

4.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section contains information about the existing and projected population and housing supply in the Town of Danville relevant to the Draft 2030 General Plan. It provides an overview of the current regulatory framework, describes existing conditions, and analyzes the potential impacts of the Draft 2030 General Plan.

A. Regulatory Framework

This section summarizes key State, regional, and Town regulations and policies pertaining to population and housing in Danville.

1. Regional Housing Needs Allocation

California law requires local jurisdictions to allow for the construction of an assigned share of the region's projected housing needs. This share is called the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The specific RHNA number for a jurisdiction is important because State law mandates that each jurisdiction provide sufficient land to accommodate a variety of housing opportunities for all economic segments of the community to meet or exceed this number of housing units. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), as the regional planning agency, calculates the RHNA for 101 individual jurisdictions within the nine county San Francisco Bay Area region, including Danville.

2. Association of Bay Area Governments Projections

For the past three decades, ABAG has produced biannual forecasts of population, household, and job growth for the San Francisco Bay Area, its counties, and its individual cities. The most recent projection series available at the time of adoption of the General Plan is Projections 2009. Although ABAG is in the process of revising these forecasts, new numbers have not yet been adopted. Thus Projections 2009 is still considered the definite source of local and regional forecasts and is referenced throughout this EIR.¹ As noted be-

¹ As appropriate, the preliminary new forecasts now under consideration by ABAG are cited in the EIR for comparative purposes only.

low, the Town has modified the Projections 2009 forecasts for use in this EIR to reflect actual development capacity of the Town and its Planning Area.²

The 2009 forecast was completed at both the regional and sub-regional levels, utilizing data on existing development, future land use plans, proximity to existing job centers, past development patterns, and travel times, to project where growth is likely to occur in the future. The ABAG forecasts appear to overestimate residential growth potential within the Danville town limits and underestimate residential growth potential in the unincorporated Danville Planning Area, based on the existing designations in the Danville 2010 General Plan.

3. Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element

The most recent Danville Housing Element was adopted in 2009 for the 2007-2014 housing element planning period. The Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element outlines the steps the Town will take to meet its fair share of the region's housing needs between 2007 and 2014, in accordance with the RHNA distributed by ABAG. Through this process, Danville made a commitment to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to update the Danville 2010 General Plan, with a requisite change to the Land Use Map, to designate at least 9.6 additional acres of land for higher density housing than provided for under the 2010 Plan.

B. Existing Conditions

This section describes the existing population, housing, and employment conditions in the Danville Planning Area to provide context for the analysis of the Draft 2030 General Plan in this Draft EIR. The Planning Area includes

² The traffic model in use by CCTA at the time of this General Plan Update was based on ABAG Projections 2005 (LUIS 2005). As part of the General Plan, the Town updated the model forecasts to reflect a more realistic scenario based on actual development potential and the distribution of vacant land. The resulting household forecasts are higher than those in Projections 2005 and lower than those in Projections 2009.

the land within the Town limit; a small undeveloped area west of the Town; the largely built-out 317 +/- acre Sphere of Influence (SOI) area (abutting the east side of the Lawrence-Leema Road Specific Plan area and south of Camion Tassajara); the partially built-out 507 +/- acre eastern portion of the Alamo Creek area (i.e., section east of current SOI); the virtually built-out 565 +/- acre Bettencourt Ranch/Shadow Creek/Hansen Lane area; and the 680 +/- acre undeveloped, agricultural/rural residential Upper Tassajara Valley Area.

The various components of the Planning Area are described below in more detail, with a focus on existing and projected population and household totals. In Section C of this chapter, the effects of the updated General Plan on the projected population and household totals are addressed.

1. Population and Household Estimates

As noted earlier, the baseline year for General Plan analysis purposes is 2010. The population reported by the 2010 Census for Danville at that time was 42,039, with 15,420 households. This is the total used as the baseline in the General Plan EIR traffic model, and in the noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas analyses which rely on outputs from this model.

