

## II. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### A. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS AND TRENDS

#### 1. Population

At the time of the 2000 Census, Danville contained 15,130 housing units, consisting of 11,622 detached single family residential units (76.8%); 2,557 attached single family residential units (16.9%); and 951 multiple family residential units (6.3%) (see **Table 2**). At the time of the 2000 Census, it was estimated that there were 314 vacant housing units in Danville, representing 2.1% of the 15,130 total housing units. With an average household size determined to be 2.78 persons per occupied unit, the 2000 Census set Danville's population 41,715 persons.

Based on forecasts set forth in *ABAG Projections 2007*, Danville is expected to add approximately 650 households between 2000 and 2015, covering a period extending slightly past the end of the 2007 - 2014 Housing element planning period. With the addition of these households, ABAG projects Danville's population to increase to 44,400 persons. Correspondingly, the total housing unit count is projected to be approximately 16,350 units (with approximately 16,010 occupied units).

#### 2. Age Characteristics

The median age of Danville residents in 2000 was calculated to be 39.9 years (compared to a median age of 36.4 for Contra Costa County as a whole) (see **Table 3**).

Age trends for Danville, as compared to Contra Costa County as a whole, are revealed when Census 2000 data is compared to 2007 estimates reported in the Bureau of Census publication entitled *2005 - 2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates*. While the percentage makeup of Danville's younger and older residents generally is in line with countywide totals, there appears to be a trend for a relative decrease in the percentage of residents under five years of age and a trend for a relative increase in the percentage of residents 65 and older in age.

#### 3. Race and Ethnicity

Danville's population is less racially diverse than Contra Costa as a whole (see **Table 4**). Data from the 2000 Census and from *2005 - 2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates* indicates both jurisdictions are becoming more diverse over time. The more recent estimates indicate relative increases in the percentage of residents in virtually all ethnic categories except White, which shows a decrease in Danville from 83.0 percent to 78.8 percent and in the County from 57.9 to 51.9 between the two survey periods.

Table 2

**POPULATION AND HOUSING UNITS (1985 - 2008)**  
**- Town of Danville**

---

<b>POPULATION:</b>						
	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>
<i>Persons</i>	27,550	31,306	36,168	41,715	42,958	42,629
<i>Housing Units</i>	9,623	11,466	13,140	15,130	15,605	15,713
<i>Vacancy Rate</i>	4.18	3.51	2.74	2.08	2.07	2.07
<i>Ave. Household Size</i>	3.016	2.817	2.756	2.784	2.781	2.740
 <b>HOUSING UNITS:</b>						
<i>Detached SFR</i>	Not available	8,886(77.5%)	10,110(76.9%)	11,622(76.8%)	12,009(77.0%)	12,077(77.0%)
<i>Attached SFR</i>	Not available	2,081(18.1%)	2,223(16.9%)	2,557(16.9%)	2,561(16.4%)	2,570(16.4%)
<i>MFR - 2 to 4</i>	Not available	150(1.3%)	266(2.0%)	269(1.8%)	279(1.8%)	288(1.8%)
<i>MFR - 5 plus</i>	Not available	342(3.0%)	534(4.1%)	682(4.5%)	756(4.8%)	778(4.8%)
<i>Mobile Homes</i>	Not available	7(<0.0%)	7(<0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

---

Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, Population Estimates for 1-1-85. Sacramento, California.

State of California, Department of Finance, E-8 Historical Population and Housing for Cities, Counties, and the State 1990-2000. Sacramento, California, August 2007.

State of California, Department of Finance, Population Estimates for California Cities, Counties, and the State January 1, 1981 to January 1, 1990. Sacramento, California.

State of California, Department of Finance, City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2008 Sacramento, California.

State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2008.

Table 3

**POPULATION BY AGE AND GENDER (2000 & 2007)**  
**- Town of Danville and Contra Costa County**

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>DANVILLE 2000 (%)</b>	<b>DANVILLE 2007 (%)</b>	<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY 2000 (%)</b>	<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY 2007 (%)</b>
<i><b>Total</b></i>	41,715 (100%)	42,534 (100%)	948,816 (100%)	1,011,372 (100%)
<i><b>Male</b></i>	20,228 (48.5%)	20,036 (47.1%)	463,270 (48.8%)	496,617 (49.1%)
<i><b>Female</b></i>	21,487 (51.5%)	22,498 (52.9%)	485,546 (51.2%)	514,755 (50.9%)
<i><b>Under 5</b></i>	2,961 (7.1%)	2,389 (5.6%)	66,128 (7.0%)	65,347 (6.5%)
<i><b>5 - 17</b></i>	8,956 (21.5%)	8,884 (20.9%)	185,666 (19.6%)	186,646 (18.5%)
<i><b>18 - 64</b></i>	25,498 (61.1%)	26,098 (61.4%)	589,750 (62.2%)	641,286 (63.4%)
<i><b>65 &amp; Older</b></i>	4,300 (10.3%)	5,163 (12.1%)	107,272 (11.3%)	118,093 (11.7%)
<i><b>Median Age</b></i>	39.9	Not Available	36.4	Not Available

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census SF1, SF3, and DPA-DP4.

Bureau of the Census, 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates.

Table 4

**RACE AND ETHNICITY (2000 & 2007)**  
**- Town of Danville and Contra Costa County**

<b>TOWN OF DANVILLE RACE/ETHNICITY</b>	<b>2000 PERSONS</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2007 PERSONS</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</i>	1,945	4.7	1,953	4.6
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino</i>	39,770	95.3	40,581	95.4
<i>White</i>	34,618	83.0	33,496	78.8
<i>Asian</i>	3,722	8.9	4,804	11.3
<i>Black or African American</i>	375	0.9	434	1.0
<i>American Indian &amp; Alaska Native</i>	66	0.2	68	0.2
<i>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</i>	46	0.1	116	0.3
<i>Some other race</i>	68	0.2	147	0.3
<i>Two or more races</i>	875	2.1	1,516	3.6
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RACE/ETHNICITY</b>	<b>2000 PERSONS</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2007 PERSONS</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</i>	167,776	17.7	220,862	21.8
<i>Not Hispanic or Latino</i>	781,040	82.3	790,510	78.2
<i>White</i>	549,409	57.9	525,270	51.9
<i>Asian</i>	102,681	10.8	132,623	13.1
<i>Black or African American</i>	86,851	9.2	92,046	9.1
<i>American Indian &amp; Alaska Native</i>	3,648	0.4	2,610	0.3
<i>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</i>	3,157	0.3	3,916	0.4
<i>Some other race</i>	2,636	0.2	5,309	0.5
<i>Two or more races</i>	32,658	3.4	28,736	2.8

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census SF1, SF3, DPA-DP4.

Bureau of the Census, 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates.

#### 4. Employment

Up until the early 1980's, the Tri-Valley region was primarily a bedroom community. ABAG reported in *Projections 1994* for 1980 that the Tri-Valley region had 51,386 total households, 76,875 employed residents, and 48,775 total jobs. This meant that, in 1980, 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. For its portion of the jobs/housing picture, Danville had 0.47 jobs per employed resident in 1980. See **Tables 5 and 6** for employment data for Danville and the sub-region.

