schools), corridor (to close gaps in the bicycle/pedestrian network) and ADA improvements. Additional improvements are planned to recreate a Class I bicycle trail along the Escondido Creek as a linear trail with separate transportation and recreation elements. Other recent planning efforts to increase resources in this neighborhood while minimizing gentrification include the Downtown Grand Avenue Vision Plan, the adoption of an Updated Climate Action Plan, ongoing efforts to create an East Valley Specific Plan, and an Environmental Justice Element pursuant to Section 65302(h) in compliance with SB 1000.

Contributing Factors:

- Historical patterns of minority concentration
- Location of affordable housing
- Land use and zoning laws (high density and mobile park designations in these areas)
- Lack of recruitment of landlords in high opportunity areas for HCV use

Access to Opportunities

TCAC/HCD

As discussed earlier, HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task force that created Opportunity Maps to identify resources levels across the state. Every year, the Fair Housing Task Force updates opportunity maps that assess census tracts for place-based characteristics, including population and demographic factors, employment access, and economic mobility. Census tracts are grouped into six categories based on an analysis of access to opportunity:

- Highest Resource



- High Resource
- Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
- Moderate Resource
- Low Resource
- High Segregation & Poverty

Escondido does not have any highest resource, high resource, or moderate resource (rapidly changing) census tracts (Table E-3). While tracts range from high poverty and segregation to moderate resources, there is a geographic pattern for low resource tracts in the center of the City, which correspond with the tracts that have a high concentration of low income Hispanic population (Figure E-14, Figure E-10). These census tracts also have a high concentration of single-female headed households (Figure E-8). By contrast, tracts with moderate resources are those with married couples or married families with children, with a non-majority race composition. Overall, the City's semi-rural/suburban areas are considered moderate and low resource, and the Downtown, East Valley, and South Centre City Parkway areas are considered low resource, with two tracts considered to have "high segregation and poverty." Part of tract 202.14, considered an area of high segregation and poverty, is also part of Mission Park's community.



Table E-3: Opportunity Map Scores by Census Tract

| Census Tract | Economic Domain Score | Environmental Domain Score | Education Domain Score | Composite Index | Final Category |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 6073020103 | 0.379 | 0.092 | 0.424 | -0.293 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020105 | 0.41 | 0.349 | 0.409 | -0.183 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020106 | 0.412 | 0.431 | 0.171 | -0.337 | Low Resource |
| 6073020107 | 0.236 | 0.655 | 0.156 | -0.439 | Low Resource |
| 6073020108 | 0.087 | 0.309 | 0.092 | -0.644 | Low Resource |
| 6073020109 | 0.25 | 0.332 | 0.126 | -0.492 | Low Resource |
| 6073020202 | 0.051 | 0.265 | 0.108 | -0.687 | Low Resource |
| 6073020206 | 0.046 | 0.32 | 0.451 | -0.427 | Low Resource |
| 6073020207 | 0.058 | 0.294 | 0.415 | -0.458 | Low Resource |
| 6073020208 | 0.238 | 0.34 | 0.422 | -0.292 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020209 | 0.024 | 0.338 | 0.415 | -0.524 | Low Resource |
| 6073020210 | 0.191 | 0.325 | 0.267 | -0.452 | Low Resource |
| 6073020211 | 0.065 | 0.256 | 0.393 | -0.491 | Low Resource |
| 6073020213 | 0.043 | 0.301 | 0.108 | N/A | High Segregation & Poverty |
| 6073020214 | 0.009 | 0.219 | 0.053 | N/A | High Segregation & Poverty |
| 6073020304 | 0.496 | 0.178 | 0.658 | 0.061 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020305 | 0.398 | 0.234 | 0.484 | -0.139 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020306 | 0.407 | 0.109 | 0.74 | 0.071 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020307 | 0.256 | 0.021 | 0.588 | -0.477 | Low Resource |
| 6073020308 | 0.029 | 0.232 | 0.087 | -0.762 | Low Resource |
| 6073020309 | 0.263 | 0.084 | 0.537 | -0.288 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020401 | 0.573 | 0.082 | 0.644 | 0.021 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020403 | 0.456 | 0.121 | 0.207 | -0.382 | Low Resource |
| 6073020404 | 0.588 | 0.032 | 0.499 | -0.213 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020405 | 0.754 | 0.044 | 0.644 | 0.079 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020500 | 0.209 | 0.111 | 0.222 | -0.552 | Low Resource |
| 6073020601 | 0.13 | 0.162 | 0.113 | -0.645 | Low Resource |
| 6073020602 | 0.188 | 0.287 | 0.036 | -0.63 | Low Resource |
| 6073020705 | 0.364 | 0.448 | 0.405 | -0.204 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020706 | 0.544 | 0.241 | 0.516 | -0.019 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020707 | 0.197 | 0.574 | 0.207 | -0.444 | Low Resource |
| 6073020708 | 0.581 | 0.354 | 0.46 | -0.005 | Moderate Resource |
| 6073020709 | 0.497 | 0.08 | 0.174 | -0.422 | Low Resource |

Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020.



