

City of Lemon Grove General Plan Housing Element 2021-2029



August 2021 July 2022 May 2023

**Prepared by:
City of Lemon Grove
3232 Main St.
Lemon Grove, CA 91945**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Background	2
Community Profile	3
Housing Stock Characteristics	22
Affordable Housing	32
Housing Constraints	36
Housing Resources	59
Housing Plan	75
Implementing Programs	79
Quantified Objectives	93
Appendix A: Public Participation	A-1
Appendix B: Sites Inventory	B-1
Appendix C: Review of Past Accomplishments	C-1
Appendix D: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	D-1

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 County Population Growth (2000-2050)
- Figure 2 Age Distribution
- Figure 3 Age Characteristics
- Figure 4 Race & Ethnicity
- Figure 5 Racial Composition
- Figure 6 Employment Characteristics
- Figure 7 Average Salary by Occupation
- Figure 8 Household Characteristics
- Figure 9 Change in Household Types
- Figure 10 Average Persons per Household
- Figure 11 Household Income - Lemon Grove and San Diego Region
- Figure 12 Median Household Income
- Figure 13 Median household Income - Comparison to Regional Median
- Figure 14 Housing Assistance Needs for Lower Income Households
- Figure 15 Overcrowded Housing Units
- Figure 16 Special Needs Groups in Lemon Grove
- Figure 17 Persons Age 65 and Over
- Figure 18 Licensed Care Facilities
- Figure 19 Disability Status
- Figure 20 Large Households
- Figure 21 Single Parent Households
- Figure 22 Homelessness in Lemon Grove and Surrounding Cities
- Figure 23 Homeless Shelter and Services - East San Diego County
- Figure 24 Housing Unit Growth
- Figure 25 Projected Housing Units
- Figure 26 Types of Housing Unit (2020)
- Figure 27 Projected Types of Housing Units (2040)
- Figure 28 Occupied Units
- Figure 29 Occupied Units - Household Size
- Figure 30 Vacancy Rates by Community and Property Age
- Figure 31 Housing Stock Age
- Figure 32 Substandard Units
- Figure 33 Median Home Sales Price
- Figure 34 Housing Stock Age

Figure 35 Average Monthly Rent
Figure 36 Affordable Housing Costs
Figure 37 Governmentally Regulated Affordable/Senior Housing Projects
Figure 38 Market Value "At-Risk" Units
Figure 39 Rental Subsidies Required
Figure 40 Estimated New Construction Cost
Figure 41 Disposition of Home Loans
Figure 42 Land Use Designations Permitting Residential Use
Figure 43 Residential Development Standards
Figure 44 Use Regulations for Residential Districts
Figure 45 Regional Comparison of Planning Fees
Figure 46 Residential Street Widths
Figure 47 Processing Times
Figure 48 Processing Time by Process/Permit
Figure 49 Housing Needs for 2021-2029 Housing Element
Figure 50 RHNA Credits and Remaining Need
Figure 51 Units Entitled Project List
Figure 52 Under Review Project List
Figure 53 DVSP Projects
Figure 54 STA I (VSP) Infill and Redevelopment Potential
Figure 55 STA II Redevelopment Potential
Figure 56 General Commercial Redevelopment Potential
Figure 57 Residential Infill & Vacant Sites
Figure 58 RHNA Summary
Figure 59 CalEnviroScreen Results
Figure 60 Pollution Burdens
Figure 61 Particulate Matter
Figure 62 Asthma Related Emergency Room (ER) Visits per 10,000 People
Figure 63 Traffic Density
Figure 64 Ground Water Threats
Figure 65 Property Crime and Violent Crime Rates
Figure 66 Total Quantified Objectives 2021-2029

Introduction

The Housing Element is a component of the General Plan which assesses the housing needs of all economic segments of the City of Lemon Grove. 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 eight years.

State law requires that all cities adopt a Housing Element and describes in detail the necessary contents of the Housing Element. This Housing Element responds to those requirements and responds to the special characteristics of the City's housing environment. This Housing Element incorporates the most current data and information readily available at the time of writing. It also includes an evaluation of the Housing Element adopted in 2013, an assessment of the current and potential housing actions, and an assessment of resources of the private sector and all levels of the public sector.

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

Purpose and Content

The Housing Element is designed to provide the City with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy for promoting the production of safe, decent, and affordable housing within the community. A priority of both State and local governments, Government Code Section 65580 states the intent of creating housing elements:

"The availability of housing is of vital statewide importance, and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order."

Per State Law, the Housing Element has two main purposes:

- To provide an assessment of both current and future housing needs and constraints in meeting these needs; and
- To provide a strategy that establishes housing goals, policies, and programs.

The Housing Element is an eight-year plan for the 2021-2029 period (April 15, 2021 through April 15, 2029) and serves as an integrated part of the General Plan. Because of its relevancy and need to be accurate it is updated more frequently than the General Plan. The Housing Element identifies strategies and programs that focus on:

- Matching housing supply with need;
- Maximizing housing choice throughout the community;
- Assisting in the provision of affordable housing choice;
- Removing government and other constraints to housing investment; and
- Promoting fair and equal housing opportunities.

The Housing Element consists of the following major components, which have been evaluated for consistency with the General Plan and will allow the City to achieve goals and policies within the General Plan:

- A profile and analysis of the City's demographics, housing characteristics, and existing and future housing needs.
- An analysis of constraints to housing production and maintenance. Constraints include potential market, governmental, and environmental limitations to meeting the City's identified housing needs.
- An overview of resources available to further housing production and maintenance. Resources include land available for new construction, opportunities for rehabilitation and revitalization, and financial and administrative resources available for implementing housing programs. In addition, this section also examines opportunities for energy conservation.
- An assessment of housing accomplishments during the previous Housing Element period, 2013-2021.
- A statement of the Housing Plan to address the City's identified housing needs, including a formulation of housing goals, policies, and programs.

Background

Incorporated in 1977, Lemon Grove is a city with unique small town charm in the midst of a bustling metropolis. The idyllic community of approximately 27,208 residents (January 1, 2019, SANDAG Estimate) and spanning only 3.9 square miles ranks the third smallest jurisdiction in the San Diego region based on population and geographic size. Lemon Grove is known for being centrally located – providing easy access to downtown San Diego, mountains, and beaches. Residents enjoy larger lots, lower taxes, and fewer assessment fees compared to other communities in the County, and developers benefit from less regulatory constraints and impact fees. Diverse housing opportunities, an award-winning school district, and a variety of free community activities are also among many reasons the City appeals to homeowners.

The City's location in the region helps explain its suburban and semi-rural patterns of development. Its western and southern boundaries are adjacent to suburban parts of the City of San Diego such as Skyline Paradise Hills. To the north is the City of La Mesa, and its eastern border adjoins an unincorporated area of San Diego County known as Spring Valley. Residents and visitors steadily flow through Lemon Grove's downtown business district via the San Diego Trolley, making Lemon Grove a dynamic central hub. State Route 94 borders the City on the north, providing access to downtown San Diego. State Route 125 is adjacent to the City's easterly border and provides access to Chula Vista and the international border with Mexico to the south and access to communities to the north, including La Mesa and Santee.

First settled in 1869 by sheep rancher Robert Allison, Lemon Grove is known for having the "Best Climate on Earth," recalling the community's agricultural origins of plentiful citrus groves. Few groves remain today, but the "Best Climate" motto still refers to a simple way of life that seems to have vanished from other parts of the County. Although just seven minutes from downtown San Diego and nestled in the middle of a bustling trade area, Lemon Grove has maintained its authentic small town feel.

Public Participation

Citizen participation is one of the most important components of the Housing Element process. The City of Lemon Grove Community Development Department utilized the following strategy to solicit critical community input in preparing the City's 2021-2029 Housing Element.

On March 3, 2021 and March 9, 2021, the City conducted online community workshops on the Housing Element. The meeting flyer was posted on the City's upcoming events section of the website and the City's social media accounts, as well as emailed to organizations. During the workshops, the City provided an

overview of the Housing Element requirements and update process. Participants were encouraged to discuss topics such as housing problems in Lemon Grove, underserved groups, and priority housing needs in the community. The City also conducted specialized outreach with stakeholder groups and conducted a statistically valid survey to guide the development of the Housing Element. A summary of the public outreach feedback is included in Appendix A and illustrates the basis for the development of the Housing Plan, including programs to address housing needs within the City.

Public Review of Draft Housing Element

The Draft Lemon Grove Housing Element was made available for public review at the following locations:

- City Hall
- Library
- City website

Data Sources and Methodology

In preparing the Housing Element, various sources of information were consulted. While the decennial Census provides the most complete basis for population and household characteristics, information from the 2010 is considerably out of date and 2020 Census data was not yet available at the time of this writing. Moreover, the 2010 Census does not contain detailed information on household, income, and housing characteristics. Therefore, several sources were used to gather more recent data, including the following:

- 2018 & 2019 American Community Survey by the Census Bureau
(Note: The American Community Survey (ACS) is conducted on a very small sample of the population. As such, the data tend to have large margins of errors, especially for the more detailed levels of questions and small geographic units. Therefore, this Housing Element may not present all ACS data available when the margins of errors appear to be unreasonable.)
- Population and demographic data updated by the State Department of Finance
- Housing market information, such as home sales and rents, from Dataquick and Realtytrack, among other sources
- Lending patterns from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) database
- Labor statistics from California Employment Development Department

Relationship to Other General Plan Elements

The City of Lemon Grove's General Plan is comprised of Community Development, Mobility, Housing, Public Facilities, Safety, Noise, Conservation & Recreation, and Health & Wellness Elements. The content of the Housing Element is consistent with the goals and policies of all elements of the General Plan. Furthermore, when any element in the General Plan is amended, the Housing Element will be reviewed and modified, if necessary, to ensure continued internal consistency among elements.

Community Profile

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 Lemon Grove, 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.

Population Characteristics

Lemon Grove's population rose from 24,954 in 2000 to an estimated 26,526 in 2020 (**Figure 1**) The SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast estimates that the Lemon Grove population will reach 28,673 in 2035 and 30,903 in 2050. From 2010-2020 Lemon Grove grew at a slower rate of 4.8% than neighboring jurisdictions such as Santee, Chula Vista, and San Diego, which each exceeded a growth rate of 8%.

Figure 1
County Population Growth (2000-2050)

Jurisdiction	Population					Percent Change	
	2000	2010	2020	2035*	2050*	2000-2010	2010-2020
Chula Vista	173,860	243,916	272,202	326,625	345,586	40.3%	11.6%
El Cajon	94,819	99,478	104,393	109,383	115,465	4.9%	4.9%
La Mesa	54,751	57,065	59,966	70,252	77,881	4.2%	5.1%
Lemon Grove	24,954	25,320	26,526	28,673	30,903	1.5%	4.8%
National City	54,405	58,582	62,099	73,329	85,121	7.7%	6.0%
San Diego	1,223,341	1,307,402	1,430,489	1,665,609	1,777,936	6.9%	9.4%
Santee	53,090	53,413	57,999	63,812	66,313	0.6%	8.6%
County	2,813,833	3,095,313	3,343,355	3,853,698	4,068,759	10.0%	8.0%

* Represents an estimate from the SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2000-2010

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) tend 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.

The population of Lemon Grove is, as measured by the median age of its residents, comparable to most neighboring communities and the County as a whole. In 2018, Lemon Grove's median age was 35.4 years; almost exactly the same as the County's median age. Seniors (65 years and older) make up about 13% of Lemon Grove's population, while children under 18 are about 25% of the population. **Figure 2** compares changes in the age composition of Lemon Grove's population from 2000 to 2018, while **Figure 3** compares the percentage of individuals under 18, over 65, and the median age of Lemon Grove with nearby communities.

Figure 2
Age Distribution

	Under 18 Years	18-64 Years	65 Years and Over
2000	27.6%	60.4%	12.0%
2010	25.5%	63.3%	11.2%
2018	25.3%	61.8%	12.9%

Figure 3
Age Characteristics

Jurisdictions	Under 18 years			Over 65 years			Median Age
	2000	2010	2018	2000	2010	2018	
Chula Vista	28.80%	27.90%	25.70%	11.20%	10.00%	12.10%	34.9
El Cajon	27.80%	25.70%	25.40%	11.30%	11.00%	11.90%	34.0
La Mesa	19.80%	19.60%	20.70%	17.10%	14.20%	14.40%	35.5
Lemon Grove	27.60%	25.50%	25.30%	12.00%	11.20%	12.90%	35.4
National City	30.10%	25.50%	21.00%	11.20%	10.60%	12.60%	33.6
San Diego	23.90%	21.40%	20.10%	10.40%	10.70%	12.30%	34.7
Santee	28.30%	23.80%	21.60%	8.90%	10.70%	14.20%	38.8
County	25.60%	23.40%	22.00%	11.10%	11.40%	13.30%	35.6

** Sources: Bureau of the Census, (2000-2010); ACS 2014-2018, Table S0101 (5-Year Estimates).*

Race/Ethnicity Characteristics

Race/ethnicity of the population is important to an analysis of housing needs and conditions for several reasons. A community's racial and ethnic composition may have implications for housing needs to the extent that different groups have different household characteristics, income levels, and cultural backgrounds that may affect their housing needs and preferences. Different racial and ethnic groups differ in their attitudes toward and/or tolerance for "housing problems" as defined by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including overcrowding and housing cost burden, perceptions regarding housing density and overcrowding, as well as the cultural practices of living with extended families tend to vary among racial and ethnic groups.

Figure 4
Race & Ethnicity – Lemon Grove, Surrounding Areas, and San Diego Region, 2018

** Source: ACS 2014-2018, (5-Year Estimates).*




Figure 5
Racial Composition (2018)

Jurisdiction	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other
Chula Vista	18%	4%	59%	0.1%	16%	1%	3%
El Cajon	57%	6%	29%	0.2%	4%	0.4%	5%
La Mesa	56%	7%	26%	0.1%	7%	0.3%	5%
Lemon Grove	29%	14%	47%	0.1%	6%	0.4%	4%
National City	10%	5%	64%	0.2%	19%	1%	1%
San Diego	43%	6%	30%	0.2%	16%	0.4%	4%
Santee	70%	2%	18%	1%	5%	0.3%	5%
County	46%	5%	34%	0.4%	12%	0.4%	4%

* Source: ACS 2014-2018, (5-Year Estimates).

Employment 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. **Figure 6** shows employment characteristics for Lemon Grove in 2010 and 2018.

Figure 6
Employment Characteristics (2018)

Industry	2010 ACS		2018 ACS	
	% of City Employment	% of County Employment	% of City Employment	% of County Employment
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, Mining	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%
Construction	8.0%	7.2%	8.5%	5.9%
Manufacturing	7.1%	9.2%	5.8%	9.2%
Wholesale Trade	2.4%	2.9%	2.9%	2.4%
Retail Trade	10.0%	10.8%	11.9%	10.5%
Transportation, Warehousing, Utilities	7.3%	3.8%	6.8%	4.1%
Information	2.9%	2.5%	1.5%	2.0%
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, Rental, Leasing	7.2%	7.4%	4.1%	6.2%
Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, Waste Management	11.3%	14.2%	11.7%	15.1%
Educational Services, Health Care, Social Assistance	22.1%	19.9%	21.5%	21.3%
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation, Food Services	9.6%	10.6%	12.1%	11.9%
Other Services, except Public Administration	4.4%	5.2%	6.1%	5.4%
Public Administration	6.8%	5.4%	6.3%	5.5%

*Sources: ACS 2010; ACS 2014-2018, Table S2403 (5-Year Estimates). (2010 Employed: 10,723; 2018 Employed: 12,042)

Figure 7 displays mean annual wage data for occupations compiled by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) for the San Diego Metropolitan Statistical Area. **Figure 7** shows education and healthcare occupations generally offer moderate pay scales while the food preparation and retail sales offer the lower wages.

Figure 7
Average 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 Department (EDD), Occupational Wage data, 2020

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 and unrelated individuals living together. Persons living in retirement or convalescent homes, dormitories or other group living situations are not considered households. Household type and size, income levels, the presence of special needs populations, and other household characteristics determine the type of housing needed by residents, their preferences, and their ability to obtain housing that meets their needs. For example, single-person households, typified by seniors or young adults, tend to reside in apartment units or smaller single-family homes. Families typically prefer and occupy single-family homes. This section details the various household characteristics affecting housing needs.

According to 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, there were 1,118,980 households (i.e., occupied housing units) in San Diego County. Of these, 8,494 households, less than 1% percent, were

residing in Lemon Grove. As shown in **Figure 8**, among the Lemon Grove households, 33.2% were families with children. Conversely, 21.9% of Lemon Grove households consisted of single person households, which is much smaller than La Mesa.

Figure 8
Household Characteristics

Jurisdiction	Single Person Households	Senior Headed Households	Families with Children	Single-Parent Households	Large Households	
					Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
Chula Vista	16.5%	17.8%	40.3%	11.0%	39.6%	36.4%
El Cajon	21.3%	18.7%	35.6%	11.1%	27.8%	34.1%
La Mesa	31.3%	22.2%	26.8%	9.1%	19.77%	19.0%
Lemon Grove	21.9%	20.4%	33.2%	11.4%	33.9%	25.9%
National City	21.4%	21.9%	32.8%	11.4%	33.9%	25.9%
San Diego	27.4%	17.8%	26.6%	7.4%	24.0%	21.6%
Santee	28.0%	19.1%	31.1%	8.4%	24.3%	26.2%
County	23.7%	19.8%	30.0%	8.2%	26.2%	26.2%

Sources: ACS 2014-2018, Tables DP02 and B25009 (5-Year Estimates).

Figure 9 shows that in 2018, Lemon Grove households consisted mostly of families (71%). Between 2010 to 2018, the number of family households in the City increased between 2010 and 2018, while single households decreased.

Figure 9
Change in Household Types (2010-2018)

Household Type	2010 ACS		2018 ACS	
	#	%	#	%
Families	5,856	67.6%	5,996	71.0%
Non-Families	2,813	32.4%	2,475	29.3%
Single	2,259	26.1%	1,849	21.9%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000-2010 Census; ACS 2014-2018, Table DP02 (5-Year Estimates).

Household Size

Household size is a significant factor in housing demand. Often, household size can be used to predict the unit size that a household will select. For example, small households (one and two persons per household) traditionally can find suitable housing in units with zero to two bedrooms while larger households (three or more persons per household) can usually find suitable housing in units with three to four bedrooms.

In 2018, the average number of persons per household in the cities near Lemon Grove ranged from 2.5 to 3.4, with a regionwide average of 2.9 persons per household. Lemon Grove had an average of 3.13 persons per household. **Figure 10** compares household size in Lemon Grove to household size in surrounding cities and the County. Household size varied among the cities, with La Mesa having the lowest average household size among surrounding jurisdictions. SANDAG estimates that average household size in the region will decrease slightly over the next 30 years.

Figure 10
Average Persons per Household
Lemon Grove, Surrounding Cities, and San Diego Region, 2018

Jurisdiction	Persons Per Household (2018)	Projected Average Household Size (2050)
Chula Vista	3.35	3.28
El Cajon	3.06	2.89
La Mesa	2.52	2.38
Lemon Grove	3.13	3.00
National City	3.39	3.41
San Diego	2.71	2.64
Santee	2.63	2.80
County	2.87	2.81

Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table DP02 (5-Year Estimates); SANDAG Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast (2050), 2013.

Household Income

Household income indicates the wealth of a community and therefore is directly connected to the ability to afford housing. As household income increases, the more likely that household is to be a homeowner. 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 Income: households earning up to 30% of the AMI
- Very Low Income: households earning between 31 and 50% of the AMI
- Low Income: households earning between 51% and 80% of the AMI
- Moderate Income: households earning between 81% and 120% of the AMI
- Above Moderate Income: households earning over 120% of the AMI

Combined, the extremely low, very low, and low income groups are referred to as lower income.

(Note: Federal housing and community development programs typically assist households with incomes up to 80 percent of the AMI and use different terminology. For example, the Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program refers households with incomes between 51 and 80 percent AMI as moderate income (compared to low income based on State definition).

Figure 11 compares household income in Lemon Grove and in the San Diego region. In 2019 Lemon Grove had a greater percentage of households earning between \$15,000 and \$75,000 than the region as a whole, and a smaller percentage of higher income households earning over \$125,000. Nearly 25 percent of Lemon Grove households earned less than \$30,000 annually.


Figure 11
Household Income
Lemon Grove and San Diego Region, 2019



Source: SANDAG Current Estimates (2019)

Household incomes in Lemon Grove tend to be slightly lower than many cities in the region as a whole. Median household income in the City was \$62,004 in 2018, compared to the San Diego County median household income of \$74,855. **Figure 12** compares median household income in Lemon Grove and in the San Diego region in 2018.

Figure 12
Median Household Income (2018)



Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table S1901 (5-Year Estimates).

Figure 13 compares median income in Lemon Grove to neighboring cities and the region. Median household income in the City was on the lower end of the spectrum for the region but similar to surrounding jurisdictions.

Figure 13
Median Household Income (2018) - Comparison to Regional Median

Jurisdiction	Median Household Income	Percent Above/Below Regional Median
Chula Vista	\$76,354	+2%
El Cajon	\$52,593	-30%
La Mesa	\$63,947	-15%
Lemon Grove	\$62,004	-17%
National City	\$46,032	-39%
San Diego	\$75,456	+1%

Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table S1901 (5-Year Estimates).

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 Lemon Grove. Detailed CHAS data based on the 2013-2017 ACS data is displayed in **Figure 14**. 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 slightly lower percentage of housing problems (46%) compared to owner-households (54%).
- Approximately 73% of the extremely low income (households earning up to 30 percent of the AMI) and 78% very low income households (households earning between 31% and 50% of the AMI) experienced a cost burden greater than 30%.

Overpayment (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 "over payers": 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 overpayment indicators to determine the extent and level of funding and support that should be allocated to a community. State and federal programs typically define over-payers as those lower income households paying over 30% of household income for housing costs. A household is considered experiencing a severe cost burden if it spends more than 50% of its gross income on housing.

Figure 14 illustrates overpayment detail by income group and household type for Lemon Grove between 2013 and 2017. Approximately 51% of low income households, 78% of very low income households, and 85% of extremely low income households were overpaying versus 31% of moderate income households and 11% of moderate income and above households.

Figure 14
Housing Assistance Needs for Lower Income Households

Household by Type, Income, and Housing Problem	Owner	Renter	Total Households
Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)	235	1075	1,310
With cost burden >30%	165 (70%)	945 (88%)	1,110 (85%)
With cost burden >50%	135 (57%)	825 (77%)	960 (73%)
Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)	540	930	1,470
With cost burden >30%	320 (60%)	830 (89%)	1,150 (78%)
With cost burden >50%	245 (45%)	325 (35%)	570 (39%)
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	715	880	1,595
With cost burden >30%	365 (51%)	450 (51%)	815 (51%)
With cost burden >50%	175 (24%)	60 (7%)	235 (15%)
Moderate Income (81-100% AMI)	895	405	1,300
With cost burden >30%	320 (36%)	80 (20%)	400 (31%)
With cost burden >50%	95 (11%)	-	95 (7%)
Above Moderate Income (>100% AMI)	2,170	575	2,745
With cost burden >30%	245 (11%)	45 (8%)	290 (11%)
With cost burden >50%	40 (2%)	-	40 (1%)
Total	4,550	3,865	8,415

Note: Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is "select monthly owner costs", which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes. Data presented in this table are based on special tabulations from the American Community Survey (ACS) data. Due to the small sample size, the margins of errors can be significant. 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) (ACS 2013-2017), 2020.

Overcrowding

The combination of low incomes and high housing costs has forced many households to live in overcrowded housing conditions. "Overcrowding" is generally defined as a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room in house (including living room and dining rooms, but excluding hallways, kitchen, and bathrooms). 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.

The 2010-2014 ACS reported that over 5% of Lemon Grove households lived in overcrowded conditions (**Figure 15**). Overcrowding disproportionately affected renters (4.7% of renters versus 3.3% of owners); indicating overcrowding may be the result of an inadequate supply of larger sized rental units. The 2014-2018 ACS reported that overcrowding increased from 5.6% of all households to 8.0%.

Figure 15
Overcrowded Housing Units (2010-2018)

Overcrowding	Owner Households		Renter Households		Total Households	
	Number	% of Owners	Number	% of Owners	Number	% of Owners
ACS 2010-2014						
Total Overcrowded (>1.0 persons/room)	158	1.8%	331	3.8%	489	5.6%
Severely Overcrowded (>1.5 persons/room)	41	0.4%	122	1.4%	163	1.8%
ACS 2014-2018						
Total Overcrowded (>1.0 persons/room)	279	3.3%	403	4.7%	682	8.0%
Severely Overcrowded (>1.5 persons/room)	67	0.7%	137	1.6%	204	2.4%

Sources: ACS 2010-2014 (Units:8,669); ACS 2014-2018, Table B25014 (5-Year Estimates). (Units:8,494)

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 Lemon Grove may experience higher incidences of housing overpayment (cost burden), overcrowding, or other housing problems. The special needs groups analyzed include the elderly, persons with disabilities, homeless people, single parents, large households, and farm workers (**Figure 16**). Many of these groups overlap, for example many farm workers are homeless, and many elderly people have a disability of some type. The majority of these special needs groups could be assisted by an increase in affordable housing, especially housing located near public transportation and services. Overall, the changes between 2012 and 2018 reflect an aging population and an increase in large households, while other special needs groups were generally unchanged on a percentage basis, except for increases in persons with disabilities and single-parent households.

Figure 16
Special Needs Groups in Lemon Grove (2018)

Special Needs Group	2012		2018	
	Number of People or Households	% of Total Households or Population	Number of People or Households	% of Total Households or Population
Households with Seniors	2,106	24.3%	2,570	30.3%
Senior Headed Households	851	10.2%	926	10.9%
Seniors Living Alone	935	10.4%	883	10.4%
Persons with Disabilities	2,267	9.2%	3,253	12.3%
Large Households	1,041	12.6%	1,368	16.1%
Single Parent Households	1,785	21.6%	2,492	29.3%
People Living in Poverty	3,021	12.0%	3,324	12.5%
Farmworkers	0	0%	16	0.05%
Unsheltered	24	0.9%	18	0.06%

Sources: 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimate Data Profiles, 2012 Housing Element, ACS 2014-2018, Tables DP02, S2502, S1810, S1101, S1701, and S2401 (5-Year Estimates); Regional Task Force on the Homeless WeAllCount Report, 2020. (Total Households: 8,494; Population 26,811)

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. **Figure 17** shows that 3,448 persons were age 65 and over in Lemon Grove in 2018. This accounted for about 13% of residents, slightly lower than the percentage found in the region as a whole.

Figure 17
Person Age 65 and Over

Jurisdiction	Total	Age 65+	Percent Age 65+
Chula Vista	266,468	32,212	12.1%
El Cajon	103,285	12,341	11.9%
La Mesa	59,562	8,590	14.4%
Lemon Grove	26,767	3,448	12.9%
National City	60,896	7,643	12.6%
San Diego	1,401,932	171,804	12.3%
Santee	57,615	8,190	14.3%
County	3,302,833	439,595	13.3%

Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table DP05 (5-Year Estimates).

From 2014-2018, 10.9% of City households were headed by someone 65 years old or older. Aside from overpayment problems faced by seniors due to their relatively fixed incomes, many seniors are faced with various disabilities. Roughly 9.4% of Lemon Grove's senior population was listed as having one or more disabilities in the 2014-2018 ACS. Among these disabilities, the most common were ambulatory difficulties and independent living difficulties.

In 2020, Lemon Grove was home to 29 residential care facilities for seniors licensed by the State (**Figure 18**). The majority of the 510 beds were provided in two large care facilities. Licensed residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons are permitted by right in all residential zones.

Figure 18
Licensed Care Facilities

Facility Type	Facility Size (<= 6 beds)		Facility Size (>6 beds)	
	Facilities	Beds	Facilities	Beds
Residential Care Facilities for Elderly	4	24	2	335
Adult Residential Care Facilities	13	78	3	37
Adult Day Care Facilities	3	-	-	-
Group Homes	2	12	2	24

Note: Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly are facilities that provide services to persons 60 years of age and over and persons under 60 with compatible needs. RCFEs may also be known as assisted living facilities, retirement homes and board and care homes. The facilities can range in size from six beds or less to over 100 beds. The residents in these facilities require varying levels of personal care and protective supervision. Adult Residential Facilities are facilities of any capacity that provide 24-hour non-medical care for adults ages 18 through 59, who are unable to provide for their own daily needs. Adults may be physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, and/or mentally disabled. Small Family Homes provide 24-hour-a-day care in the licensee's family residence for six or fewer children who are mentally disabled, developmentally disabled, or physically handicapped, and who require special care and supervision as a result of such disabilities. Group Homes are facilities of any capacity and provide 24-hour non-medical care and supervision to children in a structured environment. Group Homes provide social, psychological, and behavioral programs for troubled youths. There are 18 Children's Residential Group Homes in San Diego County. The addresses of these facilities have been redacted to protect the safety and wellbeing of clients. Source: State of California, Community Care Licensing Division, 2020.

Persons with Disabilities (Including Developmental Disabilities)

Physical, mental, and/or developmental disabilities may prevent a person from working, restrict one's mobility, or make it difficult to care for oneself. Thus, disabled persons often have special housing needs related to limited earning capacity, a lack of accessible and affordable housing, and higher health costs associated with a disability. Some residents suffer from disabilities that require living in a supportive or institutional setting.

The 2014-2018 ACS defines six types of disabilities: hearing difficulties, vision difficulties, cognitive difficulties, ambulatory difficulties, self-care difficulties, and independent living difficulties. A more detailed description of each disability is provided below:

- Hearing difficulty: Refers to respondents who are deaf or have serious difficulty hearing.
- Vision difficulty: Refers to respondents who are blind or have serious difficulty seeing even when wearing glasses.
- Cognitive difficulty: Refers to respondents with serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or making decisions due to a physical, mental, or emotional condition.
- Ambulatory difficulty: Refers to respondents who experience serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs.
- Self-care difficulty: Refers to respondents who have trouble dressing or bathing.
- Independent living difficulty: Refers to respondents who experience difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor's office or shopping due to a physical, mental, or emotional condition.

According to the 2014-2018 ACS, approximately 12.3% of Lemon Grove residents had a disability. The ACS tallied the number of disabilities by type for residents with one or more disabilities. Among the disabilities tallied, 27.7% were hearing difficulties, 18.4% were vision difficulties, 41.5% were cognitive difficulties, 62.4% were ambulatory difficulties, 24.7% were self-care difficulties, and 45.9% were independent living difficulties (**Figure 19**). The 2018 ACS reported that 15.5% of persons with disabilities in San Diego County were living below the poverty level. It also estimates that a majority (55%) of persons with a disability in the County are not in the labor force. Of those with a disability in the labor force, 89% are employed.

Within Lemon Grove, the Developmental Services Continuum, Inc. is a nonprofit organization that provides services to developmentally disabled individuals locally. The services are contracted with the San Diego Regional Center (SDRC) which provides a range of services to persons with or affected by developmental disabilities. Services include diagnostic and eligibility assessments, program planning, case management, and other services and supports. The SDRD has four offices in the county and is one of 21 non-profit regional centers in California providing lifelong services and support for people with developmental disabilities residing in San Diego and Imperial Counties. As of June 2018, the Regional Center had just

over 27,000 clients living in San Diego County. The ARC of San Diego and Community Interface Services offer comprehensive services for persons or individuals with developmental disabilities and their families, including diagnosis, counseling, coordination of services, advocacy and community education/training. Additional local data can be found in the San Diego Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, May 2020, prepared for the San Dan Diego Regional alliance for Fair Housing at https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/draft_analysis_of_impediments_2020.pdf

Figure 19
Disability Status

Disability Type	% of Disabilities Tallied			
	Under 18	Age 18-64	Age 65+	Total
Hearing Difficulty	-	8.1% (263)	19.6% (638)	27.7% (901)
Vision Difficulty	-	8.8% (286)	10.1% (329)	18.4% (597)
Cognitive Difficulty	3.2% (104)	23.5% (764)	14.8% (482)	41.5% (1,350)
Ambulatory Difficulty	-	29.5% (961)	32.8% (1,068)	62.4% (2,029)
Self-care Difficulty	0.1% (4)	10.5% (343)	14.1% (458)	24.7% (805)
Independent Living Difficulty	-	22.3% (725)	23.6% (767)	45.9% (1,492)

Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table S1810 (5-Year Estimates). (Total disability estimate 3,253)

Changes in State law requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. As defined by State 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: a) self-care; b) receptive and expressive language; c) learning; d) mobility; e) self-direction; f) capacity for independent living; or g) economic self-sufficiency; and
- 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. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Developmental Disabilities department, approximately 17% of children between the ages of 3 and 17 have one or more developmental disabilities. This equates to 108 persons in the City of Lemon Grove with developmental disabilities, based on the 2014-2018 ACS population.

The California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) serves over 330,000 Californians with developmental disabilities. The San Diego Regional Center served approximately 29,206 residents as of 2019, 17% of which were served at the East County Office located in Santee. Most of these individuals reside in a private home with their parent or guardian and over 50% were under the age of 18.

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.

Resources

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.

State and federal legislation mandate that a specified number of units in new or rehabilitated multi-family apartment complexes be accessible to individuals with limited physical mobility. The City offers flexibility in development standards for projects proposing housing affordable to seniors and persons with disabilities. In addition, a number of residential care facilities are located in Lemon Grove to accommodate persons with disabilities.

Large Households

Large households are defined as those consisting of five or more members. These households comprise a special need group because of the often 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 result in accelerated unit deterioration.

Figure 20 compares the number of large households in Lemon Grove to that of the San Diego region. In 2019, close to 16% of households in Lemon Grove consisted of five or more persons, compared to 12% region wide. Among large households in Lemon Grove, the 2019 ACS reported 63.7% percent were owner-households and 36.2% percent were renter-households.

Figure 20
Large Households

Jurisdiction	Persons in Household			Total
	5	6	7+	
Lemon Grove	716	301	351	1,368
Percent of Total	8.4%	3.5%	4.1%	16.1%
San Diego County	78,930	32,607	21,051	132,588
Percent of Total	7.0%	2.9%	1.9%	11.9%

Source: ACS 2019, Table B25009 (5-Year Estimates); Households: 8,494

Resources

Lower and moderate income large households can benefit from various affordable housing programs. These include the First-Time Homebuyer Down Payment and Closing Cost Assistance programs, affordable housing development assisted with City, State, and federal funds, and Housing Choice Vouchers, among others.

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 a particularly vulnerable group because they must balance the needs of their children with work responsibilities, often while earning limited incomes.

An estimated 9.6% of Lemon Grove households were headed by single parents in 2018 (**Figure 21**), the large majority of which were headed by females (69%). According to the 2014-2018 ACS, 12% of single-parent female-headed households with children had incomes below the poverty level.

Figure 21
Single Parent Households

	Total Households	Single-Parent Households	Percent Total Households	Female Headed Households with Children	Percent Single-Parent Households
Lemon Grove	8,494	821	9.6%	609	74.2%
County	1,118,980	92,411	8.3%	66,423	71.9%

Source: ACS 2014-2018, Table DP02 (5-Year Estimates). Households: 8,494

Resources

Lower-income single-parent households can benefit from programs that provide direct rental assistance or that will facilitate the development of affordable housing. Homeownership opportunities can also be expanded for low and moderate-income single-parent households through the First-Time Homebuyer ~~Downpayment~~Down payment and Closing Cost Assistance programs offered by the County of San Diego.

Residents Living in Poverty

Families, particularly female-headed families, are disproportionately affected by poverty. The 2014-2018 ACS reported that 12.5% of the City's total households were living in poverty. Nearly 20% of all households living below the poverty level were single female-headed households. Most housing programs that target households with extremely low incomes (up to 30 percent AMI) will benefit households living in poverty.

Homeless

Throughout the country and the San Diego region, 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~~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 (Section 65583(1) (6)) 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 the Homeless (RTFH) is San Diego County's leading resource for information on issues of homelessness. RTFH compiles data from a physical Point-In-Time (PIT) count of sheltered (emergency and transitional) and street homeless persons. The 2020 Count was conducted during the last week of January and the results are shown in **Figure 22**. Chula Vista and El Cajon had the largest homeless populations of the Eastern County cities and Lemon Grove is estimated to be home to 18 homeless persons.

Figure 22
Homelessness in Lemon Grove and Surrounding Cities (2020)

Jurisdiction	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total	% of County
Chula Vista	101	212	313	4.1%
El Cajon	474	310	784	10.3%
National City	3	125	128	1.7%
Lemon Grove	0	18	18	0.2%
Santee	0	25	25	0.3%
La Mesa	0	52	52	0.7%
County	3,648	3,971	7,619	100%

Source: Regional Housing Task Force on the Homeless WeAllCount Report, 2020.

Resources

The East County Homeless Task Force (ECHTF) is a community-based volunteer program of the San Diego East County Chamber Foundation, a 501(c)(3) public benefit charitable organization. The ECHTF promotes collaboration between public, private, and non-profit sectors to discover and action solutions for homelessness in East County. Its Steering Committee includes managers from East County cities, County staff, the Chamber, residents, and leaders from local businesses, faith communities, non-profit health, housing, and outreach service providers. The following inventory lists additional homeless resources.

Figure 23 – Homeless Shelters and Services – East San Diego County

Agency	Program Name	Target Population	Service	Location
<i>Public Assistance</i>				
US Social Security Administration	-	-	-	La Mesa
SDSU	WIC	Women with Children	Funding for healthy foods for babies and young children.	Spring Valley
American Red Cross	WIC	Women with Children	Funding for healthy foods for babies, young children, nutrition classes/counseling, breastfeeding support.	Spring Valley
East County Public Health Center	-	Mixed Population	Immunizations, TB Medication, STD Testing & Hep. A Vaccinations	El Cajon
<i>Food Resources</i>				
Samoa / Lutheran Feeding Ministry	Food Pantry	Mixed Population	-	Lemon Grove
St. John of the Cross Catholic Church	Food Pantry	Mixed Population	-	Lemon Grove
<i>Healthcare Services</i>				
Grossmont Spring Valley Family Health Center (FHCS)	-	Mixed Population, General Homeless <u>General Homeless</u>	Comprehensive medical, family, counseling, women's health services. Provides healthcare services to people experiencing homelessness.	Spring Valley
Women's Health & Wellness Center	Borrego Health	Mixed Population	Comprehensive medical services, accepts Medi-Cal.	La Mesa
East Region Public Health Center	-	Mixed Population	Immunizations, TB Medication, STD Testing & Hep A Vaccinations	El Cajon
Rady Children's Urgent Care	-	Mixed Population	Pediatric urgent care services including all medical	La Mesa
Sharp Rees-Stealy La Mesa Urgent Care	-	Mixed Population	-	La Mesa
U.S. HealthWorks Urgent Care	-	Mixed Population	-	La Mesa
<i>Mental health/Substance Abuse Resources</i>				
Alvarado Parkway Institute, La Mesa Adult Behavioral Health	-	Mixed Population	Behavioral Health System	La Mesa
Grossmont Family Counseling Center	-	Mixed Population	Behavioral Health System	La Mesa
Heartland Wellness Recovery Center	-	Mixed Population	-	El Cajon
Spring Valley Family Counseling Center	-	Mixed Population	Healthcare and behavioral health supportive services	Spring Valley

<i>Reunification Programs</i>				
Salvation Army	"A Way Back Home"	General Homeless	Case management, transportation & needs arrangements, travel assistance, connection to services upon arrival.	El Cajon

<i>Shelters, Housing, and Case Management</i>				
Crisis House	-	General Homeless	Crisis intervention, case management, counseling, emergency food assistance, homeless day storage, mail service & telephone access.	El Cajon
East County Transitional Living	-	General Homeless	Emergency Shelter, Transitional Living, Drug Addiction, Faith-Based Learning	El Cajon
Eastern Lights	-	Homeless Youth (18-25)	Temporary Youth Shelter	El Cajon
Interfaith Shelters	-	General Homeless	Seasonal shelters in local churches	-

Source: East County Homeless Task Force & Home Start, 2020; www.ecassist.org

Agricultural Workers

Agricultural workers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Permanent farm laborers work in the fields, processing plants, or support activities on a generally year-round basis. When workload increases during harvest periods, the labor force is supplemented by seasonal labor, often supplied by a labor contractor. For some crops, farms may employ migrant workers, defined as those whose travel distance to work prevents them from returning to their primary residence every evening.

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 (EDD), farmworkers in San Diego County earned an average of \$31,729 annually. This limited income is exacerbated by their tenuous and/or seasonal employment status. It is estimated that there are between 100 and 150 farm worker camps located throughout the San Diego region, primarily in rural areas. 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.

Determining the true size of the agricultural labor force is problematic. For instance, the government agencies that track farm labor do not consistently define farmworkers (e.g., field laborers versus workers in processing plants), length of employment (e.g. permanent or seasonal), or place of work (e.g. the location of the business or field). Further limiting the ability to ascertain an accurate number of agricultural workers within Lemon Grove is the limited data available on the City due to its relatively small size. Therefore, the Census is the only source of information that can be referenced. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, only 0.05% (16 residents) of Lemon Grove residents (permanent and seasonal) were employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining occupations and 0.5% (8,464 residents) in San Diego County. The City does not have commercial agricultural uses at this time.