The Tri Valley region has experienced massive job growth and an extensive amount of residential development since 1980. ABAG's *Projections 2007* indicated that the Tri-Valley Region had 184,540 total jobs in 2000 (a 275+% increase from 1980). While some of this job growth is likely attributable to changes ABAG implemented in its 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 95% to 99,750 total households over the same period of time. *Projections 2007* indicated that the number of employed residents in the area has increased by around 95% since 1980, rising to 149,301 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 to 1.85 jobs per household in the twenty year period. For its portion of the area's jobs/housing picture, Danville actually saw a decrease in jobs as expressed by a ratio compared to total employed residents. 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.

ABAG's *Projections 2007* forecasts that the prior trends in place for the region will start to abate moving through to the year 2010. ABAG projects that total jobs in the Tri-Valley region will increase by almost 12% in the decade (rising to 206,190 total jobs) but will be outpaced with the corresponding increase in the number of households added to the area (estimated to increase by almost 24% in the same ten-year period to rise to 121,470 total households). For the period, the number of employed residents in the area is projected to increase more than 18% to a total of 177,000 employed residents. Taken collectively, the period from 2000 to 2010 is expected to show an improvement in the jobs/housing balance for the area as the ratio of jobs per employed residents is forecast to decrease from 1.24 in 2000 to 1.16 in 2010.

As the decade concludes, the Tri-Valley area is projected to have virtually completed its 30-year change over from bedroom community to major employment center. Total jobs in the area will have increased by almost 170,000 jobs (a 325%+/- increase) while total households in the area will have increased by 70,000+/- (a 135%+/- increase).

Table 5

**HOUSEHOLD POPULATION/HOUSEHOLDS/JOBS (1985 - 2015)**  
**- Town of Danville and Tri-Valley Region**

<b>HOUSEHOLD POPULATION:</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2015</b>
<i>Danville Population</i>	31,200	38,600	43,400	44,400
<i>% Increase</i>	--	+23.7%	+12.4%	+2.3%
<i>Tri-Valley Region Population (1)</i>	191,748	245,000	305,900	357,100
<i>% Increase</i>	--	+27.8%	+24.9%	+16.7%
<b>HOUSEHOLDS:</b>				
<i>Danville Households</i>	10,540	13,640	15,360	16,010
<i>% Increase</i>	--	+29.4%	+12.6%	+4.2%
<i>Tri-Valley Region Households</i>	60,220	87,050	110,080	130,680
<i>% Increase</i>	--	+44.6%	+26.5%	+18.7%
<b>JOBS:</b>				
<i>Danville Jobs (2)</i>	7,810	7,760	13,980	15,340
<i>% Increase</i>	--	--	--	+9.7%
<i>Tri-Valley Region Jobs (2)</i>	52,950	129,250	186,370	227,270
<i>% Increase</i>	--	--	--	+21.9%

Footnotes: (1) Includes incorporated Contra Costa County communities of Danville and San Ramon, incorporated Alameda County communities of Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton and the unincorporated areas of Alamo-Blackhawk.

(2) A change in methodology on job count between publications of Projections results in an inability to compare percentage increases from decade to decade except for a comparison of totals for 2005 and projections for 2015.

Sources: ABAG, Projections 2000. December, 1999.

ABAG, Projections 2007. December, 2006.

Table 6

**JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE TRENDS (1990 - 2020)**  
**- Town of Danville and the Tri-Valley Region**

<b>HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>1990 (%)</b>	<b>2000 (%)</b>	<b>2010 (%)</b>	<b>2020 (%)</b>	<b>% CHANGE</b>
<i>Alamo/Blackhawk</i>	6,312 (8%)	8,022 (8%)	8,490 (7%)	8,770 (3%)	+39%
<i>Danville</i>	12,028 (15%)	15,266 (15%)	16,180 (13%)	16,770 (13%)	+39%
<i>San Ramon</i>	12,895 (17%)	16,981 (17%)	22,340 (18%)	27,430 (18%)	+113%
<i>Dublin</i>	6,834 (9%)	9,335 (9%)	16,600 (13%)	21,310 (13%)	+219%
<i>Livermore</i>	20,998 (27%)	26,315 (26%)	31,160 (26%)	35,750 (26%)	+70%
<i>Pleasanton</i>	18,960 (24%)	23,831 (23%)	26,700 (22%)	29,570 (26%)	+56%
<i>Tri-Valley Region</i>	78,027 (100%)	99,750 (100%)	121,470 (100%)	139,600 (100%)	+79%
<b>EMPLOYED RESIDENTS</b>	<b>1990 (%)</b>	<b>2000 (%)</b>	<b>2010 (%)</b>	<b>2020 (%)</b>	<b>% CHANGE</b>
<i>Alamo/Blackhawk</i>	9,357 (8%)	11,265 (8%)	13,370 (8%)	12,500 (6%)	+34%
<i>Danville</i>	18,823 (15%)	21,791 (15%)	22,040 (12%)	24,230 (11%)	+29%
<i>San Ramon</i>	21,192 (17%)	26,561 (18%)	32,720 (18%)	42,640 (20%)	+101%
<i>Dublin</i>	11,030 (9%)	14,864 (10%)	24,240 (14%)	32,880 (15%)	+198%
<i>Livermore</i>	31,854 (26%)	39,622 (27%)	45,960 (26%)	57,230 (27%)	+80%
<i>Pleasanton</i>	31,300 (25%)	35,198 (24%)	38,670 (22%)	46,420 (22%)	+48%
<i>Tri-Valley Region</i>	123,556 (100%)	149,301 (100%)	177,000 (100%)	215,900 (100%)	+75%
<b>TOTAL JOBS</b>	<b>1990 (%)</b>	<b>2000 (%)</b>	<b>2010 (%)</b>	<b>2020 (%)</b>	<b>% CHANGE</b>
<i>Alamo/Blackhawk</i>	3,860 (3%)	5,390 (3%)	5,450 (3%)	5,960 (2%)	+11%
<i>Danville</i>	8,800 (7%)	14,740 (8%)	16,040 (8%)	17,070 (7%)	+16%
<i>San Ramon</i>	32,490 (26%)	40,140 (22%)	43,880 (21%)	51,650 (21%)	+29%
<i>Dublin</i>	12,870 (10%)	16,540 (9%)	22,910 (11%)	31,790 (13%)	+147%
<i>Livermore</i>	33,630 (27%)	48,250 (26%)	53,650 (26%)	65,840 (27%)	+96%
<i>Pleasanton</i>	33,710 (27%)	59,480 (32%)	64,260 (31%)	73,180 (30%)	+117%
<i>Tri-Valley Region</i>	125,360 (100%)	184,540 (100%)	206,190 (100%)	245,490 (100%)	+96%
<b>JOBS/EMPLOYED RESIDENTS RATIO</b>	<b>1990 (%)</b>	<b>2000 (%)</b>	<b>2010 (%)</b>	<b>2020 (%)</b>	<b>% CHANGE</b>
<i>Alamo/Blackhawk</i>	0.41/1.00	0.48/1.00	0.41/1.00	0.48/1.00	+17%
<i>Danville</i>	0.47/1.00	0.68/1.00	0.73/1.00	0.70/1.00	+63%
<i>San Ramon</i>	1.53/1.00	1.51/1.00	1.34/1.00	1.21/1.00	-21%
<i>Dublin</i>	1.17/1.00	1.11/1.00	0.95/1.00	0.97/1.00	-17%
<i>Livermore</i>	1.06/1.00	1.22/1.00	1.17/1.00	1.15/1.00	+8%
<i>Livermore</i>	1.08/1.00	1.69/1.00	1.66/1.00	1.58/1.00	+46%
<i>Tri-Valley Region</i>	1.01/1.00	1.24/1.00	1.16/1.00	1.14/1.00	+13%

Footnote: (1) City totals reflect corporate boundary plus sphere of influence area.