More recent data is available from the California Department of Finance (DOF), although this data is not incorporated as part of the baseline used in this EIR and is provided here for anecdotal purposes only. This data indicates that Danville had a population of 42,450 on January 1, 2012. The DOF estimated 15,950 total housing units in Danville on that date, with an assumed vacancy rate of 3.2% (514 units). Total estimated households after providing for assumed vacancies was 15,436 households. The 2012 DOF report estimated Danville's persons-per-household (PPH) ratio at 2.73.

Danville's sphere of influence area (SOI) along its eastern boundary was shown on the 2010 General Plan to be limited to the four-acre 120-bed Reutlinger Community for Jewish Living senior care facility (4000 Camino Tassajara) and the 317 +/- acre area lying directly east of the Lawrence-Leema Road Specific Plan Area – also identified as the “Intervening Properties” and

“Wendt Ranch”. County approvals granted over the Intervening Properties and Wendt Ranch (i.e., a series of three General Plan Amendment Study approvals and associated P-1; Planned Unit Rezoning, Final Development Plan, and Major Subdivision approvals) led to the construction and occupancy of about 725 residential units within the area as of January 1, 2011, including a townhome complex and an apartment development as well as single family homes. Remaining development potential in the current SOI is limited to 52 additional single family units, being the County-approved, but undeveloped lots in the planning sub-area.

Applying the Town-wide household size and vacancy rate data to this area yields an estimated 2010 population of about 1,920, increasing to about 2,050 at buildout. An additional 120 residents in group quarters are estimated to be on site at the Reutlinger Home (with corresponding total 2010/2030 populations of 2,040 and 2,160 for the entire area).

The Draft 2030 General Plan seeks an expansion of Danville’s SOI to include three discrete additional planning sub-areas beyond the SOI lands reflected in the 2010 General Plan. The three sub-areas are:

- ◆ the portion of the Alamo Creek project lying east of Danville’s current SOI boundary (i.e., east of the historic eastern boundary of the Wendt Ranch project);
- ◆ the Bettencourt Ranch/Shadowcreek/Hansen Lane area (largely constituted by properties along the north side of Camino Tassajara that had previously been within Danville’s SOI); and
- ◆ the 680+/- acre Upper Tassajara Valley Area.

Current and projected housing and population estimates for the three planning sub-areas is discussed below.

- ◆ Eastern Portion of Alamo Creek planning sub-area

The 507+/- acre Eastern Portion of Alamo Creek planning sub-area carries P-1; Planned Unit Development District zoning and was partially

developed in 2010, the baseline year for General Plan analysis. An estimated 195 residential units were in place in the planning sub-area in 2010. The area had County approvals that will provide for approximately 425 additional single family residential units and 120 multi-family units. Applying Town-wide household size and vacancy data to this area, the 2010 population was about 520 and the buildout population will be about 1,960.

◆ Bettencourt Ranch/Shadow Creek/Hansen Lane planning sub-area

The 565+/- acre Bettencourt Ranch/Shadow Creek/Hansen Lane Planning Sub-Area had an estimated 950 residential units were in place as of January 1, 2011, with the potential for only about a dozen more units (through potential future minor subdivision activity in the Hansen Lane area). The 2010 population of this area is estimated at about 2,500 and is not expected to change significantly at buildout.

◆ Upper Tassajara Valley Area planning sub-area

The entire 680+/- acre Upper Tassajara Valley Area Planning Sub-Area lies beyond the County Urban Limit Line (ULL) and has an AL - Agricultural Land general plan designation. As January 1, 2011, the area was occupied by eight single family residences (one each on eight different properties - with one property also containing a second dwelling unit) and assorted agricultural structures. Taking property size, zoning, and development status into consideration, a net increase of 22 units was calculated for General Plan analysis purposes. Existing population is estimated to be 20 persons and buildout population is projected to be about 80.

