

II. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS AND TRENDS

1. Population, Housing Units, and Households

The 2010 Census set Danville's population at 42,039 persons, inclusive of 243 persons in group quarters. The 2010 population was split between 20,313 males (48.3%) and 21,726 females (51.7%). The 2010 Census indicated 84.4% of all households were owner-occupied households (13,020 households) with the remaining 15.6% of households being renter-occupied households (2,400 households). At the time, 3.2% of all housing units were vacant (514 housing units). At the time of the 2010 Census, Danville contained 15,934 housing units, consisting of 12,067 detached single family residential units (75.7% of the total units); 2,900 attached single family residential units (18.2%); 153 multifamily units in buildings with 2-4 units per building (1.0%); and 797 multifamily units in buildings with 5-plus units per building (5.0%). (Refer to Table 2) The 2010 Census estimated that there were 514 vacant housing units in Danville, representing 3.3% of the housing units. The number of households in a community is the number of occupied housing units. Danville's vacancy rate has generally been in the range of 2% to 3%, meaning there are generally 2% to 3% less households than there are housing units. During the Great Recession the Town experienced an unusually high vacancy rate, which converted to a drop in the number of households present. The number of households in Danville was established by the 2010 Census to be 15,420 households. The number of households increased by 4,253 (a 38.1% increase) between 1990 and 2010, with the vast majority of the increase (i.e., 3,649 households - or 85.8% of the change) occurring between 1990 and 2000. Projections 2013 forecasts the number of households in Danville will increase by 520 households (+3.4%) between 2010 and 2020, taking the total to 15,940 households. To put these increases in context, the 1990 Census and 2010 Census indicated the increase in households for the entire Tri-Valley Region was 40,130 households (a 57.4% increase) from 1990 to 2010, taking the number of households from 69,866 to 109,996, with just over one half of the increase (i.e., 20,653 households - or 51.4%) occurring between 1990 and 2000. Projections 2013 forecasts the number of households in the Tri-Valley Region will increase by 10,814 households (+9.8%) between 2010 and 2020, taking the total to 120,810 households. As a result of the Great Recession, Danville and the other cities making up the Tri-Valley Region saw a decline in the number of households after the tabulation of household in the 2010 Census. The decline resulting from the Great Recession (a result in a temporary upward spike in vacancy rates for the cities in the Region) is reflected in data from the 2006-2010 ACS, which indicates a drop from the 2010 Census totals of 245 households for Danville (a 1.6% decline) and 3,556 households for the Tri-Valley Region (a 3.2% decline).

Table 2
Housing Units (1990-2013)
- Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 2 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Housing Units	1990 Census ⁽¹⁾	2000 Census ⁽²⁾	2010 DOF ⁽³⁾	2013 DOF ⁽³⁾
Total Housing Units	11,466	15,336	15,934	15,962
<i>Single Family Detached</i>	8,886 (77.5%)	11,780 (76.8%)	12,067 (75.7%)	12,091 (75.7%)
<i>Single Family Attached</i>	2,081 (18.1%)	2,592 (16.9%)	2,900 (18.2%)	2,904 (18.2%)
<i>Multifamily 2 to 4 Units</i>	150 (1.3%)	273 (1.8%)	153 (1.0%)	153 (1.0%)
<i>Multifamily 5-plus Units</i>	302 (2.6%)	691 (4.5%)	797 (5.0%)	797 (5.0%)
<i>Mobile Homes</i>	47 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	17 (0.1%)	17 (0.1%)

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing Characteristics, California.
2. US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census Count.
3. State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2013 with 2010 Census Benchmark.

Note: The drop in the number of units shown in the Multifamily 2 to 4 category between 2000 and 2010 reflects a change in methodology in the manner that single family attached units are defined. The units dropped from this category shifted into the 2010 total in the Single Family Detached category.

Table 3
Population and Households (1980 - 2010)
- Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 2 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Population and Households	1980 Census	1990 Census	2000 Census	2010 Census
Total Population	26,446	31,306	41,715	42,039
<i>In Households</i>	Not Available	30,875	41,251	41,796
<i>In Group Quarters</i>	Not Available	134	464	243
Total Households	8,357	11,167	14,816	15,420
<i>Family Households</i>	7,388 (88.4%)	9,304 (83.3%)	11,869 (80.1%)	11,978 (77.7%)
<i>With own children <18 years</i>	4,430 (53.0%)	4,547 (40.7%)	6,259 (42.2%)	5,858 (40.0%)
<i>Persons per family</i>	Not Available	3.05	3.13	3.10
Average Household Size	3.15	2.79	2.78	2.74
Vacancy Rate	Not Available	3.5% (390 units)	2.1% (314 units)	3.3% (514 units)

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census Counts SF1, SF3, DP1-DP4, CTPP, Census 2010 DP-1.

2. Age Characteristics

The median age of Danville residents in 2010 was calculated to be 44.5 years (compared to a median age of 38.5 for Contra Costa County as a whole). (Refer to Table 4) Age trends for Danville are revealed when Census 2000 data is compared to Census 2010 data. Danville's population is trending older, as evidenced by the relative decrease in the percentage of residents under five years of age (i.e., 2,961 persons for 7.1% of total population in 2000 versus 2,044 persons for 4.9% of the population in 2010) and the relative increase in the percentage of residents 65 and older in age (i.e., 4,300 persons for 10.3% of total population in 2000 versus 6,048 persons for 14.4% of the population in 2010).

Table 4
Population Characteristics (2000 & 2010)
- Town of Danville and Contra Costa County

[Amends and replaces Table 3 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Population by Gender and Age Grouping and Median Age		2000 Census - Danville	2000 Census - County	2010 Census - Danville	2010 Census - County
Population by Gender					
	<i>Total Population⁽¹⁾</i>	41,715 (100.0%)	948,816 (100.0%)	42,039 (100.0%)	1,049,025 (100.0%)
	<i>Male⁽²⁾</i>	20,228 (48.5%)	463,270 (48.8%)	20,313 (48.3%)	511,526 (48.8%)
	<i>Female⁽²⁾</i>	21,487 (51.5%)	485,546 (51.2%)	21,726 (51.7%)	537,499 (51.2%)
Population by Age Grouping ⁽³⁾					
	<i>Under 5</i>	2,961 (7.1%)	66,128 (7.0%)	2,044 (4.9%)	67,018 (6.4%)
	<i>5-19</i>	9,635 (23.1%)	208,172 (21.9%)	9,961 (23.7%)	220,495 (21.0%)
	<i>20-64</i>	24,819 (59.5%)	567,244 (59.8%)	23,986 (57.1%)	631,074 (60.2%)
	<i>65 & Older</i>	4,300 (10.3%)	107,272 (11.3%)	6,048 (14.4%)	130,438 (12.4%)
	<i>Median Age⁽³⁾</i>	39.9 years	36.4 years	44.5 years	38.5 years
	<i>Group Quarters Population⁽⁴⁾</i>	464	11,337	243	10,314
	<i>Institutionalized - Nursing Homes</i>	94	3,081	243	3,306
	<i>Institutionalized - Other</i>	-	2,211	4	2,040 ^(a)
	<i>Not Institutionalized</i>	370	4,550	56	4,968

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1:P1 and SF1:P1.
2. US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1:P12 and SF1:P12.
3. US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1:P13 and SF1:P13.
4. US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1:P37 and SF1:P20.

3. Race and Ethnicity

Danville's population is less racially diverse than Contra Costa as a whole. (Refer to Table 5) The 2010 Census indicates that Contra Costa County is now a "minority majority" County, with 52.2% of the population identifying as non-white. Data from the 2000 Census and 2010 Census also indicates both jurisdictions are becoming more diverse over time. The data indicates decreases in the percentage of residents identifying as white, with a decrease in Danville from 83.0% to 78.1% and in the County from 57.9% to 47.8% between the two survey periods.

4. Employment

Up until the early 1980's, the Tri-Valley Region was primarily a bedroom community. *Projections 1994* indicated that the Tri-Valley Region had 51,386 total households, 76,875 employed residents, and 48,775 total jobs in 1980. This meant that the area had a net surplus of housing as a function of available area jobs. Specifically, there were 0.63 jobs present in the area per employed resident in 1980. For its portion of the jobs/housing picture, Danville was estimated to have had 0.47 jobs per employed resident in 1980.

The Tri Valley Region experienced massive job growth along with an extensive amount of residential development between 1980 and 2000. The 2000 Census indicated that the Tri-Valley Region had 161,820 total jobs in 2000 (a 230+% increase from 1980). While some of this job growth is likely attributable to changes implemented in the methodology to count jobs (i.e., how home-based jobs were accounted for), it is clear that the increase in total jobs outpaced the development of total households in the area. Households were estimated to have increased by around 75% to 90,159 total households over the same period of time. (Refer to Tables 5 and 6) The 2000 Census indicated that the number of employed residents in the area has increased by around 95% between 1980 and 2000, rising to 150,080 employed residents by 2000.

The growth the area experienced favored the development of new jobs over new housing. The ratio of jobs per household shifted from 0.95 jobs per household to 1.79 jobs per household in the twenty year period. Danville's status as a net provider for housing to the area and region solidified during this period when the total number of jobs in the Tri-Valley Region caught up, and surpassed, the total number of employed residents in the area.

