

CITY OF DAVIS

2013–2021 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

ADOPTED FEBRUARY 25, 2014



TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY: **PMC**[®]



March 25, 2014

Melinda Coy

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Division of Housing Policy Development

2020 W. El Camino, Suite 500

Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: CITY OF DAVIS ADOPTED HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE


Dear Ms. Coy:

Enclosed is the City of Davis's 5th round Adopted Housing Element for review. Based on your review in the letter dated January 2, 2014 and our phone discussion with you and City staff on December 13, 2013, in addition to input received from the public, Planning Commission and City Council we've revised the draft Housing Element. We feel this revised draft of the Davis Housing Element addresses nearly all of the concerns you originally had and meets all of the statutory requirements.

As in the first draft submitted in October 2013, green highlighting has been used to indicate sections or tables that have been updated for you to focus on in your streamlined review.

We look forward to hearing from your office. If you have any questions regarding the draft, please do not hesitate to contact me at (805) 250-7981 or asinsheimer@pmcworld.com.

Sincerely,


Amy Sinsheimer, PMC

CC: Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator

Enclosures/Attachments:

Adopted 2013–2021 Housing Element

RESOLUTION NO. 14-025 SERIES 2014

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DAVIS CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT THE
UPDATED HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN FOR 2013-2021
AND DIRECT STAFF TO SUBMIT THE UPDATED HOUSING ELEMENT TO
THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
FOR STATE CERTIFICATION**

WHEREAS, the City's Housing Element has been updated and includes current demographic and housing stock information as required by State Housing Law; and

WHEREAS, the City has identified an adequate list of housing sites to accommodate the amount, type and income levels required by the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation; and

WHEREAS, the City has conducted an environmental review of the Housing Element, prepared Initial Study and Negative Declaration #03-13 and has determined that this update will not result in a significant effect on the environment; and

WHEREAS, the dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies has eliminated the majority of the local resources for affordable housing development and required the City of Davis to explore creative mechanisms for accommodating housing needs;

WHEREAS, the Element contains program actions to meet the goal to provide housing that is affordable for residents with low incomes and low-paying jobs, fixed incomes, and pensions; and to strive to meet the identified current and projected local need for housing and for housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households including provision of Davis' eight-year fair share of regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the City will continue to diligently seek resources to create and conserve the supply of housing; and

WHEREAS, the only Disadvantaged Urban Community within the Davis Planning Area is Royal Oaks Trailer Park, adjacent to the south Davis City limits. Royal Oaks is adequately served by municipal infrastructure and services, and no additional analysis is necessary; and

WHEREAS, the City has submitted its draft Housing Element document to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and has made changes and updates in response to HCD's questions and comments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Davis that:

1. The City Council hereby certifies Negative Declaration #03-13 that has been prepared for this update to the City's Housing Element as adequate under the California Environmental Quality Act. No significant impacts are identified and no mitigation is required;

2. Program Action 10 in the draft document, relating to the Cannery project, shall be replaced with the following text:

Amend the zoning for the University Flats sites within the Residential-High Density subareas of The Cannery site to require a minimum net density of 20 units per acre or greater. Alternatively, subject to approval of The Cannery developer, the City shall amend the zoning in a subarea within The Cannery site where all of the following criteria can be met: achieve a minimum net density of 20 units per acre or greater, accommodate at least 96 units, and the requirements of Government Code section 65583.2(h).

3. Program Action 43 in the draft document, relating to review of the Affordable Housing Ordinance, shall be replaced with the following text:


The City shall review the Affordable Housing Ordinance at least every five years to confirm its effectiveness. The next such review shall be scheduled no later than December 2016. The review shall evaluate number and types of affordable and market housing units constructed, the effectiveness of accessory dwelling unit pilot program in providing affordable housing, in-lieu fees generated and the purposes to which they are allocated, and consistency with other local policy objectives, including smart growth principles, accessibility, energy efficiency, etc. Robust public outreach shall be a required component of this review.

4. The City Council adopts the updated Housing Element, which includes changes in response to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)'s review of the document in accordance with state law;
5. The City Council directs staff to resubmit this updated Housing Element document for certification by HCD.


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council for the City of Davis this 25th day of February, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES: Lee, Swanson, Krovoza

NOES: Frerichs, Wolk


Joseph F. Krovoza
Mayor

ATTEST:


Joe S. Mirabile, CMC
City Clerk

Chapter 1 – Introduction	1-1
Chapter 2 – Review of Previous Housing Element	2-1
Chapter 3 – Housing Needs Assessment.....	3-1
Chapter 4 – Site Inventory and Local Resources.....	4-1
Chapter 5 – Constraints to Housing Production.....	5-1
Chapter 6 – Housing Goals, Policies, Standards, and Actions	6-1
Chapter 7 – Implementation Program	7-1

Appendices

Appendix A - Full Underutilized Sites List

Appendix B - Land Inventory Maps

TABLES

Table 1: City of Davis Regional Housing Needs Allocation (January 1, 2013 to October 31,2021).....	1-3
Table 2 Review of Program Action Objectives in 2008-2013 Housing Element.....	2-2
Table 3: Population and Household Trends.....	3-6
Table 4: Age Distribution, 2000 and 2010.....	3-8
Table 5: Household Income Distribution, 2000 and 2010.....	3-9
Table 6: Employment by Industry, Davis, 2010.....	3-12
Table 7: Davis Workers by Place of Residence, 2010	3-13
Table 8: UC Davis Faculty and Staff Place of Residence, 2010	3-14
Table 9: Household Income Distribution of Davis Workers, 2010	3-15
Table 10: Annual Worker Earnings, 2010.....	3-15
Table 11: Selected Salaries and Affordable Housing Costs, 2007.....	3-16
Table 12: Ratio of Jobs to Employed Residents, 2000 and 2010	3-18
Table 13: Population, Household, and Employment Projections	3-21
Table 14: Housing Stock by Year Built	3-26
Table 15A: Housing Condition Survey Results	3-27
Table 15B: Housing Stock Characteristics.....	3-28
Table 15C: Persons Per Room, 2000 and 2010.....	3-29
Table 16: Housing Problems for all Households, 2010	3-30
Table 17: City of Davis Multifamily Affordable Housing Stock, 2013.....	3-31
Table 18: Selected Average Multifamily Apartment Rents in Davis by Unit Size, 2012.....	3-38

Table 19: Housing Sales Prices in Davis, October 2012–April 2013	3-39
Table 20: Davis Household Cost Burdens, 2010.....	3-40
Table 21a: Davis Family Households Income Category Distribution, 2010	3-41
Table 21b: Monthly Housing Affordability Levels for Davis Family Households by Income Category and Size, 2013.....	3-42
Table 22: Household Tenure by Age of Householder, 2000 and 2010.....	3-57
Table 23: Elderly Households and Housing Cost Burdens, 2008	3-58
Table 24: Family and Non-Family Households by Size, 2000 and 2010	3-59
Table 25: Household Size and Tenure, 2000 and 2010.....	3-60
Table 26: Number of Bedrooms by Tenure, 2000–2010.....	3-61
Table 27: Large Family Households and Housing Cost Burdens, 2000.....	3-62
Table 28: UC Davis Off-Campus Households, 2010–2011	3-63
Table 29: Single Head of Household with Children, 2000 and 2010	3-64
Table 30: Civilian Non-Institutionalized Population with Disabilities, 2000	3-65
Table 31: Persons with Disabilities by Employment Status, 2010	3-67
Table 32: Persons with Developmental Disabilities by Age, 2010.....	3-68
Table 33: Yolo County Farm Employment, 1990 to 2010	3-69
Table 34 A: Yolo County Homeless Population, January 2013	3-70
Table 34 B: Yolo County Unsheltered Count	3-70
Table 34 C: Yolo County Sheltered Count	3-71
Table 35: Households by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2010.....	3-72
Table 36: Affordable Units At-Risk of Converting to Market Rate Rents.....	3-77
Table 37: RHNA Based on SACOG and Department of Finance Projections.....	3-81
Table 38: City Estimated Housing Production (based on available sites) to Meet RHNA	3-82
Table 39: Building Permits and Certificates of Occupancy Units Credited Toward Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) January 1, 2013 Through April 30, 2013	4-2
Table 40: Approved Projects Units Credited Toward Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as of April 30, 2013.....	4-4
Table 41: Inventory of Available Underutilized Sites and Accessory Dwelling Units to Meet Unmet RHNA as of April 30, 2013	4-11
Table 42: Land Inventory Summary and Progress Towards RHNA	4-13
Table 43: Projections Analysis.....	4-14
Table 44: Lot Consolidation Sites in The B and 3 rd Area.....	4-18
Table 45: 2013 Rents For Low- and Very Low-Income Rental Units in a Garden Apartment Building (1-5 Stories).....	4-23
Table 46: Additional Residential Opportunity Sites – Not Needed For RHNA 2013-2021 Housing Element.....	4-29
Table 47: General Plan Residential Densities With Density Bonus	5-3
Table 48a: Provisions for a Variety of Residential Use Types by Zones	5-8
Table 48b: Provisions for a Variety of Residential Use Types by Zones.....	5-9
Table 49: Sample Election Costs	5-19

Table 50: Potential Costs of Universal access Features.....	5-31
Table 51: City of Davis Planning Division Fee Schedule, Effective July 22, 2013	5-43
Table 52: City of Davis Planning Division Development Processing Time Limits	5-48
Table 53a: Provide Adequate Sites (Housing Supply) Implementation Plan.....	7-2
Table 53b: Provide Adequate Sites (Housing Supply) Implementation Plan	7-8
Table 54: Assist in Affordable Housing Development Implementation Plan	7-10
Table 55: Program to Promote Equal Housing Opportunities (Access) Implementation Plan.....	7-14
Table 56: Address Governmental Constraints Implementation Plan	7-17
Table 57a: Conserve and Improve Condition of Affordable Housing Stock Implementation Plan	7-19
Table 57b: Conserve and Improve Condition of Affordable Housing Stock Implementation Plan	7-20
Table 58a: Energy Conservation Implementation Plan.....	7-21
Table 58b: Energy Conservation Implementation Plan – Quantified Objectives.....	7-23

FIGURES

Figure 1.....	4-33
---------------	------

I.0 HOUSING AND THE GENERAL PLAN VISION

Historically, Davis has adopted an active approach in the assessment of housing need and the provision of housing to address local need, in order to ensure community diversity and to maintain the agricultural roots of the city. Davis has had a commitment to affordable housing since the 1980s that was formalized with its adoption of an inclusionary housing policy in 1987. Inclusionary requirements and a grassroots movement to produce the city's first affordable housing non-profit were reactions to housing costs that were impacting the fabric of the community—and still do. The following City of Davis General Plan Visions adopted in 2001 continue to assist in guiding the city's policies and planning goals related to housing:

- Quality of Life – including fostering a safe, diverse and sustainable environment that supports and stimulates Davis' individuals, families and youth through minimizing impacts of traffic, noise, pollution, crime and litter.
- Small Town Character – maintaining a compact city form that is surrounded by farmland and greenbelts and maintains Davis' small town character that enhances livability and social interaction.
- Diversity – celebrate and encourage a diverse cultural community.
- Arts and Culture – Identify and preserve archeological, historical and cultural resources.
- Natural Resource Protection – pursue sustainability and minimize impacts on Davis' land, water, air and biological resources.
- Distinct Neighborhood Identity – preserve and create neighborhoods that residents can identify, that include gathering places, and that promote a diversity of housing options that will enable people with a wide range of needs, economic levels, cultural identities, and ages to live in Davis.
- Neighborhood-Oriented Transportation System – promote transportation systems that harmonize with the city's neighborhoods and enhances quality of life.
- Parks and Open Space Program – Provide a park system and recreational programs and facilities that meet the diverse needs of Davis citizens.

- Agriculture – protect the viability of agriculture and prime agricultural land in and around Davis.
- Synergistic Partnership with UC Davis – recognize and strengthen the positive partnership between the City and UC Davis.
- Regional Context – recognize Davis’ role within the broader region, including understanding the impact of city policies on the region and through joint planning efforts.
- Regional Leadership – Make Davis a regional leader in slow and well-managed growth, agricultural and environmental preservation, and cultural diversity.
- Accountable, Citizen-Based Planning – Involve citizens on a continuous basis in all aspects of planning.

These visions have led to Davis’ adoption of policies that promote smart growth, local affordable housing and workforce housing programs, agricultural land mitigation and preservation, energy conservation and reduction, mixed-use and redevelopment incentives, local housing production targets, and the creative use and reuse of city land and resources. This Housing Element continues these local policies, as stated in the Davis General Plan. The following overarching goals from these policies were then used to form housing location principles for the consideration of potential housing sites.

“The overarching goals in the Davis General Plan which should influence housing location decisions include: A compact city surrounded by farmland and habitat with slow urban growth; a pedestrian-oriented vital downtown area; a connected greenway system; neighborhoods with schools, parks, greenbelts and shopping; a variety of housing types, designs and prices to meet local housing needs including affordable housing; conservation of energy and resources; a healthy living environment with clean air and compatible noise levels; a balanced transportation system which promotes alternative modes; and city fiscal stability.”

1.1 Regional Housing Needs Allocation

State law mandates that each area’s council of governments develop the Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) for its region. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is lead agency in developing the RHNP for the six counties and 22 cities that it serves, including Davis, that make up the Sacramento Region. SACOG’s plan is also required to include the Tahoe Basin portions that are within El Dorado and Placer counties, and the city of South Lake Tahoe. It is SACOG’s responsibility to coordinate with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to determine a regional housing needs projection. SACOG then allocates the projected need (in housing units) to each jurisdiction using the drafted RHNP for the region.

In November 2012, HCD issued a regional allocation of 104,970 units to the six-county region for the period from January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2021. This number was based on information provided by the California Department of Finance. Within this number, subcategory allocations by economic category were also issued for the region, with a breakdown as follows:

- Extremely-low income (less than 30% of area median income): 12,280 units (11.7%)
- Very low income (30% to 50% of area median income): 12,280 units (11.7%)
- Low Income (51% to 80% of area median income): 17,220 units (16.4%)
- Moderate (81% to 120% of area median income): 19,520 units (18.6%)
- Above Moderate (above 120% of area median income): 43,670 units (41.6%)

Using the SACOG-created methodology, reviewed and commented on by the localities, this regional allocation led to the following Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the City of Davis during this planning period:

**TABLE I: CITY OF DAVIS REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION
(JANUARY 1, 2013 TO OCTOBER 31, 2021)**

	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
Breakdown by Income Categories (in dwelling units)	124	124	174	198	446
Total Allocation	1,066 dwelling units				

1.2 Community Participation

The drafting of this Housing Element update included a substantial amount of time and effort by the City of Davis from the City Council, members of city commissions and city staff. In January 2013, the Davis City Council initiated a General Plan update to the city's Housing Element. The update was to focus on planning for the provision of adequate sites to meet the city's next Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the 7.8 year period from January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2013 and to meet the City's 1% Growth Policy.

Two public meetings related to the Housing Element, noticed publicly, were held by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council. On August 28, 2013, a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and Social Services Commission was held to provide a Housing Element update status report, and receive input and comments. Comments and input from the Commission can be generally summarized to include:

- Population and universal design to address age in place;
- Update on Affordable Housing Ordinance;
- Clarifications of living group, and Housing Policies 3.3 and 3.4; and
- Land inventory clarification relative to underutilized sites, and why Carlton Plaza should be credited toward lower income households in the land inventory. The Social Services Commission requested that additional information on the Carlton Plaza be provided regarding the intent of State law on sites allowing at least 30 units per acre to be counted toward lower income households as was applied to the Carlton Plaza project in the draft land inventory tables. The Commission in conjunction with the Legal Services of Northern California question the credit given to Carlton Plaza as they contend unit cost at the project will be more than any lower income person could afford.

On September 24, 2013, the City Council received the Draft Housing Element update information and took no formal action. The goal of this outreach was to provide an update to the City Council, interested parties, and the general public on the status of the Housing Element update process, and the next step of submitting the draft Housing Element to HCD for Streamlined Review. The Council asked clarifying questions, but took no formal action related to the Housing Element update.

Noticing for the meetings regarding this update included outreach to the following organizations:

- 1) Yolo County Housing (local housing authority)
- 2) Sacramento Housing Alliance
- 3) California Coalition for Rural Housing
- 4) Legal Services of Northern California (local office)
- 5) Local for-profit housing developers
- 6) Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC)
- 7) Davis Chamber of Commerce
- 8) Local nonprofit affordable housing developers

It should also be noted that the City has offered several opportunities for public participation with regard to the City's affordable housing requirements outside the Housing Element process. As part of the implementation of the 2008-2013 Housing Element, the City has evaluated and updated its affordable housing requirements. This process occurred over approximately six months and included

public input and stakeholder feedback at a series of public meetings and through direct outreach. Preliminary meetings for this discussion began at the City Council on February 5, 2013, and March 26, 2013. A meeting was also held with the Social Services Commission on April 13, 2013, to receive input on the proposed changes to the affordable housing requirements. As part of these first steps, the City Council directed the Social Services Commission to hold a public forum on potential changes to the affordable housing requirements; local developers, nonprofit affordable housing organizations, public housing employees, local legal services staff, and other interested parties were invited to this forum. Many attended and weighed in on the areas of consideration. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 22, 2013, to adopt changes to the affordable housing ordinance and policies. At two subsequent meetings—July 9, 2013, and August 27, 2013—the City Council adopted changes to local affordable housing requirements including implementation of SB 2 and AB 2634. Local residents and stakeholders were kept apprised of these meeting dates and participated in written and spoken public comment during this process.

As part of the City’s outreach regarding updates to the affordable housing requirements and the Housing Element, city staff invited participation and feedback from the countywide Homelessness and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC) through its then-president Bill Pride of Davis Community Meals. HPAC discussed local policy changes at a few of its meetings and provided written comment to the City. HPAC is comprised of non-profit and public organizational representatives who serve low-income households throughout Yolo County. HPAC includes the following types and examples of organizations:

- Affordable Housing Organizations (Community Housing Opportunities Corporation (CHOC), Mutual Housing California, and Yolo County Housing)
- Emergency Shelter and Resources Organizations (Davis Community Meals and Short-term Emergency Action Committee (STEAC))
- Food and Other Service Organizations (Yolo County Food Bank, CommuniCare Health, and Legal Services of Northern California)
- Local Public Agencies (Yolo County Office of Education and city representatives)
- Yolo County Homeless Coordinator

Outreach to HPAC was in addition to specific outreach to the other affordable housing organizations listed above and to Legal Services of Northern California.

Input from the community was incorporated into the goals, policies and program actions of the housing element update. The City, along with the City Council weighed all comments provided by Davis residents. Many of the specific comments received from members of the community focused

on the land inventory and identifying sites to meet the RHNA. Many comments were received and a summary of representative comments are listed below:

- The sites inventory including sites used to address the lower-income RHNA, in particular underutilized sites.
- Add more to the review and revise section of the Housing Element,
- Use updated homeless count information,
- Include additional data on housing for the disabled in Davis,
- Include additional analysis of the housing needs of farmworkers,
- Revise some program actions,
- Need more justification to count accessory dwelling units towards RHNA, and
- Add more description of public participation process.

The City held a Planning Commission hearing to review the adoption draft Housing Element on February 12, 2014 and a City Council hearing for adoption of the Housing Element on February 25, 2014.

1.2 A. Response to Input Received

The City has made revisions in response to input received on the Draft Housing Element as follows:

- Additional information about coordination with the Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition was added to Section 1.
- Section 2 was substantially revised to fully report on progress towards implementation of the goals, policies, and program actions from the previous Housing Element.
- 2013 homeless count information was added to Section 3.
- New Harmony affordable housing project received its certificates of occupancy in 2013. Updates have been made in several sections to reflect this date.
- In Section 4 the Mission Residences site and The Cannery site were moved to the list of underutilized sites as they are approved but have not yet received building permits. They are included in Table 41. Additionally, further description of each site and the units accommodated on them have also been included.

- Additional description and analysis of the methodology for including the numbers of accessory dwelling units both at The Cannery site and citywide has been added to Section 4.
- The density assumptions for the underutilized sites in Table 41 have been checked, revisions made where necessary, and further explanation added to Sections 4 and 5.
- Further analysis and information substantiating the potential for lot consolidation and redevelopment in the underutilized areas of the City have been added to Section 4 and Appendix A.
- Unit potential for the green sites in Table 46 were added to Section 4.
- Language in the section discussing transitional housing was clarified for consistency with state law in Section 5.
- Section 7 was substantially revised to streamline the program actions, consolidating them when possible. Additional information was added to many program actions regarding timing and expected results of implementation.
- A program action to require development at a minimum net density of 20 units per acre or greater on areas of The Cannery site identified for lower income units has been added to Section 7.
- A program action to monitor development of underutilized sites for lower-income housing and encourage and facilitate lot consolidation of underutilized sites has been added to Section 7.

The City has made a diligent effort to obtain public comment on the housing needs of the community and has considered all input in the development of its goals, policies and program actions. Refer to Section 6 and 7 for more details on policy and program action language.

1.3 Organization of Housing Element

Following this introduction, the Housing Element contains the following sections:

- Section 1. An Introduction of Davis General Plan vision and policies, background in the creation of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for this planning period, and a summary of the community outreach efforts that surrounded this update.
- Section 2. A review of the prior (2008-2013) Element, including a summary of the results, an analysis of the City's progress toward achieving its adopted goals and objectives, and an appraisal of its housing policies with the incorporation of lessons learned for this Housing Element Update.

- Section 3. A Housing Needs Assessment, which analyzes socio-economic conditions, housing conditions, population projections, special needs groups, local overcrowding and overpaying, and market cost trends to determine the City's current and future housing needs.
- Section 4. An Adequate Sites Inventory and Analysis, which identifies potential housing sites to accommodate the City's RHNA, analyzes their suitability and availability, and offers other site alternatives to address local housing needs.
- Section 5. A Constraints Analysis, which addresses governmental constraints to housing development such as zoning and fees, and non-governmental constraints, such as the high cost of land. This analysis includes specific consideration of governmental constraints to the provision of housing for persons with disabilities.
- Section 6. Goals, Standards, Policies, and Actions, designed to address the City's housing needs (supply and affordability), ensure equal access to housing, reduce housing constraints, work to preserve existing housing opportunities, and promote energy conservation in housing. This section includes quantified objectives that may be used to measure the City's progress.
- Section 7. An Implementation Plan, which summarizes local housing programs and establishes a timeline, available funding sources, and responsible party for carrying out Housing Element actions.

Appendices

2.0 REVIEW OF THE 2008-2013 HOUSING ELEMENT

This section documents the City's achievements under the 2008-2013 Housing Element with respect to the actions and objectives contained in the element, describes the relative success of the City's efforts to implement the 2008-2013 objectives, and contains recommendations for changes to address current and projected needs and state requirements between 2013 and 2021. Table 2 on the following page summarizes the steps taken during the past housing planning period to accomplish the quantified objectives provided in the City's 2008-2013 Housing Element.