TOWN OF DANVILLE
GENERAL PLAN 2030 EIR
POPULATION AND HOUSING

TABLE 4.12-1 EXISTING AND PROJECTED POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS FOR TOWN OF DANVILLE AND ENVIRONS UNDER EXISTING GENERAL PLAN

Planning Sub-Area	Estimated 2010 Population	Estimated 2010 Households	Projected 2030 Population Under Existing General Plan Designations	Projected 2030 Households Under Existing General Plan Designations
Town of Danville	42,040	15,420	44,020	16,150
Danville SOI (per Danville 2010 General Plan Land Use Map)	2,040	700	2,160	750
Eastern Portion of Alamo Creek	520	190	1,960	720
Bettencourt Ranch/Shadow Creek/Hansen Lane	2,510	920	2,540	930
Upper Tassajara Valley Area	20	< 10	80	30
Totals	47,130	17,240	50,760	18,580

Notes: Vacancy rate of 3.2% assumed to convert housing units to households. Household size of 2.73 assumed, with group quarters added to yield population. All figures rounded to nearest 10. Projected 2030 Households Under Existing General Plan is based on “buildout” estimates, with ABAG Projections 2009 used as a benchmark. For areas within the Town boundary, the ABAG 2030 forecasts exceed the actual number of households that could be accommodated under the 2010 Danville General Plan.

2. Demographic and Household Trends

Table 4.12-2 presents key demographic indicators for Danville for a 20 year period extending from 1990 to 2010. The data are for the Town of Danville only, and exclude the unincorporated Planning Area. The bulleted list below summarizes key trends and findings:

- ◆ Population of the Town grew from 31,300 to just over 42,000 over this 20-year time period, a 34 percent increase.
- ◆ The number of households increased by 45 percent during this same period. Most of the increase in households took place between 1990 and 2000, with much slower growth occurring between 2000 and 2010.
- ◆ Average household size dropped from 2.82 in 1990 to 2.72 in 2010.
- ◆ The percentage of the Town's housing units that are renter occupied grew from 12 percent of all units in 1990 to 16 percent in 2010.
- ◆ The percentage of the Town's housing units that are multi-family increased from 4.3 percent of the housing stock in 1990 to 7.4 percent in 2010.
- ◆ The vacancy rate dropped from 3.8 percent in 1990 to 3.2 percent in 2010.
- ◆ Danville's median age increased from 38.1 in 1990 to 44.3 in 2010, with the greatest increase occurring after 2000.
- ◆ The number of Danville residents over 65 increased from 8.4 percent of Danville's total in 1990 to 13.8 percent in 2010. During that same period, the percentage of residents under 18 remained constant, at about 26 percent of all residents.
- ◆ The percent of households with children has declined, while the percentage of one-person households has increased.

Additional information on current demographics may be found in the next section.

TOWN OF DANVILLE
GENERAL PLAN 2030 EIR
POPULATION AND HOUSING

TABLE 4.12-2 KEY DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS FOR DANVILLE (INCORPORATED AREA ONLY), 1990-2010

	1990	2000	2010
Total Households	10,962	15,130	15,934
Total Population	31,306	41,715	42,039
Persons Per Square Mile	1,868 (16.6 Sq Miles)	2,304 (18.1 Sq Miles)	2,332 (18.1 Sq Miles)
Median Age	38.0	39.9	44.5
Owner-Occupied Units	9,007 (88%)	13,198 (89%)	13,020 (84%)
Renter-Occupied Units	1,264 (12%)	1,618 (11%)	2,400 (16%)
Detached Single Family	8,886 (77.5%)	11,453 (78.7%)	12,094 (76.3%)
Attached Single Family	2,081 (18.2%)	2,296 (15.8%)	2,597 (16.4%)
Multifamily 2-4 units	150 (1.3%)	266 (2.3%)	294 (1.9%)
Multifamily 5+ units	342 (3.0%)	234 (3.6%)	867 (5.5%)
Average Persons Per Household	2.82	2.78	2.72
Average Family Size	3.08	3.13	3.10
Vacant Units	371	314	514
Vacancy Rate	3.8%	2.1%	3.2%
Persons Under 18	8,147 (26.0%)	11,917 (28.6%)	11,196 (26.6%)
Persons Under 5	1,979 (6.3%)	2,961 (7.1%)	2,044 (4.9%)
Persons Over 65	2,626 (8.4%)	4,300 (10.3%)	6,048 (14.4%)
Single Parent Households	1,011 (11.2%)	1,982 (13.1%)	2,358 (14.8%)
Households with own children under 18 yrs	N/A	6,249 (41.3%)	5,858 (36.7% of Households)
Householder Living Alone, 65 yrs or older	371 (3.4%)	826 (5.5%)	1,365 (8.6% of Households)