Table 5
Population by Race / Ethnicity (2000 & 2010)
- Town of Danville and Contra Costa County

[Amends and replaces Table 4 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Population by Race/Ethnicity ⁽¹⁾	2000 Census - Danville	2000 Census - County	2010 Census - Danville	2010 Census - County
Total Population	41,715 (100.0%)	948,816 (100.0%)	42,039 (100.0%)	1,049,025 (100.0%)
Hispanic	1,945 (4.7%)	167,776 (17.7%)	2,879 (6.8%)	255,560 (24.4%)
Not Hispanic				
<i>White – Not Hispanic^(a)</i>	34,618 (83.0%)	549,409 (57.9%)	32,834 (78.1%)	500,923 (47.8%)
<i>Black – Not Hispanic^(b)</i>	375 (0.9%)	86,851 (9.2%)	355 (0.8%)	93,604 (8.9%)
<i>AIAN – Not Hispanic^(c)</i>	66 (0.2%)	3,648 (0.4%)	47 (0.1%)	2,984 (0.3%)
<i>Asian – Not Hispanic^(d)</i>	3,722 (8.9%)	102,681 (10.8%)	4,360 (10.4%)	148,881 (14.2%)
<i>NHPI – Not Hispanic^(e)</i>	46 (0.1%)	3,157 (3.3%)	61 (0.1%)	4,382 (4.2%)
<i>Other – Not Hispanic^(f)</i>	68 (0.2%)	2,636 (0.3%)	110 (0.3%)	3,122 (0.3%)
<i>2Plus – Not Hispanic</i>	875 (2.1%)	32,658 (3.4%)	1,393 (3.3%)	39,569 (3.8%)

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1:P8 and SF1:P5.

Notes:

- a. "White" refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa. It includes people who indicated their race(s) as "White" or reported entries such as Irish, German, Italian, Lebanese, Arab, Moroccan, or Caucasian.
- b. "Black or African American" - or "Black" - refers to a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicated their race(s) as "Black, African Am., or Negro" or reported entries such as African American, Kenyan, Nigerian, or Haitian.
- c. "American Indian and Alaska Native" - or "AIAN" - refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment. This category includes people who indicated their race(s) as "American Indian or Alaska Native" or reported their enrolled or principal tribe, such as Navajo, Blackfeet, Inupiat, Yup'ik, or Central American Indian groups or South American Indian groups.
- d. "Asian" refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam. It includes people who indicated their race(s) as "Asian" or reported entries such as "Asian Indian," "Chinese," "Filipino," "Korean," "Japanese," "Vietnamese," and "Other Asian" or provided other detailed Asian responses.
- e. "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" - or "NHPI" refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands. It includes people who indicated their race(s) as "Pacific Islander" or reported entries such as "Native Hawaiian," "Guamanian or Chamorro," "Samoan," and "Other Pacific Islander" or provided other detailed Pacific Islander responses.
- f. "Other" includes all other responses not included in the White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander race categories described above. Respondents reporting entries such as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a Hispanic or Latino group (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish) in response to the race question are included in this category.

Table 6
Total Population / Household Population / Households (1980 - 2010)
- Town of Danville and Tri-Valley Region

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 5 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Total Population		1990 Census⁽¹⁾	2000 Census⁽¹⁾	2010 Census⁽¹⁾	2020 Projection⁽³⁾
Danville Total Population		31,306	41,715	42,039	43,500
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	33.2%	0.8%	3.5%
Tri-Valley Region Total Population		197,132	253,409	311,476	339,300
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	28.6%	22.9%	8.9%
	<i>Danville as a Percentage of Tri-Valley</i>	15.9%	16.5%	13.5%	12.8%
Household Population		1990 Census⁽¹⁾	2000 Census⁽¹⁾	2010 Census⁽¹⁾	-
Danville Household Population		30,875	41,251	41,796	-
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	33.6%	1.3%	-
Tri-Valley Region Household Population		192,550	247,132	304,418	-
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	28.3%	23.2%	-
	<i>Danville as a Percentage of Tri-Valley</i>	16.0%	16.7%	13.7%	-
Households		1990 Census⁽¹⁾	2000 Census⁽¹⁾	2010 Census⁽¹⁾	2020 Projection⁽⁵⁾
Danville Households		11,167	14,816	15,420	15,940
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	32.7%	4.1%	3.4%
Tri-Valley Region Households		69,866	90,519	109,996	120,810
	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	29.6%	21.5%	9.0%
	<i>Danville as a Percentage of Tri-Valley</i>	16.0%	16.4%	14.0%	13.2%

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 1990, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts.
2. American Community Survey 2006-2010 5-year estimates.
3. ABAG, *Projections 2013 2020 Total Population*.
4. American Community Survey 2007-2011 5-year estimates.
5. ABAG, *Projections 2013 2020 Households*.

Note: The Tri-Valley Region includes the incorporated jurisdictions of Danville and San Ramon for the Contra Costa County sub-region and the incorporated jurisdictions of Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore for the Alameda County sub-region.

Table 7
Jobs / Employed Persons (1990 - 2020)
- Town of Danville and Tri-Valley Region

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 6 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Jobs	1990 Projection⁽¹⁾	2000 Census⁽²⁾	2010 Census⁽²⁾	2020 Projection⁽³⁾
Danville Jobs	8,800	13,760	13,460	15,680
<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	56.4%	(3.0%)	16.5%
Tri-Valley Region Jobs	125,360	161,820	167,020	200,970
<i>Percentage Increase</i>		29.1%	3.2%	20.3%
<i>Danville as a Percentage of Tri-Valley</i>	7.0%	8.5%	8.1%	7.8%
Employed Persons	1990 Census⁽²⁾	2000 Census⁽²⁾	2006-2010 ACS⁽⁴⁾	--
Danville Employed Persons	17,052	20,907	19,005	-
<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	22.6%	(9.1%)	-
Tri-Valley Region Employed Persons	108,876	133,277	147,620	-
<i>Percentage Increase</i>	-	22.4%	10.7%	-
<i>Danville as a Percentage of Tri-Valley</i>	15.7%	15.7%	12.9%	-

Sources:

1. ABAG, *Projections 2007*. 1990 Total Jobs.
2. US Census Bureau, 1990, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts.
3. ABAG, *Projections 2013*. 2020 Total Population.
4. American Community Survey 2006-2010 5-year estimates.

Note: The Tri-Valley Region includes the incorporated jurisdictions of Danville and San Ramon for the Contra Costa County sub-region and the incorporated jurisdictions of Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore for the Alameda County sub-region.

Projections 2013 forecasts that the prior trends in place for the region continue through to the year 2020. *Projections 2013* estimates that total jobs in the Tri-Valley Region will increase by 33,950 (20.3%) in the decade, rising to 200,970 total jobs from the 2010 total of 167,020 jobs. *Projections 2013* estimates the number of households added to the area will increase by 25,436 (6.8%) in the decade, rising to 120,810 households from the 2010 total of 109,996 households. *Projections 2013* estimates the population added to the area will increase by 27,824 (9.0%) in the decade, rising to 339,300 persons from the 2010 total of 311,476 persons.

As the current decade concludes, the Tri-Valley area will have experienced a 40-year conversion from bedroom community to major employment center. Total jobs in the area will have increased by more than a 412% increase (200,970 jobs projected in 2020 compared to 48,775 jobs estimated to have been present in 1980). Meanwhile, total households in the area will have increased by over 250%

in the same time frame (120,810 households projected in 2020 compared to 47,081 households estimated to have been present in 1980). Total population in the area will have increased by over 230% in the time frame (339,300 persons projected in 2020 compared to 145,807 persons estimated to have been present in 1980).

B. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

1. Household Type

Housing needs and/or desires vary with household type. According to the 2010 Census, a large percentage of Danville's households are family households (77.7%). For Contra Costa County at large, the 2010 Census indicates that 70.4% of households were family households. Except for the larger number of households that are family households, household compositions in Danville are generally similar to household compositions present at the countywide level.

Danville has a wide range of housing product types. Home to one of the State's first Planned Unit Developments, Danville has, since the 1970's, provided for mixed residential densities in its various neighborhoods. As of January 1, 2014, Danville's housing stock consisted of 12,091 detached single family residential units (75.7% of all units); 2,904 attached single family residential units (18.2%); 153 multifamily residential structures with 2 to 4 units (1.0%); and 797 multifamily residential structures with 5 or more units (5.0%). (Refer to Table 2)

2. Household Size

The 2010 Census determined Danville's average household size to be 2.74 persons per household (down from 2.78 for the average household size determined by the 2000 Census). Both the California Department of Finance and the Bureau of Census had shown a trend for household size decline in Danville - but the Department of Finance has shown an incremental increase each year since 2010, with household size estimated to again having reached 2.78 persons by the start of 2014.

The Bureau of Census estimated Danville's the average household size at 3.15 in the 1980 Census (Refer to Table 3) The reduction in the average household size has impacted Danville's rate of population increase. While the number of households increased by 4.1% from 2000 to 2010 (from 14,816 to 15,420), Danville's population only increased 0.8% (from 41,715 to 42,039) - with this limited increase also influenced by a temporary rise in the vacancy rate of housing units in Danville. (Refer to Tables 3 and 8)