Opportunity Indicators

HUD developed an index for assessing fair housing by informing communities about disparities in access to opportunity. The index was included in the 2020 San Diego Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice ("AI"). Table E-4 shows index scores for the following opportunity indicator indices (values range from 0 to 100):

In Escondido:

- **Low Poverty Index:** The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.
Black, Hispanic, and Native-Americans have a higher exposure to poverty than White and Asian/Pacific Islanders, with Hispanics having the lowest score/highest exposure.
- **School Proficiency Index:** The higher the score, the higher the school system quality is in a neighborhood.
White population had scored highest than all other races, indicating higher school quality system in their neighborhoods. Hispanics scored the lowest.
- **Labor Market Engagement Index:** The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood.
Whites scored the highest and Hispanics scored the lowest, indicating a higher labor force participation and human capital among Whites compared to all other minority races.
- **Transit Trips Index:** The higher the trips transit index, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.
Hispanics scored the highest and whites scored the lowest, indicating Hispanics are more likely to use public transit.
- **Low Transportation Cost Index:** The higher the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.
Cost of transportation was lowest for Hispanics and highest for whites. This may be related to the high use of public transit by Hispanics.
- **Jobs Proximity Index:** The higher the index value, the better access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.
Native-Americans scored the highest, followed by Hispanic and Blacks. Whites scored among the lowest on job proximity, indication a lower access to employment opportunities for White residents.
- **Environmental Health Index:** The higher the value, the better environmental quality of a neighborhood.
Whites scored the highest while Hispanics scored the lowest, indicating White population has access to better environmental quality while Hispanics have the worst.

Overall, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American communities were more likely to be impacted by poverty, limited access to proficient schools, lower labor market participation rates, and poor environmental quality than White residents. Hispanic residents were the most likely to reside in areas with the lowest environmental quality levels, lowest school proficiency, lowest labor market engagement and most exposure to poverty. Hispanic residents were also most likely to use public transportation.



While these indices do not show the geographic distribution of these communities, given that Hispanic population is highly concentrated in the urban downtown center of the City (including the Mission Park community), it is likely that the Hispanic community in this area of the City is experiencing unequal access to opportunities compared to other areas of the City. This is supported by the individual analysis in the previous sections of this analysis which identified tract 202.14 as R/ECAP.

In the County, Native American, Black, and Hispanic residents were more likely (compared to other racial/ethnic groups) to be impacted by poverty, limited access to proficient schools, lower labor participation rate. Black residents were most likely to reside in areas with the lowest environmental quality levels, the lowest accessibility to employment centers, and the lowest cost of transportation. Black and Asian residents scored highest as most likely to utilize public transportation.



Table E-4: Opportunity Indicators in Escondido and San Diego County

| | Low Poverty | School Proficiency | Labor Market | Transit | Low Transportation Cost | Jobs | Environmental Health |
|--|-------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|-------------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Escondido | | | | | | | |
| Total Population | | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 43.28 | 37.79 | 41.14 | 78.66 | 63.19 | 41.67 | 39.58 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 33.94 | 28.16 | 32.53 | 86.74 | 71.34 | 42.83 | 33.46 |
| Hispanic | 30.08 | 21.66 | 29.39 | 88.31 | 72.37 | 42.35 | 30.93 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | 42.64 | 34.36 | 39.52 | 80.57 | 64.68 | 40.38 | 38.63 |
| Native American, non-Hispanic | 37.19 | 28.36 | 35.76 | 84.03 | 68.32 | 44.13 | 34.78 |
| Population below federal poverty line | | | | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | 35.98 | 32.2 | 37.19 | 84.22 | 68.56 | 42.83 | 35.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 26.28 | 22.15 | 31.14 | 88.59 | 76.63 | 42.18 | 30.13 |
| Hispanic | 25.71 | 20.75 | 26.71 | 90.17 | 75.36 | 46.89 | 27.52 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | 21.05 | 16.34 | 28.22 | 88.42 | 68.27 | 39.84 | 31.09 |
| Native American, non-Hispanic | 28.73 | 22.45 | 26.37 | 89.23 | 75.52 | 28.60 | 32.84 |
| San Diego County | | | | | | | |
| Total Population | | | | | | | |
| White, Non-Hispanic | 61.91 | 64.61 | 48.93 | 70.89 | 55.42 | 52.89 | 54.81 |
| Black, Non-Hispanic | 51.74 | 53.72 | 35.21 | 78.11 | 63.07 | 49.79 | 43.66 |
| Hispanic | 51.71 | 53.49 | 37.87 | 75.68 | 60.19 | 51.28 | 47.15 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic | 65.75 | 64.96 | 55.06 | 78.19 | 59.63 | 51.68 | 47.98 |
| Native American, Non-Hispanic | 50.41 | 48.00 | 31.93 | 54.60 | 47.68 | 56.76 | 67.85 |
| Population below federal poverty line | | | | | | | |
| White, Non-Hispanic | 51.94 | 58.45 | 41.93 | 72.79 | 58.18 | 52.36 | 51.65 |
| Black, Non-Hispanic | 42.16 | 42.08 | 33.28 | 86.15 | 69.30 | 48.05 | 36.75 |
| Hispanic | 39.99 | 46.71 | 32.57 | 79.68 | 65.00 | 48.70 | 42.87 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic | 60.01 | 60.14 | 48.58 | 75.21 | 59.26 | 51.72 | 50.68 |
| Native American, Non-Hispanic | 45.10 | 37.12 | 34.42 | 64.82 | 54.52 | 51.65 | 57.91 |
| Source: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing ("AFFH") Data and Mapping Tool ("AFFH-T"), 2017. | | | | | | | |



Fair Housing Issues

White residents are located on the outskirts of the City and have access to better schools, environmental quality, and labor market participation than Escondido minorities. There is a concentration of affluence for whites in the outskirts, with higher median incomes (lower exposure to poverty). Alternatively, minorities, which are concentrated in the center of the City have limited access to opportunities (lower school quality, environmental quality, labor force participation) and live in lower resource areas (with some in areas with high poverty and segregation).