Source: US Census, 1990, 2000, 2010

3. Key Housing Indicators

a. Vacancy Rates

Housing vacancy rates are an indication of whether the housing supply is meeting community demand. A high vacancy rate can be a sign of excess housing supply, while a very low vacancy rate can imply that housing is insufficient to meet demand. Low vacancy rates can also indicate rising housing prices due to an inadequate housing supply. The vacancy rate for Danville (Census 2010) was 3.2 percent in 2010. Despite an increase in vacancy since 2000, when the rate was 2.1 percent, this low vacancy rate implies that the demand for housing in the Danville remains relatively high.³

b. Household Size

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the Town of Danville has an average household size of 2.72 persons, which reflects a very slight decrease in household size from 2000, when the average household size was 2.78 persons. On January 1, 2012, the Department of Finance estimated average household size in the Town at 2.73. This figure has been used for projections purposes throughout this EIR.

The persons per household (PPH) estimates are more reliable for making population estimates when applied to larger samples – e.g., Town wide for 15,000+ households. As the Town moves closer to build-out the estimates warrant fine tuning to account for housing product. For new development projects, the Town applies multipliers of 2.9 for single family homes and 2.45 for multi-family units. Based on the composition of units projected through 2030, this equates to a weighted average of 2.73 for all units.

c. Tenure

Danville has a high rate of home ownership. In 2010, approximately 84 percent of housing units in Danville were owner-occupied. This figure decreased

³ California Department of Finance, 2011. Census 2010.

slightly from 2000, when approximately 89 percent of housing units were owner-occupied.⁴

d. Housing Costs and Affordability

The cost of housing in Danville could have an effect on population growth and demographic trends. Home prices in Danville are among the highest in Contra Costa County. Between 2000 and 2007, the median home price rose 14.2 percent from \$908,000 to \$1,030,000.⁵ Since 2008, the real estate market downturn has caused home prices to decline in Danville. Median home prices had fallen approximately 23.4 percent from their 2007 high to \$789,000 in the first quarter of 2008.⁶ The 2008-2010 American Community Survey (2008-2010 ACS) estimated the median home price for Owner-Occupied Housing in Danville had recovered slightly to \$907,400. The 2010 estimated median home price for Danville was about two-thirds higher than the estimated countywide median home value for Owner-Occupied Housing in Contra Costa County, which was \$548,200.⁷

Median gross rents for rental units in Danville are slightly higher than neighboring communities and much higher than the median gross rent countywide for Contra Costa County. As estimated by the 2005-2009 American Community Survey (2005-2009 ACS) for California, median gross rent in Danville was \$1,985. This compared to median gross rental income for the other four cities making up the Tri-Valley ranging from Livermore at \$1,292, Pleasanton at \$1,518, San Ramon at \$1,569, and Dublin at \$1,640. These prices are higher than those estimated countywide for Contra Costa County, where the 2005-2009 ACS estimated median gross rent was \$1,239.

Estimated median household income (in 2010 inflation-adjusted dollars) in Danville was \$128,810. In comparison, the median household income

⁴ California Department of Finance, 2011. Census 2010.

⁵ Town of Danville, 2009. *2007-2014 Housing Element*.

⁶ US Census Bureau Fact Finder, <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

⁷ 2008-2010 American Community Survey for California.

countywide for Contra Costa County was estimated at \$77,838.⁸ As discussed later in Section 3.a., Danville residents typically have higher median annual incomes than their counterparts across the county, even in matching employment sectors. For many Danville residents, these relatively high incomes render housing more affordable. However, a significant portion of Danville residents, especially those with lower incomes, experience difficulty obtaining affordable housing.