Sources: ABAG, Projections 2000. December, 1999.

ABAG, Projections 2007. December, 2006.

## **B. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS**

### **1. Household Type**

Housing needs and/or desires vary with household type. According to the 2000 Census, a large percentage of Danville's households are family households (80 percent). This compares to a Contra Costa County total of 70 percent households estimated to be family households (*2005 - 2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates*). 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 densities in its various neighborhoods. As of January 1, 2008, Danville's housing stock consisted of 15,713 detached single family residential units (77.0%); 2,570 attached single family residential units (16.4%); 288 multiple family residential structures with 2 to 4 units (1.8%); and 756 multiple family residential structures with 5 or more units (4.8%) (**refer to Table 2**).

### **2. Household Size**

The 2000 Census determined Danville's average household size to be 2.78 persons per household (down from 2.82 for the average household size determined by the 1990 Census). Both the California Department of Finance and the Bureau of Census indicate an assumed trend decline for the average household size in Danville. The Bureau of Census estimated Danville's the average household size at 2.73 in its *2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates* (see **Table 7**). The Department of Finance estimated Danville's household size at 2.74 as of January 1, 2008 (**refer to Table 2**). The assumed reduction in the average household size means Danville's estimated population has reduced from its highest estimated total (i.e., 43,372 persons per the Department of Finance estimate for January 1, 2004) by some 743 persons to the current official estimate (i.e., 42,629 persons per the Department of Finance estimate for January 1, 2008), despite the estimated addition of 130 households over the four year period (**refer to Tables 2 and 7**).

### **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. ABAG's *Projections 2007* estimated Danville's 2005 mean household income to be \$168,400 (covering the corporate boundary of Danville and its adjoining sphere of influence area). This was the third highest total for the 23 surveyed areas in Contra Costa County and compares to a countywide mean household income figure of \$98,400. Only Orinda and the

Table 7

**HOUSEHOLD BY TYPE/HOUSING TENURE (1990, 2000 & 2007)**  
**- Town of Danville**

<b>HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTIC</b>	<b>1990 NUMBER (%)</b>	<b>2000 NUMBER (%)</b>	<b>2007 NUMBER (%)</b>
<i>Occupied housing units</i>	11,064 (100%)	14,816 (100%)	15,246 (100%)
<i>Owner-occupied housing units</i>	9,632 (87.1%)	13,198 (89.1%)	Not Available
<i>Renter-occupied housing units</i>	1,414 (12.8%)	1,618 (10.9%)	Not Available
<i>Family households</i>	9,115 (82.4%)	11,865 (80.1%)	12,057 (79.1%)
<i>With own children under 18</i>	Not Available	6,249 (42.2%)	5,798 (38.0%)
<i>Female householder, no husband present</i>	746 (6.7%)	1,049 (7.1%)	Not Available
<i>With own children under 18</i>	Not Available	623 (4.2%)	Not Available
<i>Non-family household</i>	1,949 (17.6%)	2,951 (19.9%)	Not Available
<i>Householder living alone</i>	1,413 (12.8%)	2,295 (15.5%)	Not Available
<i>Householder <math>\geq 65</math> years old living alone</i>	372 (3.4%)	826 (5.6%)	Not Available
<i>Female <math>\geq 65</math> years old living alone</i>	280 (2.5%)	Not Available	Not Available
<i>Households with individuals &lt;18 years old</i>	Not Available	6,432 (43.4%)	Not Available
<i>Households with individuals &gt;65 years old</i>	1,757 (15.9%)	2,779 (18.8%)	Not Available
<i>Average household size</i>	2.82	2.78	2.73
<i>Average family size</i>	3.05	3.13	3.14
<i>Median value owner-occupied housing units</i>	\$359,200	\$541,400	\$973,100
<i>Median rent renter-occupied housing units</i>	\$999	\$1,604	\$1,764
<i>Households with earnings mean income</i>	\$78,863	\$137,094	\$147,101
<i>Individuals in poverty</i>	657 (2.1%)	908 (2.2%)	1,425 (3.4%)

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census SF1, SF3, DPA-DP4.

Bureau of the Census, 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates.

unincorporated community of Alamo-Blackhawk were shown to have higher average incomes. Mean household incomes for Danville were projected by *ABAG Projections 2007* to increase to \$175,200 by 2010 and \$183,700 by 2015. Median household income for a four-person household for the Alameda County/Contra Costa County area, the baseline household income figure utilized to calculate very low, low, moderate and above moderate income levels in the two-county standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA), was estimated to be \$86,100 for 2008.

Mean income levels for a community only partially reflect how household income levels may affect the ability to secure housing. The Census Bureau tracks housing costs as a function of total household income. Households that are considered to be overpaying for housing are those households where  $\geq 30\%$  of gross household income is devoted to housing costs. According to the 2000 Census, 31.6% percent of Danville's owner-occupied households and 36.7% of its renter-occupied households assigned  $\geq 30\%$  of their gross household income on housing. For comparison purposes, the draft Contra Costa County Housing Element (Table 6-11) indicated 28.6% of owner-occupied households and 38.4% of renter-occupied households assign  $\geq 30\%$  of gross household income to housing costs.

Incurring housing costs in excess of 30% of gross household income is particularly a concern to lower income households which have little margin to cover extra expenditures. The 2000 Census indicated that 69.0% of Danville's 126 extremely low income renter-households were devoting  $>30\%$  of their gross household income to housing costs and that 84.7% of the 347 extremely low income owner-households were  $>30\%$  of their gross household income to housing costs. The 2000 Census indicated that 87.8% of Danville's 115 very low income renter-households were devoting  $>30\%$  of their gross household income to housing costs and that 70.2% of the 420 very low income owner-households were  $>30\%$  of their gross household income to housing costs. **(See Table 8)**

Supportive housing and single room occupancy (SRO) housing are two housing options that have a demonstrated ability to assist extremely low income and very low income households. Housing policies established for this planning period should be "weighted" to favor assistance to extremely low income and very low income households where such policies would lead to deeper income subsidies, housing supportive services, development of SRO or shared housing options, or rent subsidies/vouchers or the equivalent.

On a parallel by different track, the 2000 Census reported 908 persons, residing in 154 Danville households (1.3%) met the standard of poverty status in 1999.