Because a negligible portion of community residents are employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining occupations and there is little potential for this occupational category to expand within

Lemon Grove, no housing programs or policies are needed to address the needs of farmworkers, other than an amendment to the Municipal Code to clarify that farmworker housing is permitted.

Note: Data sources includes EDD 2020 Occupational Employment and Wage Data, 1st Quarter. Accessed October 2020; The Agricultural Worker Health Study. 2002. Case Study 2: North San Diego County, and 2014-2018 ACS S2403.

Students

The City is located in the proximity of both San Diego State University, Grossmont College and Cuyamaca College. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, 1,994 residents (7.4% of the population) are enrolled in college or graduate school. This estimate is comparable to San Diego County as a whole (9% of residents). San Diego State University is the largest university in the east San Diego County region, with over 33,000 students. The university provides housing for an estimated 23% of enrolled students. Typically, students do not automatically qualify as low incomes and they can impact the local housing market due to their more transient nature.

Resources

Many State and federal programs are not available to students. However, City housing programs designed to expand affordable rental housing opportunities in the City may help expand housing options for students.

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 Lemon Grove to identify how well the current housing stock meets the needs of current and future residents of the City.

Consistent with an urbanized, largely built-out community, Lemon Grove has experienced relatively little housing growth since 2000. The housing stock in the City grew from 8,722 units in 2000 to 9,139 units in 2020, or a 1.7% increase from 2000-2010 and a 3.1% increase from 2010-2020 (**Figure 24**).

Figure 24
Housing Unit Growth (2000-2020)

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change	
				2000-2010	2010-2020
Chula Vista	59,495	79,416	86,785	33.5%	9.3%
El Cajon	35,190	35,850	36,282	1.9%	1.2%
La Mesa	24,943	26,167	26,929	4.9%	2.9%
Lemon Grove	8,722	8,868	9,139	1.7%	3.1%
National City	15,422	16,762	17,290	8.7%	3.2%
San Diego	469,689	516,033	549,070	9.9%	6.4%
Santee	18,833	20,048	21,248	6.5%	6.0%
County	1,040,149	1,164,786	1,226,879	12.0%	5.3%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000-2010 Census; DOF E-5: Population and Housing Estimates, 2020

Projected Housing Units

Figure 25 shows that between 2020 and 2030, Lemon Grove is projected to gain 4.7% in housing stock or 426 units. This expected increase in housing units is significantly lower than the 1,359 units that the City is asked to plan for through the RHNA process. Region-wide, approximately 10% more units will be added to the housing stock by 2030. Between 2020 and 2040, Lemon Grove is projected for a 9.6% increase in housing stock and approximately 17% more units will be added in the region. By 2050, the City housing stock is expected to increase 15.2% compared to 22% regionwide. Most of the East County cities are expected to experience similar rates of housing growth compared to the region between 2020 and 2050.

Figure 25
Projected Housing Units (2000-2050)


Jurisdiction	2020	2030	2040	2050	Percent Change		
					2020-2030	2020-2040	2020-2050
Chula Vista	86,785	99,031	105,107	108,273	14.1%	21.1%	24.8%
El Cajon	36,282	37,513	39,586	40,758	3.4%	9.1%	12.3%
La Mesa	26,929	28,414	30,922	33,407	5.5%	14.8%	24.1%
Lemon Grove	9,139	9,565	10,016	10,526	4.7%	9.6%	15.2%
National City	17,290	19,554	22,510	24,736	13.1%	30.2%	43.1%
San Diego	549,070	610,931	661,247	695,703	11.3%	20.4%	26.7%
Santee	21,248	22,549	23,548	23,886	6.1%	11.0%	12.4%
County	1,226,879	1,348,802	1,434,653	1,491,935	9.9%	16.9%	21.6%

Source: DOF E-5: Population and Housing Estimates, 2020; SANDAG 2050 Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, 2020.

Housing Type

Lemon Grove maintains a diverse housing stock. **Figure 26** shows that in 2020, Lemon Grove had more single-family units (65.8%) than the County average (50.8%). As a ~~result~~ ~~result~~, Lemon Grove also had fewer multi-family units (46.8%) than the County average (36.8%). Less than one percent of the units were mobile homes/trailers.

Figure 26
Types of Housing Units (2020)



Source: DOF E-5: Population and Housing Estimates, 2020.

Figure 27 shows that the proportion of both single-family units and mobile homes in Lemon Grove is projected to decrease, while the proportion of multi-family units is expected to increase.

Figure 27
Projected Types of Housing Units (2040)

Housing Type	2020 (Estimate)	% of Total	2030 (Projected)	% of Total	2040 (Projected)	% of Total
Single-Family (Attached & Detached)	6973	76.4%	6,995	73.1%	6,999	69.9%
Multi-Family	2098	23.0%	2,523	26.4%	3,006	30.0%
Mobile Homes	47	0.5%	47	0.5%	11	0.1%
Total Housing	9,118	100%	9,565	100%	10,016	100%

Source: SANDAG 2050 Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, 2013.

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 2011, among the City's occupied housing units, approximately 54% were owner-occupied, while 41% were renter-occupied (**Figure 28**). According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the amount of ~~owner-occupied~~owner-occupied units in Lemon Grove decreased to 50.2% of the occupied units. Renter-occupied housing units made up less than one-half (44.6%) of the City's occupied housing stock. Approximately 5% of total housing units were vacant in 2019.

Figure 28
Occupied Units

Tenure	2011		2019	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner Occupied	4,792	54.0%	4,500	50.2%
Renter Occupied	3,670	41.4%	3,994	44.6%
Total Occupied	8,462	95.4%	8,494	94.8%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 Census; ACS 2015-2019, Table DP04 (5-Year Estimates). (2011: 8,868; 2019: 8,957)

As shown in **Figure 29**, renter-occupied households had a slightly lower average household size than owner-occupied households. In 2011, average renter-household size was 2.83 persons compared to 2.99 persons for the average owner-household. In 2019, average owner-household size increased to 3.40, while household size for renter occupied households remained fairly constant.

Figure 29
Occupied Units – Household Size

Tenure	Average Household Size	
	2011	2019
Owner Occupied	2.99	3.40
Renter Occupied	2.83	2.81
Total Occupied	2.91	3.10

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 Census; ACS 2015-2019, Table DP04 (5-Year Estimates). (2011: 8,868; 2019: 8,957)

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~~ 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 Lemon Grove was 4.3% (**Figure 30**). Vacancy rates in Lemon Grove were similar to those in neighboring east county communities.

Figure 30
Vacancy Rates by Community and Property Age


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
Chula Vista	3.1%	3,333	104	4.1%	684	28	2.8%	356	10	2.80%	177	5
El Cajon	5.1%	2,034	104	5.3%	1,874	100	2.9%	34	1	-	-	-
La Mesa	3.6%	983	34	4.3%	533	23	-	-	-	3.60%	112	4
Lemon Grove	4.3%	70	3	4.3%	70	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
National City	1.3%	154	2	1.3%	154	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
East San Diego Co.	4.3%	3,893	167	5.0%	2,797	141	2.2%	45	1	3.60%	112	4
County	4.1%	23,000	936	-	-	-	3.0%	1,038	31	3.10%	289	9

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

Housing Age and Condition

Age of housing is an important characteristic because it is often an indicator of housing condition. Many Federal and State programs use age of housing as one factor to determine housing needs and the availability of funds for housing and/or community development. **Figure 31** shows that the housing stock in Lemon Grove is relatively old. Lemon Grove's housing stock grew significantly between 1950 and 1959. Approximately 46 percent of dwelling units were built before 1960, 26 percent more than in the region as a whole. This high percentage of older housing stock could indicate a growing need for housing rehabilitation at varying levels to maintain the existing housing stock.

Figure 31
Housing Stock Age



Although the Census does not include statistics on housing condition based upon observations, it includes statistics that correlate closely with substandard housing conditions. The three factors most commonly used to determine housing conditions are age of housing, overcrowding, and lack of plumbing/kitchen facilities. 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 enforcement, property maintenance and housing rehabilitation programs to stem housing deterioration. A number of housing units in Lemon Grove are beginning to show a need for rehabilitation. The scope of rehabilitation needed ranges from minor to substantial. Where it is not financially feasible to rehabilitate the units, replacement housing may be required.

Figure 32
Substandard Units

Condition	Number	Percentage
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	14	0.16%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	83	0.98%
Total occupied substandard units	97	1.14%
Total occupied units	8,494	


Source: ACS 2015-2019, Table DP04 (5-Year Estimates).

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 Lemon Grove residents.

Home Ownership Market

In 2020, median home prices in the East County areas of San Diego ranged from \$490,000 in National City to \$660,000 in the City of San Diego (**Figure 33**). Lemon Grove's median home price is above the median home price at \$557,500.

Figure 33
Median Home Sales Price (2020)



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

Median home sale prices in Lemon Grove increased by over 18% percent between 2019 and 2020. Other eastern San Diego cities saw similar increases in their median home prices during this time period.

Figure 34
Change in Median Home Sale Prices (2019-2020)

Jurisdiction	2019	2020		% Change in Median Sale Price
	Price	Number Sold	Price	
Chula Vista	\$507,000	291	\$580,000	+14.4%
El Cajon	\$490,000	158	\$560,000	+14.3%
La Mesa	\$553,000	92	\$616,250	+11.4%
Lemon Grove	\$470,000	20	\$557,500	+18.6%
National City	\$439,000	16	\$490,000	+11.6%
San Diego	\$620,000	1,562	\$660,000	+6.5%
Santee	\$540,000	85	\$585,000	+8.3%
County	\$585,000	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 from property owners representing 23,000 units. Although this survey sampled a broad variety of rental housing, it was not a scientific sampling.

Figure 35 shows that in the spring of 2019, average monthly rents in Lemon Grove ranged from \$913 for a studio apartment to \$1,558 for a three-bedroom apartment. Apartment rents in Lemon Grove tend to be slightly lower than rents in other East County cities.

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.

The Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) conducts annual household income surveys nationwide to determine a household's eligibility for federal housing assistance. Based on this survey, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) developed income limits that can be used to determine the maximum price that could be affordable to households in the upper range of their respective income category. Households in the lower end of each category can afford less by comparison than those at the upper end. **Figure 36** shows the maximum affordable home and rental prices for residents in San Diego County and the maximum amount that a household can pay for housing each month without incurring a cost burden (overpayment). This amount can be compared to current housing asking prices (**Figure 34**) and market rental rates (**Figure 35**) to determine what types of housing opportunities a household can afford.

Figure 35
Average Monthly Rent

Jurisdiction	Unit Type	Spring 2019 Units / Properties Surveyed	2019 Monthly Rent	2019 Rent per Sq. Foot	Fall 2018 Monthly Rent	Spring 2018 Monthly Rent
Chula Vista	Studio	12/6	\$1,134	\$2.67	\$1,210	\$1,157
	1 BR	1314/32	\$1,487	\$2.19	\$1,539	\$1,425
	2 BR	1728/38	\$1,820	\$1.86	\$1,850	\$1,685
	3+ BR	279/12	\$2,213	\$170	\$2,299	\$2,000
El Cajon	Studio	37/2	\$1,187	\$2.74	\$752	\$910
	1 BR	766/11	\$1,495	\$2.29	\$1,724	\$1,413
	2 BR	1059/23	\$1,663	\$1.82	\$1,728	\$1,602
	3+ BR	181/10	\$2,169	\$1.91	\$2,185	\$1,901
La Mesa	Studio	34/4	\$1,419	\$2.83	\$1,168	\$1,149
	1 BR	453/13	\$1,526	\$2.29	\$1,568	\$1,619
	2 BR	326/17	\$1,826	\$1.92	\$1,968	\$2,081
	3+ BR	143/5	\$2,352	\$1.84	\$2,397	\$2,410
Lemon Grove	Studio	64/2	\$913	\$2.28	\$891	\$874
	1 BR	2/2	\$963	\$2.04	\$1,030	\$948
	2 BR	1/1	\$1,600	\$1.88	\$1,282	\$1,564
	3+ BR	3/3	\$1,558	\$1.73	-	\$1,568
National City	Studio	-	-	-	-	-
	1 BR	137/2	\$1,005	\$2.26	-	-
	2 BR	16/2	\$1,567	\$1.46	\$1,075	-
	3+ BR	1/1	\$1,750	\$1.76	\$1,900	\$1,703
San Diego	Studio	280/29	\$1,367	\$3.41	-	-
	1 BR	4,069/121	\$1,845	\$2.66	-	-
	2 BR	6,416/159	\$2,241	\$2.11	-	-
	3+ BR	1,104/56	\$2,753	\$2.15	-	-
Santee	Studio	-	-	-	-	-
	1 BR	166/3	\$1,552	\$2.43	\$1,599	\$1,572
	2 BR	486/6	\$1,811	\$1.98	\$1,740	\$1,757
	3+ BR	22/2	\$1,983	\$1.89	\$1,737	\$2,348
County	Studio	659/56	\$1,315	\$3.03	-	-
	1 BR	8,256/221	\$1,684	\$2.48	-	-
	2 BR	12,143/301	\$2,071	\$2.04	-	-
	3+ BR	1,933/121	\$2,526	\$2.01	-	-

- Represents data not available. Source: San Diego County Apartment Association Survey, Spring 2019.

Figure 36
Affordable Housing Costs

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
2-Person	\$27,750	\$694	\$198	\$243	\$66,792	\$496
3-Person	\$31,200	\$780	\$240	\$273	\$70,498	\$541
4-Person	\$34,650	\$866	\$283	\$303	\$73,809	\$583
5-Person	\$37,450	\$936	\$348	\$328	\$68,801	\$589
Very Low Income (50% of Area Median Income)						
1-Person	\$40,450	\$1,011	\$164	\$354	\$130,009	\$847
2-Person	\$46,200	\$1,155	\$198	\$404	\$145,806	\$958
3-Person	\$52,000	\$1,300	\$240	\$455	\$159,576	\$1,061
4-Person	\$57,750	\$1,444	\$283	\$505	\$172,736	\$1,161
5-Person	\$62,400	\$1,560	\$348	\$546	\$175,652	\$1,213
Low Income (80% of Area Median Income)						
1-Person	\$64,700	\$1,618	\$165	\$566	\$233,862	\$1,454
2-Person	\$73,950	\$1,849	\$198	\$647	\$264,647	\$1,651
3-Person	\$83,200	\$2,080	\$240	\$728	\$293,192	\$1,841
4-Person	\$92,400	\$2,310	\$283	\$809	\$321,128	\$2,027
5-Person	\$99,800	\$2,495	\$348	\$873	\$335,821	\$2,148
Median Income (100% of Area Median Income)						
1-Person	\$64,900	\$1,623	\$164	\$568	\$234,719	\$1,459
2-Person	\$74,150	\$1,854	\$198	\$649	\$265,504	\$1,656
3-Person	\$83,450	\$2,086	\$240	\$730	\$294,263	\$1,847
4-Person	\$92,700	\$2,318	\$283	\$811	\$322,413	\$2,035
5-Person	\$100,100	\$2,503	\$348	\$876	\$337,105	\$2,155
Moderate Income (120% of Area Median Income)						
1-Person	\$77,900	\$1,948	\$164	\$682	\$290,392	\$1,784
2-Person	\$89,000	\$2,225	\$198	\$779	\$329,100	\$2,028
3-Person	\$100,150	\$2,504	\$240	\$876	\$365,782	\$2,264
4-Person	\$111,250	\$2,781	\$283	\$973	\$401,855	\$2,498
5-Person	\$120,150	\$3,004	\$348	\$1,051	\$422,971	\$2,656

Source: California Department HCD, 2020 Income limits; Assumptions: 2020 HCD income limits; 30% gross household income as affordable housing cost; 35% of monthly affordable cost for taxes and insurance; 10% ~~downpayment~~down payment; and 3% interest rate for a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage loan. Utilities based on San Diego County Utility Allowance.

Extremely Low income Households

Extremely low income households earn 30 percent or less of the County area median income – up to \$24,300 for a one-person household and up to \$37,450 for a five-person household in 2020. Extremely low income households cannot afford market-rate rental or ownership housing in Lemon Grove without assuming a cost burden.

Very Low income Households

Very low income households earn between 31 percent and 50 percent of the County area median income – up to \$40,450 for a one-person household and up to \$62,400 for a five-person household in 2020. A very low income household can generally afford homes offered at prices between \$130,009 and \$175,652, adjusting for household size. Given the costs of ownership housing in Lemon Grove, 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 Lemon Grove.

Low income Households

Low income households earn between 51 percent and 80 percent of the County's area median income - up to \$64,700 for a one-person household and up to \$99,800 for a five-person household in 2020. The affordable home price for a low income household at the maximum income limit ranges from \$233,862 to \$335,821. Based on the asking prices of homes for sale in 2020 (**Figure 34**), ownership housing would not be affordable to low income households. As of Spring 2019, few low income households in Lemon Grove would be able to find adequately sized affordable apartment units (**Figure 35**) and the availability of such units may be limited.

Median income Households

Median income households earn between 81 percent and 100 percent of the County's area median income - up to \$64,900 for a one-person household and up to \$100,100 for a five-person household in 2020. The affordable home price for a median income household at the maximum income limit ranges from \$234,719 to \$337,105. Based on the asking prices of homes for sale in 2020 (**Figure 34**), ownership housing would not be affordable to median income households. As of Spring 2019, some median income households in Lemon Grove would be able to find adequately sized affordable apartment units (**Figure 35**) but the availability of such units may be limited.

Moderate income Households

Moderate income households earn between over 100 percent of the County's Area Median Income – up to \$120,150 depending on household size in 2020. The maximum affordable home price for a moderate income household is \$290,392 for a one-person household and \$422,971 for a five-person family. Moderate income households in Lemon Grove would still have some trouble finding and purchasing adequately-sized homes. Appropriately-sized market-rate rental housing is generally affordable to households in this income group.

Extremely Low Income Households

Households with extremely low income have a variety of housing situations and needs. Extremely low income households may require specific housing solutions such as deeper income targeting for subsidies; housing with supportive services; single-room occupancy (SRO's) and/or shared housing; and rent subsidies (vouchers). Extremely low income is defined as households with income less than 30 percent of the area median income. In 2009, approximately 2,129 extremely low income households resided in the City representing 25.8 percent of the total households, compared to 2,070 extremely low income households representing 24.3% in 2019 (Figure 14). Additionally, more than 85% of total households (Owner:165, Renter:945) have a cost burden greater than 30%. In 2011, among the City's occupied housing units, approximately 54% were owner-occupied, while 41% were renter-occupied (Figure 28). According to

the 2015-2019 ACS, the amount of ~~owner-occupied~~owner-occupied units in Lemon Grove decreased to 50.2% of the occupied units. Renter-occupied housing units made up less than one-half (44.6%) of the City's occupied housing stock. Approximately 5% of total housing units were vacant in 2019. Figure 49 shows a need for 148 extremely low income household units by 2029. These units are anticipated to be constructed at properties identified in the Sites Inventory (Appendix B) at densities greater than 30 du/acre. The City has entitled a multi-family project with two very low income density bonus units in the past year. This has proven to be an effective strategy as shown by the City's ability to meet RHNA goals in the previous cycle. Additionally, the City is seeking to improve the existing Density Bonus Ordinance through the implementation of Program 5, which intends to introduce greater flexibility for density bonus projects.

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 April 15, ~~2021~~2021, through April 15, 2031. Consistent with State law, this section identifies publicly assisted housing units in Lemon Grove, analyzes their potential to convert to market rate housing uses, and analyzes the cost to preserve or replace those units.

Publicly Assisted Housing

The City of Lemon Grove has a range of publicly assisted rental housing affordable to lower and moderate income households. **Figure 37** provides a summary listing of affordable projects in the City. Within the 2021-2031 "at-risk" housing analysis period Hillside Terrace is considered at risk of converting to market-rate housing.

Figure 37
Governmentally Regulated Affordable/Senior Housing Projects

Name	Address	Number of Units	Monitoring Agency	Potential Date of Subsidy Termination
Terrace Garden	3281 College Place	150 (senior 55+)	Padre Properties	N.A.
Hillside Terrace	3262 College Place	18 (Section 8)	Urban Futures	2023
St John's Plaza	8150 Broadway	100 (98 senior 62+ and 99 Section 8)	Archdiocese of San Diego	2036
Grove Lofts	8465 Broadway	1 (Very Low Income)	City of Lemon Grove	2061
Citron Court	7385 Broadway	36 (26 very low, 9 low income)	Urban Futures	2064
Mallard Court	Mallard Court	4 (Moderate Income)	City of Lemon Grove	2071

Source: Rosario Pritchard, Community Manager, St. John's Plaza, City of Lemon Grove Community Development Department and County of San Diego Housing and Community Development Services – Rental Assistance and Affordable Housing Directory 2020; https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/sdhcd/docs/rental-assistance/housing_resource.pdf

Preservation of At-Risk Housing

Within the 2021-2031 “at-risk” housing analysis ~~period, one period, one~~ projects (Hillside Terrace) is considered at risk of converting to market-rate housing. This projects offer 18 housing units that are affordable to lower income households with project-based Section 8 rental subsidies, however the City consulted with the owner and this project is expected to renew its Section 8 contract and not convert to market ~~rate-rate~~.

Section 8 contracts are a source of affordable housing and are subject to a periodic renewal process; however, the approval is fairly automatic. If the property owner decides to allow the Section 8 program to lapse, the tenants would be notified and would have one year to relocate. Subject to funding availability, HUD would make Section 8 vouchers available to the tenants. Tenants could decide to use the voucher at the project or at a different location. County HCD is currently assisting 350 recipients with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in Lemon Grove. In addition, out of the 56,180 applicants currently on the HCV Waiting List, 805 identify as living in Lemon Grove.

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. The following discussion highlights ways that the City could preserve affordable housing. All of the presented alternatives are costly, likely beyond the ability of the City of Lemon Grove to manage without large amounts of subsidy from Federal, State and other local resources. These options are described below.

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. The estimated value of the ~~resitriected~~restricted units at Hillside Terrace is shown in **Figure 38**.

Current market value for the units is estimated on the basis of the project’s potential annual ~~income,~~ ~~and income and~~ operating and maintenance expenses. As indicated below, the estimated market value of Hillside Terrace is \$2.47 million. This estimate is provided for the purpose of comparison and understanding the magnitude of costs involved and does not represent the precise market value of this project. The actual market value at time of sale will depend on market and property conditions, lease-out/turnover rates, among other factors.

Figure 38
Market Value of “At-Risk” Units

Hillside Terrace	At-Risk Units
One-Bedroom Units (540 sq. ft.)	3
Two-Bedroom Units (850 sq. ft.)	15
Annual Operating Cost	\$127,893
Gross Annual Income	\$325,755
Net Annual Income	\$197,862
Market Value	2,473,275

Market value for project is estimated with the following assumptions: Average market rent based on Fair Market Rents (FY 2021) established by HUD. Studio (Efficiency) \$1,320, One-bedroom unit = \$1,460; Two-bedroom unit = \$1,613; Annual income is calculated on a vacancy rate = 5%; Annual operating expenses per square foot = \$8.90; Market value = Annual net project income multiplication factor; Multiplication factor for a building in good condition is 12.5.

Rental Assistance

Tenant-based rent subsidies can also 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.

Figure 39
Rental Subsidies Required

Unit Size	At-Risk Units	Fair Market Rent	Household Size	Household Annual Income	Affordable Costs (Minus Utilities)	Monthly per Unit Subsidy	Total Monthly Subsidy
Very-Low Income (50% AMI)							
1-BR	3	\$1,460	2	\$46,200	\$751	\$709	\$2,127
2-BR	15	\$2,064	3	\$52,000	\$1,061	\$1,003	\$15,045
Total	18	-	-	-	-	-	\$17,172

Notes: Fair Market Rents (FMR) FY 2021 are determined by HUD; San Diego County 2020 Area Median Household Income (AMI) limits set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Affordable cost = 30% of household income minus utility allowance.

Purchase of Affordability Covenants

Another option to preserve the affordability of at-risk projects 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. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City could ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable.

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.~~^{i.e.}, square footage and number of bedrooms), location, land costs, and type of construction.

For the project, assuming 540 square feet for one bedroom units (3 dwelling units); 850 sq. ft. for two bedroom units (15 dwelling units) and total construction of about \$161.23 square foot, the replacement costs would be \$2,833,034.

Figure 40
Estimated New Construction Cost

Unit Size	(A) Total Units	(B) Estimated Average Unit Size (sq. ft.)	(C) Estimated Gross Building Size	(D) Estimated Gross Building Costs
1-BR	3	540	1,944	\$313,431
2-BR	15	850	12,750	\$2,569,603
Total	18	-	-	\$2,883,034
Average Unit Cost				\$160,168

Notes: (C) = (A) x (B) x 1.20 (i.e. 20% inflation to account for hallways and other common areas); (D) = (C) x \$161.23 (per square foot construction costs) x 1.25 (i.e. 25% inflation to account for parking and landscaping costs); * County of San Diego Building Division, 2017 Valuation Multipliers.

Cost Comparisons

The above analysis attempts to estimate the cost of preserving the at-risk units under various options. In general, providing additional incentives/subsidies to extend the affordability covenant would require the least funding over the long run, whereas the transfer of ownership would be the most costly option. Over the short term, providing rent subsidies would be least costly but this option does not guarantee the long-term affordability of the units.

The cost to build new housing to replace the 18 at-risk units is high, with an estimated total cost of over \$2.47 million, excluding land, on- and off-site improvements, and permit fees. When these other costs are considered, new construction is the more expensive option than transfer of ownership (\$2.88 million). Both the construction of new housing and transfer of ownership would be substantially more expensive than providing rent subsidies similar to Section 8 vouchers (\$206,064 annually). However, rent subsidies does not provide long-term affordable housing.

Resources for Preservation

Preservation of at-risk housing requires not only financial resources but also administrative capacity of nonprofit organizations. These resources are discussed in detail later in this Housing Element in the "Housing Resources" section.

Housing Constraints

Actual or potential 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 Lemon Grove 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 Lemon Grove and elsewhere in the San Diego region is the high cost of land. This section describes various governmental, market, and environmental constraints on the development of housing that meets the needs of all economic segments of Lemon Grove's population.

Market Constraints

Market constraints significantly affect the cost of housing in ~~Lemon Grove, and~~ Lemon Grove 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 Lemon Grove.

Economic Factors

Market forces on the economy and the trickle down effects on the construction industry can act as a barrier to housing construction and especially to affordable housing construction. California's housing market peaked in the summer of 2005 when a dramatic increase in the State's housing supply was coupled with low interest rates. The period between 2006 and 2010, however, reflects a time of significant change as the lending market collapsed and home prices saw significant decreases. Double-digit decreases in median sale prices were recorded throughout the State at this time. More recently, housing prices have recovered, with prices in Lemon Grove trending steadily upward. However, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020 is anticipated to significantly impact the region's economy, including the housing market.

Construction Costs

Construction costs vary widely according to the type of development. Multi-family housing is generally less expensive to construct than single-family homes on a per unit basis. However, a wide variation within each housing type exists depending on the size of the unit and the number and quality of amenities provided. Such amenities include fireplaces, swimming pools, and interior features among others.

A number of factors influence construction costs and the sales price. A reduction in amenities and the quality of building materials (above a minimum acceptability for health, safety, and adequate performance) could result in lower sales prices. Another factor related to construction costs is the number of units built at one time. As the number increases, overall costs generally decrease as builders are able to take advantage of economies of scale. This type of cost reduction is of particular benefit when density bonuses are used for the provision of affordable housing. Manufactured housing may provide for lower priced housing by reducing construction and labor costs. However, due to the high cost of land in urban neighborhoods, new construction of manufactured housing cannot be assumed to meet the housing needs of lower-income households.

Land Costs

The cost of raw land typically accounts for a large share of total housing production costs. Land costs vary depending on whether the site is vacant or has an existing use that must be removed. Similarly, site constraints such as environmental issues (e.g., steep slopes, soil stability, seismic hazards) can be a factor driving up the cost of developable land. Typically, land prices can add to the cost of a residential development project and ultimately be a constraint on housing development.

Few vacant lots remain in the City of Lemon Grove. Future residential development will primarily occur as infill developments and redevelopment of existing underutilized properties. Developing on previously developed properties in general is more costly than developing on vacant land given the higher site acquisition and demolition costs.

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 are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of the applicants. This applies to all loan applications for home purchases, improvements and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance. The data for Lemon Grove was compiled by census tract and **Figure 41** summarizes the disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2018 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Lemon Grove. Included is information on loan applications that were approved and originated, approved but not accepted by the applicant, denied, withdrawn by the applicant, or incomplete.

Figure 41
Disposition of Home Loans

Loan Type	Total Applicants	Percent Approved	Percent Denied	Percent Withdrawn
Government-Backed Purchase	167	74.3%	6.6%	14.9%
Conventional Purchase	183	70.5%	7.6%	14.8%
Refinance	1,017	55.7%	17.5%	15.5%
Home Improvement	101	34.6%	46.5%	11.9%
Total	1,468	58.2%	16.9%	15.2%

Note: Approved applications include those that are approved and originated (accepted by the applicants) and those that are approved but not accepted by the applicants. Source: www.ffiec.gov, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data for 2018.

Home Purchase Loans

In 2018, a total of 183 households applied for conventional loans to purchase homes in Lemon Grove. The overall loan approval rate was 70.5% and 7.6% of applications were denied. In comparison, 78% of conventional home loan applications were approved in San Diego County. Approximately 167 home purchase applications were submitted in Lemon Grove through government-backed loans (for example, FHA, VA) in 2018; 74.3% of these applications were approved. To be eligible for such loans, residents must meet the established income standards, maximum home values, and other requirements. For government-backed loans, the approval rate for the San Diego County was 83%. In general, access to home purchase financing in Lemon Grove is lower than countywide trends.

Refinance Loans

The majority of loan applications submitted by Lemon Grove residents in 2018 were for refinancing their existing home loans (1,017 applications). 55.7% of these applications were approved, while 17.5% were denied. In the San Diego County, 64% of refinancing applications were approved.

Home Improvement Loans

A larger proportion of Lemon Grove applicants were denied for home improvement loans than any other type of loan applications. 46.5% of applicants were denied and just 34.6% were approved by lending institutions in 2018. The high denial rate may be explained by the nature of these loans. Most home improvement loans are second loans and therefore more difficult to qualify due to high income-to-debt ratios. In San Diego County, home improvement loan applications had a much higher approval rate (64%) than in Lemon Grove.

Foreclosures

The period of 2000 to 2005 represents an inflated housing market in the San Diego region and nationwide. With low interest rates, “creative” financing (such as zero down, interest payment only, and adjustable loans), and predatory lending practices (such as aggressive marketing, hidden fees, negative amortization), many households purchased homes that were beyond their financial means. Many homebuyers were misled to assuming refinancing to lower interest rates would always be an option and home prices would continue to rise at double-digit rates. Many were unprepared for the hikes in interest rates, expiration of short-term fixed rates, and decline in sales prices that set off in 2006. Suddenly faced with significantly inflated mortgage payments, and mortgage loans that are larger than the worth of the homes, foreclosure was the only option available to many households.

Following a peak in foreclosures in 2008, the number of foreclosures has steadily declined down from over 15,000 in 2009 to less than 1,000 in 2018. Lemon Grove is in an even more favorable condition, with foreclosure rates lower than those in San Diego County at 1 in every 9,343 compared to Lemon Grove at 1 in every 8,949 (www.realtytrac.com). However, it is expected that the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will lead to an increase in foreclosure rates in the future.

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, in particular, 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 Lemon Grove and efforts to address them.

Land Use Controls

The Community Development 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.

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. **Figure 42** lists the residential land use designations in the General Plan.

The City's residential land use designations provide for the development of a wide range of housing types at various densities including single-family dwellings, mobile homes, townhomes, condominiums, second dwelling units, and multi-family units. Therefore, the land use regulations are not considered a constraint to residential development.

Figure 42
Land Use Designations Permitting Residential Use

Land Use Category	Zoning District	Density (du/acre)	Character
Low Density Residential	Residential Low (RL)	Maximum 4 du/ac	Detached houses. Typical uses include accessory dwelling units, churches, day care, open space, public facilities, home businesses and others which are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood
Low/Medium Density Residential	Residential Low Medium (RLM)	Maximum 7 du/ac	Detached houses. Typical uses include accessory dwelling units, churches, day care, open space, public facilities, home businesses and others which are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood
Medium Density Residential	Residential Medium (RM)	Maximum 14 du/ac	Detached and attached houses including duplexes and town houses, and limited condominiums and apartments. Typical uses include accessory dwelling units, churches, day care, open space, public facilities, home businesses and others which are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood
Medium/High Density Residential	Residential Medium High (RMH)	Maximum 29 du/ac	Duplexes, town houses, condominiums, and apartments. Typical uses include accessory dwelling units, churches, day care, open space, public facilities, home businesses and others which are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood
Mixed-Use	Special Treatment Areas (STAs)	Minimum 25-45 du/ac	Mix of residential (condominiums and apartments) retail and office uses within the same building, lot or area, with the intent of creating lively pedestrian oriented villages near the trolley stations.
Retail Commercial	General Commercial (GC)	Maximum 29 du/ac	Retail operations providing a wide range of goods and services, catering to both local and regional customers. Includes shopping center, grocery stores, professional services and other compatible retail businesses that are auto-oriented. Dwellings may be located on floors above street level commercial at a maximum density of 29 du/ac.

Source: City of Lemon Grove General Plan and Municipal Code

Mixed-Use Special Treatment Areas

The City has designated 23.88 acres of land for mixed-use development. Mixed-use development allows a mix of retail, office, apartment, and condominium development. The mixed-use designations are located in two areas of the City, Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP) area and Special Treatment Area (STA) II. In both locations, the mixed-use concept is primarily intended to encourage increased transit use and would provide a residential population to help support local commercial uses. Residential densities within the DVSP are established as minimum densities ranging from 25 du/ac to 45 du/ac.

Retail Commercial Mixed-Use Areas

Approximately 130 acres within the City are designated for Retail Commercial use with the General Commercial (GC) zone. These areas are located along the Broadway commercial corridor. Existing zoning regulations allow for residential uses of up to 29 du/ac when located on floor above the street level commercial. The Housing Plan includes a program to amend the zoning ordinance to allow residential densities greater than 30 du/ac through a density bonus program which is further described below.

Density Bonus

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. The State density bonus law has undergone multiple amendments in recent years. AB 1763 made a number of changes to density bonus requirements for affordable projects. The bill requires a density bonus to be granted for projects that include 100% lower income units, but allows up to 20% of total units in a project that qualifies for a density bonus to be for moderate-income households. Under the revised law, density bonus projects must be allowed four incentives or concessions, and for developments within ½ mile of a major transit stop, a height increase of up to three additional stories or 33 feet. A density bonus of 80% is required for most projects, with no limitations on density placed on projects within ½ mile of a major transit stop. The bill also allows developers to request the elimination of minimum parking requirements for rental units affordable to lower-income families that are either supportive housing or special needs housing, as defined. AB 2345 signed by the Governor in September 2020 further incentivizes the production of affordable housing. The City of Lemon Grove implements the State density bonus law. In 2020, the City's Planning Commission approved a 17-unit density bonus project in the RLM zone. The Housing Plan includes a program to amend the zoning ordinance to ensure the affordable housing density bonus regulations conform to current State law and identifies incentives for retail commercial mixed-use areas.

Community Housing (Condominium) Conversion Ordinance

Lemon Grove strives to find a balance between affordable homeownership and affordable rental opportunities in the community. Condominium conversions can create for-sale housing opportunity for moderate-income households, mostly first-time buyers. However, the conversion of apartments to condominiums removes rental units from the City's housing stock and could impact lower-income households and households with other special housing needs. In 2016, the City Council approved an update to the Community Housing (Condominium) Conversion Ordinance to encourage the provision of housing and meeting minimum develop standards and the purpose of each zoning district.

Residential Development Standards

Citywide, excluding the specific plan areas, the City regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development primarily through the Zoning Code which is available at <http://qcode.us/codes/lemongrove/>. The following summarizes the City's existing residential zoning districts:

- Residential Low Density (RL) zone - The residential low density zone is intended to encompass an area of larger residential lots providing for single-family development. The minimum lot area is ten thousand square feet for residential uses; twenty thousand square feet for churches and other uses.
- Residential Low/Medium Density (RLM) zone - The residential low/medium density zone is intended to provide for small lot single-family development. The minimum lot area is six thousand square feet for residential uses; twenty thousand square feet for churches and other uses.
- Residential Medium (RM) zone - The residential medium density zone is intended primarily to provide for moderate intensity housing development, such as duplexes or townhouses, mixed with smaller lot single-family homes. The minimum lot area is six thousand square feet, subject to a minimum three thousand square feet per dwelling unit, for residential purposes; twenty thousand square feet for churches and other uses.
- Residential Medium/High (RMH) zone - The residential medium/high density zone is intended to provide for more compact multifamily housing development, such as garden apartments. The minimum lot area is six thousand square feet, subject to a minimum one thousand five hundred square feet per dwelling unit, for residential purposes; ten thousand square feet for churches and other uses.
- Residential Professional (RP) zone - The residential/professional zone is available to business, professional, or health practice uses combined with multifamily residential uses. The minimum lot area is thousand square feet subject to a minimum one thousand five hundred square feet per dwelling unit. No development project shall contain fewer than two dwelling units, or less than one unit per full three thousand square feet of lot area.
- General Commercial (GC) - The general commercial (GC) zone is available to auto-oriented, generally large-scale businesses and activities offering retail goods and services meant to serve the needs of local and regional shoppers. Dwellings may be located on floors above street level commercial at a maximum density of 29 du/ac.

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 **Figure 43**. 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.

**Figure 43
Residential Development Standards**

Zone	Maximum Density	Min. Lot Area	Min Lot Size		Bldg. Height		Setbacks			Min Usable Open Space	Parking
			Width	Depth	Main Bldg.	Other Bldg.	Front	Side	Rear		
RL	4 du/ac	10,000 sq. ft.	60'	90'	25'	15'	25'	10'	25'	2,000 sq. ft./du	2 spaces per du; both garaged
RL/M	7 du/ac	6,000 sq. ft.	60'	90'	25'	15'	25'	5'	20'	1,500 sq. ft./du	
RM	14 du/ac	6,000 sq. ft.; Min. 3,000 sq. ft/du	60'	90'	25'	15'	25'	5'	20'	1,500 sq. ft first unit, 500 sq. ft. per additional unit	2 spaces per du; 1 guest parking per 4 du
RM/H	29 du/ac (1 du per 3,000 sq. ft.)	6,000 sq. ft ; Min 1,500 sq. ft/du	60'	90'	45'	15'	25'	5'	20'	500 Sq. ft/du	
R/P	43 du/ac (1 du per 3000 sq. ft, min 2 du per project)		60'	90'	30'	15'	25'	5'	20'	500 Sq. ft/du	

Source: City of Lemon Grove Municipal Code

Parking Standards

Communities that require an especially high number of parking spaces 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. Typically, the concern for high parking standards relates mostly to multi-family, affordable, or senior housing. The City of Lemon Grove has parking requirements that are similar to other jurisdictions in eastern San Diego County requiring garaged parking for single-family homes and no garaged parking for multi-family developments.

The City provides flexibility in parking requirements with tandem spaces and potential parking reductions. To facilitate mixed-use development in the City, shared parking and tandem parking are allowed within a planned development permit. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing projects meeting the State density bonus requirements will be eligible for reduced parking pursuant to State law.

Height Limit

To promote mixed use development, the developer can apply for a planned development permit to increase height limits. In 2020, the City Council approved a height increase from 65 ft. to 73 ft. as part of a mixed-use development approval.

Short-term Rentals

As home-sharing websites have risen in popularity in recent years, there has been a significant increase in the number of homes being offered on a short-term basis to generate rental income. Homes may be offered as “home-shares,” where the primary resident offers one or more rooms to visitors while remaining on site, or whole homes may be rented on a daily or weekly basis. While the impact of short-term rentals on housing availability and affordability is still being evaluated, there is evidence that short-term rentals have a negative effect on housing affordability by changing the way residential properties are used and reducing housing availability for local residents.

San Diego County jurisdictions vary in their approach to short-term rentals. Some, particularly coastal cities where short-term rentals are most popular, explicitly allow short-term rentals in at least some zones, typically requiring permits, and specifying that short-term rentals must meet various performance standards to be allowed to operate.

La Mesa, El Cajon, and Santee do not explicitly address short-term rentals in their adopted regulations. The City of Lemon Grove does not allow entire homes to be used as short-term rentals, but rentals but does permit home-sharing with a permit. During 2020, the City permitted two home share permits. As a smaller jurisdiction located further from key tourist destinations in the County, home sharing permits in Lemon Grove have not generated the same challenges to housing availability that they do in locations with higher percentages of residences being used for short-term rentals.

Provision for a Variety of Housing Types

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. **Figure 44** below summarizes the various housing types permitted within the City's zoning districts.