Contributing Factors:

- Racially concentrated areas of affluence in outskirts of City
- Location of affordable housing
- Lower quality schools in central census tracts
- Lower environmental quality in central census tracts

Disproportionate Needs

The AFFH Rule Guidebook defines 'disproportionate housing needs' as 'a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing needs when compared to the proportion of a member of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing the category of housing need in the applicable geographic area' (24 C.F.R. § 5.152). The analysis is completed by assessing cost burden, severe cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing.

Housing Problems

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) developed by the Census for HUD provides detailed information on housing needs by income level for different types of households. The following conditions are considered housing problems according to HUD CHAS data:

- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30 percent of gross income;
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50 percent of gross income;
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room); and/or Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom)



Table E-5: Any Housing Problem by Tenure and Race

| With Housing Problem | White | Black | Asian | Am Ind | Pac. Islander | Hispanic | Other | All |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|
| Escondido | | | | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 30.6% | 29.5% | 38.7% | 8.2% | 0.0% | 48.8% | 46.7% | 35.8% |
| Renter-Occupied | 57.7% | 49.5% | 51.3% | 61.9% | 70.0% | 74.9% | 53.6% | 66.1% |
| All Households | 40.5% | 44.6% | 43.1% | 44.8% | 35.0% | 66.8% | 50.1% | 51.0% |
| San Diego County | | | | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 31.2% | 39.7% | 33.6% | 25.2% | 31.5% | 43.0% | 35.6% | 33.9% |
| Renter-Occupied | 50.9% | 62.3% | 51.1% | 52.0% | 60.9% | 67.1% | 55.2% | 57.1% |
| All Households | 38.9% | 55.4% | 41.0% | 38.0% | 51.6% | 57.7% | 46.9% | 44.8% |
| Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017. | | | | | | | | |

As shown in Table E-5, housing problems were most prevalent amongst Hispanic households. Pacific Islander and White households were least likely to have a housing problem. Approximately 67% of Hispanic households had one or more housing problem, and renter Hispanic households had the highest incidence of housing problems across of all races and tenues (75%). In comparison, only 51% of all households in the City experienced one or more housing problems. A higher proportion of Escondido households experienced housing problems than the County (51% and 45%, respectively). Escondido renters also experienced housing problems at higher rates than the County (66% versus 57%). While renter-occupied Hispanic households also experience the highest rates of housing problems in the County (67%), Escondido's Hispanic renter households experience housing problems at higher rates.

Elderly and large households may also be subject to disproportionate housing problems, whether it is affordability or adequate physical needs (number of rooms, complete facilities). Table E-6 shows that renter elderly (66%) and large households (84%) experience housing problems at a greater rates than all households in the City (51%) and County (45%). Renters in both the City and the County experience housing problems at a greater rate than owners. However, a larger proportion of large renter-households experience housing problems than all the County large renter-households.

Table E-6: Housing Problems for Elderly and Large Households by Tenure

| With Housing Problem | Renters | | | Owners | | | All HH |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|------------|--------|
| | Elderly | Large HH | All Renter | Elderly | Large HH | All Owners | |
| Escondido | 65.5% | 83.8% | 66.0% | 34.9% | 59.3% | 31.9% | 50.9% |
| San Diego County | 62.1% | 79.6% | 57.1% | 33.8% | 46.3% | 33.9% | 44.8% |
| Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017 | | | | | | | |



Cost Burden

A household is considered cost burdened if it spends more than 30% of its income in housing costs, including utilities. Similar to the any housing problem trends, Hispanic households experience cost burdens at highest rates compared to all other races and all households in Escondido (Table E-7). All racial minorities, except Asian and Pacific Islanders, experienced cost burden at higher rates than Whites. Also, renters, regardless of race, experience cost burdens at higher rates than owners in both the City and County.

Escondido elderly and large households also experience cost burdens at slightly higher rates than the County, but renters of these groups experience the cost burden at the highest rates. More than two thirds of elderly-households experience cost burdens (Table E-8).

| Table E-7: Cost Burden by Tenure and Race | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| Cost Burden >30% | White | Black | Asian | Am Ind | Pac Islander | Hispanic | Other | All |
| Escondido | | | | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 29.6% | 28.3% | 31.6% | 8.0% | 0.0% | 37.8% | 47.1% | 31.9% |
| Renter-Occupied | 55.3% | 49.7% | 43.3% | 61.9% | 77.8% | 61.0% | 51.8% | 57.5% |
| All Households | 38.9% | 44.6% | 35.7% | 44.5% | 36.8% | 53.9% | 49.4% | 44.8% |
| San Diego County | | | | | | | | |
| Owner-Occupied | 30.4% | 37.5% | 30.6% | 22.2% | 0.0% | 36.3% | 34.1% | 31.7% |
| Renter-Occupied | 48.5% | 58.9% | 43.7% | 46.1% | 54.2% | 58.2% | 51.4% | 52.0% |
| All Households | 37.5% | 52.3% | 36.2% | 33.6% | 46.9% | 49.7% | 44.1% | 41.2% |
| Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017 | | | | | | | | |

| Table E-8: Cost Burden for Elderly and Large Households by Tenure | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|
| With Cost Burden > 30% | Elderly | Large HH | All Renter | Elderly | Large HH | All Owners | All HH |
| Escondido | 63.7% | 58.3% | 57.5% | 34.6% | 34.2% | 31.9% | 44.8% |
| San Diego County | 59.8% | 56.0% | 52.0% | 33.5% | 31.3% | 31.7% | 41.3% |
| Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017 | | | | | | | |

The highest concentration of renter- and owner-households experiencing cost burdens are located on the downtown urban center census tracts within the City (Figure E-19). Renter-households with cost burdens extend across the most of the City from west to east. In these tracts, over 60% of renter-households experience housing cost burdens. For owners, the tracts with a high concentration of owners with cost burdens is limited to two tracts in the northern central part of the City.



