

ENCINITAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT
November 20, 2024
Draft 11-101-2024



*Final report prepared and submitted by
Mayor Tony Kranz and Deputy Mayor Allison Blackwell*

Introduction

On June 26, 2024, the Council for the City of Encinitas (City) approved the formation of an Affordable Housing Task Force (AHTF) led by Mayor Tony Kranz (Chair) and Deputy Mayor Allison Blackwell (Co-Chair) to pursue sites for a City-led affordable housing development with a minimum of 45 affordable units. 45 units was the minimum number of units being considered for a City-owned parcel at 634 Quail Gardens Drive also known as L-7.

On August 14, 2024, Mayor Kranz appointed all eleven (11) applicants from the community to the Task Force:

- Council District 1 | Dennis Kaden, Richard Stern, Elena Thompson
- Council District 2 | Bob Kent, Richard Solomon, Nivardo Valenzuela¹
- Council District 3 | Felicia Gamez-Weinbaum, Karen Koblenz, George Wielechowski
- Council District 4 | Eli Stern, Dan Vaughn

The goals of the AHTF were:

1. Understand all relevant housing laws, the City's Sixth Cycle Housing Element 2021-2029 including Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and affordable housing development and financing.
2. Identify and evaluate feasible affordable housing sites that the City owns or can partner with the property owner.
3. Ensure that the affordable housing site recommendations are linked to the City's policies, strategic plan, and planning priorities.
4. Ensure transparency in communications about affordable housing needs, challenges, and the work of the Affordable Housing Task Force.
5. Make recommendations regarding affordable housing locations and possible financing options at the conclusion of the task force work.

¹ Nivardo Valenzuela resigned from the AHTF on October 22, 2024, due to work obligations that conflicted with the remaining meetings and work of the Task Force.

The AHTF had nine (9) meetings from August 20, 2024, to November 12, 2024. The meetings were open to the public and noticed according to the Brown Act. The AHTF covered many agenda items including:

- Overview of relevant affordable housing requirements
- Review of the affordable housing studies done by Kosmont Companies (Kosmont) in 2021
- Review of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) laws and numbers
- Creation of site selection scoring rubric (Site Rubric)
- Development of preliminary Potential Site List and refinement to the Site Rubric
- Discussion of outreach efforts to faith-based organizations and San Diego County
- Overview of affordable housing financing, presented by Chelsea Investment Corporation and Community Housing Works
- Application of Site Rubric to potential sites
- Analysis and prioritization of potential sites
- Review and discussion of draft report and presentation to City Council

The committed citizens on the AHTF put forth their time, energy, attention, and resources in service to their community. On behalf of the City of Encinitas, we are grateful for their engagement in this work. This final report is the summary of their efforts. As co-chairs of the AHTF, we recommend acceptance of this report by the full City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor Tony Kranz
Chair of AHTF

Deputy Mayor Allison Blackwell
Co-Chair of AHTF

Executive Summary

The City of Encinitas has a 6th Cycle Housing Element, 2021-2029, which meets state law today. The Housing Element relies on R-30 by-right zoning to provide most of its low-income affordable housing capacity, which under state law are presumed to be 100% affordable. However, in all but one case, when these projects are entitled, most units are market rate and not affordable to low-income persons. As a result, the City's excess capacity for low-income housing approved with the Housing Element has been significantly reduced, and First, the City of Encinitas has a 6th Cycle Housing Element, 2021-2029, which meets state law today. However, the City runs close to the edge of triggering No Net Loss² and carefully monitors the progress against our Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for low- and moderate-income housing types carefully³.