TABLE 2 REVIEW OF PROGRAM ACTION OBJECTIVES IN 2008-2013 HOUSING ELEMENT

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Policy 7.1 Housing Supply		
<p>Program Action I. Process the planning entitlement application for the Oakshade affordable housing project (APNs 069-020-084 and 069-020-085) to allow for the provision of low and very-low income units needed to meet the City’s RHNA for this planning period.</p>	See objectives.	Delete.
<p>Objective a. Process planning entitlements. Responsible Agencies: Planning Division and Housing staff, with action by Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: March 2009, completed Potential Funding: Planning application fees and potential assistance from HOME and Redevelopment funds</p>	Entitlements were processed. Construction was completed for the Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project) in March 2013. The project provides 69 units of lower-income rental housing, including 25 extremely low income units, 16 very low income units, and 27 low income units.	Delete.
<p>Objective b. Consider funding request for project from non-profit affordable housing developers Responsible Agencies: Planning Division and Housing staff, with action by Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: March 2009, completed Potential Funding: Planning application fees and potential assistance from HOME and Redevelopment funds</p>	Completed.	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 2. Continue to give priority water and sewer services to units necessary to meet the City's RHNA for this planning period, with specific priority given to affordable housing units.</p> <p>Objective a. Ensure priority when processing required units for RHNA and affordable housing units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development and Public Works Departments, with action by the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning application fees</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City processes all applications as they are submitted and expedites projects that meet RHNA requirements, to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 3. As a vehicle for long range planning, continue to rank the sites with the best development potential for housing for allocation processes under the City's 1% policy, including development agreements that include adequate citizens' participation and City Council oversight in the planning implementation of the allocation processes.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Set up guidelines</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Completed set up guidelines.</p>	<p>Modify and continue. Objective will be modified to continue processing applications.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 4. Analyze the mechanism whereby existing and future mobile home sites can be made permanently affordable.</p> <p>Objective a. Analyze various models and policies, including Rancho Yolo grant research, make recommendation</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p> <p>Objective b. Review and take action</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Implementation was delayed based on limited city resources, including the dissolution of redevelopment and cuts to housing staff.</p> <p>Implementation was delayed based on limited city resources, including the dissolution of redevelopment and cuts to housing staff.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 5. As part of proposed large housing developments, consider requiring a percentage of small residential lots and structures with related floor area ratio standards to contribute to the supply of affordable housing and to avoid overbuilding of lots.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Consider policy beyond current requirement for a mix of housing types</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009, as part of General Plan Update</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This policy has been applied to new housing projects.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 6. Evaluate mechanism by which the City can encourage increased densities in Davis in order to facilitate greater affordability without sprawl. Study such dwellings as row houses, town houses, second story apartments over businesses, impact of increased allowable densities, and second dwelling units. At a minimum, the study parameters should include analysis of the cost of construction impact on local infrastructure, impact to the city General fund, affordability, proximity to shopping and services and consistency with neighborhood preservations standards as they relate to adaptive reuse, privacy, open space, building mass and scale and parking impact issues.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Consider policy beyond current requirement for a mix of housing types</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and</p>	<p>City has adopted additional policies to implement this objective. (Resolution #11-077; 6/14/11)</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009, as part of General Plan Update</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 7. Strive to provide owner-occupied townhouses and condominiums in and near the core area and the neighborhood shopping centers geared to empty-nesters and singles and couples without children, in order to limit sprawl and provide lifestyle alternatives for those who do not need large suburban houses.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Consider additional steps to promote these types of development, particularly for potential housing sites that rank high on City list.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with direction from City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing, starting Spring 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>City has adopted additional policies to implement this objective. (Resolution #11-077; 6/14/11)</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 8. As directed by City Council, City staff will develop a report on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the suspended Middle Income Housing Ordinance by June 2011.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a.</p>	<p>The suspension of the Middle Income Housing Ordinance continues. Implementation of this</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Evaluate whether the requirement is a constraint on housing development</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Housing Staff b. Social Services Commission and City Council c. Planning Division <p>Timeframe: June 2011</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>objective was delayed based on the slow housing market.</p>	
<p>Program Action 9. The City of Davis will complete a comprehensive review of the following policies to evaluate the cumulative impact on residential development: the 1 percent Growth Policy, Measure J, the Phased Allocation Ordinance and the Middle Income Ordinance (currently suspended). The review will identify the cumulative impact of these separate policies, initiatives and ordinances on residential development and direction on any changes to address the identified regulatory barriers. The review will evaluate the City's ability to achieve the ultimate common goals established by these policies and ensure that there is no redundancy in the combination of their implementation. As issues are identified as part of this review the City will implement changes to mitigate and remove barriers, increase the transparency of these policies and establish ways to streamline these policies and processing permit procedures to assist with the development of a variety of housing types to serve a range of income levels.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Evaluate whether the requirement is a constraint on housing development</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: a. Planning Division b. Housing Staff</p> <p>Timeframe: December 2012</p> <p>Potential Funding: General Fund/Staff time</p>	<p>Initial review was completed April 6, 2010 by the city Council. The Middle Income Ordinance was suspended and the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance has since been modified. Additional review will occur in the upcoming planning period.</p>	<p>Continue</p>
<p>Program Action 10. The City will review the current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to ensure that its requirements do not unduly impact a developer's ability to develop housing in the City of Davis. The City is currently conducting visioning workshops on its affordable housing program to explore program options for increasing affordability of existing housing stock and for encouraging additional in-fill development and to ensure that the intent of the program allows for the development of affordable housing through the completion of housing developments. The City will also review recent court cases regarding inclusionary housing requirements to ensure compliance with state law.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Evaluate whether the requirement is a constraint on housing development</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p>	<p>This review was completed with changes being adopted in July and August 2013. This objective will be modified and continued to evaluate the 2013 changes.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>a. Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: June 2011</p> <p>Potential Funding: Affordable Housing Funds</p>		
<p>Program Action 11. The City will facilitate the development of housing to meet the needs of the City of future growth sites (identified as green sites in Table 44). The City will expedite planning applications on these sites, meet with interested property owners to provide them an overview of the planning application process, assist with implementing rezones and provide flexibility in development standards to promote the production of housing types that can serve a range of income levels.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Facilitate development of housing.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing. As projects come forward, the City will facilitate the development of housing on these sites.</p> <p>Potential Funding: General Fund and Project Application Fees</p>	The City has implemented the stated objectives for the highest priority "green light" development sites. Zoning has been approved on six of these "green light" sites (Verona, Chiles Ranch, Willowbank Park, New Harmony, Carlton Plaza, and Grande) and construction has begun or has been completed on all but the Chiles Ranch and Grande sites.	Process applications and project changes as needed to provide the sites in the land inventory list. This objective will be continued.
<p>Program Action 12. Explore mechanisms for encouraging and financing the construction of housing to meet the needs of households with children with low, very low, and extremely low incomes.</p>	See objectives.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Work with local affordable housing developers</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: a. Housing Staff</p> <p>Timeframe: December 2011</p> <p>Potential Funding: HOME, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside, Housing Trust Fund, CDBG</p>	<p>Completed New Harmony.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b. Provide funding assistance through HOME and Redevelopment Funds</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: b. Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: December 2011</p> <p>Potential Funding: HOME, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside, Housing Trust Fund, CDBG</p>	<p>Assisted New Harmony with HOME and Redevelopment Funds.</p>	<p>Modify and continue. Change to assistance through HOME and the Housing Trust Fund.</p>
<p>Objective c. Provide land dedication sites for development</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: c. Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Due to a lack of financing, the City delayed award of land dedication sites.</p>	<p>Continue, complete Strategic Plan for Affordable Housing Program.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>December 2011</p> <p>Potential Funding: HOME, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside, Housing Trust Fund, CDBG</p> <p>Objective d. Work with CalHFA on the provision of financing to resale-restricted units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: December 2011</p> <p>Timeframe:</p> <p>Potential Funding: HOME, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside, Housing Trust Fund, CDBG</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 13. Adopt zoning provisions allowing housing to meet the special housing needs of single persons or small households with low, very low- and extremely low- incomes by the following actions:</p> <p>This will include provisions addressing single room occupancy units (SRO), which are small units meant for a single person to inhabit as a permanent residence that may have a private bathroom or kitchen but not both.</p> <p>Work with the Housing Authority to provide Housing Choice Vouchers to small households with extremely low- and very low-incomes.</p> <p>Allow such housing, subject to discretionary review, in appropriate residential and commercial areas.</p>	<p>The City’s zoning ordinance has been amended to define and allow SROs in the City. This portion of the Program Action was completed. Yolo County Housing currently provides 391 Housing Choice Vouchers in the City. The City will work with the Housing Authority to secure the needed number of vouchers for City residents.</p>	<p>Modify, deleting language about the completed zoning changes, and continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Continue assessing commercial areas that have potential to accommodate residential uses (e.g. neighborhood shopping centers)</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: June 2011; Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Completed.</p>	<p>Delete</p>
<p>Program Action 14. Amend the City’s zoning code to include a definition of “emergency shelter.” In addition, list “emergency shelter” of 35 beds or fewer as a permitted use in the Industrial Zoning District (I). With a current land capacity of 75.22 acres, emergency shelters of 35 beds or fewer will be allowed in the I zoning district by right without a CUP or other discretionary action.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Compliance with SB 2 by clarifying that emergency shelters are permitted uses in the C-I district.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: September 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Staff time</p>	<p>Ordinance No. 2413 which included these code amendments to allow emergency shelters by right in the C-I District was adopted by the City Council on June 25, 2013. Completed.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 15. Per SB 2, transitional and supportive housing must be treated as residential uses. Specific definitions of each of these are needed to ensure clarity of what type of housing constitutes a supportive or transitional housing type. To this end, the City will add definitions of “transitional” and “supportive” housing to the Zoning Ordinance in accordance with state law.</p>	See objective.	Delete.
<p>Objective a. Compliance with SB 2 by clarifying that emergency shelters are permitted uses in the C-I district.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: September 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Staff time</p>	This objective was intended to address implementation of Senate Bill 2 related to transitional and supportive housing and erroneously duplicated the objective from Program Action 14. The transitional and supportive housing ordinance, including emergency shelters, was adopted by the City Council on June 25, 2013 (Ordinance No. 2413). Completed.	Delete.
<p>Program Action 16. Streamline the permit-approval process to the extent feasible by offering pre-application meetings and concurrent review of applications.</p> <p>Objective a. Encourage the construction of housing to meet the needs of single persons and households with children with extremely low, very-low, and low incomes.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division</p>	See objective.	Continue.
	Approximately 128 one bedroom very low, low, and moderated income units were built in the first few years of this RHNA period. The 69-unit New Harmony affordable housing project was recently completed and will further address the needs of households with children and is now being rented.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 17. Facilitate the process for reasonable accommodations in land use, zoning, funding, development and use of housing for persons with disabilities and adopt an ordinance that specifies procedures and standards for granting reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities. Consistent with policies that ensure a fair and equitable dispersal of group homes throughout the city. Complete adoption of the local reasonable accommodations ordinance currently being processed.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Complete processing of Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and action by City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>The City adopted a Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance in July 2008. Completed.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 18. Complete a review of land use and zoning standards to promote housing for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Complete processing of the Accessible Features Checklist</p>	<p>Completed.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and action by City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 19. Create incentives to encourage the establishment of fully accessible housing for people with disabilities in addition to requirements for accessible units otherwise mandated by federal and state law, including providing density bonuses for additional units that incorporate universal design or other similar design principles.</p>	See objectives.	Delete.
<p>Objective a. Research and make recommendations on potential incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff with Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Updated accessibility policy instead. Development community did not support the incentive concepts.	Delete.
<p>Objective b. Take action on recommendations</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p>	Updated accessibility policy instead. Development community did not support the incentive concepts.	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Timeframe: 2009 Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time		
Program Action 20. Facilitate the inclusion of accessibility and visitability features in the construction of new housing to the greatest extent possible, including use of incentives.	See objectives.	Continue.
Objective a. Enforcement of Visitability/ Accessibility Policy Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Timeframe: Ongoing Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time	The City has a visitability/accessibility policy that it applies to new housing projects. The City has also adopted the state-issued checklist requiring developers to offer additional features of accessibility.	Continue.
Objective b. Adoption of Accessible Features Checklist Ordinance Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council Timeframe: Spring 2008 Potential Funding:	The City has a visitability/accessibility policy that it applies to new housing projects. The City has also adopted the state-issued checklist requiring developers to offer additional features of accessibility.	Completed. Continues to apply to projects. Delete objective.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Already budgeted staff time		
<p>Program Action 21. Evaluate the Visitability/Accessibility Policy in 2010 after it has been applied to a variety of projects. Specifically, review the effectiveness of the policy targets and its categories of exemption, and determine if any modifications should be made including consideration of converting the policy to an ordinance.</p>	See objectives.	Modify and continue.
<p>Objective a. Track development of visitable and accessible units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing and by 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Staff has been tracking the approval and construction of projects with visitable and accessible units. The Social Services and Senior Citizen Commissions hosted a series of workshops in 2010 and 2011 to assess the policy and any needed updates. City Council directed staff to draft a Universal Access Ordinance at their meeting on November 13, 2012.	Modify to adopt ordinance, as directed by the updated policy and Council direction in November 2012. Continue objective.
<p>Objective b. Assess the policy for areas to improve, update as needed</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing and by 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Staff has been tracking the approval and construction of projects with visitable and accessible units. The Social Services and Senior Citizen Commissions hosted a series of workshops in 2010 and 2011 to assess the policy and any needed updates. City Council directed staff to draft a Universal Access Ordinance at their meeting on November 13, 2012.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 22. Continue to work with UC Davis to provide housing for students.</p>	See objective.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Meet regularly with UC Davis staff to communicate on areas to collaborate.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: City Manager’s Office and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 23. Support the provisions in the Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between the City of Davis and UC Davis in 1989, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The goal and intention of UC Davis to provide on-campus housing for 25% of the current (1988-89) base student population of 21,000 and for 35% of the new student population; and 2. The agreement that UC. Davis’ maximum and optimum three-term student population on the Davis campus is 26,000. <p>In addition, rely upon the University to provide on-campus student housing to provide for accelerated enrollment beyond 24,000 students by the year 2000-01 and 26,000 students by the year 2005-06. Seek an update of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) including the percentage of student housing to be provided on campus.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Meet regularly with UC Davis staff to communicate on areas to collaborate</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: City Manager's Office and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 24. Urge the University to provide on-campus housing for living groups.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Meet regularly with UC Davis staff to communicate on areas to collaborate</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: City Manager's Office and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 25. Investigate as a strategy City, RDA and UC Davis joint sponsorship of targeted student and faculty staff housing within the City limits.</p>	See objective.	Delete.
<p>Objective a.</p>	City determined that it would not annex West	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Continue to assess feasibility of annexing West Village project</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, City Manager’s Office and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Village project.</p>	
<p>Program Action 26. Consider the proximity to campus, transit routes, and bike paths when siting student housing projects.</p> <p>Objective a. Consider with planning application review</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Planning application fees</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 27. Recognize the City's commitment to housing students by pursuing policies and actions which will facilitate the availability of housing which is compatible with existing neighborhoods and is easily accessible by public transit and bicycle.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Consider policies that facilitate student housing that is compatible with existing neighborhoods and transit options</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009, as part of General Plan Update</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 28. Explore programs to assist City staff, UC Davis staff and faculty, Yolo County staff, and school district staff to live in Davis.</p> <p>Objective a, b and c.</p> <p>a. Apply Affordable Housing and Middle Income Ordinances b. Require use of Local Workforce Incentive System c. Research and consider other opportunities</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: a., b, and c. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objectives.</p> <p>The Middle Income Ordinance is currently suspended due to market conditions and will be removed from Objective a. This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. These objectives will be modified and continued.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Modify and continue</p>
<p>Program Action 29. Create incentives to provide local housing for local employees. Continue to utilize local employee incentive system as a means of connecting local employees to local affordable and middle ownership</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>opportunities. The City holds a lottery drawing to decide the recipient of an affordable ownership or rental units when one becomes available. The Incentive System for the Local Workforce allows more “tickets” for members of the local workforce to be put into the drawing. This system was developed to ensure the local workforce could live in the community. To address fair housing issues, elderly and disabled households were also included in this incentive system since they are less likely to be part of the local workforce.</p>		
<p>Objective a. Require use of Local Workforce Incentive System</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 30. Periodically conduct demographic studies to predict the need for housing and care of senior citizens and other special needs populations. These studies should include statistics on age, gender, income levels, marital status, state of health, and supportive services required.</p>	<p>The City completed outreach and an assessment of local needs as part of its consolidated planning required under Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partners (HOME) programs. This planning occurs every five years. Additionally, the City completed a senior housing needs study in the fall of 2009. This information educates the planning review process of projects and encourages increased</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Develop a plan that assesses the need and identifies options for an affordable assisted living project</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>accessibility in all new housing types.</p> <p>The Eleanor Roosevelt Circle affordable apartments were developed with a higher level of service, but not as assisted living. Assisted living is too resource intensive in lean budget times.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 31. Develop design guidelines and site criteria for senior housing and care in order to ensure that housing targeted for seniors is appropriately designed.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Modify to state that the guidelines are adopted and will continue to be utilized in the review of projects.</p>
<p>Objective a. Develop criteria</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009, as part of General Plan Update</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Completed, guidelines adopted and applied to projects.</p>	<p>Delete. New objective to implement Program Action 30 will be included in Housing Element update.</p>
<p>Program Action 32. Provide incentives to builders to provide housing and care choices for seniors of all income levels.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Consider potential incentives based on assessed need.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Insufficient resources. Objective will be continued.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 33. Support efforts by the USDA Rural Housing Services and Yolo County Housing Authority to provide housing for farmworkers and their families by offering letters of support, attending meetings with developer and USDA, and offering funding priorities if needed.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Support efforts</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 34. Encourage developers to seek funding from sources such as USDA Rural Housing Services for construction of additional units of permanent housing for farmworkers in Davis by offering letters of support, attending meetings with developer and USDA, and offering funding</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>priorities if needed.</p> <p>Objective a. Encourage developers and offer letters of support</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff with action by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and already committed Redevelopment Funds</p> <p>Objective b. Assist Yolo County Housing Authority in completion of rehabilitation of seven permanent units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff with action by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Complete work in 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and already committed Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City has and continues to assist Yolo County Housing with the rehabilitation of the seven farmworker units in Davis at Davis Solar Farmworker housing.</p> <p>Rehabilitation is complete at this stage in the lives of the units.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 35. Provide sites for at least 498 housing units during the current planning period, including at least 31 very-low income units, 119 low income units, 163 moderate income units, and 185 above-moderate income units.</p>	<p>The City has provided adequate sites to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Based on building permit information for this planning period, the City has exceeded all RHNA requirements, including every income category and the total amount. The City has provided</p>	<p>Modify based on the city's RHNA for the current planning period and continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
	adequate sites so that the following has been built during this planning period, even before adding the units in 2013: 120 Very Low, 197 Low, 54 Moderate (carryover extra VL and L units), 358 Above Moderate, and a Total of 729.	
<p>Objective a. Process applications, as required by law</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department with action by Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project) is now constructed and being rented.	Continue.
<p>Objective b. Expedite review of Oakshade affordable housing site</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department with action by Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees</p>	The Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project) has been constructed and is being rented. This objective has been met.	Delete.
<p>Program Action 36. Provide 11 supportive housing units for mentally disabled households at-risk of homelessness.</p>	See objective.	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Units complete, City monitors ongoing affordability and special needs Responsible Agencies: Housing staff Timeframe: January 2013, completed Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>Completed in the rehabilitation of the 15-unit Homestead project, providing extremely low income units for 21 households (an additional 6 households served and deeper affordability gained after rehab work) with supportive services.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 37. Provide 21 supportive housing units for elderly households at-risk of homelessness.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Units complete, City monitors ongoing affordability and special needs Responsible Agencies: Housing staff Timeframe: January 2013, completed Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>All 21 units were completed in the Eleanor Roosevelt Circle project, providing extremely low income units with supportive services. This was completed as projected.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 38. Provide 19 supportive housing units for households at-risk of homeless with a physical disability, mental disability, or drug/alcohol dependence.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Units complete, City monitors ongoing affordability and</p>	<p>All 19 units were completed in the Cesar Chavez Plaza project, providing extremely low income units with supportive services. This was</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
special needs Responsible Agencies: Housing staff Timeframe: January 2013, completed Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds	completed as projected.	
Program Action 39. Provide at least 100 units for low income single-parent and family households, providing at least 50 units for very-low income households.	See objective.	Delete.
Objective a. Process affordable housing applications, including Oakshade/ New Harmony Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: January 2013 Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds	Entitlements were processed and construction completed for the Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project). The project provides 69 units of lower-income rental housing including 25 extremely low income units, 16 very low income units, and 27 low income units.	Delete.
Program Action 40. Provide at least 50 units for extremely-low income households by providing funding priority to developments including units affordable to extremely low-income households.	See objective.	Delete.
Objective a. Process affordable housing applications, including Oakshade/	Entitlements were processed and construction completed for the Oakshade affordable housing	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>New Harmony</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: December 2012; monitoring annual through General Plan Annual Report</p> <p>Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>site (New Harmony affordable housing project). The project provides 69 units of lower-income rental housing including 25 extremely low income units, 16 very low income units, and 27 low income units.</p>	
<p>Program Action 4I. Provide at least 200 units of first-floor accessible and fully accessible housing units.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Modify and continue. 108 accessible and first-floor accessible units were built during the planning period. This total rises to 324 units if visitable units are included in the total. This action can be lowered to 100 units in the upcoming period.</p>
<p>Objective a. Review all housing developments for consistency with accessibility and visitability requirements</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding:</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees		
<p>Program Action 42. Provide at least 60 units of elderly housing units.</p> <p>Objective a. Units complete, City monitors ongoing affordability and special needs</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: January 2013, completed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Completed through the Eleanor Roosevelt Circle senior affordable housing project.</p>	<p>Delete.</p> <p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 43. Support provision of at least 1,400 housing units for faculty, staff, and students on the UC Davis campus.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. (as stated)</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: The City</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is the ongoing construction of West Village that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 44. Provide at least 100 one-bedroom units and 6 single room occupancy units for single-person and</p>	See objective.	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>small households.</p> <p>Objective a. Units complete, City monitors ongoing affordability and special needs</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: January and November 2007</p> <p>Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>Units were completed and are monitored regularly. The 6 SRO units represent the increase in households served at Homestead. The 100 one-bedroom units were provided by the 60-unit Eleanor Roosevelt Circle project and the 53-unit Cesar Chavez Plaza project. Actual production exceeds the 100-unit estimate.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 45. Continue to facilitate at least 18 ministerial second units and 24 discretionary second units.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue as projected in Section 4.</p>
<p>Objective a. Expedite processing of second unit applications.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b. Provide education on developing second units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Objective c. Consider code changes to accommodate additional second units, include public workshops and noticing with any proposed changes.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective d. Consider neighborhood plans that would further facilitate the development of second units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 46.</p> <p>Continue to support existing transitional housing and emergency shelter options provided in the city, and consider opportunities to provide shelter for 5 to 10 other households at-risk of homelessness or currently homeless, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • youth transitioning out of foster care • homeless individuals post hospital care in need of shelter to accommodate physical recovery 	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Maintain existing levels of transitional and emergency shelter options.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing Team, Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time. Specific funding needs would be requested by individual projects.</p>	<p>Existing shelter options and transitional housing options have been maintained. The City is working on the potential addition of permanent supportive housing for another 4-8 individuals.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b. Work with local housing and service providers to identify opportunities to provide shelter for stated needs groups.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing Team, with actions by Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time. Specific funding needs would be requested by individual projects.</p>	<p>The City has and continues to partner with Davis Community Meals, Yolo Community Care Continuum, and Yolo County Housing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
Policy 7.2 Affordable Housing		