The trend continues that census tracts/areas with high poverty and cost burdens tend to be Hispanic-dominant tracts in the center of the City



Affordability could be a barrier to housing for persons with disabilities or special needs populations who rely on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) as their primary source of income, which ranges from \$954 to \$1,776, depending on their qualifications. Households may experience cost burden when SSI incomes are not adequate to pay for rent and not increasing at rates comparable to rent increases. According to Table 34 in the Housing Element, average rental rates in Spring 2019 for a one-bedroom unit was \$1,490, which would imply SSI recipients would spend more than 30% their income on rent.



Figure E-19: Overpayment by Renter and Owner Households





Overcrowding



Overcrowding is defined as housing units with more than one person per room (including dining and living rooms but excluding bathrooms and kitchen). According to the 2018 five-year ACS estimates (Table 11 in the Housing Element), a higher percentage of households in Escondido (12%) are living in overcrowded conditions than the County (6.7%). Escondido has the highest concentration of overcrowded households in the North County region (Figure E-20). Within the City, overcrowded households are located in the central census tracts identified as having a high concentration of Hispanic population and lower income households (Figure E-20, Figure E-2, Figure E-10). In these tracts, over 15% of households are overcrowded.

Substandard Conditions

The City estimates that in any given year, about 300 units may be considered substandard and requiring rehabilitation. Escondido's substandard units are all suitable for rehabilitation. Housing age is frequently used as an indicator of housing condition. In general, residential structures over 30 years of age require minor repairs and modernization improvements, while units over 50 years of age are likely to require major rehabilitation such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. Over 88% of housing is older than 30 years old in the City, with 22% being older than 50 years old (Table 30 in the Housing Element). However, older housing units are concentrated in the central census tracts of the City (Figure E-21). According to 2014-2018 ACS data, the median year housing was built in these tracts was before 1980 (i.e. they are at least 40 years old).



Figure E-20: Distribution of Overcrowded Households



// Search / Map / B25035

Median year structure built—Estimate ▾ in **38 Geos** ▾ in **2018** ▾

Survey/Program: American Community Survey
Geographies: Census Tract

Product: 2018: ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables

Legend

- 1990–2000
- 1980–1989
- 1968–1979
- No Data

Italicized numbers indicate the number of geography areas in each data class.