Table 8

**Housing Problems for Low Income Households (2000)**  
**- Town of Danville**

<b>Census 2000 - Household Income/Housing Tenure</b>	<b>Total Renters</b>	<b>Total Owners</b>	<b>Total Households</b>
<b>Household Income &lt;30% MFI (1)</b>	126	347	473
<i>% with any housing problems</i>	69.0%	84.7%	80.5%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;30%</i>	69.0%	84.7%	80.5%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;50%</i>	69.0%	74.6%	73.2%
<b>Household Income &gt;30% to &lt;50% MFI</b>	115	420	535
<i>% with any housing problems</i>	87.8%	70.2%	74.0%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;30%</i>	87.8%	70.2%	74.0%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;50%</i>	68.7%	56.0%	58.7%
<b>Household Income &gt;50% to &lt;80% MFI</b>	204	606	810
<i>% with any housing problems</i>	92.6%	62.9%	70.4%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;30%</i>	92.6%	62.9%	70.4%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;50%</i>	58.8%	49.2%	51.6%
<b>Household Income &gt;80%</b>	1,136	12,059	13,195
<i>% with any housing problems</i>	21.9%	27.8%	27.3%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;30%</i>	21.9%	27.2%	26.4%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;50%</i>	7.6%	6.0%	5.9%
<b>Household Income &gt;50% to &lt;80% MFI</b>	1,581	13,432	15,013
<i>% with any housing problems</i>	39.5%	32.2%	32.9%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;30%</i>	36.7%	31.6%	32.2%
<i>% Cost Burden &gt;50%</i>	22.2%	11.3%	12.4%

Footnote: (1) "MFI" is mean family income (for Danville this is mean family income for the Alameda County/Contra Costa County area).

Source: State of the Cities Data Systems: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data  
<http://socds.huduser.org/scripts/odbic.exe/CHAS/statetable.htm>

#### **4. Overcrowding**

The extent that a condition of overcrowding is present in a community is determined by applying the Census Bureau's definition of "room" to a review of housing conditions for the presence of greater than one person per room. Overcrowding may be a result of the lack of adequately sized units in a community, the presence of high housing costs, and/or as a result of income conditions that may force households into an overcrowded condition so they may devote a higher percentage of income to non-housing expenses.

The 1990 Census reported overcrowding in only 66 of 11,064 occupied units (less than one half of one percent of the households in Danville). In addition, 83 percent of the housing units in the Town were reported to have six or more rooms. The 2000 Census information reported overcrowding in 157 (1.0%) of the 15,027 surveyed units had an overcrowding condition. Overcrowding in Danville is not considered to be a significant issue.

## C. SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

This section addresses households in Danville with special housing needs. Special needs groups included, but is not limited to, the following: seniors; persons with disabilities; large family households; single-parent households (notably female-headed households with children under 18 years in age); migrant/farm worker households, those in need of transitional or supportive housing, and the homeless. Special housing needs households will often have greater difficulty in finding decent, affordable housing. As a result, these households may experience a higher prevalence of lower income, overpaying for housing, overcrowding or other housing problems. The most recent comprehensive data source regarding Danville's special needs populations is the 2000 Census. Changes in the totals for special needs populations between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census reflect, to a large part, the fact that there was a 32% increase in the total number of households (i.e., household count increased from 11,466 to 15,130) (see **Table 9**).

### 1. Senior Households

Senior households have special housing needs primarily due to three major concerns - physical disabilities/limitations, income, and health care costs. The 2000 Census data for Danville reveals that the total number of seniors in Danville, as well as the percentage of seniors making up the total population of the Town, grew between 1990 and 2000. In 1990, 8.4% of persons living in households were  $\geq 65$  years in age (2,626 persons in 1,648 households). By 2000 that number had almost doubled (growing to 4,300 persons in 2,779 households) and had increased as a function of the overall population total, increasing to be 10.3% of all persons living in households. To underscore Danville's trend towards an older population, the 1980 Census showed that only 4.9% of the Danville population was  $\geq 65$  years in age (1,450+/-persons).

The special housing needs of seniors are, to a degree, addressed by the presence of residential care facilities in a community. Senior care facilities offer a range of care, ranging from non-medical facilities (commonly addressed as "Assisted Living" facilities) to skilled nursing facilities. Danville currently has approximately 550 beds in 31 licensed non-medical senior residential care facilities (see **Table 10**).

### 2. Persons with Disabilities

Effective on January 1, 2002, SB 520-Chesbro, amended housing element law and Government Code Section 65008. As a result, State housing element law now requires localities to include the following in the preparation and adoption of a housing element:

- As part of a governmental constraints analysis, an element must analyze potential and actual constraints upon the development, maintenance and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities and demonstrate local efforts to remove governmental constraints that hinder the locality from meeting the need for housing for persons with disabilities (Section 65583(a)(4)).

Table 9

**SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSEHOLDS (1990 & 2000)**  
- Town of Danville

SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS	1990	2000
<i>Disability or mobility limitations</i>		
- <i>Individuals w/ a work disability</i>	1,183 (4.9% persons ≥16)	1,525 (4.9% persons ≥16)
<i>16-64 years of age</i>	773 (65.3%)	996 (65.3%)
<i>65+ years of age</i>	410 (34.7%)	529 (34.7%)
- <i>Ind. with a mobility disability</i>	399 (1.6% persons ≥16)	498 (1.6% persons ≥16)
<i>16-64 years of age</i>	191 (47.9%)	239 (47.9%)
<i>≥65 years of age</i>	208 (52.1%)	259 (52.1%)
<i>Persons ≥65 years in households</i>	2,626 (8.4% of all persons)	4,300 (10.3% of persons)
- <i>In family households</i>	2,055 (78.3%)	3,366 (78.3%)
- <i>Living alone</i>	372 (14.2%)	609 (14.2%)
- <i>In non-family households</i>	29 (1.1%)	47 (1.1%)
- <i>With non-relatives</i>	41 (1.6%)	67 (1.6%)
- <i>In group quarters</i>	129 (4.9%)	211 (4.9%)
<i>Large family households</i>	1,069 (9.7% of all households)	1,506 (10.2% of households)
- <i>Five or more persons - rental</i>	117 (10.9%)	126 (8.4%)
- <i>Five or more persons - ownership</i>	952 (89.1%)	1,380 (91.6%)
<i>Female head of households</i>	746 (6.7% of all households)	1,049 (7.1% of households)
- <i>Related children</i>	446 (59.8%)	623 (59.4%)
<i>Agricultural workers</i>	112 (0.6% of all persons)	52 (0.1% of persons)
<i>Homeless (1)</i>	-	-
<b>Total all households</b>	<b>11,466</b>	<b>15,130</b>

Footnote: (1) A County-wide survey in 2007 by Project Hope, in partnership with the Contra Costa Inter-jurisdictional Council identified three adult male homeless persons in Danville.

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

Bureau of the Census, Census 2000 of Population and Housing Summary File 1 (Produced by the California State Census Data Center).

*Migrant and Seasonal Farm worker Enumeration Profiles Study - California*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2000.