Figure 44
Use Regulations for Residential Districts

Residential Type	Zoning District						
	RL	RLM	RM	RMH	RP	MU	GC
Single-Family Detached (1DU)	P	P	P	NP	NP	NP	NP
Single-Family Detached (2DU)	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	NP
ARDU (Second Unit)	P	P	P	P	NP	NP	NP
Duplex	NP	NP	P	CUP	NP	NP	NP
Multi-Family (3-4 DU)	NP	NP	CUP	CUP	P	NP	CUP
Multi-Family (5+ DU)	NP	NP	CUP	CUP	P	NP	CUP
Senior Housing (35+ DU)	NP	CUP	CUP	CUP	P	NP	CUP
Small Residential Care	P	P	P	P	P	P	MUP
Small Family Day Care	P	P	P	P	A	A	CUP
Large Residential Care	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	NP	NP	CUP
Large Family Day Care	MUP	MUP	NP	NP	NP	CUP	CUP
Boarding or Lodging House	NP	NP	NP	CUP	NP	NP	NP
Visitor Accommodations	NP	NP	NP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Emergency Shelter	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P
Single-Room Occupancy	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Manufactured Homes	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Mobile-Homes	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Transitional Housing	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Farmworker Housing	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Supportive Housing	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP

Notes: P=Permitted; NP=Not Permitted; A=Permitted, but must be accessory to a primary use; CUP=Conditional Use; SP=Same Process based on housing type; DU=Dwelling Unit; U=Unrestricted; MUP=Minor Use; Emergency Shelters permitted in the Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone in the GC zone.

Single-Family Dwelling

A “single-family dwelling” is defined in the Zoning Code as a freestanding building, built on, or assembled pursuant to the requirements of the Uniform Building Code, or a mobile home as defined in the National Mobile Home Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 5401, et seq.), installed on a permanent foundation, designed or used exclusively for occupancy by one household and containing one dwelling unit, as well as any state authorized, certified or licensed residential facility serving six or fewer persons.

Accessory Rental Dwelling Unit

Accessory rental dwelling units (ARDUs) 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. ARDUs may be an alternative source of affordable housing for lower-income households and seniors. The passage of AB 1866 (effective July 2003) requires 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 should be permitted in all residential zones where a primary single-family unit already exists. More recent state legislation, including AB 68, AB 881, and SB 13, modified the fees, application process, and development standards for accessory dwelling units, with the goal of lowering barriers to ARDU development and increasing overall numbers of ARDUs.

The City also allows junior accessory dwelling units in accordance with State law on lots zoned for single-family or multi-family residential use. Unlike other accessory dwelling units, junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) must be contained entirely within a single-family residence and may not be larger than 500 square feet. While they must include an efficiency kitchen and separate entrance, bathroom facilities may be shared with the primary residence and the two units must maintain a connection between the junior accessory dwelling unit and the main living space of the primary residence. JADUs are permitted in addition to accessory dwelling units.

The Lemon Grove zoning regulations include requirements for permitting ARDUs, but these requirements need to be updated to be consistent with State law which currently supersedes the City’s regulations for ARDUs and JADUs. The Housing Plan includes a program to amend the zoning ordinance to update the regulations for ARDUs and JADUs to be consistent with State law and to explore options for greater flexibility.

Multi-Family Dwellings

According to SANDAG’s Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast for 2020, multiple-family housing makes up approximately 23 percent of the housing stock in Lemon Grove in 2020. The Zoning Ordinance provides for multi-family developments in the RM, RMH, and RP zones, as well as the GC zone, and the mixed-use areas of the Downtown Village Specific Plan with a commercial component. The maximum density for the ranges from 14 units per acre in the RM zone to 43 units per acre in the RP zone. The minimum residential density within Downtown Village Specific Plan is 25 units per acre. The Zoning Ordinance specifies a CUP for multi-family projects, which requires a zoning consistency finding, but almost all new projects are approved through the Planned Development Permit process which allows for additional development standard flexibility.

Mobile Home Parks

Mobile homes provide opportunities for lower cost housing. The siting and permit process for mobile home parks are subject to the same development standards as single-family dwellings (Lemon Grove Municipal Code Section 17.08.030 “Dwelling, Single Family”).

Manufactured Housing

Manufactured housing can be an affordable housing option for low and moderate income households. The siting and permit process for manufactured housing is subject to the same development standards as single-family dwellings (Lemon Grove Municipal Code Section 17.08.030 “Dwelling, Single Family”).

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.

Residential care facilities are permitted in all residential zones provided that they are licensed by the State and serve six or fewer persons. Residential care facilities serving more than six persons are permitted in the same residential zones with a Conditional Use Permit. Similarly, residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons are permit in commercial zones (as a residential use) and facilities with more than six persons are also permitted with a Conditional Use Permit. Processing times and findings for conditional use permits can found in Figure 48 and the subsequent discussion. Over the previous Housing Element cycle the City did not deny any conditional use permit requests for large residential care facilities. Additional information regarding care facilities and available beds within the City can be found in, Figure 18. The CUP process ensures compatibility with surrounding properties and zoning consistency through findings and does not constrain the development of large residential care facilities. Additionally, a developer may also request a Planned Development Permit which allows further flexibility in development standards, which allows for reductions in cost and increased supply, Overall, as shown in Figure 18 the City has been able to partner with residential care providers to approve a large number of care facilities including large facilities that operate compatibly with surrounding properties and uses.

Emergency Shelters and Low Barrier Navigation Centers

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. Lemon Grove’s share of the regional unsheltered homeless population is estimated to be 18 individuals in 2020.

In 2019 the City of Lemon Grove amended its zoning ordinance to allow emergency shelters in the GC (Emergency Homeless Shelter Overlay Zone) as a permitted use and subject to certain conditions, including a size limit of no more than 60 beds, requirements for adequate on-site supervision, and a management plan. Individuals may not stay in an emergency shelter for longer than six months, and emergency shelters may not be located within 300 feet of another emergency shelter. The zone includes 21 parcels with a total site area of 13.48 acres and average site area of 0.64 acres. The zone is developed with 116,922 sq. ft. of commercial space which could be readily converted into an emergency shelter. Many of the commercial suites are occupied, but several tenant spaces within the individual centers are vacant and available for rent. The site ~~are is~~ developed with significant on-site parking (majority in excess of one space per 500 sq. ft.) and can easily accommodate parking for staff working at the shelter. The Zoning Ordinance does not require more parking than other residential or commercial uses in the zone. Surrounding properties are primarily commercial, with the exception of some residential uses to the south. The residential uses are located at an elevation significantly higher than the zone,

AB 139 requires the assessment of shelter needs be based on the most recent Point-in-Time Count and the parking standards for shelters be based on staffing levels. The most Point-in-Time Count reflects a reduction in the unsheltered homeless population from 35 individuals in 2019 to 18 individuals in 2020. Based on the most current Point-in-Time Count, no changes or updates are needed for the emergency shelter zoning regulations.

AB 101 requires cities to allow a Low Barrier Navigation Center development by right in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements. A “Low Barrier Navigation Center” is defined as “a Housing First, low-barrier, service-enriched shelter focused on moving people into permanent housing that provides temporary living facilities while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing.” Low Barrier shelters may include options such as allowing pets, permitting partners to share living space, and providing storage for residents’ possessions. AB 101 also sets a timeline for jurisdictions to act on applications for Low Barrier Navigation Center developments. The requirements of this bill are effective through the end of 2026, at which point they are repealed. A program in the Housing Plan of this Housing Element includes amendments to the zoning ordinance allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers by right in areas zoned for mixed use and nonresidential zones permitting multi-family uses.

Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing

California Health and Safety Code (Section 50801(i)) defines “transitional housing” and “transitional housing development” as buildings configured as rental housing ~~developments, but~~ 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 the 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.

AB 2162 requires supportive housing projects of up to 50 units be permitted by right in zones where multifamily and mixed-use developments are permitted, when the development meets certain conditions, such as providing a specified amount of floor area for supportive services. The City may choose to allow projects larger than 50 units by right, as well. The bill also prohibits minimum parking requirements for supportive housing within ½ mile of a public transit stop.

Currently, the City treats transitional housing for the homeless as "residential care facilities" in the Lemon Grove Zoning Ordinance. Residential care facilities are permitted in all residential zones provided that they are licensed by the State and serve six or fewer persons. Residential care facilities serving more than six persons are also permitted pursuant a Conditional Use Permit. Program 14 will clarify that transitional and supportive housing is permitted as a residential use in all zones and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone, including permanent supportive housing where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses pursuant to Government Code section 65651.

The City's Zoning Ordinance currently addresses the provision of transitional and supportive housing within the definition of a "Family" and states that "Family" means "one or more individuals occupying a dwelling unit, including transitional and supportive housing, and living as a single household." Transitional housing pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 50801(i) is therefore permitted by right where housing is permitted, and subject to the same development standards as other housing development. Supportive housing pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 50675.14(a)(B)(2) is also permitted by right as required by state law, and subject to the same development standards as other housing development.

Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Units

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.

One site at 1790-1822 Dayton Drive contains 24 studios with shared kitchen facilities (four studios per kitchen) within an established single-family residential area. The Lemon Grove Zoning Code includes specific provisions for SRO units and includes the use in the definition of visitor accommodations, which are allowed in the General Commercial zone subject to the issuance of a CUP. The existing Zoning Code therefore permits SRO units in close proximity to transit infrastructure and is consistent with AB 2634 (Housing for Extremely Low Income Households) enacted in 2007.

Farmworker 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.

Therefore, 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 will be required. In Lemon Grove, there is not a specific need for farm worker housing, as demonstrated in the Needs Assessment of this document. Agriculture is allowed in the City as an accessory use to a residential use as described on Chapter 17.16 of the Zoning Ordinance, but does not play a significant role in Lemon Grove. In order to confirm compliance with Health and Safety Code sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, the Employee Housing Act, the City will amend the Zoning Ordinance to clearly allow employee housing consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds to be permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone.

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 (modifications or exceptions) in 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.

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), Lemon Grove permits residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons in all residential zones. Residential care facilities are permitted in all residential zones provided that they are licensed by the State and serve six or fewer persons. Residential care facilities serving more than six persons are also permitted the GC zone pursuant a Conditional Use Permit. The City does not have a local requirement for proximity between two special needs housing sites.

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 Ordinance. Specifically, a restrictive definition of “family” that limits the number of and differentiates between related and unrelated individuals living together may 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’s Zoning Ordinance defines family as, “one or more individuals occupying a dwelling unit, including transitional and supportive housing, and living as a single household.” The current definition of “family” does not limit the number of unrelated individuals in a household.

Building Codes

Government Code Section 12955.1 requires that 10 percent of the total dwelling units in multi-family buildings without elevators consisting of three or more rental units or four or more condominium units be 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.
- The public and common areas shall be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.
- All the doors designed to allow passage into and within all premises shall be sufficiently wide to allow passage by persons in wheelchairs.
- All premises within covered multifamily dwelling units shall contain the following features of adaptable design:
 - An accessible route into and through the covered dwelling unit.
 - Light switches, electrical outlets, thermostats, and other environmental controls in accessible locations.
 - Reinforcements in bathroom walls to allow later installation of grab bars around the toilet, tub, shower stall, and shower seat, where those facilities are provided.
 - Useable kitchens and bathrooms so that an individual in a wheelchair can maneuver about the space.

The Building Division of the City's Community Development Department 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.

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 from persons with disabilities 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 of Lemon Grove does not have a separate process for review and approval of requests for reasonable accommodation with respect to zoning, permit processing or building laws. Such requests would be considered in conjunction with the appropriate regulatory process based on the nature of the request. If the request for accommodation does not require regulatory review, there is no further involvement on the part of the City. All of the City's development regulatory processes provide for appeals procedures. The City will amend the Zoning Ordinance to implement a formal reasonable accommodation procedure to address reasonable accommodation requests.

Permits and Processing

Existing regulations provide for the review and approval of both large and small group homes in the City's residential zones as well as the GC zone. Lemon Grove permits residential care facilities serving six or fewer persons in all residential zones. Residential care facilities are permitted in all residential zones provided that they are licensed by the State and serve six or fewer persons. Residential care facilities serving more than six persons are also permitted the GC zone pursuant a Conditional Use Permit.

A request to retrofit a property to increase accessibility would be processed through the normal building permit procedures, if the proposed work required a permit. Information about the zoning, permit processing

and building law is provided to property owners, developers and the general public, by telephone, the City's ~~web-site~~[website](#) and at the Community Development Department counter.

Conclusion

Overall, the City has no major constraints to housing for persons with disabilities. However, the Zoning Ordinance will be amended within one year of the adoption of the Housing Element to address reasonable accommodation procedures.

Development and Planning 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 planning services and other public services and facilities in the City. As part of the Housing Element update, the City contacted several developers active in the City to discuss potential constraints to housing development. City fees have not been found to act as a constraint to the development of housing in Lemon Grove. The City's current Master Fee schedule (2020) is posted on the City website at <https://www.lemongrove.ca.gov/city-hall/finance/-folder-98> and includes cost recovery deposits for planning and engineering permits. The current Master Fee Schedule is posted on the City of Lemon Grove website. **Figure 45** summarizes the most common planning fees for the City of Lemon Grove and surrounding jurisdictions. In general, most of the City's fees are lower than those in other nearby San Diego communities.

Figure 45
Regional Comparison of Planning Fees (2020)

Jurisdiction	Lemon Grove	El Cajon	La Mesa	National City	San Diego
Design Review	N/A	N/A	\$1,890-\$3,255	\$3,700	N/A
Conditional Use Permit	\$1,500	\$5,195	\$2,094-\$4,150	\$3,700	\$8,000
Tentative Parcel Map	\$2,550 +150/lot	\$3,625+ 26/lot	\$5,859	\$3,000	\$10,000
Plan Check	N/A	N/A	Full Cost Recovery	N/A	\$291-\$493
Final Parcel Map	\$3,500	\$5,100	\$3,357+\$323/lot	N/A	\$3,458.86++
Tentative Subdivision Map	\$3,750+ \$75-\$125/lot	\$6,225+ \$74/lot	\$7,557	\$4,000	\$10,000
Final Subdivision Map	\$6,000	\$6,710+	\$5,069+\$388/lot	N/A	\$3,750.56+
Variance	\$750	\$1,025	\$2,097-\$4,127	\$3,700	\$8,000
Environmental Review – Initial Study	Third Party Contractor	\$5,100+\$263/lot	\$1,426-\$3,003	\$1,100	\$1,170.45- \$2,340.89
General Plan Amendment	\$3,000	\$3,505	\$15,179	\$5,500	\$12,000

n.a. = information not readily available; Source: Cities of El Cajon, La Mesa, National City and San Diego, 2020; plan check valuation based

The San Diego County Building Industry Association recently issued their 2021 Fee Survey

(<https://www.biasandiego.org/>), which highlights the costs associated with permitting one new housing unit (single-family dwelling) including sewer, water, and school fees. The highest fees were for the Torrey Highlands community within the City of San Diego at \$166,277, followed by Chula Vista and Oceanside at \$91,340 and \$81,377, respectively. The City of Lemon Grove fees were among the lowest in San Diego County at \$35,342 with only Imperial Beach having lower fees at \$33,119. If accounting for a 3,000 sq. ft. dwelling constructed at approximately \$100 per square foot, the permitting and review costs for the City are less than 12% of total costs compared to more than 25% of total costs for the highest fees in BIA fee survey. Similarly, the fee study illustrates that the permit fees for multi-family development within the City are among the lowest in the County. Therefore, the cumulative impact of fees and the proportion of development costs is not a constraint to development in the City.

Development impact fees are charged to a new development in order 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. The City of Lemon Grove charges a parkland impact fee (\$513 to \$900 per unit) and sewer connection fee (\$3,509 per equivalent dwelling unit).

The City of Lemon Grove also implements a Residential Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program. This regional program for collecting a traffic impact fee on new residential development is required by the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. The fee is intended to ensure that future development pays its fair share of the cost of the regional arterial system and related regional transportation improvements. Currently the fee is \$2,533.15, increasing annually based on the percentage set forth in the Engineering Construction Cost Index published by the Engineering News-Record. All jurisdictions in the County of San Diego collect this fee, either at the time of the subdivision map or as a condition of building permit approval. Overall, the City's development fees are comparable or lower than those charged by neighboring cities and therefore not a constraint to housing development in the City.

On- and Off-Site Improvements

Site improvements in the City consist of those typically associated with development for on-site improvements (fronting streets, curbs, gutters, sewer/water, and sidewalks) and off-site improvements (drainage, parks, traffic, schools, and sewer/water). These improvements are required dependent on the project. On- and off-site improvements are costs associated with the provision of services necessary for the health and safety of the public. Because residential development cannot take place without the addition of adequate infrastructure, site improvement requirements are not seen as a constraint to the development of housing within the City.

Lemon Grove does impose standardized infrastructure requirements. Adopted policies in other elements of the General Plan call for street and sidewalk improvement standards adequate to serve and protect public safety. The improvements and exactions required for residential development are limited to those improvements needed to allow the project based on its impacts.

For single-family residential developments, examples of typical on-site improvements might include storm water detention facilities, roads, sidewalks, perimeter walls, fire hydrants, and emergency access drives. The Fire Department may require fire breaks and fuel management areas if a project is within or near brush areas. Multi-family developments also may include common open space and recreation areas. Sites listed on the inventory are expected to require typical on-site improvements.

Typical off-site improvements for both single-family and multi-family developments might include: new

curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, road improvements and traffic control needed to serve the development, street trees, and landscaping. Utilities may need to be upgraded or installed to serve the development, including water mains, sewer mains, storm water pollution prevention measures, and under grounding of electric utilities. Residential street widths vary depending upon the classification and are shown below in **Figure 46**. Sites listed on the inventory are expected to require typical off-site improvements.

Figure 46
Residential Street Widths

Classification	Travelway/ROW	LOS C Capacity ADT
Major Road	78' curb to curb/ 98'	30,000
Class I Collector	64' curb to curb/84'	22,000
Class II Collector	52' curb to curb/72'	16,000
Class III Collector	40' curb to curb/60'	7,500
Residential Collector	36' curb to curb/56"	7,500

Source: City of Lemon Grove

Infill residential projects may be required to install a variety of improvements depending on site-specific circumstances and neighborhood needs. As mentioned previously, required site improvements are limited to just those needed to serve the project and offset related impacts.

For residential projects, the landscaping requirement is 15 percent of the total site area. Projects subject to discretionary review, such as single-family subdivisions and multi-family projects are required to submit landscaping plans as part of the overall project. The City also amended the Municipal Code to incorporate the State mandated water conservation provisions. For projects not subject to discretionary review (e.g., a new single-family home on an individual lot), a calculation of water allowance is required. Open space requirements will apply to residential projects under certain circumstances such as the presence of steep slopes, flood plains, sensitive habitat, or other environmentally constrained features. The purpose of such restrictions is to protect environmentally or geologically sensitive areas from potential adverse effects of development.

Building Codes and Enforcement

The City of Lemon Grove has adopted the 2019 California Building Code. This code is considered to be the minimum necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare. 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 to 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 appeals process to challenge interpretations of the building code requirements.

Local Permits and Processing Times

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. 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 within six months. **Figure 47** provides a detailed summary of the typical processing procedures and timelines of various types of projects in the City.

**Figure 47
Processing Times**

Project Type	Reviewing Body	Public Hearing Required	Appeal Body (if any)	Estimated Total Processing Time
Single-Family Subdivision	City Council	Yes	N/A	6 to 12 months
Multiple-Family	Planning Commission	Yes	City Council	3 to 6 months
Multiple-Family (with subdivisions)	City Council	Yes	N/A	6 to 12 months
Mixed Use	Planning Commission	Yes	City Council	3 to 6 months

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2020

Single Family

A single-family dwelling, on an existing parcel, is subject to a building permit to ensure compliance with zoning regulations and the building and fire codes. Approval of a building permit for a single-family dwelling is administrative. Staff involved in the approval process includes members of the Planning Division, Engineering Division, Building Division and Fire Department. Processing time is approximately 4-6 ~~weeks~~, ~~but weeks but~~ is highly dependent on the quality of the initial submittal.

If the proposed single-family project does not conform to the development regulations of the zone, it requires a discretionary action. Examples of discretionary approval include a minor modification or variance. This type of project is considered by the Community Development Manager or Planning Commission, respectively. Approval is based on findings as outlined in the zoning regulations. Processing time is 2-4 months.

A single-family project, which includes a subdivision, requires a public hearing and approval of the City Council. The basis for approval is the City's subdivision regulations and the permitted density of the underlying zone. The City Council ratifies the Planning Commission decision. The length of time required to process a subdivision map is variable, based on the size and complexity of the project. In most cases, the approval process can be completed in 6-12 months.

Multi-family Housing

Multi-family housing on an existing parcel is subject to a building permit to ensure compliance with zoning regulations and the building and fire codes. Approval of a building permit for a multi-family project in the is ministerial for small projects and most larger projects (5 or more units) require discretionary review. Staff involved in the approval process includes members of the Planning Division, Engineering Division, Building Division and Fire Department. Processing time is approximately three months, but dependent on the size of the project and quality of the initial submittal.

If the multi-family housing is proposed as a condominium the approval process also includes a subdivision map. Processing time is approximately four to six months and the project is subject to review by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

New residential development is subject to various review and permit processes. The processing time for the most common residential development applications are summarized in **Figure 48**. These applications are processed concurrently.

Figure 48
Processing Time by Process/Permit

Process/Application	Approximate Timeframe
Conditional Use Permit	3-6 months
Planned Development Permit	3-6 months
General Plan Amendment	6-12 months
Environmental Impact Reports	6-12 months
Plan Check/Building Permits	1 month
Variance	2-3 months
Zone Change	6-9 months

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Conditional Use Permit

A conditional use is a use determined by the City as having such unique or diverse characteristics that predetermination of regulations for either its operation or location is not practicable. The Planning Commission has the authority to grant, conditionally grant, or deny a conditional use permit application, based on the following findings:

- The use is compatible with the neighborhood or the community;
- The use is not detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity;
- The use complies with performance standards according to Section 17.24.080; and
- The use is consistent with applicable provisions of the particular zoning district and with policies and standards of the general plan

An application for a Conditional Use Permit requires a public hearing and appeals of any Planning Commission decision can be made to the City Council.

Planned Development Permits

Planned Development Permits are required for certain residential, commercial, or industrial development to be developed as integrated parts on a single site through economical and efficient design techniques. The goal is to produce lasting, desirable development in accordance with general plan objectives for the surrounding area; and development that meets standards of environmental quality, public health and safety, and efficient use of the city's resources. The following findings are required to approve a planned development permit:

- The development is not detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, or general welfare.
- The development complies with applicable provisions of this title and/or deviations that comply with applicable provisions in subsection D.
- The development is consistent with general plan policies and standards and other applicable plans or policies adopted by the City Council.
- The development density or intensity does not exceed general plan limitations.
- Existing infrastructure such as utilities, transportation systems, and communication networks adequately serve the development or will be upgraded to efficiently accommodate the additional burdens imposed.

General Plan Amendment and/or Zone Change

A proposed housing project may include a general plan amendment and/or rezone. This type of approval is discretionary, requiring approval by the Planning Commission and City Council. Approval of a rezone or general plan amendment would depend on the applicant's ability to show that the proposal would further and not detract from the City's established land use goals.

CEQA Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance process determines the timeframes for approval of many discretionary projects. Most projects are handled through an exemption or the negative declaration process, which is processed concurrently with other discretionary approval processes. However, if an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required a minimum of six months is added to the approval process.

Processing and Permit Procedures

Existing processing and permit procedures have proven to be successful because the City of Lemon Grove is one of only a few cities in California that were able to meet their RHNA goals during the 5th RHNA cycle. Although discretionary review is required, this process is short and streamlined as shown in Figures 47 and 48. Over the previous Housing Element cycle the City granted all discretionary housing permit applications and did not issue any denials; therefore, confirming certainty in the housing review process. Additionally, the review process has proven to be efficient by identifying potential development concerns early in the review process and therefore eliminating the need to update and revise technical documents, such as Soils Reports, during permit review thereby reducing housing costs. The findings for discretionary project review are not a constraint to housing development because they introduce additional flexibility into the permit process by allowing deviations from development standards. This process has proven to be very successful in the City and has prevented projects from needing to obtain more complicated approvals such as a variance findings. Overall, existing permit procedures are not constraints to development because they allow flexibility, reduce housing costs, increase supply, streamline review, and confirm approval certainty.

The City allows developers to submit and process building permits while concurrently processing discretionary review; therefore the length of time between receiving approval for a housing development and the submittal of building permits does not represent a constraint to housing development. The Housing Element also includes Program 13 which encourages developers to develop projects at General Plan identified densities. Furthermore, Program 11 will maintain a residential sites inventory in compliance with SB 166 (No Net Loss) and ensure RHNA capacity is maintained.

Environmental and Infrastructure Constraints

Natural landforms, hazards, or habitat can constrain residential development opportunities in a community. Portions of otherwise developable sites with steep or unstable slopes, soils that are susceptible to liquefaction or other geologic conditions, or contain sensitive habitat, could constrain development capacity. Another factor adding to the cost of new home construction is the cost of providing adequate infrastructure such as streets, curbs, gutter, sidewalks, water and sewer lines, and street lighting. The cost of these additions or improvements is borne by developers and then, to the extent possible, added to the cost of new housing units, impacting affordability. This section summarizes potential environmental and infrastructure constraints on residential development in Lemon Grove.

Geologic and Seismic Hazards

A variety of techniques are available to mitigate hazards related to soil. Once the particular characteristics of a soil are known appropriate construction practices can be incorporated into development plans. Appendix J of the Uniform Building Code contains basic regulations governing grading. In 2008, the City Council updated the Grading Ordinance which includes additional provisions that address concerns specific to the City.

Several major active faults pass through the Southern California region. They are parallel, trend in a northwest/southeast direction, and display lateral or sideways movement. The San Andreas Fault is over 650 miles long and runs northwest from the Gulf of California to north of San Francisco Bay. This fault is the most active fault in California and the maximum magnitude of future earthquakes could range from 7.3 to 8.2. A magnitude 8 earthquake on the southern segment of the San Andreas could produce Mercalli intensities of VII to IX in eastern San Diego County.

The San Jacinto fault is parallel to and west of the San Andreas. This fault stretches 125 miles and cuts diagonally across the northeast corner of San Diego County. The San Jacinto Fault is the most active in San Diego County and portions of this fault are only 60 to 80 miles from the City of San Diego. An earthquake of magnitude 7.0 could produce Mercalli intensities of VI or VII in the coastal areas. The Elsinore Fault is approximately 135 miles and is the longest active fault in the County. An earthquake with a magnitude as high as 7.0 is possible for this fault and could cause damage equal to intensity VII or greater.

Ground shaking is by far the greatest seismic hazard. Distance mitigates ground shaking originating on the San Andreas, San Jacinto and Elsinore faults and ground shaking from a moderate earthquake centered on any of these faults might not be detected in Lemon Grove. In addition to ground shaking, liquefaction, a soil phenomenon in which water saturated unstable soil loses its strength when subjected to the forces of intense prolonged ground shaking, can also occur.

The Lemon Grove Safety Element of the General Plan provides policy guidelines in the area of seismic safety. Policies requiring the implementation of the Uniform Building Code will also reduce seismic risk for new construction.

Flood Hazards

In Lemon Grove, flooding most significantly affects the industrial areas located along Federal Blvd. Localized flood also occurs in some residential areas after prolonged rain, but these areas are not mapped Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zones. All new development in the City is required to be elevated above the level of the 100 year flood. New development, or substantial improvement of existing structures, requires construction of flood protection improvements.

The Safety Element of the City's General Plan includes policies to provide flood control and storm water drainage facilities that will protect the health and safety of Lemon Grove's citizens and minimize impacts to property to the greatest extent feasible.

Sanitation and Wastewater Capacity

The Lemon Grove Sanitation District, established as a county sanitation district in 1947, manages and maintains approximately 68 miles of collection pipes that transport sewage to the City of San Diego treatment plants. The district, a separate entity from the City of Lemon Grove with separate financing, is operated as an Enterprise Fund by the City. Any property or building must possess a permit from the Sanitation District prior to connection to the district's main lines.

In 2016, the Lemon Grove Sanitation District contracted with Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc. (DWE) to create a Sanitary Sewer Master Plan (Master Plan) study. The purpose of the Master Plan was to serve as a planning document to evaluate the capacity of the existing collection system, determine improvement needs under future build-out conditions, develop Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) for the short-term (5 years) and long-term (20 years) based on those needs and model future program needs while performing on-going inspection, maintenance, and video recording of the entire sewer collection system. The final completed Master Plan, dated August 31, 2017, was presented to the District Board and approved on October 17, 2017. The District is approximately two-thirds built out based on the General Plan and serves 10,843 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) at present with an estimated 15,881 EDUs at buildout.

Water Capacity

The Helix Water District delivers water to a highly urbanized services area with a population of approximately 270,000 residents and 56,000 service connections. Covering nearly 50 square miles, the district serves the cities of Lemon Grove, La Mesa, and El Cajon, and portions of the unincorporated communities of Lakeside and Spring Valley.

The District operates as a public agency under the Irrigation District Law of the State of California. Governed by an elected Board of Directors, the District establishes water charges, levy assessments and all policy, procedures and regulations related to providing high quality water service to the District's customers.

The District is a member of the San Diego County Water Authority, which is a member of the Metropolitan Water Authority. The district purchases water from these wholesaler agencies and does not sell water to other agencies. Based on historical averages, approximately 17% of the District's supply comes from sources within San Diego County and 83% is imported from Northern California and the Colorado River via the Metropolitan Water District and the County Water Authority.

Approximately 79% of the District's water is provided to residential users. Total annual water demand within the district is 31,139 acre feet/year, with residential demand at 25,000 acre feet/year.

As required by the California Water Code, in July of 2016 the Board adopted the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan Update. The Plan includes an analysis of the District's efforts required by state law SB X7-7 enacted in 2009. SB X7-7 requires agencies to develop baseline per capita water use and to develop reduced per capita consumption targets (in GPCD) in order to comply with the conservation goals of the 2020 plan. All agencies must meet their interim urban water use target by 2015. The District's 2015 interim water use target is 128 GPCD; for fiscal year 2015, the District had an actual GPCD of 103 which is below the interim target. Current water use levels are also below the District's 2020 water use target of 114.

The Urban Water Management Plan projects that, between 2010 and 2050, the land within the District's existing service area that is devoted to residential uses will increase by approximately 1,299 acres. This increase in residential service will be the result of diminished agricultural uses and redevelopment of currently served but under-developed parcels. The Plan projects that 36,477 acre feet/year will be required to serve the needs of District customers in 2040. These projected water demands account for water needs of low-income housing.

The Helix Water District adopted the Urban Water Management Plan in the summer of 2016. The Plan indicates adequate water supply to meet the capacity requirements in Lemon Grove. An update to the plan for meeting the region's long-term water needs is under development by the San Diego County Water Authority, in collaboration with its 24 member agencies. In 2020 Helix Water District also initiated an update of the Urban Water Management Plan.

Fire Protection

In 2010, the Cities of Lemon Grove, La Mesa, and El Cajon, entered into a joint exercise of powers agreement for organizational management of fire protection, fire prevention services, emergency medical services, and community emergency preparedness. This cooperative sharing agreement created an organization that is recognized as Heartland Fire & Rescue, an Insurance Service Office (ISO) Class 1 Fire Department.

The Heartland Fire & Rescue management team is inclusive of:

- Fire Chief
- Division Chiefs (3)
- Fire Marshal
- Battalion Chiefs (5)
- Deputy Fire Marshal
- Emergency Preparedness Coordinator
- Management Analysts (2)
- Administrative Support Staff (3)

This single management team is a shared expense among the three cities. This unique cooperative fire services agreement provides cost containment opportunities, while maintaining local control. This combining of management responsibilities of three neighboring cities ensures a high level of fire and emergency medical services delivery, and maximizes resource utilization by eliminating management redundancies that are experienced as separate organizations.

Heartland Fire & Rescue is comprised of eight fire stations. Staffed daily are:

- Nine Advanced Life Support (ALS) First Responder Engine companies, with one being a certified Medium Rescue
- One ALS Squad
- One Operational Battalion Chief
- Two ALS First Responder Truck companies

The joint powers agreement of Heartland Fire & Rescue serves a population of over 186,000 and responds to approximately 22,000 calls for emergency services each year.

Housing Resources

This section analyzes the resources available for the development, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing in the City of Lemon Grove. This analysis includes an evaluation of the availability of land resources for future housing development, the City's ability to satisfy its share of the region's future housing need, the financial resources available to support housing activities and the administrative resources available to assist in implementing the City's housing programs. Additionally, this section examines opportunities for energy conservation and equity.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Future housing need refers to the share of the regional housing need that has been allocated to the City of Lemon Grove. The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) assigns a numeric regional housing goal to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). SANDAG is then mandated to allocate the housing goal to city and county jurisdictions in the region. In allocating the region's future housing needs to jurisdictions, SANDAG is required to take the following factors into consideration pursuant to Section 65584 of the State Government Code:

- Market demand for housing;
- Employment opportunities;
- Availability of suitable sites and public facilities;
- Commuting patterns;
- Type and tenure of housing;
- Loss of units in assisted housing developments;
- Over-concentration of lower income households; and
- Geological and topographical constraints.

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the SANDAG region was adopted in August 2020. This RHNA covers a planning period from June 30, 2020 through April 15, 2029. The major goal of the RHNA is to assure a fair distribution of housing among cities and counties within the San Diego region, so that every community provides an opportunity for a mix of housing for all economic segments. 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 assure that adequate sites and zoning are made available to address anticipated housing demand during the planning period.

The City of Lemon Grove's share of regional future housing needs is a total of 1,359 new units for the 2021-2029 Housing Element. This allocation is distributed into various income categories, as shown in **Figure 49**. The RHNA includes a fair share adjustment which allocates future (construction) need by each income category in a way that meets the State mandate to reduce the over-concentration of lower income households in one community.

Figure 49
Housing Needs for 2021-2029 Housing Element

Income Category (% of County AMI)	RHNA	Percent
Extremely Low (30% or less)	148	9.5%
Very Low (31 to 50%)	147	9.5%
Low (51 to 80%)	166	12.2%
Moderate (81% to 120%)	193	14.2%
Above Moderate (Over 120%)	705	51.9%
Total	1,359	100%

Source: Final Regional Housing Needs Allocation, SANDAG, August 2020.

AMI = Area Median Income

Note: The City has a RHNA allocation of 259 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 percent of the very low income units as extremely low. Assuming an even split, the City's RHNA allocation of 259 very low-income units may be divided into 129 very low and 130 extremely low-income units. However, for purposes of identifying adequate sites for the RHNA allocation, State law does not mandate the separate accounting for the extremely low-income category.

Credits toward RHNA

Since the RHNA uses June 30, 2020 as the baseline for growth projections for the Housing Element planning period of 2021-2029, jurisdictions may count any new units built or issued certificates of occupancy since June 30, 2020 toward the RHNA. This section describes the applicability of the rehabilitation and new construction credits, while latter sections discuss the availability of land to address the remaining RHNA. **Figure 50** summarizes the units that can be credited against the City's RHNA.

Figure 50
RHNA Credits and Remaining Need

Income Category (% of County AMI)	RHNA	Permitted	Potential ARDU	Entitled	Under Review	Remaining Need
Extremely Low / Very Low (0 to 50%)	295	-	-	2	2	291
Low (51 to 80%)	166	-	-			166
Moderate (81% to 120%)	193	9	120	9		55
Above Moderate (Over 120%)	705	-	-	203	45	457
Total	1,359	9	120	214	47	969

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Permitted Units: The City also has issued building permits for 9 units since July 1, 2020. All of the building permits have been for Accessory Rental Dwelling Units (ARDUs) and count toward the City's RHNA in the moderate income category based on the City's rental housing market conditions. Many of the ARDUs in the City have been smaller units, similar in size to small one-bedroom or studio units

Potential ARDUs: New State laws passed since 2017 have substantially relaxed the development standards and procedures for the construction of ARDUs. Lemon Grove has seen a steady growth of ARDUs in the community with 8 units permitted in 2019, and 11 permitted in 2020. The City also observed steady growth in ARDU applications with 40 applied for in 2020. The city will also be updating the ARDU Ordinance with SB2 grant funds in the Fall/Winter of 2021. Given the accelerated rate of ARDU development in 2020, the City anticipates permitting at least 15 ARDUs per year for a total of at least 120 ARDUs in the eight-year planning period between 2021 and 2029. With the lack of affordability data available, the City expects that all new ARDUs to be affordable to moderate income households based on the City's rental housing market conditions. Many of the ARDUs in the City have been smaller units, similar in size to small one-bedroom or studio units.

Units Entitled: As of March 1, 2020, the City has eight projects entitled and in various stages of progress. The projects include a variety of housing types including single-family homes, townhomes, multi-family units, and a mixed-use project. The affordable units will be deed restricted pursuant to affordable housing regulatory agreements.

**Figure 51
Units Entitled Project List**

Location	Project Description
8373 Broadway (The Terraces)	70-unit condominium development on a 2.88-acre lot; pending grading plan submittal
Broadway & Grove St. (Kelvin)	5-Story vertical mixed-use project at corner of Broadway and Grove St. with approximately 3,500 sq. ft. of retail and 66 units; pending grading plan submittal
7508 Church St.	17-unit multi-family development, 2 of which are affordable to very low-income households; building and grading permits submitted
Dain Dr.	13 Single-Family homes, grading initiated, pending building permit issuance
Golden Ave.	22-unit condominium project, grading initiated; pending building permit issuance
8200 Hilltop Dr.	6-unit townhouse development on an existing vacant lot; pending grading plan submittal
8084 Lemon Grove Wy.	9-unit affordable housing project (moderate income)
Palm St. & Camino de las Palmas (Vista Azul)	20-unit Planned Development consisting of 6 attached twin homes and 14 single family detached homes on a vacant 2-acre parcel
Total	214 units

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Under Review Projects: As of March 1, 2020, the City has six projects that are at different stages in the development process. The six projects include 15 single-family homes and 32 multi-family units. The affordable units will be deed restricted pursuant to affordable housing regulatory agreements.

**Figure 52
Under Review Project List**

Location	Project Description
2283 Berry St.	Request to subdivide an existing 55,757 sq. ft. lot into eight (8) single-family parcels averaging 4,000 to 4,200 sq. ft. per lot.
8012 & 8034 Golden Ave.	Proposed density bonus project consisting of 10 unit and 13-unit apartment buildings on separate lots. Two of the 23 units are very low-income units
Lemon Grove Ave.	Proposed 9-unit apartment building (north of Mt. Vernon St.)
6557 Macarthur Dr.	Tentative parcel map for four single-family lots (three new units)
2135 Washington St.	Tentative parcel map for four single-family lots (three new units)
1515 Skyline Dr.	Proposed lot-split into two single-family lots (one new unit)
Total	47 units

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Residential Sites Inventory

State law requires that jurisdictions demonstrate in the Housing Element that the land inventory is adequate to accommodate that jurisdiction's share of the region's projected growth. This is accomplished through an evaluation of vacant and underutilized residential and mixed-use properties for the potential for residential development within the timeframe of the Housing Element.

Realistic Capacity

Consistent with HCD Guidelines, methodology for determining realistic capacity on each identified site must account for land use controls and site improvements and reflect current trends of development.

Residential Zones: The Lemon Grove Sites Inventory utilizes an estimate of 80% of maximum development to demonstrate realistic capacity for development in residential zones. This estimate is based on existing patterns of development in residential areas and the expected projects in the City that are going to be developed, including the projects in Figure 51, which all exceed 80% of maximum development capacity.

Downtown Village Specific Plan: Within the City's Downtown Village Specific Plan the City has achieved mixed-use densities that are more than double the minimum required densities. For these areas, the realistic capacity is measured at 150% of the minimum required densities, which is significant lower than the actual achieved densities. In the General Commercial zone (Mixed-Use) the density is conservatively estimated at 30 du/ac which is significantly lower than the 52 du/ac achieved for the Citron Ct. project on the Broadway commercial corridor that was constructed in 2007. It should also be noted that the Citron Ct. successfully combined sites of less than ½ acre into a single development site. Additionally, the Broadway & Grove St. (Kelvin) project, also known as City Mark, (identified in Figure 51) is currently under construction in the Downtown Village Specific Plan, Village Commercial Zone 5. -The minimum density for residential development within the VC5 zone is 35 dwelling units per net acre. The project proposes contains 66 dwelling units at a net density of 87 dwelling units per acre, -again, significantly higher than the minimum

~~allowed. Additionally, for the~~ General Commercial zones: ~~staff~~ Staff utilizes an estimate of 75% of the development to account for constraints related to existing structures.

Special Treatment Areas I & II

There are seven Special Treatment Areas (STAs) identified in the City's 1996 General Plan. STAs were identified as areas that have significant potential for new development or redevelopment or require special planning attention. Special Treatment Area I is implemented by the Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP) and requires minimum densities up to 25-45 units per acre. The DVSP area is a traditional downtown commercial district located around the intersection of Broadway and Lemon Grove Avenue. A mix of retail and office uses presently dominates this area, but some multiple family residences are also situated there. The DVSP includes objective development standards for structures. ~~Recent mixed-use~~ Mixed-use developments and expected projects have achieved densities that are more than double the minimum densities. **Figure 53** lists three approved projects within the DVSP, two of which have been constructed and one is currently ~~processing grading and building permits~~ under construction. The Celsius (I and II) and Citronica projects were both able to successfully combine parcels that were less than ½ acre into a development site during the prior planning period. Existing policies and procedures that allow deviations from development standards through a Planned Development Permit (see earlier discussion on permits and processing) proved successful and allowed the projects to be approved.