VIEW TABLE

Color Palette

Data Classes
3 ▾

Classification Types
Equal Interval ▾

38 Geos

2018


200.20, 200.21, 200.22, 200.23, 200.24, 200.25, 200.26, 200.27, 200.28, 200.29, 200.30, 200.31, 200.32, 200.33, 200.34, 200.35, 200.36, 200.37, 200.38, 200.39, 200.40, 200.41, 200.42, 200.43, 200.44, 200.45, 200.46, 200.47, 200.48, 200.49, 200.50, 200.51, 200.52, 200.53, 200.54, 200.55, 200.56, 200.57, 200.58, 200.59, 200.60, 200.61, 200.62, 200.63, 200.64, 200.65, 200.66, 200.67, 200.68, 200.69, 200.70, 200.71, 200.72, 200.73, 200.74, 200.75, 200.76, 200.77, 200.78, 200.79, 200.80, 200.81, 200.82, 200.83, 200.84, 200.85, 200.86, 200.87, 200.88, 200.89, 200.90, 200.91, 200.92, 200.93, 200.94, 200.95, 200.96, 200.97, 200.98, 200.99, 201.00, 201.01, 201.02, 201.03, 201.04, 201.05, 201.06, 201.07, 201.08, 201.09, 201.10, 201.11, 201.12, 201.13, 201.14, 201.15, 201.16, 201.17, 201.18, 201.19, 201.20, 201.21, 201.22, 201.23, 201.24, 201.25, 201.26, 201.27, 201.28, 201.29, 201.30, 201.31, 201.32, 201.33, 201.34, 201.35, 201.36, 201.37, 201.38, 201.39, 201.40, 201.41, 201.42, 201.43, 201.44, 201.45, 201.46, 201.47, 201.48, 201.49, 201.50, 201.51, 201.52, 201.53, 201.54, 201.55, 201.56, 201.57, 201.58, 201.59, 201.60, 201.61, 201.62, 201.63, 201.64, 201.65, 201.66, 201.67, 201.68, 201.69, 201.70, 201.71, 201.72, 201.73, 201.74, 201.75, 201.76, 201.77, 201.78, 201.79, 201.80, 201.81, 201.82, 201.83, 201.84, 201.85, 201.86, 201.87, 201.88, 201.89, 201.90, 201.91, 201.92, 201.93, 201.94, 201.95, 201.96, 201.97, 201.98, 201.99, 202.00, 202.01, 202.02, 202.03, 202.04, 202.05, 202.06, 202.07, 202.08, 202.09, 202.10, 202.11, 202.12, 202.13, 202.14, 202.15, 202.16, 202.17, 202.18, 202.19, 202.20, 202.21, 202.22, 202.23, 202.24, 202.25, 202.26, 202.27, 202.28, 202.29, 202.30, 202.31, 202.32, 202.33, 202.34, 202.35, 202.36, 202.37, 202.38, 202.39, 202.40, 202.41, 202.42, 202.43, 202.44, 202.45, 202.46, 202.47, 202.48, 202.49, 202.50, 202.51, 202.52, 202.53, 202.54, 202.55, 202.56, 202.57, 202.58, 202.59, 202.60, 202.61, 202.62, 202.63, 202.64, 202.65, 202.66, 202.67, 202.68, 202.69, 202.70, 202.71, 202.72, 202.73, 202.74, 202.75, 202.76, 202.77, 202.78, 202.79, 202.80, 202.81, 202.82, 202.83, 202.84, 202.85, 202.86, 202.87, 202.88, 202.89, 202.90, 202.91, 202.92, 202.93, 202.94, 202.95, 202.96, 202.97, 202.98, 202.99, 203.00, 203.01, 203.02, 203.03, 203.04, 203.05, 203.06, 203.07, 203.08, 203.09, 203.10, 203.11, 203.12, 203.13, 203.14, 203.15, 203.16, 203.17, 203.18, 203.19, 203.20, 203.21, 203.22, 203.23, 203.24, 203.25, 203.26, 203.27, 203.28, 203.29, 203.30, 203.31, 203.32, 203.33, 203.34, 203.35, 203.36, 203.37, 203.38, 203.39, 203.40, 203.41, 203.42, 203.43, 203.44, 203.45, 203.46, 203.47, 203.48, 203.49, 203.50, 203.51, 203.52, 203.53, 203.54, 203.55, 203.56, 203.57, 203.58, 203.59, 203.60, 203.61, 203.62, 203.63, 203.64, 203.65, 203.66, 203.67, 203.68, 203.69, 203.70, 203.71, 203.72, 203.73, 203.74, 203.75, 203.76, 203.77, 203.78, 203.79, 203.80, 203.81, 203.82, 203.83, 203.84, 203.85, 203.86, 203.87, 203.88, 203.89, 203.90, 203.91, 203.92, 203.93, 203.94, 203.95, 203.96, 203.97, 203.98, 203.99, 204.00, 204.01, 204.02, 204.03, 204.04, 204.05, 204.06, 204.07, 204.08, 204.09, 204.10, 204.11, 204.12, 204.13, 204.14, 204.15, 204.16, 204.17, 204.18, 204.19, 204.20, 204.21, 204.22, 204.23, 204.24, 204.25, 204.26, 204.27, 204.28, 204.29, 204.30, 204.31, 204.32, 204.33, 204.34, 204.35, 204.36, 204.37, 204.38, 204.39, 204.40, 204.41, 204.42, 204.43, 204.44, 204.45, 204.46, 204.47, 204.48, 204.49, 204.50, 204.51, 204.52, 204.53, 204.54, 204.55, 204.56, 204.57, 204.58, 204.59, 204.60, 204.61, 204.62, 204.63, 204.64, 204.65, 204.66, 204.67, 204.68, 204.69, 204.70, 204.71, 204.72, 204.73, 204.74,

E-41

Displacement risk

UCLA's displacement project defines residential displacement as "the process by which a household is forced to move from its residence - or is prevented from moving into a neighborhood that was previously accessible to them because of conditions beyond their control." As part of this project, the UCLA team has identified populations vulnerable to displacement (named "sensitive communities") in the event of increased redevelopment and drastic shifts in housing cost. They defined vulnerability based on the share of low-income residents per tract and other criteria including: share of renters is above 40%, share of people of color is more than 50%, share of low-income households severely rent burdened, and proximity to displacement pressures. Displacement pressures were defined based on median rent increases and rent gaps. Using this methodology, sensitive communities are concentrated along the southern coast the City of San Diego, National City, Chula Vista and Imperial Beach and in Lemon Grove, La Mesa, and El Cajon in inland areas. In the North County, sensitive communities are located in census tracts in Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido (Figure E-22). Within the City of Escondido, sensitive communities are concentrated in the central and northcentral census tracts.

Figure E-22: Sensitive Communities



Local Knowledge

Escondido's growth has been marked by an increase in the Hispanic population. From 1990 to 2000 the City of Escondido's Hispanic population grew approximately 16 percentage points (from 23% to 39%) while the White population decreased 3 percentage points (from 71% to 68%). By 2018, the City of Escondido had one of the highest shares of Hispanic residents (52%) in the County. Only the cities of Chula Vista (60%) and National City (64%) have a higher share of Hispanic population. While the City has historically had a high proportion of Hispanic population, Hispanic population was exacerbated during World War II when the United States began contracting laborers (or braceros) to fill the labor shortages. According to the National Latino Research Center (NLRC), a labor camp located near the Mission Park neighborhood on Quince and Valley Parkway once housed nearly two hundred Mexican workers at one point. Even after the war, economic opportunities continued to attract Hispanic immigrants to the City. Today, the Mission Park community is known as a transient community, as it is the "first stop" for many immigrants in the City. As such, language is a barrier for many of its residents.

The City of Escondido discontinued its Housing Commission due to lack of funding (primarily a result of the dissolution of redevelopment). The Housing Commission's responsibility included outreach and coordination of housing programs. In 2021, the City Council established the Housing Subcommittee, an ad hoc committee comprised of two councilmembers, with staff support from the City Manager's Office, the City Clerk, City Attorney's Office, and Community Development Department. The Housing Subcommittee's purpose is to discuss pertinent housing issues within the City and convey information to city staff on such matters. The Subcommittee also reports back to the full City Council on relevant activities and topics of interest. At the most recent housing subcommittee meeting, held on February 17, 2022, the topics discussed included discussion on affordable and inclusionary housing within the City, as well as guest speaker from the City of Vista on how they are approaching housing development within their city.