Formatted: Superscript

As an alternative to by-right development, the City has been pursuing a City-led 100% affordable housing development project to provide the City with control over the type of development that can be built including size/stories, bulk, mass, and community character. Secondly, beyond helping the City's Housing Element remain in compliance with state law, there is a secondary priority of aligning housing capacity with the housing needs of the community. here is a need for affordable housing in the City. The average rent for a 1-bedroom apartment is \$2,800 per month⁴ which requires earning \$53.85 per hour i.e. \$112,000 per year. This is, hardly affordable for a teacher, retail worker, or lifeguard, or senior on a fixed income, based upon a guideline that a household should not be spending more than 30% of their monthly gross income on housing/shelter costs.⁵ Existing

² No Net Loss law requires that a jurisdiction ensure their Housing Element sites continue to have capacity at all times to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) by income group throughout the planning period which for Encinitas is 2021-2029. If during the planning period, the jurisdiction has a shortfall of sites to accommodate its remaining RHNA, the jurisdiction must take immediate action to correct the shortfall to include either sites previously unidentified with capacity to accommodate the shortfall or sites that have been rezoned to correct for the shortfall. Reference: Memorandum by California Housing and Community Development Agency on No Net Loss, dated October 2, 2019. <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos/docs/sb-166-final.pdf>

³ See City's Total Capacity Over RNHA (No Net Loss Buffer) <https://www.encinitasca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11030/638650975971100000>

⁴ Zillow.com

⁵ The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines "rent burdened" as any household that spends more than 30% of their gross monthly income on rent/sheltering costs. See City of Encinitas Displacement Risk Analysis, December 2023, p.14.

affordable housing has diminished through renovations and increasing rents. And the private sector is not building an adequate supply of new affordable housing units, and most of the units being built are deed-restricted rental units affordable to people at the low-income level but not very low income or extremely low income levels. Additionally, the focus on rental units has led to a dearth of affordable starter homes for people looking to grow generational wealth and have ownership participation in the community.⁶

Recently, the City's efforts on a 100% affordable housing development have focused on the City-owned parcel at The AHTF launched in response to growing community concern about a 100% affordable housing development on the City-owned parcel at 634 Quail Gardens Drive, also known as L-7. However, there were growing concerns about this parcel including community concern about additional housing along Quail Gardens Drive, financial feasibility, and projected low yield of affordable units. This led to the Council launching the AHTF to look at other sites that could be developed for affordable housing. Mayor Kranz served as the Chair and Deputy Mayor Blackwell served as the Co-Chair. Regardless of the origin of the AHTF, there are good reasons for the City to be proactive on affordable housing opportunities. First, the City of Encinitas has a 6th Cycle Housing Element, 2021-2029, which meets state law today. However, the City runs close to the edge of triggering No Net Loss⁷ and monitors the progress against our Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for low- and moderate-income housing types carefully⁸. Making a City-led affordable housing development project a priority will provide the City

⁶ Although private developers are required to meet the minimum threshold of affordable unit percentage under the City's inclusionary ordinance (15-20% based on the affordability of the unit provided (e.g. very low or low income), the courts have determined that property owners and developers are entitled to a "fair and reasonable return" on new development, and the city cannot require more deed-restricted affordable units without providing additional incentives like financial subsidies or increased density.

⁷ No Net Loss law requires that a jurisdiction ensure their Housing Element sites continue to have capacity at all times to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) by income group throughout the planning period which for Encinitas is 2021-2029. If during the planning period, the jurisdiction has a shortfall of sites to accommodate its remaining RHNA, the jurisdiction must take immediate action to correct the shortfall to include either sites previously unidentified with capacity to accommodate the shortfall or sites that have been rezoned to correct for the shortfall. Reference: Memorandum by California Housing and Community Development Agency on No Net Loss, dated October 2, 2019: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/housing-element-memos/docs/sb-166-final.pdf>

⁸ See City's Total Capacity Over RNHA (No Net Loss Buffer) <https://www.encinitasca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11030/638650975971100000>

~~with control over the type of development that can be built including size/stories, bulk, mass and community character and will help build a buffer against No Net Loss.~~

~~Secondly, there is a need for affordable housing in the City. The average rent for a 1-bedroom apartment is \$2,800 per month⁹, hardly affordable for a teacher, retail worker, or lifeguard. Existing affordable housing has diminished through renovations and increasing rents. And the private sector is not building an adequate supply of new affordable housing units.¹⁰~~