**Figure 53
DVSP Projects**

Project Name / Address	Zoning	Total Units	Permitted Density	Actual Density	% Above Min. Density
Kelvin / 7946 Broadway	VC5	66	Minimum 35 du/ac	87 du/ac	248%
Celsius I & II / 100 Citronica Ln.	TMU7 and TMU5	102	Minimum 35 du/ac and 25 du/ac	70 du/ac	200%+
Citronica I & II	TMU 7	136	Minimum 35 du/ac	112 du/ac	320%

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Based on the development history in Lemon Grove, the assumption that a majority of new mixed-use or residential projects within the DVSP may occur at 150% of the minimum density represents a realistic and reasonable assumption. **Figure 54** demonstrates the developable acres within the DVSP and the unit potential based on the assumptions.

**Figure 54
STA I (DVSP) Infill and Redevelopment Potential**

Zoning	Min. Density	Developable Acres	Unit Potential	Existing & Entitled Units	Unit Potential
3-Story Mixed-Use	25+ du/ac	12.28 ac.	413	31	382

5-Story Mixed-Use	35+ du/ac	4.54 ac.	218	66	152
Total					534

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Note: No existing residential uses

Special Treatment Area II does not have an implementing Specific Plan. The Implementation Plan for the Housing Element includes the development of a Specific Plan with grant funds. Since the Specific Plan has not been developed, the potential density for the site is accounted for on the lower range of the expected 20-43 du/ac range.

Figure 55
STA II Redevelopment Potential

Zoning	Density	Developable Acres	Unit Potential	Existing & Entitled Units	Unit Potential
Mixed-Use	20-43 du/ac	4.4 ac.	88	0	88
Total					88

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021,

Note: No existing residential uses

General Commercial ~~(Mixed-Use)~~

In general, residential development over the past five -years in the commercial zones have been limited due to a number of reasons. One, the vast majority of the commercial parcels are owned by local longtime residents, who -useing the leasing as income and like the small town feel. Additionally, most commercial parcels are zero lot line parcels that were developed forty years ago in a very small parcel pattern (narrow and long parcel sizes) and support a wide range of service-oriented shops, craft stores, reuse clothing stores and a scattering of retail shops with low overhead and rent.

Mid-size parcels at the easterly and westerly ends of the downtown could support larger scale opportunities, such as the mixed-use project at Broadway & Grove St. (City Mark) currently under construction in the Downtown Village Specific Plan area. The project may serve as a catalyst project for surrounding general commercial zones to transition to similar mixed-use or converted to all residential type developments. The City Mark “Kelvin” project is 5-Story Mixed-Use building totaling 68,828 square feet in floor area. The ground floor will include two separate commercial tenant spaces and a property management office as well as a resident lobby, fitness room, mail room, bicycle storage room, utility rooms, and refuse enclosure. The above ground floors containproposed 66 apartment units. This project will achieve a density of 87 dwelling units per acre, which is significantly over the minimum allowed in the Village Commercial 5 zone, which is 35 dwelling and even higher still than that allowed in the General Commercial zone, 29 du/ac. This type of infill development along Broadway illustrates the development potential for General Commercial zoning throughout the City to transition to mixed-use. As the need for housing continues to escalate and residual land value increases for infill development, it is reasonable to expect a trend conversion of General Commercial to Mixed-Use.

Since 2020, the City has seen decreased demand for commercial properties and have received inquiries to convert upper floor commercial spaces into residential units. The City has permitted one mixed-use project along the Broadway commercial corridor, which is known as Citron Ct. The project consolidated

~~three parcels to achieve a total site area is 0.69 ac. and the development includes 36 units and 2,190 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space. This project was able to achieve a density of over 52 du/ac. and this type of infill development illustrates the development potential for General Commercial (Mixed-Use) zoning. The General Commercial zone currently allows 29 du/ac.~~

The City General Commercial zone encompasses 132.79 ~~acres;~~acres, which at 29 du/ac equates to a development potential of 3,850 dwelling units. It is unlikely that all 132.79 acres will redevelop over the 8-year Housing Element cycle, but it is reasonable to assume that older buildings are more likely to redevelop based on market conditions. City staff reviewed development records and identified 54 properties located in the General Commercial zone that were built more than 50 years ago, totaling approximately 31.6 acres. When calculated at 29 du/ac these 54 properties would yield more than 600 dwelling units, which exceeds the remaining need of 457 units for lower income households (up to 80% AMI). Additionally, the sites inventory includes numerous existing commercial sites that are vacant and have been cited by the City for code enforcement issues. ~~Since 2020, the City has seen decreased demand for commercial properties and have received inquiries to convert upper floor commercial spaces into residential units. Development trends have favored the elimination of commercial building spaces to accommodate mixed-use projects. Non-residential performance standards have not been an impediment to any mixed-use projects, with all applications submitted having been approved and constructed or are about to commence construction.~~

Since 2020, the City has seen an increase in commercial renovation and expansion of services with little decreased demand for additional commercial properties. However, City staff and have received inquiries to convert second story or add a upper floor for residential units and expect that to increase with recent ADU legislation. Additionally, non-residential performance standards have not been an impediment to any mixed-use projects, with all applications submitted having been approved and constructed or are about to commence construction.

There are no strong trends or underlying interests towards properties in the General Commercial corridors (Broadway and Lemon Grove Avenue) –redeveloping to mixed-use or high density residential uses. However, the following factors suggest that if redevelopment is to occur in the General Commercial zone, it is not likely to develop 100% commercial and it is likely to include some level of residential development.

i

- Mixed-use redevelopment in the Downtown Village Specific Plan Commercial Zones
- An increase in commercial renovation and expansion of services with little demand for additional commercial properties.
- An increase in inquiries to convert commercial second stories or add a floor for residential units with an expectation for that to increase with recent ADU legislation.

Additionally, there are several opportunities along the fringes of these corridors from aging commercial sites, underutilized parcels and –sites with existing code violations to redevelop into mixed-use or residential could materialize over the course of times, as the legacy property owners turn over their properties.

Figure 56
General Commercial Redevelopment Potential

Zoning	Density	Developable	Unit	Existing &	Unit
--------	---------	-------------	------	------------	------

		Acres	Potential	Entitled Units	Potential
General Commercial	29 du/ac	31.6	916	83	790
Subtotal					790
75% of Subtotal					592

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021,

Note: Program 24 will preserve/replace existing affordable unit residential

Zoning Appropriate to Accommodate Housing Affordable to Lower Income Households

The City recognizes that higher-density developments provide the potential for lower construction costs because of economies of scale created and are therefore most suitable for development of housing affordable to lower income households. Mixed use sites included in the sites inventory have the greatest potential to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households. Current General Commercial zoning allows a maximum density of 29 du/ac. Per Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B), the City's Housing Plan includes a program to update the density bonus ordinance.

Residential Infill & Vacant Sites

The City's remaining share of the regional housing need will be addressed through scattered vacant and underutilized sites that are suitable and appropriately zoned for development of more intense residential uses. Appendix B includes a listing of individual sites, and identifies the size, zoning designation, general plan designation, and realistic capacity for each. Single-family infill sites may be constructed with a building permit and subdivision map. Multi-family projects with 5 or more units will require a planned development permit.

The inventory of scattered vacant land designated for residential or mixed-use development totals about 50 acres (**Figure 57**).

Figure 57
Residential Infill & Vacant Sites

Zoning	Land Use	Density	Acres	Max. Unit Potential	Existing Units	Total Units
Low Density Residential	Single Family	1-4 du/ac	13.47	53	0	31
Low/Medium Density	Single Family	4-7 du/ac	26.09	221	10	150
Medium Density	Multi-Family	7-14 du/ac	0.51	5	0	4
Medium-High Density	Multi-Family	14-29 du/ac	1.24	35	4	20
Total						205

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Note: Program 24 will preserve/replace existing affordable unit residential

Adequacy of Sites for RHNA

Based on the development potential on Special Treatment Areas, General Commercial Mixed-Use, and expected projects and infill/vacant sites, the City is able to fully accommodate its RHNA.

Figure 58

RHNA Summary

Project	Total Units	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
Remaining RHNA	969	457	55	457
Development Potential	1,497	622		797
STA I (DVSP)	534	534		-
STA II	88	88		
General Commercial (Mixed-Use)	592	-	-	592
Infill & Vacant Sites	205	-	-	205

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

Availability of Site Infrastructure and Services

All residential and mixed use sites identified in the inventory are located within urbanized areas where infrastructure and public services are readily available. Public services, dry utilities, and facilities are available to adequately serve all of the potential housing sites. Lateral water and sewer lines would be extended onto the properties from the adjoining public rights-of-way as development occurs. Any missing public improvements (e-g-e.g., curbs, gutters, sidewalks) along property frontages would also be constructed at that time by the property developer. Additionally, water and sewer capacity are available to accommodate all development shown in the sites inventory and anticipated by the General Plan. None of the housing sites are subject to significant environmental constraints that would prevent the reuse of these sites.

Financial Resources

Providing affordable housing for lower and moderate income households require the creative layering of multiple funding sources. Key funding sources available to the City of Lemon Grove for the construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing include the following:

SB2 and Local Early Action Planning (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 Lemon Grove received \$150,000 for planning efforts to facilitate housing production. For the second year and onward, 70 percent 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). HCD is in the process of closing out the Year One planning grant allocations and has not begun the process of allocating the Year Two affordable housing funds.

In the 2019-20 Budget Act, Governor Gavin Newsom allocated \$250 million for all regions, cities, and counties to do their part by prioritizing planning activities that accelerate housing production to meet identified needs of every community. With this allocation, HCD established the Local Early Action Planning Grant Program (LEAP) with \$119 million for cities and counties. LEAP provides one-time grant funding to cities and counties to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that will

facilitate the acceleration of housing production and help local governments prepare for their 6th cycle RHNA, much like the SB2 Planning Grants. The City is utilizing LEAP grant funding for public outreach for the Housing Element update as well as the development of a Specific Plan for Special Treatment Area II near the Massachusetts Trolley Station.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds

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 percent 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.

For over 20 years, the City has participated in the CDBG Program, predominately relying on CDBG funds for street rehabilitation capital improvement projects in eligible neighborhoods. Two other programs have been supported with CDBG funds in the past including the San Diego Food Bank school food backpack program which was supported through FY 2011-12 and the Center for Social Advocacy which was supported through FY 2010-11. In more recent years, the funds have primarily been used for street rehabilitation and accessible pedestrian ramps.

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)

The HOME program provides federal funds for the development and rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing for households with incomes not exceeding 80 percent 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 (households earning up to 80 percent of the AMI).

Lemon Grove receives HOME funds through its participation in the San Diego HOME Consortium. Lemon Grove residents are eligible to apply to County programs to receive funding.

<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/sdhcd/home-buyers-owners/calhome-program.html>

Housing Choice Voucher Program

The San Diego County Department of Housing and Community Development Services (HCDS) serves as the Housing Authority of the County of San Diego. HCDS manages approximately \$6.5 million in federal funds committed to the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Rental Assistance Program on behalf of the City of Lemon Grove. County HCDS is currently assisting 350 recipients with HCVs in Lemon Grove.

Administrative Capacity

Described below are public and private sector organizations that have been involved in housing activities in Lemon Grove. These agencies are involved in the improvement of the housing stock, expansion of affordable housing opportunities, preservation of existing affordable housing, and/or provision of housing assistance to households in need.

City of Lemon Grove Community Development Department

The Community Development Department provides primary administrative oversight of the City's housing projects and programs. Within this department, the Planning Division manages the City's housing programs, assists developers with tax credit applications, submits applications for HCD-sponsored housing grant opportunities, and processes affordability covenants.

San Diego County Department of Housing and Community Development Services

The County of San Diego, Department of Housing and Community Development Services (HCDS) administers Section 8 rental assistance on behalf of the City of Lemon Grove. County HCDS is currently assisting 350 recipients with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in Lemon Grove. In addition, out of the 56,180 applicants currently on the HCV Waiting List, 805 identify as living in Lemon Grove.

Housing Developers and Service Providers

The City collaborates with a number of affordable housing developers and service providers to accommodate the housing needs of Lemon Grove residents. The following are housing developers and service providers active in the region:

- San Diego Community Housing Corporation (SDCHC): SDCHC is a housing and community development organization focused on developing, preserving, and maintaining affordable housing. Since 1994, SDCHC has acquired/developed 1,055 multi-family units, developed 48 new single-family homes, and rehabilitated 58 single-family homes.
- San Diego Habitat for Humanity: Habitat for Humanity has worked throughout the County of San Diego to provide affordable single-family ownership housing for lower income households.
- Center for Social Advocacy: The Center for Social Advocacy operates the Shared Housing Program to match people in need of housing with people who have housing resources. This effort provides affordable housing for the housing seeker and additional income for the housing provider.
- San Diego Interfaith Housing: San Diego Interfaith Housing Foundation (SDIHF) aims to reach out to seniors, the disabled and working poor not served by the traditional housing market. SDIHF attempts to create better and more affordable housing opportunities for neighbors throughout San Diego County. The organization has built and manages several successful communities consisting of over 900 affordable housing units. Their role in these developments included, but was not limited to project feasibility, land acquisition, analyzing and securing financing, coordinating and managing the development team of architects, engineers and contractors, lease-up, property management and resident services.

- **Interfaith Shelter Network:** Interfaith Shelter Network provides a Rotational Shelter Program for homeless families and individuals at East County churches during the winter months.

Opportunities for Energy Conservation

Title 24, Building Energy Standards for Residential Development, establishes energy budgets or maximum energy use levels. The standards of Title 24 supersede local regulations, and State requirements mandate 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. Specifically, the City will continue to promote the San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) Company website through the City's Climate Action Plan. SDG&E provides an Energy Savings Assistance Program that is designed to help lower the monthly bill, while making the home more comfortable. Income qualified households can request SDG&E's authorized contractors to provide free:

- New, energy-efficient refrigerators, air conditioners, and lighting;
- New or repaired doors and windows;
- Microwaves, water heaters and high-efficiency clothes washers; and
- Insulation, weather-stripping and caulking to lower heating and cooling costs

Environmental Justice


Senate Bill (SB) 1000 (Leyva, 2016) amended Government Code Section 65302 to require that both cities and counties that have disadvantaged communities incorporate environmental justice into their General Plans. Low-income communities and communities of color often bear a disproportionate burden of pollution and associated health risks based on legacy decisions that place industrial or polluting uses next to these communities. Environmental justice seeks to address these inequities by reducing the pollution experienced by these communities and ensuring their input is considered in land use and policy decisions that directly impact them. The purpose of the legislation is to address the “unique or compounded health risks” in disadvantaged communities by decreasing pollution exposure, increasing community assets, and improving overall health.

Environmental Justice Communities

The City is required to identify Environmental Justice communities by analyzing disproportionate burdens on low-income areas. The City's analysis utilized the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (“CalEnviroScreen”), which is a data tool developed by CalEPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 39711 and other statutory requirements. CalEnviroScreen provides statewide data that can be used to identify communities disproportionately impacted by, or vulnerable to, environmental pollution and contaminants. The mapping tool contains 12 indicators related to pollution burden and 8 indicators that track population characteristics. The higher the CalEnviroScreen, the more a community is impacted. Census tracts that fall within the highest quartile of scores (between 75 to 100) are considered “disadvantaged communities” under SB 1000. **Figure 59** identifies the burdened areas as those north of Central Ave. and south of SR-94, as shaded in the darker orange color.

Figure 59

CalEnviroScreen Results



Source: <https://oehha.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4560cfbce7c745c299b2d0cbb07044f5>

Pollution Sources

California Government Code Section 65302(h) mandates that the environmental justice analysis assess the “unique or compounded health risks” due to pollution exposure in communities and focuses on pollution sources related to air pollution, groundwater contamination, and toxic and hazardous materials. According to CalEnviroScreen 3.0, the top three pollution burdens for the City’s environmental justice communities (compared to other census tracts across the state) are fine particle (PM 2.5) concentration, traffic density, and solid waste sites and facilities. Percentages at or above 75 percent demonstrate an unhealthy level of pollution or a high level of vulnerability to environmental hazards.

Figure 60
Pollution Burdens

Location	Pollution Burden		
	Particulate Matter (2.5)	Traffic Density	Solid Waste Facilities
North of Central Ave.	66%	87%	86%

Source: CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 2018

Particulate Matter

Particulate matter (PM) refers to a broad class of aerosolized solid and liquid particles that come from a variety of mobile and stationary sources involving combustion. These particles include any combination of organic chemicals, dust, allergens, and metals. Exposure to PM is linked to adverse effects on the heart and lungs depending on the particulate size. The smaller the particle size, the higher likelihood the particles can penetrate the lungs and, in some cases, the bloodstream.

PM 2.5 refers to particles that have a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less. Research indicates that short and long-term exposure to PM 2.5 can cause lung injury and inflammation, blood clot formation, asthma attacks, and chronic bronchitis. Children, the elderly, and persons suffering from cardiopulmonary disease, asthma, and chronic illness are the most vulnerable to the effects of PM exposure. According to

CalEnviroScreen 3.0, the City's environmental justice community experiences slightly higher PM 2.5 concentration levels than the County's average.

Figure 61
Particulate Matter

Location	Particulate Matter (2.5)
North of Central Ave.	11.2
San Diego County Average	11.0

Source: CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 2018; Annual mean concentration of PM 2.5 over three year (2012-2014)

Asthma

Asthma is a chronic lung disease characterized by episodic breathlessness, wheezing, coughing, and chest tightness. While the causes of asthma are poorly understood, it is well established that exposure to traffic and outdoor air pollutants, including PM, ozone, and diesel exhaust, can trigger asthma attacks. People with asthma are also especially susceptible to pneumonia, flu, and other respiratory illnesses.

Based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0 data, the City's environmental justice community experiences more asthma-induced emergency room (ER) visits than the County as a whole. In comparison to the State, the area north of Central Ave. has a higher rate of ER visits for asthma (per 10,000 visits) than 76 percent of other census tracts, putting it within the top 25 percent in the state.

Figure 62
Asthma-Related Emergency Room (ER) Visits per 10,000 People

Location	ER Visits
North of Central Ave.	67
San Diego County Average	49

Source: CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 2018; (2011-2013)

The higher rate of asthma-related ER visits in environmental justice communities is also closely linked to traffic density (measured by vehicle kilometers/hour divided by total road length) and proximity to freeways and other high-volume road networks. As such, many census tracts within the City's environmental justice community score in the top quarter tier of state census tracts for traffic density.

Traffic Density

Traffic density is primarily related to State Route 94 at the City's northerly boundary. Traffic density is shown in **Figure 63** and reflects the sum of traffic volumes adjusted by road segment length divided by the total road length within 150 meters of the census tract boundary.

Figure 63
Traffic Density

Location	Traffic Volumes
North of Central Ave.	1,700
San Diego County Average	1,175

Source: CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 2018; (2011-2013)

Solid Waste Facilities

Solid waste sites and facilities, such as landfills, composting sites, and recycling centers, are susceptible to contaminating air, water, and soil with hazardous materials. While many newer facilities are designed to meet environmental standards, solid waste facilities may still impact nearby communities via odors, vermin, and increased truck traffic. The existing EDCO facility operating north of Central Ave. is currently undergoing a renovation and operates in accordance with all performance standards. The CalEnviroScreen data disclosing this as a burden is therefore purely based on the proximity of the facility to the environmental justice community and not necessarily the negative impacts the facility imposes to the City.

Water Contamination

Water contamination can impact environmental justice communities in many ways, including polluted streams, rivers, and other bodies of water that make outdoor recreation and water access especially hazardous to humans. Since water quality is a regional issue, goals and policies must apply countywide to protect, enhance, and restore water resources for environmental justice communities.

The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) is responsible for providing safe drinking water to its 24 retail member agencies and their customers. The member agencies are represented on a 36-member Board of Directors. Approximately 80 percent of the county's water is imported through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, from the Colorado River and the State Water Project. The pipelines come under the Water Authority's ownership just south of the Riverside-San Diego county line and carry either fully treated potable water or untreated water that is then treated within the county.

Groundwater Threats

Groundwater accounts for about 5 percent of the San Diego region's water supply portfolio. While the Water Authority does not hold groundwater rights, it does provide financial and technical assistance to member agencies that are evaluating, planning, and implementing groundwater recovery projects. Groundwater basins are susceptible to contamination from numerous sources, including leaking underground storage tanks, industrial operations, and agricultural activities. CalEnviroScreen uses data from GeoTracker to determine groundwater threat scores for each census tract. The State Water Resources Control Board uses GeoTracker to identify sites that impact or potentially impact water quality. **Figure 64** shows that the area north of Central Ave. received a score higher than the County average primarily due to the presence of the EDCO facility and industrial uses in close proximity to Chollas Creek.

Figure 64
Ground Water Threats

Location	Weighted Score
North of Central Ave.	118
San Diego County Average	18

Source: CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 2018; (2018)

Crime Locations

Increased crime activity in neighborhoods, such as property theft and violent assaults, can have significant impacts on the health, well-being, and social cohesion of a community and contribute to premature death and disability, poor mental health, and increased prevalence of certain illnesses such as high blood pressure. SANDAG's Criminal Justice Research Division aims to support local criminal justice planning and

policy initiatives by providing data reporting and analyses of crime occurrence, trends, and response strategies. The City reports crime data to SANDAG through the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) Database. In 2017, there were approximately 2,032 violent and property crimes per 100,000 people in the County. Of these, five out of six crimes were property crimes, and one out of six crimes was a violent crime. Property crimes include burglary, theft, and motor vehicle thefts. Violent crimes include murder, rape, robberies, and aggravated assaults. Within the unincorporated county, the Sheriff's Department provides crime data reporting based on "Sheriff Beat" areas that do not directly correlate to the census tract level for environmental justice communities.

Figure 65 compares the City's environmental justice community and the County overall and their incidents of violent crime and property crime rates per 1,000 residents for a six-month period between in 2020. It is important to note that the crime rate north of Central Ave. is primarily related to the low population density when compared to the size of the existing commercial areas, which are subject to property crimes.

Figure 65
Property Crime and Violent Crime Rates

Crime Rate (per 1,000 people)	North of Central Ave.	Unincorporated Area	County of San Diego
Population (2018)	4,153	492,491	3,343,364
Property Crime Rate	13.7	10.1	7.0
Violent Crime Rate	11.1	3.2	1.8
Total Crime Rate	24.8	13.4	8.9

Source: CrimeMapping and ARJIS, 2020

Health and Wellness

Food environment factors, including proximity to grocery stores and restaurants, food prices, food and nutrition assistance programs, and other community characteristics, have an influence on food choices, nutrition, and quality. A healthy and efficient food system helps to increase access to healthy and affordable food options, supports the local economy and food supply chain, and protects our natural resources and ecosystem by supporting small-scale farmers and sustainable agriculture. The City's General Plan Health and Wellness Element has integrated food equity policies into the General Plan and also includes goals and policies for active living, including the prevention of illness related to obesity and diabetes.

Promotion of Civic Engagement

Equitable and effective planning and decision-making processes, especially for environmental justice issues, should meaningfully involve the most impacted community members. Promoting civic engagement is imperative for the City to prioritize improvements and programs in environmental justice. This level of engagement can help strengthen community involvement and deepen the investment of stakeholders in identifying and realizing community improvements. Environmental justice issues can be more organically identified and resolved if there are accessible and culturally relevant opportunities to engage in decision-making processes prioritizing low-income communities, communities of color, and linguistically isolated communities. Also, providing timely and updated information for how residents can reach relevant and appropriate City staff can be an important step to increase transparency and accountability across City

provided programs and services.

Language Isolation

Language isolation occurs when there are households with individuals over the age of 14 that have limited English proficiency. When public information and notifications are offered only in English, these households are at a disadvantage when trying to attain important information or participate in public engagements that may impact their health, wellbeing, or economic opportunity. Communities with high levels of linguistically isolated households tend to have lower participation levels when only English is used. The County of San Diego measures linguistic isolation as an indicator of social well-being. According to 2017 data, 7.2 percent of the County population experiences linguistic isolation compared to 9.2 percent statewide. Measured by subregional areas, Southeastern San Diego has the highest rate of language isolation at 11.6 percent followed by El Cajon (9.8%), Lemon Grove (5.5%), and Spring Valley (4.3%).

Access to Internet

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 has highlighted other inequities, especially the “digital divide” in accessing affordable and reliable internet, broadband, and cellular data which have become the necessary norm for virtual community engagement, online learning, social communication, and real-time and important information and resources. In the County overall, 9.1% of households do not have internet access and more than one-fifth of households in north of Central Ave. do not have internet access (21.5%), followed by the areas east of Lemon Grove Ave. and Spring Valley (11.6%). This lack of internet access has important implications for full engagement in political and stakeholder decision-making processes, especially when accommodations are only made for virtual and online access.

Housing Plan

The Housing Plan presents the City’s eight-year housing plan, which sets forth goals, policies, and programs to address the identified housing needs and other housing issues. The City of Lemon Grove’s Housing Plan for addressing the identified housing needs is detailed according to the following five areas:

- Maintenance and Preservation;
- Provision of Adequate Sites;
- Affordable Housing Opportunities;
- Removal of Governmental Constraints; and
- Promote Equal Housing Opportunities.

Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies

This section of the Housing Element contains the primary goal, objectives, and policies the City will implement to address a number of important housing related issues. The primary goal, objectives, and the supporting policies are identified in the following sections.

Primary Goal

Ensure that suitable, safe housing is available at a cost that is affordable to all current and future residents of this community. To this end, the City will encourage a variety of individual choices of tenure, type, and location of housing throughout the community.

Maintenance and Preservation

Many factors can determine the “life expectancy” of a dwelling unit including quality of workmanship, age, type of construction, and maintenance. The City’s goal is to preserve the housing stock and to avoid physical decline that will require a larger rehabilitation effort to restore quality and value. In addition, it is important to preserve affordable housing units in the community to maintain adequate housing opportunities for all residents.

Objective 1: Maintain and enhance the quality of residential neighborhoods in Lemon Grove.

Policy 1.1: Advocate for the rehabilitation of substandard residential properties by homeowners and landlords.

Policy 1.2: Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock (Gov. Code 65583(c)(4)).

Policy 1.3: Preserve dwelling units “At-Risk” of converting to market-rate housing (Gov. Code 65583(c)(6)(d)).

Related Programs: 1, 4-5, 8-11, 12-13, 16-17

Objective 2: Encourage a balanced mix of housing.

Policy 2.1: Promote a variety of housing types.

Policy 2.2: Preserve the existing housing opportunities for low and moderate income families currently living within the community, and maintain the existing housing stock in good condition.

Policy 2.3: Attempt to preserve restricted low income housing in the City that is “At-Risk” of converting to market-rate housing.

Policy 2.4: Utilize incentives to encourage a balanced mix of housing.

Policy 2.5: Implement City’s adopted resolution on “smart growth” and explore opportunities to identify sites for their potential as “Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.”

Policy 2.6: Encourage conversion of apartments to condominiums for first-time homebuyers and to improve housing stock.

Related Programs: 2-21

Provision of Adequate Sites

The City of Lemon Grove encourages the production of new housing units that offer a wide range of housing types to ensure that an adequate supply is available to meet the existing and future needs of all groups. The provision of a balanced inventory of housing in terms of unit type (e.g., single-family, apartment,

condominium, mixed-use residential/commercial), cost and style will allow the City to fulfill a variety of housing needs.

Objective 3: Encourage the adequate provision of housing in a variety of costs, types, styles, locations, and tenures to meet the existing and future needs of Lemon Grove residents.

Policy 3.1: Provide a variety of residential development opportunities in the City including low density single family homes, moderate density town homes, higher density apartments and condominiums, and residential/commercial mixed-use to fulfill regional housing needs.

Policy 3.2: Encourage both the private and public sectors to produce or assist in the production of housing in accordance with the SANDAG RHNA quantified objectives for all income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above-moderate households), persons with disabilities, elderly households, large households, female-headed households, and homeless persons.

Policy 3.3: Ensure that low income housing is developed in areas with adequate access to employment opportunities, community facilities, and public services and is not concentrated in any single area within the City.

Policy 3.4: Encourage the development of new dwelling units designated for lower income and special needs households within close proximity to public transportation and community services.

Policy 3.5: Encourage the development of childcare facilities to coincide with new housing development if appropriate based upon the project circumstances and evaluate the use of incentives to encourage development of childcare facilities when appropriate.

Policy 3.6: Implement the State and Federal senior housing requirements (California Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civil Code sections 51, 51.2 and 51.3) and the Federal Fair Housing Act (42 USCA section 3601 et seq.)).

Policy 3.7: Implement State requirements for large family daycare facilities (Health and Safety Code 1597).

Policy 3.8: Consider pedestrian circulation patterns for new development projects near the trolley (MTS) right-of-way to ensure safety within the rail corridor. Safety factors to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and appropriate fencing to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way.

Related Programs: 1-22

Objective 4: Provide increased opportunities for home ownership.

Policy 4.1: Assist low and moderate income residents in achieving home ownership.

Policy 4.2: Encourage alternative forms of home ownership, such as shared equity ownership, limited equity cooperatives, and community land trusts.

Related Programs: 3-4, 13, 20

Promote Equal Housing Opportunities

To make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, the City must ensure equal and fair housing opportunities are available to all residents.

Objective 5: Promote equal opportunity for all residents to reside in housing of their choice.

Policy 5.1: Support the prohibition of discrimination in the sale or rental of housing with regard to

race, ethnic background, religion, disability, income, sex, age, and household composition.

Policy 5.2: Assist in the enforcement of fair housing laws by providing support to organizations that receive and investigate fair housing allegations. Monitor compliance with fair housing laws, and refer possible violations to enforcing agencies.

Policy 5.3: Promote equal housing opportunities (Gov. Code 65583(c)(5)).

Related Programs: 1, 5, 11, 15, 23

Objective 6: Provide adequate housing sites (65583(c)(1)).

Policy 6.1: Provide capacity to accommodate regional need, sites to accommodate all income levels a variety of housing types.

Related Programs: 2-4, 6, 11-15, 14

Affordable Housing Opportunities

The City recognizes the most cost-effective approach to providing affordable housing to its lower and moderate income households is to maintain a supply of permanent or long-term affordable housing units. The following policies are intended to expand the City's affordable housing inventory. Furthermore, the option of home ownership has become a privilege in Southern California, which is often not available to lower and even moderate income households, particularly the first-time home buyers. While condominiums offer a relatively affordable home ownership option in Lemon Grove, the down payment serves as a barrier to many potential ~~home-buyers~~homebuyers.

Objective 7: Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the need of extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income households (65583(c)(2)).

Policy 7.1: Utilize Federal, State, and local financing and subsidies.

Policy 7.2: Provide regulatory concessions and incentives.

Related Programs: 11, 14, 16-22

Removal of Governmental Constraints

Due to their unique circumstances, certain groups in the community require special assistance to attain decent and affordable housing. The following goals and policies address the special housing needs of the elderly, disabled, homeless, agricultural workers, and persons of lower and moderate income households, especially those of extremely low incomes. In addition to policies designed to increase the availability and adequacy of the City's affordable housing stock, it is important that support services are available that ensure efficient utilization of the housing stock. Of particular importance in Lemon Grove are housing related services for seniors, the disabled, and the homeless.

Objective 8: Address Governmental Constraints (65583(c)(3)).

Policy 8.1: Review and monitor regulations concerning: land use controls, building codes, site improvement requirements, fees and exactions, and processing and permit procedures.

Policy 8.2: Monitor availability of housing for persons with disabilities.

Policy 8.3: Address the impediments to affordable housing: discretionary permit requirements for multifamily housing, explicit provisions for mobile homes, manufactured housing, transitional housing and emergency shelters; and ADA compliance.

Related Programs: 6-7, 11, 14-15

Environmental Justice

Include environmental justice in the planning and decision-making process that addresses the inequities

resulting from environmental hazards and health impacts in the built environment to ensure that all people have the right to live, work, and play in a safe and healthy environment.

Objective 9: Address unique or compounded health risks in environmental justice communities by decreasing pollution exposure, increasing community assets, and improving overall health.

Policy 9.1: Consistent with the Community Development Element, avoid land use conflicts by ensuring sensitive land uses are adequately buffered from industrial uses and other facilities that may pose a threat to human health.

Policy 9.2: Improve air quality conditions for environmental justice communities by collaborating with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District to continue to identify and reduce point source emissions (Ozone, Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5, Diesel PM) and by collaborating with business and property owners to reduce the impacts of tobacco and nicotine products.

Policy 9.3: Ensure public facilities are equitably located and services distributed throughout environmental justice communities at an operational level comparable to the rest of the City.

Policy 9.4: Support funding and financing mechanisms to provide and enhance community desired public facilities and service in environmental justice communities.

Policy 9.5: Ensure all residents have healthy and safe living conditions, particularly for households in environmental justice communities

Policy 9.6: Ensure all residents have access to affordable housing options to reduce the prevalence of cost-burdened households, particularly for owners and renters in environmental justice communities.

Related Programs: 7-10

Implementing Programs

The goals and policies outlined above address Lemon Grove's identified housing needs. These goals and policies are implemented through a series of housing programs offered by the City. This section describes the programs the City will carry out during the timeframe of the Housing Element. Each program identifies the specific steps needed to carry out the policies. Also provided under each program are the anticipated impacts (quantifiable objectives if feasible, target population), the responsible agencies, financing, and the schedule for completion. **Figure 67** at the end of this section summarizes the quantifiable objectives set forth for the various housing programs.

The following programs address a range of housing needs and represent a commitment by the City to address those needs in a responsible manner. The programs are designed to build upon one another; no single program should be perceived as the panacea for all the City's needs. Most of the programs are continued from the previous housing element cycle. Many of them are modified to reflect the changed market conditions or streamlined to offer flexibility in implementation.

Review and Revision

Implementing Programs are based on the review of the previous Housing Element Programs including the appropriateness, effectiveness, and progress in implementation. A detailed review and analysis of programs from the previous Housing Element is included in Appendix C. Overall, the programs were

cumulatively successful as the City was able to meet its RHNA goals from the previous Housing Element cycle.

In 2018, SANDAG generated a Regional Housing Progress Report, which is available on SANDAG's website at: https://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_2132_22605.pdf. Based on the information provided by the local jurisdictions in the region, this report shows that in 2018 50,714 units were constructed of the 161,980 unit RHNA Allocation. At the time of publication, Lemon Grove was the only City that had met its requirements during the 5th RHNA cycle.

The existing programs were also successful in meeting the needs of special needs populations. County HCDS is currently assisting 350 recipients with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in Lemon Grove and the City continues to promote the HCV programs home buyer assistance programs. The implementing programs also address special needs populations (Figure 16) and include programs to assist an aging population and large households through accessory dwelling unit construction and an increase multi-family development near transit to assist persons with disabilities and single parent households.

Program 1: Continue to Implement Nonconforming Unit Ordinance

The City of Lemon Grove Development Code provides for the reconstruction of substantially destroyed nonconforming residential buildings and uses located in residential zones. Section 17.24.090(F)(I) (Nonconforming Uses) of the Development Code provides for the issuance of Reconstruction Permits to allow the restoration of substantially damaged or destroyed residential units. The City will continue to implement this provision of the Development Code.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City of Lemon Grove General Fund

Schedule: Ongoing. ~~High priority; and a Aggressively going after conforming uses, and upgrades.~~

Related Objectives: 1, 3, 5.

Program 2: Encourage Accessory ~~Rental~~ Dwelling Units (ADUs)

The State has adopted new laws for Accessory ~~Rental~~ Dwelling Units (ARDUs). The City ~~Council recently adopted (April May 17, 2022) its ADU Ordinance to~~ intends to review and revise the City's ARDU ordinance for be consistent ~~with State law. The local ADU Ordinance will, and explore and implement options for introducing provide direction and additional local flexibility for the very active additional housing option. within the first four months of the planning process, . Options including theinclude, the allowance of ARDUs in the RP zone and additional incentives to the~~ The City will continue to promote ARDUs as an at affordable residential options. The ADU Ordinance closely follows the State guidelines for rental rates such as flexibility for parking, development standards, and expediting permit processing, and fee options. The City's stated goal for this Housing Element is to permit 15 ARDUs per year over 8 years or a total of 120 ARDUs. The City ~~will monitor the ADU~~ progress on an annual basis in conjunction with the General Plan Annual Progress Report and will rezone additional sites within six months on an annual basis if stated goals are not met. reevaluate program viability if stated goals are not met over a two consecutive year period.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: SB2 Grant Funds

Schedule: ~~In 2021, evaluate the City's ADUARDU Ordinance adopted in AprilMay 17, 2022 and complete the update by 2022.~~

Related Objectives: 2-3, 6.

Program 3: Facilitate Development of Higher Density Housing

The City has established minimum densities between 25 and 45 dwelling units to the acre as part of its Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP), also known as STA I. The City has adopted not only minimum densities at a high density level but it has also established development standards that facilitate higher densities, including reduced parking standards for the nearby transit services (trolley station and bus stops). The City's goal will be to achieve 150% of minimum densities within STA I.

The City will continue to support the application of this program through the development of a specific plan for STA II while ensuring development standards are met and community character is maintained.

On May 17, 2022, the Lemon Grove City Council approved Zoning Ordinance Amendment ZA2-200-0002 which revised the Density Bonus Ordinance to align with current State Law.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: Local Early Action Planning Grant

Schedule: Conduct public outreach and complete Specific Plan adoption for STA II by 2022

Related Objectives: 2-4, 6.

Program 4: Utilize Code Enforcement Regulations to Improve Housing

Code Enforcement staff receives complaints regarding substandard housing and forwards these complaints to the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Quality (DEHQ). DEH investigates the complaint, requires compliance with housing codes to improve the overall quality and conditions of site, notifies appropriate agencies as applicable, and coordinates warnings, fines, abatement, and liens as appropriate until compliance is resolved. The code enforcement process is continuously monitored for effectiveness and the program will be adjusted as warranted.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove and DEH.

Funding Source: General Fund, Project Applicants.

Schedule: Ongoing.

Related Objectives: 1-3, 5

Program 5: Update and Utilize Density Bonus Provisions

The City intends to review and revise the City's Density Bonus ordinance for consistency with State law and explore options for introducing additional local flexibility to achieve higher densities.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: SB2 Grant Funds

Schedule: ~~In 2021, evaluate the~~ The City adopted the updated Density Bonus 's Ordinance on May 17⁵, 2022 and complete the update by 2022.

Related Objectives: 2-3, 6, 8

Program 6: Prepare or Modify Plans for Special Treatment Areas

The first Lemon Grove General Plan was adopted in 1980. Because most of the City was developed when this plan was prepared, a system of Special Treatment Areas (STAs) was established to identify areas with significant development potential. Specific guidelines are established for each STA and focus on the unique site characteristics and development opportunities.

STA II, Massachusetts Station, is planned to be a neighborhood residential and commercial mixed-use center adjacent to the Massachusetts Avenue Trolley Station. The residential component will consist of condominiums and/or apartments. The specific plan development will analyze densities to achieve a successful transit-oriented development. The City will continue to support the application of this program through the development of a specific plan for STA II while ensuring development standards are met and community character is maintained

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: Local Early Action Planning Grant

Schedule: Conduct public outreach and complete Specific Plan adoption for STA II by 2022

Related Objectives: 2-3, 6, 8

Program 7: Promote Community Based Neighborhood Improvement Districts

This program allows property owners and/or business owners to target an area for improvement then levy a special tax on their respective properties or businesses to provide funds for the improvements. Similar districts include Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Local Improvement Districts (LIDs), Community Service Districts (CSDs), Municipal Improvement Districts (MIDs), and Public Improvement Districts (PIDs). The services provided and the geographic boundaries are decided by the members of the district and can include a number of services: landscaping, security, recreation, historic preservation, and vehicle parking management. The districts share the ability to fund themselves through taxes or assessments.

Implementing Agency: Citizens, Businesses, Property Owners, City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: Property or business owner tax or assessment.

Schedule: ~~Ongoing~~ Under consideration

Related Objectives: 1-3.

Program 8: Promote the CPTED principles

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) provides best practices and design principles to help prevent or reduce criminal activity and reduces the perception of unsafe neighborhoods. The concepts include surveillance, access control, territoriality, and maintenance. Projects will be evaluated on these concepts and recommendations to incorporate the concepts will be communicated to the project team.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove, San Diego County Sheriff's Department.

Funding Source: Project Applicants.

Schedule: Ongoing. All new development is reviewed by the Sheriff's Department Crime Prevention Specialist for consistency with CPTED principles.

Related Objectives: 1-3.

Program 9: Sustainable Mobility Plan or Sidewalk Master Plan

Lemon Grove will develop a Sustainable Mobility Plan or Sidewalk Master Plan (SMP) to improve access, safety, and connectivity to schools, parks, and other community destinations. An SMP is needed to provide students, residents, and visitors with safer and more accessible non-motorized transportation options while improving connectivity, creating economic vibrancy, and reducing GHG emission. The SMP will include an outreach plan, "pop-up" events, workshops, and surveys to ensure authentic and equitable engagement of project stakeholders, especially those who will directly benefit from sustainable mobility implemented projects. The SMP aligns with the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and builds upon the City's Connect Main Street to integrate multimodal transportation and land use planning. The outcome of the SMP will be identified projects that will help create a healthier, safer, and more connected Lemon Grove.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove

Funding Source: Potential Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program

Schedule: Schedule is dependent on grant funding. ~~Actively pursuing updating and requiring new and renovations to improve public right of way. A Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (\$315,000) was awarded April 2022 for the preparation of a Sustainable Mobility Plan (SMP).~~

Related Objectives: 1-3.