On August 11, 2021 during the adoption hearing of the Housing Element, the City Council directed staff to explore additional housing programs in the future. These include the following potential programs and activities:

- Reinstating the Housing Commission
- Considering inclusionary housing
- Prioritizing homeownership
- Avoiding housing in High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and within proximity to a freeway
- Providing additional tenant protections
- Establishing a community land trust
- Considering local hire policies

Upon public review of the draft housing element, staff received substantive public comment from the Escondido Community Housing Coalition, San Diego Housing Federation, Sierra Club North County Group, and public members Erik Felix and Lauren Harper. These public comments touched on topics such as the constraints associated with Proposition S, a request to bring back the Escondido Housing Commission, support for an inclusionary housing ordinance (including land value recapture), tenant protections, request for higher performance goals on housing programs, establishment of minimum density requirements, and concerns surrounding potential perpetuation of segregation and low income communities within the City as a result of the City's RHNA sites. City staff met with public commenters to discuss their comments in January and February of 2022 and included additional language, as well as program changes, to address their concerns. As a result of those public comments, subsequent revisions to housing programs have been made, such as the addition of programs 2.9 and 2.10, revisions and/or added language to programs 1.4, 1.8, 2.1, 3.2 and 3.4; and, the addition of Housing Policy 1.11.

Other Relevant Factors

Other factors that impact the disproportionate housing needs include sanctioned and widespread exclusionary practices and policies such as redlining, and discriminatory racial covenants and real estate practices.

"Redlining" refers to the practice by mortgage lenders that involved refusing to provide loans to people within particular geographic areas except under more restrictive terms¹³. Historically, this practice impacted minorities, especially the African American and Black communities, by denying mortgages within the geographic areas where these communities resided, as identified by lending institutions such as the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Private covenants in both individual property deeds as well as within home owners' associations and neighborhood groups further exacerbated disproportionate housing needs for communities of color by excluding individuals from purchasing or renting residential properties. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has conducted national audits of racial discrimination in the rental and homeownership markets, with the most recent in 2012. The 2012 Housing Discrimination Study concluded that Black, Hispanic, and Asian households continue to experience discrimination in the housing market.

Under the Unruh Civil Rights Act of 1959, citizenship, including immigration status, is a protected class in most instances of housing accommodations in California. In 2006, Escondido's City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2006-38 R: *An Ordinance of the City of Escondido, California Establishing Penalties for the Harboring of Illegal Aliens in the City of Escondido*. This ordinance prohibited any person, or business entity, who owned a residential dwelling unit from leasing, renting, or letting undocumented persons reside knowingly, with enforcement of civil and criminal penalties for those found to have undocumented tenants residing on their property. It also established English as the official language of the City. This past ordinance was later repealed by the City Council.

Fair Housing Issue

Disproportionate Housing Needs and Displacement Risk are found primarily within census tracts in the center of the city. Renters, specifically elderly and large renter households, experience cost burden at higher rates than any other household type. Cost-burdened renters are concentrated in the center of the City. Overcrowded households are also concentrated in the center of the City.

¹³ Schwartz, A.F. (2015). *Housing Policy in the United States* (3rd ed.) (p. 336). Routledge.

Sensitive communities, those at higher risk of displacement, are also concentrated in the center of the City.

Contributing Factors

- Median rent increase
- The availability of affordable units in a range of sizes
- Lack of renter protections
- Median income of residents
- Displacement of residents due to economic pressures

B. Site Inventory

For a complete assessment of the City's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, an analysis of the RHNA sites and their impact on fair housing conditions is provided. For each map, RHNA sites are shown by their income level. Additionally, a comparison of the RHNA units is provided against that of the whole City acreage. While this helps to illustrate fair housing patterns across the City, not all land in the City is suitable for additional housing. This includes a large area dedicated to open space in the northeast portion of the City as well as low-density residential estates and residential agriculture zones on the outer portions of the City. These do impact the comparison percentages. The City's core and major population centers are located in central areas of the City.


The City is focusing growth as infill within the downtown area that has access to regional transit, employment opportunities, and social resources. Downtown Escondido is listed as a Smart Growth Opportunity Area by SANDAG. The long-term vision of the City is to prioritize infill development along transit corridors and nodes that provide and improve access to transportation, employment centers and social resources. As such, the majority of RHNA sites are located in the central area of the City.

Integration and Segregation

To assess the impact of RHNA sites on integration and segregation, the sites were looked at in the context of concentration of minority populations, populations with a disability, children in married family households and income levels.


Figure E-23 displays the RHNA sites by income distribution level with the percentage of each census block group that is non-White. The accompanying chart (Figure E-24) displays the percentage of RHNA units and total city acreage that are in each quartile. The majority of low and moderate income RHNA units are clustered within the Downtown and South Centre City Specific Plan areas. Over half (57%) of the RHNA units are located in areas with greater than 80% non-White populations. Currently, 64.5% of the population in the City is non-White, and 52% of the population is Hispanic. The center of the City sees higher concentrations of minority populations than the outer areas of the City.