Table 8
Household by Type / Housing Tenure (1990, 2000, 2010 & 2007-2013)
- Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces Table 7 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Household Characteristics	1990 Census ⁽²⁾	2000 Census ⁽³⁾	2010 Census ⁽⁴⁾	2007-2011 or 2011-2013 ACS
Total Households	11,167	15,130	15,934	Not Available
Occupied Housing Units	11,064	14,816	15,420	Not Available
<i>Owner-Occupied</i>	9,632 (87.1%)	13,198 (89.1%)	13,020 (84.4%)	Not Available
<i>Renter-Occupied</i>	1,414 (12.8%)	1,618 (10.9%)	2,400 (15.6%)	Not Available
<i>Vacant Units</i>	Not Available	314 (2.1%)	514 (3.2%)	Not Available
Family Households - Total	9,115 (82.4%)	11,865 (80.1%)	11,978 (77.7%)	Not Available
<i>With Own Children <18 yrs.</i>	Not Available	6,249 (42.2%)	5,858 (38.0%)	Not Available
Female Householder - Total	746 (6.7%)	1,049 (8.8%)	1,140 (9.5%)	Not Available
<i>With Own Children <18 yrs.</i>	Not Available	670 (63.9%)	657 (57.6%)	Not Available
Non-Family Household - Total	1,949 (17.6%)	2,951 (19.9%)	2,951 (19.9%)	Not Available
<i>Householder Living Alone</i>	1,413 (12.8%)	2,295 (10.9%)	Not Available	Not Available
Householder ≥ 65 Living Alone	372 (3.4%)	826 (5.6%)	Not Available	Not Available
<i>Female ≥ 65 Living Alone</i>	280 (2.5%)	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
Households with Individuals <18 yrs.	4,547 (40.7%)	6,432 (43.4%)	5,858 (38.0%)	Not Available
Households with Individuals ≥ 65 yrs.	1,757 (15.9%)	2,779 (18.8%)	4,170 (27.0%)	Not Available
Average Household Size	2.79	2.78	2.71	Not Available
Average Family Size	3.05	3.13	3.10	Not Available
Median Value Owner-Occupied Units	\$358,200	\$541,400	Not Available	\$822,300
Median Gross Rent Renter-Occupied Units	\$999	\$1,604	Not Available	\$2,000+
Median Household Income	\$74,472	\$114,064	Not Available	\$130,946
Median Family Income	\$78,863	\$125,867	Not Available	\$152,639
Per Capita Income	\$31,265	\$50,773	Not Available	\$60,833
Families Below Poverty Level	Not Available	1.3%	Not Available	3.1%
<i>% Female Households In Poverty</i>	Not Available	5.3%	Not Available	22.3%
<i>% Female HHLDs w/ Children <18 In Poverty</i>	Not Available	7.3%	Not Available	29.9%
Individuals in Poverty	657 (2.1%)	908 (2.2%)	Not Available	4.9%

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 1990, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts SF1, SF3, DP1-DP4, CTPP, Census 2010 DP-1.
2. 2007-2011 ACS 5-year estimates.
3. 2011-2013 ACS 3-year estimates.

Note: There may be high margins of error associated with the 2007-2011 ACS data pertaining to Families Below Poverty Level and Individuals in Poverty due to the small sample size used to make the estimate.

3. Household Income

Household income greatly influences housing opportunities as it directly affects a household's ability to balance expenditures on housing costs against expenditures for other, basic necessities. Average household incomes for the San Ramon Valley are high compared to average incomes for the County and for the Bay Area Region. The 2000 Census estimated median household incomes in Danville to be \$114,064 (as compared to a median income Countywide of \$63,675). For context, converting this estimate to 2011 dollars raises the median household income to \$153,986, with the converted median income Countywide at \$85,961. Estimates from the 2007-2011 ACS indicate Danville experienced a 13.4% drop in median income from 2000 to 2011 in adjusted dollars, with the 2011 median income estimated to be \$133,360. Median income Countywide also dropped in the period, falling to \$79,135, a 7.9% drop from the income levels of 2000.

The reported poverty rate in Danville was 2.2% according to the 2010 Census and was 4.3% in 2011 according to the 2007-2011 ACS.

4. Overpaying for Housing

Median income levels for a community only partially reflect how household income levels may affect the ability to secure housing. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), households should spend less than 30 percent of their income on housing, including utilities, taxes, and insurance. However, an estimated 45 percent of the households in Contra Costa County have a cost burden of more than 30 percent. This is an increase of 42 percent since 2000.

The 2006-2010 ACS estimated that 465 of Danville's 2,205 renter-occupied households present at the time (21.1%) assigned between 30% and 50% of their total income to housing costs in 2010, with another 470 renter-occupied households (21.3%) estimated to be assigning over 50% of their total income to housing costs at that time. The 2006-2010 ACS estimated that 3,115 of Danville's 12,970 owner-occupied households present at the time (24.0%) assigned between 30% and 50% of their total income to housing costs in 2010, with another 2,240 owner-occupied households (17.3%) estimated to be assigning over 50% of their total income to housing costs. **(Refer to Table 9)**

Incurring housing costs in excess of 50% of household income is particularly a concern to lower income households which have little margin to cover extra expenditures.

Table 9
Renter-Occupied and Owner-Occupied Households Overpaying for Housing
- Town of Danville (2006-2010)

[Amends and replaces Table 8 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Renter-Occupied and Owner-Occupied Households Overpaying for Housing ⁽¹⁾	Total Renter-Occupied Units	Very Low Income Units (<50% of Median)	Low Income Units (>50 to <80% of Median)	Moderate Income Units (>80 to <120% of Median)	Above Moderate Income Units (>120% of Median)
Renter-Occupied Units (Renter Households)	2,205	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	Not Calculated
<i>Lower Income Renters Paying >30% but <50%</i>	465 (21.1%)	50 (2.3%)	110 (5.0%)	155 (7.0%)	150 (6.8%)
<i>Lower Income Renters Paying >50%</i>	470 (21.3%)	315 (14.3%)	135 (6.1%)	20 (0.9%)	0 (N/A)
Owner-Occupied Units (Owner Households)	12,970	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	Not Calculated	Not Calculated
<i>Lower Income Owners Paying >30% but <50%</i>	3,115 (24.0%)	130 (0.1%)	125 (0.1%)	375 (0.3%)	2,485 (19.1%)
<i>Lower Income Owners Paying >50%</i>	2,240 (17.3%)	595 (4.6%)	460 (3.5%)	440 (3.4%)	735 (5.7%)

Source: American Community Survey 2006-2010 - CHAS Data Sets Table 12.

Note: ABAG advises that there are high margins of error associated with the 2006-2010 CHAS data.

Supportive housing **is a housing option that** has a demonstrated ability to assist extremely low income and very low income households.

Housing policies established for this planning period should favor assistance to extremely low income and very low income households where such policies would lead to deeper income subsidies, housing supportive services, or shared housing options, or rent subsidies/vouchers or the equivalent.

5. Overcrowding

In order to avoid extraordinary housing costs, many lower income households rent smaller apartments or live with friends or relatives to economize on housing costs. For the purposes of this report, overcrowding is defined as households with more than one occupant per room.

The 1990 Census reported overcrowding in 66 of Danville's 11,064 occupied units (<0.5%). The 2000 Census reported overcrowding in 157 (1.0%) of Danville's 15,027 occupied units. **The 2006-2010 ACS estimated that 75 owner-occupied units in Danville were over-crowded and 25 owner-occupied units were**

considered to be severely over-crowded. The 2006-2010 ACS estimated that 35 renter-occupied units in Danville were over-crowded and that there were no severely over-crowded renter-occupied units. The 2006-2010 ACS defined over-crowded conditions as a condition of greater than one but less than one and one half persons per room. Severely over-crowded conditions were considered to be present by the 2006-2010 ACS were greater than one and one half persons per room were determined to be present. (Refer to Table 10)

Table 10
Renter-Occupied and Owner-Occupied Households that live with
Overcrowding or Severe Overcrowding (2006-2010) - Town of Danville
 [Amends and replaces, in part, Table 8 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Overcrowded or Severely Overcrowded Renter-Occupied and Owner-Occupied Households ⁽¹⁾	Danville	Contra Costa County
Total Households (Occupied Units)	15,175	364,085
Renter-Occupied Households (Occupied Units)	2,337	134,085
<i>Overcrowded Renter Households</i>	35	6,789
<i>Severely Overcrowded Renter Households</i>	0	1,665
Owner-Occupied Households (Occupied Units)	13,234	246,051
<i>Overcrowded Owner Households</i>	75	4,258
<i>Severely Overcrowded Owner Households</i>	25	1,032

Source: 2006-2010 ACS (CHAS Data Sets Table 10) and 2011-2013 ACS.

Notes:

- a. ABAG advises that there are high margins of error associated with the 2006-2010 CHAS data.
- b. An “overcrowded” housing condition is considered to exist where there is greater than one but less than or equal to one and one half persons per room present.
- c. A “severely overcrowded” housing condition is considered to exist where there is greater than one and one half persons per room present.

Overcrowding in Danville is not considered to be a significant issue. Where overcrowding is present in Danville, it tends to be larger family households in owner-occupied homes with multiple bedrooms, rather than families crowding into one bedroom rental apartments.

C. SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

Certain groups have greater difficulty in finding decent, affordable housing due to their special needs and/or circumstances. Special circumstances may be related to one’s employment and income, family characteristics, disability, and household characteristics. As a result, certain residents may experience a higher prevalence of lower income and/or housing cost burden, overcrowding, or other housing problems.

In the context of this document, special needs groups include the following: senior households, physically and mentally disabled (including developmental disabled) persons, large family households, single-parent households (female-headed households with children in particular), homeless persons, and agricultural workers. This section provides discussion of the housing needs facing each particular group as well as programs and services available to address their housing needs. The US Census Bureau's 2008-2012 ACS provides the most current data available and is the primary source used to estimate the size of a particular group. **Table 11** summarizes the special needs groups.

1. Senior Households

Senior households have special housing needs primarily due to three major concerns - physical disabilities/limitations; income; and health care costs. In 2000, 4,300 persons (10.3% of Danville's total population) were ≥ 65 years in age. By 2010 that number had increased to 6,048 (14.4% of the total population). To underscore Danville's trend towards an older population, the 1990 Census showed 2,658 persons were ≥ 65 years in age in Danville and the 1980 Census showed that only 4.9% of the Danville population was ≥ 65 years in age (1,450 persons).

Some of the special needs of seniors are as follows:

- Limited Income - Many seniors have limited income available for health and other expenses. The 2011-2013 ACS estimated that 6.3% of persons 65 years and over had income in the prior twelve months below the poverty level.
- Disabilities - The 2011-2013 ACS estimates that 2,001 of Danville's 7,209 seniors 65 years or over in age has a disability limitation (27.7% of seniors).
- The 2011-2013 ACS estimated that there were 1,742 households in Danville with one or more person present 65 years and over. Because of physical and/or other limitations, seniors may have difficulty in carrying out regular home maintenance or repair activities.