Program 10: Encourage Energy Conservation and Sustainability

The City will encourage energy conservation and sustainability through implementation of the Climate Action Plan (CAP) adopted in 2020. The City's goal is to achieve maximum use of conservation measures and alternative, renewable energy sources in new and existing residences. New development including public projects will incorporate energy efficient equipment and building techniques to reduce overall power consumption. Site design, structural orientation and building materials influence energy requirements. Discretionary planned developments may utilize energy conservation elements to offset waivers of certain development standards.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: General Fund.

Schedule: Ongoing, ~~requiring all detach ADU units per State guidelines to install solar. Beginning January 1, 2022. ,aAll new or renovations are required to install Title 24 improvements-~~

Related Objectives: 1-3.

Program 11: Maintain Residential Site Inventory

A key element in satisfying the housing needs of all segments of the community is the provision of adequate sites for housing of all types, sizes and prices. This is an important function in both zoning and General Plan designations. A variety of residential types are provided for in Lemon Grove, ranging from large single-family sites to higher density mixed-use projects within Special Treatment Areas I & II.

The City's land use policy and development regulations are adequate to accommodate the City's overall RHNA of 1,359 units. To ensure that the City monitors its compliance with SB 166 (No Net Loss), the City will develop a procedure 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; and
- ~~Net change in capacity and summary of remaining capacity in meeting remaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).~~

~~Additionally, based on the findings in the realistic capacity section (page 66) in relation to the unlikelihood of commercially zoned properties redeveloping to 100% commercial in the future, the City will perform a mid-cycle monitor of this program to see if the trend of not 100% commercial continues.~~

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City of Lemon Grove General Fund.

Schedule: Develop a procedure in ~~2021-2022~~2023 to monitor the development of sites identified in the sites inventory and ensure adequate sites are available to meet the remaining RHNA by income category.

Related Objectives: 2-8.

Program 12: Preserve Affordable Dwelling Units “At Risk” of Converting to Market Rates

The City will monitor affordable dwelling units that are at risk of converting to market rates during the housing element cycle and will consider measures to preserve their affordability prior to expiration of affordability contracts. These measures will include the purchase of affordability contracts, working with non-profit housing organizations to preserve affordability, coordination with the County Department of Housing and Community Development, securing continued subsidies, and/or committing available housing set-aside monies from the Housing Agency. The Hillside Terrace Apartments located at 3264 College Place and St. John’s Plaza located at 8150 Broadway are the only units identified as being “At-Risk” of converting to market rates through 2029.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove and non-profit developers.

Funding Source: City of Lemon Grove General Fund.

Schedule: ~~August/September~~ Develop a procedure for monitoring of conversion of affordable dwelling units to market rate by the end of 2023.

Related Objectives: 1-3, 6.

Program 13: Cooperate/Coordinate with Housing Developers, Agencies, and Tenant Groups

For-profit and non-profit housing developers promote and develop housing and identify and eliminate non-governmental constraints to housing development. Non-profits are often a critical component in the development of low and moderate income housing. The City of Lemon Grove compiled the following list of non-profit developers who have been active in the area. The City will maintain a current list of developers and potential development sites:

- San Diego Interfaith Housing;
- San Diego Community Housing Corporation;
- Habitat for Humanity;
- Mexican-American Anti-Poverty Advisory Committee (MAAC);
- Affirmed Housing Group;
- National CORE Renaissance; and
- Fairfield Residential LLC.

The City will continue to augment and refine this list of developers for purposes of soliciting their involvement in affordable housing construction in the City, including large residential care facilities. The City will continue to work with developers to ~~insure~~ ensure that all opportunities are assessed. The City will encourage interested agencies and/or tenant groups to form partnerships to obtain housing resources.

The City will continue to utilize housing organizations to provide financial assistance and technical support in the development of affordable housing, including housing development within Special Treatment Areas (STAs). The actions that the City will take specifically include but are not necessarily limited to: identify potential funding assistance (State and Federal funds); identify sites available for development; establish entitlement incentives as may be necessary and appropriate; encourage development at General Plan identified densities, and others as may be added by the City.

The City will coordinate with the Helix Water District and Lemon Grove Sanitation District to ensure that specific procedures have been adopted to grant priority water and sewer service to developments with units affordable to lower-income households. (Gov. Code, § 65589.7.)

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: Federal, State and local funds.

Schedule: ~~August/September~~Ongoing.

Related Objectives: 1-4, 8.

Program 14: Reduce Governmental Constraints for the Provision of Housing (Low Barrier Navigation Centers, Transitional and Supportive Housing, Employee Housing, and Reasonable Accommodation)

Pursuant to State law, the City is obligated to address, and where legally possible, remove governmental constraints affecting the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. Removing constraints on housing development can help address housing needs in the City by expediting construction (SB 35), and lowering development costs.

Extremely low income households and households with special needs have limited housing options in Lemon Grove. AB 101 requires access to low barrier navigation centers. Pursuant to State law, the City will establish provisions for Low Barrier Navigation Centers as development by right in areas zoned for mixed uses and nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses if it meets specified requirements. A “Low Barrier Navigation Center” is defined as “a Housing First, low-barrier, service-enriched shelter focused on moving people into permanent housing that provides temporary living facilities while case managers connect individuals experiencing homelessness to income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing.”

The City will also amend the Zoning Ordinance to clarify that transitional and supportive housing is permitted as a residential use in all zones and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type and in the same zone where multifamily and mixed uses are permitted, including nonresidential zones permitting multifamily uses pursuant to Government Code section 65651. Additionally, the City will modify procedures to allow group homes for seven or more persons to facilitate objectivity and approval certainty. Furthermore, the City will revise parking requirements for emergency shelters to be limited to parking for staff. The City will also amend the Zoning Ordinance to ~~clearly~~ allow employee housing in compliance with Health and Safety Code section 17021.5, consisting of no more than 12 units or 36 beds to be permitted in the same manner as other agricultural uses in the same zone and to implement a formal reasonable accommodation procedure to address reasonable accommodation requests. Lemon Grove does not have a separate process for review and approval of requests for reasonable accommodation with respect to zoning, permit processing or building laws.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City General Fund, Project Applicants.

Schedule: Amend the Zoning Ordinance within one year of Housing Element ~~adoption~~certification.

Related Objectives: 2-3, 6-8.

Program 15: Participate in Regional Analysis of Housing Need

Pursuant to State housing law (Government Code Section 65584, et seq.), the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to provide the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) with the determination of San Diego County’s existing and projected housing need prior to each

Housing Element cycle; also known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). SANDAG coordinates with housing stakeholders and city and county officials to allocate the region's housing needs amongst the region's 18 cities and the County of San Diego in four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate). A methodology for the distribution amongst the jurisdictions is developed in accordance with the objectives and factors contained in State law. The City will participate in the Regional Analysis of Housing Needs during each RHNA cycle.

Implementing Agency: State HCD, SANDAG.

Funding Source: City General Fund.

Schedule: Ongoing and specifically during each RHNA cycle.

Related Objectives: 2-3, 5.

Program 16: Pursue Affordable Housing Funding Sources

Successful implementation of housing element programs to create and maintain affordable housing will depend on a variety of State, Federal, and local funding sources. The City of Lemon Grove will actively pursue funding to assist in the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of any housing type. The City will identify these funding opportunities to both for-profit and non-profit developers as part of the residential development processes, especially those projects that have the potential for affordable housing. The actions that the City will take specifically include, but are not necessarily limited to: identify potential funding assistance (State and Federal funds if they were to become available); identification of sites available for development and infill opportunities; consideration of entitlement process(es) incentives as may be necessary and appropriate; and others as may be added by the City. The City will continue to work in concert with the County of San Diego, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), as a major resource for the implementation of the appropriate housing programs. The City will conduct proactive and regular outreach to developers to assist in the development of housing for households with special needs, persons experiencing homelessness; farmworkers; persons with disabilities, including developmental; and elderly. The following funding sources are available for these uses:

- A. Community Development Block Grants and HOME Funds - As an incentive for developers to provide a sufficient level of affordable housing, CDBG funds and HOME funds are available through the County. These Federal funds are made available through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process administered through the County Department of Housing and Community Development. Housing development, or acquisition, or acquisition and rehabilitation proposals are evaluated and rated based on the development's housing affordability and other important criteria. In 2005, the City began contracting with the County HCD to encumber for a three year period, rather than on an annual basis. The program will continue to be used for ongoing tenant/landlord mediation services and street rehabilitation.
- B. Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) - This State program provides tax credits for owners of or investors in low income rental housing. The tax credits are available for use over a 10-year period. The credits are normally sold to investors to help finance the initial development of a project. For a period of 15 years, the tax credit recipients must meet certain affordable rental rate and occupancy requirements for low or very low income households. At a minimum, the owner must reserve, at affordable rental rates, either 20 percent of the total units for households with income

at or below 50 percent of regional median, or 40 percent of the units for households with income at or below 60 percent of regional median.

The City will assist developers in gaining funding for the development of affordable housing through the LIHTC program. Investors receive a credit against Federal tax owed in return for providing funds to developers to build or renovate housing for low income households. The capital subsidy allows rents to be set at below market rates. The possible tax credits available range from 4 to 9 percent depending on the extent of the project's affordability.

- C. Tax-Exempt Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bond Program - Under this program, the County issues tax-exempt revenue bonds and uses the proceeds to provide below market construction and permanent financing for rental housing developments. Bond-financed development must reserve, at a minimum, either 20 percent of the total units for households whose annual income is at or below 50 percent of San Diego's Area Median Income (AMI), or 40 percent of total units for households whose annual income is at or below 60 percent of San Diego's AMI. Affordable rental rate restrictions and occupancy requirements for the reserved units shall remain in place for a minimum of 20 years.
- D. Tax Credit for Low Income Rental Housing Program - This program is administered by the State of California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and provides tax credits for owners of or investors in low income rental housing. The tax credits are available for use over a 10-year period. The credits are normally sold to investors to help finance the initial development of a project. For a period of 15 years, the tax credit recipients must meet certain affordable rental rate and occupancy requirements for low or very low income households. At a minimum, the owner must reserve, at affordable rental rates, either 20 percent of the total units for households with income at or below 50 percent of regional median, or 40 percent of the units for households with income at or below 60 percent of regional median.
- E. Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) - County HCD administers the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program, a Federal housing program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Established in 1992, the HOPWA Program is designed to provide states and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing and housing-related support service needs of low income persons living with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) or related diseases and their families. Housing and service providers compete for these funds through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) application process. The NOFA is made available contingent on the availability of funds from HUD. The planning process for the HOPWA Program encourages community participation and input through consumer and provider surveys, focus groups, and one-to-one interviews. Additionally, the community has the opportunity to participate through the HIV Housing Committee, which serves as an advisory body to HCD.

Programs funded through the HOPWA Program must be housing related and funding is prioritized as follows:

1. Activities which provide affordable housing for low income persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;

2. Activities which enable low income persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families to become housed; and
 3. Services needed to enable low income HIV/AIDS clients to remain housed, locate housing, and prevent homelessness.
- F. Other Programs - The City will semi-annually refer to the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development's Program Directory to expand its potential funding sources and determine the availability of funding. The City also will contact County HCD for updates on a semi-annual basis to determine the funding opportunities and the City's potential to take advantage of any appropriate programs. The City will annually communicate the results of these steps with County HCD and the development community, both for-profit and non-profits.

Implementing Agency: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, State Tax Allocation Committee, State HCD, County HCD, and City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: CDBG, HOME, and California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and others as the Directory may identify.

Schedule: August/September 2022

Related Objectives: 1-3, 7.

Program 17: Promote County of San Diego Home Repair Loan/Grant Programs

As the City's housing stock ages, the need for housing rehabilitation to enhance and preserve neighborhood quality will continue to increase. Therefore, the City will continue to promote rehabilitation programs.

The City will make the information available about these programs at City Hall. Periodic reminders and updates through City-wide information dissemination venues (web site, mail outs, electronic notifications, public notices, etc.) will be provided. In addition to these steps, the City will work with the County to ensure that the County marketing efforts include outreach to the residents of Lemon Grove.

- A. Grants: Grants of up to \$12,000 are available to low income mobile homeowners to repair their mobile homes. To be eligible to receive this grant, the applicant's family income must be below eighty percent (80 percent) of San Diego County's median income adjusted for family size and must be owner-occupied.
- B. Deferred Loans: The County of San Diego Department of Housing and Community Development offers the Home Repair Loan Program for Owner-Occupied Property that provides loans for the repair of homes. The City will continue to advertise the Housing Authority of the County of San Diego's Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program. This program offers low interest home improvement loans to eligible homeowner occupants. To be eligible to receive this loan, the applicant's family income must be below eighty percent (80 percent) of San Diego County's median income adjusted for family size. Deferred loans are offered at three percent simple interest and calculated annually on the unpaid principal. The total amount borrowed must be repaid when the property changes hands or the recipient moves from the property. Owners may borrow up to \$25,000 for a single-family home. The amount of the loan is determined by the cost of rehabilitating the property as well as the borrower's ability to repay the loan. The total amount borrowed must be repaid when the property changes hands or the recipient moves from the property.

Implementing Agency: County of San Diego Department of Housing and Community Development Services.

Funding Source: County of San Diego Department of Housing and Community Development Services.

Schedule: Ongoing. Evaluate the activity, funding, and effectiveness mid-way through this Housing cycle.

Related Objectives: 1-3, 7, 9

Program 18: Coordinate Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and Public Housing

The City will continue to coordinate with the Housing Authority of San Diego County who will continue to administer the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program and the Public Housing Program. The Housing Authority will support the County's applications for additional Section 8 allocations. This program provides rental assistance to eligible very low and low income households. The subsidy represents the difference between the rent that exceeds 30 percent of a household's monthly income and the actual rent charged. For Public Housing, the household's annual gross income shall be at or below 50 percent of San Diego's Area Median Income (AMI).

County HCDS is currently assisting 350 recipients with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in Lemon Grove. In addition, out of the 56,180 applicants currently on the HCV Waiting List, 805 identify as living in Lemon Grove. The City will make HCV information available at City Hall. It also will provide periodic reminders and updates through City-wide information dissemination venues (web site, mail outs, electronic notifications, public notices, etc.). In addition to these steps, the City will work with the County to ensure that the County marketing efforts include outreach to the residents of Lemon Grove with a goal of 450 HCVs during Housing Element implementation.

Implementing Agency: The County of San Diego Department of Housing and Community Development.

Funding Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Schedule: Ongoing. Evaluate the participation and effectiveness mid-way through this Housing cycle.

Related Objectives: 2-3, 7, 9

Program 19: Participate in the Fair Housing Council of San Diego's (FHCSO) Fair Housing Program

The City of Lemon Grove supports fair housing laws and statutes. To promote equal opportunity, the City participates in the Fair Housing Council of San Diego's (FHCSO) Fair Housing Program. The City distributes the FHCSO's information on fair housing, and refers fair housing questions and housing discrimination claims to the FHCSO. The FHCSO will:

- A. Advocate for fair housing issues;
- B. Conduct outreach and education;
- C. Provide technical assistance and training for property owners and managers;
- D. Coordinate fair housing efforts;
- E. Assist to enforce fair housing rights;
- F. Collaborate with other fair housing agencies;
- G. Refer and inform for non-fair housing problems; and,
- H. Counsel and educate tenants and landlords.

Additionally, as part of the CDBG process, the City will explore additional opportunities to enhance fair housing in the City (for example as a potential part of a FHCSO marketing campaign when STA I units are

available for sale and rent and as part of the City's overall fair housing activities associated with all residential developments). The City will make the information available at its City Hall as well as the Development Services Department. It also will provide periodic reminders and updates through City-wide information dissemination venues (web site, mail outs, electronic notifications, public notices, etc.). In addition to these steps, the City will work with the FHCS to insureensure that its marketing efforts include outreach to the residents of Lemon Grove.

Implementing Agencies: City of Lemon Grove, Fair Housing Council of San Diego.

Funding Source: City of Lemon Grove General Fund, CDBG, and Fair Housing Council of San Diego.

Schedule: Ongoing.

Related Objectives: 2-3, 7, 9

Program 20: Promote Funding Opportunities for Home Ownership and Rental Assistance

The City of Lemon Grove will actively promote funding to assist opportunities for home ownership and rental assistance. The City will identify and update these funding opportunities and make the sources available at City Hall. The City will continue to work in concert with the County of San Diego, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), as a major resource for the home ownership programs. The following funding sources currently are available for these uses:

- A. Down payment and Closing Cost Assistance (DCCA) Program - The DCCA Loan Program is a homeownership program designed to make funds available to low and very low-income households to help with the purchase of their first home within Lemon Grove and other participating jurisdictions in San Diego County. This program offers low-interest deferred payment loans of up to 17 percent of the maximum allowable purchase price (adjusted annually) and a closing cost of four percent, not exceeding \$10,000. DCCA loan funds may be used to pay down payment and closing costs of a qualifying single-family home, condominium, townhouse, or manufactured home on a permanent foundation. Program goals include assisting one household annually.
- B. Housing Choice Vouchers Program - The Housing Choice Voucher program extends rental subsidies to very low income (up to 50% of AMI) families and the elderly, who spend more than 30% of their income on rent. The subsidy represents the difference between the excess of 30% of the monthly income and the actual rent. Rental assistance is issued to recipients as vouchers, which permit tenants to locate their own housing and rent units beyond the federally determined fair market rent in the area, provided the tenants pay the extra rent increment. The City of Lemon Grove contracts with the San Diego County Housing Authority (under the County HCDS) to administer the Housing Choice Voucher program. As 2020, 350 Lemon Grove Households are beneficiaries of the Housing Choice Voucher program.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove, County of San Diego HCD, San Diego County Housing Authority

Funding Source: Home Funds, HUD Housing Choice Vouchers

Schedule: Ongoing

Related Objectives: 2-4, 7

Program 21: Encourage Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households

Encourage the development of housing units for households earning 30 percent or less of the median income for San Diego County. The City will encourage development of housing for extremely-low income households through a variety of activities such as conducting proactive and regular outreach to housing developers, providing financial or in-kind technical assistance or land-write downs, providing expedited processing, identifying grant and funding opportunities, applying for or supporting applications for funding on an ongoing basis, reviewing and prioritizing local funding at least twice during the planning period, and/or offering additional incentives beyond the density bonus provisions. The City will also seek opportunities to assist in the development of housing for households with special needs, persons experiencing homelessness; farmworkers; persons with disabilities, including developmental; and elderly through outreach to developers and by monitoring and seeking grant opportunities.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove

Funding Source: City of Lemon Grove General Fund

Schedule: August/September

Related Objectives: 2, 3, 5-7, 9

Program 22: By-Right Approval of Projects with 20% Affordable Units on “Reuse” Sites

Pursuant to AB 1397 passed in 2017, the City will ~~amend the Zoning Ordinance to~~ require by-right approval of housing development that includes 20 percent of the units as housing affordable to lower income households, on sites being used to meet the 6th cycle RHNA that represent “reuse sites” previously identified in the 4th and 5th cycles Housing Element. The “reuse” sites are specifically identified in the inventory (see Appendix B).

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City General Fund

Schedule: Amend the Zoning Ordinance within one year of Housing Element ~~adoption~~certification.

Related Objectives: 3, 5-7

Program 23: Promote Equal Housing Opportunities & Fair Housing Services

To make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, the Housing Plan must include actions that promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of their special characteristics as protected under Federal and State fair housing laws. Lemon Grove also takes steps to affirmatively further fair housing by promoting the services of the Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc, which provides free Fair Housing services and tenant/landlord referral information to Lemon Grove residents. In 2019, the City, along with all other jurisdictions in San Diego County, participated in a regional Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice. The City will continue to promote equal housing opportunities and fair housing services:

- A. Actively participate in the SDRAFFH to coordinate regional responses to housing discrimination issues.
- B. Continue to post fair housing services and resources on the City’s website and expand access to community meetings by publishing fair housing information in non-traditional media (such as social media platforms).
- C. Ensure outreach is multilingual,
- D. City staff meet with community members routinely to discuss needs
- E. Continue to promote the Housing Choice Voucher program to rental property owners
- F. Collaborate with the Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc. to increase education and outreach regarding the State’s new Source of Income Protection (SB 329), defining Housing Choice

Vouchers as a legitimate source of income for housing and to address rising and current ~~trends~~^{trends} of fair housing issues.

- G. Serve 450 residents, landlords, and housing professionals with fair housing services annually
- H. Encourage systematic code enforcement activities that maintain housing stock while ensuring such enforcement does not cause displacement.
- I. Promote housing mobility strategies and displacement mitigation strategies to ensure equitable access to opportunity using available resources in the San Diego region:
 - 1. Promote affordable and accessible transportation options to enhance access to education and economic development opportunities.
 - 2. Promote tenant protections, conservation of existing stock, preservation of units at-risk of conversion to market-rate uses, acquisition and rehabilitation of existing stock, including naturally occurring affordable housing, and removing barriers to building affordable housing.
 - 3. Continue to work with regional partners such as the San Diego County Land Trust to acquire and preserve affordable housing.
 - 4. Collaborate with the Lemon Grove School District to promote a diversity of students and staff.
 - 5. Promote landlord education and outreach on source of income discrimination and voucher programs.
- J. Target investment in areas of most need focused on improving community assets such as schools, recreational facilities and programs, social service programs, parks, streets, active transportation and infrastructure.
- K. Seek funding to prioritize basic infrastructure improvements (e.g., water, sewer) in disadvantaged areas.
- L. Utilize acquisition and rehabilitation of vacant and blighted properties to improve the community when feasible.
- M. Continue intergovernmental coordination on areas of high need.
- N. Expand access to community meetings, including addressing language barriers.
- O. Promote Accessory Dwelling Unit opportunities.
- P. Evaluate opportunities for affordable housing replacement in conjunction with the planned Density Bonus Ordinance update.
- Q. Evaluate displacement issues in conjunction with the STA II Specific Plan near the Massachusetts Trolley Station and in other targeted growth areas.
- R. Increase visibility of the City's small business assistance efforts.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City General Fund

Schedule: Ongoing.

Related Objectives: 5-7

Program 24: Replacement Housing

In order to ensure that existing affordable residential units on potential redevelopment sites in the Sites Inventory are preserved or replaced, the City shall develop a replacement housing policy as set forth in Government Code section 65915, subdivision (c)(3).

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City General Fund

Schedule: Develop replacement housing policy within one year of Housing Element adoption/certification.

Related Objectives: 5-7

Program 25: Small Lot Development/Lot Consolidation

The opportunities for site consolidation are applicable to individual zones on a block by block basis. However, there have not been any recent trends towards consolidations of lots in Lemon Grove. Many of the commercial sites in particular have been owned for a by long time property owners and are unlikely at this stage to consolidate. The City previously had a Redevelopment Agency (now defunct) that provided assistance in the way of Tax Incremental Financing (TIF). The City does not currently have any lot consolidation incentives or programs since dissolution of Redevelopment in the State of California. Tax increment financing (TIF) is no longer available.

To incentivize lot consolidations, the City of Lemon Grove will simplify the lot consolidation process and streamline review of lot consolidation applications. In addition, the City will reach out to the common parcel owners and properties with adjacent access and common characteristics to encourage lot consolidation as part of the development process.

Implementing Agency: City of Lemon Grove.

Funding Source: City General Fund

Schedule:

- Within a year of certification, develop appropriate incentives and review procedures to facilitate small lot development and lot consolidation for affordable housing development. Incentives for lot consolidation may include:
 - Simplifying the lot consolidation process for applicants
 - Expedited/Streamlined review process
- Ongoing outreach to property owners regarding lot consolidation incentives. Engage the Community Development Department to facilitate communications among property owners and interested developers for lot consolidation potential and/or packaging parcels for redevelopment.

Quantified Objectives

Housing element law requires that quantified objectives be developed with regard to new construction, rehabilitation, conservation, and preservation activities that will occur during this housing element cycle. **Figure 66** summarizes the City of Lemon Grove's quantified objectives for the housing element cycle. A description of each follows.

Figure 66
Total Quantified Objectives, Lemon Grove, 2021-2029

	Extremely Low Income	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
RHNA	148	147	166	193	705	1,359
New Construction*	128	132	128	266	1,024	1,678
Units to be Conserved			117			117
Units to be Assisted						
Down payment and Closing Cost Assistance			8			8
Housing Choice Vouchers	150	150	150			450
Conservation			117			117
Rehabilitation		25	25	25	125	200

**New construction estimate is based on 512 mixed-use units distributed evenly among extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income units, with the addition of RHNA credits from Figure 50*

***The City estimates that 200-300 units will be remodeled and/or rehabilitated as part of the conventional market.*

Source: Lemon Grove Community Development Department, 2021

New Construction

SANDAG, as part of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), allocated 1,359 new dwelling units to the City for this Housing Element cycle, which represents an average of 170 units per year. This average does not accurately represent historic development trends which are typically less than 30 dwelling units per year, with higher production associated with larger infill projects that occur less frequently. The average is also significantly higher than SANDAG's projected growth for the City as found in the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast which anticipates 536 dwelling units to be added to the City by 2035. This forecast used a variety of factors including land available for development to project the amount of new housing. The City anticipates that much of the new construction will result from increased infill development, especially within the Downtown Village Specific Plan area and along the General Commercial Mixed-Use areas.

In addition to the goal of 1,359 new dwelling units, the City has also set goals for the affordability of the new units. As shown, the goals of the City under the RHNA allocations are for 128 of the units to be available to extremely low income households, 132 to very low income households, 128 to low income households, 266 to moderate income households, and 1,024 to above moderate income households.

Rehabilitation


The City anticipated that 200 dwelling units would be rehabilitated between 2010 and 2020 through participation in the housing rehabilitation programs and owner initiated improvements. The income level goals are estimates based upon the income requirements of the various rehabilitation programs. From 2010-2020, the City approved 1 multi-family alteration, 412 roof improvements, and 396 single-family rehabilitations. Based on comparable analyses, multi-family dwellings are assumed to be affordable to low income households and single-family dwelling are assumed to be affordable to moderate income households. The City anticipates that 200 units will need to be rehabilitated by 2029. The estimate is based on activity of the Code Enforcement officer over the last two years where approximately one building code issue has been identified every two weeks on average.

Conservation

At the Hillside Terrace Apartments, there are 18 dwelling units deed restricted to low income households at risk of converting to market rates during this housing element cycle and at St. John's Plaza there are 99 dwelling units deed restricted to low income households. The deed restrictions are set to expire in 2023 and 2024. The City will monitor these affordable units and consider measures to preserve their affordability prior to expiration of affordability contracts.

Assistance

The City's quantified conservation objective for 2021-2029 is 350. There are 350 Lemon Grove households receiving Section 8 certificates and vouchers, a decrease of 72 vouchers from 2010-2020. In addition, out of the 56,180 applicants currently on the HCV Waiting List, 805 identify as living in Lemon Grove. The City's ability to expand this program or even maintain it at its current level is dependent upon the Federal budget process.



Public Participation Summary Report

DRAFT | April 9, 2021

Prepared for:
The City of Lemon Grove

Prepared by:



In Association with:
FM3 Research
Community Translations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW 3

II. COMMUNITY SURVEY 7

III. ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE 9

IV. POP-UP EVENT 15

V. COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS 19

VI. STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS AND PRESENTATIONS 24

VII. APPENDICES 26

I. OVERVIEW

In February 2021, the City of Lemon Grove initiated a public participation process to support development of the Housing Element Update (HEU) for the 2021 through 2029 period. Public participation is essential to the update process, providing the community an opportunity to define the City's future growth. The Housing Element should reflect the community's goals and values and address the community's needs by identifying potential types and locations for new housing.

The Housing Element is an element of the City's General Plan to achieve the City's housing goal while meeting the requirements of the State of California (Article 10.6 of the Government Code) and includes: analysis of the previous Housing Element and current housing factors (physical, fiscal, regulatory); identification of constraints to achieving the goal; and proposed modifications and refinements to the objectives, policies and programs identified in the previous Housing Element.

The public participation process included a range of activities designed to reach the breadth of Lemon Grove residents and stakeholders with a vested interest in housing, including: community workshops, a statistically-valid survey; an online questionnaire; a "pop-up" outreach activity, and presentations to and conversations with key stakeholders and groups.

The process included support from a consultant team led by MIG, Inc., a San Diego-based planning and communications firm, which led development and implementation of the participation process. Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3), a policy and opinion research firm, designed and conducted a statistically valid survey of Lemon Grove residents. Mariana Lopez of Community Translations, an interpretation and translation professional based in the San Diego-Tijuana region, provided interpretation and translation support for bilingual English/Spanish communications and engagement.

This report summarizes the public participation process, overall findings, and findings from each activity.

Public Participation Objectives

To guide the design and implementation of the public participation process, the City and project team identified the following objectives:

- Educate the community on the purpose and need for the HEU
- Reach a representative cross-section of the City's community members
- Conduct targeted engagement among community members with the greatest needs related to housing and livability
- Design and conduct multiple methods for reaching the community
- Understand community concerns and ideas related to housing in the City
- Document the participation process and resulting community input to inform the HEU

Key Questions

Following are the key questions that informed the development of communication and participation materials designed to educate the community and solicit input. The questions relate to key considerations informing development of the HEU. Most activities included most of the questions as written or refined, depending upon the activity format and participants.

Housing Needs and Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who are the community members in Lemon Grove with the greatest housing needs?• What are the major housing challenges and issues in Lemon Grove?
Potential Areas for New Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What general areas of the City do you believe are ideal for new housing?• What are considerations for locating new housing in pedestrian-friendly areas, near Trolley stations, and near shopping and services?
Mixed-Used Housing Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are potential areas of the City for incorporating housing as part of mixed-use development?
Priorities for Housing Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What types of housing goals, policies and regulations are most important to you? (Options provided.)

Communication and Notification Tools

The project team designed and deployed a range of communication and notification methods and tools to build awareness and invite participation in the HEU process. The appendix includes copies of many of these communications:

- **Project Information Sheet:** This sheet served as the primary communication and notification material used to build awareness and invite participation in the methods described in this section.
- **Social Media Platform and Postings:** The project team established a Facebook page dedicated to the HEU. Multiple postings inviting participants to the online questionnaire and community workshops occurred during the process. Additionally, some postings included “sponsored boosts” to reach Lemon Grove residents, and some postings were re-posted or shared by the City’s Facebook page and those of community-based organizations. Over 1,800 Lemon Grove residents received/viewed the postings.
- **City Email Communications (e-blasts) and Calendar:** A city e-blast reached 302 recipients, and three (3) calendar notifications reached a total of 364 recipients.
- **Direct Email:** Community-based organizations and key stakeholders received direct email messages from project team members encouraging their participation in the activities.
- **Sharing/Forwarding:** Multiple community-based organizations and community members offered to share the above communications through their communication networks of Lemon Grove residents and stakeholders.

Public Participation Activities

The public participation plan outlined a range of activities that occurred February 2021 through March 2021. The following table outlines each activity's format, time frame, target audiences and key questions that guided the information sharing and input gathering.

Activity and Timing	Format and Outreach	Target Audiences	Key Questions
Community Survey Feb. 16 – Mar. 3	Statistically valid, +/-4.7% at the 95% confidence level Conducted via phone and online Offered in English and Spanish Invited via phone and text	445 City residents, 18+ years of age, address-based Representative sample of City demographics	Housing needs and community benefits Potential areas for new housing Priorities for housing policies Mixed-using housing opportunities
Online Questionnaire Feb. 24 – Mar. 31	Internet-based Offered in English and Spanish Invited via email, City e-blasts, and social media	City residents and stakeholders 216 responses (full or partial)	Housing needs and community benefits Potential areas for new housing Priorities for housing policies Mixed-using housing opportunities
Pop-Up Event Mar. 20	Drive-thru Food Distribution – City of Lemon Grove, Lions Club and Thrive Lemon Grove	Low-income residents 79 participants	Housing needs and challenges Residents with the greatest needs Potential areas for new housing
Community Workshops (2) Mar. 3 & 9	Video- conference (Zoom) Interactive presentation, discussions and input Invited via email, City e-blasts, and social media	City residents and stakeholders 47 participants	Housing needs and community benefits Potential areas for new housing
Stakeholder Interviews and Presentations Multiple dates	One-on-one or small group	City residents, community-based organizations (CBOs) and stakeholders 40 participants (est.)	Housing needs and challenges Potential areas for new housing Opportunities for extended outreach

Summary of Key Findings

Following is a summary of key findings across the public participation activities. Specific findings by activity are in the following sections of this report.

- Many participants indicated the cost of housing as a reason for living in Lemon Grove
- Housing affordability is an ongoing and growing issue for many community members
 - Young families/adults, older adults, and low-income community members have the greatest housing challenges and needs
- Detached single-family homes, condos/townhomes and granny flats are the types of housing needed most
- Priority goals include:
 - Revitalizing underused shopping centers and business districts
 - Protecting single-family homes from multi-unit buildings
 - Maintaining neighborhood character
- Locating housing in mixed-use developments along most portions of Broadway tend to be higher priority locations
- Some participants support locating more housing close to the Trolley stations, with some considerations:
 - Target low-income, transit-dependent community members
 - Provide flexibility with parking requirements
- Adequate Infrastructure and community impacts – including parking and traffic – are important considerations for housing locations

Report Organization

This summary report is organized by public participation activity. Each section briefly describes the activity format, time frame, key questions, and target audiences, as well as a summary of the findings and discussion items.

- I. Overview
- II. Community Survey
- III. Online Questionnaire
- IV. Pop-Up Event
- V. Community Workshops
- VI. Stakeholder Interviews and Presentations
- VII. Appendices

II. COMMUNITY SURVEY

FM3 conducted a statistically valid community survey to collect input from a representative sample of Lemon Grove residents on the following topics related to the HEU:

- Attitudes toward housing policy
- Familiarity with and attitudes towards mixed-use development
- Resident preferences for City of Lemon Grove requirements for developers of new multi-unit housing buildings
- Resident reactions to reasons why Lemon Grove should submit a housing plan to the State

Survey Specifics and Methodology

Following is an overview of the survey specifics and methodology:

Dates	February 16-March 3, 2021
Survey Type	Addressed Based Survey
Research Population	City of Lemon Grove Residents 18 Years of Age and Older
Total Interviews	445
Margin of Sampling Error	(Full Sample) $\pm 4.7\%$ at the 95% Confidence Level
Contact Methods	Telephone calls, email invitations and text invitations
Data Collection Modes	Telephone interviews and online survey
Languages	English and Spanish

Survey Findings and Conclusions

Following are findings and conclusions from the community survey. Specific survey questions and tallied results are included in the appendix to this report.

- High percentages rate revitalizing underused or abandoned commercial centers; protecting housing affordability; maintaining the character of the City's neighborhoods and protecting single family neighborhoods from multi-unit residential buildings as extremely high priorities or major priorities.
- Less than half highly prioritize the building of multi-unit housing on vacant property or near the two trolley stations.
- Slightly more than six-in-ten say they are familiar with the term mixed-use development, though roughly only two-in-ten are very familiar.
- Slightly more than half initially favor mixed-use development that included housing in the City, but after information almost three-quarters favor it, suggesting that explaining the term will increase understanding and level of support.
- A slight majority highly prioritize mixed-use development, with housing, in downtown Lemon Grove, and commercial areas along Broadway.

- Most residents would like to see the City require the developer(s) of new multi-unit housing buildings to include enough parking, community benefits, infrastructure improvements and having the City provide incentives to the developers to provide more affordable housing for veterans, seniors and individuals with disabilities.
- The vast majority of residents indicated that each of three outcomes from submitting a plan to meet State housing requirements are extremely or very important as reasons for doing so.

DRAFT

III. ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

The project team designed and deployed a questionnaire in an online format to collect input from Lemon Grove residents and stakeholders on the following topics related to the HEU:

- Housing needs and community benefits
- Potential areas for new housing
- Priorities for housing policies
- Mixed-using housing opportunities

Questionnaire Specifics and Methodology

Following is an overview of the questionnaire specifics and methodology:

Dates	February 24-March 31, 2021
Target Audience	City of Lemon Grove Residents and Stakeholders
Total Responses	445
Notification Methods	Email, City e-blasts and social media
Format	Online questionnaire
Languages	English and Spanish

Questionnaire Results

Following is a summary of each question and the results. Some questions mirrored those in the community survey. Because the online questionnaire is distributed broadly without controls for the sample size and respondent demographics, it is important to note that the results are not statistically valid.

1. What are your reasons for living in Lemon Grove? (Select all that apply)

- 56.9% said cost of housing
- 38.5% said close distance to family and friends
- 25.4% said distance from home to shopping, restaurants, healthcare, or other services
- 23.1% said other
- 22.3% said distance from work
- 14.6% said types of housing available
- 10.8% said quality of housing
- 10.8% said range of housing choices
- 10.8% said transportation options
- 9.2% said my place of birth
- 6.9% said community and recreation amenities, like parks and recreation centers
- 4.6% said schools
- 3.9% said none of the above

2. Thinking about the 5 years prior to the coronavirus outbreak, had you experienced any of the following housing issues within the last 5 years? (Select all that apply)

- 35.4% said no housing issues
- 26.9% said lack funding for repairs
- 24.6% said adult children living at home due to inability to afford housing
- 17.7% said struggle to pay rent/mortgage
- 14.6% said significant rent increase
- 12.3% said too many people in the house (overcrowding)
- 7.7% said other
- 3.9% said housing discrimination

3. Since the coronavirus outbreak, have you experienced any of the following housing issues? (Select all that apply)

- 39.2% said no housing issues
- 28.4% said lack funding for repairs
- 19.2% said adult children living at home due to inability to afford housing
- 17.7% said struggle to pay rent/mortgage
- 6.9% said too many people in the house (overcrowding)
- 6.9% said other
- 6.1% said significant rent increase
- 3.9% said housing discrimination

4. What types of housing does Lemon Grove need most? Select up to three types.

- 61.5% said detached single-family homes
- 39.2% said condominiums/townhomes
- 24.6% said accessory dwelling units (also known as granny flats or guest houses)
- 19.2% said senior housing
- 14.6% said temporary housing for people looking to transition from homelessness
- 13.1% said duplexes or triplexes (2 or 3 unit buildings)
- 13.1% said other
- 12.3% said smaller scale apartment buildings (4 units)
- 11.5% said medium scale apartment buildings (5 units or more)
- 10.8% said housing for families and individuals who need supportive services like jobs training and social services
- 1.5% said mobile home parks

5. There are many potential goals that could be part of Lemon Grove’s plan for more housing and equal housing opportunities. For each potential goal listed below, please choose how high a priority you think it should be to include that goal in the plan.

	Extremely high priority	Major priority	Minor priority	Not a Priority	Don’t know	No Answer
Protecting neighborhoods that have mostly single-family homes from changes that would allow multi-unit residential buildings in the neighborhood	72 (55.4%)	24 (18.5%)	13 (10.0%)	9 (6.9%)	1 (0.8%)	11 (8.5%)
Protecting affordable housing currently in the city	36 (27.7%)	37 (28.5%)	30 (23.1%)	18 (13.9%)	1 (0.8%)	8 (6.2%)
Maintaining the character of Lemon Grove’s neighborhoods	71 (54.6%)	24 (18.5%)	15 (11.5%)	8 (6.2%)	5 (3.9%)	7 (5.4%)
Encouraging more affordable rental housing	22 (16.9%)	19 (14.6%)	33 (25.4%)	43 (33.1%)	1 (0.8%)	12 (9.2%)
Using new development as an opportunity to upgrade Lemon Grove’s business districts and downtown area	70 (53.9%)	30 (23.1%)	11 (8.5%)	13 (10.0%)	1 (0.8%)	5 (3.9%)
Addressing the housing needs of individuals and families at all income levels	33 (25.4%)	31 (23.9%)	40 (30.8%)	16 (12.3%)	2 (1.5%)	8 (6.2%)
Locating new housing close to stores and services to create more walkable neighborhoods	24 (18.5%)	38 (29.2%)	32 (24.6%)	28 (21.5%)	1 (0.8%)	7 (5.4%)
Encouraging the building of more multi-unit housing near Lemon Grove’s two trolley stations	11 (8.5%)	20 (15.4%)	31 (23.9%)	62 (47.8%)	1 (0.8%)	5 (3.9%)
Revitalizing shopping centers that are underused or abandoned	90 (69.2%)	27 (20.8%)	5 (3.9%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (4.6%)

6. To meet the City's long-term housing demand, the City will need to plan for more homes. Please review some potential areas in Lemon Grove that could include new housing in the future. This type of housing would be in the form of "mixed-use" development, which would have retail uses on the ground level, with housing or office space above or next to the retail uses. Please choose how high of a priority it should be to allow mixed-use development that includes housing in each of these areas.