Figure E-23: RHNA Sites and Minority Population by Census Block Group



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and SanGIS Data Warehouse


Figure E-24: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Minority Population



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and Michael Baker International


Figure E-25 displays the RHNA sites by income distribution level against the percentage of the population with a disability by census tract. The accompanying chart (Figure E-26) displays the breakdown comparison of low-income units, RHNA units, and City acreage among the percentage of the population with a disability. The City only has one census tract that averages over 20% of the population with a disability. The breakdown is roughly the same between each of the three categories; RHNA units are not overly concentrated in areas that have either high or low percentages of the population with a disability.

Figure E-25: RHNA Sites and Population with a Disability by Census Tract



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool, SanGIS Data Warehouse, and MBI


Figure E-26: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Disability Status



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and MBI

Figure E-27 displays RHNA Sites against the percentage of children that are in married couple households by census tract. Generally, lower income RHNA sites are located in areas with lower concentration of families. Typically, lower income RHNA sites are for higher density development. The smaller units are more affordable and generally more appropriate for small households.


Figure E-27: RHNA Sites and Children in Married-Couple Households by Census Tract



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool, SanGIS Data Warehouse, and MBI


Figure E-28 displays the RHNA sites and income distribution against the percentage of each census block group that are in the low or moderate income categories. Darker red census tracts have a higher percentage of the population that are in the low or moderate income categories. The accompanying chart (Figure E-29) displays the breakdown of RHNA units and city acreage that fall into each quartile as displayed on the map. Both the map and table show that more RHNA units are clustered into areas of the City with a higher percentage of low- and moderate-income populations.

Figure E-28: RHNA Sites and Low to Moderate Income Population by Census Block Group



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and SanGIS Data Warehouse

Figure E-29: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Low to Moderate Income




Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and MBI

R/ECAPs

Escondido has one R/ECAP area in the City, Census Tract 202.14. The tract is shown in Figure E-30 along with the RHNA sites by their income level. The R/ECAP is located within the Downtown Specific Plan. About one-quarter of the RHNA units are within this R/ECAP area. Of the 2,790 units that are located in the R/ECAP area, 1,558 are low-income, 387 are moderate income, and 845 are above moderate income. The majority of RHNA sites in the R/ECAP tract are clustered south of Escondido Creek and are largely non-residential and commercial existing uses. New units are not being clustered around existing housing within the R/ECAP.

Figure E-30: RHNA Sites and R/ECAP Areas



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and SanGIS Data Warehouse

RCAAs

As previously discussed, the City has one census tract that could be considered an RCAA, a small tract in the southernmost part of the City. This tract is zoned Residential Estates (R-E). There is one above-moderate income RHNA site located partially within this tract.


Access to Opportunities

Figure E-31 displays the RHNA sites by income level and TCAC composite score by census tract. The accompanying chart (Figure E-32) displays the percentage of RHNA units and percent of the city acreage in each TCAC opportunity designation. Two census tracts, 202.13 and 202.14, fall into the high segregation and poverty designation. These census tracts have a population of 3,865 and 6,039, respectively. This area falls within the Downtown Specific Plan. The high segregation and poverty area comprises about 2% of the City. One quarter of RHNA units are in this area. Table E- 9 displays the location of RHNA units by the TCAC designation. The majority of units (5,783) are within the low resource designation, while 2,927 are located in the area of high segregation and poverty and 753 are within the moderate resource designation.

About 46% of the City and 61% of RHNA units fall into the low resource category, while half the City and only 8% of the RHNA units fall into the moderate resource category. No areas of the City are categorized in the high or highest resource designation.


While the City has 52.2% of its total areas classified as “moderate resource,” most of these moderate resource areas are semi-rural to rural in nature, and consist of open-space, agriculture, and master-planned developments. Most of these moderate resource areas are not suitable for significant high-density new housing due to environmental constraints. The City’s core and major population centers are almost universally considered as low resource or high-segregation and poverty.

Figure E-31: RHNA Sites and TCAC Designation



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool, SanGIS Data Warehouse and MBI

Figure E-32: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by TCAC Composite Score




Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and MBI

Table E- 9: Location of Sites by TCAC Designation

| CA TCAC Designation | Number of Units (Sites Inventory) |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Moderate Resource | 787 |
| Low Resource | 5,383 |
| High Segregation and Poverty | 2,339 |
| Source: 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Maps | |


Figure E-33 displays the RHNA sites by income allocation and CalEnviroScreen 4.0 percentile scores for the City. The accompanying chart displays the percentage of low-income RHNA units, total RHNA units, and City acreage that fall into each percentile group of the CES 4.0. Generally, the more rural and less populated outer areas of the City see higher CES 4.0 scores. These areas consist of open space, agriculture, and low-density housing. Over half of low-income units and total RHNA units are in the 50-60% CES 4.0 percentile.

Figure E-33: RHNA Sites and CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Scores



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and SanGIS Data Warehouse

Figure E-34: RHNA Units and City Acreage Comparison by Cal EnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile



Source: HUD AFFH Data Viewer Tool and MBI

Improved Conditions, Exacerbated Conditions, and Other Relevant Factors

As shown by the analysis of RHNA sites, many RHNA units are located in census tracts that display trends of desegregation and integration, low opportunity scores or are designated as a R/ECAP area. Though these are clearly areas with disproportionate needs, the City is actively working to address these needs. As the City is focusing growth in these areas with disproportionate needs, the City has adopted the Downtown Specific Plan and South Centre City Specific Plan to address place-based segregation.