Households spending more than 30 percent of household income on housing costs are generally considered to have a high “housing burden.” As of 2010, close to one half of Danville’s estimated 2,053 rental households (852 rental households – or 48% of total rental households) applied at least 30 percent of gross household income to housing costs. Paralleling these estimates, 49.9 percent of Danville’s estimated 11,107 owner-occupied households applied at least 30 percent of gross household income to housing costs. In comparison, an estimated 56.0 percent of the renter households and 52.8 percent of the owner-occupied households countywide in Contra Costa County applied at least 30 percent of gross household income to housing costs.⁹

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines income groups as follows:

- ◆ Extremely Low Income – less than 30 percent of the Median Household Income.
- ◆ Very Low Income – 30 percent to 50 percent of the Median Household Income.
- ◆ Low Income – 50 percent to 80 percent of the Median Household Income.
- ◆ Moderate Income and Above Moderate Income – greater than 80 percent of the Median Household Income.

⁸ 2008-2010 American Community Survey for California.

⁹ 2006 – 2010 American Community Survey (5-year estimates) – Housing Characteristics, Costs, Tenure, Units by Type.

Because the Contra Costa County/Alameda County Area has such high relative incomes, the breakpoint between Low Income and Moderate Income is lower for this area for determination of household income. For June 2011, published income figures for this metropolitan statistical area (MSA) had the breakpoint between Low Income and Moderate Income Households at 71.2% of median income for the MSA rather than the typical 80.0% breakpoint. In practice, this means it is even more challenging to provide housing for below moderate income households in the MSA.

In general, households with lower incomes were more likely to experience high housing cost burdens. High housing cost burdens were most prevalent for extremely low-, very low- and low-income households, more than half of whom paid over 30 percent of income for housing in 2000. Approximately 69 percent of extremely low-income renter-households and 84.7 percent of the extremely low income owner-households; and 87.8 percent of very low-income renter-households and 70.2 percent of very low-income owner-households had a high housing cost burden in 2000.¹⁰ Between 2000 and 2007, housing costs increased at a faster rate than income, making housing less affordable in Danville. The balance shifted between 2007 and 2010, but other factors such as the availability of financing and adjustable mortgages continued to create housing market challenges. In spite of the 2007-2010 price decline, Danville's housing costs remain high for the region, increasing the risk of high housing burdens for low- or even middle-income households.

c. Future Housing Needs

ABAG generates a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) figure for Danville, which is the minimum number of housing units necessary to accommodate population growth for all income levels in Town. The RHNA figure for Danville in this time period indicates that Danville must be able to accommodate a total of 583 new dwelling units in the seven-year RHNA cycle from 2007 to 2014. The RHNA is distributed by income category.

¹⁰ Town of Danville, 2009. *2007-2014 Housing Element*.

Danville's 583 units were distributed as follows:

- ◆ Extremely Low/Very Low-Income (up to 30 percent and up to 50 percent, respectively, of Average Median Income [AMI]): 196 units (34 percent).
- ◆ Low-Income (51 to 80 percent of AMI): 130 units (22 percent).
- ◆ Moderate-Income (81 to 120 percent of AMI): 146 units (25 percent).
- ◆ Above Moderate-Income (more than 120 percent of AMI): 111 units (19 percent).

The 2007-2014 Housing Element establishes goals and policies accompanied by a detailed work plan to address a 187 unit Very Low Income and 34 unit Low Income Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) shortfall during the 2007-2014 housing element planning period.

4. Employment

Employment and housing trends are interrelated. Growth or decline in the number of jobs available in Danville in the future could also affect the housing market. If employment opportunities increase, market conditions could become more favorable for building additional housing within the community to provide homes for these workers. If employment opportunities decline, the housing market could decline as well. However, while there is a link between the number of jobs available and the housing market within Danville, the Town's position in the greater Bay Area also makes housing and employment fluctuations in surrounding cities important in assessing the future market in Danville.

a. Employers

The types of employers and economic sectors within Danville have an effect on the housing market within the community. The 2010 Census results provide the best sector-specific, civilian employment data available for Danville, although they exclude the small number of jobs outside the Town in the unincorporated Planning Area.