Various programs such as congregate care, supportive services, rental subsidies, and housing rehabilitation assistance can address the special needs of seniors. For the frail elderly, or those with disabilities, housing with architectural design features that accommodate disabilities can help ensure continued independent living. Elderly with mobility/self-care limitations also benefit from transportation alternatives.

The Contra Costa County Advisory Council on Aging has adopted Best Practice Development Guidelines for multifamily Senior Housing projects. These guidelines provide a framework to help guide the planning, design, and review of new senior housing developments in the County. The guidelines are an information tool for local community groups, architects, planners, and developers. Senior housing with supportive services can be provided for those who require assistance with daily living.

Social and supportive services are available in Contra Costa County through various agencies and organizations, including the County Area Agency on Aging and the John Muir Senior Services Program. Multiple service providers offer an array of assistance including Alzheimer's service programs, respite care, day programs, addiction services, financial assistance, and Meals on Wheels.

The County Area Agency on Aging, in particular, offers information services for seniors on a variety of topics, including: health, housing, nutrition, activities, help in home, employment, legal matters, transportation, financial or personal problems, paralegal advice, health screening, and day activities for the disabled. (Refer to Tables 11 and 12)

2. Persons with Disabilities

Physical, mental, and/or developmental disabilities may prevent a person from working, restrict one's mobility, or make it difficult to care for them. Disabled persons often have special housing needs, may have limited earning capacity, and often incur higher health costs due to the disability. Some residents suffer from disabilities that require living in a supportive or institutional setting. The U.S. Census Bureau defines six types of disabilities: hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living difficulties.

The 2011-2013 3-Year ACS estimated that 3,012 disabled persons resided in Danville (with a margin of error estimated to be +/-542 persons), representing approximately 7.1% of Danville's total population (+/-1.3%).

The breakdown of disabled persons in Danville in the six categories was estimated as follows: 1,129 persons with a hearing difficulty; 228 persons with a vision difficulty; 1,313 persons with a cognitive difficulty; 1,473 persons with an ambulatory difficulty; 787 persons with a self-care difficulty; and 1,330 persons with an independent living difficulty.

It is noted that the disabilities are not category-exclusive (i.e., one person may have multiple disabilities) and the estimates have a high margin of error.

Table 11
Special Needs Groups - Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces Table 9 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Special Needs Group	Contra Costa County		Danville	
	Persons ⁽⁸⁾	Households	Persons ⁽⁷⁾	Households
Household Population/Households	1,038,711	375,364	41,796	15,420
Person with a Disability ⁽¹⁾	102,983 (9.9%)	-	3,050 (7.3%)	-
Seniors (≥65 years old) ⁽¹⁾	130,438 (12.6%)	-	6,048 (14.5%)	-
<i>Owners</i>	64,753 (6.2%)	-	3,141 (7.5%)	-
<i>Renters</i>	15,583 (1.5%)	-	586 (1.4%)	-
<i>Below Poverty Line⁽²⁾</i>	8,002 (0.8%)	-	345 (0.8%)	-
<i>Living Alone⁽²⁾</i>	33,082 (3.2%)	-	1,403 (3.4%)	-
Employed with a Disability ⁽³⁾	17,404 (1.7%)	-	475 (1.1%)	-
Unemployed with a Disability ⁽³⁾	4,054 (0.4%)	-	124 (0.3%)	-
Developmentally Disabled ⁽⁴⁾	3,900 (0.4%)	-	172	-
Total Family Households ⁽¹⁾	-	265,280 (70.7%)	-	11,978 (77.7%)
<i>Female Headed Family⁽⁵⁾</i>	-	46,706 (12.4%)	-	1,140 (7.4%)
<i>Female HF - children <18 age</i>	-	28,241 (7.5%)	-	657 (4.3%)
<i>Female HF - no children <18 age</i>	-	18,285 (6.9%)	-	483 (3.1%)
Large Family Households	-	41,328 (11.0%)	-	1,506 (9.8%)
<i>Owners</i>	-	29,082 (7.7%)	-	1,380 (8.9%)
<i>Renters</i>	-	12,246 (3.3%)	-	126 (0.9%)
Homeless ⁽⁶⁾	6,635 (2,386 Unsheltered)	-	4 (All Unsheltered)	-

Sources:

1. American Community Survey 2008-2012 5-year estimates (Seniors: Table B25007) (Disabled: Table S1810) (Single Parent Household: Table B11001) (Large Family Household: Table B25009) (Agricultural Workers: Table 3224050).
2. American Community Survey 2007-2011 5-year estimates.
3. American Community Survey 2009-2011 3-year estimates.
4. California Department of Development Services, Regional Center of the East Bay (Developmentally Disabled).
5. 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census (SF1:P35)(SF1:P39)
6. ABAG and Contra Costa County Homeless Count.
7. 2010 Decennial Census SF1:P1

Notes:

- a. Agricultural Workers includes all non-management agricultural works as a percent of employed person aged 16 and over.
- b. ABAG advises that there is a high margin of error associated with the 2007-2011 ACS data.
- c. ABAG and Contra Costa County Homeless Count have differing estimates. Homeless number under the County heading is for the entire County, not just the unincorporated portion of Contra Costa County.
- d. ACS data indicates the Town does not have any individuals employed in the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, and Mining Sector.

Table 12
Licensed Community Care Facilities (August 2014)
- Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces Table 10 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Type of Facility	Number of Facilities	Capacity	Capacity by Type of Disability ^(a)			
			Dementia	Developmental	Hospice	Elderly
Adult and Elderly Facilities						
Adult Day Program Facility ^(b)	1	3	-	-	-	-
Adult Residential Facility ^(c)	2	12	-	6	-	-
Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFE) ^(d)						
≤6 Resident Capacity	23	138	54	-	30	54
>6 Resident Capacity	4	373	-	-	36	337
Subtotal	30	526	54	6	66	342
Children's Residential Facilities						
Crisis Nursery ^(e)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Group Homes ^(f)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Small Family Homes ^(g)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foster Family Home ^(h)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Large Family Child Care Home	1 (2 PSOI)	14 (26 SOI)	-	-	-	-
Licensed Child Care Facility						
Family Child Care Homes ⁽ⁱ⁾						
Small Family Child Care Home	20 (1 SOI)	1,284 (127 SOI)	-	-	-	-
Large Family Child Care Home			-	-	-	-
Child Care Center ^(j)	tbd	tbd	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	tbd	tbd	-	-	-	-
Infant Center	3	50	-	-	-	-

Source: State of California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division. August, 2104.

Notes:

- a. The dashes (“-”) indicate no facilities of that type shown on State database for Danville as of review date.
- b. The specialized care columns are not mutually exclusive.
- c. “Adult Day Program Facility” means a community-based facility or program that provides care to persons 18 years of age or older in need of personal services, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living or for the protection of these individuals on less than a 24-hour basis
- d. “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.
- e. “Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly” (RCFE) provide care, supervision and assistance with activities of daily living, such as bathing and grooming and may also provide incidental medical services. The facilities 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.
- f. "Crisis Nursery" means a facility licensed to provide short-term, 24-hour non-medical residential care and supervision for children under six years of age, who are either: (a) voluntarily placed by a parent or legal guardian due to a family crisis or a stressful situation, for no more than 30 days, or (b) temporarily placed by the county child welfare services agency for typically no more than 14 days.
- g. "Group Home" means a facility which provides 24-hour-a-day care and supervision to children (generally nonmedical care); provides services to a specific client group; and maintains a structured environment, with such services provided at least in part by staff employed by the licensee. Since small family and foster family homes, by definition, care for six or fewer children only, any facility providing 24-hour care for seven or more children must be licensed as a group home facility.

- h. 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.
- i. Foster Family Homes provide 24-hour care and supervision in the licensee's family residence for no more than six children. Care is provided to children who are mentally disabled, developmentally disabled, or physically handicapped, children who have been removed from their home because of neglect or abuse, and children who require special health care needs and supervision as a result of such disabilities.
- j. "Family Child Care Homes" must be in the licensee's own home. A FCCH reflects a home-like environment where non-medical care and supervision is provided for periods of less than 24 hours. Small Family Child Care Homes provide care to no more than 8 children. Large Family Child Care Homes provide care to no more than 14 children.
- j. "Child Care Centers" (CCCs) are usually located in a commercial building. Non-medical care and supervision is provided for infant to school-age children in a group setting for periods of less than 24 hours.

The living arrangement of disabled persons depends on the severity of the disability. Many live at home independently or with other family members. To maintain independent living, disabled persons may need assistance. This can include special housing design features for the disabled, income support for those who are unable to work, and in-home supportive services for persons with medical conditions among others. Services are typically provided by both public and private agencies. It is recognized that there is a scarcity of appropriate housing for persons with disabilities and that there is a need for more accessible, adaptable, and affordable housing.

The County has provided HOME funds to several projects in the County for disabled populations, including: Belle Terre located in Lafayette; Berrellesa Palms located in Martinez; and Third Avenue located in Walnut Creek. The development of these projects reflects a growing recognition of the significant housing needs of the disabled. The County Health Services Department, in cooperation with the Department of Conservation and Development, uses Mental Health Services Act funds to support permanent supportive housing, with seven projects funded to date.

Both the federal Fair Housing Amendment 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.

The Town analyzed its zoning regulations, permitting procedures, development standards, and building codes to identify potential constraints for housing for persons with disabilities. The Town's findings of that analysis are described below.

a. Zoning Regulations

State law preempts local zoning controls over certain licensed residential care facilities. If a licensed facility serves six or fewer persons (a “small family care facility”), the law states this is a residential use and, therefore, cannot be treated any differently than a typical family living situation. This means that the Town cannot require any special permits, business license, home occupation permit, fire code restrictions, building codes, etc. unless such is required of any other family dwelling. Occupancy (i.e., the number of people in the family) is limited by the Uniform Housing Code, which applies to all residences, and is based on the size of each bedroom.