**Table 10**

**LICENSED COMMUNITY CARE FACILITIES (March 2009)  
- Town of Danville**

Type of Facility	Number of Facilities	Capacity	Capacity by Type of Disability (1)			
			Dementia	Developmental	Physical	Hospice
<b>Group Home (2)</b>	1	6	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<b>Adult Residential (3)</b>	2	12	Not Determined	Not Determined	Not Determined	Not Determined
<b>Residential Care of the Elderly (4)</b>						
<b>≤6 Resident Capacity</b>	22	132	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<b>&gt;6 Resident Capacity</b>	5	370	Not Determined	Not Determined	Not Determined	Not Determined
<b>Adult Day Care (5)</b>	1	30	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<b>Totals</b>	31	550				

- Footnotes: (1) The specialized care columns are not mutually exclusive.
- (2) Group homes provide specialized treatment for persons under the age of 18.
- (3) Adult residential facilities provide care for adults with various disabilities or disorders.
- (4) Elderly residential facilities provide care for persons age 60 and above.
- (5) Adult day care is nonresidential day care services to functionally impaired adults or adults who are 60 years of age or older.

Sources: San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, March 2008.  
 State of California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division, March 2008.  
 Town of Danville Development Services Department. March, 2008.

- As part of the required constraints program, the element must include programs that remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities (Section 65583(c) (3)).

### Overview of Disability Issues

Persons with disabilities have a wide range of different housing needs, which vary depending on the type and severity of the disability as well as personal preference and lifestyle. The 2000 Census defined six types of disabilities: sensory, physical, mental, self-care, go-outside-home, and employment. A detailed description of each disability is provided below:

- *Sensory disability*: Refers to blindness, deafness, or severe vision or hearing impairment.
- *Physical disability*: Refers to a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying.
- *Mental disability*: Refers to a mental condition lasting more than six months that impairs learning, remembering, or concentrating.
- *Self-care disability*: Refers to a condition that restricts ability to dress, bathe, or get around inside the home.
- *Go-outside-home*: Refers to a condition that restricts ability to go outside the home alone to shop or visit a doctor's office.
- *Employment disability*: Refers to a condition that restricts ability to work at a job or business.

Extrapolating from the 2000 Census, it can be assumed that upwards of 10 percent of Danville residents over five years of age have a disability (**refer to Table 8**). The 2000 Census reveals that among the disabilities tallied, physical disabilities, disabilities that limited the ability to go outside the home, and employment disabilities were most prevalent, although the full range of disabilities was present in the community.

In planning for housing for persons with disabilities, there are a wide range of different disabilities, and different people with the same 'disability' may have different levels of functioning which affect their housing needs and choices.

### Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Both the federal Fair Housing Amendment Act (FHAA) and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act direct local governments to make reasonable accommodations (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.

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 (number of people) is limited by the Uniform Housing Code, which applies to all residences, and is based on the size of each bedroom.

Residential care facilities serving between seven and twelve clients (“large family care facilities”) 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. 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 (except as provided under Government Code Section 65008).

The Land Use Element of the General Plan provides for the development of multiple family housing in the three land use categories, with a fourth to be established through the scheduled update to the Danville 2010 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 multiple family 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. Necessary improvements to enhance accessibility may result in conflicts with the Municipal Code (e.g., numerical and/or dimensional requirements for parking may be modified to install handicap parking).

The Town can provide reasonable accommodation through an administrative variance procedure, with approvals granted at the Zoning Administrator level. Minor variances can be requested for a variety of development standards. Public hearings for such requests would only be necessitated upon appeal of the administrative action. During the current planning period, it would be appropriate for the Town to review the single family and multiple family zoning regulations to assure appropriate and clear flexibility is built into the regulations to allow variation either by right or through the administrative variance process that is “armed” up front with clearly defined findings that would allow authorization to grant minor variances to provide reasonable accommodation.

The Building Division actively enforces 2007 California Building Code provisions that regulate the access and adaptability of buildings to accommodate persons with disabilities. No unique restrictions are in place that would constrain the development of housing for persons with disabilities. Government Code Section 12955.1 requires that 10 percent of the total dwelling units in multi-family buildings without elevators consisting of three or more rental units or four or more condominium units subject to the following building standards for persons with disabilities:

- The primary entry to the dwelling unit shall be on an accessible route unless exempted by site impracticality tests.
- At least one powder room or bathroom shall be located on the primary entry level served by an accessible route.

Development Services 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 other incentives to reduce the cost of development for housing projects serving special needs populations.

It would be appropriate for the Town to analyze its fee schedule and planning entitlement review and permitting process to assure reasonable accommodation is provided to future housing projects serving special needs groups, including seniors and persons with disabilities, with funding assistance and other regulatory concessions/incentives, as appropriate and subject to funding availability.

#### 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, *familial 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. (Emphasis added.)

“Family” is not defined in the Danville 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. Single Parent Households**

Single parent households generally have lower incomes and higher living expenses, often making the search for affordable, decent and safe housing more difficult for this group. These households have special needs relating to access to childcare, health care and other supportive services.

In 2000, 4.1 percent of all households in Danville were single parent family households headed by female (623 households).

#### **4. Large Family Households**

Large family households are defined as households containing five or more persons. Because there is a limited supply of adequately sized households to accommodate large family households, they are considered a special need group. Because there is often a need for large family households to save for non-housing related expenses, these families often reside in relatively smaller units, resulting in overcrowded living conditions. The 1990 Census reported that 1,069 Danville households included five or more people (9.7% of all households). This subset of households grew to become 10.2% of all Danville households by 2000, being 1,506 of all households.

#### **5. Agricultural Workers**

Agricultural workers are those workers earning their primary income through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. According to the 1990 Census, 112 persons in Danville were employed in the farming, forestry, and fishing occupational category in 1990 (representing 2.1% of all Contra Costa County persons in that occupational category). Based on a statewide study of migrant and seasonal farm workers completed in 2000, 2,470 migrant and seasonal farm workers were working in Contra Costa County (*Migrant and Seasonal Farm worker Enumeration Profiles Study - California*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2000). Assuming that Danville has maintained a 2.1% share of the County's agricultural labor, it would be estimated that approximately 52 Danville residents are migrant or seasonal farm workers.

#### **6. Homeless Persons**

Project Hope, in partnership with the Contra Costa Inter-jurisdictional Council on homelessness, conducted a count of the regional homeless population on January 30, 2007. The survey identified 4,157 homeless persons in Contra Costa County, including 321 children and 70 unaccompanied youth. A total of 2,408 persons of the homeless in the county (58%) were sheltered at the time the survey was conducted, leaving 1,749 unsheltered.

The survey documented the presence of three unsheltered male homeless individuals in Danville, representing less than one percent of the countywide unsheltered population. Although the point-in-time count indentified 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 lead to homelessness.

Although no homeless shelters are located within Danville, there are various facilities located in Contra Costa County and the Tri-Valley area available to provide shelter for

homeless individuals and families. As of Spring 2004, ten facilities with approximately 517 emergency shelter beds were operated in Contra Costa County, with 306 beds for individuals and 211 serving families. This information was compiled by Contra Costa County Continuum of Care Board in 2004, as published in their report *Ending Homelessness in 10 Years: A County-Wide Plan for the Communities of Contra Costa County*. The nearest facilities to Danville that provide transitional housing beds (there were 591 transitional beds reported in Contra Costa County as of Spring 2004) are located in Clayton (Diablo Valley Ranch), Concord (Sunrise House) and in Martinez (Mountain View House). The nearest facilities to Danville that provide permanent supportive housing beds (there were 524 permanent supportive beds reported in Contra Costa County in 2004) are located in Pleasant Hill (Garden Park Apartments) and El Cerrito (Idaho Apartments).