Table 4.12-3 shows the 2010 Census-estimated percentage of employed residents working in particular industries in Danville. The largest proportion of employed Danville residents, about 20 percent, work in the education or health services field. When combined with retail, manufacturing, and financial and professional services, these five largest employment sectors comprise 63 percent of Danville's employed residents. In Danville, median annual earnings in these fields ranged from approximately \$61,000 to \$150,000 in 2010. In Contra Costa County, median annual earnings for these same fields ranged from \$24,000 to \$61,000 in 2010, putting the annual earnings of Danville workers well above those of their countywide counterparts. Table 4.12-3 also shows the median annual earnings by industry sector.

Representing 4.3 percent of the workforce, arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services is Danville's lowest paying industry sector, with median annual earnings of \$17,593. Manufacturing is Danville's highest paying sector; it features median annual earnings of \$150,222 and represents 9.6 percent of the workforce. This income typically corresponds to executive-level office positions in the manufacturing sector, rather than factory jobs. Danville's largest employment sector—education and health services—had annual median earnings of \$62,750.¹¹

¹¹ 2010 U.S. Census, U.S. Census Bureau, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>, Accessed on November 17, 2011

TOWN OF DANVILLE
GENERAL PLAN 2030 EIR
POPULATION AND HOUSING

TABLE 4.12-3 EMPLOYMENT AND MEDIAN INCOME BY INDUSTRY WITHIN
THE DANVILLE TOWN LIMIT – 2010 CENSUS

Industry	Percentage of Employed Residents	Median Annual Earnings
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0.5%	\$140,100
Construction	6.1%	\$62,090
Manufacturing	10.8%	\$150,222
Wholesale trade	4.3%	\$72,380
Retail trade	9.6%	\$61,544
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:	3.0%	\$100,130
Information	4.0%	\$120,171
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	16.0%	\$72,391
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services:	16.2%	\$101,020
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	20.1%	\$62,750
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services:	4.3%	\$17,593
Other services, except public administration	1.8%	\$35,357
Public administration	3.4%	\$99,238
Danville Median Annual Income	--	\$81,586

Source: 2010 U.S. Census, U.S. Census Bureau, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>, accessed on November 17, 2011.

b. Employment Trends

ABAG's Projections 2009 indicated that there were 14,740 jobs in the Danville Subregional Study Area in 2000 and 15,020 in 2010, an increase of just 2.1 percent.¹² According to Projections 2009, other cities in the Tri-Valley area, such as San Ramon, Pleasanton, and Livermore, experienced net employment decreases during this period.

Danville is projected to experience economic growth that would increase the number of jobs within the Planning Area. ABAG Projections 2009 indicates a Year 2030 forecast of 17,310 for the Danville Subregional Study Area, or an increase of 2,290 jobs above the 2010 baseline estimate. This is a 15 percent increase over the 20 year time period. By contrast, ABAG Projections 2009 forecasts a 37 percent increase over the same time period for the County as a whole and a 39 percent increase for the five cities which collectively make up the Tri-Valley Area.

As noted earlier in this chapter, ABAG is developing revised projections as part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (One Bay Area). The preliminary figures indicate the Danville had 13,440 jobs in 2010 and was expected to grow to 17,600 jobs by 2040.¹³ Since the SCS has not yet been adopted and its projections have not yet been integrated into regional traffic and air quality models, the SCS figures are not used in this EIR. The SCS projections indicate a lower baseline and a substantially higher job growth rate for Danville than was forecast by Projections 2009.

c. Jobs and Housing Balance

The availability of housing in a community affects the likelihood of people working and living in the same place. If there is sufficient housing supply,

¹² The Danville "Subregional Study Area" (SSA) as defined by ABAG includes land within the Town and land within the unincorporated area on the eastern side of the Town. It is slightly larger than the "Planning Area" evaluated in this EIR. According to ABAG Projections 2009, the unincorporated SSA had 1,160 jobs in 2010, while the incorporated area had 13,860 jobs (totaling 15,020 jobs).