A residential care facility serving between seven and twelve clients (a “large family care facility”) may operate in all residential zones upon submittal and approval of a Land Use Permit. Criteria that would be used to review the merits of such permits would be limited to specific performance standards (primarily traffic generation and safety standards) and are not specific to the proposed use.

Occupancy standards for residential care facilities are the same as those for all other residential uses as promulgated by the California State Fire Marshal’s Office. The Town has not adopted a minimum spacing standard for residential care facilities. Except as provided under Government Code Section 65008, the Town cannot impose different requirements on residential developments which are subsidized, financed, insured or otherwise publically assisted than are different than would be imposed on non-assisted developments.

The Land Use Element of the General Plan provides for the development of multifamily housing in the four land use categories, the fourth category - i.e., Multifamily - High Density (25 - 30 units per acre) - having been established through the adoption of the Danville 2030 General Plan. Zoning districts deemed consistent with these land use categories include all the M-Districts listed in the Municipal Code and the P-1 District. Regular multifamily housing for persons with special needs, such as apartments for seniors and for persons with disabilities, are considered regular residential uses permitted by right under these land use categories and zoning districts.

Flexibility in development standards is reasonable, and provided, to accommodate requests from persons with disabilities to ensure that homes are accessible for the mobility impaired. The Building Division provides ongoing assistance for rehabilitation efforts for single family properties and for public facilities to install necessary accommodations, including installation of accessibility ramps and railings to meet handicapped accessibility needs.

Accommodation is given (as directed by the Town's Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance approved in September, 2014) for improvements needed to enhance accessibility, regardless of whether they may result in conflicts with other requirements in the Municipal Code (e.g., numerical and/or dimensional requirements for parking may be modified to install handicap parking).

The Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance allows requests for reasonable accommodation to be granted by the Chief of Planning. If the physical expression of the reasonable accommodation is visible from the street fronting the affected property, the Chief of Planning may refer the request to the Design Review Board and/or to the Planning Commission. Public notice, where such referral is made, is to be consistent with the public noticing process for comparable items.

b. Building Codes

The Development Services Department - Building Division actively enforces 2013 California Building Code provisions that regulate the access and adaptability of buildings to accommodate persons with disabilities. No unique restrictions are in place that would constrain the development of housing for persons with disabilities. Government Code Section 12955.1 directs that a minimum of 10 percent of the total dwelling units in multifamily buildings without elevators consisting of three or more rental units or four or more condominium units abide to the following building standards to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities:

- The primary entry to the dwelling unit shall be on an accessible route (unless exempted by a site impracticality test);
- The dwelling unit shall have an adaptable design relative to the accessible route through the unit, the design and location of environmental controls such as light switches, reinforcement of bathroom walls for retrofit for later accessibility improvements such as grab bars, and ability to readily retrofit the kitchen to accommodate the needs of an individual in a wheelchair;
- At least one powder room or bathroom shall be located on the primary entry level served by an accessible route.

c. Planning Entitlement Permitting Fees and Review Process

Development Services Department and Community Development Department fees and development impact fees can increase the cost of housing and, therefore, can potentially constrain the development of housing for persons with disabilities, many of whom are of lower income due to earning limitations. The

Town has provided fee waivers and fee deferrals, relaxed parking standards, and **authorized** other incentives to reduce the cost of development for housing projects serving special needs populations.

It **is** appropriate for the Town to **systematically** analyze its fee schedule and planning entitlement review and permitting process **on an ongoing basis** to assure reasonable accommodation is **being** provided to future housing projects serving special needs groups, including seniors and persons with disabilities, with funding assistance and other regulatory concessions/incentives.

d. Definition of Family

The Town cannot impose different requirements on residential developments, or emergency shelters, than those imposed on developments generally because of the race, sex, color, religion, ethnicity, national origin, ancestry, lawful occupation, family status, disability, and/or age of the intended occupants, or because the development is intended for occupancy by persons and families of low, moderate, or middle income, except as provided Government Code Section 65008.

As part of the recent update to the single family residential and multifamily regulations (see Town Council Resolution Nos. 2014-03, 2014-04 and 2014-05), the Town formalized the definition of "Family" in the Municipal Code. The Town does not regulate residency by discriminating between biologically related and unrelated persons nor does it regulate or enforce the number of persons constituting a family.

3. Developmental Disabilities

SB 812, which took effect January 2011, amended State housing element law to require an evaluation of the special housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. A "developmental disability" is defined as a disability that originates before an individual becomes 18 years old, continues or can be expected to continue indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. Developmental disabilities include intellectual disabilities, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This term does not include disabilities that are solely physical in nature, though there are a significant number of persons with developmental disabilities who also require adaptations in their housing to address physical disabilities.

Most developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals may require a supervised group living environment. Historically, the most severely

affected individuals lived in an institutional environment where on-site medical attention and physical therapy are provided. In recent years, many adults living in institutional settings have transitioned to community-based housing and services. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, the first housing issue for the developmentally disabled is the transition from living at home with a parent/guardian as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult. The State Department of Developmental Services currently provides community based services to approximately 243,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two community-based facilities. The Regional Center of the East Bay (RCEB) serves Alameda and Contra Costa counties. RCEB works in partnership with many individuals and other agencies to plan and coordinate services and supports for people with developmental disabilities.

A community-based Board of Directors, which includes individuals with developmental disabilities, family members and community leaders, provides guidance and leadership. In addition, the Housing Consortium of the East Bay (RCEB) provides housing outreach and support services; develops affordable housing, partners with other nonprofit and for profit companies to secure set-asides within larger rental communities; and owns and operates special needs affordable housing. RCEB staff, in partnership with Developmental Disabilities Board Area 5, provided housing need information for individuals with developmental disabilities for Contra Costa. This data is available at the city level and indicates that Danville has 172 developmentally disabled residents who are considered eligible for social services from the Regional Center for the East Bay. Of this total, 87 are 18 years of age or less, 81 are between the ages of 19 and 64, and four are age 65 or older.

There are a number of housing types appropriate for people living with a development disability: licensed and unlicensed single-family homes, Housing Choice vouchers (Section 8), and affordable housing with rent restrictions may all be appropriate options. Unless an individual is able to receive significant subsidies, homeownership is not a viable option in Danville for the developmentally disabled. Considerations for housing siting and development include proximity to transit and services, and physical accessibility to the unit.

Danville will continue to support housing developments and opportunities such as those listed above.

4. Single Parent Households

Because of their relatively lower incomes and high living expenses, single-parent households generally have difficulty finding affordable, decent and safe housing.

These households have special needs relating to access to childcare, health care and other supportive services. The 2011-2013 ACS estimated that 917 of all households in Danville (5.9%) were headed by a single parent. The 2007-2011 5-Year ACS estimated that while only 2.9% of Danville's households had household incomes placing them below poverty level, household incomes of 22.3% of female headed households were below poverty level and household incomes of 29.9% of female headed households with children under 18 were below poverty level.

5. Large Households

Large households are defined as households containing five or more persons. Because there is a limited supply of adequately sized households to accommodate large households, they are considered a special need group. Because there is often a need for large households to save for non-housing related expenses, these households often reside in relatively smaller units, resulting in overcrowded living conditions. The 2007-2011 ACS estimated that 1,525 Danville households included five or more people (9.9% of all households) – qualifying them as large family households. As a subset of this total, it was estimated there were 199 renter-occupied large family households. While large family households do not necessarily live in overcrowded or severely overcrowded conditions, the 2006-2010 ACS estimated there were 35 renter-occupied overcrowded households, 75 owner-occupied overcrowded households and 25 owner-occupied severely overcrowded households in Danville.

6. Agricultural Workers

Agricultural workers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. According to the 2000 Census, 16 persons in Danville were employed in the farming, forestry, and fishing occupational category (down from an estimate of 112 persons in the 1990 Census). Farmworkers are generally considered to have special housing needs because of their limited income and the seasonal nature of their employment.

According to the 2012 Agricultural Census, 2,049 workers were employed on farms in Contra Costa County, with a reported 89 migrant workers. The majority of the farmworker population in the unincorporated areas consists of resident-households requiring permanent affordable housing rather than migratory workers with seasonal housing needs. Currently, the Danville Municipal Code permits farmworker housing for seasonal workers in agricultural districts (i.e., the A-2 and A-4 zoning districts) subject to approval of a land use permit.

The Town of Danville complies with the Employee Housing Act (California Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6) as regards the housing needs of agricultural workers.

7. Extremely Low Income Households

Extremely low income households – those earning less than 30 percent of area median income – face significant housing needs. In accordance with Chapter 891, Statutes of 2006 (AB 2634), cities must quantify the existing and projected extremely low income households and analyze their needs.

Data from the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), taken from the 2006-2010 ACS, estimated the number of extremely low income households in Danville to be 625 households. Results from past decennial census counts point to the probability that many of these households are occupied by senior citizens. As seniors are typically on fixed incomes, an increase in rents can have a considerable impact on extremely low income senior renters. Senior homeowners with extremely low incomes also face significant needs related to maintaining their homes. Again as shown by data from prior census counts, it can be assumed that many of these extremely low income households experience overpayment and/or have at least one type of housing problem.

Housing types to accommodate the needs of extremely low income households include transitional and supportive housing, multifamily rental housing, rental housing included as part of a mixed use project (e.g., residential-over-commercial housing), factory-built housing, workforce housing and mobile homes.