As mentioned in the Introduction, the AHTF had five (5) goals regarding affordable housing, and the task force has made progress on all five goals, as follows:

1. *Understand all relevant housing laws, the City's Sixth Cycle Housing Element 2021-2029 including Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and affordable housing development and financing.* California housing laws are complex and are continually changing. The AHTF devoted time in ~~many several~~ meetings to learn about the various laws and their interplay. The first meeting on August 20th, included an overview on what affordable housing is, what income levels and typical occupations qualify for affordable housing, and the maximum affordable rental payments based on unit size and incomes. The August 27th, meeting included a discussion of affordable housing by design concepts and options. On October 8th, the AHTF heard a presentation from Chelsea Investment Corporation (Chelsea) and Community HousingWorks (CHW), which provided ~~good~~ context around the ~~general~~ need for more affordable housing, along with its inherent challenges, e.g., site selection/control, closing financial gaps through multiple financial sources, and lengthy timelines.
2. *Identify and evaluate feasible affordable housing sites that the City owns or can partner with the property owner.* ~~A rubric or set of selection criteria ("Site Rubric") was developed that became The Site Rubric was~~ an essential part of the process to identify, evaluate, and rank potential affordable housing sites. The AHTF engaged in

⁹Zillow.com

¹⁰Although private developers are required to meet the minimum threshold of affordable unit percentage under the City's inclusionary ordinance (15-20% based on the affordability of the unit provided (e.g. very low or low income), the courts have determined that property owners and developers are entitled to a "fair and reasonable return" on new development, and the city cannot require more deed-restricted affordable units without providing additional incentives like financial subsidies or increased density.

an iterative process, where the criteria and scoring were tested, and the Site Rubric was further refined by the AHTF. This iterative and collaborative process helped the AHTF identify potential sites, score, eliminate and rank sites. At the September 17th, September 24th, and October 15th AHTF meeting's the task force ranked, and scored, and prioritized the potential sites as a group. In addition, the AHTF provided individual scores for each site that were also included in the median site selection ranking. This approach allowed for each AHTF member's perspective to be considered.

3. *Ensure that the affordable housing site recommendations are linked to the City's policies, strategic plan, and planning priorities.* The Site Rubric contains a criterion to evaluate whether any potential site supports the City's Housing Element Goal 2.2, General Plan and HCD Guidelines. The AHTF leveraged Staff's expertise in evaluating this criterion.
4. *Ensure transparency in communications about affordable housing needs, challenges, and the work of the Affordable Housing Task Force.* All meetings of the AHTF were publicly noticed, and members of the public attended each of the meetings and were given the opportunity to provide public comment (Oral Communication). The City also set up an Affordable Housing Task Force page on its website, which served as a useful tool for communicating the work of the AHTF with the public and included all agendas, attachments, public comments, and audio recordings of each meeting.
5. *Make recommendations regarding affordable housing locations and possible financing options at the conclusion of the task force work.* Based upon the AHTF's relatively limited meeting time frame and scope of work, the AHTF narrowed potential sites to the Top Sites for consideration by the City Council. The AHTF identified four Top Sites which all provide more capacity for affordable housing than L-7 while retaining City control. The AHTF also identified three other government-owned properties that could contribute to affordable housing solutions.¹¹ However,

¹¹ The three additional government-owned sites identified are: (1) Oakcrest Park (developed parking lot area), which currently hosts the Safe Parking Lot, may be suitable for tiny homes or other low-cost modular housing; (2) Pacific View Arts Center, under AB 812 could host tiny or other low-cost modular housing specifically for artists as part of an appropriately-designated cultural district; and (3) County-owned Burn Site could potentially host the City's Public Works vehicles and equipment to enable affordable housing development on the current Public Works site.