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 47. Encourage use of Federal Tax Credits and other federal and state subsidy programs for production of low-income housing.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Provide letters of support Responsible Agencies: Housing staff Timeframe: Ongoing Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continues.
<p>Program Action 48. Encourage the use of all non-City available affordable housing incentive programs available to Davis residents for both new and existing housing by advertising the programs on the City website and in public meeting places. The incentive programs include: delayed fees for homebuyers, shared equity programs and mortgage-credit certificates.</p>	See objectives.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Encourage use of available programs Responsible Agencies: Housing staff Timeframe: Effective immediately and ongoing as programs change. Potential Funding:</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Already budgeted staff time and grants like CalHOME that fund education</p> <p>Objective b. Promote and facilitate use of homebuyer education</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Timeframe: Effective immediately and ongoing as programs change.</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and grants like CalHOME that fund education</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 49. Pursue means of securing additional housing affordable to low-income households and land for such housing including, but not limited to, land dedication, land exaction, and other private funding opportunities.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Look for new opportunities to provide affordable housing</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, Redevelopment Agency Board and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: HOME, CDBG, Redevelopment Funds, Housing Trust Funds</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue, as resources allow.</p>
<p>Program Action 50. Create incentives to the development of affordable housing through measures such as flexible development standards that are compatible with and protective of the surrounding neighborhood. Most of the</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>City's vacant sites are in the PD zone, which is meant to foster development flexibility. For non-PD sites, the City can consider parking reserves or waivers on development standards such as setbacks, lot coverages, and open space of up to 10 percent.</p> <p>Objective a. Process affordable housing projects under planned development zoning</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 5I. Use local resources to support programs in the city that assist in placing high-risk renters into affordable housing units.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. List this objective as a critical need in future CDBG/HOME funding cycles</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Annual funding cycle</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time		
Program Action 52. If new lands are added to the City's General Plan Area, identify, zone and develop affordable housing sites early in the planning process. Objective a. Apply to projects in application Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with actions by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: Ongoing Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees	See objective. This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue. Continue.
Program Action 53. Work to maintain continued affordability of existing affordable housing with expiring federal, state, or local subsidy programs by annually monitoring each at-risk project and working with owners to develop of plan for conservation of the units. This may include offering technical assistance in identifying alternative funding sources if original funding will expire, a partnership with the City's redevelopment agency or other mechanisms deemed appropriate.	See objective.	Continue.
Objective a. Enforce affordability covenants and resale restrictions. Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with support from the Social Services	The City partnered with Yolo County Housing and Legal Services of Northern California by supporting public information efforts for residents affected by the transition of Anderson	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Annually and ongoing as needed.</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Place Apartments. The majority of these transitioning units became tenant-based vouchers rather than project-based subsidy. It is difficult for the City to assist further without Redevelopment funding and/or an interested owner.</p>	
<p>Program Action 54. Assist residents who are displaced from subsidized housing in finding comparable accommodations.</p> <p>Objective a. Assist displaced residents</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and other city staff as needed</p> <p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Ongoing referral services, as needed. Six households were relocated as part of the Homestead rehabilitation project. All six received relocation benefits and found comparable housing. Statistics for the Anderson Place project are not known to the City, since it was not a funder or owner of the project. City staff provided affordable housing information to residents, as requested, and Legal Services, with Yolo County Housing, also completed extensive resident outreach and assistance.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue to provide referral services.</p>
<p>Program Action 55. Establish a referral service to assist very low and low-income households in identifying affordable housing in Davis and surrounding areas.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Create central application system for affordable rental housing units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p>	<p>The City met with owners and managers of affordable housing units, gained initial buy-in from them on the concept, and started drafting a central pre-application. There was consensus that only the pre-application could be centralized, due</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Housing staff with assistance from Informational Systems staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Winter 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>to varying application types. There was also concern about trying to share sensitive household information, including credit reports. This objective will continue in partnership with Yolo County Housing, who would like to offer this countywide.</p>	
<p>Objective b. Maintain city affordable housing webpage</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff with assistance from Informational Systems staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 56. Compile and maintain a list of vacant sites in Davis which are suitable for affordable housing development.</p> <p>Objective a. Maintain list on city affordable housing webpage</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City has this list at its website located at: www.city-managers-office.cityofdavis.org/housing-and-human-services/affordable-housing-program/upcoming-affordable-housing-projects</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 57. Monitor creation and availability of</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
affordable housing on an annual basis.		
<p>Objective a. Annual monitoring of new affordable housing units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City monitors annual creation of affordable housing units through the Annual Report on housing production that is submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development. The City met its RHNA requirements for the current planning cycle.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 58. If monitoring shows that the percentage of affordable units available does not meet identified affordable housing needs, take further actions to encourage construction of affordable housing, such as increasing allowed densities or restructuring the Affordable Housing Ordinance.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Assess availability of affordable units and determine need for further action</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>No further action required during this planning period. The City produced an amount of affordable housing units in excess of its RHNA requirements.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b.</p>	<p>Ongoing, as needed.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Identify and recommend action</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 59. Encourage and seek funding for shared housing for residents with low-incomes, fixed incomes and pensions.</p>	See objectives.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Provide information and shared housing agreements</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Senior Center staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Some information was previously provided to the Senior Commission and at the Senior Center. Shared housing models were used in the rehabilitation of Homestead. No additional work in this area is currently planned due to limited interest.	Continue.
<p>Objective b. Post opportunities for shared housing</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Senior Center staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. Staff has posted very little information due to a lack of opportunities and interest. This option to post information is still available to seniors.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 60. Maintain standards for the regulation of condominium conversion applications so that low-income households receive appropriate displacement protection or benefits.</p> <p>Objective a. Process applications under City’s condo conversion ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Existing condominium conversion requirements continue to be in place through City Code. The City monitors conversions through the application process.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 61. Provide written handouts and work with developers to provide signs to disclose the locations of sites approved for future affordable housing development to low and moderate-income persons. In written materials, disclose that affordable housing sites may be developed with affordable housing as envisioned in the General Plan.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Generate handouts</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Notices and signage are generated for each project. In the current planning period these have included subdivisions with affordable ownership housing units, such as the Verona, Mahogany Lane and Willowbank Park subdivisions.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
2008-2009 Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time		
<p>Program Action 62. The City shall review the Housing Element beginning in January 2010 to determine (1) its progress toward meeting the goals of the Housing Element and any further actions needed to meet them before the end of the current Housing Element planning period; and (2) whether adequate sites will be available to meet the prospective identified needs for the next planning period and, if not, any actions needed during the remainder of the current planning period to make them available.</p> <p>Objective a. Review Housing Element for progress in Implementation Plan and availability of adequate sites</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City completes an Annual Report regarding progress on the Housing Element, including these items.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 63. The City shall petition our state and national representatives for more affordable housing resources.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Track and state support (in writing) for bills that provide more affordable housing resources</p>	<p>The City Council has been actively participating in the legislative process through its subcommittee and will continue to do so.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 64. Amend the Affordable Housing Ordinance to establish a more precise timeline for transfer of dedicated land and the award of dedicated land for development by non-profits to promote neighborhood acceptance.</p> <p>Objective a. Amend ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This has not yet been completed. The objective will be continued. This item has been negotiated on an individual project basis. This amendment was overlooked as part of the recent ordinance update, but will be considered during the next ordinance review.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 65. Monitor the production of middle income units under the Middle Income Ordinance.</p>	<p>The Middle Income Ordinance was suspended during implementation of this objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Monitor production of Middle Income units</p>	<p>The Middle Income Ordinance was suspended during implementation of this objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 66. Review the Middle Income Ordinance periodically to identify any necessary amendments.</p> <p>Objective a. Review and assess need to amend ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>The Middle Income Ordinance is currently suspended. Program Action will be modified to re-evaluate appropriateness of suspension no later than January 2016.</p> <p>The Middle Income Ordinance is currently suspended. Objective will be modified to re-evaluate appropriateness of suspension no later than January 2016.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p> <p>Modify and continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 67. Provide at least 100 units for low income single-parent and family households, providing at least 50 units for very-low income households.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 38. Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Process affordable housing applications, including Oakshade</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social</p>	<p>Completed. Entitlements were processed and construction completed for the Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project). The project provides 69 units of lower-income rental housing including 25</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 38. Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>extremely low income units, 16 very low income units, and 27 low income units. The Cesar Chavez Plaza project was also completed, providing 53 one-bedroom units, including 31 at very low incomes.</p>	
<p>Program Action 68. Provide at least 50 units for extremely-low income households.</p> <p>Objective a. Process affordable housing applications, including Oakshade</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Land dedication sites, HOME, Redevelopment Funds</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Completed. Entitlements were processed and construction completed for the Oakshade affordable housing site (New Harmony affordable housing project). The project provides 69 units of lower-income rental housing including 25 extremely low income units, 16 very low income units, and 27 low income units. Cesar Chavez Plaza provided 19 extremely low income units and Eleanor Roosevelt Circle provided 21 extremely low income units.</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 39. Delete.</p> <p>Duplicative of Program Action 39. Delete.</p>
<p>Policy 7.3 Removal of Constraints on Housing Production</p>		
<p>Program Action 69. Evaluate the credit given for land dedication in light of General Plan densities and the likely parcel sizes.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective a. Review credit given and make recommendation</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p>	<p>Completed July 2013.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 70. Consider a more equitable tax structure for future proposed city parcel tax by basing tax on unit square footage so that smaller units pay proportionally lower tax.</p> <p>Objective a. Consider variation on tax structure</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Finance Department, with action by the City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Recent City parcel taxes provide reductions/exemptions for seniors and lower income households. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 71. Provide financial incentives to rental property owners on the condition of making individual units permanently affordable. Options for incentives include but are not limited to market-rate rehabilitation loans and fee waivers.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Offer incentives to owners of expiring affordable units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p>	<p>Ongoing, as resources are available. As part of Anderson Place's transition out of affordability, Yolo County Housing was able to provide housing choice vouchers. The City did not have additional resources to offer the owner, nor was the owner interested in additional public</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Redevelopment Housing Funds or Housing Trust Fund</p>	subsidies or requirements.	
<p>Program Action 72. Increase resources for Affordable Housing. Study a variety of mechanisms to increase financial resources to increase the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>Objective a. Research mechanisms and make recommendations</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City has not identified many options, but is currently discussing affordable housing rents on city-owned affordable housing as a potential ongoing revenue source to the program.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 73. Provide financial incentives to landlords on the condition of making the properties permanently affordable. Options for incentives include below market-rate rehabilitation loans, fee waivers for rehabilitation permits, and others to be negotiated by the Social Services Commission.</p>	See objectives.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Offer incentives to landlords of expiring affordable units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission,</p>	See Program Action 71.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: As needed Potential Funding: Redevelopment Housing Funds or Housing Trust Fund		
Objective b. Offer incentives to increase affordable housing stock Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council Timeframe: As needed Potential Funding: Redevelopment Housing Funds or Housing Trust Fund	The City does not have adequate resources or interested owners for this objective.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 74. Since the promotion of the construction of second units has been of interest to local commissions and is currently being considered by the City Council, the City performed outreach during their zoning code amendments concerning permitting second units by-right. This outreach will continue as the City plans to provide additional education to the public on what is permitted for developing a second unit. This education model will be based on Santa Cruz's "Accessory Dwelling Unit Manual".</p> <p>Objective a. Offer incentives to homeowners to add granny flats and second units. Examples of these incentives might be by offering workshops on procedures, costs and design and</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>A current City Council goal is to promote/facilitate second units by various actions. Staff and the Planning Commission have begun to explore options. Implementation is</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>establishing a revolving fund with low cost loans to allow homeowners to make necessary structural changes; reduced interest for loans used for Section 8 tenant.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: August 2010 and ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	ongoing.	
<p>Program Action 75. Develop and implement guidelines for infill development and comprehensive car management strategies immediately following the adoption of the General Plan so that guidelines and strategies will be in place prior to the approval of significant new infill development.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Infill guidelines are in place, assess. Promote infill with new strategies. Car management strategies are development with individual projects.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department and Redevelopment Agency staff, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 76. Initiate a zoning ordinance amendment that would encourage density bonuses for residential projects in proximity to public facilities and services including bus stops.</p> <p>Objective a. Research and consider density bonus for this project category</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Spring 2009, as part of General Plan Update</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>As individual projects are proposed, the City has continued to allow higher density based on the locational characteristic of the project. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 77. Periodically review Zoning Ordinance performance standards and revise them as needed to ensure high environmental quality, streamlined processing where appropriate, and compliance with State standards.</p>		
<p>Objective a. Omnibus updates to the Zoning Ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Every 2-3 years</p>	<p>Omnibus updates to the Zoning Ordinance have been completed. Major amendments have not been initiated. It is anticipated that additional amendments will occur in the 2013-2021 cycle.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 78. Streamline the permit-approval process to the extent feasible by offering pre-application meetings and concurrent review of applications.</p> <p>Objective a. Streamline permit approval process</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Effective immediately; Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning and building processing fees</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The Planning Commission and City Council have discussed and called for a study of all processes and possible changes. Implementation has begun and continues.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 79. Investigate a “one-stop” approval process for non-discretionary applications, which require actions from multiple departments. The purpose would be to avoid unnecessary and confusing processing steps.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Investigate the potential for such process</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, with all other Departments</p> <p>Timeframe: 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding:</p>	<p>Staff has explored possibilities including but not limited to encroachment permits and business licenses. Implementation has been initiated. Additionally the City has combined the offices of the development functions of Public Works and Community and Sustainability Departments so as to further enhance the one stop process.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Already budgeted staff time		
<p>Program Action 80. Encourage inter-organizational representation in the long-term planning efforts of each agency, especially in relationships between the City, UC Davis, Yolo County, surrounding cities and DJUSD.</p> <p>Objective a. Attend inter-organizational meetings and attend public hearings related to long-term planning, information decision-makers</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 81. Develop a method for documenting, distributing and maintaining interpretations of the municipal code, the General Plan, and program policies as each relate to development approval</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Maintain Interpretations Binder at planning counter.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Planning Division</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees</p>		
<p>Program Action 82. Continue outreach efforts to inform architects and builders of City standards and requirements.</p> <p>Objective a. Produce handouts, write articles for the Focus, provide updated information online</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: All City Departments</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 83. Consider expanding the use of third-party project reviewers and plan checkers to reduce permit processing time.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Reduce permit processing time</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and planning and building processing fees</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City has continued the use of third-party reviewers, but only when needed to reduce processing time.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 84. Provide at least 200 units of first-floor accessible and fully accessible housing units.</p> <p>Objective a. Review all housing developments for consistency with accessibility and visitability requirements</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 40. Delete.</p> <p>Duplicative of Objective 40.a. Delete.</p>
Policy 7.4. Residential Conservation		
<p>Program Action 85. Periodically conduct a survey of the condition of residential structures in Davis to identify any need for rehabilitation or replacement.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Conduct surveys with home retrofit program</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff with HOME sub-recipient Rebuilding Together</p> <p>Timeframe: Every 3 years</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The last Housing Conditions windshield survey was completed in 2009. In 2011 and 2012 the City received over 800 resale inspection applications and processed 1,223 code enforcement cases. In the 2011–2012 fiscal year the City set aside \$125,000 to rehabilitate four affordable housing units. The City is also working with owners of local aging affordable rental units to assist in the rehabilitation of an estimated 10 rental units over the upcoming fiscal year. The</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
	<p>City will continue planning and assessing for future rehabilitation needs of aging affordable units. In addition, the City has also recently created an Accessible Home Improvement Loan Program using HOME funds that is available to low-income owners to make accessible improvements to their homes, as well as work to address health and safety and/or code violations. Since 2008 the City has not replaced any housing units and does not have any plans to do so. The City's efforts to rehabilitate aging units and the sound condition of the majority of the housing stock continues to provide Davis with housing in overall good condition.</p>	
<p>Program Action 86. Continue to require maintenance and preservation of the existing housing stock through the existing Resale/Retrofit inspection program and by requiring inspection of houses on resale.</p> <p>Objective a. Continue Resale/Retrofit Inspection Program</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Building Division</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 87. Encourage landlords to maintain all rental units in sound condition through City information, the</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
resale program, and technical assistance and support.		
<p>Objective a. Provide information to local landlords</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department and housing staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 88. Continue to support the existing program at the Senior Center which assists senior home owners in maintaining their homes by providing arrangements for volunteers to perform home maintenance services.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Continue support</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budget staff time and use of HOME or CDBG funds</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 89. Develop a program to assist low-income homeowners and owners of affordable rental housing in the upkeep of their residential units, as needed.</p>	Completed.	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Objective a. Research existing programs and recommend one that suits the needs of Davis residents</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions for the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2010</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Completed. The city has created a rehabilitation program focused on features of accessibility as well as general rehabilitation work. No owners have utilized this program yet. It did assist a local non-profit owner by serving two residents at Fox Creek, a deed-restricted affordable housing apartment complex in Davis. The City also created a solar program that has assisted one low-income homeowner.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 90. Support a program to assist low-income seniors and persons with disabilities who own their own home with the completion of free and subsidized accessibility upgrades and repairs.</p> <p>Objective a. Continue supporting the Rebuilding Together program, or one similar</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed. The City is now providing its own grants and loans through the program described in Program Action 89. The City also continues to support efforts of Rebuilding Together through referrals.</p>	<p>Delete.</p> <p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 91. Upon the completion of infill related studies and the adoption of infill and densification design</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>guidelines and strategies, the Community Development Department shall make available a basic information sheet to inform interested parties that second or additional units are allowed in residential categories and the design guidelines affecting their construction and design.</p>		
<p>Objective a. Information sheet exists and will be continued to be disbursed.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 92. Provide financial assistance to ensure housing retrofit assistance for at least 120 elderly or disabled low-income households.</p> <p>Objective a. Provide funding to retrofit program.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City has funded a low-income ownership housing retrofit program to address health and safety items, accessibility features, and opportunities for solar installation in local housing units. To date, no one has utilized the program.</p>	<p>Continue and reduce estimated number of households to 10 based on the expanded scope of the rehabilitation work.</p> <p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Potential Funding: CDBG, HOME, Redevelopment Agency Funds or Housing Trust Funds		
Program Action 93. Preserve at least 20 affordable housing units at-risk of conversion to market.	See objective.	Continue.
Objective a. Negotiate with owners and other potential funders with the objective to preserve affordable units. Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with negotiations and actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council Timeframe: As needed Potential Funding: CDBG, HOME, Redevelopment Agency Funds or Housing Trust Funds	In the previous planning period, the City preserved 20 single family homes and a four building 112-bed apartment complex from conversion to market rate. The City currently owns and leases this affordable housing to income-qualified households. In the upcoming planning period the City will identify long-term strategies for the use of these affordable housing units. This objective will be continued.	Continue.
Policy 7.5. Access to Housing		
Program Action 94. Continue to monitor the number of persons seeking emergency shelter in Davis and Yolo County. Evaluate the resulting data to determine what facilities and social services are needed in Davis to cooperatively address the overall county needs of the identified population.	See objective.	Continue.
Objective a. Monitor the local needs (city and county) for emergency housing Responsible Agencies:	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Inter-agency county homeless task force, with housing and social services staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 95. Continue to participate in an inter-agency county homeless task force.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Participate in meetings and with financing</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time and through assistance from HOME</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 96. Serve at least 100 people annually with the City's Fair Housing/Mediation Services by disseminating information about these services throughout the community. The information describing the Fair Housing/Mediation Services will be posted on the City's website and in public places such as the library, City buildings and other appropriate public meeting places.</p>	See objective.	Modify and continue.
<p>Objective a.</p>	The City provides resource and referral information, as well as information on how to file	Continue Fair Housing