8. Homeless Persons

In January 2013, the County Homeless Program staff, assisted by various homeless service programs and volunteers, conducted the biannual homeless census of sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness in Contra Costa County. The survey identified 3,798 homeless persons in Contra Costa County, including 1,092 persons (29%) categorized as chronically homeless individuals; 851 persons (22%) categorized as chronic substance abusers; 713 persons (19%) categorized as severely mentally ill; 447 persons (12%) categorized as victims of domestic violence; and 277 persons (7%) categorized as veterans. A total of 2,448 of the homeless (64%) were sheltered at the time the survey was conducted, leaving 1,350 (36%) unsheltered. The survey documented the presence of four unsheltered homeless individuals in Danville, representing less than 0.3% of the County-wide unsheltered population. Although the point-in-time count identified homeless individuals within Danville, it is acknowledged that the survey represents only a snapshot view, with the count reflective just of the number of identified homeless on the particular day of the count. It is further

recognized that individuals and families may move in and out of homelessness and in and out of shelters over the course of a year. Homeless individuals and families have the most immediate housing need of any special needs population subgroups. They also have one of the most difficult set of housing needs to meet, due to the diversity of the population that find themselves homeless and the complex set of factors that would have led to homelessness.

There are no homeless shelters located within Danville. There are various facilities located in Contra Costa County that provide shelter for homeless individuals and families. The draft Contra Costa County Housing Element indicates there are nine homeless shelters in the County, collectively providing 367 year-round beds. The nearest mixed population interim housing emergency shelter facility to Danville in Contra Costa County is located in Concord - the Concord Adult Interim Housing facility. The draft County Housing Element indicates there are twelve transitional housing facilities in Contra Costa County, collectively providing 340 year-round beds. The nearest transitional housing facility to Danville in Contra Costa County is located in Richmond. The draft County Housing Element indicates there are seventeen facilities providing permanent housing for the homeless, collectively providing 891 year-round beds. The nearest mixed population facility to Danville providing permanent housing is located in Concord. There are also facilities in the Tri-Valley portion of Alameda County that provide shelter for homeless individuals and families. Pleasanton, Livermore, and Dublin, using a HUD Section 108 loan secured in 2002, acquired and rehabilitated the former Family Crisis Shelter in Livermore and reopened the facility as a homeless shelter (the "Sojourner House") under the ownership of Tri-Valley Haven. Additional facilities benefit homeless and formerly homeless persons in the Tri-Valley area include Bluebell transitional housing in Livermore and Carmen Avenue apartments, also in Livermore.

Under Danville's Municipal Code, emergency shelters and transitional housing are defined as facilities that, respectively, meet the needs of those who are homeless or those that were formerly homeless. Pursuant to the requirements of SB 2, Danville has amended its zoning regulations to permit emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action within commercial areas carrying the DBD: Downtown Business District Area 3 - Old Town Mixed Use zoning designation. Land zoned DBD - Area 3 is a compact, multi-property area totaling slightly more than five acres along Front Street and in close proximity to the Downtown core. Area 3 provides adequate area and an adequate number of separate parcels to accommodate the emergency shelter needs for Danville - if such a facility was pursued for development. The zoning change to DBD - Area 3 properties are consistent with the intent and requirements of SB 2.

C. HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

1. Housing Growth

Danville's residential growth rate has varied since 1970, as shown in **Table 13**. The construction of several thousand housing units during the period from the 1970 through the end of the 1990's represented the last significant surge of residential development that Danville will experience. With the adoption of a Growth Management Element in 1991, new residential projects approved in Danville were required to be found to be in compliance with specified performance standards relative to public facilities and services. With the adoption of the Danville **2030** General Plan in **March, 2013**, the Town determined there was sufficient infrastructure and public facilities in place and/or planned to accommodate the projected amount of residential growth through the **planning period covered by the 2030 Plan (i.e., through 2030, the "horizon year" for the Plan).**

2. Housing Type and Tenure

Housing tenure refers to the status of the occupants of housing, indicating whether the occupant owns or rents the housing unit. While housing tenure generally conforms to the type of housing unit (i.e., attached units and multiple family units tend to **be renter-occupied households than is the case for** detached units), many of Danville's attached single family residential units and multiple family units are owner-occupied units and many of Danville's detached single family residential units are rent-**occupied** units. The **2010** Census indicates that owner-occupied units comprised **84.4%** of Danville's housing stock while rental units comprised the remaining **15.6%**. **(Refer to Table 8)**

3. Housing Age and Condition

As is the case for most of the Tri-Valley Region, Danville's **housing is** relatively new. **(Refer to Table 13)** Only **434** units, or **2.8%** of the existing housing stock **in place as of the end of 2013**, were built prior to 1950. A majority of the housing stock in Danville (i.e., **11,941 units - or 77.6%**) was built since 1970, with **roughly half** of that total being less than thirty years of age. A general rule in the housing industry is that structures older than thirty years begin to show signs of deterioration and require reinvestment to maintain their quality. Unless properly maintained, homes older than fifty years will typically require major renovations to remain in good working order. The housing stock in Danville is considered to be in excellent condition, in part because of the relative newness of housing in Danville and in part because of the relatively high incomes and high home values that have been present, and continue to be present, in the area.

Table 13
Age and Condition of Housing
- Town of Danville

[Amends and replaces Table 11 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Age of Housing/ Condition of Housing	Housing Units	Percentage of Housing Units
Age of Housing Total Housing Units		
<i>Total Housing Units⁽¹⁾</i>	15,382	100.0%
<i>Built 2010 through 2013⁽²⁾</i>	126	0.8%
<i>Built 2000 through 2009⁽²⁾</i>	750	4.9%
<i>Built 1990 through 1999⁽³⁾</i>	3,535	23.0%
<i>Built 1980 through 1989⁽³⁾</i>	2,506	16.3%
<i>Built 1970 through 1979⁽³⁾</i>	5,024	32.7%
<i>Built 1960 through 1969⁽³⁾</i>	1,764	11.5%
<i>Built 1950 through 1959⁽³⁾</i>	1,243	8.1%
<i>Built 1940 through 1949⁽³⁾</i>	236	1.5%
<i>Built 1939 or earlier⁽³⁾</i>	198	1.3%
Condition of Housing		
<i>Occupied Housing Units⁽⁴⁾</i>	15,448	100.0%
<i>Occupied Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities⁽⁵⁾</i>	none	none
<i>Occupied Units Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities⁽⁵⁾</i>	178	1.2%
<i>Occupied Units Without Telephone Service Available⁽⁵⁾</i>	73	0.5%

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census Counts, 2007-2011 ACS (5-year estimates) SF3:H34 and B25034.
2. Town of Danville Community Development Department - Planning Division. August 2014.
3. Ibid 1.
4. State of California, Department of Finance, Report E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2013 with 2010 Census Benchmark.
5. US Census Bureau, 2007-2011 ACS (5-year estimates) B25047, B25048, and B25051.

Note: The total for housing units is not inclusive of second dwelling units. A total of 92 second dwelling units were built during the last planning period (i.e., between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2013). This delivery rate was higher than the development output of second dwelling units for the 1999-2007 planning period where 62 second units were built. With 154 second units built between 1999 and the end of 2013, the annual average production was 10¼ units.

According to estimates made by the 2007-2011 American Community Survey, no housing units in Danville lacked complete individual plumbing facilities and 178 of occupied units (1.1%) lacked complete kitchen facilities. The Town's Building Division estimates that no more than 50 units in Danville require major rehabilitation (less than one unit in 300), and virtually no units in Town require replacement.

4. Housing Costs and Affordability

a. Sales and Rental Survey

With acknowledgement of recent **recovery from the prior** decline in home prices due to the economic downturn, home prices are relatively high in the south central portion of Contra Costa County and in the Tri-Valley Region.

Pursuant to information derived from the California Association of Realtors, the median home sales prices for single family homes in the central portion of Contra Costa County **was \$765,960 in June 2014.** For context, June 2014 values tabulated by DataQuick for the Tri-Valley Area in 2014 were as follows: Danville \$995,000; Dublin \$743,000; Livermore \$570,000; Pleasanton \$783,000; and San Ramon \$800,000. **(Refer to Table 14).**

Table 14
Median Housing Values -
State of California, Alameda & Contra Costa Counties and Tri-Valley Area
[Amends and replaces Table 12 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

State / County / City	2000 (1999 Dollars) ⁽¹⁾	2000 (2011 Dollars) ⁽²⁾	2007-2011 (2011 Dollars) ⁽³⁾	2014 (2014 Dollars)
State of California	\$198,900	\$268,515	\$421,600	\$480,280 ⁽⁴⁾
Contra Costa County	\$253,800	\$342,630	\$490,200	\$786,930 ⁽⁵⁾
<i>Danville</i>	\$537,000	\$724,950	\$877,000	\$995,000 ⁽⁶⁾
<i>San Ramon</i>	\$421,000	\$568,350	\$731,300	\$800,000 ⁽⁶⁾
Alameda County	\$291,900	\$394,065	\$558,300	\$652,070 ⁽⁵⁾
<i>Dublin</i>	\$327,300	\$441,855	\$624,000	\$743,000 ⁽⁶⁾
<i>Livermore</i>	\$309,100	\$417,285	\$544,300	\$570,000 ⁽⁶⁾
<i>Pleasanton</i>	\$428,200	\$578,070	\$747,400	\$783,000 ⁽⁶⁾

Sources:

1. US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Counts: SF1-H85.
2. The US Census Bureau estimates for 2000 were adjusted to 2011 dollars through application of the Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI), with the price index calling for a 35% increase to the 2000 values.
3. 2007-2011 ACS (5-year estimates): B25077.
4. <http://www.dailynews.com/business/20140916/california-home-sales-drop-as-median-price-rises> California Association of Realtors Article
5. <http://www.car.org/aboutus/onecoolthing/county/> California Association of Realtors Article
6. 2014 Data Quick Information Systems

The median home prices contained in the **Table 14** were generated from DataQuick Information Systems. **DataQuick reports show that prices have not returned to pre-recession levels.** Contra Costa County's Draft 2014-2022 Housing Element indicates the median home price in Contra Costa in January 2007 was \$575,000, with the

Great Recession resulting in a home price drop in April 2014 to a median home price of \$455,000. However, according to the RealtyTrac U.S. Foreclosure Market Report the Bay Area is in the top five markets in the country in foreclosure recovery. The price statistics are derived from all types of home sales, including new and existing, condominiums and single family units. The website cautions that movements in sales prices should not be interpreted as changes in the cost of a standard home, though it is clear that there has been measurable erosion on home sales prices due to the current economic downturn. Median prices can be influenced by changes in cost, as well as changes in the characteristics and size of homes sold. Due to the low sales volume in some cities or areas, median price changes may exhibit unusual fluctuation.