DRAFT 11-101-2024

the AHTF ~~cannot make~~is not making a full recommendation to the Council about specific sites to pursue. Also, the AHTF is unable to provide financing options without having a specific site recommendation and detailed site-specific analysis including environmental and development potential. Nevertheless, the AHTF has put forth thoughtful analysis about possible affordable housing sites for the Council to consider pursuing now or in the future.

In conclusion, the AHTF's work provides a way to be proactive in meeting affordable housing objectives. The key takeaway is that all the Top Sites are publicly owned (City or North County Transit District (NCTD) land), creating the potential for a much higher percentage of units that would meet the City's RHNA requirements. Having the City in the driver's seat on affordable housing development gives the community more control over what is built and where. It is also ~~the right thing to do for our community and~~ helpful in keeping the City's Housing Element certified by the state Housing and Community Development department.

Site Selection

To develop an inventory of potential affordable housing sites (Potential Site List (Attachment B), the AHTF primarily looked at public land (land owned by the City, NCTD, County of San Diego or school districts) and land owned by faith-based organizations or schools.

The focus on public land made sense because land cost is a significant portion of a housing development's expense. This expense is eliminated when the City of Encinitas or the County of San Diego ~~donates~~ contributes the land.

The focus on land owned by faith-based organizations also made sense considering SB 4 – Affordable Housing on Faith Lands Act. SB 4, also known as Yes in God's Backyard, was signed into law by Governor Newsom on October 11, 2023, and provides a streamlined process for religious organizations to develop qualifying affordable housing on their property.

The AHTF requested a map of all City owned, other public land (NCTD and schools/college), and faith-based organizations (Attachment C) to view and help identify potential sites. The AHTF site identification process yielded twenty (20) sites on the Potential Site List.

City-Owned Land

In exploring City-owned land, the AHTF leveraged the analysis performed by Kosmont in 2021. The City retained Kosmont to identify opportunities for development of affordable housing beyond the sites identified in the 6th Cycle Housing Element 2021-2029. The AHTF included many sites from the Kosmont reports on the Potential Site List.

The AHTF also looked at all other City-owned parcels with a focus on sites that could yield 45 or more housing units. Based on this analysis, several sites were added to Potential Site List including several City-owned parks.

Pacific View Art Center land that currently does not have structures was also added to the Potential Site List. Although this site has small available acreage, the AHTF deemed it appropriate to add this site because of the availability of AB 812. AB 812 was signed into law in October 2023 and allows cities to reserve up to 10% of a project's affordable housing units for artists if the units reserved are located within or within one-half mile from a state-designated cultural district or within a locally designated cultural district, as specified.

County-Owned Land

The Kosmont analysis in 2021 included the San Diego County Burn Site (APN: 259-121-36-00 and 259-121-37-00), zoned Public/Semi-Public, and the AHTF included this site on the Potential Site List. On September 13, 2024, Mayor Kranz and Deputy Mayor Blackwell met

with County ~~representatives staff~~ to discuss the site. The portion of the site containing the landfill is unavailable for development due to environmental limitations that require expensive and extensive remediation (e.g. estimated tens of millions of dollars)¹². The County is doing a feasibility study to determine if there could be a passive use e.g., county park.

The remainder of the site is a clay cap over approximately 20 feet of ash. The Mayor and Deputy Mayor explored with the County representatives whether a housing development could be built on this area. The County representations explained that an engineering study would be required to determine whether this parcel could support any structures, including modular structures that rested on top of the clay cap, without disturbing the clay cap. The County representatives expressed that a less invasive use of the area could be feasible; for example, storing Public Works vehicles and equipment.