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Provide information related to California Housing Law and schedule mediation services as needed.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Fair Housing and Mediation Services staff</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: CDBG funds</p>	<p>a formal fair housing or fair employment complaint Modify program action to remove mediation services as they were ended in July 2011 due to insufficient city funding. The city has served and continues to serve from 204 to 915 people annually through this program.</p>	<p>services.</p>
<p>Program Action 97. Permanently maintain the affordability of required affordable rental units for very low, low, or moderate-income households.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Monitor affordability covenants and resale restrictions</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 98. Establish a process that alerts the city and identifies opportunities for staff to work with residents and landlords/owners in the event of sharp rental increases or evictions of groups of tenants; by landlords of rental properties with 40 or more units. Special attention shall be given to projects with potential for large-scale gentrification or displacement of Section 8 residents without appropriate</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>relocation to other similar affordable units.</p> <p>Objective a, b and c.</p> <p>a. Create a process to get informed.</p> <p>b. Assist residents with housing information</p> <p>c. Mediate between landlord and tenant</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p> <p>Housing and mediation staff, with support from the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe:</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding:</p> <p>Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Objectives a. and b. are ongoing items and continue to be in progress. The City worked on these objectives with Yolo County Housing during the transition of Anderson Place Apartments.</p> <p>Objective c. The City provided mediation services from the start of the planning period until July 2011. The program action will be modified to delete objective c. due to dissolution of the City's Community Mediation Services.</p>	<p>Modify and continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 99. Strive to create and maintain an adequate supply of rental and ownership housing that is affordable to extremely-low, very-low, low, and moderate income households.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a.</p> <p>Enforce Affordable Housing Ordinance</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p> <p>Housing staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe:</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding:</p> <p>Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. All new applications for housing that were submitted during this planning period were subject to this ordinance. Through this ordinance, deed-restricted affordable housing units were developed.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 100. Continue offering incentives to homeowners and developers to reserve spaces on upper floors of retail commercial buildings, downtown and elsewhere, for housing.</p> <p>Objective a. Continue mixed-use and condominium incentives.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Redevelopment and housing staff, with support from the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City's codes, policies, and planning staff continue to support mixed use developments. The City continues to see mixed use developments downtown and planned for in upcoming larger subdivisions like the Cannery and Nishi property.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 101. As a last resort and as authorized by law, use the city's power of eminent domain to buy affordable housing and keep it affordable.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Use eminent domain in critical situations to preserve affordable housing units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Redevelopment and housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: As needed</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>Not pursued, but remains available to the City if it becomes necessary for a future project.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Program Action 102. Social Services Commission shall continue to monitor affordable housing programs supported by CDBG, HOME, Housing Trust Fund, and Redevelopment Fund identified for affordable housing. Currently produced annual reports will be amended to include information about the Housing Trust Fund and Redevelopment Fund, including expenditures and income.</p> <p>Objective a. Maintain affordable housing in the Commission’s scope and provide necessary information.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The Social Services Commission (SSC) reviews and provides recommendations regarding affordable housing policies and development. Often the SSC hosts community discussions for local residents, advocates, and developers on related subject matters, and also weighs in on funding decisions. The City Council has found this to be a helpful role of the SSC and plans for it to continue in their scope.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 103. The Social Services Commission shall continue to review and make recommendations on affordable housing units and on local affordable housing policy.</p> <p>Objective a. Review and make recommendations on affordable housing.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Social Services Commission</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The Social Services Commission has and will continue to make recommendations on affordable housing to the City Council.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 104. The Social Services Commission shall regularly review current needs for continuing targeting of resources to moderate, low and very-low income households.</p> <p>Objective a. Compile annual Critical Needs list</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, the Social Services Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The Social Services Commission considers local needs annually as part of the local Critical Needs List for CDBG and HOME grants. Discussion of local Critical Needs occurs in October, November, and December each year.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 105. The Social Services Commission and its staff in coordination with Yolo County Housing Authority, shall work cooperatively and proactively with Section 8 rental property owners to encourage them to remain in the program and with Section 8 tenants to educate them on their legal rights.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Program outreach and education with Section 8 owners and tenants.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff with the Social Services</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Commission Timeframe: As needed Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time		
Program Action 106. Establish reciprocal communication with the Yolo County Housing Authority when either agency is made aware of the filing of opt-out notices by Section 8 rental property owners and/or receipt of notices by Section 8 tenants.	See objective.	Continue.
Objective a. Maintain communication with the Yolo County Housing Authority. Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff Timeframe: Ongoing Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
Program Action 107. Forward all existing and new opt-out notices to Legal Services of Northern California in Woodland.	See objective.	Continue.
Objective a. Forward opt-out notices. Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 108. In all cases of new subsidized affordable for-sale housing, except those cases in which the City determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the housing shall be in or under the control of a housing land trust, a limited equity cooperative, fee simple ownership with permanent affordability requirements and significant city oversight, or other permanent affordability arrangements with significant city oversight. Also should economic circumstances, or state and federal subsidies dictate that permanent affordability requirement be released for a specific development project, then appropriate recapture mechanisms for the subsidies and owner occupancy for the longest period feasible shall be imposed. Specific findings for release of the permanent affordability requirement shall be established in the Affordable Housing Ordinance.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Develop all new ownership housing units with permanent resale restrictions to maintain long-term affordability.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding:</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Already budgeted staff time		
<p>Program Action 109. In all cases of new subsidized affordable rental housing, except in those cases in which the City Council determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the city shall develop appropriate mechanisms to assure permanent affordability.</p>	See objective.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Record a permanent affordability covenant to the deed of all new affordable rental housing units</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 110. In all cases of new subsidized affordable housing, whether for-sale or rental, in which the City determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the city shall develop appropriate mechanisms to assure recapture of the subsidies and its appreciated value upon resale, or refinance, or termination of affordability restrictions. Also, should economic circumstances, or state and federal subsidies dictate that permanent affordability requirement be released for a specific development project, then appropriate recapture mechanisms for the subsidies and owner occupancy for the longest period feasible shall be imposed. Specific findings for release of the permanent</p>	See objective.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>affordability requirement shall be established in the Affordable Housing Ordinance.</p> <p>Objective a. Develop all new ownership and rental housing units with permanent resale restrictions and affordability covenants to maintain long-term affordability.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action III. In cases of new subsidized affordable housing, whether for-sale or rental, and whether or not the City Council determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the housing and the land on which it is located shall be subject to easements or deed restrictions to assure compliance with Actions a, b, or c, whichever applies.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Develop all new ownership and rental housing units with permanent resale restrictions and affordability covenants to maintain long-term affordability.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 112. If the common-law Rule Against Perpetuities or any other provisions of state law proves to be an obstacle to implementation of this policy and these actions, the City Council shall seek state legislation to amend or waive the provision that is the obstacle.</p> <p>Objective a. No state law has been an obstacle, but staff is working on connecting all available funds to permanently affordable units.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff.</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 113. Continue to utilize an incentive system for the local workforce, through a lottery, as part of the city's buyer selection process for low/moderate income and middle income affordable ownership units. The system shall provide the highest number of lottery tickets to households with a member of the local workforce.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Enforce use of the incentive system with the sales of all new affordable and middle income ownership units.</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Responsible Agencies: Housing and social services staff, with action from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council.</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Policy 7.6. Energy Conservation.</p>		
<p>Program Action 114. Develop programs to increase energy conservation on the household and business level.</p> <p>Objective a. Develop programs to promote conservation.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: October 2008</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>The City is collaborating with the Cool Davis “non-profit” organization to develop programs to increase energy conservation on household level. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 115. Use subsidies, expedited permit processing, density bonuses or other incentives to support implementation of photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies to provide a portion of the City's energy needs.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Identify potential incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies:</p>	<p>The City is collaborating with the Cool Davis “non-profit” organization to support photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
Climate Action Team Timeframe: 2009 Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources		
Objective b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from City Council Timeframe: 2009 Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources	The City is collaborating with the Cool Davis “non-profit” organization to support photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies. Implementation is ongoing.	Continue.
Program Action 116. Offer incentives to developers for projects that result in energy savings of at least 20 percent when compared to the energy consumption that would occur under similar projects built to meet the minimum standards of the energy code.	See objectives.	Continue.
Objective a. Identify potential incentives Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team Timeframe: 2009 Potential Funding:	Applied in individual project reviews. Implementation is ongoing.	Continue.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p> <p>Objective b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>Applied in individual project reviews. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 117. Provide incentives for retrofitting existing homes and businesses for improved energy efficiency. An example of a retrofit feature would be a passive solar device.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Identify potential incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>Incentives are currently available to lower income households. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from City Council</p>	<p>Applied in individual project reviews. Implementation is ongoing.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>		
<p>Program Action 118. Support the opportunity for efficient public transit by siting large apartment complexes on arterial streets, in the core and near neighborhood centers and the University.</p> <p>Objective a. Support appropriate projects that utilize existing transit and a close proximity to community services and shopping</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City places higher priority on infill projects near transit and community facilities through General Plan policies and places priority on such projects in the development processing system.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 119. At least 80 percent of all residential lots in any proposed new development should be oriented so that buildings have their long axes within 22.5 degrees of east/west. Allow a developer not providing the required percentage to demonstrate that other site design, building design or construction measures would provide similar opportunities for conserving energy.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a.</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. These requirements are enforced in the</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Enforce lot orientation requirements.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>planning review of new subdivisions.</p>	
<p>Program Action 120. Develop and implement energy-efficient design requirements that go beyond the State building standards for energy efficiency.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Identify potential requirements</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>The City adopted Tier I Cal Green building code standards as mandatory.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective b. Review and adopt necessary requirements</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from the Planning Commission and City Council</p>	<p>The City adopted Tier I Cal Green building code standards as mandatory.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>		
<p>Program Action 121. Develop design guidelines for climate-oriented site planning, building design and landscape design to promote energy efficiency.</p>	See objectives.	Continue.
<p>Objective a. Identify design guidelines</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Applied in individual project reviews. Implementation is ongoing as resources allow.	Continue.
<p>Objective b. Review and adopt necessary guidelines</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from the Planning Commission and City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	Applied in individual project reviews. Implementation is ongoing as resources allow.	Continue.
<p>Program Action 122. Offer incentives to developers for</p>	Duplicative of Program Action 115. Program	Delete.

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>projects that result in energy savings of at least 20 percent when compared to the energy consumption that would occur under similar projects built to meet the minimum standards of the energy code.</p>	<p>Action will not be continued.</p>	
<p>Objective a. Identify potential incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 115. Program Action will not be continued.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Objective b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>Duplicative of Program Action 115. Program Action will not be continued.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
<p>Program Action 123. Energy efficient landscaping and preservation of existing shade trees is encouraged on all building sites.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Encourage the landscaping and provide additional information</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. Energy-efficient landscaping is required through design review, particularly in the shading</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>to developers.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>by trees of south and west sides of buildings and parking lots. Guidelines for compliance are made available to designers and developers.</p>	
<p>Program Action 124. Continue to enforce and support water conservation ordinances.</p> <p>Objective a. Enforce existing water conservation ordinances.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Community Development and Public Works Departments</p> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time</p>	<p>See objective.</p> <p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City adopted a new water-efficient landscape ordinance. The City adopted Tier I Cal Green as mandatory which includes water conservation in buildings.</p>	<p>Continue.</p> <p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 125. Explore incentives to retrofit water conserving plumbing in existing residences and businesses.</p>	<p>See objectives.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Identify potential incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Climate Action Team</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p>	<p>Offer rebates to retrofit water conserving fixtures. Implementation is ongoing as resources allow.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

Program Actions	Progress/Effectiveness	Appropriateness for 2013-2021 Housing Element
<p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>		
<p>Objective b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: Staff, with action from City Council</p> <p>Timeframe: 2009</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>Offer rebates to retrofit water conserving fixtures. Implementation is ongoing as resources allow.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Program Action 126. Reduce the City's Green House Gas emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels or neutral no later than 2050.</p>	<p>See objective.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>
<p>Objective a. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Responsible Agencies: All City departments, commissions, and the City Council.</p> <p>Timeframe: Resolution adopted November 2008 so is an ongoing, goal for 2050</p> <p>Potential Funding: Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources</p>	<p>This is an ongoing item that continues to be in progress. The City is implementing its adopted Climate Action and Adaptation Plan in the areas of mobility, energy, land use and buildings, consumption and waste, food and agriculture, community engagement, and government operations. Progress on the actions include but are not limited to: a community car share program; developing a transportation implementation plan; work toward a local financing district for residential properties for energy efficiency; and a program to engage households in a carbon reduction program.</p>	<p>Continue.</p>

3.0 HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This section of the Housing Element documents demographic and housing trends in the City of Davis. Sources used in this section include: the 2000 US Census; the 2010 US Census; the 2006–2010 US Census American Community Survey (ACS); the 2008–2010 US Census ACS; the California Employment Development Department (EDD); the California Department of Finance (DOF); and the US Census OnTheMap application and the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) Origin-Destination Employment Statistics database.

Summary of Housing Needs Assessment

Between 2000 and 2010, Davis population and household growth was lower than that of the Sacramento-Yolo Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA)¹. The City also exhibited a smaller average household size and a smaller share of households with children relative to the region. In addition, Davis households included a higher share of renters as compared to the CMSA. The large proportion of the Davis population that corresponds to the University of California, Davis student population partially explains the high share of renters in the City as well as the large percentage of households with incomes in lower-income brackets. However, Davis also had a relatively high share of households with high incomes, establishing an income distribution with large concentrations of households at the low and high ends.

With the UC Davis campus immediately adjacent to the City limits, the educational, health, and social services employment category represents the largest employer in the Davis area. While 31.3 percent of Davis workers live within the City, an estimated 23.8 percent of UC Davis faculty and staff reside in the City. Davis workers living within the City exhibit greater household income disparity as compared to in-commuters, with higher shares of lower and higher household incomes and fewer households in the middle-income ranges. Davis workers also demonstrate a greater wage, or earnings, disparity relative to workers in the CMSA. However, a survey of employers located in Davis indicates a large range of potential worker earnings that varies based on occupation and employment tenure. Overall, there is a balance between employment opportunities and housing in the Davis area, if jobs on the UC Davis campus are included in the analysis.

¹ The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA includes the Counties of Yolo, Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado.

SACOG projects that population, household, and employment growth rates for the City of Davis will lag behind the CMSA during this Housing Element planning period, even with the addition of UC Davis' planned West Village neighborhood to the City's anticipated growth. However, employment projection figures for the City of Davis and West Village do not include most of the projected employment growth anticipated on the UC Davis campus. This additional campus employment will offer significant employment opportunities for Davis residents.

Current Housing Conditions

The Davis housing stock is relatively new housing and in overall good condition. Compared to the CMSA, the City does have a smaller proportion of single-family detached housing units and a larger share of apartments. In addition, Davis housing vacancy rates are consistently low, indicating high levels of local housing demand relative to the available supply.

The high level of housing demand and the overall quality of life in the community has also contributed to high housing costs in Davis. In Davis, 36.5 percent of all households experienced some level of excessive housing cost burden in 2010, though renter households experienced a disproportionate share of housing affordability problems. In 2010, monthly rental rates for one- and two-bedroom apartment units averaged between \$998 and \$1,307. These rates are not affordable to the very low- and extremely low-income households that would likely be interested in renting these units. Moreover, the majority of renter households fall into these household income categories. Also, with a median home price of \$463,500, the Davis for-sale housing market is affordable only to households with above-moderate income levels. Very few for-sale housing options exist for households earning less than \$100,000 annually.

Special Needs Populations

Relative to the CMSA, Davis had lower shares of elderly households, large family households, single-parent households, and persons with disabilities. Fewer elderly households and large family households were found to be overpaying for housing in Davis relative to their counterparts in the CMSA, although the majority of renter households in both these special needs populations fell in the very low- and low-income categories in 2000. Farmworkers represent another special needs population exhibiting changing trends in housing preferences. Many farmworker families are seeking permanent, year-round housing options near urban centers. Migrant farmworkers without families, in contrast, are unable to find affordable seasonal housing and must often travel long distances to work.² Though the Yolo County Housing Authority's Davis Migrant Center is not fully occupied, single migrant workers are not eligible for units at the center under current policies. In order for single migrant workers to be able to occupy units at the Davis Migrant Center, changes to State and Federal admission requirements as well as other regulations would be necessary.

²Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission. "Memo: Receive summary and update on the Yolo County LAFCO Housing Policy meetings." December 11, 2006.

With an estimated 23,233 student and faculty and staff households residing in Davis, the UC Davis campus population is the largest single component of the Davis housing market. While the university projects the student population will grow during the Housing Element planning period, the university expects to house most of the increase on campus and in the planned West Village neighborhood. However, just under 1,000 new faculty and staff households are expected to seek residences in the City through 2015.³

This section consists of the following informational subsections:

3.0 Existing Population and Household Characteristics

3.1 Employment: Local Employers and Wages

3.2 Population, Household, and Employment Growth Projections

3.3 Housing Stock Characteristics: Type, Conditions, Overcrowding and Vacancy

3.4 Housing Costs and Affordability: Overpaying for Housing

3.5 Special Housing Needs: Elderly Households, Single-Person Households, Large Family Households, UC Davis Student Households, UC Davis Faculty and Staff Households, Single Female- and Male-Headed Households, Disabled Households, Farmworker Households, Persons in Need of Emergency Shelter, Minority Households, Developmental Disabilities

3.6 Energy Conservation in Housing: Going Green from Slab to Ceiling

3.7 Affordable Housing Units At-Risk: Taking Stock and Saving It

3.8 Existing and Projected Housing Needs: RHNA and Local Needs

3.1 Existing Population and Household Characteristics

Population Growth Trends

The DOF's E-1 Population Estimates dated May 1, 2012, provide the most currently available population figure for Davis of 65,052. Table 3 displays Census 2000 and 2010 data and reveals a lower population growth rate in Davis between 2000 and 2010 as compared to the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA, West Sacramento, and Woodland. The City of Davis grew by approximately 8.8 percent during the 10-year period, an increase of slightly more than 5,000 persons, to a 2010 population level of 65,622. The CMSA's population increased by 19.6 percent, Woodland's population increased by 12.9 percent and West Sacramento's population grew by 54.2 percent.

³ UC Davis. 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR. Table 4.11-10.

Household Growth Trends

Household growth trends generally mirrored population trends between 2000 and the 2006–2010 ACS average, with the City lagging behind the CMSA and West Sacramento. In the CMSA, the number of households increased by 16.7 percent over the 10-year period while West Sacramento's households increased by 52.8 percent. In contrast, at 8.4 percent, the growth rate in Davis represents less than half the CMSA level. The 2006–2010 average of 24,873 households in Davis represented an increase of approximately 2,000 new households above the number of households in the year 2000.

Household Size

As reflected in Table 3, the average household size in Davis increased slightly in 2010 to 2.6 persons per household. Though the average household size in the CMSA increased only marginally, the 2010 average of 2.67 persons per households indicates slightly larger households within the CMSA as compared to Davis. Household size in both Woodland and West Sacramento increased by less than 1 percent from 2000 to 2010.

Household Type

Table 3 also highlights the fact that significantly fewer households in Davis have children as compared to the CMSA, Woodland, and West Sacramento. Within the CMSA, 32.0 percent of households in 2010 had at least one member under the age of 18. In Davis, only 27.0 percent of households in 2010 included at least one child. Households without children represented the majority of households in both geographies. However, the share of households with children decreased by 13.6 percent between 2000 and 2010 in the CMSA. Woodland had a large proportion of households with children with 41.4 percent of all households in 2010, while West Sacramento's number was slightly lower at 37.5 percent.

Household Tenure

Renter households corresponded to a far larger share of total households in Davis as compared to the CMSA. Partially attributable to the student population attending UC Davis, approximately 57.0 percent of Davis households rented their homes in 2010. In the CMSA, only 36.0 percent of households rented in 2010, which was a 6.7 percent decline from 2000.

Age Distribution

As shown in Table 4, the Davis population included a high concentration (28.5 percent) of persons between the ages of 20 and 24 in 2010, highlighting again the impact of the UC Davis student population. Only 7.3 percent of the CMSA population fell into this bracket. Relative to the CMSA, the Davis population included a smaller share of both children under the age of 19 and persons age 55 and over. Children represented 25.1 percent of the City's total population as compared to 28.0 percent in the CMSA. In addition, approximately 19.0 percent of the population in Davis was 55 or over in 2010. In the CMSA this age group corresponded to 23.6 percent of the total population in 2010.

Household Income Distribution

Though the share of Davis households earning less than \$25,000 declined between 2000 and 2010, at 24.8 percent this income bracket remained significantly high as compared to the CMSA's 18.8 percent share. UC Davis student households may impact the income distribution reported in Table 6. Though earnings for these households are low, students often receive supplemental, unreported income in the form of financial support from parents.

The large number of households in Davis with earnings in the lowest-income bracket affects the overall distribution and average of household incomes within the City. In 2010 the median household income in Davis of just over \$59,500 fell short of the CMSA's median household income of nearly \$64,500. The median income of Davis households also increased at a slower pace than in the rest of the CMSA. With an approximate rise in unadjusted median household incomes of \$17,000 between 2000 and 2010, Davis experienced an increase of approximately 40 percent. The unadjusted median household income increased by \$18,000 in the CMSA over the same period, or approximately 39 percent. However, accounting for inflation and converting 2006 median household incomes into 2010 dollar amounts reveals that real incomes have also increased in both Davis and the CMSA. Adjusted median household income increased from \$53,000 in 2000 to \$59,500 in 2010. In the CMSA, adjusted median household income increased from \$57,600 to \$64,500 over the same time period.

Davis had a smaller share of households in the \$50,000 to \$75,000 income bracket in 2010. These households represented only 14 percent of total Davis households as compared to 19 percent of households in the CMSA. However, the City had a larger share, 31 percent, of households earning over \$100,000 in 2010. In the CMSA, this income category equaled approximately 26 percent of total households. Though the share of households in this high income bracket increased in both geographies between 2000 and 2010, Davis experienced slightly greater growth than the CMSA.

TABLE 3: POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD TRENDS

	2000	2006–2010 ACS	Percent Change 2000–2010
Davis			
Population	60,308	65,622	8.8%
Households	22,948	24,873	8.4%
Average Household Size	2.5	2.6	2.0%
Household Type			
HH with Children (a)	27.0%	26.9%	0.0%
HH without Children	73.0%	73.1%	0.0%
Tenure			
Owner	45.0%	43.0%	-4.4%
Renter	55.0%	57.0%	3.6%
Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (b)			
Population	1,796,857	2,149,127	19.6%
Households	665,298	776,574	16.7%
Average Household Size	2.65	2.67	0.7%
Household Type			
HH with Children (a)	37.0%	32.0%	-13.6%
HH without Children	63.0%	68.0%	8.2%
Tenure			
Owner	61.0%	64.0%	4.3%
Renter	39.0%	36.0%	-6.7%
Woodland			
Population	49,151	55,468	12.9%
Households	16,751	18,721	11.8%
Average Household Size	2.9	3.0	1.0%
Household Type			
HH with Children (a)	43.5%	41.4%	-5.0%
HH without Children	56.5%	58.6%	3.9%
Tenure			

	2000	2006–2010 ACS	Percent Change 2000–2010
Owner	58.5%	55.9%	-4.4%
Renter	41.5%	44.1%	6.2%
West Sacramento			
Population	31,615	48,744	54.2%
Households	11,404	17,421	52.8%
Average Household Size	2.8	2.8	0.9%
Household Type			
HH with Children (a)	38.4%	37.5%	-2.5%
HH without Children	61.6%	62.5%	1.6%
Tenure			
Owner	54.5%	58.7%	7.7%
Renter	45.5%	41.3%	-9.3%

Notes:

(a) Households with children have at least one member under the age of 18.

(b) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census, 2006–2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

TABLE 4: AGE DISTRIBUTION, 2000 AND 2010

Age Range	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Under 5	2,772	4.6%	2,444	3.7%	124,756	6.9%	144,004	6.7%
5–9	3,195	5.3%	2,927	4.9%	141,670	7.9%	145,077	6.8%
10–14	3,306	5.5%	3,337	5.5%	140,018	7.8%	150,005	7.0%
15–19	6,911	11.5%	6,609	11.0%	133,832	7.4%	161,818	7.5%
20–24	13,698	22.7%	17,200	28.5%	120,919	6.7%	155,987	7.3%
25–34	9,015	14.9%	8,528	14.1%	248,411	13.8%	291,231	13.6%
35–44	7,348	12.2%	6,295	10.4%	293,566	16.3%	283,516	13.2%
45–54	6,807	11.3%	6,807	11.3%	245,456	13.7%	311,051	14.5%
55–59	1,939	3.2%	3,268	5.4%	80,576	4.5%	134,643	6.3%
60–64	1,313	2.2%	2,610	4.3%	64,102	3.6%	113,387	5.3%
65–74	1,976	3.3%	2,957	4.9%	107,413	6.0%	138,292	6.4%
75–84	1,511	2.5%	1,716	2.8%	73,190	4.1%	83,707	3.9%
85 and over	517	0.9%	924	1.5%	22,948	1.3%	36,409	1.7%
Total Population (a)	60,308	100.0%	65,622	100.0%	1,796,857	100.0%	2,149,127	100.0%
Median Age	25.2		25.2		35.2		37.3	

Note:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 US Census, SACOG 2012

TABLE 5: HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION, 2000 AND 2010

Income Range	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than \$25,000	7,666	33.4%	5,995	24.8%	41,510	24.9%	36,370	18.8%
\$25,000–\$49,999	4,954	21.6%	4,539	18.8%	48,072	28.9%	44,067	22.7%
\$50,000–\$74,999	3,552	15.5%	3,473	14.4%	34,208	20.6%	36,497	18.8%
\$75,000–\$99,999	2,450	10.7%	2,708	11.2%	19,372	11.6%	26,529	13.7%
\$100,000 or more	4,337	18.9%	7,481	30.9%	23,269	14.0%	50,396	26.0%
Total Households	22,959	100.0%	24,196	100.0%	166,431	100.0%	193,859	100.0%
Unadjusted Median Household Income	\$42,454		\$59,517		\$46,106		\$64,491	
Adjusted Median Household Income (b)	\$53,036		\$59,517		\$57,598		\$64,491	

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) 2000 median incomes for all three geographies are adjusted by a factor of 1.249, based on the California Consumer Price Index as reported by the California Department of Finance, in order to reflect incomes adjusted to 2006 dollars.

Sources: 2000 Census, 2006-2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

3.1 Employment: Local Employers and Wages

Local Industry Employment

Table 6 reports 2010 employment data supplied by the 2006–2010 Census ACS for the City of Davis. The large number of employed persons in the educational, health, and social services category, nearly 14,000 (44.7 percent of the employed population), reflects the economic magnitude of UC Davis within the local community. Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services, at 12.7 percent (3,969 employees) of total employment in 2010, represented the second largest employment category. Retail trade is the third largest industry in Davis, with nearly 2,941 employees (9.4 percent of those employed).

Large Employers

According to the City of Davis comprehensive annual financial report for fiscal year 2010, the largest employers in Davis included UC Davis, the Davis Joint Unified School District, the City of Davis, and Sutter Davis Hospital. UC Davis employed 30,770 people in 2010, which represented 46.2 percent of all employees within the City. UC Davis had a larger proportion than any other employer by a large margin. The Davis Joint Unified School District employed 1.5 percent of the total workforce with 972 employees followed by the City of Davis with 572 employees. Sutter Davis Hospital employed about 375 people in 2010 and was the fourth largest employer.

Worker Commuting Patterns

Based on 2010 OnTheMap Application and LEHD's Origin-Destination Employment Statistics database data reported in Table 7, 31.3 percent of those working in the City of Davis lived in the City. Of the 68.7 percent that commuted into Davis for work, 8.6 percent lived in the City of Sacramento. Another 8.1 percent of Davis workers resided in Woodland. Less than three percent of those employed in Davis lived in Vacaville while 2.6 percent commuted from West Sacramento.

Table 8 reports slightly different commuting patterns for UC Davis employees. Approximately 23.8 percent of UC Davis faculty and staff lived in Davis, while the remaining 76.2 percent commuted from elsewhere. Approximately 14.8 percent resided in the City of Sacramento, as compared to the 8.6 percent of Davis workers commuting from Sacramento as reported in Table 7. UC Davis staff also commuted in high percentages from Woodland, Elk Grove, and West Sacramento.