¹³ The SCS figure is for the incorporated area only.

there is a higher chance that people will choose to live and work in the same community. Providing a good jobs-to-housing balance is important because it could potentially improve regional traffic and reduce pollution. Per Census data from within the Danville Town Limit, in 2010 there were an estimated 1.2 employed residents per household. Per adjusted ABAG household and job estimates for areas within the Town Limit, Danville had 0.97 jobs per household in 2010. Danville currently has more employed residents than jobs, offsetting other Tri-Valley cities that have an imbalance of more jobs than housing.

C. Standards of Significance

A population and housing impact would occur if the Draft 2030 General Plan would:

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

D. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the potential impacts from the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan on population and housing in the Town. It discusses project impacts as well as cumulative impacts. This section is organized by and responds to each of the potential impacts identified in the previous section, Standards of Significance.

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would allow for an increase of approximately 2,250 households or 6,150 residents within the Danville Planning Area, for a total Planning Area population of 53,240 by 2030. This is approximately 910 households (and 2,480 residents) greater than the increase that was forecast for the equivalent geographic area without General Plan Land Use Map changes. The difference is attributable to the following specific General Plan Land Use Map changes:

- ◆ Re-designation of HOS 6, 7, 8, and 11 from various Downtown Business designations which do not allow housing to DBD 11 (net gain of about 90 units)
- ◆ Re-designation of HOS 12, HOS 23, 2 acres of HOS 24, and 1 acre of HOS 3 from various non-residential or single family residential designations to Residential-Multifamily-High/Medium Density (net gain of about 150 units)
- ◆ Re-designation of 2.7 acres of HOS 26 to Mixed Use (net gain of about 60 units)
- ◆ Re-designation of 1.6 acres of HOS #3 and 5 acres of HOS #24 to Residential –Multifamily-High Density (net gain of about 210 units)
- ◆ Re-designation of HOS 17 to Residential – Multifamily-High Density (net gain of about 40 units, if site redevelops)
- ◆ Re-designation of HOS 18, 19, 21, and 27 to DBD 12, with the presumption of a density bonus on sites 18, 19, and 27 (net gain of about 390 units)¹⁴

Re-designation of land use for residential growth under the 2030 General Plan would be both limited and highly targeted, with a small number of additional units outside of the Town’s core. Additional housing would be encouraged on key opportunity sites in already developed areas (i.e., the Housing Opportunity Sites – or HOS’s).

¹⁴ A 3.2 percent vacancy rate is applied to convert housing units to households. Numbers are rounded to the nearest 10.

In addition, vacant and/or underutilized properties throughout Danville and beyond the eastern boundary of the Danville, could be developed with housing. However, these areas can be developed under their current zoning and General Plan designations, and their capacity will not be impacted by adoption of the 2030 Plan. Although a change to the sphere of influence boundary is proposed, no substantive changes to General Plan designations are proposed within the expansion area, and no change in development capacity (or housing potential) are anticipated in that area. Likewise, previously developed areas of the Town have capacity for an unknown number of secondary dwelling units; this capacity will not be impacted by adoption of the 2030 Plan.

The net effect of the changes on the Land Use Map would be to increase the Year 2030 buildout forecast for the Danville Planning Area to 19,490 households and 53,240 people. The incremental increase is associated entirely with changes on Housing Opportunity Sites within the existing Town Boundaries, as there are no substantive changes to the General Plan Land Use Map proposed for the sphere of influence or Planning Area.

The General Plan would decrease Danville's Year 2030 employment forecast relative to Projections 2009. This is due to the re-designation of 10.5 acres along the south side of Diablo Road (HOS 18, 19, and 27), 3.2 acres at El Cerro/El Pintado (HOS 12), and 1 acre at HOS 23 from office designations to residential designations, the re-designation of HOS 21 (1.7 acres) from a retail designation to a residential designation, and the re-designation of 1.6 acres of HOS 3 from mixed use to a residential designation.

Some of the 18 acres would have been unlikely to generate employment growth even under current General Plan designations since they are already developed with *residential* uses (e.g., HOS 19). However, on some of these sites, the re-designation to residential use may lead to the removal of existing office buildings. Jobs displaced from these sites may relocate to other buildings in Danville, or move to other cities, resulting in a net loss of employment. Future opportunities for job growth on these sites would be precluded.