North County Transit District (NCTD) Land

The AHTF also looked at two NCTD owned parcels (APN: 258-190-26-00 and 258-190-23-00) comprised of approximately 6.04 acres. NCTD is embarking on a process to revitalize and reimagine 11 transit stations throughout North County (map as Attachment F) and provides a potential way of generating ongoing revenue for the agency. The projects are considered transit-oriented development (TOD), meaning they include housing, retail, businesses and other community amenities like parks, trails and gathering spaces, in a compact area close to transportation hubs, such as trains or bus stations. As a result, there are several cities that have or are currently partnering with NCTD to build affordable housing (e.g. Oceanside, Carlsbad, and Escondido), with a focus on sites that could yield 45 or more housing units. Based on this analysis, two NCTD owned sites were added to Potential Site List.

Faith-Based Organization and School Land

On September 20, 2024, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor sent a letter to twenty-six (26) faith-based organizations and MiraCosta College (See Attachment E) to inform them about SB 4 and to inquire whether they would like to discuss affordable housing on their land. In follow up, Planning Manager Patty Anders reached out by phone to these organizations to ensure they received the September 20th letter and to personally inquire if there was any interest in building affordable housing.

The AHTF members also recommended certain faith-based sites be added to the potential site list where the site appeared to have enough available land for an affordable housing development of at least 45 units.

¹² County burn site documentation provided by the County located on the AHTF webpage:
<https://www.encinitasca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11098/638660703265717119>

City staff only had replies from a few faith-based organizations in response to the City's letter and follow up calls. Some expressed interest in further conversation or bringing the item to their respective boards: Christian Science Reading Room, Temple Solel, Seacoast Church, and Water's Edge Church. Some expressed no interest in pursuing affordable housing on their property: Saint John the Evangelist Catholic Church, Leichtag Foundation, MiraCosta College, and St. Andrew's Episcopal Church.

When staff had clarity on a faith-based organization's or a school's interest in affordable housing development, the information was communicated to the AHTF, and the Potential Site List was updated and resulted in removing faith-based sites from further consideration.¹³

Private Land

The AHTF did not reach out to all private landowners about interest in affordable housing development. One privately owned site, Leichtag Foundation, was considered by the AHTF but was eliminated due to the City not having control of the land, and the property owner indicated they were not interested giving mixed signals in developing affordable housing on their site. The Council may wish to explore potential interest further.

In addition, the AHTF initially thought privately-owned land where the landowners expressed interest in a mixed-use housing development under AB 2011 or SB 6 could be include on the Potential Site List. AB 2011, known as Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act of 2022, and SB 6, known as Middle Class Housing Act of 2022, both became effective on July 1, 2023. Both laws are designed to facilitate the development of affordable and middle-class housing and mixed-use developments on land that is zoned on sites where retail, office and parking are principally permitted uses. These bills now allow affordable and mixed-use projects on land that has historically prohibited housing. However, very few landowners have expressed interest in a project under AB 2011 or SB 6. Therefore, the AHTF determined there were no AB 2011 or SB 6 eligible sites to add to the Potential Site List for consideration.

Prioritization Process

A couple of AHTF members volunteered to develop a draft Site Rubric to use when scoring sites on the Potential Site List and to be tested by the AHTF. The draft was shared with the AHTF members, tested and then collaboratively revised and finalized by the group (See Attachment A). The Site Rubric covers six criteria, each with a weighting/score, for a total of

¹³ There was an initial belief that SB 4 applied to land owned by all schools (elementary, high school, college/university). As a result, Oakcrest Middle School was added to the Potential Site List and scored using the Site Rubric. Since SB 4 applies only to higher education institutions, Oakcrest Middle School was eliminated from consideration.

100 possible points:

1. Opportunity (25 points): This criterion looks at the size of the site and how many affordable units could possibly be built on the site.
2. Land Contribution (10 points): This criterion looks at the possibility of land being contributed or the cost to acquire the land.
3. Supports Encinitas Housing Element Goal 2.2, General Plan and HCD Guidelines (15 points): This criterion was ~~assessed~~ given a preliminary score by Development Services staff based on the Housing Element and HCD Guidelines.
4. Proximity to services, transportation (20 points): This criterion examines whether the site is within ¼ mile walking distance from services, retail, and public transportation.
5. Challenges: (20 points): This criterion considers any challenges concerning the site, including environmental and physical constraints, loss of open space, relocation due to existing use, safety, lack of site infrastructure, upzoning/Prop A vote requirement, lack of site control, and community opposition.
6. Readiness/Timeliness (10 points): This criterion looks at how long it would take to develop an affordable housing project on the site.