Worker Wages

Table 9 provides 2010 household income of workers that commute to Davis from elsewhere and those who reside in the City. Workers residing in Davis displayed a higher share of households in the highest-income bracket with a smaller proportion earning household incomes in the mid- and low-range categories. Approximately 21.4 percent of Davis workers residing in the City had household incomes below \$15,000 as compared to 33.3 percent of in-commuters. Workers residing in Davis exhibited higher shares of household incomes over \$40,000. Approximately 51 percent of workers

that both lived and worked in Davis in 2010 had household incomes in this high-income bracket. In 2010, 36.4 percent of workers commuting in to Davis had household incomes in this category.

Table 10 shows the annual worker earnings in 2010 for those employed in Davis and those employed in the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA. Overall, workers earning over \$65,000 per year were more prevalent in Davis than in the CMSA. The largest income differential was in the \$50,000 to \$65,000 income range, followed by the \$100,000 or more category.

Wages by Employer

Table 11 provides detailed information regarding the salary ranges earned by employees in various Davis workplaces. The table illustrates the large variability in earnings among Davis workers, related to occupational categories. The lowest salary schedules are associated with retail positions, though floor staff positions at Borders are assumed to only provide part-time employment. Overall, daycare workers earn the second lowest salaries as compared to other occupations, though Master Teachers and Curriculum Specialists for a daycare facility may earn as much as teachers in the Davis Joint Unified School District. Within the school district, teacher salaries can fall within a fairly large range. With the exception of clerks, UC Davis employees tend to earn relatively higher salaries. Similarly, City of Davis employees and tech workers generally earn in the mid to high salary ranges compared to other local workers.

Due to the range in earnings, employees in various occupation categories also have differing affordability thresholds for housing. Maximum affordable monthly housing costs for the local occupations listed in Table 11 can range from a low of \$180 up to \$2,895, depending on the individual's occupation and tenure in that position. However, the maximum monthly housing costs reported in Table 11 only take into account the salary of that employee. Many households have more than one wage earner, increasing the household's ability to spend on housing beyond what these calculations estimate.

Jobs-Housing Balance

Table 12 calculates the ratio of jobs to employed residents in 2010 for the City of Davis as well as seven other cities and the CMSA as a whole. This ratio is used as a standard benchmark to assess a community's job to housing balance.

Using 2000 and 2010 Census data it is possible to estimate the ratio of employed residents, whether working in Davis or elsewhere, to the total population. This calculation excludes members of the Davis community that are not part of the labor force and therefore not in need of a job. Davis exhibited the highest ratio of employed residents to the total local population in the set of nine jurisdictions. In other words, a greater share of Davis residents was employed, relative to the other communities.

The 2010 jobs-to-employed-residents ratio reveals that Davis, with a ratio of 0.48 employed residents to total residents, offers a high level of employment opportunities for local residents seeking work. Communities such as West Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Roseville, and the CMSA overall had fewer jobs available than the estimated number of residents that were employed, showing Davis is a job center that attracts in-commuters.

TABLE 6: EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, DAVIS, 2010

Industry (a)	Employed	Percent
	Workers (b)	of Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	148	0.5%
Construction	824	2.6%
Manufacturing	1,109	3.5%
Wholesale trade	282	0.9%
Retail trade	2,941	9.4%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	658	2.1%
Information	638	2.0%
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing	1,086	3.5%
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	3,969	12.7%
Educational, health, and social services	13,990	44.7%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	2,549	8.2%
Other services (except public administration)	884	2.8%
Public administration	2,186	7.0%
Total (b)	31,264	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Industry employment figures report the number of jobs in each geography, not the number of employed residents.

(b) Total employed civilian population 16 years or over.

Sources: 2006-2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

TABLE 7: DAVIS WORKERS BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE, 2010

Place of Residence (a) (b)	2010	
	Number	Percent
Davis, CA	4,232	31.3%
Sacramento, CA	1,162	8.6%
Woodland, CA	1,091	8.1%
Vacaville, CA	382	2.8%
West Sacramento, CA	345	2.6%
Dixon, CA	278	2.1%
Elk Grove, CA	246	1.8%
Roseville, CA	173	1.3%
San Francisco, CA	155	1.1%
Arden-Arcade CDP, CA	143	1.1%
San Jose, CA	143	1.1%
North Highlands CDP, CA	126	0.9%
Yuba City, CA	120	0.9%
Rancho Cordova, CA	119	0.9%
Winters, CA	119	0.9%
Fairfield, CA	111	0.8%
Citrus Heights, CA	102	0.8%
All Other Locations	4,477	33.1%
Workers Commuting into Davis	13,524	100.0%

Notes:

(a) All places showing more than 100 workers commuting into Davis are shown.

(b) Table excludes a small number of residents who commute in from out of state.

Sources: US Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002-2010).

TABLE 8: UC DAVIS FACULTY AND STAFF PLACE OF RESIDENCE, 2010

City/Community	UCD Faculty and Staff	
	Number	Percent of Total
Davis, CA	4,719	23.8%
Sacramento, CA	2,928	14.8%
Woodland, CA	1,320	6.7%
Elk Grove, CA	703	3.5%
West Sacramento, CA	583	2.9%
Arden-Arcade CDP, CA	447	2.3%
Dixon, CA	418	2.1%
Vacaville, CA	398	2.0%
North Highlands CDP, CA	267	1.3%
Folsom, CA	263	1.3%
Roseville, CA	258	1.3%
Carmichael CDP, CA	252	1.3%
University of California, Davis CDP, CA	247	1.2%
Rancho Cordova, CA	241	1.2%
Antelope CDP, CA	230	1.2%
Florin CDP, CA	223	1.1%
Foothill Farms CDP, CA	206	1.0%
All Other Locations	6,143	31.0%
Total	19,846	100.0%

Sources: US Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002–2010).

TABLE 9: HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF DAVIS WORKERS, 2010

Income Range	Household Incomes of Persons Living and Working in the City of Davis		Household Incomes of Persons Commuting into the City of Davis	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than \$15,000	906	21.4%	3,094	33.3%
\$15,000 to \$39,999	1,151	27.2%	2,806	30.2%
\$40,000 or more	2,171	51.3%	3,382	36.4%
Total	4,228	100%	9,282	100%

Sources: US Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter of 2002-2010).

TABLE 10: ANNUAL WORKER EARNINGS, 2010

Annual Earnings	Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
\$1 to \$9,999 or less	635	1.3%	14,979	2.7%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1,466	3.0%	13,719	2.5%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	4,886	10.0%	56,697	10.1%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	5,131	10.5%	62,856	11.2%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	8,600	17.6%	103,734	18.5%
\$50,000 to \$64,999	6,059	12.4%	93,515	16.7%
\$65,000 to \$74,999	4,300	8.8%	45,777	8.2%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	7,427	15.2%	69,156	12.4%
\$100,000 or more	10,310	21.1%	99,254	17.7%
Total (b)	48,814	100%	559,687	100%

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) Total Davis workers may differ slightly from figures reported in commuting patterns due to different sample population sizes.

Source: 2010 Census

TABLE 11: SELECTED SALARIES AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING COSTS, 2007

	Monthly Salary		Annual Salary		Maximum Monthly Housing Cost (a)	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
UC Davis						
Associate Professor	\$6,120	\$7,650	\$73,440	\$91,800	\$1,836	\$2,295
Librarian	\$5,563	\$8,885	\$66,756	\$106,620	\$1,669	\$2,666
Accountant III	\$4,026	\$5,638	\$48,312	\$67,656	\$1,208	\$1,691
Clerk	\$1,768	\$2,652	\$21,216	\$31,824	\$530	\$796
City of Davis						
Planner	\$5,387	\$6,548	\$64,640	\$78,570	\$1,616	\$1,964
Principal Planner	\$6,814	\$8,283	\$81,770	\$99,392	\$2,044	\$2,485
Public Safety Dispatcher I & II	\$3,413	\$4,564	\$40,961	\$54,767	\$1,024	\$1,369
Firefighter I & II	\$5,467	\$7,310	\$65,603	\$87,714	\$1,640	\$2,193
Associate Civil Engineer	\$5,538	\$6,732	\$66,461	\$80,783	\$1,662	\$2,020
Senior Civil Engineer	\$6,657	\$8,091	\$79,878	\$97,092	\$1,997	\$2,427
Park Maintenance Worker I & II	\$2,967	\$3,967	\$35,605	\$47,606	\$890	\$1,190
Senior Office Assistant	\$2,745	\$3,337	\$32,941	\$40,041	\$824	\$1,001
Davis Joint Unified School District						
High School Principal	\$7,201	\$9,649	\$86,408	\$115,793	\$2,160	\$2,895
Teacher	\$2,718	\$6,040	\$32,614	\$72,482	\$815	\$1,812
Accounting Technician I, II, & III	\$2,374	\$5,061	\$28,488	\$60,732	\$712	\$1,518
Custodian Team Leader I, II, & III	\$2,374	\$4,371	\$28,488	\$52,452	\$712	\$1,311
Borders						
Floor Staff (b)	\$600	\$640	\$7,200	\$7,680	\$180	\$192
Supervisor	\$1,368	\$1,512	\$16,416	\$18,144	\$410	\$454
Child Development Inc.						
Assistant Teacher/ Cook	\$1,733	\$2,080	\$20,800	\$24,960	\$520	\$624
Associate Teacher	\$1,907	\$2,427	\$22,880	\$29,120	\$572	\$728

	Monthly Salary		Annual Salary		Maximum Monthly Housing Cost (a)	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Teacher	\$2,080	\$2,773	\$24,960	\$33,280	\$624	\$832
Master Teacher	\$2,253	\$3,293	\$27,040	\$39,520	\$676	\$988
Curriculum Specialist	\$2,600	\$3,640	\$31,200	\$43,680	\$780	\$1,092
Tech Company (c)						
Product Development Manager	\$6,667	\$8,333	\$80,000	\$100,000	\$2,000	\$2,500
Scientist	\$5,000	\$6,667	\$60,000	\$80,000	\$1,500	\$2,000
Senior Research Associate	\$4,167	\$5,000	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$1,250	\$1,500
Office Manager	\$3,750	\$4,583	\$45,000	\$55,000	\$1,125	\$1,375
Sales Operations Assistant	\$2,083	\$2,917	\$25,000	\$35,000	\$625	\$875

Note:

(a) Assumes 30 percent of gross income expended on housing costs.

(b) Assumes only part-time employment at 20 hours per week. May understate income since employees may hold multiple jobs and possibly work over 40 hours a week.

(c) Company requested to remain anonymous.

Sources: UC Davis Professorial Salary Scales, 2006-2007 academic year; UC Academic Salary Scales, 2006;

UC, Office of the President Pay Scales, 2007; DJUSD Office of Human Resources Pay Scales, 2006-2007;

www.cityofdavis.org, 2007; Davis Borders staff, 2007; Keith Vencel, Regional Staffing Manager, Child Development Inc., 2007; BAE, 2007.

TABLE 12: RATIO OF JOBS TO EMPLOYED RESIDENTS, 2000 AND 2010

Community	2000			2010 (a)		
	Population	Employed	Employed Residents/	Population	Employed	Employed Residents/
		Residents	Population		Residents	Population
Davis, CA	60,308	31,165	0.52	65,622	31,264	0.48
95616 and 95618 zip codes (b,c)	60,308	31,165	0.52	65,176	33,680	0.52
Citrus Heights, CA	85,230	41,152	0.48	83,301	40,853	0.49
Elk Grove, CA	60,255	28,265	0.47	153,015	66,993	0.44
Folsom, CA	51,912	23,053	0.44	72,203	30,535	0.42
Rancho Cordova, CA	54,586	24,047	0.44	64,776	28,733	0.44
Rocklin, CA	36,563	18,355	0.50	56,974	26,732	0.47
Roseville, CA	80,092	36,667	0.46	118,788	53,783	0.45
West Sacramento, CA	31,604	11,607	0.37	48,744	21,322	0.44
Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (c)	1,796,857	799,989	0.45	2,149,127	957,441	0.45

Notes:

(a) Population figures from 2010 Census and employment figures from 2006-2010 Census ACS.

(b) Includes total 2005 employment and population for the 95616 and 95618 zip codes as a proxy for 2010.

(c) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 Census, 2006-2010 Census ACS, SACOG 2012

3.2 Population, Household, and Employment Growth Projections

The following section presents 2008 SACOG projections, the most current and geographically detailed projections available for population, households, and employment in the Sacramento region which was developed for the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (MTP/SCS). These projections are reported in Table 13, based on SACOG jurisdiction-level data for the City of Davis plus the city's sphere of influence. SACOG projections were provided for 2008, 2020, and 2035; data for 2013 was interpolated using the growths from 2008 to 2020, and 2021 data was interpolated using 2020 and 2035 data.

The projections for the planned neighborhood at UC Davis, West Village, are derived from information available in the UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR as well as the West Village Implementation Plan. It is assumed that Phase I of the West Village Implementation Plan will be completed in 2013, and the second and final Phase will be completed in 2015. Below, 2013 projections reflect Phase I completion and 2021 shows Phase II projections.

Population and Households

SACOG projects that population in Davis will grow by 9.0 percent from 2013 to 2021 and households will grow by 9.5 percent in the same time period. The City is expected to add 6,868 persons and 3,135 households in the current Housing Element cycle. These projections however do not include the growth anticipated from the West Village project on land currently outside Davis City limits.

With the addition of West Village to the Davis projections, the population and household growth rates for the Davis community area approach the estimated growth rates are slightly greater than in the CMSA. For example, population growth increases from 9.0 percent to 9.3 percent with the addition of full implementation of the West Village project. By full buildout, expected in 2015, nearly 4,200 people in 1,650 households will reside in West Village. The projections reported in Table 13 assume that Phase I will be completed by 2013 and Phase II will be completed in 2015, and reported for 2021. The West Village population and household projections only represent a portion of the growth anticipated at UC Davis. The UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR estimates that 30,000 students and over 17,700 employees will be associated with the Davis campus by 2015. However, of the students and employees that will not reside in West Village or on campus, the EIR projects that a net of 60 additional students and 970 employee households will seek housing in the City of Davis through 2021, based on the university's overall growth projections.

Employment

SACOG projects that the growth rate of employment opportunities in Davis, estimated at 4.2 percent from 2013 to 2021, will be the result of 1,470 additional employment opportunities from 2013 to 2021. This growth rate amounts to about half the growth rate estimated for CMSA employment between 2013 and 2021.

Employment at West Village may include jobs at the Community Education Center, a planned elementary school, and office and retail positions in a planned mixed-use center. All three job-generating uses are included in the first phase of West Village, and account for approximately 230 new positions. This small number of new jobs does not impact the projected annual average growth rate for employment in the Davis community area because they are assumed to all be in place during 2013, the housing element baseline year.

TABLE 13: POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

	2008	2013(a)	2021 (b)	Percent Change 2013–2021
City of Davis (c)				
Population	72,334	76,462	83,330	9.0%
Households	30,972	32,947	36,082	9.5%
Employment	34,159	34,952	36,422	4.2%
West Village, UC Davis (d)				
Students	-	2,592	3,000	15.7%
Faculty and Staff and Dependents (e)	-	1,016	1,178	15.9%
Subtotal: West Village Population	-	3,608	4,178	15.8%
Student Households (f)	-	1,013	1,173	15.8%
Faculty and Staff Households	-	410	475	15.9%
Subtotal: West Village Households	-	1,423	1,648	15.8%
Community Education Center	-	90	90	0.0%
Elementary School Employees	-	20	20	0.0%
Mixed-use Center Employees (g)	-	120	120	0.0%
Subtotal: West Village Employment	-	230	230	0.0%
Total: Davis and West Village				
Population	72,334	80,070	87,508	9.3%
Households	30,972	34,370	37,730	9.8%
Employment	34,159	35,182	36,652	4.2%
Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (h)				
Population	2,053,820	2,165,985	2,365,448	9.2%
Households	764,632	818,638	909,381	11.1%
Employment	911,357	950,709	1,023,204	7.6%

Notes:

(a) City of Davis and CMSA information interpolated from 2008 and 2020 figures. City of Davis includes sphere of influence.

(b) City of Davis and CMSA information interpolated from 2008 and 2035 figures. City of Davis includes sphere of influence.

(c) City of Davis figures include demographics within the sphere of influence.

(d) West Village figures based on completion of Phase I in 2013 and Phase II in 2015.

(e) Assumes 2.48 persons per household from the UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR.

(f) Assumes 2.56 students (or beds) per student household based on UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR.

(g) Assumes one employee per 375 square feet of office and retail commercial space.

(h) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: SACOG 2013; UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR; UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR Addendum #1, November 2006; West Village Implementation Plan, UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, November 2006.

3.3 Housing Stock Characteristics: Type, Conditions, Overcrowding and Vacancy

This section reports information regarding housing stock characteristics such as age, condition, and types of structures for both the City of Davis and the CMSA. This part of the report also analyzes vacancy rates and the availability of affordable housing in Davis. Data sources utilized in the following analysis include the 2000 Census, 2010 Census, 2006–2010 ACS, 2008–2010 ACS, the City of Davis, the California DOF, the 2012 Apartment Vacancy and Rental Rate Survey conducted by the UC Davis Office of Student Housing, the Yolo County Housing Authority, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Housing Stock Age and Condition

The age of the housing stock in Davis exhibits a relatively similar pattern to that of the CMSA. As relayed in Table 14, an estimated 49 percent of the housing stock in both geographies was built between 1980 and 2010. The City of Davis has approximately 13,135 houses that were built prior to 1980s. As of 2010 in Davis, 48.7 percent of the housing stock was built since 1980 and as a consequence of the City's relatively new housing stock, the units in Davis are in good condition overall.

In addition, both areas experienced a building boom in the 1970s, with 24.6 percent of the Davis housing stock and 19.4 percent of housing in the CMSA built in that decade. A significant difference between the age of housing stock in Davis compared to the CMSA is that Davis possesses a smaller share of housing units built prior to 1960. Additionally, high land costs and buyer desirability have led to increased reinvestment into these older properties within the core area because of the value they represent to landowners.

In June 2008, a windshield survey was conducted to identify general housing conditions of areas with older homes in Davis. The windshield survey included a sampling of 234 houses throughout central Davis, in areas where the oldest housing stock exists. This sampling provides percentage representation for all older homes within the City. The condition of housing was assessed by a survey of housing unit exteriors using five structural categories: foundation, roofing, siding, frontage/driveway, and windows. Based on the five categories listed above, each housing structure was rated as being in sound or dilapidated condition, or in need of minor, moderate, or substantial repairs. The information collected during the survey is summarized in Table 15a: Housing Condition Survey Results.

The vast majority of the housing surveyed was found to be in sound condition or needed minor repair. There were about 21 (8 percent) homes that needed moderate to substantial repair. Typical structural defects observed included roofs in need of replacement, damaged siding, peeling paint, broken steps, cracked or uneven frontage, and dislodged roof gutters. Overall, the houses appeared

to be structurally sound but some were in need of maintenance and/ or cosmetic improvements. Based on this survey, staff extrapolated the statistical information to apply to the entire City of Davis housing stock for homes built prior to 1980. The small percentage of homes in need of moderate or substantial repair does not currently justify the need for a rehabilitation program. City staff will monitor home conditions again at the conclusion of this Housing Element term and will assess future need of this type of program. The City has not identified any housing units in need of rehabilitation or replacement during the current planning period.

In 2011 and 2012 the City received over 800 resale inspection applications and processed 1,223 code enforcement cases. In the 2011–2012 fiscal year the City set aside \$125,000 to rehabilitate four affordable housing units. The City is also working with owners of local aging affordable rental units and has set aside HOME funding to assist in the rehabilitation of an estimated 10 rental units over the upcoming fiscal year. The City will continue planning and assessing for future rehabilitation needs of aging affordable units. In addition, the City has also recently created an Accessible Home Improvement Loan Program using HOME funds that is available and able to assist low-income owners with accessible improvements to their homes, as well as work to address health and safety and/or code violations. Since 2008 the City has not replaced any housing units and does not have any plans to do so. The City's efforts to rehabilitate aging units and the sound condition of the majority of the housing stock continues to provide Davis with housing in overall good condition.

Type of Housing Structures

As Table 15b highlights, single-family detached units constituted the largest single component of the housing stock in Davis in 2010. However, at 44.4 percent of total units, this share lagged behind the CMSA where 67.8 percent of the housing stock consisted of single-family detached units. Davis did possess a slightly higher share of single-family attached units, such as townhomes, relative to the CMSA. More significantly, the large share of housing units in structures with five or more units in Davis, 35.6 percent of total units, indicates a prevalence of apartment buildings in Davis as compared to the CMSA.

Renter-Occupied Units

In 2010, according to the US Census as shown in Table 15c, there were 22,948 housing units in the City of Davis. Of these units, 12,712 (or 55.4 percent) were renter-occupied. This high proportion of renter-occupied units is reflective of the high student population in Davis. Of these renter-occupied units, 37 percent contain two to nine units. Of renter-occupied units, 36.2 percent were in large complexes of 10 or more units. The next highest proportion of units was in the single-family unit category with 25.5 percent of renters living in that situation.

Vacancy Rates

Davis vacancy rates have exhibited a slight upward trend from 2000 to 2010, as shown in Table 15b. According to the US Census, the overall vacancy rate in Davis increased from 2.8 percent in 2000 to 3.8 percent in 2010. In 2000, 60.8 percent of vacant units were for rent and only 16.1 percent were

for sale. The remaining vacant units (23.1 percent) consisted of other vacant units such as unoccupied homes that were already rented or sold or seasonal homes. By 2010, the percent of vacant homes for rent dropped to 51.2 percent, while 9.4 percent were for sale. Vacant homes for seasonal use, however, saw a large percentage increase with 17.2 percent of all vacant homes falling into that category.

In general, these figures indicate a trend toward slightly higher vacancy rates in Davis. Nevertheless, vacancy rates remain extremely low. Within the field of urban economics, a residential vacancy rate of approximately 5 percent is considered an indicator of a real estate market with sufficient housing options for both renters and buyers, and a reasonable balance between supply and demand.

Overcrowding

The Census defines overcrowding as having more than one person per room in a housing unit and the Census definition of a room is: “whole rooms used for living purposes...including living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, finished recreation rooms, enclosed porches suitable for year-round use, and lodgers' rooms. Excluded are strip or pullman kitchens, bathrooms, open porches, balconies, halls or foyers, half-rooms, utility rooms, unfinished attics or basements, or other unfinished space used for storage. A partially divided room is a separate room only if there is a partition from floor to ceiling, but not if the partition consists solely of shelves or cabinets.”

Based on the 2010 Census data, Davis experienced a lower incidence of overcrowding compared to the CMSA. In 2010, around 3 percent of CMSA households lived in overcrowded conditions compared to 1.7 percent in Davis. In both locations, a higher share of renter households lived in overcrowded conditions relative to households that owned their place of residence. In Davis, approximately 1.4 percent of renters live in overcrowded units compared to 0.2 percent of owners. In the CMSA, 2.2 percent of renters and 0.8 percent of homeowners lived in overcrowded conditions. This information is further displayed in Table 15c.

Housing Problems

Table 16 shows the number of households by tenure that reported one or more housing problems, organized by income level. A housing problem is defined as one of the following: lacking kitchen or plumbing, more than one person per room, or a cost burden greater than 30%. In Davis, 25.6 percent of all households reporting one or more housing condition problems were renter-occupied, and 74.3 percent were owner-occupied. This distribution is reversed in the CMSA with 55.6 percent of homes with problems being renter-occupied and 44.3 percent owner-occupied.

City of Davis Affordable Housing Requirements

The Davis Affordable Housing Ordinance (18.05.010 – 18.05.017) establishes inclusionary housing requirements for new housing projects. The City requires that ownership and rental units be affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate income households. Moreover, for new rental housing developments, with twenty or more units, the City requires that certain percentages of the units be affordable to very low, low and moderate-income households. Rental developments with between

five and 19 units are required to provide 15 percent of the units to low-income households and ten percent to very low-income households. Moreover, the ordinance requires that all affordable rental units remain affordable in perpetuity.