At the same time, job potential may increase on a number of sites within the PDA as a result of the re-designation of land from DBD Areas 4 and 7 to DBD Area 11. It is possible that some of the employment growth which would otherwise have located on the Housing Opportunity Sites listed above will locate in these areas. There are also other sites within the Downtown Area that are not developed to their full potential which may accommodate increases in employment.

Under the Draft 2030 General Plan, housing growth in Danville is projected to outpace job growth, with rates of 13.5 and 9.1 percent, respectively. By 2030, the adjusted ABAG data project that within the Planning Area there will be an average 0.86 jobs per household. This is lower than the trend for Contra Costa County, which projects a countywide jobs-per-household ratio of 1.15 by 2030, and lower than the present ratio.¹⁵ This decrease in Danville is due to projected housing growth exceeding job growth, as well as the inclusion of existing residential areas that lie beyond the Town Limit, but within the Planning Area. The decrease may be offset by increases in jobs associated with home employment and telecommuting, but that margin is difficult to quantify.

Regarding the other component of the CEQA significance threshold listed above (indirect inducement of population growth through infrastructure extension), the Draft 2030 General Plan includes improvements to infrastructure, such as bikeway improvements, that would be intended to provide adequate infrastructure for the existing population and for population increases associated with the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan. As stated in Section 4.13, Public Services and Recreation, and Section 4.15, Utilities and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the public services and infrastructure improvements in the Draft 2030 General Plan are sufficient to provide for the limited and targeted population increase that would result from the implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan. At the same time, implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would not result in any major expansions of

¹⁵ ABAG, 2009, *Forecast 2009*.

infrastructure that could allow or encourage growth in new or as yet undeveloped areas.

In conclusion, implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would result in population and job increases. However this growth is expected and has been planned for and the impacts have been addressed in the individual resource chapters in the DEIR. Growth within Danville is expected to be generally consistent with the projected build-out of the General Plan, which is based on assumptions about known potential opportunity sites, development projects, and the land use designations included in the General Plan land use map and zones included in the Town zoning map. Moreover, proposed development that is new under the 2030 General Plan would be largely restricted to already developed areas. Therefore, the population growth associated with implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would be modest, expected, and highly targeted, thus rendering its impact *less-than-significant*.

- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The Draft 2030 General Plan would not result in the displacement of substantial amounts of housing or population. There are no residential areas which would be re-designated for other uses, and any limited residential redevelopment that could occur under the plan would result in a higher number and density of units. There would be only one developed residential parcel where this would take place, with a re-designation from Residential - Multifamily - Medium Density to Residential - Multifamily - High Density (HOS 17). Parcels within the Downtown Master Plan area and south of Downtown Danville that were designated for office, retail, or commercial uses in the Danville 2010 General Plan would be re-designated for residential and/or mixed-use development. By encouraging new combined residential/commercial development in these areas, the Draft 2030 General Plan would actually establish additional housing, while avoiding displacement. Therefore, the impacts of the Draft 2030 General Plan on displacing housing units would be *less-than-significant*.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

As discussed in response to Criterion b), implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan is not expected to result in the displacement of a substantial number of housing units. The increased housing opportunities to be created in the community would support the existing population and would not cause the displacement of people. As a result, the Draft 2030 General Plan is not expected to displace substantial numbers of people who either live, work or both live and work within the Town. Therefore, implementation of the Draft 2030 General Plan would have a *less-than-significant* impact regarding the displacement of people.

E. Cumulative Impacts

As described above, the Draft 2030 General Plan would not have significant impacts on population growth and would not displace housing or people. The surrounding communities in Contra Costa County are expected to accommodate similar amounts of growth over the period of the Draft 2030 General Plan, and the greater Bay Area region as a whole will have increased employment opportunities and population. However, as the Draft 2030 General Plan would not induce substantial growth, the cumulative effect on population and housing in the region would be *less-than-significant*.

F. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since the Draft 2030 General Plan would not induce any significant impacts, no mitigation measures are necessary.