The draft housing element update for Contra Costa County, citing data derived from several market studies and a review of June 2014 rental listings, indicates that rental rates vary significantly between the three regions of the County. Market rents range from a low for a one-bedroom apartment in East County of \$878 to a high of \$1,245 in Central County.

The range for two bedroom apartments is cited at \$1,400 to \$2,000, with three bedroom rental units ranging from \$1,700 to \$2,400. According to the County's draft housing element, as of the end of the first quarter of 2014, vacancy rates for apartment units in the County were 3.6%, as compared to a 4.9% vacancy rate average for the five largest Bay Area Counties. At the first quarter of 2012, Contra Costa County's vacancy rate had been 4.6%.

The declining vacancy rate was matched with a 14% average increase in rental rates in that two year period. This trend indicates a tightening of the rental market. As long as vacancy rates remain below five percent, rents are likely to continue increasing. **Table 15** provides rental data for both Alameda and Contra Costa Counties and the five Tri-Valley cities. The table underscores the impact of the Great Recession on rental rates. There is no ACS data available yet to reflect the upward swing of rental rates reflecting pressures on rental properties as a result of the improvement in the economy.

Local rental rate data is provided later on in this section and reflects very steep increases in rental rates since 2010.

Tables 16 and 17 provides information regarding Fair Market Rents (FMRs), an index primarily used to determine payment standard amounts for HUD's Housing Choice Voucher program. HUD's Policy Development and Research Office estimates FMRs for metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan county FMR areas. FMRs are gross rent estimates. To accomplish this objective, FMRs must

Table 15
Fair Market Rent by Unit Bedrooms (Fiscal Years of 2005, 2008, 2011 and 2014)
- Contra Costa County

[Amends and replaces Table 14 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Fair Market Rents (FMRs) by Fiscal Year and Bedroom Count ⁽¹⁾					
Fiscal Year (Publish Date)	Efficiency	One-Bedroom	Two-Bedroom	Three-Bedroom	Four-Bedroom
FY 2005 (Oct. 2004)	\$945	\$1,132	\$1,342	\$1,870	\$2,293
FY 2008 (Sept. 2007)	\$866	\$1,046	\$1,239	\$1,680	\$2,080
FY 2011 (Dec. 2009)	\$974	\$1,176	\$1,393	\$1,889	\$2,339
FY 2014 (May 2014)	\$1,035	\$1,255	\$1,578	\$2,204	\$2,704

Source: U.S. HUD Office of Policy Development and Research - Datasets: Fair Market Rents (2005, 2008, 2011 & 2014)

Note: Fair Market Rent is a term in real estate that indicates the amount of money that a given property would command, if it were open for leasing at the moment. Fair market rent is used by the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to determine initial renewal rents for some expiring project-based Section 8 contracts, to determine initial rents for housing assistance payment (HAP) contracts in the Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy program (Mod Rehab), and to serve as a rent ceiling in the HOME rental assistance program. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) annually estimates FMRs for 530 metropolitan areas and 2,045 nonmetropolitan county FMR areas.

Table 16
Median Gross Rents
- State of California, Alameda & Contra Costa Counties and Tri-Valley Cities

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 13 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

State / County/ City	2000 (1999 Dollars) ⁽¹⁾	2000 (2011 Dollars) ⁽²⁾	2007-2011 (2011 Dollars) ⁽³⁾
State of California	\$747	\$1,008	\$1,185
Contra Costa County	\$898	\$1,212	\$1,309
<i>Danville</i>	\$1,604	\$2,165	\$2,001
<i>San Ramon</i>	\$1,388	\$1,874	\$1,632
Alameda County	\$852	\$1,150	\$1,228
<i>Dublin</i>	\$1,356	\$1,831	\$1,749
<i>Livermore</i>	\$1,035	\$1,397	\$1,367
<i>Pleasanton</i>	\$1,219	\$1,646	\$1,625

Sources: 1. US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Counts: SF1-H63.

2. The US Census Bureau estimates for 2000 were adjusted to 2011 dollars through application of the Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI), with the price index calling for a 35% increase to the 2000 values.

3. 2007-2011 ACS (5-year estimates): B25064.

Notes: 1. There are high margins of error associated with the 2007-2011 ACS data.

2. The rental rates for Danville include rates for both apartment rentals and for rentals of single family homes - which command much higher rental rates than apartments and outnumber apartments by more than 3:1.

Table 17
Median Gross Rent (2000 and 2011)
- Town of Danville and Contra Costa County

[Amends and replaces, in part, Table 13 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Median Gross Rent ⁽¹⁾			
Jurisdiction	2000 (1999 dollars)	2000 (2011 dollars) ⁽²⁾	2007-2011 (2011 dollars)
Danville	\$1,604	\$2,165	\$2,001
Contra Costa County	\$898	\$1,212	\$1,309

Sources:

1. U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census Counts:SF1 H63
2. 2007-2011 ACS (5-year estimates): B25064

Note: The 2000 median gross rent data contained in the middle column reflects an adjustment to 2011 dollars using the Bay Area CPI, with a 35% upward CPI adjustment applied between 1999 and 2011. The Bay Area CPI is available for viewing at <http://www.abaga.ca.gov/planning/research/cpi.html>.

be both high enough to permit a selection of units and neighborhoods and low enough to serve as many low income families as possible. The level at which FMRs are set is expressed as a percentile point within the rent distribution of standard-quality rental utilities, except telephones, cable or satellite television service, and internet service. HUD sets FMRs to assure that a sufficient supply of rental housing is housing units. The current definition used is the 40th percentile rent, the dollar amount below which 40 percent of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented. The 40th percentile rent is drawn from the distribution of rents of all units occupied by recent movers (renter households who moved to their present residence within the past 15 months). HUD is required to ensure that FMRs exclude non-market rental housing in their computation. Therefore, HUD excludes all units falling below a specified rent level determined from public housing rents in HUD's program databases as likely to be either assisted housing or otherwise at a below-market rent, and units less than two years old.

Table 18 provides information about surveyed rent schedules for rental units within Danville.

b. Housing Affordability by Household Income

HUD publishes household income data annually. **Table 19** shows the maximum annual income levels for each income group, adjusted for household size, as established for 2014 for the Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Area. This information is utilized to calculate the maximum affordable housing payments for different households (varying by size and income level) and is also used to determine household eligibility for federal housing assistance. In evaluating affordability, the maximum affordable price refers to the maximum amount that could be afforded by households at the upper end of the range of their respective

Table 18
Rental Rates for Danville Apartments and for Apartments in the Surrounding Area
(October 2014) - Town of Danville and Surrounding Area
[Amends and replaces Table 15 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Plan	Bedrooms	Bathrooms	Price Range	Size Range
Sequoia Grove - Podva Lane @ San Ramon Valley Blvd. - 38 units				
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,785	724 sf
A - C	2 Bedroom	1 - 2 Bath	\$2,050 - \$2,250	912 sf
Rose Garden Apartments - Rose Garden Shopping Center - 55 units				
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,785	676 sf
A - D	2 Bedroom	1 - 2 Bath	\$2,050 - \$2,175	756 sf - 963 sf
Danville Park Apartments - 217 Valley Creek Lane - 96 units				
A - B	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,770 - \$1,961	650 sf - 700 sf
A - C	2 Bedroom	1 - 2 Bath	\$1,958 - \$2,286	850 sf - 1,150 sf
El Dorado Apartments - 164 El Dorado Avenue - 7 units				
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,250	750 sf
A - B	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,650	850 sf
Villages at Monterossa - 1000 Casa Blanca Terrace, Danville - 96 units				
A - B	2 Bedroom	2 Bath	\$2,534	1,000 sf - 1,100 sf
Crow Canyon - 1700 Promontory Lane, San Ramon - 400 units				
A - B	Studio	1 Bath	\$1,690	436 sf
A - B	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,713 - \$2,209	702 sf - 845 sf
A	2 Bedroom	2 - 2.5 Bath	\$2,061 - \$3,021	900 sf - 1,114 sf
Bel Air - 2000 Shoreline Loop, San Ramon - 462 units				
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,691 - \$2,906	575 sf - 727 sf
A - B	2 Bedroom	1 - 2 Bath	\$2,129 - \$3,041	956 sf - 1,057 sf
A - D	3 Bedroom	2 Bath	Not Supplied	1,332 sf
Promontory View Apartments - 3300 Promontory Lane, San Ramon - 306				
A	Studio (Junior)	1 Bath	\$1,550 - \$1,625	575 sf
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,695 - \$1,850	726 sf
A - B	2 Bedroom	2 Bath	\$1,995 - \$2,535	962 sf - 1073 sf
A	3 Bedroom	2 Bath	\$2,580 - \$2,750	1,280 sf
Canyon Woods Apartments - 401 Canyon Woods Place, San Ramon - 192 units				
A	Studio	1 Bath	\$1,575	436 sf
A	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,995	769 sf
A	2 Bedroom	2 Bath	\$2,575	1,115 sf
The Retreat - 1459 Creekside Drive, Walnut Creek - 316 units				
A - B	Studio	1 Bath	\$1,294 - \$1,719	497 sf - 796 sf
A - B	1 Bedroom	1 Bath	\$1,599 - \$1,949	657 sf - 732 sf
A - B	2 Bedroom	1 - 2 Bath	\$2,153 - \$2,586	936 sf - 1,079 sf