Based upon AHTF discussions, certain criteria were given heavier weight:

- Opportunity – 25 points
- Proximity to services, transportation – 20 points
- Challenges – 20 points

Other criteria were given less weight:

- Supports Encinitas Housing Element Goal 2.2, General Plan and HCD Guidelines
- Land Contribution: Land contribution served as an initial proxy for financial feasibility since it was too early in this process to determine a potential project's financial feasibility; and the contribution of land enhances the overall financial feasibility of a project.
- Readiness/Timeliness

The AHTF applied the finalized Site Rubric to the Potential Site List and discussed and determined the site ratings as a group during several meetings (September 17th, September 24th, and October 15th). In addition, the AHTF members individually rated the sites (See Attachment A). The AHTF then looked at the AHTF group scores, the average of the individual scores, and the median of the individual scores.

Formatted: Font: Aptos

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 +
Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

These various data sorts were utilized in the AHTF's ranking of the sites on the Potential Site List. The AHTF determined the sites would be categorized into 3 categories: (1) Top four sites, (2) Other sites considered, and (3) Sites considered and eliminated.

Site Analysis

Table 1 includes the 20 sites on the Potential Site List by category. The "~~Other sites~~ ~~Sites considered~~ Considered" are sites where the AHTF scored 51-65 points using the Site Rubric.

The sites that were considered and eliminated are generally faith-based organizations, parks, and a school/college that do not desire to build housing on their land at this time. The eliminated sites also include some City-owned land (parks and protected open space areas) that the AHTF deemed unsuitable for a housing development.

Table 1: Site Categorization (alphabetical order)

Top Sites	Other Sites Considered	Sites Considered and Eliminated
City Hall	County Burn Site	Beach Chapel
NCTD Parking	L-7 – 634 Quail Gardens Drive ¹⁴	Cottonwood Creek Park
NCTD Parking + City Hall	Oakcrest Park (Developed Area)	Indian Head Canyon
Public Works site	Pacific View Arts Center	Leichtag Foundation
	Seacoast Community Church	MiraCosta College – San Elijo Campus
		Oakcrest Middle School
		Orpheus Park
		Purple Z
		Self-Realization Fellowship
		Saint John Catholic Church
		St. Andrew Episcopal Church

There are four (4) sites that scored the highest using the Site Rubric and are publicly owned. Two of the top four sites are owned by the City and one is partially owned by the City (NCTD Parking + City Hall). In Table 2 below, there is a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each site. For all four sites, the AHTF determined that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages and that these are good locations for the City to pursue an affordable housing development. Any development project on these sites would require upzoning and a Prop A vote.

¹⁴ L-7 (634 Quail Gardens Drive) scored the lowest of the Other Sites Considered category. Recently, the Parks and Recreation Commission voted unanimously to recommend that Quail Gardens Park be created on the L-7 property. This recommendation will be presented to City Council in the near future. As a result, there are several AHTF members who desire to eliminate L-7 (634 Quail Gardens Drive) from the list of sites considered. However, the AHTF left this property in “Other Sites Considered” category for three reasons: (1) the site scored between 51-65 points on the Site Rubric when using the median and group scores, (2) because the City Council moved to begin Phase 1 of public outreach for this property (See minutes of June 26, 2024 City Council Regular Meeting), and because (3) the AHTF members were not unanimous about eliminating this property from consideration; the AHTF left this property in “Other Sites Considered.”