## **D. HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS**

### **1. Housing Growth**

Danville's residential growth rate has varied since 1970, as shown in **Table 11**. 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 2010 General Plan in August 1999, 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 build out period of 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 have more renters than 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 rental units.

The 2000 Census indicates that owner-occupied units comprised 89.1% of Danville's housing stock while rental units comprised the remaining 10.9% (**refer to Table 7**).

### **3. Housing Age and Condition**

As is the case for most of the Tri-Valley region, Danville has a relatively new housing stock (**refer to Table 11**). Only 346 units, or 2.3% of the existing housing stock as of the year 2009, were built prior to 1950. A majority of the housing stock in Danville (i.e., approximately 80%) was built since 1970, with close to 60% 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. According to the 2000 Census, only 24 units (<0.2%) lacked complete individual plumbing facilities and only 159 units (1.0%) lacked complete kitchen facilities. The Town's Building Division

Table 11

**AGE OF HOUSING (March 2009)**  
**- Town of Danville**

---

<b>DECADE CONSTRUCTED</b>	<b>NUMBER OF UNITS</b>	<b>PERCENT OF TOTAL</b>
<i>2001 or Newer</i>	473	3.1%
<i>1991 thru 2000</i>	3,562	23.4%
<i>1981 thru 1990</i>	2,831	18.6%
<i>1971 thru 1980</i>	5,262	34.6%
<i>1961 thru 1970</i>	1,665	11.0%
<i>1951 thru 1960</i>	1,061	7.0%
<i>1941 thru 1950</i>	282	1.9%
<i>Pre-1940</i>	64	>1.0%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15,200</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

---

Sources: Contra Costa County Tax Assessor Office.

Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark, Sacramento, California, May 2008.

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 declines 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 south central portion of Contra Costa County and the Tri-Valley in November 2008 were as follows: Danville \$789,000; Dublin \$447,000; Livermore \$343,000; Pleasanton \$655,000; and San Ramon \$790,000 (see **Table 12**).

The median home prices contained in the **Table 12** were generated from DataQuick Information Systems, as posted on the California Association of Realtors website. 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 cited data compiled by RealData, Inc. (June, 2008) in its finding that apartment rental rates in the County are relatively high and continuing to rise. The County's draft housing element cites data indicated an average gross monthly unfurnished rent (excluding utility costs) in the unincorporated County of \$1,430 in June 2008, representing an increase of 5 percent since June 2007. Like home sales prices, rental rates also vary by size and location of the units. Countywide, the average rent ranged from \$936 for a 1-bedroom to \$2,237 for a 2 bedroom in the central county area. According to the County's draft housing element, vacancy rates for apartment units in the County in mid 2008 were 4.4%, as compared to 4.1% for the Bay Area as a whole. With a relatively high number of owner occupant households threatened by foreclosure due to the current economic downturn, it is anticipated that the vacancy rate will decrease as families leaving foreclosed homes create additional demand for rentals (see **Table 13**).

Table 12

**MEDIAN HOME SALES PRICES (2007 & 2008)**  
**- Alameda County/Contra Costa County Area and Selected Cities**

---

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>November 2007</b>	<b>November 2008</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<i>Contra Costa County</i>	\$521,000	\$260,000	-50.1%
<i>Danville</i>	\$1,030,000	\$789,000	-23.4%
<i>San Ramon</i>	\$803,000	\$790,000	-1.6%
<i>Alameda County</i>	\$495,000	\$300,000	-39.4%
<i>Dublin</i>	\$491,500	\$447,000	-9.1%
<i>Livermore</i>	\$480,000	\$343,000	-28.5%
<i>Pleasanton</i>	\$715,000	\$655,000	-8.4%

---

Source: California Association of Realtors, <http://www.car.org/index.php?id=MzgyOTM>, accessed on 3/23/09.

Table 13

**MONTHLY APARTMENT RENTAL RATES (June 2008)**  
**- Contra Costa County**

---

Region	Type: Bedroom (BR)			Overall Average Rent
	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	
<i>East</i>	\$ 936.00	\$1,074.00	\$1,313.00	\$1,108.00
<i>Central</i>	\$1,582.00	\$2,237.00	--	\$1,910.00
<i>West</i>	\$1,148.00	\$1,395.00	--	\$1,272.00
<i>Countywide Average</i>	\$1,222.00	\$1,569.00	\$1,313.00	\$1,430.00

---

Source: Contra Costa County Draft 2007 - 2014 Housing Element as cited from RealData, Inc. June 2008.

**Table 14** provides information regarding Fair Market Rents (FMRs), an index primarily used to determine payment standard amounts for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Choice Voucher program. HUD annually estimates FMRs for 530 metropolitan areas and 2,045 nonmetropolitan county FMR areas. FMRs are gross rent estimates. They include the shelter rent plus the cost of all tenant-paid utilities, except telephones, cable or satellite television service, and internet service. HUD sets FMRs to assure that a sufficient supply of rental housing is available to program participants. To accomplish this objective, FMRs must 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 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 15** provides information about surveyed rent schedules for rental units within Danville. **Table 16** provides information on households overpaying for housing.

b. Housing Affordability by Household Income

The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) publishes household income data annually. **Table 17** shows the maximum annual income levels for each income group, adjusted for household size. This information is utilized to calculate the maximum affordable housing payments for different households (varying by size and income level) and their eligibility for federal housing assistance. The information pertinent to Danville is the income levels determined to be present for the Alameda County/Contra Costa County area. In evaluating affordability, the maximum affordable price refers to the maximum amount that could be afforded by households in the upper range of their respective income category. Households in the lower ends of the category can afford less in comparison. **Table 18** shows the affordable housing costs for renter-occupied households (indicating affordable housing costs for extremely low, very low, low, moderate and above moderate income categories) as a function of household size. **Table 19** shows the affordable housing costs for ownership households for the same income categories, again as a function of household size.

Table 14

**FAIR MARKET RENTS & BAY AREA APARTMENT RENTAL RATES**  
**- Contra Costa County and Bay Area**

**Fair Market Rents by Unit Bedrooms from 2000 to 2005**  
**Contra Costa County, California (1)**

<b>FMR Year</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>One-Bedroom</b>	<b>Two-Bedroom</b>	<b>Three-Bedroom</b>	<b>Four-Bedroom</b>
<i>FY 2009</i>	\$905	\$1,093	\$1,295	\$1,756	\$2,174
<i>FY 2005</i>	\$945	\$1,132	\$1,342	\$1,870	\$2,293
<i>FY 2000</i>	\$607	\$734	\$921	\$1,263	\$1,509

**Bay Area Apartment Rental Rates (2)**

<b>County</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<i>Contra Costa</i>	\$1,157	\$1,142	\$1,156	\$1,214	\$1,238	7.0%

Footnote: (1) Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are primarily used to determine payment standard amounts for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Choice Voucher program. HUD annually estimates FMRs for 530 metropolitan areas and 2,045 nonmetropolitan county FMR areas. FMRs are gross rent estimates. They include the shelter rent plus the cost of all tenant-paid utilities, except telephones, cable or satellite television service, and internet service. HUD sets FMRs to assure that a sufficient supply of rental housing is available to program participants. To accomplish this objective, FMRs must 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 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.