The City of Davis also adopted a Middle Income Housing Ordinance (18.06.0) in 2004 to address the housing needs of households with incomes of between 120 and 180 percent of the median Yolo County household income, adjusted for household size. The Middle Income Housing Ordinance is currently suspended due to the decreases in overall housing prices and in an effort to support consistent housing development in spite of a difficult construction financing environment.

Multifamily Affordable Housing Complexes

Table 17 details the current multifamily affordable housing stock in Davis. This table addresses the requirements set forth in California Government Code 65583 for “a listing of each development by project name and address, the type of governmental assistance received, the earliest possible date of change from low-income use, and total number of elderly and non-elderly units that could be lost from the locality’s low-income housing stock.” Forty-eight communities will provide nearly 2,400 affordable units to Davis residents at the start of this Housing Element planning period, with more units in planning and predevelopment stages. Existing unit sizes range from studio efficiencies to four-bedroom apartments. Several communities provide affordable housing targeted to special needs populations such as seniors and persons with disabilities.

For-Sale Affordable Housing Opportunities

In addition to affordable rental units, the City of Davis has also adopted policies to require affordable ownership options in all new ownership housing, with some policies aimed to target housing production for the City’s workforce. Of the 2,355 total units described in Table 17, 96 are affordable ownership units that are built and are resale-restricted ownership units for low- and moderate-income households. These units have all been privately subsidized.

TABLE 14: HOUSING STOCK BY YEAR BUILT

Year Structure Built	Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Percent of Total
Built 2005 or later	n/a	n/a	978	3.8%	n/a	n/a	57,748	6.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	n/a	n/a	2,193	8.6%	n/a	n/a	100,466	11.5%
Built 1990 to 1999	5,843	24.7%	5,351	20.9%	138,050	19.3%	128,242	14.7%
Built 1980 to 1989	3,698	15.7%	3,956	15.4%	143,842	20.1%	145,112	16.6%
Built 1970 to 1979	7,271	30.8%	6,291	24.6%	165,152	23.1%	169,443	19.4%
Built 1960 to 1969	4,021	17.0%	3,741	14.6%	105,241	14.7%	97,903	11.2%
Built 1950 to 1959	1,639	6.9%	2,169	8.5%	88,076	12.3%	94,154	10.8%
Built 1940 to 1949	551	2.3%	112	0.4%	36,126	5.1%	37,344	4.3%
Built 1939 or earlier	588	2.5%	822	3.2%	38,494	5.4%	41,734	4.8%
Total Units	23,611	100.0%	25,613	100.0%	714,981	100.0%	872,146	100.0%

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 Census, 2006-2010 ACS

TABLE 15A: HOUSING CONDITION SURVEY RESULTS

Housing Type	Sound	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Dilapidated	Total
Single (230)	153	57	16	3	1	230
Mobile (0)						0
Duplex (4)	2	1	1			4
Multifamily(0)						0
Total	155	58	17	3	1	234
Percent	66%	25%	7.3%	1.3%	.4%	100%

Source: City staff survey, 2008

TABLE 15B: HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

	Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	of Units	of Total	of Units	of Total	of Units	of Total	of Units	of Total
Total Housing Units								
Occupied Housing Units	22,948	97.2%	25,060	96.2%	665,298	93.0%	781,437	90.3%
Vacant Housing Units	669	2.8%	996	3.8%	49,683	7.0%	84,126	9.7%
<i>Vacant - For rent</i>	406	1.7%	510	2.0%	13,899	1.9%	26,942	3.1%
<i>Vacant - For sale only</i>	108	0.5%	94	0.4%	6,948	1.0%	12,010	1.4%
<i>Vacant - Rented or sold, not occupied</i>	57	0.2%	89	0.3%	3,318	0.5%	3,443	0.4%
<i>Vacant - For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</i>	74	0.3%	172	0.7%	22,481	3.1%	27,508	3.2%
<i>Vacant - For migrant workers</i>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	122	0.0%	144	0.0%
<i>Vacant - Other vacant</i>	39	0.2%	131	0.5%	2,915	0.4%	14,079	1.6%
Units in Structure								
I-unit detached	10,575	45.0%	11,577	44.4%	469,547	66.0%	586,745	67.8%
I-unit attached	2,347	10.0%	2,430	9.3%	42,920	6.0%	46,187	5.3%
2 to 4 units	2,122	9.0%	2,390	9.2%	49,822	7.0%	51,868	6.0%
5 or more units	8,182	34.0%	9,274	35.6%	124,556	18.0%	152,118	17.6%
Mobile home, trailer, or other	385	2.0%	385	1.5%	28,136	4.0%	28,645	3.3%
Total units (b)	23,611	100.0%	26,056	100.0%	714,981	100.0%	865,563	100.0%

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 Census, DOF 2012, SACOG 2012

TABLE 15C: PERSONS PER ROOM, 2000 AND 2010

Persons Per Room	2000				2010			
	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)		City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number (b)	Percent of Total	Number (b)	Percent of Total	Number (c)	Percent of Total	Number (c)	Percent of Total
Owner-Occupied Housing Units								
1.00 Person per Room or less	10,057	43.8%	391,059	58.8%	11,268	46.7%	468,189	43.1%
1.01–1.50 Persons per Room	99	0.4%	10,127	1.5%	53	0.2%	6,503	0.6%
1.51–2.00 Persons per Room	43	0.2%	4,927	0.7%	0	0.0%	1,594	0.1%
2.01 Persons per Room or more	35	0.2%	1,603	0.2%	0	0.0%	447	0.0%
<i>Subtotal: Owner-Occupied</i>	<i>10,234</i>	<i>44.6%</i>	<i>407,716</i>	<i>61.2%</i>	<i>11,321</i>	<i>46.9%</i>	<i>476,733</i>	<i>43.8%</i>
Renter-Occupied Housing Units								
1.00 Person per Room or less	11,641	50.7%	221,930	33.4%	12,465	51.7%	280,765	25.9%
1.01–1.50 Persons per Room	537	2.3%	16,806	2.5%	234	1.0%	16,397	1.5%
1.51–2.00 Persons per Room	484	2.1%	11,739	1.8%	110	0.5%	6,574	0.6%
2.01 Persons per Room or more	50	0.2%	7,106	1.1%	0	0.0%	956	0.1%
<i>Subtotal: Renter-Occupied</i>	<i>12,712</i>	<i>55.3%</i>	<i>257,581</i>	<i>38.8%</i>	<i>12,809</i>	<i>53.2%</i>	<i>304,692</i>	<i>28.1%</i>
Total Households	22,948	100.0%	665,298	100.0%	24,130	100.0%	781,425	100.0%

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) 2000 figures estimated using a calculation of the Census 2000 Summary File 3 percentage allocation for each tenure subcategory, and applying those distributions to the 2000 Census Summary File 1 owner-occupied and renter-occupied household figures.

(c) Figures for Davis in 2010 come from the 2008-2010 Census ACS.

(d) Figures for the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA come from the 2010 Census.

Sources: 2000 Census, 2008-2010 ACS, 2010 Census

TABLE 16: HOUSING PROBLEMS FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS, 2010

	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Total Housing Units with Problem(s)	Number	Percent of Total Housing Units with Problem(s)
Renter-Occupied Households				
Extremely Low Income (\leq 30% AMI)	330	3.1%	19,950	5.8%
Very Low Income (31%–50% AMI)	310	2.9%	22,535	6.6%
Low Income (51%–80% AMI)	335	3.1%	39,390	11.5%
Moderate and Above-Moderate Income (Above 80% AMI)	1,770	16.5%	108,155	31.7%
<i>Subtotal Renter-Occupied Households with Housing Unit Problem(s)</i>	2,745	25.6%	190,030	55.6%
Owner-Occupied Households				
Extremely Low Income (\leq 30% AMI)	3,110	29.1%	52,800	15.5%
Very Low Income (31%–50% AMI)	1,875	17.5%	44,155	12.9%
Low Income (51%–80% AMI)	1,715	16.0%	37,535	11.0%
Moderate and Above-Moderate Income (Above 80% AMI)	1,250	11.7%	16,610	4.9%
<i>Subtotal Owner-Occupied Households with Housing Unit Problem(s)</i>	7,950	74.3%	151,100	44.3%
Total Housing Units with Problem(s)	10,695	100.0%	341,130	100.0%

Source: SACOG 2012

TABLE 17: CITY OF DAVIS MULTIFAMILY AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK, 2013

Apartment Complex	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Type	Funding Sources	Affordability End Date
Adobe at Evergreen	1500 Shasta Dr	120	30	Family	Tax Credit	Permanent
Allegre Apts	1659 Drew Cr	152	17	Family	221d4 NC/SR	Permanent
Arlington Farms Apts	2900 Portage Bay West	138	28	Family	Project-based vouchers	Permanent
Becerra Plaza	326 Becerra Way	21	20	Wholly physically disabled	202/811	Permanent
Cal Aggie Christian Association	433 Russell Boulevard	10	10	SRO	Private	Permanent
Cassel Lane	Cassel Lane	5	5	Family	Private	Permanent (Ownership)
Cesar Chavez Plaza	1220 Olive Dr	53	53	Special Needs and Single/Small HH	Redevelopment ¹ , MHP	Permanent
Cornucopia Cooperative	233/239 J Street	8	8	Single/Small HH, Student focus	Redevelopment ¹	Permanent
DaVinci Court Apts	1666 Da Vinci Ct	51	18	Family	Private	Permanent
Davisville Apts	1221 Kennedy Pl	70	70	Senior	223(f)	2031
El Macero Village	4735 Cowell Blvd	104	21	Family	Private	Transitioning out of Section 8
Eleanor Roosevelt Circle	675 Cantrill Dr	60	60	Senior, including Special Needs	Redevelopment, MHP, HOME, and CDBG	Permanent
Fox Creek	1515 Valdora St	36	36	Family	Redevelopment	Permanent
GAMAT Homes	Various – West &	20	20	Family	Private	Permanent

Apartment Complex	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Type	Funding Sources	Affordability End Date
	South Davis					
Glacier Circle	2358 Glacier Place	1	1	Senior	Private	Permanent
Heather Glen	2324 Shasta Dr	62	62	Family	Redevelopment	Permanent
Homestead Cooperative	2610 Grambling Ct	15	15	Special Needs and Single/Small HH	HOME, Redevelopment, City	Permanent
Mahogany Lane	Cottonwood (off Montgomery)	8	8	Family	Private	Permanent (Ownership)
Moore Village	2444 Moore Blvd	59	59	Family	HOME, Redevelopment, City	Permanent
New Harmony	3030 Covell Boulevard	69	69	Family	HOME, Redevelopment, City	Permanent
Olive Court	1414 Olive Dr	24	24	Family	City	Permanent
Olympic Cottages	1707 Olympic Dr	30	12	Senior	n/a	Permanent
Owendale Apts	3023 Albany Ave	45	45	Family	MHP, HOME, Redevelopment, City	Permanent
Pacifico Cooperative	1752 Drew Cir	96	96	Single/Small HH, Student focus	City	Permanent
Parque Santiago	Messina and Serrano Terrace (off Ensenada)	5	5	Family	Private	Permanent (Ownership)
Pinecrest Apts	920 Cranbrook Ct	40	38	Family	236	2044

Apartment Complex	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Type	Funding Sources	Affordability End Date
Rosa Parks Apts	1205 5th St	10	10	Family	CHRP-R, City	Permanent
Rosewood Park Apts	616 Ohlone St	24	24	Family	City, Redevelopment	Permanent
Sharps and Flats	1660 Drew Cir	97	34	Family	Private	Permanent
Shasta Point Retirement Community	1501 Shasta Dr	68	68	Senior	202 Capital Advance for Elderly	Permanent
Shepherds Close	728 B Street	1	1	Family	Private	Permanent
Sojourner Truth Gardens	1220 5th St	14	14	Family	City, CHFA	Permanent
Southfield Park Condos	Greene Terrace	60	60	Family	Private	Permanent (Ownership)
Sterling Court	803-809 10th St	4	4	Family	City Housing Trust Fund	Permanent
Summerhouse	2525 E 8th St	15	12	Wholly developmentally disabled	202 Direct Loan Converted to Cap Adv w/PRAC	Permanent
Suntree Apts	2033 F St	95	59	Family	Section 8 contract	2020
Terracina at Wildhorse	1800 Moore Blvd	70	70	Family	Tax Credit	Permanent
The Alhambra Apts	4500 Alhambra Dr	160	160	Family	Tax Credit	Permanent
Tremont Green	5663 Marden St	36	36	Family	Redevelopment, MHP, HOME, and CDBG	Permanent
Tuscany Villas	2526 E 8th St	30	36	Family	Rental Housing Construction Program- HCD	Permanent

Apartment Complex	Address	Total Units	Affordable Units	Type	Funding Sources	Affordability End Date
Twin Pines Community/Northstar Apartments	3333 F St	36	36	Family	542(c) HFA Risk Sharing -- NC/SR, City, State HOME	Permanent
University Retirement Community	1515 Shasta Dr	161	63	Senior	Private	Permanent
Verona	Cubre, Nido, Ramita, and Verona Terrace (off Fifth and Alhambra)	18	18	Family	Private	Permanent (Ownership)
Villa Calabria	2537 E 8th Street	6	6	Senior	Rental Housing Construction Program—HCD	Permanent
Walnut Terrace Apts	3101 5th St	30	30	Senior	City, HOME, Redevelopment	Permanent
Willow Glen	310 Becerra Way	12	12	Senior	Tax Credits and Rental Housing Construction Program—HCD	Permanent
Windmere	3100 5th St	48	48	Family	542(c) HFA Risk Sharing—NC/SR, Tax Credits, CDBG	Permanent
Windmere II	3030 5th St	58	58	Family	CHFA, Tax Credits, CDBG, HOME, Redevelopment	Permanent
Total Units		2,355	1,689			

Source: City of Davis, 2013

¹City will seek new funding sources for developments with Redevelopment as a funding source in the near future as Redevelopment funds are no longer available.

3.4 Housing Costs and Affordability: Overpaying for Housing

This section studies the costs of rental and for-sale housing in Davis and provides a general assessment of market-rate housing affordability in Davis. Data sources utilized in the following analysis include the 2000 Census, 2010 Census, the City of Davis, the 2012 Apartment Vacancy and Rental Rate Survey conducted by the UC Davis Office of Student Housing, the Yolo County Housing Authority, HUD, and HCD.

Apartment Rental Rates

As detailed in Table 18, according to a survey conducted by the UC Davis Student Housing Office, there were nearly 7,800 unfurnished apartment units available for rent in 2012. This figure excludes furnished apartments as well as rental units not in apartment complexes and rent-restricted units. Almost 3,400 of those units were two-bedroom apartments with an average monthly rent of \$1,307. The vacancy rate for these units was a low 1.7 percent. One-bedroom apartments represented the second most prevalent size of units, with nearly 2,200 units in the market. At an average monthly cost of \$998, these apartments exhibited the second highest vacancy rate overall at 1.8 percent. Overall, average monthly rents ranged from \$871 to \$2,870, increasing with unit size. After factoring in Yolo County utility allowances for each type of unit, the annual household income required to afford rental apartments in Davis ranged from \$34,840 to approximately \$114,800.⁴ However, there were very few of the larger and generally more expensive apartments available in Davis. The household incomes required for one and two-bedroom apartments, comprising the largest share of units, were between \$39,920 and \$52,280.

For-Sale Housing Prices

Table 19 reports that the median single-family home price in Davis between October of 2012 and April of 2013 equaled \$463,500. Approximately 28.2 percent of units sold during that time period cost over \$600,000. Another 11.1 percent of the units were priced between \$300,000 and \$350,000 as well as \$400,000 and \$450,000, and 10.7 percent were between \$450,000 and \$500,000.

Based on the assumption of a 30-year standard mortgage, a 10 percent down payment, and a 6.5 percent fixed interest rate, as well as allotments for mortgage insurance, property taxes, and hazard insurance, Table 19 estimates the annual household income required to purchase homes in the various cost categories. While the minimum annual household income required to purchase the home with the lowest recorded home sale price of \$137,000 is just over \$41,000, very few options exist in Davis for households earning less than \$75,000 annually. Furthermore, in order to afford a \$550,000 home, a price near the median single-family home price, the minimum annual household income required approaches \$165,000.

⁴ Annual household income requirement figure based on assumption that 30 percent of annual household income is expended on housing costs, including utilities.

Housing Cost Burden

Table 20 presents household income and housing cost burden information based on the 2006–2010 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (CHAS) figures from HUD. According to this data source, between 2006 and 2010, 74.2 percent of cost burdened households in Davis fell in the very low- and extremely-low income category. The vast majority of these very low- and extremely-low income households were renters. In fact, more than half of all cost-burdened renter households fell into the very low- and extremely-low income categories. These figures are likely impacted by the prevalence of student households in Davis. Among cost-burdened households, 28.5 percent were owner-occupied with moderate or above moderate household incomes. In contrast, only 13.8 percent of renter households had household incomes in these categories.

Housing Affordability Assessment

Table 21a estimates the share of Davis family households that fall into each of the household income categories as defined by HCD. Non-family households are excluded from this analysis due to a lack of data available on household earnings by size. In order to generate the estimates in Table 21a, income per households from the 2010 Census was analyzed against the 2013 income limits provided by HCD to get the number of households per income category. These homes were distributed by family household size using the 2010 Census.

Table 21a can also be utilized to estimate the number of extremely low-income households in the City (as required by Chapter 891 Statutes of 2006 Assembly Bill 2634). The City must document the number of existing as well as projected extremely low-income households. According to CHAS data, the City was home to 1,968 family households that were extremely low-income in 2010. As cited previously, these figures are likely impacted by the prevalence of student households in the City. This total of 1,968 households is approximately 15.1 percent of the City's existing family households. With the overall population of Davis projected to increase by 2,990 households through 2021, it is estimated that approximately 451 additional extremely low-income households will live in Davis. This means that by 2013 there could likely be 1,968 extremely low-income households in Davis.

Table 21b translates the 2013 income limits to the maximum monthly housing cost households in each income and size category can afford. These estimates assume that households expend 30 percent of gross income on housing costs. For renter households, costs include rent and utilities. Housing costs for owner households consist of mortgage principal and interest payments, property taxes, and insurance costs as well as utilities.

As reported in Table 18 the annual income requirements needed to afford an apartment in Davis in 2013 ranged from \$34,840 for a studio apartment to \$114,800 for a five-bedroom apartment unit. A one-bedroom unit costs an average of \$998 per month. These units are affordable to households with an annual income of \$39,920. As displayed in Table 21b, this type of unit is affordable to a two-person family household earning a low income but not to most very low- and extremely low-

income two-person family households. A two-bedroom unfurnished apartment, averaging \$1,307 in monthly rent and an additional \$203 in monthly utility costs, requires approximately \$52,280 in annual household income. Based on Table 21b, only some two-person family households earning between 80 and 120 percent of AMI and all higher income households could afford these units. Two-bedroom units are also not affordable to very low-income and low-income three-, four-, and five-person family households.

As reported in the For-Sale Housing Prices section above, while a limited number of market-rate housing options exist in Davis for households with incomes between \$60,000 and \$100,000, annual household incomes generally need to exceed \$100,000 in order to afford the purchase price of a home in Davis. Therefore, only families earning above-moderate incomes, regardless of family size, could afford a home in Davis. According to Table 21a, approximately 50.9 percent of all Davis family households fall into the above-moderate income category. The remaining 49.1 percent of families have lower household incomes than what is generally required to purchase a home at market price in the City.

Summary

The Davis housing stock is relatively new, and in overall good condition. However, compared to the CMSA, the City does have a smaller proportion of single-family detached housing units and a larger share of apartments. In addition, Davis has exhibited consistently low vacancy rates, indicating high levels of local housing demand relative to available supply.

The high level of housing demand and limited supply of housing contributes to high housing costs in Davis. As a result of the high housing costs in Davis, approximately 46 percent of all Davis households (7,779 households) experienced some level of excessive housing cost burden in 2010, though renter households experienced a disproportionate share of housing affordability problems. Of this 46 percent of households overpaying, 5,565 households were very low-income households. In 2010, one- and two-bedroom apartment units averaged monthly rental rates between \$998 and \$1,307. These rates are not affordable to the very low- and low-income households that may be interested in renting these units. Moreover, the majority of renter households fall into these household income categories. Also, with a median home price of \$463,500, the Davis for-sale housing market is affordable only to households with above-moderate income levels. Very few for-sale housing options exist for households earning less than \$100,000 annually, outside of City inclusionary programs.

TABLE 18: SELECTED AVERAGE MULTIFAMILY APARTMENT RENTS IN DAVIS BY UNIT SIZE, 2012

Unit Size	Number of Units (a)	Percent Vacant	Average Monthly Rent	Utility Allowance	Household Annual Income Requirement (b)
Studio Unfurnished	180	1.7%	\$871	\$161	\$34,840
One Bedroom Unfurnished	2,192	1.8%	\$998	\$172	\$39,920
Two Bedroom Unfurnished	3,371	1.7%	\$1,307	\$203	\$52,280
Three Bedroom Unfurnished	1,236	2.5%	\$1,888	\$236	\$75,520
Four Bedroom Unfurnished	806	0.2%	\$2,582	\$312	\$103,280
Five Bedroom Unfurnished	4	0.0%	\$2,870	\$317	\$114,800

Notes:

(a) Does not include subsidized apartments, rooms in homes rented out, or single-family homes that are rented.

(b) Annual household income requirement figure based on assumption that 30 percent of household income is expended on housing costs, including utilities.

Sources: UC Davis Student Housing Office 2012 Davis Apartment Vacancy and Rental Rate Survey, 2013

TABLE 19: HOUSING SALES PRICES IN DAVIS, OCTOBER 2012–APRIL 2013

Unit Sales Price	Number (a)	Percent Total	Unit Price	Down Payment	Principal & Interest	Mortgage Insurance	Property Insurance	Property Taxes	Annual Payment	Household Income Requirement (b)
Under \$200,000	9	3.8%	\$199,999	\$10,000	\$23,000	\$1,560	\$500	\$2,500	\$10,433	\$60,000
\$200,000 - \$249,999	7	3.0%	\$200,000	\$10,000	\$23,000	\$1,560	\$500	\$2,500	\$10,433	\$60,000
\$250,000 - \$299,999	17	7.3%	\$250,000	\$12,500	\$28,750	\$1,950	\$625	\$3,125	\$13,042	\$75,000
\$300,000 - \$349,999	26	11.1%	\$300,000	\$15,000	\$34,500	\$2,340	\$750	\$3,750	\$15,650	\$90,000
\$350,000 - \$399,999	23	9.8%	\$350,000	\$17,500	\$40,250	\$2,730	\$875	\$4,375	\$18,258	\$105,000
\$400,000 - \$449,999	26	11.1%	\$400,000	\$20,000	\$46,000	\$3,120	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$20,867	\$120,000
\$450,000 - \$499,999	25	10.7%	\$450,000	\$22,500	\$51,750	\$3,510	\$1,125	\$5,625	\$23,475	\$135,000
\$500,000 - \$549,999	15	6.4%	\$500,000	\$25,000	\$57,500	\$3,900	\$1,250	\$6,250	\$26,083	\$150,000
\$550,000 - \$599,999	20	8.5%	\$550,000	\$27,500	\$63,250	\$4,290	\$1,375	\$6,875	\$28,692	\$165,000
Over \$600,000	66	28.2%	\$600,000	\$30,000	\$69,000	\$4,680	\$1,500	\$7,500	\$31,300	\$180,000
Median Single-Family Home Price		\$463,500								

Notes:

- (a) Number of single-family units sold in Davis between October 2012 and April 2013.
- (a) Ownership Cost Assumptions:
 Percent of Income for Housing Costs (Principal, Interest, Taxes, and Insurance) 30% of gross annual income
 Mortgage Terms Standard Mortgage Terms
 Down Payment 5.0% of home value
 Annual Interest Rate 6.5% fixed

Sources: Realtor.com 2013

Loan Term	30 years
Annual Mortgage Insurance	0.78% of mortgage
Annual property tax rate	1.25% of home value
Annual Hazard Insurance	0.25% of home value

TABLE 20: DAVIS HOUSEHOLD COST BURDENS, 2010

Households	All Income Levels		Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% of AMFI)		Very Low Income (30% to 50% of AMFI)		Low Income (51% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Cost Burdened Households	Number	Percent of Cost Burdened Households	Number	Percent of Cost Burdened Households	Number	Percent of Cost Burdened Households	Number	Percent of Cost Burdened Households
Owner Households										
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	2,208	26.4%	78	0.9%	78	0.9%	130	1.6%	2,000	23.9%
With 51% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	844	10.1%	245	2.9%	245	2.9%	210	2.5%	389	4.6%
Subtotal: Cost Burdened Owner-Occupied Households	3,052	36.5%	323	3.9%	323	3.9%	340	4.1%	2,389	28.5%
Renter Households										
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	2,708	32.3%	368	4.4%	368	4.4%	1,305	15.6%	1,035	12.4%
With 51% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	2,612	31.2%	2,093	25.0%	2,093	25.0%	395	4.7%	124	1.5%
Subtotal: Cost Burdened Renter-Occupied Households	5,320	63.5%	2,461	29.4%	2,461	29.4%	1,700	20.3%	1,159	13.8%
Total Households (a)	8,372	100.0%	2,784	33.2%	2,784	33.2%	2,040	24.4%	3,548	42.4%

Note:

(a) Total households figures may not match figure in Table 1 due to different survey methodologies.