Table 2: Site Categorization (prioritization order – median score)

Top Sites	Advantages	Disadvantages
Public Works site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City-owned land • ~4.5 acres which may yield at least 45 affordable units • Site would allow for clustered or other innovative housing design to allow adequate open space • No adjacent residential development • Close to services, retail, and public transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires relocation of Public Works facility/ staff and SDWD staff which is costly and without identified new location.¹⁵ • Located within the Coastal Zone and upzoning would be required, adding time and cost to overall project length
NCTD Parking + City Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City owns the City Hall land of ~5.2 acres • NCTD owns ~6 acres which may yield at least 45 affordable units • Site would allow for clustered or other innovative housing design to allow adequate open space • No adjacent residential development on NCTD site; residential to the north of City Hall site • City Hall could be redesigned as mixed use and include parking (including NCTD parking), City Hall, and affordable housing • Close to services, retail, and public transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City does not own NCTD land and would need partnership with NCTD • Would be an extensive project that would likely take greater than 5 years to complete • Located within the Coastal Zone and upzoning would be required, adding time and cost to overall project length

¹⁵ One possible site to consider for relocation of Public Works facility/staff and SDWD staff is the County Burn Site and nearby Sheriff’s Department sub-station (joint facility of City of Encinitas and County of San Diego). This requires further discussion with County representatives including [the](#) County Supervisor.

Top Sites	Advantages	Disadvantages
NCTD Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~6 acres which may yield at least 45 affordable units • Site would allow for clusters or other innovative housing design and provide adequate open space • No adjacent residential dwellings • NCTD is doing similar projects in Oceanside, Carlsbad and Escondido • Grant funding may be available • Close to services, retail, and public transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City does not own the land and would need partnership with NCTD • Developing this site for housing will result in loss of parking, which would need to be replaced • Would be an extensive project that would likely take greater than 5 years to complete • Located within the Coastal Zone and upzoning would be required, adding time and cost to overall project length
City Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~5.2 acres which may yield at least 45 affordable units • City-owned land • Site would allow for clustered or other innovative housing design to allow adequate open space • Adjacent residential development to the north • Close to services, retail, and public transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~5.2 acres but unclear if the site can yield at least 45 affordable units and City Hall offices • <u>Would be an extensive project that would likely take greater than 5 years to complete</u> • Located within the Coastal Zone and upzoning would be required, adding time and cost to overall project length

Other Means of Supporting Affordable Housing

As noted above, the process to build an affordable housing community is an inherently lengthy multi-year process. As a result, the AHTF discussed other innovative strategies to preserve existing affordable housing stock and build more affordable homes in Encinitas including:

- Incentivizing below-market rate ADUs

- [Reaching out to ADU owners to ensure the City is getting credit for any below-market rents nm](#)
- Expanding housing choice voucher funding
- Investing in Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) to help preserve existing affordable housing
- Advocating for RHNA reform to get credit for NOAH
- Monitoring AB 2011 and SB 6 interest particularly the use of these laws to develop mixed-use projects¹⁶
- Exploring tiny home developments and other modular building developments
- [Developing housing for developmentally disabled adults](#)
- [Revising the City's inclusionary ordinance to require extremely- and/or very-low-income affordable units](#)
- Enacting a mobile home park ordinance to help control [pad-rentslot rents paid by mobile home park residents](#) (several cities such as Chula Vista and Chino have done this already)

While the AHTF is not advocating for any idea shown in the list above, this list can be useful to current and future Councils as they work on meeting state housing laws and ensuring a good mix of affordable housing units for Encinitas.

Appendix

Attachments:

- A. Site Selection Scoring Rubric (Scoring Guide and AHTF Group Scores)
- B. Potential Site List
- C. Publicly owned and faith-based organization sites map
- D. Individual AHTF Members Rubric Scores and commentary on final report
- E. Template letter to faith-based organizations
- F. NCTD Transit Oriented Development Map

¹⁶ The City's website has an AB 2011 and SB 6 interactive mapping tool available at <https://www.encinitasca.gov/government/departments/development-services/policy-planning-housing/policy-planning/ab-2011-and-sb-6-implementation>