	Extremely high priority	Major priority	Minor priority	Not a Priority	Don't know	No Answer
Along Broadway, from College Avenue to Lemon Grove Depot Trolley Station	26 (20.0%)	37 (28.5%)	32 (24.6%)	24 (18.5%)	3 (2.3%)	8 (6.2%)
Downtown Lemon Grove, within Broadway to the north, Lincoln Street to the south, Lemon Grove Avenue to the west and Kempf to the east	27 (20.8%)	30 (23.1%)	30 (23.1%)	30 (23.1%)	3 (2.3%)	10 (7.7%)
Near the Massachusetts Avenue Trolley Station	22 (16.9%)	22 (16.9%)	31 (23.9%)	37 (28.5%)	5 (3.9%)	13 (10.0%)
Commercial areas along Broadway between Kempf and Sweetwater	27 (20.8%)	33 (25.4%)	36 (27.7%)	19 (14.6%)	5 (3.9%)	10 (7.7%)
Around Lemon Grove Depot Trolley Station	19 (14.6%)	26 (20.0%)	30 (23.1%)	43 (33.1%)	0 (0.0%)	12 (9.2%)

7. What else would you like the City to consider when updating the Housing Element? (100 word limit)

This question asked respondents to list other considerations for the Housing Element. 53.9% of respondents provided comment(s). All responses are provided in the Appendix.

About You:

8. Please choose the statement that best describes you. Select one.

- 83.9% said they live in Lemon Grove
- 8.5% said they live and work in Lemon Grove
- 5.4% did not answer
- 1.5% said they work in Lemon Grove
- 0.8% said they do not live or work in Lemon Grove

9. Which best describes your current type of home? Select one.

- 80.0% said a detached single-family home
- 5.4% said a condominium/townhome
- 3.9% said a duplex/triplex/fourplex

- 2.3% said an apartment
- 0.8% said accessory dwelling unit (granny flat/guest house)
- 3.9% did not answer
- 3.9% said other
- 0.0% said a mobile home
- 0.0% said a group home/assisted living
- 0.0% said temporary housing for people looking to transition from homelessness
- 0.0% said they do not currently have a permanent home

10. Which best describes your current housing situation? Select one.

- 74.6% said own
- 18.5% said rent
- 3.9% did not answer
- 1.5% said other
- 0.8% said do not own a home or pay rent
- 0.8% said do not currently have a permanent home

11. Which of the following applies to your family situation?

- 31.5% said children under age 19 live with me at my home
- 23.1% said none of the above
- 19.2% said I have children ages 19 or older who no longer live at my home
- 14.6% said I have children ages 19 or older who live with me at home
- 5.4% did not answer
- 6.2% said other

12. Please indicate your gender. Select one.

- 66.9% said female
- 20.0% said male
- 7.7% said no answer
- 4.6% said prefer not to state
- 0.8% said non-binary

13. How do you identify yourself? Select all that apply.

- 53.1% said White/Caucasian
- 26.2% said Latino/Latina
- 9.2% said African American/Black
- 9.2% said prefer not to state
- 5.4% said Native American
- 4.6% said Asian or Pacific Islander
- 3.1% said other

14. Which year were you born, or which age range includes your age? Select one.

- 0.0% said 2002-1996 (18-24)
- 7.7% said 1995-1991 (25-29)
- 10.0% said 1990-1986 (30-34)
- 10.8% said 1985-1981 (35-39)
- 10.8% said 1980-1976 (40-44)
- 6.2% said 1975-1971 (45-49)
- 10.0% said 1970-1966 (50-54)
- 8.5% said 1965-1961 (55-59)
- 12.3% said 1960-1956 (60-64)
- 13.9% said 1955-1946 (65-74)
- 2.3% said 1945 OR EARLIER (75 and over)
- 1.5% said prefer not to state
- 6.2% did not answer

IV. POP-UP EVENT

The project team designed a “pop-up event” linked to an existing community event to collect input from Lemon Grove residents who are low-income and typically difficult to reach on the following topics related to the HEU:

- Housing needs and community benefits
- Residents with the greatest needs
- Potential areas for new housing

Event Specifics and Methodology

Following is an overview of the event specifics and methodology:

Date	March 20, 2021; 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Target Audience	City of Lemon Grove residents who are low-income
Total Responses	79
Notification Method	Participation requested at the Drive-Thru Food Distribution event
Format	Paper questionnaire
Languages	English and Spanish

The pop-up event format involves attending an existing community event that normally draws the desired target audience. This approach supports engaging those who may normally be difficult to reach through other methods. For the HEU, including the input of low-income residents of Lemon Grove is important due to housing affordability and access challenges.

The City of Lemon Grove partners with the Lions Club of Lemon Grove and Thrive Lemon Grove to conduct a monthly “Drive-Thru Food Distribution” event at the Lemon Grove Recreation Center. Recipients must prove their Lemon Grove residency to receive food. The project team participated in the event on March 20 by requesting participants to complete a short questionnaire.

Due to Covid-19 conditions and public health requirements, project team members followed distancing and handling protocols (e.g., sanitized markers, untouched paper, etc.). After receiving their food, participants received the questionnaire and a marker through their vehicle window, pulled their vehicle to the side, completed the questionnaire in their cars, and returned the completed questionnaires to project team members before driving away. Project team members practiced social distancing and wore vinyl gloves and face masks.

The pop-up event questionnaire was a shortened version of the online questionnaire. Anyone who declined to complete the questionnaire at that time received a project information sheet with a link to the online questionnaire to complete at a convenient time.

Pop-Up Event Results

Following is a summary of each question and the results. Because the pop-up event questionnaire is distributed without controls for the sample size and respondent demographics, it is important to note that the results are not statistically valid.

1. Since the coronavirus outbreak, have you experienced any of the following housing issues? (Select all that apply)

- 39.2% said struggle to pay rent/mortgage
- 31.7% said lack funding for repairs
- 25.3% said no housing issues in the last 5 years
- 17.7% said adult children living at home due to inability to afford housing
- 10.1% said significant rent increase
- 6.3% said too many people in the house (overcrowding)
- 3.8% said other
- 1.3% said housing discrimination

2. What types of housing does Lemon Grove need most? (Select up to three types)

- 41.8% said detached single-family homes
- 29.1% said senior housing
- 24.1% said duplexes or triplexes (2 or 3 buildings)
- 22.8% said housing for families and individuals who need supportive services like jobs training and social services
- 20.3% said accessory dwelling units (also known as granny flats or guest houses)
- 16.5% said smaller scale apartment buildings (4 units)
- 13.9% said temporary housing for people looking to transition from homelessness
- 12.7% said medium scale apartment buildings (5 units or more)
- 10.1% said condominiums/townhomes
- 7.6% said mobile home parks

3. To meet the City's long-term housing demand, the City will need to plan for more homes. Please review some potential areas in Lemon Grove that could include new housing in the future. This type of housing would be in the form of "mixed-use" development, which would have retail uses on the ground level, with housing or office space above or next to the retail uses. Please choose how high of a priority it should be to allow mixed-use development that includes housing in each of these areas.

	Extremely high priority	Major priority	Minor priority	Not a Priority	Don't know	No Answer
Along Broadway, from College Avenue to Lemon Grove Depot Trolley Station	16 (20.3%)	16 (20.3%)	11 (13.9%)	12 (15.2%)	9 (11.4%)	15 (19.0%)
Downtown Lemon Grove, within Broadway to the north, Lincoln Street to the south, Lemon Grove Avenue to the west and Kempf to the east	14 (17.7%)	19 (24.1%)	12 (15.2%)	9 (11.4%)	7 (8.9%)	18 (22.8%)
Near the Massachusetts Avenue Trolley Station	16 (20.3%)	17 (21.5%)	15 (19.0%)	11 (13.9%)	6 (7.6%)	14 (17.7%)
Commercial areas along Broadway between Kempf and Sweetwater	8 (10.1%)	16 (25.3%)	17 (21.5%)	10 (12.7%)	7 (8.9%)	21 (26.6%)
Around Lemon Grove Depot Trolley Station	12 (15.2%)	18 (22.8%)	12 (15.2%)	13 (16.5%)	5 (6.3%)	19 (24.1%)

4. Please choose the statement that best describes you. (Select one)

- 82.3% said I live in Lemon Grove
- 7.6% said I do not live or work in Lemon Grove
- 7.6% did not answer
- 2.5% said I live and work in Lemon Grove
- 0.0% said I work in Lemon Grove

5. Which of the following applies to your family situation?

- 43.4% said children under age 19 live with me at my home
- 24.1% said none of the above
- 17.7% said I have children ages 19 or older who live with me at home
- 8.9% did not answer
- 5.1% said I have children ages 19 or older who no longer live at my home
- 1.3% said other

6. Please indicate your gender. Select one.

- 68.4% said female
- 22.8% said male

- 7.6% said no answer
- 1.3% said prefer not to state
- 0.0% said non-binary

7. How do you identify yourself? Select all that apply.

- 41.8% said Latino/Latina
- 19.0% said White/Caucasian
- 17.7% said Asian or Pacific Islander
- 7.6% said Native American
- 3.8% said African American/Black
- 2.5% said prefer not to state
- 2.5% said other

8. Which year were you born, or which age range includes your age? Select one.

- 2.5% said 2002-1996 (18-24)
- 2.5% said 1995-1991 (25-29)
- 5.1% said 1990-1986 (30-34)
- 7.6% said 1985-1981 (35-39)
- 10.1% said 1980-1976 (40-44)
- 11.4% said 1975-1971 (45-49)
- 10.1% said 1970-1966 (50-54)
- 3.8% said 1965-1961 (55-59)
- 13.9% said 1960-1956 (60-64)
- 16.5% said 1955-1946 (65-74)
- 6.3% said 1945 OR EARLIER (75 and over)
- 2.5% said prefer not to state
- 7.6% did not answer

V. COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

The project team conducted two (2) community workshops to explain the purpose, process, and components of the HEU, as well as to collect input from Lemon Grove residents and stakeholders on these topics:

- Housing needs and community benefits
- Potential areas for new housing
- Priorities for housing policies
- Mixed-using housing opportunities

Workshop Specifics and Methodology

Following is an overview of the workshop specifics and methodology:

Dates	March 3 & 9, 2021; 6:00 pm – 7:03 pm
Target Audience	Lemon Grove residents and stakeholders
Total Participants	47
Notification Methods	Email, City e-blasts and social media
Format	Video conference (Zoom)
Languages	English and Spanish

The purpose of the community workshops was to engage the public and collect input on housing experiences, community needs, goals for housing and potential locations for housing in the city. The workshops provided an overview of and solicited input on the HEU.

Due to Covid-19 and public health requirements, the workshop format used the Zoom videoconference platform. City staff provided an informational presentation on the HEU, MIG staff served as facilitator and note-takers, and Community Translations staff provided simultaneous, Spanish language translation on a parallel Zoom audio channel. Participants responded to questions asked by the project team and provided comments and questions over audio and using the Zoom "chat" function. Note-takers recorded comments and questions on a "digital whiteboard" that was visible during the workshop and included in the appendix of this report.

Summary of Discussions

Following is a summary of the questions and comments provided during the workshops. City staff responses to questions or comments are listed in *italics*.

What do you think are the major housing issues/challenges Lemon Grove is facing now and into the future?

- Lack of housing opportunities
- Financial pressures and conflicts with having permanent housing and retaining custody of children
- Lack of parking
- More rental units instead of condos - could potentially lower housing prices for people looking to buy
 - *City can't dictate if condos or apartments are built on a certain site, it depends on the market, but we can provide guidelines for development*
- Current status of infrastructure is lacking - we need to update City infrastructure to accommodate more people
- Financial barriers to owning homes
 - *We can work with certain organizations that can help to alleviate some financial challenges for prospective buyers and this will be something we are looking at in the Housing Element*
- Struggle for non-profits to provide housing due to high cost of property in San Diego - Does Lemon Grove have land available for a cooperative effort?
 - *Since Lemon Grove is such a new city there is limited land that is available and the previous tools the city could use to purchase land are no longer existent*
 - *We are looking into other partnerships with organizations such as YIGBY (yes in God's backyard) to build a cooperative effort*
- Average median sale price of Lemon Grove is in the high 500's and seems to be in high demand - Need to look at developing townhomes and condos for buyers
- Parking issues for housing near Massachusetts trolley station
 - *If the zoning were to be changed there would be an impact analysis on the site and an effort would be made to ensure there wasn't an impact on single family homes*
- Lack of density and housing close to the downtown corridor that presents a barrier to new businesses coming into Lemon Grove
- Ability of the school district to handle increased density?
 - *New projects pay school fees when developing which can help to fund school districts to handle the increased density*
 - *Anything proposed in the HE has been accounted for in the long range growth plan for the school districts - new projects will require consultation with the school districts*
- Limited space and limited open space/green space
 - *The City does have an in-lieu fee that is applied to new development to help fund potential new open/green space*
- Affordability, lack of infrastructure, tax revenue, safety
- Not enough low income housing
- Need more housing for families
- providing more housing options that don't require owning a car - two amazing trolley stations, but minimal housing within walking distance
- Would like to see zoning/height changes to accommodate more high-density, walkable, transit-oriented housing near the trolley stations
 - *Developers have to provide offsets that can address some of the community needs*
- Affordable housing challenge in the region and statewide - Housing becomes unaffordable to front line workers because they do not make enough wages

- On the other side of the spectrum, there are now many professionals who struggle to afford housing due to student debts. So, I'd say that the affordability crisis is widening those whom it effects making affordability a major factor in future development.

**What types of community members do you believe struggle the most with housing in Lemon Grove?
What are their specific challenges?**

- Affordable housing
- People who don't have a high enough income are not able to own their own homes
- Seniors and older adults who may be ready to downsize or leave their homes don't have many options
- Development at commercial corridors would help our local economy grow

What are specific locations or general areas in Lemon Grove that you believe are best suited for more housing?

- Broadway and Sweetwater - nearby the strip joint
- On the strip
- on LG Ave @ vfw - Lincoln
- incorporating mixed use along Broadway going east from lemon grove avenue
 - *Redevelopment of downtown along Broadway - was considered by council but ultimately not approved*
- LG Ave a few blocks south of Palm is there any plan to build housing there? -
 - *No new approved construction on that site*
- Affordable, senior housing and commuter housing near the trolley
- Mixed-use surrounding the Food 4 Less around Broadway west
 - *One challenging aspect of redevelopment is the City cannot make developers build more housing or on certain sites - ultimately comes down to the property owner*
- Commercial corridors and areas within the pedestrian shed to trolley stops
- Housing near trolley stops - more flexible parking requirements incentives for developers
- Large apartment complex on Lemon Grove Way - would love to expand services to families in the City

What types of new housing is needed in the areas that are best suited for more housing?

- Smaller scale buildings
- Tiny homes
 - *Certain forms of tiny homes are only able to be placed in certain zoned neighborhoods, but there is an option to look into allowing mobile tiny homes to be located on single family homes*
- Affordable senior housing
- Senior housing
- Multi-generations housing
- Granny-flats/ADUs to accommodate multi-family or multi-generational
- Housing that is self-sufficient and sustainable - look into establishing/mandating areas for urban ag.

- *CA building energy use standards have been updated and are applied to every new development project*
- Redevelopment of underutilized properties
- Mix-use housing
- focus on mixed use development at our commercial corridors and within the pedestrian shed to our trolley stops
- Housing near the trolley stations
- Housing on churches or faith based organizations sites is a great idea
 - *In El Cajon a church is using tiny homes/sleeping cabins that could be a good reference*
- Would prefer to see church development on properties close to amenities and services
 - *Example would be Lemon Grove United Methodist - very large parking lot and walkable to restaurants, grocery stores, bus lines, etc.*
- Extended families living together in the same townhome - is there interest in LG?
- I would like to see townhomes

General Input and Additional Comments

- Wouldn't tiny homes make sense to increase housing stock?
 - *Identify what a tiny home is first - manufactured home (offsite) vs. trailer (moveable)*
 - *Manufactured homes can be permitted as an ADU/Tiny Home - Trailers not allowed for dwelling unless it is located in a modular home park*
- For a residential home, are they allowed an ADU and a Jr ADU?
 - *City ordinance for ADUs is superseded by state law - if the City does not have an ordinance for certain state laws, state law prevails. State guidance allows 1 ADU & 1 Jr ADU*
- Could the City of Lemon Grove provide a "standard" building set for ADUs?
 - *standard set can be used, provided that their lot has the space and fire separation requirements, without having to pay certain costs - would take away one of the barriers to build*
 - *With City budget constraints it is not currently possible to develop a unique set for LG - Other city's approved ADU plans across the County can be used in LG*
- Would existing apartment complexes be allowed to build additional apartments if they had the space on the lot as a way to increase units?
 - *To add units the site would have to comply with zoning law - if more units can be accommodated then units can be added*
- The nonprofit I work for has a large apartment complex in Lemon Grove on Lemon Grove Way and would love to expand services to families in Lemon Grove - especially those involved in Child Welfare Services. Would love Tiny Homes to be legal in Lemon Grove.
- Hear how many people in the community wanting more rental properties or more owned properties - I just mention this because it may be beneficial to have an explanation/conversation about why rentals are developed vs owned buildings.
 - *One challenge for the City is that we do not actually build the housing - only plan for it. We can help guide construction but cannot force it upon any site*
 - *Economic feasibility is more related to current trends - e.g., converting condos in 2006*
- How much of the new housing can be built without changing anything
 - *Almost all of the 1359 units can be accommodated in existing general commercial zones*

- *Looking into other opportunity sites that were not included in the last HE (e.g., Massachusetts Trolley Station site)*
- Does LG lay out the number of parking spaces required in significant depth? - Would be helpful if that info could be provided and could also allow for expanded incentives for developers
 - *Have parking standards, but there is a lot of flexibility in the code which fluctuates by project*
 - *Other confusing aspect of parking are the addition of density bonus projects (separate parking standards)*
- I don't see options for 3 story housing?
 - *Majority of city has a height limit of 3 story (other than Downtown area).*
- Where is the parking?
 - *For parking, requirements differ for certain areas of the City and we will be looking at getting more input on where increased parking should be located with the HE*
- Why are they considering building where we have businesses already there?
- What are the real consequences of not meeting the RHNA and why should LG build more housing if other cities were not punished for not meeting the RHNA
 - *Cities are required to plan for RHNA allocation not build those units and if they do plan for meeting the allocation they will not be punished*
- Would the City receive more funding if it does end up building the 1,300 + units?
 - *The City is mainly funded by property taxes and if a property is redeveloped then the value is reassessed which would generate an increase in property tax revenue*
- When was the RHENA data for average income levels gathered for LG?
 - *Have to pull data from a variety of sources - Census data is the primary source of data (American Community Survey 5 year estimate)*
- What will the traffic impact of 1,300+ units look like for our small city?
 - *General plan and zoning are in place for pre planned for units - would look at traffic impacts if we changed the zoning in certain areas*
 - *Any change to the zoning law would require a CEQA analysis that would look at the parking impact*

VI. STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS AND PRESENTATIONS

The project team conducted one-on-one interviews and presentations with key stakeholders to briefly explain the purpose, process, and components of the HEU, as well as to collect input on these topics:

- Housing needs and challenges
- Potential areas for new housing
- Opportunities for extended outreach

Specifics and Methodology

Following is an overview of the specifics and methodology:

Dates	Various from Feb. through Mar. 2021
Target Audience	Lemon Grove key stakeholders
Total Participants	40 (estimated)
Notification Methods	Email and phone contact
Format	Phone or video conference (Zoom)
Language	English

One-on-one interviews and small group presentations with key stakeholders are valuable in collecting input related to respective communities and constituencies, particularly those who are hard-to-reach. The project team and City staff conducted interviews and small group presentations with the following stakeholders:

One-on-One Interview	Small Group Presentation
KellyAnne Rodriguez, East Region, Health and Human Services Agency, County of San Diego	Lemon Grove Clergy Association
Rosalina Spencer, Legal Aid Society of San Diego (fair housing provider)	Soroptimists of Lemon Grove
Pastor Bryon Scott, Engage Community Church	Lemon Grove Collaborative

Summary of Discussions

Who are the community members that you believe have the greatest needs with housing in Lemon Grove? What are their specific challenges?

- Overall, affordability is a challenge for nearly everyone, but most significantly for:
 - Young families
 - Young adults
 - Older adults

- The “working poor”: those whose income is slightly higher than qualifying levels for public assistance
- Older adults also require living and mobility assistance
- Low-income community members who have limited options, and who may be doubling/tripling use of a single unit:
 - New immigrants and refugees
 - Non-/limited-English speakers
 - Homeless
- Those who can benefit from fair housing assistance are difficult to reach, particularly during the pandemic
- Residential property owners have concerns about losing value
 - ADU/granny flat options are valued

What are specific locations or general areas in Lemon Grove that you believe are best suited to more housing? What types of housing do you envision at those locations (e.g., single-family homes, multi-unit, granny flats, condominiums, apartments, etc.)?

- Underused and dilapidated commercial properties
- Infill development on mixed-use corridors
- Walkable and close to services and transportation
- Tiny homes
- ADU's/Granny flats on private property - tax value; disperse throughout the city
- Massachusetts Trolley Station, with improvements to pedestrian safety
- Washington/Golden Ave lot
- Church and New Jersey location
- Parking considerations are important
- Distributing affordable housing is important to equity and preventing gentrification

Related to public outreach for this Housing Element Update, what organizations do you think would be helpful in spreading the word and generating participation among City of LG community members?

- Resident Leadership Academy
- Lemon Grove Collaborative
- Lemon Grove Clergy Association
- Thrive Lemon Grove
- Soroptimist Club
- Food Distribution sites
- Lions Club
- Historical Society
- Masonic Lodge
- VFW
- American Legion
- Lemon Grove Unified School District and Parent Teacher Association

VII. APPENDICES

- A. Project Information Sheet - English
- B. Project Information Sheet – Spanish
- C. Social Media Postings
- D. City Email Communication
- E. Community Survey Results - Presentation to the City Council
- F. Online Questionnaire - English
- G. Online Questionnaire – Spanish
- H. Online Questionnaire – Additional Responses to Question 7
- I. Pop-Up Event Questionnaire – English
- J. Pop-Up Event Questionnaire – Spanish
- K. Community Workshops – Slideshow
- L. Community Workshops – Digital Whiteboards

APPENDIX B


Appendix B: Site Inventory

STA I (DVSP) Infill and Redevelopment Potential

Zoning	Min. Density	Developable Acres	Unit Potential	Existing & Entitled Units	Unit Potential
3-Story Mixed-Use	25+ du/ac	12.28 ac.	413	31	382
5-Story Mixed-Use	35+ du/ac	4.54 ac.	218	66	152
Total					534

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021






1. All sites included in prior Housing Element
2. STA I General Plan Designation
3. Opportunities for site consolidation are applicable to individual zones on a block by block basis.
4. Affordability Level – Low and Moderate Income (greater than 30 du/ac)





APN	Address	Lot Size (SF)	Zone	Exst. # of DUs	Min. DU/AC	Anticipated # of DUs	Bldg Size (SF)	Existing Land Use
480-043-13	7770 Broadway	27,007	TMU- 5	-	35	32	6,400	retail
480-043-14	7702 Broadway	25,265	TMU- 5	-	35	30	12,240	retail
480-043-15	no site address	7,000	TMU- 5	-	35	8	0	parking
480-101-04	3338 Main St	15,000	TMU- 3	-	25	13	3,320	retail
480-101-05	3308 Main St	15,510	TMU- 3	-	25	13	5,838	restaurant
480-101-06	7716 Pacific Ave	7150	TMU- 3	-	25	6	1,820	retail
480-101-07	Pacific Ave	6,500	TMU- 3	-	25	5	0	retail
480-101-08	3343 Olive St	6,500	TMU- 3	-	25	5	540	restaurant
480-101-09	Olive St	6,500	TMU- 3	-	25	5	0	retail
480-101-10	7761-7785 Broadway	4,140	TMU- 3	-	25	3	0	parking
480-101-11	7761 Broadway	7,650	TMU- 3	-	25	6	7,200	retail
480-101-12	7769-79 Broadway	13500	TMU- 3	-	25	11	11,085	retail
480-102-02	3288 1/2 Main St	10,500	TMU- 3	1	25	9	3,924	residential
480-102-03	3282 Main	6,850	TMU- 3	3	25	6	2,520	
480-102-08	3277 Olive St	6,250	TMU- 3	5	25	5	4,480	residential
480-102-09	7735 Pacific Ave	11,700	TMU- 3	-	25	10	5,200	office/retail
480-102-16	3274 Main St	23,475	TMU- 3	20	25	20	10,822	residential
480-102-15	3260 Main St	10,500	TMU- 3	1	25	9	2,342	residential
480-111-06	7847 Lester Ave	7,000	VC- 3	-	25	6		retail
480-111-07	7859 Lester Ave	7,000	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-08	7865 Lester Ave	6,900	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-09	7883 Lester Ave	6,850	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-10	7891 Lester Ave	6,750	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-11	7917 Lester Ave	6,800	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-12	Lester Ave	6,650	Parking VC- 3	-	25	0	0	parking
480-111-13	7920 Broadway	3,250	VC- 3	-	25	2	1,000	retail
480-111-14	7918 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,500	retail
480-111-15	7914 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,275	retail
480-111-16	7904 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,775	retail

480-111-17	7896 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	3,000	restaurant
480-111-18	7892 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,400	retail
480-111-19	7888 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,350	retail
480-111-20	7888 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,350	retail
480-111-21	7880 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,000	retail
480-111-22	7874 Broadway	4,720	VC- 3	-	25	4	0	open space
480-111-23	7870 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,575	retail
480-111-24	7860 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,875	restaurant
480-111-25	7850 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,325	office
480-111-26	7846 Broadway	7,670	VC- 3	-	25	6	4,000	retail
480-111-27	7836 Broadway	7,670	VC- 3	-	25	6	5,696	restaurant
480-111-28	7826 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	4,931	retail
480-111-29	7820 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,660	restaurant
480-111-30	7816 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	1,500	restaurant
480-111-31	7810 Broadway	3,835	VC- 3	-	25	3	2,520	retail
480-111-32	7800 Broadway	6950	VC- 3	-	25	6	5,256	retail
480-111-33	7938 Broadway	33,000	VC- 3 Parking	-	25	0	11,420	office
480-111-34	7946 Broadway	42,075	VC- 5	66	35	50	5,690	Kelvin
480-111-35	3434 Grove St	18,125	VC- 5	-	35	22	3,189	office
480-111-36	3475 Lemon Grove Ave	30,000	VC- 3	-	25	25	14,027	retail
480-112-01	7801 Broadway	37,026	VC- 3	-	25	32	15,922	retail
480-112-02	3307 Lemon Grove Ave	5,250	VC- 3	-	25	4	4,230	restaurant
480-112-04	7875 Broadway	10,700	VC- 3	-	25	9	8,700	retail
480-112-05	7885 Broadway	6,450	VC- 3	-	25	5	2,700	retail
480-112-06	7895 Broadway	12,900	VC- 3	-	25	11	8,890	retail
480-112-07	7905 Broadway	10,850	VC- 3	-	25	9	5,000	retail
480-112-08	7919 Broadway	14,005	VC- 3	-	25	12	5,986	retail
480-112-09	7931 Broadway	13,875	VC- 3	-	25	12	2,920	retail
480-112-10	7939 Broadway	13,740	VC- 3	-	25	11	6,060	retail
480-112-11	7945 Broadway	15,000	VC- 3	-	25	12	6,060	retail
480-112-12	7949 Broadway	14,100	VC- 3	-	25	12	6,240	retail
480-112-14	7944 Golden Ave	9,000	VC- 3	-	25	7	3,292	office
480-112-16	7863 Broadway	31,800	VC- 3	-	25	27	13,462	office
480-112-17	7955 Broadway	6,750	VC- 3	-	25	5	3,620	retail
480-133-04	7963 Broadway	51,836	VC- 5	-	35	62	41,728	restaurant
480-133-05	7979 Broadway	11,616	VC- 5	-	35	14	1,950	restaurant
475-472-01	7815 Lemon Grove Way	4,800	VC- 3	-	25	4	2,300	retail

475-472-02	7815 North Ave	5,250	VC- 3	1	25	4	3,730	retail
475-472-03	Lemon Grove Ave	6,875	VC- 3	-	25	5	0	parking
475-472-27	3521 Lemon Grove Ave	7,055	VC- 3	-	25	6	2,300	restaurant
							Total	534

<u>Existing Land Use Summary</u>		
<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Typical Site Photos</u>
<u>Retail</u>	<p>The typical retail and commercial properties in STA I are depicted by the images to the right. As shown in the images they represent strip mall type development with angled parking and drive isle located between the businesses and the street. These buildings were built in the (1948-1957), many of which are outdated and need major improvements. A number are vacant and the majority of the properties are 1-story. If redeveloped, it is estimated that these parcels could support up to 321 residential units.</p>	 
<u>Restaurant</u>	<p>Similar to the retail and commercial buildings above, many of the restaurant uses are in the same strip mall type developments and were built in 1948-1957. Due to these uses being located in strip mall type development, there is little room for outdoor dining and other opportunities. If redeveloped it is estimated that these parcels could support up to 122 residential units.</p>	 
<u>Office</u>	<p>There are limited office spaces in STA I. As mentioned above, the majority of the buildings in this area are characterized by strip mall development and do not support office type uses. There is an opportunity for redevelopment in some of these areas to accommodate future office space and provide job opportunities in Downtown Lemon Grove. If</p>	


	<u>redeveloped, it is also estimated that these parcels could support up to 69 residential units.</u>	
<u>Parking</u>	<u>The parking areas in STA I offer an opportunity for redevelopment. The picture on the right is the typical strip commercial parking that is seen along the Broadway corridor in this part of Lemon Grove. It disconnects businesses from the street front. The parking on the left is a parking lot located behind buildings along Broadway. If redeveloped, it is also estimated that these parcels could support up to 16 residential units.</u>	
<u>Open Space</u>	<u>There is little to no open space in STA I. There is a linear promenade that is mainly concrete that is considered "open space". However, this area is home to the homeless population and crime making it a less than desirable place to be.</u>	
<u>Residential</u>	<u>Over the past 5 years there have been 3 major multi-family housing developments in STA I. This includes the Celsius and Citronica projects, as shown in the image on the left and the City Mark development which is currently under construction. These developments are mixed use buildings that offer ground floor commercial uses. There is an opportunity for more of this type of development in STA I. If other residentially designated properties in STA I redeveloped, it is also estimated that these parcels could support up to 43 residential units.</u>	

STA II Redevelopment Potential

Zoning	Density	Developable Acres	Unit Potential	Existing & Entitled Units	Unit Potential
Mixed-Use	20-43 du/ac	4.4 ac.	88	0	88
Total					88

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

1. Site previously included in prior Housing Element
2. STA II General Plan Designation
3. Opportunities for site consolidation are applicable to individual zones on a block by block basis.
4. Affordability Level – Low and Moderate Income (greater than 30 du/ac)




General Commercial Redevelopment Potential

Zoning	Density	Developable Acres	Unit Potential	Existing & Entitled Units	Unit Potential
General Commercial	30 du/ac	31.6	948873	83	790
Subtotal					790
75% of Subtotal					592

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

1. Sites not included in prior Housing Element
2. Opportunities for site consolidation are applicable to individual zones on a block by block basis.
3. ~~————~~ Affordability Level —Above Moderate Income. If needed, there is potential for Low and Moderate Income along Broadway.









GC - General Commercial Zone RC - Retail Commercial General Plan Designation					
APN	Address	Potential Dwelling Unit(s)	Lot Area (SF)	Existing Dwelling Unit(s)	Block Group
479-013-03-00	6915-6935 North Ave.	15	23,087	0	-
479-051-13-00	7346-7350 Broadway	3	5,200	0	B







479-081-05-00	3320 Vista Ave.	7	11,761	10	G
480-021-01-00	7395 North Ave.	4	6,921	2	D
480-021-02-00	3560-3562 West St.	4	6,179	2	D
480-021-03-00	3552-3556 West St.	4	5,976	3	D
480-021-04-00	3534-3538 West St.	4	6,044	3	D
480-021-05-00	3514-3516 West St.	4	6,475	2	D
480-042-20-00	7626-7630 Broadway	3	5,662	0	E
480-081-10-00	7576 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	1	K
480-081-11-00	7564-7568 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	2	K
480-081-12-00	7558 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	1	K
480-081-14-00	7534-7536 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	2	K
480-081-15-00	7524 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	2	K
480-081-17-00	7512 Pacific Ave.	4	6,098	1	K
480-081-19-00	7559-7585 Broadway	11	16,552	0	K
480-081-20-00	7553 Broadway	5	8,712	0	K
480-081-21-00	3342 Buena Vista Ave.	4	6,098	1	K
480-084-11-00	7494 Pacific Ave.	5	8,712	1	K
480-084-12-00	7486 Pacific Ave.	5	8,341	1	K
480-084-13-00	7474-7476 Pacific Ave.	5	8,094	4	K
480-084-14-00	7466 Pacific Ave.	5	8,680	1	K
480-084-15-00	7456 Pacific Ave.	5	8,197	5	K
480-084-16-00	7448 Pacific Ave.	5	8,680	1	K
480-084-17-00	7436 Pacific Ave.	5	8,237	1	K
480-084-22-00	3385 West St.	5	8,661	1	K
480-084-23-00	7387 Broadway	17	26,136	0	K
480-084-24-00	7407 Broadway	6	9,478	0	K
480-131-06-00	7968-7970 Broadway	14	22,216	0	F
480-132-02-00	8015 Broadway	8	12,632	0	L
480-132-09-00	8035 Broadway	17	27,007	0	L
480-401-02-00	2778 Citronella St.	7	11,460	0	O
480-401-08-00	2731-2735 Lemon Grove Ave.	2	3,484	0	O
480-501-02-00	2625-2627 Lemon Grove Ave.	4	6,969	0	P
480-501-03-00	2605-2619 Lemon Grove Ave.	13	20,037	0	P
503-014-02-00	8125 Broadway	8	12,280	0	M
503-014-12-00	3592-3598 Sweetwater Way	30	45,738	4	M
503-014-13-00	3590 Sweetwater Way	17	26,136	1	M
503-014-14-00	3576 Sweetwater Way	10	15,746	1	M
503-014-47-00	8121 Broadway	5	8,867	0	M
503-014-51-00	3528-3530 Sweetwater Way	7	10,807	2	M
577-310-28-00	1389-1391 Skyline Dr.	6	10,019	2	Q
479-081-04-00	7245 Broadway	7	10,545	0	G
479-042-18-00	7252 Broadway	4	6,969	0	A
479-042-30-00	7262 Broadway	3	4,791	0	A
479-081-02-00	7227 Broadway	15	22,215	0	G
479-042-31-00	7272 Broadway	4	6,534	0	A
479-042-14-00	7280 Broadway	3	5,227	0	A
479-042-27-00	7292 Broadway	4	6,969	0	A






479-051-20-00	3415 Citrus St	3	5,227	0	B
479-051-19-00	7310 Broadway	1	2,178	0	B
479-051-29-00	7316 Broadway	3	4,792	0	B
479-051-16-00	7324 Broadway	3	5,227	0	B
479-051-15-00	7328 Broadway	3	4,356	0	B
479-051-14-00	7340 Broadway	4	6,534	0	B
479-092-01-00	7303 Broadway	7	10,890	0	H
479-092-02-00	7309 Broadway	4	6,969	0	H
479-092-03-00	7315 Broadway	4	6,969	0	H
479-092-04-00	7319 Broadway	7	10,454	0	H
479-092-08-00	3335 Citrus St	5	7,840	1	H
479-092-07-00	7316 Pacific Ave	5	7,840	2	H
479-092-05-00	3332 Alford St	5	8,276	2	H
479-092-06-00	7324 Pacific Ave.	5	8,276	2	H
479-093-11-00	7341 Broadway	8	12,196	0	I
479-093-09-00	3339 Alford St.	5	8,276	2	I
479-093-08-00	7350 Pacific Ave.	5	8,100	1	I
479-093-12-00	7343 Broadway	5	7,840	0	I
479-093-04-00	7345 Broadway	3	5,227	0	I
479-093-13-00	3344 Harris St.	5	8,311	1	I
479-093-07-00	3316 Harris St.	5	8,276	1	I
479-052-16-00	7364 Broadway	3	5,227	0	C
479-052-15-00	7364 Broadway	1	2,178	0	C
479-052-14-00	7370 Broadway	1	2,178	0	C
479-052-13-00	7370 Broadway	1	2,178	0	C
479-052-12-00	7370 Broadway	6	9,147	0	C
480-021-73-00	7388 Broadway	8	11,824	0	C
480-084-18-00	7424 Pacific Ave	5	8,437	5	J
480-084-03-00	7411 Broadway	6	8,847	0	J
480-084-31-00	7431 Broadway	18	27,007	0	J
480-084-32-00	7457 Broadway	6	9,615	0	J
480-084-33-00	7473 Broadway	7	11,312	0	J
480-084-25-00	7475 Broadway	11	17,277	0	J
480-081-18-00	3305 New Jersey Ave.	4	6,098	2	K
480-081-16-00	3345 New Jersey Ave.	4	6,534	4	K
480-081-23-00	7513 Broadway	13	19,602	0	K
480-081-22-00	7551 Broadway	12	18,730	0	K
480-081-13-00	7546 Pacific Ave.	6	9,147	0	K
480-081-07-00	7593 Broadway	10	15,246	0	K
480-081-09-00	7590 Broadway	8	12,632	0	
480-042-22-00	7608 Broadway	11	16,117	0	E
480-042-21-00	7612 Broadway	3	5,227	0	E
480-042-19-00	7644 Broadway	7	11,325	0	E
480-042-18-00	7652 Broadway	3	5,662	0	E
480-042-17-00	7662 Broadway	3	5,662	0	E
480-042-16-00	7662 Broadway	3	5,662	0	E
480-042-23-00	7696 Broadway	11	16,988	1	E
480-131-07-00	7988 Broadway	30	43,560	0	F

480-131-01-00	3465 Grove St.	10	15,681	0	F
480-132-03-00	8025 Broadway	13	19,166	0	L
480-132-10-00	8047 Broadway	10	15,300	0	L
503-014-01-00	8121 Broadway	17	25,700	0	M
503-014-58-00	8127 Broadway	4	6,951	0	M
503-014-56-00	8141 Broadway	8	11,620	0	M
503-014-08-00	8161 Broadway	5	8,464	0	M
503-014-09-00	8161 Broadway	6	9,871	0	M
503-014-10-00	8173 Broadway	19	28,314	0	M
503-014-11-00	8181 Broadway	15	21,780	0	M
480-351-01-00	2885 Lemon Grove Ave.	16	23,958	0	N
480-351-02-00	2885 Lemon Grove Ave.	3	4,356	0	N
480-351-03-00	2855 Lemon Grove Ave.	0	4,270	0	N
480-351-06-00	2805 Lemon Grove Ave.	6	9,148	0	N
480-401-12-00	2794 Citronella St.	1	2,613	1	O
480-401-01-00	2788 Citronella St.	2	3,940	1	O
480-401-03-00	2781 Lemon Grove Ave.	3	4,356	0	O
480-401-04-00	2757 Lemon Grove Ave.	7	11,325	0	O
480-401-14-00	2749 Lemon Grove Ave.	4	6,534	0	O
480-401-07-00	2741 Lemon Grove Ave.	3	5,748	0	O
480-401-06-00	2741 Lemon Grove Ave.	4	6,098	0	O
480-401-09-00	2731 Lemon Grove Ave.	3	5,227	0	O
480-501-01-00	2643 Lemon Grove Ave.	10	15,681	0	P
577-310-40-00	1501 Skyline Dr.	28	40,946	0	Q
577-310-38-00	1411 Skyline Dr.	7	10,454	0	Q
577-310-30-00	1411 Skyline Dr.	7	10,454	0	Q
577-310-29-00	1403 Skyline Dr.	7	10,454	0	Q
577-310-32-00	1445 Skyline Dr.	6	10,019	0	Q
	Subtotal	873	1,376,265	83	
		Total	75%	592	

Block Group Summary		
Group	Site Photo	Description

A		Block A consists of six parcels with commercial uses. County Assessor records do not specify construction dates, but the structures appear to be constructed prior to City incorporation in 1977. The combined site is approximately 0.7 acres. Maximum density would allow 20 dwelling units, but with a mixed-use reduction the sites inventory accounts for 15 dwelling units at this site. A constructed mixed-use project approximately 600 ft. to the east of this site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre. If the same density was achieved at this site, the project would include 36 dwelling units.
B		Block B consists of six parcels with over 30% of block under common ownership. A primary review application for a mixed used development covering 50% of the site was processed in 2020, but a subsequent development application has not been received. Maximum density would allow 17 units, but the sites inventory account for 75% of the maximum. A constructed mixed-use project approximately 150 ft. to the east of this site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre. If the same density was achieved at this site, the project would include 33 dwelling units.
C		Block C includes three parcels that are developed with parking which comprise 30% of 0.75 acre block. An existing office building on the site is a candidate for conversion to mixed-use. The City recently received an inquiry to convert an office building in Block G (800ft. to the west) into a mixed-use project. The mixed-use project across the street from this site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, which would equate to 39 dwelling units at this site. The sites inventory accounts for 15 dwelling units within Block C.
D		Block D includes duplex and triplex structures built between 1950 and 1956. The 0.75 acre site could develop with 21 units. With consolidation, the City may be able to vacate adjacent right-of-way (Lemon Ave.) to increase the number of dwelling units. The sites inventory accounts for 15 dwelling units in Block D. A mixed-use project 450 ft. to the south achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, which would equate to 39 dwelling units at this site.
E		Block E includes multiple auto repair uses and a vacant commercial building. In 2020, the City Council approved a 70-unit townhome project on a site with multiple auto related uses that will be closing. The overall 1.66 acre site accounts for 34 dwelling units in the sites inventory. If the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved less than a quarter mile to the west, the site could potentially accommodate 86 dwelling units.
F		The majority of Block F is vacant or underutilized. The 1.87 acre site accounts for 33 dwelling units in the sites inventory. Block F is adjacent to the City's downtown where projects have been approved with densities greater than 70 dwelling units per acre. If the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway, the site could be built with 97 dwelling units.