(2) Average of sizes from studio to three bedroom townhouses.

Sources: Department of Housing and Urban Development,  
<http://www.huduser.org/datasets/fmr/fmrs/histsummary>, accessed on 3/2/09.

Real Data, Inc.

**Table 15**  
**RENTAL RATES FOR DANVILLE APARTMENTS AND FOR**  
**APARTMENTS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA (MARCH 2009)**  
**- Town of Danville and Surrounding Areas**

Sequoia Grove - Podva Lane @ San Ramon Valley Blvd. (38 units)				
2 Bedroom	2	1 - 2	\$1750 - \$1850	724 - 913
Rose Garden Apartments - Rose Garden Shopping Center (55 units)				
1 Bedroom	1	1	\$1425	676
2 Bedroom	2	1	\$1445 - \$1495	756 - 857
2 Bedroom	2	2	\$1545 - \$1695	896
Danville Park Apartments - 217 Valley Creek Lane (96 units)				
Bedroom	1	1	\$1220 - \$1425	540 - 670
2 Bedroom	2	1 - 2	\$1425 - \$1675	850 - 1150
El Dorado Apartments - 164 El Dorado Avenue (7 units)				
1 Bed	1	1	\$1250	750
2 Bed	2	1	\$1540 - \$1580	750
3 Bed	3	2	\$1680	1019
Canyon Creek - 1000 Canyon Village Circle, San Ramon (268 units)				
1 Bed	1	1	\$1195	734
1 Bed	1	1	\$1295	734
2 Bed	2	1	\$1215	976
2 Bed	2	2	\$1307	1029
Bel Air - 2000 Shoreline Loop, San Ramon (462 units)				
Studio	1	1	\$974	436
1 Bed	1	1	\$1029	712
1 Bed	1	1	\$1100	702
1 Bed	1	1	\$1350	770
1 Bed	1	1	\$1550	845
Pinnacle Crow Canyon - 1700 Promontory Lane, San Ramon (400 units)				
Studio	1	1	\$1170 - \$1280	575
1 Bed	1	1	\$1380 - \$1490	727
2 Bed	2	1	\$1605 - \$1725	956
2 Bed	2	1	\$1705 - \$ 1815	1057
3 Bed	3	1	\$2195 - \$2305	1332

Source: Town of Danville Development Services Department. March, 2009.

**Table 16**

**HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING FOR HOUSING (1990 & 2000)  
- Town of Danville and Unincorporated Contra Costa County**

<b>LOCATION, PERIOD, &amp; TENURE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS (1)</b>	<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING FOR HOUSING</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING FOR HOUSING</b>
<i>Danville - 1990 Census</i>			
<i>Owners</i>	9,072	2,158	24%
<i>Renters</i>	1,295	582	45%
<i>Danville - 2000 Census</i>			
<i>Owners</i>	12,736	3,056	24%
<i>Renters</i>	1,600	645	42%
<b>POVERTY STATUS</b>	<b>CENSUS 2000</b>	<b>2007 ACS ESTIMATES</b>	
<i>Individuals in Poverty</i>	908 (2.2%)	1,425 (3.4%)	
<i>- 18 years and older</i>	707 (2.4%)	Not determined	
<i>- 65 years and older</i>	247 (2.4%)	Not determined	
<i>Families</i>	153 (1.3%)	Not determined	
<i>Families with Female Head of Household</i>	54 (5.3%)	Not determined	
<i>- w/ related children &lt;18 yrs.</i>	48 (7.3%)	Not determined	

Footnote: (1) The 2000 Census determined there were 13,198 owner-occupied units (89.1%) and 1,618 renter-occupied units (10.9%). For purposes of determining the number of households overpaying for housing, 2000 Census determined 3,056 of 12,736 reporting owner-occupied households assigned  $\geq 35\%$  of gross household income to housing and 645 of 1,600 reporting renter-occupied households assigned  $\geq 30\%$  of gross household income to housing.

Sources: Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census of Population and Housing.

Bureau of the Census, 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates.

Table 17

**MAXIMUM QUALIFYING HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD  
SIZE AND INCOME LEVEL (February 2008)  
- Alameda County/Contra Costa County Area**

<b>MAXIMUM INCOME LEVEL / HOUSEHOLD SIZE</b>	<b>1-person</b>	<b>2-person</b>	<b>3-person</b>	<b>4-person</b>	<b>5-person</b>	<b>6-person</b>	<b>7-person</b>
<i>Median Income Income (100% of Median Household Income)</i>	\$60,300	\$68,900	\$77,500	\$86,100	\$93,000	\$99,900	\$106,800
<i>Moderate Income (81 – 120% of Median Household Income)</i>	\$72,300	\$82,600	\$93,000	\$103,300	\$111,600	\$119,800	\$128,100
<i>Low Income (51 – 80% of Median Household Income)</i>	\$46,350	\$53,000	\$59,600	\$66,250	\$71,550	\$76,850	\$82,150
<i>Very Low Income (31 – 50% of Median Household Income)</i>	\$30,150	\$34,450	\$38,750	\$43,050	\$46,500	\$49,950	\$53,400
<i>Extremely Low Income (&lt;30% of Median Household Income)</i>	\$18,100	\$20,700	\$23,250	\$25,850	\$27,900	\$30,000	\$32,050

Source: Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development, 2008 Income Limits. February, 2008.

Table 18

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING COSTS FOR  
RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS (February 2008)  
- Alameda County/Contra Costa County Area**

INCOME GROUP	1-person Households	2-person Households	3-person Households	4-person Households
<i>Median Income Level (100% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- Income	\$5,025/mo	\$5,742/mo	\$6,458/mo	\$7,175/mo
- Affordable Rent (1)	\$1,400/mo	\$1,615/mo	\$1,788/mo	\$2,004/mo
<i>Moderate Income Level (81-120% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- Income	\$6,025/mo	\$6,883/mo	\$7,750/mo	\$8,608/mo
- Affordable Rent	\$1,700/mo	\$1,957/mo	\$2,176/mo	\$2,434/mo
<i>Low Income Level (51-80% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- Income	\$3,863/mo	\$4,417/mo	\$4,967/mo	\$5,521/mo
- Affordable Rent	\$1,051/mo	\$1,217/mo	\$1,341/mo	\$1,507/mo
<i>Very Low Income Level (31-50% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- Income	\$2,513/mo	\$2,871/mo	\$3,229/mo	\$3,588/mo
- Affordable Rent	\$ 646/mo	\$ 753/mo	\$ 820/mo	\$ 927/mo
<i>Extremely Low Income Level (&lt;30% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- Income	\$1,508/mo	\$1,725/mo	\$1,938/mo	\$2,154/mo
- Affordable Rent	\$ 344/mo	\$ 410/mo	\$ 432/mo	\$ 497/mo

Footnote: (1) Affordable housing costs for renter-occupied households assume that 30% of gross household income, inclusive of a utility allowance, is applied toward rent. Assumed utility allowance for 1- and 2-person households is \$65.00 per month. Assumed utility allowance for 3- and 4-person households is \$90.00 per month to reflect typical renter obligations in Danville.