With the dissolution of redevelopment, the City of Escondido has limited tools and financial capacity to address the extent of housing and community development needs in these areas with disproportionate needs. Without public investments as catalysts, private investments in these declining neighborhoods are also slow and limited. To rejuvenate these neighborhoods, introducing new housing development opportunities may be the most effective strategy in attracting private investments, and therefore has the potential to produce beneficial results in terms of improved housing and neighborhood conditions, diversified housing options, and enhanced neighborhood services and amenities. However, displacement can occur when new resources are brought into low resourced areas, pushing out existing residents who may be low income. Therefore, anti-displacement measures are needed in order to ensure rejuvenation and reinvestment in low resources areas does not exacerbate segregation and poverty within the City. Programs 3.2 and 3.4 include actions to reduce and prevent displacement.

Through the Downtown Specific Plan, the City has up-zoned the downtown area for 45-100 dwelling units per acre. The City is focusing its growth in this area, which, despite its low TCAC scores, has access to transit through the North County Sprinter Station, employment centers, and close proximity to civic and social resources. Increasing housing stock and affordability in these areas will provide new housing options to families of all incomes. Furthermore, new housing in downtown Escondido will help to stabilize existing rents and prevent displacement.

Additionally, the City is adopting the East Valley Specific Plan to create more access in other parts of the City while still maintaining its smart growth goals. The East Valley Specific Plan is designed to

revitalize older commercial big box neighborhoods. It also allows for flexible uses and conversion of older medical office buildings after the Palomar Hospital campus is redeveloped.

Through the City's specific plans, programs, and other efforts, the sites inventory does not exacerbate but rather improves fair housing conditions in the City.

C. Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Regional Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

The 2020 AI concluded that the following were impediments to Fair Housing Choice in the San Diego Area. The relevance to Escondido is included below:

Impediment #1: Enforcement activities are limited. Fair housing services focus primarily on outreach and education; less emphasis is placed on enforcement.

LASSD provides fair housing services to the City of Escondido. Between 2014 and 2020, CSA served 861 Escondido residents. Records for 53 sites tested were provided in the 2020 AI. The majority of complaints for fair housing discrimination reported disability (reasonable accommodation) as the basis for discrimination.

Impediment #2: People obtain information through many media forms, not limited to traditional newspaper noticing or other print forms.

A balance of new and old media needs to be found to expand access to fair housing resources and information with an increasing young adult and senior population. The City of Escondido also primarily relies on digital media and public notices to advertise fair housing events.

Impediment #3: Patterns of racial and ethnic concentration are present within particular areas of the San Diego region.

The California Fair Housing Task force found two areas of poverty and segregation in Escondido and some census block groups throughout the City had a minority concentration exceeding the County average of 50.4%. The minority population in Escondido, including all races and ethnicities other than non-Hispanic Whites, grew from 59.6% in 2010 to 64.5% according to the 2014-2018 ACS. The analysis in this Fair Housing Assessment also found patterns of racial and ethnic concentration in the City's downtown.

Impediment #4: Housing choices for special needs groups, especially persons with disabilities, are limited.

The 2020 AI reported that 23% of the applicant-households on the waiting list for Public Housing included one person with a disability and 10% were seniors. Similarly, 22% of applicants on the waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers included one disabled member and 11% were seniors. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, 10.4% of Escondido residents experience a disability. Over 14% (21,512 persons) of Escondido residents are age 65 or over and 38% of senior residents experience a disability. There are 133 licensed residential care facilities totaling 2,918 beds located in Escondido. The City has approximately 19.1 beds per 1,000 residents, significantly higher than the average countywide (8.4 beds per 1,000 persons). The population with disabilities is concentrated in the northwest and southern census tracts of the City.

Impediment #5: Due to the geographic disparity in terms of rents, concentrations of Housing Choice Voucher use have occurred.

Escondido received only 3 percent of Housing Choice Vouchers administered by the County. Within the City, HCV use is concentrated in the central census tracts of the City, which have the most affordable rents. However, these areas also have a concentration of poverty and minorities and limited access to opportunities compared to other areas of the City. Between 2014 and 2018, rent prices in Escondido increased by 55% for a two-bedroom apartment and nearly doubled (+98%) for a one-bedroom apartment. Rent spikes in the City during that period were significantly higher than countywide, where rent for a two-bedroom apartment increased 28% and rent for a one-bedroom apartment increased 47%. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, approximately 49% of Escondido residents were renters.

Impediment #6: Hispanics and Blacks continue to be under-represented in the homebuyer market and experienced large disparities in loan approval rates.

White residents made up the largest proportion of Escondido applicants (66.5%) and also had the highest approval rate (65.3%). Black residents experienced approval rates similar to White residents. Hispanics were approved at the lowest rates (56%). The underrepresentation of Hispanics was most prevalent in Escondido, Imperial Beach, and Vista.

Despite the presence of these concentrations and impediments, the selected inventory sites are appropriate for high-density housing due to access to public transit (two North County Sprinter stations), jobs, and other support services (County Live Well has an office on Mission Avenue, Interfaith Community Services has an office on Quince Street).

Downtown Escondido and the East Valley area are listed as Smart Growth Opportunity Areas by SANDAG. Despite the appearance of low resources, the City is investing heavily into these areas. Recently adopted and updated Specific Plans will attract investment; create new, high-quality housing meeting modern standards; create a healthier and more attractive public realm including enhanced pedestrian and bicycle mobility, new parks, and open spaces to improve resources; remediate environmental hazards; and provide a mix of housing types attractive and suitable for a broader range of households and income levels to alleviate conditions of poverty and segregation.