Sources: SACOG 2012.

TABLE 21A: DAVIS FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS INCOME CATEGORY DISTRIBUTION, 2010

Income Category	2-Person Family		3-Person Family		4-Person Family		5 or More Person Family		Total	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number (b)	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% AMFI) (a)	622	4.8%	404	3.1%	585	4.5%	357	2.7%	1,968	15.1%
Very Low Income (30% to 50% AMFI) (a)	577	4.4%	313	2.4%	438	3.4%	209	1.6%	1,537	11.8%
Low Income (51% to 80% AMFI) (a)	742	5.7%	291	2.2%	341	2.6%	184	1.4%	1,558	11.9%
Moderate Income (80% to 120% AMFI) (a)	459	3.5%	306	2.3%	390	3.0%	193	1.5%	1,348	10.3%
Above Moderate Income (Over 120% AMFI) (a)	3,025	23.2%	1,391	10.7%	1,612	12.4%	605	4.6%	6,633	50.9%
Subtotal: Households in Range (b)	5,425	41.6%	2,705	20.7%	3,366	25.8%	1,548	11.9%	13,042	100.0%

Notes:

(a) Based on household income limit distribution reported by HCD for 2013.

(b) Subtotals of family households by size may not match figures in Table 19 due to rounding.

Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2013; 2010 Census; PMC 2013

**TABLE 21B: MONTHLY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY LEVELS
FOR DAVIS FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME CATEGORY AND SIZE, 2013**

Income Category	2-Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)	3-Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)	4-Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)	5-Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)	6-Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)	7 or More Person Family Max Monthly Housing Cost (a)(b)
Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% AMFI)	\$356	\$401	\$445	\$481	\$516	\$553
Very Low Income (30% to 50% AMFI)	\$595	\$669	\$743	\$803	\$863	\$921
Low Income (50% to 80% AMFI)	\$950	\$1,069	\$1,188	\$1,283	\$1,378	\$1,473
Moderate Income (80% to 120% AMFI)	\$1,426	\$1,604	\$1,783	\$1,925	\$2,068	\$2,210
Above Moderate Income (Over 120% AMFI)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes:

(a) Assumes 30 percent of gross household income is available for housing costs.

(b) Income limits for 7-person households applied to all households of 7 persons or more.

Sources: California Department of Housing and Community Development, 2013

3.5 Special Housing Needs: Elderly Households, Single-Person Households, Large Family Households, UC Davis Student Households, UC Davis Faculty and Staff Households, Single Female- and Male-Headed Households, Disabled Households, Farmworker Households, Persons in Need of Emergency Shelter, Minority Households

California Government Code Section 65583 specifically requires an analysis of “any special housing needs, such as those of the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter.” In addition, the City of Davis has identified single-person households, UC Davis student households, UC Davis faculty and staff households, families with single male heads of household, and minorities as special needs populations. This section provides demographic analyses for each of these populations as well as an assessment of their particular housing preferences and needs.

Elderly Households

Population Characteristics

Since State Housing Element law does not specifically define elderly households, this analysis investigates this special population category using both 65 and 62 years as minimum age cut-offs. Including both age limits in this report allows for the incorporation of both the 2000 and 2010 Census and recent CHAS figures from HUD.

Based on Census data, the share of households in Davis with a head of household age 65 or older was lower than the share of such households in the CMSA. As displayed in Table 22, in 2010 approximately 17.9 percent of total Davis households, or 4,187 households, fell in this category. The same year, 20.2 percent of CMSA households were headed by a householder age 65 years or more. Furthermore, between 2000 and 2010 the number of elderly households grew at a much faster pace in Davis as compared to the CMSA. Over the 10-year period, the number of elderly households increased by 52.9 percent in Davis, while in the CMSA the growth rate was only 3.6 percent.

Table 24 also reveals that in both Davis and the CMSA, most elderly households own their homes. In 2010, 12.8 percent of households in Davis were owner-occupied with a head of household age 65 while 5.1 percent of households in Davis were renter-occupied with the same head of householder age. In the CMSA, in 2010, 15.6 percent of owner-occupied homes were headed by elderly householders and 4.6 percent were renter-occupied.

Data relayed in Table 23 utilizes a slightly different definition of elderly households. Bay Area Economics (BAE) used the 2006-2008 US Census ACS dataset to determine the number of senior-headed households which have a housing cost burden by tenure. Approximately 34 percent of elderly households had a housing cost burden of 30 percent or more in 2008, and the remaining 66 percent

had a housing cost burden between 0 percent and 30 percent. Cost burdens above 30 percent were more prevalent among renter-occupied senior households, at 18.1 percent, when compared to owner occupied households which had cost burdens above 30 percent in just 16.3 percent of the households. Compared to the general population, this special needs population may be expected to increase at a faster pace during the Housing Element planning period. SACOG estimates that for the entire Sacramento region, the share of the population age 65 and over will increase from 11 percent in 2000 to 20 percent in 2030.⁵ In addition, by 2030, approximately one-third of the region's households will be headed by a householder age 65 or over and nearly half of the household growth projected for the region between 2000 and 2050 will fall in this category.⁶ The presence of UC Davis will temper the impact of these regional trends locally and Davis may continue to experience slower growth in the elderly population compared to the region, but the percent of elderly in Davis is still likely to increase.

Household Assets

Information gathered by the Federal Reserve Board as part of the 2004 Survey of Consumer Finances (2004 SCF) further illuminates the net worth of elderly households. Since many elderly households consist of retirees, annual income for elderly households is likely lower than the general population. Many elderly households rely on savings and other assets to supplement annual retirement income. However, these assets are not included in the CHAS housing cost burden calculations.

The 2004 SCF provides estimates for median values of family net worth, median family household incomes, and median household assets in 2004. However, due to the sample size, these estimates are national figures and are not available for smaller geographies. In terms of net worth, the difference between gross assets and debt, elderly households fared relatively well in 2004 as compared to other family households. The median net worth of households with a head of household between the ages of 65 and 74 equaled \$190,100. For families with a head of householder age 75 and older the median net worth value was \$163,100. Only family households in the 55 to 64 age bracket fared better, with a median net worth of \$248,700.

According to the SCF, the median value of before-tax annual income for families with a head of household between 65 and 74 was \$33,300, and \$23,700 for families with a head of households age 75 and over. However, 99.5 percent of both household categories held assets of some kind in 2004. Assets include both financial assets, such as savings bonds, publicly traded stock, and retirement accounts, as well as non-financial assets, such as real estate property and vehicles. The 2004 SCF

⁵ Levy, Stephen and Viviane Doche-Boulos. *Projections of Employment, Population, Households and Household Income in the SACOG Region for 2000-2050*. Prepared for the Sacramento Area Council of Governments. www.sacog.org. Downloaded July 11, 2007. Pg. 26.

⁶ *Ibid.* Pg. 29.

reported median asset values of \$233,200 for families with a head of household between the ages of 65 and 74, and a median value of assets of \$185,200 for families with a head of household age 75 and over.

However, non-financial assets, which are far less liquid, constitute a portion of those reported assets. An estimated 96.5 of families with a head of household between 65 and 74 held financial assets while 97.6 of families with a head of household age 75 or more held such assets. Median values of financial assets were approximately \$36,100 and \$38,800 for each respective household age category in 2004. The median values of non-financial assets for these groups equaled approximately \$161,100 and \$137,100 respectively.⁷ An estimated 95.6 percent and 92.5 percent of the respective elderly household subgroups possessed non-financial assets in 2004. While it is essential to consider assets when assessing the housing burden of seniors, one must also take into account which assets are fully available to the household, and which could be accessed in a lump sum subject to penalties.

Housing Preferences

While many elderly households are able to find housing products that meet their needs within the available local market-rate housing stock, other elderly households may require specific amenities that address the needs of older householders. Physical limitations resulting from the aging process can lead to changing housing preferences over time. For example, some elderly households may seek smaller housing units with fewer maintenance responsibilities. Some elderly households may exhibit a preference for homes without stairways or large yards. Overall, elderly households prefer locations near community amenities such as grocery stores, drug stores, and healthcare facilities. Other specific needs for elderly households could also include assisted living arrangements that provide in-home care for elderly persons no longer able to live independently. As detailed in Table 17, currently eight multifamily complexes provide senior housing in Davis, totaling 437 units. Of those units, 321 are classified as affordable.

Based on current tenure patterns of elderly households in Davis, local seniors seem to have a preference for homeownership options. In 2003 AARP, in cooperation with Mathew Greenwald and Associates, Inc., conducted a telephone survey of 2,001 Americans over the age of 45. The purpose of the study was to determine Americans' expectations about their housing needs as they age. The survey found that "more than four in five (83.0 percent) of Americans age 45 and over say they strongly or somewhat agree that they would like to remain in their current residence for as long as possible," even if they have to hire outside help to care for them.⁸ These survey results suggest a strong national preference for aging in place.

⁷ Median values of financial and non-financial assets do not add up to total median values of assets since the medians are each taken from different subpopulations.

⁸ "These Four Walls Americans 45+ Talk about Home and Community," *American Association of Retired Persons*, May 2003, 6.

Single-Person Households

Population Characteristics

Single-person households are households with only one member living alone. According to Table 24, there were an estimated 6,065 single-person households in Davis in 2010. This represents a 5.9 percent increase from 5,727 households in 2000. In Davis, single-person households comprised 25.9 percent of all households which is very similar to what is seen in the CMSA in which single-person households represent 26.0 percent of all households. This share remained steady between 2000 and 2010 in both areas. In addition, within the City, single-person households represented the largest household size category followed by two-person households.

Table 25 provides an estimate of the tenure composition for single-person households. In 2010, 10.4 percent of all households in Davis were owner-occupied single-person households, whereas 15.5 percent of households were single-person renter-occupied households. In the CMSA, the distribution of single-person households was more in 2000, at 12.3%. The share of single-person households owning their homes in the CMSA increased by less than one percentage point between 2000 and 2010.

Housing Preferences

Single-person households generally require smaller housing unit types. These single-earner households may face limited financial resources for housing costs, and as a result, could face higher housing cost burdens. As described under the Housing Costs and Affordability section, and detailed in Table 15b, studio and one-bedroom apartments exhibit very low vacancy rates. The large number of UC Davis students contributes to the demand for such units.

Large Family Households

Population Characteristics

A large family household consists of a head of household and four or more other persons living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. According to Table 24, 1,547 large family households lived in Davis in 2010. This represents 6.6 percent of total Davis households and no net increase in the share of large family households since 2000. The share of large family households in the CMSA was larger than the Davis percentage, at 11.3 percent of all CMSA households in 2010.

The 2010 CHAS data for large family households provides a clearer picture for family households with five or more members. According to this data set, 6.6 percent of Davis's households were large families of five or more persons while 1.2 percent were non-family households. Overall, 55.7 percent of Davis households were family and 44.3 percent were non-family. Non-family households were distinctly smaller with the majority being one-person households.

Housing Preferences

Large family households require larger units to accommodate family members. Families with sufficient incomes are generally able to find housing that meets their particular needs in the Davis market. Overall, 46 percent of large households experienced some housing cost burdens in 2010, as compared to 41 percent of all Davis households. However, those large family households without the financial means to purchase a home face significant housing cost burdens as compared to households that own their homes. The majority of renter households fell in the very low- and low-income categories and more of these renter households experienced some level of housing cost burden as compared to owner households. Table 18 highlights that large rental units are fairly expensive, averaging nearly \$1,900 per three-bedroom unit and \$2,600 per four-bedroom unit in 2013. Several apartment communities in Davis do offer three- and four-bedroom affordable units. The availability of duplexes and single-family homes for rent is not analyzed in this report and could offer another housing option for this special needs group in Davis. This latter housing option is also attractive to groups of university students, which may impact the rent amount and make such housing more difficult to obtain for large families. The low proportion of large family households in Davis may indicate a need for a greater number of large units, but student households competing for such units could prevent large family households from finding housing in Davis.

UC Davis Student Households

Population Characteristics

Table 28 reports the average number of students residing in the Davis area during the three quarters of the 2010–2011 academic year. Based on figures from the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, approximately 29,000 students studied at the UC Davis campus in the 2010–2011 academic year. In a study of the UC Davis population in 2012, 20.0 percent of students lived on campus and 60.0 percent resided in Davis. The remaining 20.0 percent commuted from elsewhere, primarily from locations in Sacramento County, Solano County, and other Yolo County locations.⁹

The most recent survey of on-campus housing available at UC Davis, conducted in 2012, indicates that nearly 5,800 students may be housed on campus in residence halls as well as apartment units. The remaining 17,377 students residing in the Davis area find housing within the City. Approximately 2.5 students comprise each student household based on previous research conducted for the City of Davis Internal Housing Needs Analysis in 2003. Therefore, Davis had an estimated 6,951 student households during the 2010–2011 academic year.

⁹ UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR. Tables 4.11-2 and 4.11-6.

Housing Preferences

Student households primarily seek rental units. This preference impacts the rental market in the City and results in very low vacancy rates across apartment complexes throughout Davis. In 2013, the average vacancy rate was only 3.9 percent. The average vacancy rate for Davis apartments between 2010 and 2012 was 2.5 percent¹⁰. A vacancy rate of five percent is generally considered an indicator of a healthy rental market with sufficient housing availability and options.

Assessing household incomes of student households poses some difficulty. Students are generally low-earners that often only hold part-time or seasonal employment. Students tend to receive income in the form of financial assistance and gifts from parents as well as grants and student loans that are used to cover living expenses. There is some question as to the amount of income student households may be able to expend on housing costs. Many students do not have the same financial burdens that other households experience since they remain on their parents' health insurance policies, do not have to pay off student loans while they remain enrolled in school, and generally have lower costs as compared to other households.

The UC Davis *2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR* estimated an increase of the on-campus student population to 30,000 by the 2015-2016 academic year. The EIR also projects that the majority of this growth will be accommodated in student housing located both in the central campus and the planned West Village neighborhood. According to the EIR, a maximum of 60 additional students would seek off-campus housing in Davis by 2015.¹¹ For this to occur, new student housing on campus would need to accommodate some of the recent increase in student households living within Davis. Though the EIR projects limited pressure on rental housing in Davis, as a result of increase in the student population at UC Davis, current apartment vacancy rates suggest a need for some increased availability of market-rate rental units.

UC Davis Faculty and Staff Households

Population Characteristics

According to the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, the 2010–2011 on-campus faculty and staff population was nearly 11,400. This figure excludes student employees. An estimated 51.6 percent, or 5,856, of faculty and staff members live in Davis. Assuming 1.3 faculty or staff members per household yields an estimate of 4,470 faculty and staff households living in Davis in 2010 and 2011.

Housing Preferences

Beyond a desire for locations within a short commute to the UC Davis campus, faculty and staff households exhibit similar housing preferences to the general workforce population. Currently,

¹⁰ UC Davis Student Housing Department City of Davis Vacancy and Rental Rate Survey, 2013.

¹¹ *Ibid.* Tables 4.11-9 and 4.11-10.

Aggie Village is the only development specifically targeted towards UC Davis faculty and staff. Located adjacent to both the university campus and downtown Davis, Aggie Village offers 21 single-family and 16 duplex units for faculty and staff households. Appreciation on these ownership units is capped using either the faculty salary index or the Consumer Price Index, whichever is greater. The university also offers a home loan program to help recruit and retain faculty and senior managers. There is a long waiting list at the UC Davis housing office comprised of faculty and staff who are interested in purchasing homes at Aggie Village.

Of the projected new employees associated with UC Davis growth through 2015, approximately 970 of the new hires would live in the City of Davis and another 500 employees would reside in the planned West Village neighborhood.¹² Some of this projected employment growth overlaps with the current faculty and staff estimates reported in Table 26. While details regarding the faculty housing available at West Village remain somewhat undetermined, the intention is to provide affordable housing options that will help the university attract new hires and remain competitive with other research institutions. Beyond the university's efforts, City inclusionary policies that encourage workforce housing will also benefit UC Davis faculty and staff households.

Single Female- and Male-Headed Households

Population Characteristics

Single female- or male-headed households are family households with a female or male head of household and no spouse, and at least one member of the household under the age of 18. Table 29 estimates the number of single-parent households in 2000 and 2010 for both the City of Davis and the CMSA. In 2010 approximately 2,920 households in Davis were headed by either a single female or single male. This figure represents 12.1 percent of total Davis households in 2010. In the CMSA, single-parent households accounted for 13.4 percent of all households in 2010.

Single female-headed households constitute the majority of single-parent households in both Davis and the CMSA. In Davis, 9.8 percent of all households, or 2,367 households, were single female-headed households in 2010. Of these families, 59.7 percent were renter households while the other 40.3 percent owned their homes. In the CMSA, 9.5 percent of all households were single female-headed households and 41.3 percent of these households were renters.

Single male-headed households are also underrepresented in Davis as compared to the CMSA. While single male-headed households were 2.3 percent of all Davis households in 2010, 3.9 percent of CMSA households were headed by single-male householders. Of the 551 single male-headed households in Davis, 53.5 percent were renters. In the CMSA, 45.4 percent of single male-headed households rented their homes.

¹² *Ibid.* Table 4.11-10.

Housing Preferences

As noted above, both single female- and single male-headed households primarily rent their homes. Single-parent households tend to experience higher housing cost burdens due to having only one adult income earner, coupled with greater child care needs. As a result, these households may exhibit higher demand for affordable housing options relative to the general population. Ideally, their housing would provide a minimum of two bedrooms in order to provide separate spaces for parents and children. While no affordable apartment communities target single-parent households currently, many do offer two or more bedroom units. While this special needs population only constitutes 12.1 percent of all Davis households, the lower share as compared to the CMSA may stem from a lack of affordable options that meet the specific needs of this population.

Disabled Households

Population Characteristics

California Housing Element law defines a disability to include “any physical or mental disability as defined in Government Code Section 12955.3,” which in turn refers to the definitions established in California Government Code Section 12926. Table 30 highlights that in 2000, the share of persons with some type of disability was less than half of the share in the CMSA. In Davis, 8.9 percent of the population five years and older had some type of disability. In contrast, 18.8 percent of the CMSA population age five years and older had a disability. Data from 2000 represents the most recent data accurate enough to provide a representative picture of those with disabilities in Davis.

The greatest difference in the disabled population between Davis and the CMSA appears to be in the 21 to 64 age group, followed by the 65 and over category. Though 11.9 percent of the CMSA population between 21 and 64 was disabled, only 5.3 percent of the Davis population fell into this category. Furthermore, a smaller share of Davis residents between the ages of 21 and 64 had two or more disabilities as compared to the CMSA. In both geographies, persons with two or more disabilities, across all age groups combined, amounted to the largest subgroup within the disabled population. The proportion of the total population that had two or more disabilities still remained much lower in Davis as compared to the CMSA.

Housing Preferences

For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that there is only one disabled person per household. Due to the variation in disability types, there are many different housing preferences that this special needs population could require. Overall, households with disabled members tend to fall in the lower-income brackets and have higher housing cost burdens. In addition, some persons with disabilities require additional services such as live-in care, social services, job training programs, or counseling to help them achieve independent living.

While specific figures are unavailable regarding the number of accessible housing units in Davis, at a minimum the City enforces Federal and State regulations such as the Fair Housing Amendments Act

of 1988 and the American with Disabilities Act. The City of Davis has also adopted a visitability policy that established a target that all new single-family residential units meet certain accessibility standards. Specifically, market rate and middle-income units must be visitable, and affordable low- and moderate-income units must be first-floor accessible. The policy is geared toward requiring housing types that can accommodate persons with disabilities and promote aging in place. The new accessibility requirements will apply to all new major single-family housing projects and even higher standards will be placed on affordable housing projects receiving City land or financial assistance.

Consistent with California Uniform Building Code requirements, apartment complexes and high-density residential projects include a percentage of accessible units. There are also affordable housing complexes that specifically aim to accommodate persons with disabilities by providing fully accessible units throughout the complex. In addition, a few communities specifically assist residents or households with mental or developmental disabilities. The large differential in the share of Davis's population with disabilities as compared to the CMSA suggests a possible need for more affordable housing geared toward the needs of this population in Davis.

Developmentally Disabled Households

Population Characteristics

Senate Bill (SB) 812 requires the City of Davis to discuss the needs of individuals with a developmental disability in the special needs housing analysis. A developmental disability, as defined in Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, is a disability that originates before an individual is 18 years old, continues or can be expected to continue indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for the individual, including mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This includes disabling conditions closely related to mental retardation, or requiring treatment similar to that required for individuals with mental retardation, but does not include other handicapping conditions that are entirely physical in nature.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently in a conventional housing environment, although more severely disabled individuals may require a supervised group living environment. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are available. Because developmental disabilities appear during childhood, the first issue in supportive housing for the developmentally disabled is the transition from the person's living situation as a child to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The California Department of Developmental Services provides community-based services to approximately 243,000 individuals with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two community-based facilities. The City of Davis is serviced by the Alta California Regional Center in Sacramento, which provides a point of entry to services for people with developmental disabilities. The center is a

private nonprofit community agency that contracts with local businesses to offer a wide range of services.

As of November 2012, the Alta California Regional Center provided services to 17,127 people across six counties; 268 of these people lived in Davis. Table 32 summarizes the number of Davis residents and residents of the MSA being served by age group.

Housing Preferences

There are a number of housing types appropriate for people living with a development disability: rent-subsidized homes, licensed and unlicensed single-family homes, inclusionary housing, Section 8 vouchers, special programs for home purchase, HUD housing, and SB 962 homes. The design of housing-accessibility modifications, the proximity to services and transit, and the availability of group living opportunities represent some of the types of considerations that are important in serving this need group. Incorporating “barrier-free” design in all new multi-family housing (as required by California and Federal Fair Housing laws) is especially important to provide the widest range of choices for disabled residents. Special consideration should also be given to the affordability of housing, as people with disabilities may be living on a fixed income.

In order to assist in the housing needs for persons with developmental disabilities, the City will implement programs to coordinate housing activities and outreach with the Alta Regional Center and encourage housing providers to designate a portion of new affordable housing developments for persons with disabilities, especially persons with developmental disabilities, and pursue funding sources designated for persons with special needs and disabilities. Program Action 18, Objective a. is proposed to specifically address the needs of the developmentally disabled.