G		<p>The primary development within Block G is a four story office building. The City has received inquiries about converting the upper office floors into residential units, but a formal application has not been received. The remaining sites within the block include an older commercial center and apartments built in 1965. The overall site is one acre and the sites inventory accounts for 22 dwelling units within the block. If the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved 850 ft. to the east, the site could potentially accommodate 52 dwelling units.</p>
H		<p>Block H includes multiple auto repair uses. In 2020, the City Council approved a 70-unit townhome project on a site with multiple auto related uses. Additionally, the single family homes and duplexes located on the southern portion of the block were built between 1928 and 1951. The 1.55 acre site accounts for 32 dwelling units, but if the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved 300 ft. to the east, the site could accommodate 80 dwelling units.</p>
I		<p>Block I includes a former motorcycle sales facility, which is partially vacant. Additionally, the single family homes and duplexes located on the southern portion of the block were built between 1940 and 1957. Two residential parcels have common ownership. The 1.34 acre site accounts for 27 dwelling units in the sites inventory, but if the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved across the street, the site could accommodate 69 dwelling units.</p>
J		<p>Block J includes a large commercial property that was subject to code violations and requires building upgrades prior to occupancy. The commercial properties fronting on Broadway account for 1.89 acres, but additional opportunities may include the older residential structures fronting on Pacific Ave. The sites inventory accounts for 40 dwelling units in this block, but if the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved across the street, the site could accommodate 98 dwelling units.</p>
K		<p>Majority of residential units within Block K were built in the 1930s. Existing retail spaces are 50% vacant based on street frontage and a vacant lot exists on Pacific Ave. The overall block is six acres and the sites inventory accounts for 125 units, but if the site achieved the 52 dwelling units per acre that was achieved 700 ft. to the west, the site could accommodate 312 dwelling units.</p>
L		<p>Block L consists of four commercial properties that are primarily automobile oriented, but less than 500 ft. from an existing bus stop. The site is 1.7 acres and accounts for 36 dwelling units in the sites inventory. If the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway, the site could be built with 88 dwelling units.</p>


M		Block M consists of automobile oriented uses, outdoor storage, and vacant/underutilized areas. The block is less than ¼ mile from a bus stop. In 2020, the City Council approved a 70-unit townhome project on a site with multiple auto related uses that will be closing. The site is 5.3 acres and accounts for 113 dwelling units in the sites inventory. If the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway, the site could be built with 275 dwelling units.
N		Block N includes a large parking area and older commercial buildings. The site is across the street from a City infrastructure project called "Connect Main Street" which will include bike and pedestrian facilities that will connect the City's two light rail train stations. The one acre site accounts for 19 dwelling units in the sites inventory, but could accommodate 52 units if the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway.
O		Block O includes vacant areas and older commercial buildings. The site is across the street from a City infrastructure project called "Connect Main Street" which will include bike and pedestrian facilities that will connect the City's two light rail train stations. The 1.13 acre site accounts for 21 dwelling units in the sites inventory, but could accommodate 58 units if the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway.
P		Block P includes underutilized commercial buildings. The site is across the street from a City infrastructure project called "Connect Main Street" which will include bike and pedestrian facilities that will connect the City's two light rail train stations. The 0.98 acre site accounts for 20 dwelling units in the sites inventory, but could accommodate 50 units if the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway.
Q		Block Q includes underutilized commercial buildings. The site is adjacent to an existing bus stop. The 2.12 acre site accounts for 46 dwelling units in the sites inventory, but could accommodate 110 dwelling units if the site achieved 52 dwelling units per acre, similar to a constructed mixed-use project on Broadway.

Residential Infill & Vacant Sites

Zoning (General Plan)	Land Use	Density	Acres	Max. Unit Potential	Existing Units	Total Units
Low Density Residential (LR)	Single Family	1-4 du/ac	13.47	53	0	31
Low/Medium Density (LMR)	Single Family	4-7 du/ac	26.09	221	10	160
Medium Density (MR)	Multi-Family	7-14 du/ac	0.51	5	0	4
Medium-High Density (HR)	Multi-Family	14-29 du/ac	1.24	35	4	20
Total						205

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

1. Sites included in prior Housing Element
2. Affordability Level – Above Moderate Income



APN	Existing Dwelling Unit(s)	Acreage	Potential Dwelling Unit(s)
RL – Residential Low			
503-014-55-00	0	0.15	1
576-600-14-00	0	0.22	1
576-600-15-00	0	0.24	1
503-014-24-00	0	0.26	1
479-340-54-00	0	0.28	1
503-014-23-00	0	0.29	1
503-241-13-00	0	0.39	1

503-241-14-00	0	0.39	1
503-241-32-00	0	0.32	1
478-210-15-00	0	0.49	2
478-200-10-00	0	0.56	2
478-200-52-00	0	0.56	1
503-014-26-00	0	0.71	2
478-220-30-00	0	0.77	2
478-180-48-00	0	1	1
503-140-29-00	0	1.38	5
478-210-08-00	1	2.69	3
478-210-21-00	0	4.97	5
Subtotals	1	13.47	31
RLM –Residential Low Medium			
480-480-36-00	0	0.14	1
480-612-55-00	0	0.14	1
480-612-56-00	0	0.14	1
480-612-57-00	0	0.14	1
479-381-33-00	0	0.15	1
480-221-32-00	0	0.15	1
503-201-29-00	0	0.17	1
503-211-02-00	0	0.17	1
503-211-71-00	0	0.17	1
478-210-18-00	0	0.18	1
503-202-18-00	0	0.18	1
576-150-27-00	0	0.18	1
479-260-44-00	0	0.19	1
479-502-12-00	0	0.19	1
480-150-41-00	0	0.19	1
480-551-45-00	0	0.19	1
503-211-72-00	0	0.19	1
503-330-14-00	0	0.19	1
576-223-34-00	0	0.21	1
479-170-16-00	0	0.22	1
577-150-51-00	0	0.22	1
577-161-06-00	0	0.22	1
577-610-60-00	0	0.22	1
480-551-77-00	0	0.23	1
576-150-14-00	0	0.25	1
577-150-23-00	0	0.25	1
479-340-55-00	0	0.27	1
577-150-52-00	0	0.32	2
479-350-07-00	0	0.33	2
503-202-17-00	0	0.34	2
479-320-08-00	0	0.39	2
479-220-26-00	0	0.43	2

479-250-38-00	0	0.46	2
479-160-14-00	0	0.5	2
503-310-16-00	0	0.5	2
576-150-28-00	0	0.54	2
479-501-31-00	0	0.55	3
576-083-25-00	0	0.64	3
479-220-10-00	0	0.69	3
479-381-63-00	0	0.69	3
479-442-03-00	0	0.7	3
577-141-15-00	0	0.73	3
577-141-06-00	0	0.89	4
480-360-08-00	0	0.9	4
577-150-22-00	0	1.09	6
577-150-30-00	0	1.95	9
576-302-01-00	0	2.78	8
479-320-20-00	1	1.07	3
576-083-28-00	0	1.76	5
576-020-24-00	0	0.31	1
479-501-35-00	0	1.66	5
479-501-36-00	0	0.55	1
480-611-10-00	0	0.67	2
480-520-10-00	1	2	5 (Davidson)
480-261-21-00	1	1	3 (Olive)
577-300-01-00	1	1.38	4 (DuPont)
576-140-11-00	1	1.11	3 (Berry)
480-670-01-00	1	1.16	3 (Mount Vernon)
479-320-12-00	1	1.6	4 (69 th)
479-312-17-00	1	1.02	3 (69 th)
479-312-02-00	1	1.07	3 (San Miguel)
503-251-48-00	1	2.49	7 (Crane)
Subtotals	10	39.59	150
RM – Residential Medium			
479-130-64-00	0	0.29	2 (Casa)
479-130-65-00	0	0.22	2 (Casa)
Subtotals	0	0.51	4
RMH – Residential Medium High			
499-181-28-00	0	0.08	2
480-172-04-00	0	0.18	3
499-181-24-00	1	0.37	5
475-460-08-00	0	0.61	10
Subtotals	1	1.24	20
Total			205

Small Sites

Parcels that are too small may not support the number of units necessary to be competitive and to access scarce funding resources. Parcels that are large may require very large projects, which may lead to an over concentration of affordable housing in one location or may add cost to a project by requiring a developer to purchase more land than is needed or render a project ineligible for funding. Per HCD, a parcel smaller than one half acre or over 10 acres is considered inadequate to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households, unless the housing element demonstrates development of housing affordable to lower income households on these sites is realistic or feasible.

This section considers and addresses the impact of constraints associated with small or large lot development on the ability of a developer to produce housing affordable to lower income households.

As discussed earlier in the Element, the City of Lemon Grove's share of regional future housing needs is a total of 1,359 new units for the 2021-2029 Housing Element. This allocation is distributed into various income categories (Low, Moderate and Above Moderate). The City was able to account for 390 units in approved and/or recent developments, and therefore only needs to provide 969 more units.

Based on Figure 58 earlier in the Housing Element, of the remaining 969 units, 457 of them need to be new low income units to meet the City's RHNA numbers. Based on the site inventory in this Appendix (B), sites within STA I and STA II were identified to accommodate this number. There are 622 units identified in STA I and II collectively. However, not all of these parcels meet the requirements to accommodate low income households due to being less than 0.5 acres based on the HCD's description above. Therefore, since some of these parcels were below 0.5 acres, they had to be evaluated to determine their likelihood for consolidation in order to accommodate the low income units.

The table below analyzes the parcels identified above in STA I and STA II for the likelihood of consolidation to meet RHNA requirements. Of the 622 units identified, only a handful of parcels were deemed not likely to consolidate in the future. This equated to 50 units not being able to be counted for low income. However, 572 units were deemed possible for consolidation either due to being over 0.5 acre already or if smaller, the ability to consolidate in the future based on common ownership, cohesive site characteristics, shared parking and/or access, located on a corner.

STAI						
APN	Address	Lot Size (SF)	Anticipated # of DUs	Common Ownership	Overall Potential for Consolidation	Counts towards Low Income?
480-043-13	7770 Broadway	27,007	32	No	N/A already over 0.5 acre and able to providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-043-14	7702 Broadway	25,265	30	Yes	Could consolidate in the future as parcels are adjacent, share parking, and have common ownership	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-043-15	no site address	7,000	8			Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-101-04	3338 Main St	15,000	13	No	Could consolidate in the future. This parcel is adjacent to and can be accessed through 480-101-09 and 480-101-10.	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-101-05	3308 Main St	15,510	13	No	Could consolidate in the future with parcels as they are adjacent to each other. 05 is a corner lot and all parcels share access along Pacific Avenue. 06 and 07 share common ownership	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-101-06	7716 Pacific Ave	7150	6	Yes		
480-101-07	Pacific Ave	6,500	5			
480-101-08	3343 Olive St	6,500	5	Yes	Could consolidate in the future. All parcels are part of a strip mall type cohesive development that all share common access along Broadway and Olive. All parcels share common ownership.	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-101-09	Olive St	6,500	5			
480-101-10	7761-7785 Broadway	4,140	3			
480-101-11	7761 Broadway	7,650	6			
480-101-12	7769-79 Broadway	13,500	11			
480-102-02	3288 1/2 Main St	10,500	9	No	Unlikely to consolidate. While adjacent to other small sites, this property is developed as multi-family uses on corner lot and does not share access or common features with surrounding lots	No
480-102-03	3282 Main	6,850	6	No	Unlikely to consolidate. While adjacent to other small sites, this property is a small commercial use sandwiched between residential uses and does not share common features or access with surrounding lots	No

<u>480-102-08</u>	<u>3277 Olive St</u>	<u>6,250</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unlikely to consolidate. While adjacent to other small sites, this property is developed as multi-family uses on corner lot and does not share access or common features with surrounding lots</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>480-102-09</u>	<u>7735 Pacific Ave</u>	<u>11,700</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unlikely to consolidate. While adjacent to other small sites, this property is a small commercial use sandwiched between residential uses and does not share common features or access with surrounding lots</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>480-102-16</u>	<u>3274 Main St</u>	<u>23,475</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units</u>	<u>Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation</u>
<u>480-102-15</u>	<u>3260 Main St</u>	<u>10,500</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unlikely to consolidate – currently planned to redevelop as temporary housing</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>480-111-06</u>	<u>7847 Lester Ave</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Likely to consolidate. All parcels are adjacent to each other and share a common access off of Lester Ave. Majority of parcels have common ownership</u>	<u>No – over 0.5 acre but cannot accommodate 16+ units</u>
<u>480-111-07</u>	<u>7859 Lester Ave</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Yes</u>		
<u>480-111-08</u>	<u>7865 Lester Ave</u>	<u>6,900</u>	<u>0</u>			
<u>480-111-09</u>	<u>7883 Lester Ave</u>	<u>6,850</u>	<u>0</u>			
<u>480-111-10</u>	<u>7891 Lester Ave</u>	<u>6,750</u>	<u>0</u>			
<u>480-111-11</u>	<u>7917 Lester Ave</u>	<u>6,800</u>	<u>0</u>			
<u>480-111-12</u>	<u>Lester Ave</u>	<u>6,650</u>	<u>0</u>			
<u>480-111-13</u>	<u>7920 Broadway</u>	<u>3,250</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Could consolidate in the future. All parcels are part of a strip mall type cohesive development that all share common access along Broadway. Two adjacent parcels in this strip have common ownership. Due to the size of the lots, it is likely that these parcels would need to consolidate, at least with one or two other parcels in order to redevelop.</u>	<u>Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation</u>
<u>480-111-14</u>	<u>7918 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-15</u>	<u>7914 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-16</u>	<u>7904 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-17</u>	<u>7896 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-18</u>	<u>7892 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-19</u>	<u>7888 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-20</u>	<u>7888 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-21</u>	<u>7880 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-22</u>	<u>7874 Broadway</u>	<u>4,720</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-23</u>	<u>7870 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-24</u>	<u>7860 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-25</u>	<u>7850 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-26</u>	<u>7846 Broadway</u>	<u>7,670</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-27</u>	<u>7836 Broadway</u>	<u>7,670</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-28</u>	<u>7826 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-29</u>	<u>7820 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		
<u>480-111-30</u>	<u>7816 Broadway</u>	<u>3,835</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>No</u>		

480-111-31	7810 Broadway	3,835	3	Yes		
480-111-32	7800 Broadway	6950	6			
480-111-33	7938 Broadway	33,000	0	No	Not likely to consolidate. Existing post office.	No
480-111-34	7946 Broadway	42,075	50	No	N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-111-35	3434 Grove St	18,125	22	No	N/A not over 0.5 acre but already able to provide 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-111-36	3475 Lemon Grove Ave	30,000	25	No	N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-112-01	7801 Broadway	37,026	32	No	N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-112-02	3307 Lemon Grove Ave	5,250	4	No	Likely to consolidate with 480-112-01 as it is a corner lot, they share common access and are already part of a cohesive development	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-112-04	7875 Broadway	10,700	9	No	Could consolidate in the future. All parcels are part of a strip mall type cohesive development that all share common access along Broadway. Two adjacent parcels in this strip have common ownership. Due to the size of the lots, it is likely that these parcels would need to consolidate, at least with one or two other parcels in order to redevelop.	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-112-05	7885 Broadway	6,450	5	No		
480-112-06	7895 Broadway	12,900	11	No		
480-112-07	7905 Broadway	10,850	9	No		
480-112-08	7919 Broadway	14,005	12	No		
480-112-09	7931 Broadway	13,875	12	No		
480-112-10	7939 Broadway	13,740	11	Yes		
480-112-11	7945 Broadway	15,000	12	Yes		
480-112-12	7949 Broadway	14,100	12	No		
480-112-14	7944 Golden Ave	9,000	7	No	Could consolidate with 480-133-04. These parcels do not have common ownership however, they have shared access off of Golden Avenue and shared parking	Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation
480-112-16	7863 Broadway	31,800	27	No	N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation
480-112-17	7955 Broadway	6,750	5	No	Unlikely to consolidate – currently planned to redevelop as mixed use development with boxing gym on bottom and housing units on top	No
480-133-04	7963 Broadway	51,836	62	Yes	N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units	Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation

<u>480-133-05</u>	<u>7979 Broadway</u>	<u>11,616</u>	<u>14</u>		<u>Could consolidate with 480-133-04. These parcels have common ownership and they have shared access off of Broadway and shared parking</u>	<u>Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation</u>
<u>475-472-01</u>	<u>7815 Lemon Grove Way</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Could consolidate in the future there are two sets of common ownership. The parcels include two corner lots, front Lemon Grove Ave and include shared parking lot</u>	<u>Yes – achieves over 0.5 acre and 16+ units with consolidation</u>
<u>475-472-02</u>	<u>7815 North Ave</u>	<u>5,250</u>	<u>4</u>			
<u>475-472-03</u>	<u>Lemon Grove Ave</u>	<u>6,875</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Yes</u>		
<u>475-472-27</u>	<u>3521 Lemon Grove Ave</u>	<u>7,055</u>	<u>6</u>			
<u>STA II</u>						
<u>576-301-02</u>	<u>1801 Massachusetts Ave</u>	<u>4.4 ac.</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A already over 0.5 acre and providing 16+ units</u>	<u>Yes – achieves 16+ units without consolidation</u>

[*Yes = assumed to be able to consolidate based on common ownership or building adjacency](#)

[No = not assumed to be able to consolidate based on common ownership or building adjacency](#)

[N/A = Can already support 16 du/ac without consolidation despite parcel size](#)

[Lot Consolidation](#)

[As stated above, opportunities for site consolidation are applicable to individual zones on a block by block basis. However, there have not been any trends towards consolidations of lots in Lemon Grove. Many of the commercial sites in particular have been owned for a long time property owners and are unlikely at this stage to consolidate. In the last planning period, the Celsius \(I and II\) and Citronica projects were both able to successfully combine parcels that were less than ½ acre into a development site within STA I. Celsius I and Celsius II projects combined three parcels into a 1.46 acre site now contains 102 new market rate residential units. The overall projects also realized a density of nearly 70 dwelling units per acre, thereby exceeding the minimum densities specified in the DVSP.](#)

[The City previously had a Redevelopment Agency \(now defunct\) that provided assistance in the way of Tax Incremental Financing \(TIF\). TIF was instrumental in the development of Celcius and Citronica as it provided transportation grants to reconfigure the intersection of Lemon Grove Ave, and North Ave. and this was instrumental in consolidating land parcels for the developer of Celsius and Citronica. The City does not have any lot consolidation incentives or programs since dissolution of Redevelopment in the State of California. Tax increment financing \(TIF\) is no longer available.](#)

APPENDIX C

Review of Past Accomplishments

Program	Description	Progress and Continued Appropriateness
Program 1: Continue to Implement Nonconforming Unit Ordinance	The City of Lemon Grove Development Code provides for the reconstruction of substantially destroyed nonconforming residential buildings and uses located in residential zones. Section 17.24.090(F)(I) (Nonconforming Uses) of the Development Code provides for the issuance of Reconstruction Permits to allow the restoration of substantially damaged or destroyed residential units. The City will continue to implement the Development Code.	Progress: The City did not process any nonconforming unit projects from 2013-2021. Program Evaluation: The City has a significant number of existing residential structures in commercial and light industrial areas. This program allows these structures to be rebuilt if they are damaged or destroyed by a disaster or accident. The City will continue this program as part of the 2021-2029 Housing Element.
Program 2: Encourage Second Dwelling Units	The City amended its accessory unit ordinance to comply with State law and allows second dwelling units in any residential area through ministerial actions. The process was revised so that second dwelling units no longer require special use permits but are processed through only the building permit requirements. The City, in an effort to encourage more second dwelling units, recently decreased the parking requirements. The City has made handouts available about the second dwelling unit program at City Hall. It also will provide periodic reminders and updates through City-wide information venues (web site, mail outs, electronic notifications, public notices, etc.).	Progress: Lemon Grove has seen a steady growth of Second Dwelling Units in the community with 8 units permitted in 2019, and 11 permitted in 2020. Program Evaluation: During the 2010-2020 Housing Element cycle, the State continued to modify State law regarding accessory dwelling units such as reducing setback requirements and parking standards. In 2019, the City received a grant from the State to update the accessory dwelling unit ordinance, which will occur in 2020. The City will continue this program as part of the 2021-2029 Housing Element.
Program 3: Facilitate Development of Higher Density Housing	As a means of reducing residential land costs, the City will encourage minimum densities in Special Treatment Area I (STA I) and Special Treatment Area II (STA II), both near a trolley station. The City has established minimum densities between 25 and 45 dwelling units to the acre as part of its Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP). The City has adopted not only minimum densities at a high density level but it has also established development standards that facilitate higher densities, including reduced parking standards for the nearby transit services (trolley station and bus stops). The City will continue to support the application of this program when the specific plan for STA II is prepared while ensuring development standards are met and community character is maintained.	Progress: Between 2015 and 2019 the Celsius I and Celsius II projects were approved and constructed within STA I. The project combined three parcels into a 1.46 acre site now contains 102 new market rate residential units. The overall projects also realized a density of nearly 70 dwelling units per acre, thereby exceeding the minimum densities specified in the DVSP. In 2019, the City Council also approved a new mixed-use project within STA I known as Kelvin at the corner of Broadway and Grove St. The 66-unit project was approved as market rate housing and also achieved a density of nearly 72 dwelling units per acre. Program Evaluation: The City will continue to encourage high quality residential projects within STA I and STA II in order to facilitate higher density development near the trolley stations.

<p>Program 4: Evaluate Condominium Conversion Ordinance</p>	<p>The City will explore changes to its current condominium conversion policies and ordinances based upon the existing and projected market conditions. This work will evaluate current policies and ordinances regarding: the zones within which conversions are requested; conditions for approval of conversions; in lieu fee options; and the availability of affordable units/relocation assistance.</p>	<p>Progress: The City did not amend regulations providing for condominium conversions, however, the City will continue to support condominium conversions as an opportunity for lower-cost entry housing opportunities within the City.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: Further evaluation of the Ordinance is not planned. This program will be discontinued and staff will implement Zoning Ordinance standards</p>
<p>Program 5: Use Code Enforcement to Improve Substandard Housing</p>	<p>Code Enforcement staff receives complaints regarding substandard housing and forwards these complaints to the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (DEH). DEH investigates the complaint, requires compliance with housing codes to improve the overall quality and conditions of site, notifies appropriate agencies as applicable, and coordinates warnings, fines, abatement, and liens as appropriate until compliance is resolved. The code enforcement process is continuously monitored for effectiveness and the program will be adjusted as warranted.</p>	<p>Progress: On August 4, 2020 the City Council placed a lien on a residential property at 1655 Taft St. due to continued violations related to the storage of commercial vehicles. Although the violations have continued, residents surrounding 1655 Taft St. appreciated the action by Code Enforcement and the City Council to address a nuisance condition.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program 6: Utilize Density Bonus Provisions</p>	<p>Section 65915 of the Government Code (Appendix A) contains the requirements for the City if a developer requests a density bonus for providing affordable housing as part of a development proposal. The State requests that the City modify the Municipal Code to be consistent with State Law.</p>	<p>Progress: The City Council adopted Ordinance No. 438 on February 2, 2016 and made the State requested changes to the Municipal Code. On June 22, 2020, the City's Planning Commission approved a density bonus project at the north <u>east</u>north<u>northeast</u> corner of Church St. and New Jersey Ave. In 2019, the City received a grant from the State to update the density bonus ordinance...</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program for Density Bonus Ordinance implementation and updates will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program 7: Prepare or Modify Plans for Special Treatment Areas</p>	<p>The first Lemon Grove General Plan was adopted in 1980. Because most of the City was developed when this plan was prepared, a system of Special Treatment Areas (STAs) was established to identify areas with significant development potential. Specific guidelines are established for each STA and focus on the unique site characteristics and development opportunities. The STAs involving potential residential development are identified herein and previous and potential</p>	<p>Progress: Between 2015 and 2019 the 102 new market rate residential units were constructed in STA I. The City received a State grant in 2020 to prepare a specific plan to implement STA II.</p> <p>Program Evaluations: The City will continue to implement the DVSP for STA I. The City will prepare a specific plan to implement STA II. The City will encourage development within STA IV and STA VIII and monitor market and housing conditions while seeking to identify opportunities</p>

	actions within each of these STAs are noted.	to encourage additional development
Program 8: Promote Community Based Neighborhood Improvement Districts	This program allows property owners and/or business owners to target an area for improvement then levy a special tax on their respective properties or businesses to provide funds for the improvements. Similar districts include Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Local Improvement Districts (LIDs), Community Service Districts (CSDs), Municipal Improvement Districts (MIDs), and Public Improvement Districts (PIDs). The services provided and the geographic boundaries are decided by the members of the district and can include a number of services: landscaping, security, recreation, historic preservation, and vehicle parking management. The districts share the ability to fund themselves through taxes or special assessments.	<p>Progress: The City continues to implement the Main Street Promenade Community Facilities District and search for new opportunities. In conjunction with building permits within the DVSP staff continue to require property owners to sign agreements not to oppose the future formation of a street improvement district.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program has been retained in the program section of the 201-2029 Housing Element to reflect the continued implementation of the Municipal Code.</p>
Program 9: Promote the CPTED principles	Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) provides best practices and design principles to help prevent or reduce criminal activity and reduces the perception of unsafe neighborhoods. The concepts include surveillance, access control, territoriality, and maintenance. Projects will be evaluated on these concepts and recommendations to incorporate the concepts will be communicated to the project team	<p>Progress: Planning Division entitlements are routed to the Sheriff for comments and CPTED principles are included in the conditions of approval for discretionary permit.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 10: Prepare and Adopt a Street Design Manual	Complete Streets is a national movement that promotes accessibility for all users and promotes healthier lifestyles. Streets play a major role in shaping the form of the environment. The quality of the street experience is a key element in the quality of a neighborhood. The purpose of the street design manual is to provide information and guidance for the design of the public right-of-way that recognizes many and varied purposes that a street serves incorporating neighborhood beautification, active living opportunities, walkability, bicycle paths, bicycle lockers, street lighting, street trees, pocket parks, the use of excess right-of-way, and most importantly the principles of Complete Streets such as accommodating for pedestrians, bicycles, transit users, and	<p>Progress: The City Council did not adopt a new Street Design Manual, but staff did prepare a Complete and Green Streets Manual in order to guide applicants completing public right-of-way improvements. Staff also applied for a Caltrans grant for a Sustainable Mobility Plan in 2020.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element, but we be renamed as a Sustainable Mobility Plan or Sidewalk Master Plan.</p>

	vehicles.	
Program 11: Encourage Energy Conservation and Sustainable Best Practices	Utilizing a sustainable best practices philosophy encourages decisions at each phase of the design process that will reduce negative impacts on the environment and the health of the occupants, without compromising the bottom line. It is an integrated, holistic approach that encourages compromise and tradeoffs. Such an integrated approach positively impacts all phases of a building's life-cycle, including design, construction, operation, and decommissioning. This list of sustainable best practices sources will be updated as needed and will be made available at City Hall. The City will continue to encourage the use of sustainable best practices.	<p>Progress: The City continued to support this program and information was provided upon request. The City Council also updated energy efficiency and building code standards in 2019. The adoption process typically occurs every three years with new and updated codes and regulations.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 12: Maintain Residential Site Inventory	The City updated this land inventory as a part of the SANDAG 2050 regional growth forecast process in 2009. The 2010-2020 Housing Element includes a subsequent update to the list of vacant, redevelopment, and infill land and adds an Existing Projects Inventory and a list of Potential Affordable Housing Sites. The Existing Projects Inventory lists all projects that are readily available and that potentially could be developed during 2010 through 2020 Housing Element planning period. The list of Potential Affordable Housing Sites lists sites best suited for affordable housing developments within the City at this time.	<p>Progress: Residential site inventory lists are available upon request at City Hall. The City continues to monitor its land inventory.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 13: Preserve Affordable Dwelling Units "At Risk" of Converting to Market Rates	The City will monitor affordable dwelling units that are at risk of converting to market rates and will consider measures to preserve their affordability prior to expiration of affordability contracts. These measures will include the purchase of affordability contracts, working with non-profit housing organizations to preserve affordability, coordination with the County Department of Housing and Community Development, securing continued subsidies, and/or committing available housing set-aside monies from the Housing Agency. The Hillside Terrace Apartments located at 3264 College Place and St. John's Plaza located at 8150 Broadway are the only units identified as being "At-risk" of converting	<p>Progress: The County of San Diego Rental Assistance and Affordable Housing Directory 2020 confirms that St. John's Plaza remains as an affordable housing project through 2036 and that contracts for 3262 College Place were renewed through 2023.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: The City will continue to monitor projects "At-Risk" to determine the need to continue this program as part of the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>

	to market rates through 2025.	
Program 14: Cooperate/Coordinate with Housing Developers, Agencies, and Tenant Groups	For-profit and non-profit housing developers promote and develop housing. Non-profits are often a critical component in the development of low and moderate income housing. The City of Lemon Grove compiled the following list of non-profit developers who have been active in the area. The City will maintain a current list of developers and potential development sites.	<p>Progress: The City continued to partner with San Diego Community Land Trust and Habitat for Humanity by approving extensions to an option agreement to purchase a property addresses as 8084 Lemon Grove Way for the construction of nine affordable housing units. The City also cooperated with a private developer on a density bonus project with affordable unit at New Jersey Av. and Church St.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: The City will maintain a current list of developers and potential development sites. This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 15: Reduce Governmental Constraints for the Provision of Housing	State law requires that housing elements address, and where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. The Lemon Grove Municipal Code includes a variety of density ranges that provide opportunities for housing to be built for all income levels and persons with special needs. The City will utilize State codes where local codes are not consistent.	<p>Progress: The City continued to monitor and improve development process and zoning regulations to ensure that constraints to the provision of housing are removed. The City Council adopted Ordinance No. 438 on February 2, 2016 and made the State requested changes to the Municipal Code in conformance with State law.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 16: Participate in Regional Analysis of Housing Need	Pursuant to State housing law (Government Code Section 65584, et seq.), the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to provide the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) with the determination of San Diego County's existing and projected housing need prior to each Housing Element cycle; also known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). SANDAG coordinates with housing stakeholders and city and county officials to allocate the region's housing needs amongst the region's 18 cities and the County of San Diego in four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate). A methodology for the distribution amongst the jurisdictions is developed in accordance with the objectives and factors contained in State law. The City will participate in the Regional Analysis of Housing Needs during each RHNA cycle.	<p>Progress: The City participated in the RHNA process and provided feedback to SANDAG on the methodology for the distribution amongst jurisdictions. The City commented that the methodology and distribution did not take into account unique circumstances that are only applicable to small jurisdictions and that the equity adjustment proposed by SANDAG would eliminate naturally occurring affordable housing. The City's comments were not incorporated into the final methodology and the City appealed the final decision on the methodology and distribution, but the appeal was ultimately rejected by the SANDAG Board of Directors after a weighted vote.</p> <p>Program Evaluation This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>

<p>Program 17: Pursue Affordable Housing Funding Sources</p>	<p>The City of Lemon Grove will actively pursue funding to assist in the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of any housing type. The City will identify these funding opportunities to both for-profit and non-profit developers as part of the residential development processes, especially those projects that have the potential for affordable housing. The actions that the City will take specifically include, but are not necessarily limited to: identify potential funding assistance (State and Federal); identification of sites available for development and infill opportunities; consideration of entitlement process(es) incentives as may be necessary and appropriate; and others as may be added by the City. The City will continue to work with the County of San Diego, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), as a major resource for the implementation of the appropriate housing programs.</p>	<p>Progress: The City did not receive grant funding to assist in the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of any housing type. The City continues to explore options as opportunities are presented.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program 18: Promote County of San Diego Home Repair Loan/Grant Programs</p>	<p>As the City's housing stock ages, the need for housing rehabilitation to enhance and preserve neighborhood quality will continue to increase. Therefore, the City will continue to promote these rehabilitation programs. The City will make the information available about these programs at City Hall. Periodic reminders and updates through City-wide information dissemination venues (web site, mail outs, electronic notifications, public notices, etc.) will be provided. In addition to these steps, the City will work with the County to insure<u>ensure</u> that the County marketing efforts include outreach to the residents.</p>	<p>Progress: The City promoted rehabilitation programs to residents and property owners</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Program 19: Coordinate Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and Public Housing</p>	<p>The City will continue to coordinate with the Housing Authority of San Diego County who will continue to administer the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program and the Public Housing Program. The Housing Authority will support the County's applications for additional Section 8 allocations. For Public Housing, the household's annual gross income shall be at or below 50 percent of San Diego's Area Median Income (AMI).</p>	<p>Progress: County HCD is currently assisting 350 recipients with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) in Lemon Grove. In addition, out of the 56,180 applicants currently on the HCV Waiting List, 805 identify as living in Lemon Grove.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>

Program 20: Participate in the Fair Housing Council of San Diego's (FHCSO) Fair Housing Program	The City of Lemon Grove supports fair housing laws and statutes. To promote equal opportunity, the City participates in the Fair Housing Council of San Diego's (FHCSO) Fair Housing Program. The City distributes the FHCSO's information on fair housing, and refers fair housing questions and housing discrimination claims to the FHCSO.	<p>Progress: The City worked with the FHCSO to insureensure that its marketing efforts include outreach to the residents of Lemon Grove.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 21: Promote Funding Opportunities for Home Ownership	The City of Lemon Grove will actively promote funding to assist opportunities for home ownership. The City will identify and update these funding opportunities and make the sources available at City Hall. The City will continue to work in concert with the County of San Diego, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), as a major resource for the home ownership programs	<p>Progress: Assistance was provided to 21 homebuyers within the City during the 2013-2020 Housing Element cycle based on funding from the County HCD Down Payment and Closing Cost Assistance (DCCA) Program.</p> <p>Program Evaluation: This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>
Program 22: Encourage Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households	Encourage the development of housing units for households earning 30 percent or less of the median income for San Diego County. Specific emphasis shall be placed on the provision of family housing and non-traditional housing types such as single-room occupancy units and transitional housing. The City will encourage development of housing for extremely-low income households through a variety of activities such as outreaching to housing developers on at least an annual basis, providing financial or in-kind technical assistance or land-write downs, providing expedited processing, identifying grant and funding opportunities, applying for or supporting applications for funding on an ongoing basis, reviewing and prioritizing local funding at least twice during the planning period, and/or offering additional incentives beyond the density bonus provisions.	<p>Progress: Fair housing information is available at City Hall and inquiries are referred to the County of San Diego Housing and Community Development Department.</p> <p>https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/sdhcd/fair-housing.html</p> <p>Program Evaluation This program will be continued in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p>

Source: City of Lemon Grove, 2021

APPENDIX D

Appendix D: Fair Housing Assessment

D.1 Introduction and Overview of AB 686

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 combatting 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.

D.2 Assessment of Fair Housing Issues

D.2.1 Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach

San Diego County jurisdictions are served by two fair housing service providers, CSA San Diego and Legal Aid Society of San Diego (LASSD), that investigate and resolve discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars. These service providers also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Lemon Grove is served by LASSD. 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 2014 and 2019, LASSD served 310 Lemon Grove residents. LASSD filed three fair housing complaints by Lemon Grove residents, accounting for less than one percent of the cases filed by LASSD for the entire County. The three cases each cited disability as a basis for discrimination. (HUD) 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, 2019, 414 fair housing complaints in San Diego County were filed with HUD. Less than one percent (three cases) were filed by Lemon Grove residents). In the County and City of Lemon Grove, disability-related discrimination was the most commonly reported—comprising 53 percent of all cases in the County.

The 2020 Regional Analysis of Fair Housing Choice (2020 Regional AI) found that enforcement services were inadequate in the region. The 2020 Regional AI cited that between 2014-2020, but no sites were tested in Lemon Grove. The City will work with the County Housing and Community Development (County HCD) as the lead for Urban County CDBG program, to ensure increased fair housing outreach, education, and enforcement activities take place in Lemon Grove. The 2020 Regional AI 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 Lemon Grove advertises fair housing services through placement of a fair housing services brochure at public counters, local library and will include a link to

LASSD in its website. To increase outreach, the City will include a link to the LASSD website and update outreach materials frequently. The City will advocate the County to include systematic testing in its Fair Housing Program.

D.2.2 Integration and Segregation

Race and Ethnicity

The 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. According to the 2017-2021 American Community Survey (ACS), approximately 72.4% of the Lemon Grove population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group, an increase from 61.9% during the 2006-2010 ACS. Lemon Grove has a much larger racial/ethnic minority population compared to the County, where only 55.9% of residents belong to a racial/ethnic minority group.

To assist in this analysis of integration and segregation, 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 resources 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 percent 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 D-1 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 percent 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


According to the California Fair Housing Task Force’s 2021 opportunity maps, there are no census tracts or areas of high racial segregation and poverty in Lemon Grove. Regionally, areas with high segregation and poverty are located in the Southern County, specifically in Chula Vista, National City, and the City of San Diego.

Table D-1: 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	

While the 2021 HCD/TCAC map combined both poverty and patterns of minority concentrations where census tracts that have both a poverty rate of over 30 percent and that are designated as being racially segregated were filtered into the “High Segregation & Poverty” category, the 2020 Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (2020 Regional AI) defined minority concentrations as a census block group with a proportion of minority households that is greater than the overall San Diego County minority average of 54.2 percent. Figure D-1 shows that the highest concentration of minorities in Lemon Grove is found in the northeast and southwest portions of the City. An important note on the mapping of racial/ethnic concentrations is that concentration is defined by the proportion of a racial/ethnic group in the total population of a census block group. Regionally, minority concentration areas were prevalent in the Southern region of the County, reflecting proximity to the U.S.-Mexico border.

Figure D-1
Minority Concentration Areas



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 percent of the population has a disability. Lemon Grove has the second highest proportion of population with a disability in the county (12 percent), only lower than its neighboring city of El Cajon (13 percent). The 2021 County Health Rankings

in Figure D-2 show that in the East County region, El Cajon has the highest concentration of persons with disabilities, with the population with a disability ranging between 10 and 20 percent per tract. Within Lemon Grove, all tracts within the City have a population with a disability ranging from 10 to 20 percent, except for the southwestern portion of the City (Figure D-3).

Additionally, the San Diego region has a large homeless population, and there are needs to be addressed in order to assist in finding and securing housing. The homeless population is estimated to fluctuate between 11 and 50 in Lemon Grove, which is largely due to the trolley usage in and out of the City. At the current time it is thought that Lemon Grove has the resources and facilities to look after this population. However, the homeless population continues to increase as a result of reductions in public subsidies, a lack of housing that is affordable to low and very low-income persons, and the daily life challenges that can lead a person to becoming homeless. There is still the need for housing options and affordable housing to provide the homeless population with permanent housing.

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 HCD AB686/AFFH data tool maps (Figure D-3), there is no concentration of households with adults living alone in the City. Adults living with their spouse are concentrated in southern tracts of the City, where the population of adults living with their spouse is 40 to 60 percent, compared to the 20 to 40 percent in other tracts in the City (Figure D-4).

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.~~ As shown in Figure 8 above, 33.2 percent of Lemon Grove households are families with children. The City's share of families with children is lower than the neighboring cities of Chula Vista (40 percent), El Cajon (35 percent), but higher than other neighboring cities, La Mesa (26 percent), National City (32 percent), City of San Diego (26 percent), Santee (31 percent) and the County of San Diego (30 percent). According to the HCD AFFH map in Figure D-5, children in married households are most concentrated in the southern tracts of the City. The percent of households with children in these tract ranges are above 60 percent (probably due to the housing types available), higher than the other tracts where this percentage ranges from 20 to 40 percent for the tract near SR-94 and in the tract located in the central portion of the City (Lemon Grove Ave).

Single parent households are also protected by fair housing law. Approximately 11 percent of households in Lemon Grove are single-parent households, compared to only 8 percent Countywide. 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. In Lemon Grove, over 15 percent of households in Lemon Grove are single female-headed households with children, more than the 12 percent throughout the County. As shown in Figure D-6 below, female headed households are concentrated in a tract in the northern area of the City, near SR-94 and in the tract located in the central portion of the City (Lemon Grove Ave) (Figure D-6). These tracts have between 40 to 60 percent of children living in female-headed households, compared to lower percentages in other tracts in the City.

Figure D-2: Percent of Population with Disabilities - East County Region & Lemon Grove




Figure D-3: Percent of Population Adults Living Alone – Lemon Grove




Figure D-4: Percent of Population of Adult Living with their Spouse – Lemon Grove




Figure D-5: Percent of Children in Married Couple Households – Lemon Grove





Figure D-6: Percent of Children in Single Female-Headed Households – Lemon Grove



Income Level

Identifying low or moderate income (LMI) geographies and individuals is important to overcome patterns of segregation. HUD's 2015-2019 CHAS data (Table D-2) shows that 61% of Lemon Grove households earn 80 percent or less than the area median family income and are considered lower income, higher than 47% of households Countywide. According to the 2014-2018 ACS, the median household income in Lemon Grove is \$62,004, lower than \$75,456 for the County

Table D-2: Income Level Distribution				
Income Category	Lemon Grove		San Diego County	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
<30% HAMFI	1,625	19%	174,540	16%
31-50% HAMFI	1,670	20%	149,590	13%
51-80% HAMFI	1,825	22%	203,395	18%
81-100% HAMFI	1,235	14%	119,830	11%
>100% HAMFI	2,135	25%	477,930	42%

<u>Total</u>	<u>8,495</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,125,285</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Source: HUD CHAS data (2015-2019 ACS)</u>				

Figure D-8 shows the Lower and Moderate Income (LMI) areas in the County by Census block group. HUD defines a LMI area as a Census tract or block group where over 51 percent of the population is LMI (based on HUD income definition of up to 80 percent 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, cluster 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. While most of the City of Lemon Grove is considered LMI, the highest concentration of LMI population is located in tracts in the northern portion of the City.