Source: Rent.com and Apartments.com (October, 2014)

Table 19
HUD Income Category and Maximum Household Income by Household Size
(February 2014) - Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Area

[Amends and replaces Table 17 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

HUD Income Category Maximum Household Income by Household Size ⁽¹⁾	Ext. Low (<30% Median)	Very Low (30%-50% Median)	Low (50%-80% Median)	Median (100% of Median)	Moderate (80%-120% Median)
1-Person Household	\$19,650	\$32,750	\$47,350	\$65,450	\$78,550
2-Person Household	\$22,450	\$37,400	\$54,100	\$74,800	\$89,750
3-Person Household	\$25,250	\$42,100	\$60,850	\$84,150	\$101,000
4-Person Household	\$28,050	\$46,750	\$67,600	\$93,500	\$112,200
5-Person Household	\$30,300	\$50,500	\$73,050	\$101,000	\$121,200
6-Person Household	\$32,550	\$54,250	\$78,450	\$108,450	\$130,150
7-Person Household	\$34,800	\$58,000	\$83,850	\$115,950	\$139,150
8-Person Household	\$37,050	\$61,750	\$89,250	\$123,400	\$148,100

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development, State Income Limits for 2014, February, 2014.

- Notes:
- a. In general, maximum income for low-income households reflects 80% of the mean family income level. Because the Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Area is a high income area, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has adjusted the maximum income for low-income households.
 - b. California's income limits were updated based on: (1) federal income limit changes published December 18, 2013 by HUD for its Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program income limits; and (2) adjustments HUD made based on particular State statutory provisions and HUD's Hold Harmless Policy implemented in 2013.
 - c. HUD annually updates Section 8 income limits to reflect changes in household income category levels and median income levels applicable to extremely-low, very-low, and low-income households. California law specifies that its State Income Limits must be updated based on HUD updates to its Section 8 income limit levels. The Department also revises its State Income Limit levels to reflect the following: adjustments, per State law, to some HUD county median income figures; adjustments to some household income category and area median income levels to reflect HCD's February 2013 Hold Harmless Policy; and calculation of California's moderate-income household levels based on changes to county area median income levels.

income category. Households at the mid- or lower-ends of the category can afford less in comparison. Table 20 shows the affordable housing costs for renter-occupied households (indicating affordable housing costs for extremely low, very low, low, moderate, above moderate income categories) as a function of household size. Table 21 shows the affordable housing costs for ownership

Table 20
Affordable Housing Costs for Renter-Occupied Households (February 2014)
- Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Area

[Amends and replaces Table 18 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

HUD Income Category Maximum Household Income by Household Size	Ext. Low (<30% Median)	Very Low (30%-50% Median)	Low (50%-80% Median)	Median (100% of Median)	Moderate (80%-120% Median)
1-Person Household (Studio/1 BDR Unit)	\$380	\$710	\$1,075	\$1,800	\$2,180
2-Person Household (1 BDR Unit)	\$450	\$825	\$1,245	\$2,075	\$2,510
3-Person Household (2 BDR Unit)	\$490	\$910	\$1,380	\$2,315	\$2,805
4-Person Household (3 BDR Unit)	\$525	\$995	\$1,515	\$2,550	\$3,100
5-Person Household (3 or 4 BDR Unit)	\$550	\$960	\$1,620	\$2,740	\$3,325
6-Person Household (4 BDR Unit)	\$605	\$1,150	\$1,755	\$2,955	\$3,590
7-Person Household (4 or 5 BDR Unit)	\$630	\$1,210	\$1,855	\$3,140	\$3,820
8-Person Household (5 BDR Unit)	\$685	\$1,305	\$1,990	\$3,360	\$3,465

Sources:

1. California Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development, State Income Limits for 2014. February, 2014.
2. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development - Office of Public and Indian Housing - Allowances for Tenant-Furnished Utilities and Other Services Locality: Contra Costa Housing Authority Region. October, 2008.

Notes:

- a. Affordable housing costs for Extremely Low-, Very Low-, and Low-Income renter-occupied households assume that 30% of gross household income, inclusive of a utility allowance, is applied toward rent.
- b. Affordable housing costs for Median- and Moderate-Income renter-occupied households assume that 35% of gross household income, inclusive of a utility allowance, is applied toward rent.
- c. Assumed utility allowance for a 1- or 2-person is \$79.00 to \$109.00 per month. Assumed utility allowance for a 3-person household is \$142.00 per month. Assumed utility allowance for a 4-person household is \$175.00 per month. Assumed utility allowance for a 5- or 6-person household is \$175.00 to \$208.00 per month. Assumed utility allowance for a 7- or 8-person household is \$208.00 to \$240.00 per month.
- d. HUD annually updates Section 8 income limits to reflect changes in household income category levels and median income levels applicable to extremely-low, very-low, and low-income households. California law specifies that its State Income Limits must be updated based on HUD updates to its Section 8 income limit levels. The Department also revises its State Income Limit levels to reflect the following: adjustments, per State law, to some HUD county median income figures; adjustments to some household income category and area median income levels to reflect HCD's February 2013 Hold Harmless (HH) Policy; and calculation of California's moderate-income household levels based on changes to county area median income levels.

Table 21
Affordable Housing Costs for Owner-Occupied Households (February 2014)
- Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Area

[Amends and replaces Table 19 of the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element]

Maximum Affordable Housing Costs For Owner-Occupied Households	Ext. Low Income Household (<30% Median)	Very Low Income Household (30%-50% Median)	Low Income Household (50%-80% Median)	Median Income Household (100% of Median)	Moderate Income Household (80%-120% Median)
3-Person Household (≥2 BDR Unit)	\$71,000	\$137,750	\$199,000	\$337,500	\$409,500
4-Person Household (≥3 BDR Unit)	\$77,750	\$146,500	\$224,500	\$377,500	\$457,500

Source: Town of Danville, Community Development Department - Planning Division. February, 2014

Notes:

- a. Affordable housing costs for Extremely Low-, Very Low-, and Low-Income owner-occupied households assume that 30% of gross household income is applied toward housing costs.
- b. Affordable housing costs for Median- and Moderate-Income renter-occupied households assume that 35% of gross household income is applied toward housing costs.

5. Assisted Housing at Risk of Conversion

Existing housing that receives governmental assistance may convert over time to market rate housing. In some communities, the loss of such units could constitute a significant reduction in the amount of available affordable housing. Because of that potential impact, housing element updates are required to identify publicly assisted rental housing and evaluate the potential for that housing to convert to market rate housing.

Government Code §65583(a)(9) requires jurisdictions to analyze existing assisted housing developments that are eligible to change from low-income housing uses during the next ten years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of restrictions on use.

There are no residential projects in Danville where governmental assistance was provided that are subject to these regulations. Although below market rate units (BMRs) provided through the Town's inclusionary housing program do not receive any governmental assistance, the Town made an effort over the final five years of the 2007-2014 planning period to extend the resale restriction term for BMRs units as they became available for resale to new 20-year terms. For seven of the ten most recent resale opportunities, the Town successfully reset the 20-year resale restriction term by working with the sellers of the BMRs. The sellers of the units were allowed to sell the units at 3% to 5% above the resale restriction price where they were willing to have a new resale restriction agreement recorded before the sale.

D. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS

This section addresses the existing and future housing needs of Danville. Existing housing needs refer to households earning lower income, living in overcrowded conditions or overpaying for housing. Future housing needs refer to the projected amount of housing a community is required to plan for during a specified planning period. The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) provided each regional council of governments (COG) its share of the statewide housing need. In turn, all COGs, including the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) - the COG for the nine-county Bay Area Region - are required by State law to determine the portion allocated to each jurisdiction in the region. This allocation process is referred to as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process in the ABAG Region. The 2014-2022 RHNA methodology takes into account, among other things, growth principles first initiated with the 2007-2014 RHNA methodology; projected growth in both households and jobs; proximity to transportation facilities; and historic patterns of provision for very low and low income housing needs. (Refer to Appendix A)

Future housing need refers to the share of the region's housing growth that has been allocated to a community. In allocating the region's future housing needs to the various member jurisdictions, the following factors were taken into consideration:

- Market demand for housing
- Employment opportunities
- Proximity to transportation facilities
- Availability of suitable sites for residential development
- Availability of public facilities to serve new residential development
- Commute patterns of the area work force
- Type and tenure of existing housing
- Loss of units in government assisted housing developments
- Existing over-concentration of lower income households
- Historic production rates of lower income housing
- Geological and topographical constraints to residential development

Table 1 indicates the housing allocation for Danville for the RHNA for the 2014-2022 planning period, broken down by four income categories: very low income, low income, moderate income and above moderate income. As indicated on the table, Danville's share of regional housing needs has been set at a total of 557 residential units, reflecting a small reduction from the 583 unit allocation for the RHNA for the 2007-2014 planning period.

Pursuant to AB 2634, local jurisdictions are required to project the housing needs of extremely low income households (i.e., households earning $\leq 30\%$ of the area median income). In estimating the number of extremely low income households, a jurisdiction may use 50% of the very low income allocation or apportion the very low income allocation between the very low and extremely low categories based on Census data. For purposes of housing needs assessment for the 2014-2022 Housing Element planning period, the Town's RHNA of 196 very low income units was split according to the second methodology, putting 95 units into the ELI sub-category and 101 units into the VLI subcategory. Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data from the *American Community Survey 2006-2010* supports this apportionment given the estimate of 625 extremely low income households and 665 very low income households in Danville (a 48.4% extremely low income to 51.2% very low income "split").