Sources: Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development 2008 Income Limits. February, 2008.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development - Allowances for Tenant-Furnished Utilities and Other Services. October, 2008.

Table 19

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING COSTS FOR OWNER-OCCUPIED  
HOUSEHOLDS (February 2008)**  
- Alameda County/Contra Costa County Area

<b>INCOME GROUP</b>	<b>1-person Households</b>	<b>2-person Households</b>	<b>3-person Households</b>	<b>4-person Households</b>
<i>Moderate Income Level (81-120% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- <i>Income</i>	\$6,025/mo	\$6,883/mo	\$7,750/mo	\$8,608/mo
- <i>Maximum Sales Price</i> (1)	\$268,040	\$302,543	\$337,410	\$377,544
<i>Low Income Level (51-80% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- <i>Income</i>	\$3,863/mo	\$4,417/mo	\$4,967/mo	\$5,521/mo
- <i>Maximum Sales Price</i>	\$140,343	\$156,604	\$173,228	\$195,119
<i>Very Low Income Level (31-50% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- <i>Income</i>	\$2,513/mo	\$2,871/mo	\$3,229/mo	\$3,588/mo
- <i>Maximum Sales Price</i>	\$96,561	\$106,567	\$116,937	\$132,573
<i>Extremely Low Income Level (&lt;30% of Median Household Income)</i>				
- <i>Income</i>	\$1,508/mo	\$1,725/mo	\$1,938/mo	\$2,154/mo
- <i>Maximum Sales Price</i>	\$52,779	\$56,531	\$60,646	\$70,028

Footnote: (1) Affordable housing sales prices are based on the following assumed variables: 10% down payment; 30 year fixed rate mortgage at 5.5% annual interest rate; assignment of 30% of gross household income to housing costs - to cover principal, interest, property taxes at 1.25% of valuation, homeowner association fees of \$225/month, and mortgage insurance at \$125/month. For moderate income households, assignment of 35% of gross household income to housing costs is assumed.

Sources: Department of Housing and Community Development - Division of Housing Policy Development 2008 Income Limits. February, 2008.

Town of Danville Development Services Department. March 2009

## **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)(8) through §65583(a)(9)(D) 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 only two residential projects in Danville that would potentially be subject to these regulations. One is a ten-unit apartment project built in on the west side of the community (184 El Dorado Avenue) that had a requirement imposed through project financing to provide two moderate income senior units. While the project's original financing has been replaced with private financing, the rental schedule for the entire project makes all ten units affordable to low or moderate income households - as a result of a combination of project age, the size of units, the relative shortage of onsite parking, and the current market conditions for rental projects in the area. No change in the affordability of project is envisioned in a ten year period. The second project is the 76-bed Sunrise Assisted Living of Danville residential care facility built in 1998. An affordable housing agreement was executed obligating the provision of seven units (10% of the units in the project) as units available to moderate income households (to meet Danville's inclusionary housing requirements). Project financing (through California Statewide Communities Development Corporation in 1997) was such that a more restrictive below market rate obligation was imposed (i.e., 15 units required to be affordable to very low income households). The determination as to whether the project is in compliance with either affordability standard is under review as an active code enforcement case. The project appears to have been sold in 2004, with alternate, conventional financing secured at the time of that sale.

## **E. 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 RHNA methodology implemented by ABAG takes into account, among other things, growth in both households and jobs, proximity to transportation facilities, and historic patterns of provision for very low and low income housing needs (see Appendix A).

### **1. Existing Housing Need**

As is the case for many communities, a continuing priority of Danville is enhancing or maintaining the quality of life. One key measure of quality of life is the extent of housing problems. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has developed an existing needs statement that details the number and percentage of households earning lower income, living in overcrowded conditions or overpaying for housing. Those conditions, or housing problems, are defined below:

- Lower Income - Refers to a household earning less than 80% of the County median family income, as adjusted by family size. Based on February 2008 income levels for a four-person household, the median household income for Alameda County/Contra Costa County area was \$86,100.
- Overcrowding - Refers to a housing unit that is occupied by more than one person per room, excluding kitchens, bathrooms, hallways and porches, as defined by HUD.
- Cost Burden - Refers to a renter-occupied household paying more than 30% of its gross income for housing or owner-occupied household paying more than 35% of its gross income for housing, including costs for utilities, property insurance and real estate taxes, as defined by HUD.

Overcrowding typically occurs when housing costs are so high relative to income that families double up or reside in smaller units to devote income to other basic needs. Overcrowded conditions are assumed to be in place when there is more than one person per total rooms in a housing unit.

In 2000, 4.6% of all households in the unincorporated portion of Contra Costa County lived in overcrowded conditions. As may be anticipated, overcrowding is more prevalent among renter-occupied households than owner-occupied households. The 1990 Census determined that, on a countywide basis, 9% of renter-occupied households lived in

overcrowded conditions, while 3% of owner-occupied households lived in overcrowded conditions. Overcrowding conditions in Danville were determined through the 2000 Census to be less severe than seen on a countywide basis, with less than 1.0% of all Danville households living in overcrowded conditions (157 of 15,027 household units).

In 1990, 9.7% of households in Danville had five or more persons in the household. The vast majority of these large family households (89%) were owner-occupied households. A total of 117 of these large family households were renter-occupied households (being 8.7% of all renter-occupied households).

As indicated above, a renter-occupied household is considered to be overpaying for housing if it assigns more than 30% of its gross income on housing and an owner-occupied household is considered to be overpaying if it assigns more than 35% of income to housing (the households are considered to be “cost burdened”). Households that pay 50% or more of their incomes on housing experience a severe housing cost burden. Problems of housing cost burden may occur when housing costs rise faster than income. While housing costs for owner-occupied households making post real-estate “bubble” purchases are seeing housing costs frequently being 30% below recent market highs, the relatively high housing prices in the area still significantly limit the number of households that can purchase a home in Danville or elsewhere in the central Contra Costa County corridor. While home values have seen a measurable decline, there has not been a corresponding drop in market rate rents sought by renter-occupied households.

## **2. Future Housing Need**

Future housing need refers to the share of the region’s housing growth that has been allocated to a community. ABAG is directed by the State to distribute the region’s State-assigned housing need. In allocating the region’s future housing needs to the various member jurisdictions, ABAG takes the following factors 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 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

The process undertaken by ABAG is referred to as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. In undertaking the RHNA allocation process, ABAG relied heavily on the series of ABAG-published *Projections* documents.

**Table 1** provides the breakdown of Danville’s share of future RHNA 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 583 residential units.

Pursuant to AB 2634, local jurisdictions are required to project the housing needs of extremely low income (ELI) households (i.e., households earning  $\leq 30\%$  of the area median income). In estimating the number of ELI households, a jurisdiction may use 50% of the very low income (VLI) allocation or apportion the VLI figure based on Census data. For purposes of housing needs assessment for the 2007 - 2014 Housing Element planning period, the Town's RHNA of 196 VLI units was split according to the second methodology, putting 92 units into the ELI sub-category and 104 units into the VLI subcategory. Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data (refer to Table 7B) supports this apportionment given the presence of 473 ELI households and 535 VLI households in Danville in 2000 (a 46.9% ELI to 53.1% VLI "split").