D.2.3 Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

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 Escondido, El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, and Chula Vista (Figure D-8). Larger RECAP clusters can be seen in the central/southern portion of the City of San Diego. The RECAPs located within Lemon Grove is located in the northern portion of the City adjacent to SR-94 ([Census Tract 144](#)).

[Per 2014-2018 ACS, there are approximately 1,584 households within this Census Tract. The median household income is \\$23,643. This is approximately 38% of the median household income in the City of Lemon Grove, which is \\$62,004. The 2014-2018 ACS reported that 12.5% of the City's total households were living in poverty. Approximately 20-30 percent of these households in this census tract are below the poverty line, significantly higher than the citywide poverty rate.](#)

Figure D-8: Low and Moderate Income (LMI) areas in San Diego County





Figure D-9: Racially Concentrated Areas of Poverty (RECAPs) in San Diego County



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. 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."

Based on their research, HCD defines RCAAs as census tracts where 1) 80 percent or more of the population is white, and 2) the median household income is \$125,000 or greater. RCAAs have not been studied extensively nor has a standard definition been published by HCD or HUD, this fair housing assessment uses the percent White population and median household income as proxies to identify potential areas of affluence. Based on HUD's AFFH Data, there are no RCAA's in the City of Lemon Grove. However, As Table D-23 shows, White households also tend to have higher median incomes than all the population. In Lemon Grove, White households earn approximately \$4,000 more than all households. The majority of white households are found in the southern and eastern census tracts of the City as shown in Figure D-10.

Table D-23: White Household Income and Percent Population					
	Lemon Grove	La Mesa	El Cajon	National City	San Diego County
All Households	63,548	66,051	55,309	\$47,119	\$78,980
White Alone	67,849	72,532	54,441	\$57,147	\$89,392
White Population%	40%	66%	64%	13%	56%

Source: 2019 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, S1903

Figure D-10: White Population



D.2.4 Access to Opportunities

TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps

The 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps are made from composite index scores of three different domains (economic, environmental, and education) to categorize tracts as low, moderate or high resource (Table D-3-4 shows the full list of indicators). Categorization is based on percentile rankings for census tracts within the San Diego Region. Higher composite scores mean higher resources. Regionally, high and highest resource areas are located in the North County. Most tracts along the coast from Carlsbad to Point Loma are high or highest resource. The 2021 TCAC/HCD opportunity maps identified all census tracts in Lemon Grove as either low ~~to or~~ moderate resource.


Table D-34: Opportunity Map Score and Categorization (2021)

Census Tract	Economic Domain Score	Environmental Domain Score	Education Domain Score	Composite Index Score	Final Category
06073014001	0.373	0.41	0.287	-0.299	Moderate Resource
06073014002	0.347	0.54	0.178	-0.364	Low Resource
06073014101	0.504	0.65	0.251	-0.191	Moderate Resource
06073014200	0.542	0.559	0.318	-0.146	Moderate Resource
06073014300	0.397	0.15	0.313	-0.329	Low Resource
06073014400	0.212	0.113	0.313	-0.489	Low Resource

Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, 2020 Statewide Summary Table, December 2020

Note: According to the California Fair Housing Task Force Methodology (June 2020): "Each census tract or rural block group receives a score for each indicator, except where data is missing. To account for the fact that each indicator is measured differently (e.g., percent versus dollar amount), a unit-less "z-score" is calculated for each indicator within each region. These tract level z-scores are averaged together by domain (with each indicator's score receiving an equal weighting), and the three domain scores are then averaged together to create an index score." (p.6). For a detailed description of the methodology: <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/2021-tcac-opportunity-map>

Figure D-12: 2021 HCD/TCAC Opportunity Area



Opportunity Indicators

The 2020 Regional AI used opportunity indicators developed by HUD to help inform communities about disparities in access to opportunity. These indices are only available to Entitlement Jurisdictions (with population over 50,000 and receiving CDBG funds from HUD). For Urban County jurisdictions like Lemon Grove, for which a HUD-provided index is not provided, a similar analysis as that provided by the indices was conducted using comparable information. For example, for the Low Poverty Index, the poverty status of the population provided by the 2013-2017 American Community Survey estimates were used. The 2020 Regional AI also provided an analysis of access to opportunities based on the following indicators: poverty rate, school proficiency, unemployment rate, jobs proximity, transit metrics, and Cal EnviroScreen 3.0 Scores. While these metrics do not identify specific locations within the City, they helped show the relative standing of the City compared to other small jurisdictions in the Urban County (Coronado, Del Mar, Lemon Grove, Poway, and Solana Beach). The 2020 AI did not provide the indicators for the San Diego County, so those were computed for comparison to the County in this Housing Element's fair housing assessment.

Education

According to the 2020 Regional AI, all of the schools in Lemon Grove are considered Title I schools and help low-achieving children meet state standards in core academic subjects. These schools coordinate and integrate resources and services from federal, state, and local sources. Lemon Grove has a higher percentage of Title I schools than the County overall (62.8 percent).

To be considered for Title 1 school funds, at least 40 percent of the students must be considered low-income. Kidsdata.org, a program of the Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health, estimated that 19.7% percent of children in Lemon Grove were living in poverty (2013-2017). Kidsdata.org also reported that in 2020, 70 percent of students are considered high-need (i.e. those who are eligible for free or reduced price school meals) compared to 49.9 percent of students in the County.

Employment

In terms of unemployment, the 2020 Regional AI reported that Lemon Grove had one of the highest unemployment rate (3.2 percent) of the Urban County jurisdictions (Coronado, Del Mar, Lemon Grove, Poway, and Solana Beach) but had slightly higher unemployment rates than overall San Diego County (2.8 percent). However, this data was pre-COVID in February 2020. SANDAG has since reported that as of September 5, 2020, the County's unemployment rate was 13.3 percent and Lemon Grove's unemployment rate was between 12 and 14 percent. The most recent unemployment rates published by the California Employment and Development Department (April 2021) show that Lemon Grove's unemployment rate is higher than the County (6.7 percent and 9.3 percent, respectively).

Transportation

All Transit explores metrics that reveal the social and economic impact of transit, specifically looking at connectivity, access to jobs, and frequency of service. According to the data provided by the 2020 Regional AI, Lemon Grove's score All Transit Performance score of 7.9 was the highest for the Urban County, illustrating a moderate combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible that enable a moderate number of people to take transit to work. The County All Transit score was lower than Lemon Grove's (5.3). Lemon Grove has a higher proportion of commuters that use transit (4.45 percent) than the County (3.28 percent).


Environmental

The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) developed a screening methodology to help identify California communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution called the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen). High scoring census tracts tend to be more burdened by pollution from multiple sources and are most vulnerable

to its effects, taking into account their socioeconomic characteristics and underlying health status. Lemon Grove had relative low scores (range 19-39) compared to other neighboring cities like Chula Vista (range 7-49), but much higher than Poway (range 3-16). CalEnviroScreen also reports scores as percentiles to compare tracts across the entire County. The map in Figure D-13 shows that while Lemon Grove has scores within the lower percentile in the South County region, overall the east county region has higher scores than the region and is impacted by pollution.

Table D-45: Access to Opportunity Indicators – Lemon Grove and San Diego County				
			Lemon Grove	San Diego County
Poverty Rate				
Population Below Federal Poverty level			13.8%	12.6%
White Alone			10.9%	19.9%
Black or African American Alone			23.3%	20.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native Alone			56.2%	10.3%
Asian Alone			6.8%	12.9%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone			18.0%	21.5%
Hispanic or Latino			11.7%	13.8%
School Proficiency				
Total Title I Schools			5	412
Total Schools			5	656
% of Schools			100%	62.8%
Unemployment Rate				
February 2021			9.3%	7.2%
Job Proximity				
<29 Mins.			63.7%	62.7%
30-59 Mins.			29.2%	30.4%
60 Mins. or More			7.1%	7.0%
Transit Metrics				
All Transit Performance Score			7.9	5.3
Transit Trips Per Week within ½ Mile			1,274	1,358
Jobs Accessible in 30-Min. Trip			75,237	82,735
Commuters Who Use Transit			4.45%	3.28%
Transit Routes within ½ Mile			5	4
CalEnviroScreen Percentile				
Census Tract	Score	Percentile	Score	Percentile
06073014001	24.52	48.96	18.86 (average)	33.38 (average)
06073014002	19.38	36.80		
06073014101	20.27	39.03		
06073014200	23.65	46.79		
06073014300	31.85	62.85		
06073014400	39.22	74.79		
Sum does not equal 100 due to rounding. ACS information presented in percentages and adds up to 100.1%. Source: 2020 Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice; California Department of Education Public Schools and Data File February 2020; California Employment and Development Department, Labor Force and Unemployment Rate for Cities and Census Designated Places, February 2021; https://alltransit.cnt.org/metrics/, accessed June 13, 2021. CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Results (June 2018 Update)				

Figure D-12: CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Percentile Scores



D.2.5 Disproportionate Housing 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.

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 Lemon Grove. Housing problems considered by CHAS include:

- 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)

As shown in Table D-56, renter-households, independent of race, experience housing problems at higher rates than owner-occupied households. Furthermore, White renter-households experience housing problems at higher rates than non-White households. Lemon Grove households experience housing problems (65 percent) at higher rates than the County overall (45 percent).

Table D-56: Any Housing Problem by Tenure and Race								
With Housing Problem	White	Black	Asian	Am. Ind.	Pac. Isl.	Hispanic	Other	All
Lemon Grove								
Owner-Occupied	10.3%	5.6%	0.2%	0%	0%	0%	4.7%	35.1%
Renter-Occupied	38.6%	9.1%	11.1%	1.0%	1.2%	0%	15.2%	64.0%
All Households	27.5%	7.7%	6.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0%	11.1%	64.9%
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								

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 D-6-7 shows that renter elderly and large households experience housing problems at the greater rates than all households in the City. Renters in both the City and the County experience housing problems at a greater rate than owners. However, a larger proportion of renter households experience housing problems than all the County large renter-households.

Table D-67: Housing Problems for Elderly and Large Households by Tenure							
With Housing Problem	Elderly	Large HH	All Renter	Elderly	Large HH	All Owners	All HH
Lemon Grove	50%	83.9%	64.0%	34.7%	56.7%	35.1%	54.1%
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 percent of its income in housing costs, including utilities. Similar to the any housing problem trends, Black, American Indian, Hispanic, and non-white, and Other households experience cost burdens at higher rate (about 20 percent) than White and Asian households and 10 percent above all City households (Table D-78). These racial minorities experience cost burdens at slightly higher rates in the City and the County. Also, renters, regardless of race, experience cost burdens at higher rates than owners in both the City and County. Lemon Grove elderly and large households also experience cost burdens at slightly lower rates than the County, but renters of these groups experience the cost burden at the highest rates. More than half of elderly renter-households experience cost burdens (Table D-89).

Table D-78: Cost Burden								
Cost Burden >30%	White	Black	Asian	Am. Ind.	Pac. Isl.	Hispanic	Other	All
Lemon Grove								
Owner-Occupied	32%	11%	17%	0%	0%	39%	41%	33%
Renter-Occupied	43%	64%	40%	0%	16%	60%	72%	53%
All Households	38%	59%	34%	0%	16%	65%	62%	47%
San Diego County								
Owner-Occupied	30 %	37%	30%	22%	0%	36%	34%	31%
Renter-Occupied	48%	58%	43%	46%	54%	58%	51%	52%
All Households	37%	53%	36%	33%	46%	49%	44%	41%
Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017								

Table D-89: Cost Burden for Elderly and Large Households							
With Housing Problem	Elderly	Large HH	All Renter	Elderly	Large HH	All Owners	All HH
Lemon Grove	56%	54%	54%	27%	29%	32%	47%
San Diego County	60%	56%	52%	33%	31%	32%	41%
Source: HUD CHAS 2013-2017							

Affordability could be a barrier to housing for persons with disabilities or special needs populations who rely on Supplemental Security Income 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 Figure 35: Average Monthly Rent (2019), there are no affordable rental options for SSI recipients without spending more than 30 percent on housing. The highest concentration of renter- and owner-households experiencing cost burdens are located on the Northwestern and Southeastern census tracts within the City (Figure D-14). More than 1/3 of owner households in most tracts in this area experience housing cost burdens. These census tracts also have high minority concentration and low and moderate income households. The percent of cost burdened renters is slightly less than the percentage of owner, as shown in Figure D-15).

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, a higher percentage of households in Lemon Grove (8 percent) are living in overcrowded conditions than the County (6.7 percent). Regionally, census tracts with overcrowded households are concentrated in the South County, particularly in the City of San Diego, Chula Vista, and National City. Meanwhile, within Lemon Grove, overcrowded households are located in the southern part of the City Ave (Figure D-15). This suggests a need for large housing units or accessory dwelling units, which the City will be working on to incentivize.

Substandard Conditions

The City estimates that about 7 percent of homes (594 units) in Lemon Grove are in substandard condition. This figure is based on a report from the National Center for Healthy Housing, which measures “basic housing quality” throughout the nation. The basic housing quality metric is based on the percentage of homes with “severe” or “moderate” housing problems. In the San Diego Metropolitan Service Area, the basic housing quality statistic is 7.2 percent. 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 46 percent of housing was built prior to 1960. However, old housing units are concentrated in the southern portion of the City. Most new housing built in the last 20 years has been in various infill projects with no significant locational data.

Table D-910: Age Housing Built

Age	Census Tract					
	06073014001	06073014002	06073014101	06073014200	06073014300	06073014400
Prior to 1990	87-96%	87-96%	>96%	74-96%	87-96%	74-87%
1990 or After	4-13%	4-13%	<4%	4-26%	<4-13%	13-26%

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 an interactive map that displays changes in neighborhood characteristics that may indicate displacement. Two key factors in visualizing displacement are the loss of low income households and increases in rent. As Figure D-16 shows, between 2000 and 2015, Lemon Grove experienced increases in median income and increases in median gross rents. In fact, the Urban Displacement project has identified the westerly portion of Lemon Grove as recently becoming gentrified between (2000 and 2015).

Within the City, census tracts in the northern portion of the City have experienced the highest increases in gross rents have experienced the lowest change in median income. Figure D-16 also shows that these census tracts continue to have a highest proportion of cost-burdened renters.

Figure D-14A – Percent of Cost Burdened Homeowners




Figure D-14B – Percent of Cost Burdened Renters




Figure D-15A – Percent of Owner Occupied Overcrowded Households




Figure D-15B – Percent of Renter Occupied Overcrowded Households






Figure D-16: Displacement Indicators
(A) Change in Median Household Income (2000-2015)




(B) Change in Median Gross Rent (2000-2015)




(C) Gentrified Neighborhoods (1990-2015)



(D) Burdened Renter Households (1990)



(E) Burdened Renter Households (2015)




Source: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/map/socal#>

Other Data


Tenure

Lemon Grove's population is almost evenly split between owners and renters. According to 2015-2015 ACS data, 50.2% percent of households are owner occupied, compared to 47% of households in the County. UCLA's Urban Displacement project has also mapped changes in renter population from 1990 to 2015. According to their maps, Lemon Grove has increased the concentration of renters in the northern portions of the City (Figure D-18).

Figure D-18: Change in Renter Households
(A) Renter Households – 1990



(B) Renter Households – 2015



Source: <https://www.urbandisplacement.org/map/socal#>

Mortgage Lending

A key aspect of fair housing choice is equal access to credit for the purchase or improvement of a home, particularly in light of the recent lending/credit crisis. In the past, credit market distortions and other activities such as “redlining” were prevalent and prevented some groups from having equal access to credit. The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) in 1977 and the subsequent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) were designed to improve access to credit for all members of the community and hold the lender industry responsible for community lending. Under HMDA, lenders are required to disclose information on the disposition of home loan applications and on the race or national origin, gender, and annual income of loan applicants. Table D-~~10~~-11 examines detailed 2017 HMDA data for Lemon Grove and the County.

Hispanics accounted for 41 percent of the City’s applicant pool but only 47 percent of the City’s population. By Contrast, Whites are overrepresented, accounting for 35 percent of the applicant pool but only 29 percent of the population. White and Black applicants were denied at higher rates than Hispanic and Asian applicants in the City. In the County, Hispanics were also greatly underrepresented in the applicant pool. Denial rates were also greater for minority applicants than White applicants.

Table D-4011: Loan Application and Denial by Race						
	Lemon Grove			San Diego County		
	% Applicant Pool	% Population	Denials	% Applicant Pool	% Population	Denials
White	35%	29%	30%	51%	46%	13%
Black	13.0%	14%	30%	3%	5%	20%
Hispanic	41%	47%	18%	16%	33%	17%
Asian	6%	6%	14%	10%	12%	15%
Other	5%	4%	26%	18%	3%	16%
Source: Source: www.lendingpatterns.com, 2020. 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates.						

D.2.6 Outreach

The City of Lemon Grove intends to expand outreach efforts by the City. Some of the outreach tasks include:

- Provide information and services to the public on housing programs, housing needs and housing emergencies.
- Conduct research and analysis related to housing including local and regional housing issues and programs.
- Assist residents with information on housing programs; provide information to tenants and landlords.
- Develop community relationships with organizations and landlords that will support the housing needs of the City including maintaining a list of potential resources related to tenant and landlord disputes.
- Develop and maintain housing informational brochure, City webpage, handouts and lists; perform outreach activities related to housing programs; disseminate information on various housing programs.
- Advise tenants and property-owners of their rights and responsibilities identify funding source and write grant applications related to housing.
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships with staff, vendors, governmental agencies, community organizations and the public.

The City also makes an effort to advertise City Council meetings and workshops for individuals that do not have access to the internet. In addition, the City participates in regional digital divide workshops with the intention to understand how to better serve the community and develop digital equity and transparency. City staff regularly holds in-person meetings in different portions of the City to provide information and receive feedback on community concerns.

D.2.7 Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Table D-12 below summarizes the fair housing issues identified in this Assessment of Fair Housing. Fair housing issues are apparent throughout the City in some capacity. However, these issues were most prevalent in the northern portion of the City

<u>Table D-12: Summary of Fair Housing Issues</u>	
<u>Fair Housing Issue</u>	<u>Summary</u>
<u>Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Between 2014 and 2019, 3 fair housing cases were filed by Lemon Grove residents, all were related to disability discrimination.</u> • <u>No sites were tested for discrimination in Lemon Grove</u>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lemon Grove is served by LASSD. Due to the location of LASSD offices, Lemon Grove offers a hotline and various other advertisements for their fair housing services.</u> • <u>Lemon Grove has committed to complying with the Fair Housing Act and related regulations.</u>
<u>Integration and Segregation</u>	
<u>Race and Ethnicity</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>72.4% of the Lemon Grove population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group</u>
<u>Persons with Disabilities</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lemon Grove has the second highest proportion of population with a disability in the county (12 percent), only lower than its neighboring city of El Cajon (13 percent)</u> • <u>All tracts within the City have a population with a disability ranging from 10 to 20 percent, except for the southwestern portion of the City.</u>
<u>Familial Status</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>33.2% of Lemon Grove households have one or more children under 18; 11% of households are single-parent households; 15% of households are single-parent female-headed households</u> • <u>Tracts with a high percentage of children in married households are most concentrated in the southern tracts of the City. The percent of households with children in these tract ranges are above 60 percent.</u> • <u>Tracts with a high percentage of children in female headed households are most concentrated in a tract in the northern area of the City, near SR-94 and in the tract located in the central portion of the City (Lemon Grove Ave). These tracts have between 40 to 60 percent of children living in female-headed households.</u>
<u>Income Level</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>61% of Lemon Grove households earn 80% or less than the area median family income.</u> • <u>Most of the City of Lemon Grove is considered LMI. The highest concentration of LMI population is located in tracts in the northern portion of the City.</u>
<u>Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas</u>	
<u>Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The RECAPs located within Lemon Grove is located in the northern portion of the City adjacent to SR-94 (Census Tract 144).</u>
<u>Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are no RCAAs in the City of Lemon Grove</u>

<u>Access to Opportunities</u>	
<u>Education</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tracts with the lowest education score are located south/southeastern portions of the city.</u> • <u>According to the 2020 Regional AI, all of the schools in Lemon Grove are considered Title I schools. To be considered for Title 1 school funds, at least 40 percent of the students must be considered low-income.</u>
<u>Employment</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tracts with the lowest employment score are located in the northern portion of the City, which coincides with the highest poverty rates, minority populations and lowest income.</u> • <u>The most recent unemployment rates published by the California Employment and Development Department (April 2021) show that Lemon Grove's unemployment rate is higher than the County (6.7 percent and 9.3 percent, respectively).</u>
<u>Transportation</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lemon Grove's score All Transit Performance score of 7.9 was the highest for the Urban County. The County's score was lower at 5.3.</u> • <u>Lemon Grove has a higher proportion of commuters that use transit (4.45 percent) than the County (3.28 percent).</u> • <u>Most of the City is located furthest from employment opportunities. The northern portion of the City has the highest job proximity indices.</u>
<u>Environmental</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tracts with the lowest environmental score are located in the northern portion of the City, which coincides with the highest poverty rates, minority populations and lowest income.</u> • <u>Using CalEnviroScreen, Lemon Grove had relative low scores (range 19-39) compared to other neighboring cities like Chula Vista (range 7-49), but much higher than Poway (range 3-16).</u>
<u>Disproportionate Housing Needs</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>35 percent of owner-occupied households and 64 percent of renter-occupied households have a housing problem.</u>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>White renter-households have the highest rate of housing problems in the City at 38.6 percent</u>
<u>Cost Burden</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Black, Hispanic and “Other” renter-households have the highest rate of cost burden at 64 percent, 60 percent and 72 percent respectively.</u> • <u>Elderly and large households renter-households also experience high cost burden.</u> • <u>The highest concentration of renter- and owner-households experiencing cost burdens are located on the Northwestern and Southeastern census tracts within the City. More than 1/3 of owner households in most tracts in this area experience housing cost burdens. These census tracts also have high minority concentration and low and moderate income households.</u>
<u>Over Crowding</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>8 percent of households in Lemon Grove are living in overcrowded conditions compare to 6.7 percent in the County.</u> • <u>Overcrowded households are located in the southern part of the City Ave.</u>
<u>Substandard Conditions</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>It is estimated that about 7 percent of homes in Lemon Grove are in substandard condition.</u> • <u>Dependent on the tract, between 74%-96% of the housing stock in Lemon Grove was built prior to 1990 and may be susceptible to deterioration.</u>
<u>Displacement Risk</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The westerly portion of Lemon Grove is identified as becoming gentrified and could be vulnerable to displacement.</u> • <u>Census tracts in the northern portion of the City have experienced the highest increases in gross rents but have also experienced the lowest change in median income. These census tracts continue to have a highest proportion of cost-burdened renters and are at risk of displacement.</u>

Findings from 2020 Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

The City of Lemon Grove participated in the 2020 San Diego Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (2020 Regional AI). The 2020 Regional AI concluded that the following were impediments to Fair Housing Choice in the San Diego Area (**regional impediments shown in bold**). The relevance to Lemon Grove is included below:

- **Hispanics and Blacks continue to be under-represented in the homebuyer market and experienced large disparities in loan approval rates.** Hispanics and Blacks were not significantly under-represented in the homebuyer market in Lemon Grove. Variation between percent of applicant pool and percent of the City's population was not significant. Black, Hispanic, and Asian applicants were denied at higher rates than Whites.
- **Due to the geographic disparity in terms of rents, concentrations of Housing Choice Voucher use have occurred.** There is no high concentration of HCV in Lemon Grove. The City received 1.1 percent of Housing Choice Vouchers administered by the County.
- **Housing choices for special needs groups, especially persons with disabilities, are limited.** Special needs residents, especially those that rely on SII could incur cost burden due to a lack of affordable housing options.
- **Enforcement activities are limited. Fair housing services focus primarily on outreach and education; less emphasis is placed on enforcement.** Legal Aid Society of San Diego (LASSD) provides fair housing services to the City of Lemon Grove. The City advertises Fair Housing Services through placement of a fair housing services brochure at public counters, local library and will include a link to LASSD in its website. The City will continue to refer fair housing complaints to appropriate agencies. Between 2014 and 2019, LASSD served 310 Lemon Grove residents. Records indicate that no sites were tested in the 2020 Regional AI. More testing is needed. Like the County, the City needs to place more emphasis on enforcement activities.
- **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 created to expand access to fair housing resources and information with an increasing young adult and senior population in Lemon Grove.
- **Patterns of racial and ethnic concentration are present within particular areas.** While the 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity maps did not identify any areas of high poverty and segregation in Lemon Grove in the 2021 Opportunity Maps, two census block groups located in the northern portion of the City had a minority population that exceeded the County average minority of 54.2 percent and were also identified with high CalEnviroScreen percentile scores (>60).

Summary of Additional Fair Housing Concerns

Additional fair housing concerns identified as part of this Housing Element update are summarized below:

- Persons with disabilities are most likely to be affected by fair housing issues as they reportedly experience more housing discrimination than other groups. Persons with disabilities are also more likely to experience cost burdens, particularly if they rely on SII as a form of income. Persons with disabilities are not concentrated in any particular location in the City.
- The City has ~~a two-tract~~two tracts with concentrated minority and low- and moderate-income populations that are low resource HCD/TCAC Opportunity Areas. These tracts (6073014300 and 6073014400) are in the northern portion of the City.
- Census tracts in the northern part of the City, in addition to having a high concentration of minority population and LMI households, have had low changes in median income and some changes in gross rents from 2000 to 2015, which could be an indicator of potential displacement.
- Census tracts in the southern part of the City also have some of the highest proportion of housing stock over 50 years old and may need rehabilitation. Furthermore, these areas also have the

highest overcrowding rates indicating a need for home expansions or the construction of accessory dwelling units.

D.2.8 Local Data and Knowledge

The below section summarizes how the- City of Lemon Grove has developed over time using local and City knowledge, identifies factors that contributed to the growth patterns seen today, and analyzes why areas of the City lack fair housing opportunities based on community feedback.

The City of Lemon Grove was generally built out during the 1950s-1970s, the nature of buildout resulted in inconsistent development and development standard. As can be seen by the streetscape, there is no consistent pattern or grid layout which in turn created a lack of street curb, gutters and sidewalks throughout the City. Over time, this has led to inconsistent development and lack of -communityfractured community connectivity. Due to this type of growthAs a result, specific distinct neighborhoods were never identified, therefore so today the City is generally treated as “one neighborhood”.

Although there are minority populations throughout the City, The-the northern residential portions of Lemon Grove are known to have a concentration of minority populations. These areas have a concentration number of older homes in need of rehabilitation that are mixed-in with older commercial uses that result in negative impacts from traffic and particulate matter. The same areas are known for having concentrations of minority populations. During public outreach efforts between February 2021 and March 2021, Broadway east of Lemon Grove Avenue and Lemon Grove Avenue around Lincoln Street were identified as areas that were in need of housing. In particular, mixed-use development, redevelopment of underutilized parcels, housing near transit and affordable housing were identified. These areas identified by the public are all in northern portion of the City and align with the City’s understanding of areas that are in need of investment and rehabilitation.

The southern portions of Lemon Grove are primarily developed with older ~~signle~~single-family homes that are smaller in size, which likely contributes to some the overcrowded conditions in these areas. Lemon Grove has a high percentage of “legacy property owners”. A large number of these residents bought their homes during the early buildout of Lemon Grove and have lived here most of their lives with little turnover. In part to theLikely due to the low turnover, the City is rarely seeingrarely processes larger residential developments and the trend is towards smaller infill projects on underutilized parcels or accessory dwelling units on existing single-family properties. As the community identified in public outreach efforts, this has resulted in a lack of housing options and residents are finding it increasingly difficult to find affordable housing, downsize, or even buy a home under current circumstances.


As discussed above, connectivity has been identified as a barrier for development and housing proximity to mass transit had not panned out in the City, resulting in a lack of housing projects or incentives and no larger parcels available for development. In order to try to resolve some of the inconsistencies created as the City developed and address fair housing opportunities for all residents, Future-future complete-streets projects are focused in-these areas experiencing overcrowding and other issues, which will enhance multi-modal transportation and accessibility for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit (Connect Main Street). These projects will make the surrounding residential areas more accessible to these transportation corridors. Other enhancements include ADA improvements throughout the City to further increase accessibility.

D.2.9 Other Contributions

Other contributions that affect the accumulation of wealth and access to resources include historical disinvestment, lack of infrastructure improvements, and presence of older affordable housing units that may be at risk of conversion to market-rate housing.

According to the San Diego County's Surfrider Foundation, exclusionary housing policies such as redlining and discriminatory racial covenants, reduce economic opportunities and quality of life for minorities by denying mortgages and encouraging disinvestment areas in communities of color. While no redlining maps or analysis has been prepared for Lemon Grove, Census data indicates increased White and Hispanic populations in the southern half of the City and increased Black populations near SR-94 (Figure D-19).

Figure D-19: Predominant Racial Populations



The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program is a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) program that provides funds annually to all entitlement jurisdictions. CDBG funds are used for community development and affordable housing activities that benefit low-income households and persons with special needs. The CDBG program was created by Congress in 1974 and is administered by the County of San Diego. According to the County of San Diego's website, CDBG-funded projects must satisfy one of three national program objectives:

- Provide a benefit to low and moderate income persons,
- Prevent or eliminate slums and blight, or
- Meet needs having a particular urgency.

For over 20 years, the City has participated in the CDBG Program, predominately relying on CDBG funds for street rehabilitation capital improvement projects in eligible neighborhoods. Two other programs have been supported with CDBG funds in the past including the San Diego Food Bank school food backpack program which was supported through FY 2011-12 and the Center for Social Advocacy which was supported through FY 2010-11.

During the last CDBG public hearing which was held in November 2017, there were no comments from the public and the City Council directed staff to allocate funding towards street rehabilitation for four street segments and ADA pedestrian ramps city-wide, which was completed in June 2019. Staff created an application to continue the construction of street rehabilitation project and ADA pedestrian ramps city-wide. Like past applications, the City requested two years' worth of funds in order to receive an economy of scale with a larger rehabilitation project so the recently submitted application includes FY 2020-21 and 2021-22.

Staff used the following criteria to determine potential street rehabilitation projects:

- Street segments with the lowest Pavement Condition Index (PCI) from the Pavement Management Program adopted by the City Council on May 1, 2018;
- Exhibit of eligible Census areas (Attachment B) provided by the County;
- Field visits conducted by Public Works staff; and

- Block eligibility calculations, performed by the County.

Based on these criteria, the City Council approved the following street segments to be rehabilitated with the Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22 CDBG allocation:

- Crane Street from Golden Avenue to the cul-de-sac (PCI – 31 – poor)
- Golden Avenue from Acacia Street to Kempf Street (PCI – 21 – very poor)

The City has also focused additional funds received from SANDAG's Smart Growth Incentive Program to facilitate infrastructure improvements for Phases 1-3 of the Connect Main Street project. The vision is to create a community corridor that supports active lifestyles and transportation choices by providing a safe, beautiful and sustainable linear parkway that connects people, places and activities for generations to come. Construction is expected to begin in 2022.

The conversion of federally-and -state-subsidized affordable rental developments to market-rate units can constitute a substantial loss of housing opportunity for low income residents. There are six affordable housing projects located in Lemon Grove with a total of 309 affordable units (Figure 37). An analysis of units ~~are~~ at-risk of conversion over the 2021-2029 planning period is included in the Affordable Housing section of the Housing Element (Page 30).

D.3 Sites Inventory

The City's residential neighborhoods are primarily built out. Future residential development will likely occur within the City's mixed use overlay. This RHNA strategy relies on underutilized commercial properties where residential uses are permitted. Of the 1,359 RHNA units allocated to the City, only 215 units have been identified to come from residential recycling. Appendix B illustrates the location of the sites inventory for RHNA.

As Appendix B illustrates, sites to accommodate RHNA are located throughout the City. The primary housing type identified in Appendix B is multifamily, this is due to the nature of limited vacant land or redevelopment potential of existing uses/sites. Appendix B identifies the following areas to accommodate RHNA units:

- STA I (Downtown Village Specific Plan): 534 multi-family units (infill or redevelopment)
- STA II: 88 multi-family units (redevelopment)
- General Commercial Zoned Property: 592 multi-family units (redevelopment)
- Residential Zoned Property: 191 single-family and 24 multi-family (infill and redevelopment)

Affordability assumptions based on sited lower income units along mixed-use sites which are located in the commercial corridors of the City. With this distribution, lower income sites are not concentrated in a single geographic area (or areas of racial and income segregation: see discussion below).

- Improved Conditions: The spatial analysis showed that tracts with low and moderate income households, concentrated minorities, and housing problems were located in the northern tracts of the City. However, the City has also selected sites along in the southern portion of the City (Special Treatment Area II) to be able to accommodate lower income RHNA units.
- Exacerbated conditions: The census tracts with concentrated minorities, cost burdened households, and overcrowded households, can accommodate housing of a variety of income levels since these tracts have a variety of zoning – GC (mixed-use); Downtown ~~Village~~ Village Specific Plan (DVSP), Low Density Residential (1-4 du/ac); Low/Medium Density Residential (4-7 du/ac); Medium Density Residential (7-14 du/ac), and Medium/High Density Residential (14-29 du/ac), Thus, lower income sites are not concentrated in a single geographic area (or areas of racial and

income segregation: see discussion below). The City has also focused public infrastructure and beautification improvements in these areas of the City to encourage private investment and development in these areas.

D.3.1 Integration and Segregation: Race and Income

Census tracts with the highest concentration of minority races and low- and moderate-income population (LMI) are located in the northern part of the City. The sites inventory identified mixed-use (GC zone) sites in this area as well as some residential recycling sites within these tracts for housing. However, other sites in the Special Treatment Area II and the residential zones outside of the high minority concentration areas offer additional opportunities for lower income housing.

D.3.2 Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty and Affluence

While no racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (per HUD's definition) were found in Lemon Grove, some tracts with a high concentration of minorities and LMI populations were found in the northern part of the City (see above). Concentrated areas of affluence have not been identified in the City.

D.3.3 Access to Opportunity

Since the City is made up of six census tracts, all of which are considered low to moderate resource areas (Table D-34, Figure D-12), housing units in the sites inventory are not disproportionately concentrated in different resource areas. In addition, the City has identified sites in its Sites Inventory located all around the City (Appendix B).

D.3.4 Disproportionate Housing Needs

The fair housing assessment found a need for affordable housing for people with disabilities and adequate housing for large families. The City incentivizes the production of units with 3 or more bedrooms through a Density Bonus Ordinance. Program 21 encourages the continued use of the Density Bonus Ordinance. In order to alleviate overcrowding in single-family neighborhoods, Program 2 will update the accessory dwelling unit regulations to further incentivize construction.

Figure D-14 and Figure D-15 show that census tracts with the highest concentration of cost burdened and overcrowded households were in the northern areas of the City. These areas have a variety of zoning including mixed-use (GC), Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP), and a range of residential zoning that is feasible for facilitating lower income housing, and moderate income housing.

D.4 Identification and Prioritization of Contributing Factors

The following are contributing factors that affect fair housing choice in Lemon Grove. The contributing factors are listed in priority order in the table below.

Priority No.	Topic	Description	Contributing Factors	City Actions/Programs
1	<u>Insufficient and Inaccessible Outreach and Enforcement</u>	<u>The 2020 Regional AI and the Fair Housing assessment found that outreach and enforcement were inadequate. This was due most to the reliance on old print media to advertise meetings. The analysis also found that since 2020, no sites in the City were tested for potential discrimination.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Lack of a variety of media inputs</u> <u>Lack of marketing community meetings</u> <u>Insufficient fair housing</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Promote Equal Housing Opportunities & Fair Housing Services</u> <u>Promote County of</u>

			<u>law enforcement and testing</u>	<u>San Diego Home Repair Loan/Grant Programs</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Coordinate Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and Public Housing</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>Concentration of minority and low- and moderate-income population and special needs groups</u>	<p>The analysis found a concentration of low and moderate and minority households in the northern census tracts of the City. These tracts also had high constrictions of single-female <u>single female</u>—headed households with children. These tracts were also found to have higher environmental burdens. These households need increased access to affordable housing and improved infrastructure and public facilities. All of the mixed-use zones in the City are located in transit corridors, which should improve access to transit and other services for these special needs groups. In addition, by focusing housing in mixed-use zones zoned for high-density, multi-family developments subject to ADA will bring housing choices accessible to persons with disabilities. City Council has also been actively trying to improve the south/central portion of the City with the Connect Main Street infrastructure project. Program 2 will update the accessory dwelling unit regulations to further incentivize construction in overcrowded areas in the southern portion of the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lack of private investments</u> • <u>Locating and type of affordable housing</u> • <u>Inaccessible sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, or other infrastructure</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Facilitate Development of Higher Density Housing</u> • <u>Update and Utilize the updated Density Bonus Provisions adopted by City Council on May 17, 2022</u> • <u>Coordinate public outreach efforts with the County on special needs housing development</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>Displacement Risk</u>	<p>Census tracts in the northern area of the City are at risk of displacement as a high portion of their renters experience cost burdens and gross rents continue to increase.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Unaffordable rents</u> • <u>Concentration of poverty in some census tracts</u> • <u>Availability of affordable housing</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The City has adopted an ADU ordinance on May 17, 2022 consistent with State Law to provide additional</u>

				<p><u>housing options for residential at a more affordable rate with a more convenient ministerial permitting process.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Preserve affordable dwelling units that are at risk of converting to market rate by purchasing affordability contracts and working with non-profit housing organizations</u> • <u>Pursue affordable housing funding sources</u> • <u>Encourage Housing for Extremely Low-Income Households</u> • <u>By-Right Approval of Projects with 20% Affordable Units on "Reuse" Sites</u> • _____
<u>4</u>	<u>Substandard Conditions</u>	<p><u>Census tracts in the southern part of the City also have the highest proportion of housing stock over 50 years old and may need rehabilitation. The City encourages nonprofits to offer home improvements. The City also promotes home energy programs and rehabilitation services offered by SDG&E.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Age of housing stock</u> • <u>Cost of repairs or rehabilitation</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Utilize the code enforcement process and regulations to improve housing quality.</u> • _____

D.4.1 Insufficient and Inaccessible Outreach and Enforcement

The 2020 Regional AI and the Fair Housing assessment found that outreach and enforcement were inadequate. This was due most to the reliance on old print media to advertise meetings. The analysis also found that since 2020, no sites in the City were tested for potential discrimination.

Contributing Factors:

- Lack of a variety of media inputs
- Lack of marketing community meetings
- Insufficient fair housing law enforcement and testing

D.4.2 Concentration of minority and low- and moderate-income population and special needs groups

The analysis found a concentration of low and moderate and minority households in the northern census tracts of the City. These tracts also had high concentrations of single female-headed households with children. These tracts were also found to have higher environmental burdens. These households need increased access to affordable housing and improved infrastructure and public facilities. All of the mixed-use zones in the City are located in transit corridors, which should improve access to transit and other services for these special needs groups. In addition, by focusing housing in mixed-use zones zoned for high-density, multi-family developments subject to ADA will bring housing choices accessible to persons with disabilities. City Council has also been actively trying to improve the south/central portion of the City with the Connect Main Street infrastructure project. Program 2 will update the accessory dwelling unit regulations to further incentivize construction in overcrowded areas in the southern portion of the City.

Contributing Factors:

- Lack of private investments
- Locating and type of affordable housing
- Inaccessible sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, or other infrastructure

D.4.3 Displacement Risk

Census tracts in the northern area of the City are at risk of displacement as a high portion of their renters experience cost burdens and gross rents continue to increase.

Contributing Factors:

- Unaffordable rents
- Concentration of poverty in some census tracts
- Availability of affordable housing

D.4.4 Substandard Conditions

Census tracts in the southern part of the City also have the highest proportion of housing stock over 50 years old and may need rehabilitation. The City encourages nonprofits to offer home improvements. The City also promotes home energy programs and rehabilitation services offered by SDG&E.

Contributing Factors:

- ~~Age of housing stock~~
- ~~Cost of repairs or rehabilitation~~

D.5 Conclusion

The City of Lemon Grove is committed to fair housing practices that protect against housing discrimination due to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability, familial status, age, marital status, or sexual orientation, and places a high priority on promoting and ensuring open and free choice in housing for all persons. The City recognizes that free and equal access to residential housing is fundamental to meeting essential needs and pursuing personal, educational, employment or other goals.

It is the City's intent to maintain and promote a nondiscriminatory environment in all aspects of the private and publicly funded housing markets within Lemon Grove, and to foster compliance with the nondiscrimination provisions of the Fair Housing Act. The City will take the necessary steps to overcome these possible impediments to fair housing choice and continues to support its on ongoing fair housing efforts to educate residents as well as support affordable housing programs and policies as outlined.