Farmworkers

Population Characteristics

According to data from the EDD presented in Table 33, Yolo County farm employment increased by 500 jobs, or 11.4 percent, between 1990 and 2010. Other agriculture-related jobs not occurring on farms, such as cannery employment, are categorized in other industry sectors. Data detailing the number of farmworkers living in Davis is unavailable. However, an estimate can be approximated using the EDD’s 2006–2016 estimate and projection for the Sacramento-Arden Arcade-Roseville MSA in which Yolo County and Davis are included. The EDD estimated that in 2006, there were 4,100 farmworkers and laborers (crop and nursery) and projected 5,530 for 2016. Using the proportion of population that the City of Davis represents of the total population of the MSA (including Yolo, El Dorado, Placer, and Sacramento counties), 3 percent or 147 of these total estimated farmworkers may have resided in Davis in 2006 and approximately 166 would be expected to reside there in 2016.

Primary information from organizations serving this population illuminates some demographic trends. Currently, three migrant centers operate in Yolo County, offering seasonal housing to

farmworker families. All centers are occupied, although the Davis Center had difficulties in the past due to exclusion of cannery workers. That was corrected when the federal definition of farmworker was amended through the last Farm Bill. Applicants must provide tax returns from the prior year that prove minimum earnings of \$4,425 from agricultural work in the prior year in order to establish eligibility.

Housing Preferences

Previous Housing Elements for the City have pointed to a demand for permanent housing in Davis by farmworkers and their families. A memo to the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission dated December of 2006 acknowledges these changing housing preferences, stating that “workers are obtaining permanent employment positions and establishing permanent residences in, or closer to, urban areas.” The same memo also reports that some migrant workers without families, which are ineligible for units at YCH Migrant Centers, must travel up to 50 miles from their place of employment to find housing.

Though the Yolo County Housing’s Davis Migrant Center is fully occupied, single migrant workers would not be eligible for units at the center under current policies even if there were vacancies. In order for single migrant workers to be able to occupy units at the Davis Migrant Center, changes to State and Federal admission requirements as well as other regulations would be necessary. Yolo County Housing notes that at least three local agricultural companies are among the top 10 employers of residents in the public housing and housing voucher portfolio. Both of these programs provide year round housing opportunities for extremely low income households. Davis Solar Farmworker housing also provides seven permanent homes for farmworkers.

It is difficult to determine the exact number of farmworker households in Davis. However, it is possible that they can be served by the same affordable housing opportunities as other populations in need of housing assistance. In contrast, migrant farmworkers without families have unique housing needs and may be underserved in the Davis market.

Persons In Need of Emergency Shelter

Population Characteristics

Table 34 A displays the result of a census taken in January 2013 of the homeless population in Yolo County. Tables 34 B and C display information sheltered and unsheltered homeless in various categories in Yolo County in 2013. While this point-in-time count provides some estimate of the homeless population, these figures may understate the current situation since persons and families struggling with homelessness are often in and out of shelters. According to the homeless count methodology used, a person is considered homeless only when he/she is: living in places not meant for human habitation; living in an emergency shelter; or living in transitional housing for the homeless but originally coming from the streets or an emergency shelter.

According to this census, 114 homeless persons were located in Davis. This equals 24.1 percent of the total County homeless population. The majority of the City's homeless were men. Thirty-one percent of the homeless counted in Davis were members of a family with children. These figures are mostly in-line with the Countywide figures, though the share of the homeless population in families was slightly higher for Davis relative to the rest of Yolo County.

Housing Preferences

The reasons for homelessness can vary greatly and include economic hardship, alcohol or substance abuse, mental illness, and domestic violence. Housing preferences differ among these subgroups. Individuals with substance abuse problems may be averse to rules and regulations accompanying some transitional housing options. Persons and families escaping domestic violence situations may seek more confidential transitional housing. In addition, the type of services demanded by each subpopulation varies.

Currently, several organizations offer transitional housing to the homeless population in Davis. Davis Community Meals operates a homeless shelter for men and women and transitional housing for families, as well as a cold weather shelter for individual men and women, typically from November through March each year. The Short Term Emergency Aid Committee provides motel vouchers as part of its Emergency Shelter Program. The Interfaith Rotating Winter Shelter provides cold weather shelter to the Davis homeless population at different member congregations throughout the winter. The Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Center also provides emergency shelter and transitional housing services to adults and children escaping domestic violence. While all of these organizations are able to provide shelter and services within the City, some connect to a larger regional network of organizations serving the homeless population throughout Yolo County.

A couple of developments in Davis provide permanent housing options for some of the subgroups at risk of experiencing homelessness, including fixed-income seniors, persons with physical or mental disabilities, and persons with substance abuse problems. The renovated Homestead Cooperative is operated by the Yolo Community Care Continuum for individuals with mental illness. Nearly 20 of the new one-bedroom units at Cesar Chavez Plaza are set aside for extremely low-income households with special needs such as alcohol recovery and mental illness, and the 21 units at Eleanor Roosevelt Circle are targeted for extremely low-income seniors with physical or mental disabilities or substance abuse problems.

Yolo County and the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland have maintained a countywide coalition on homelessness for over a decade and is involved in the 10-year plan to eliminate homelessness throughout the County. The plan titled "One Piece at a Time: Ending and Preventing Homelessness for Yolo County Residents" was released in 2010 and includes permanent, supportive housing options for the homeless population.

Minority Households

Population Characteristics

Table 35 reports race and ethnicity data for Davis and the CMSA in 2000 and 2010. Data for more recent years was unavailable or, due to the estimated nature, unreliable as an accurate source. Some data was available through the 2006–2010 ACS, but this data did not include any specifics on the Hispanic or Latino population. It is important to note that households are categorized based on the race and ethnicity of the head of household. Therefore, the household distribution reported in this table does not parallel the local population distribution of race and ethnicity since some households may consist of individuals of differing races and/or ethnicities. In 2000, 29.3 percent of the Davis population was a minority. These figures parallel CMSA trends. The largest minority household group in Davis, with 21.9 percent of total households, was Asian households. In the CMSA, Hispanic or Latino households of various races represented the greatest share of minority households. In addition, Davis had a significantly smaller proportion of African American households as compared to the CMSA in 2000.

According to SACOG, throughout the Sacramento region the populations of Hispanics, African Americans, and Asians are projected to grow at a faster pace than the general population between 2000 and 2030. As a result, the data anticipates a decline in the share of non-Hispanic Whites while the proportion of minority populations increases. By 2030 the share of non-Hispanic Whites will fall to approximately 54 percent, while Hispanics will comprise 23 percent of region's population. African Americans and Asians¹³ are projected to grow to nine and 13 percent, respectively, of the total regional population.¹⁴ Recent projection data released by the California Department of Finance suggests that from 2000 to 2020, non-Hispanic Whites will decline from 59 percent of Yolo County's population to 47 percent. During the same period of time Hispanics will increase from a 26 percent share to 34 percent.¹⁵

Housing Preferences

Beyond equal housing opportunities, the housing preferences of this special needs population do not differ significantly from the general population. The City provides free Fair Housing reference and referral services to Davis landlords and residents and partners with Yolo County Housing, local cities, and Legal Services of Northern California to complete annual Fair Housing Trainings for landlords and managers. In addition minority households may fall in any of the other special needs categories. Programs that address other special needs populations will also assist minority households

¹³ The Asian category incorporates all other residents that are not in the three other ethnicity categories (non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and African American).

¹⁴ Levy, Stephen and Viviane Doche-Boulos. Pg. 26-27.

¹⁵ State of California, Department of Finance. Population Projections for California and Its Counties 2000–2050, by Age, Gender and Race/Ethnicity. www.dof.ca.gov. Downloaded July 11, 2007.

with special needs as long as access to such opportunities is made available in equal measure to this community. Some portion of minority households may consist of immigrant families that may be more likely to have multiple generations living in one house together, possibly resulting in a need for housing suitable for extended families.

Special Housing Needs Summary

Relative to the CMSA, Davis had lower shares of elderly households (about three percentage points less), large family households (four percentage points less), single-parent households (one percentage point less), and persons with disabilities (ten percentage points less). While the share of minority households in Davis paralleled CMSA trends, Davis had more Asian households while Hispanic or Latino households constituted the largest share of minority households in the CMSA. Both elderly households and large family households exhibited lower housing costs burdens relative to the CMSA, although the majority of renter households in both these special needs populations fell into the very low- and low-income categories in 2000.

Single-person households comprised the largest household size in Davis and the CMSA. These households tended to rent their homes. The majority of single-parent households, headed by either a female or a male, rented their homes. Single-parent households, however, did not represent a large share of total Davis households.

With an estimated 6,000 student households seeking rental units and another 5,800 faculty and staff households residing in Davis, the UC Davis campus population greatly impacts the housing situation in the City. While the university projects the student population to grow during the current Housing Element planning period, most are expected to be housed on campus and in the planned West Village neighborhood. Just under 1,000 new faculty and staff households are expected to seek residences in the City through 2015.

Farmworkers represent another special needs population exhibiting changing trends in housing preferences. Many farmworker families are seeking permanent, year-round housing options near urban centers. Migrant farmworkers without families, in contrast, are unable to find affordable seasonal housing and must often travel long distances to work.¹⁶ Single migrant workers are not eligible for units at the center under current policies. In order for single migrant workers to be able to occupy units at the Davis Migrant Center, changes to State and Federal admission requirements as well as other regulations would be necessary.

¹⁶Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission, "Memo: Receive summary and update on the Yolo County LAFCO Housing Policy meetings," December 11, 2006.

TABLE 22: HOUSEHOLD TENURE BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER, 2000 AND 2010

Age of Householder	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner-Occupied								
15-34	1,325	5.8%	677	2.9%	47,139	7.1%	51,203	6.6%
35-64	6,859	29.9%	7,703	32.9%	259,575	39.0%	303,960	38.9%
65 and older	2,051	8.9%	3,002	12.8%	101,002	15.2%	121,570	15.6%
Subtotal:								
Owner-Occupied	10,235	44.6%	11,382	48.6%	407,716	61.3%	476,733	61.01%
Renter-Occupied								
15-34	8,963	39.1%	7,140	30.5%	105,746	15.9%	112,117	14.3%
35-64	3,107	13.5%	3,727	15.9%	123,234	18.5%	156,393	20.0%
65 and older	643	2.8%	1,185	5.1%	28,602	4.3%	36,182	4.6%
Subtotal:								
Renter-Occupied	12,713	55.4%	12,052	51.4%	257,582	38.7%	304,692	38.99%
All Households								
15-34	10,288	44.8%	7,817	33.4%	152,885	23.0%	163,320	20.9%
35-64	9,966	43.4%	11,430	48.8%	382,809	57.5%	460,353	58.9%
65 and older	2,694	11.7%	4,187	17.9%	129,604	19.5%	157,752	20.2%
Total All Households	22,948	100.0%	23,434	100.0%	665,298	100.0%	781,425	100.0%

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.
Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census

TABLE 23: ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSING COST BURDENS, 2008

Elderly Households (a)	2008(b)	
	Number	Percent
Owner Households		
With 0% to 29.9% Housing Cost Burden	1,850	58.2%
With 30% to 34.9% Housing Cost Burden	104	3.3%
With 35% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	413	13.0%
Subtotal: Owner Occupied Households	2,367	74.5%
Renter Households		
With 0% to 29.9% Housing Cost Burden	237	7.5%
With 30% to 34.9% Housing Cost Burden	167	5.3%
With 35% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	407	12.8%
Subtotal: Renter Occupied Households	811	25.5%
All Households		
With 0% to 29.9% Housing Cost Burden	2,087	65.7%
With 30% to 34.9% Housing Cost Burden	271	8.5%
With 35% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	820	25.8%
Total All Households	3,178	100.0%

Note:

(a) Elderly Households are defined as one or two-person households where either person is age 65 years or over.

(b) 2008 estimates are from the 2006-2008 ACS 3-year data set.

SOURCES: BAE, 2009.

TABLE 24: FAMILY AND NON-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS BY SIZE, 2000 AND 2010

Household Type and Size	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Family Households (b)								
1-person Household	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
2-person Household	4,762	20.8%	5,425	23.2%	177,151	26.6%	211,120	27.0%
3-person Household	2,708	11.8%	2,704	11.5%	101,155	15.2%	108,078	13.8%
4-person Household	2,534	11.0%	3,366	14.4%	91,650	13.8%	111,102	14.2%
5+ -person Household	1,287	5.6%	1,547	6.6%	75,879	11.4%	88,376	11.3%
Subtotal: Family Households	11,291	49.2%	13,042	55.7%	445,835	67.0%	518,676	66.4%
Non-Family Households (b)								
1-person Household	5,727	25.0%	6,065	25.9%	166,533	25.0%	203,482	26.0%
2-person Household	3,051	13.3%	2,122	9.1%	41,183	6.2%	46,684	6.0%
3-person Household	1,481	6.5%	1,125	4.8%	7,421	1.1%	8,257	1.1%
4-person Household	900	3.9%	807	3.4%	2,790	0.4%	2,736	0.4%
5+ -person Household	498	2.2%	273	1.2%	1,536	0.2%	1,590	0.2%
Subtotal: Non-Family Households	11,657	50.8%	10,392	44.3%	219,463	33.0%	262,749	33.6%
Total Households	22,948	100.0%	23,434	100.0%	665,298	100.0%	781,425	100.0%

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) A "family" household is two or more related people living together. Non-family households are single people living alone, or two or more unrelated people living together.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census

TABLE 25: HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND TENURE, 2000 AND 2010

Household Size	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Owner-Occupied								
1-person Household	1,953	8.5%	2,444	10.4%	81,804	12.3%	107,917	13.8%
2-person Household	3,648	15.9%	4,026	17.2%	148,345	22.3%	174,485	22.3%
3-person Household	1,791	7.8%	1,883	8.0%	67,133	10.1%	72,917	9.3%
4-person Household	1,945	8.5%	1,973	8.4%	64,003	9.6%	71,412	9.1%
5+ -person Household	898	3.9%	1056	4.5%	46,430	7.0%	50,002	6.4%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied	10,235	44.6%	11,382	48.6%	407,715	61.3%	476,733	61.0%
Renter-Occupied								
1-person Household	3,815	16.6%	3,621	15.5%	84,680	12.7%	95,565	12.2%
2-person Household	4,145	18.1%	3,521	15.0%	69,997	10.5%	83,319	10.7%
3-person Household	2,395	10.4%	1,946	8.3%	41,580	6.2%	43,418	5.6%
4-person Household	1,481	6.5%	2,200	9.4%	30,369	4.6%	42,426	5.4%
5+ -person Household	876	3.8%	764	3.3%	30,957	4.7%	39,964	5.1%
Subtotal: Renter-Occupied	12,712	55.4%	12,052	51.4%	257,583	38.7%	304,692	39.0%
Total Households	22,947		23,434		665,298		781,425	

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census

TABLE 26: NUMBER OF BEDROOMS BY TENURE, 2000–2010

Number of Bedrooms by Tenure	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number of Households	Percent of Total Households	Number of Households	Percent of Total Households	Number of Households	Percent of Total Households	Number of Households	Percent of Total Households
Renter-Occupied Households								
No Bedroom	844	0.1%	410	1.7%	20,068	3.0%	8,507	1.1%
One Bedroom	3,840	0.7%	3,043	12.6%	76,277	11.5%	73,034	9.4%
Two Bedrooms	4,704	5.5%	5,217	21.6%	97,413	14.6%	115,161	14.9%
Three Bedrooms	2,452	19.6%	3,443	14.2%	50,506	7.6%	67,171	8.7%
Four Bedrooms	805	15.7%	1,118	4.6%	12,050	1.8%	21,078	2.7%
Five or More Bedrooms	83	2.9%	137	0.6%	1,263	0.2%	3,945	0.5%
No Bedroom	32	3.8%	0	0.0%	3,088	0.5%	1,261	0.2%
Owner-Occupied Households								
One Bedroom	161	17.5%	61	0.3%	14,353	2.2%	7,089	0.9%
Two Bedrooms	1,266	26.0%	1,216	5.0%	73,319	11.0%	75,632	9.8%
Three Bedrooms	4,483	30.2%	4,950	20.5%	203,341	30.6%	235,500	30.4%
Four Bedrooms	3,603	19.2%	3,824	15.8%	98,290	14.8%	133,635	17.2%
Five or More Bedrooms	654	3.2%	777	3.2%	15,330	2.3%	33,419	4.3%
All Occupied Households								
No Bedroom	876	3.8%	410	1.7%	23,156	3.5%	9,768	1.3%
One Bedroom	4,001	17.5%	3,104	12.8%	90,630	13.6%	80,123	10.3%
Two Bedrooms	5,970	26.0%	6,433	26.6%	170,732	25.7%	190,793	24.6%
Three Bedrooms	6,935	30.2%	8,393	34.7%	253,847	38.2%	302,671	39.0%
Four Bedrooms	4,408	19.2%	4,942	20.4%	110,340	16.6%	154,713	20.0%
Five or More Bedrooms	737	3.2%	914	3.8%	16,593	2.5%	37,364	4.8%
Total Occupied Housing Units	22,927	100.0%	24,196	100.0%	665,298	100.0%	775,432	100.0%

Source: SACOG 2012

TABLE 27: LARGE FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSING COST BURDENS, 2000

Large Family Households (a)	All Income Levels		Very Low Income (Less than 50% of AMFI)		Low Income (50% to 80% of AMFI)		Moderate and Above (Over 80% of AMFI)	
	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households
Owner Households								
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	679	53%	4	2%	0	0%	675	72%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	153	12%	4	2%	40	25%	109	12%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	44	3%	10	5%	14	9%	20	2%
Subtotal: Owner Occupied Large Households	876	68%	18	10%	54	33%	804	86%
Renter Households								
With 0% to 30% Housing Cost Burden	194	15%	14	8%	50	31%	130	14%
With 30% to 50% Housing Cost Burden	134	10%	75	41%	59	36%	0	0%
With 50% or Greater Housing Cost Burden	75	6%	75	41%	0	0%	0	0%
Subtotal: Renter Occupied Large Households	403	32%	164	90%	109	67%	130	14%
Total Large Family Households	1,279		182		163		934	

Note:

(a) Related households with five or more persons.

Sources: 2000 CHAS dataset, huduser.org, 2007; BAE, 2007.

TABLE 28: UC DAVIS OFF-CAMPUS HOUSEHOLDS, 2010–2011

2010–2011 Campus Population	
UCD 2010–2011 Student Population (a)	28,968
Less Students Living Outside the Davis Area (b)	-5,794
Less Students Housed On-Campus	-5,797
UCD Students Living in the City of Davis	17,377
Subtotal: UCD Student Households in Davis (c)	6,951
UCD 2010–2011 Faculty and Staff (d)	11,357
Less Faculty and Staff Living Outside the Davis Area (e)	-5,627
UCD Faculty and Staff Living in the City of Davis	5,856
Subtotal: UCD Faculty and Staff Households in Davis (f)	4,470
Total UC Davis Households in the City of Davis	11,421

Notes:

(a) Annual average for students representing fall-winter-spring quarter averages (or in the case of law students, fall-spring semester averages).

(b) Approximately 80 percent of UCD students live in the Davis area, including the UC Davis Campus.

(c) Assumes 2.5 students per student household.

(d) Does not include student employees.

(e) Approximately 51 percent of UCD faculty and staff households live in the City of Davis.

(f) Assumes 1.31 faculty and staff per household.

Sources: UCD Office of Resource Management and Planning 2010-2011 On-Campus Population Estimates, 2012;

UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR; City of Davis Internal Housing Needs Analysis, February 2003

TABLE 29: SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD WITH CHILDREN, 2000 AND 2010

Household Type	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households	Number	Percent of Total Households
Owner								
Male Head of Household (b)	137	0.6%	295	1.2%	7,504	1.1%	19,061	1.8%
Female Head of Household (c)	425	1.9%	954	4.0%	15,594	2.3%	42,839	3.9%
Subtotal: Owner-Occupied	562	2.4%	1,249	5.2%	23,098	3.5%	61,900	5.7%
Renter								
Male Head of Household (b)	186	0.8%	256	1.1%	9,612	1.4%	22,961	2.1%
Female Head of Household (c)	686	3.0%	1,413	5.9%	35,752	5.4%	60,884	5.6%
Subtotal: Renter Occupied	872	3.8%	1,669	6.9%	45,364	6.8%	83,845	7.7%
Total: Single Parent Households	1,434	6.2%	2,918	12.1%	68,462	10.3%	145,745	13.4%
Total Households	22,948		24,130		665,298		781,425	

Note:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) Family household with a male head of household, no spouse present, and one or more household members under the age of 18.

(c) Family household with a female head of household, no spouse present, and one or more household members under the age of 18.

Sources: Census 2000, 2010.

TABLE 30: CIVILIAN NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION WITH DISABILITIES, 2000

Age Range and Disability Type	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Age 5–15	392	0.7%	17,070	1.0%
Sensory Disability (b)	46	0.1%	1,507	0.1%
Physical Disability (c)	15	0.0%	1,079	0.1%
Mental Disability (d)	263	0.5%	10,295	0.6%
Self-Care disability (e)	0	0.0%	380	0.0%
Two or More Disabilities (h)	68	0.1%	3,809	0.2%
Age 16-20	568	1.0%	16,700	1.0%
Sensory Disability (b)	40	0.1%	826	0.0%
Physical Disability (c)	56	0.1%	722	0.0%
Mental Disability (d)	88	0.2%	2,580	0.2%
Self-Care Disability (e)	0	0.0%	16	0.0%
Go-Outside-Home Disability (f)	66	0.1%	2,047	0.1%
Employment Disability (g)	138	0.2%	4,613	0.3%
Two or More Disabilities (h)	180	0.3%	5,896	0.4%
Age 21–64	3,043	5.3%	198,664	11.9%
Sensory Disability (b)	287	0.5%	11,063	0.7%
Physical Disability (c)	391	0.7%	23,056	1.4%
Mental Disability (d)	313	0.5%	10,616	0.6%
Self-Care Disability (e)	0	0.0%	338	0.0%

Age Range and Disability Type	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Go-Outside-Home Disability (f)	218	0.4%	8,038	0.5%
Employment Disability (g)	619	1.1%	49,922	3.0%
Two or More Disabilities (h)	1,215	2.1%	95,631	5.7%
Age 65 and Over	1,143	2.0%	81,240	4.9%
Sensory Disability (b)	130	0.2%	8,594	0.5%
Physical Disability (c)	340	0.6%	19,220	1.1%
Mental Disability (d)	13	0.0%	2,472	0.1%
Self-Care Disability (e)	0	0.0%	288	0.0%
Go-Outside-Home Disability (f)	81	0.1%	8,288	0.5%
Two or More Disabilities (h)	579	1.0%	42,378	2.5%
Total Disabled Population	5,146	8.9%	313,674	18.8%
Total Population 5 Years and Over	57,536		1,672,101	

Notes:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) A sensory disability is defined as blindness, deafness, or a severe vision or hearing impairment.

(c) A physical disability is a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying.

(d) A mental disability is defined as a condition that impairs learning, remembering, or concentrating.

(e) A self-care disability includes conditions that makes dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home difficult to perform.

(f) A go-outside-home disability limits a person's ability to go outside the home alone to shop or visit a doctor's office.

(g) An employment disability limits the ability to work at a job or business.

(h) Not counted in individual categories listed above.

Sources: 2000 Census

TABLE 31: PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS, 2010

Persons with Disabilities by Employment Status	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Disabled Population	Number	Percent of Disabled Population
Employed Persons with a Disability				
Age 16–20	308	6.0%	7,956	2.5%
Age 21–64	1,716	33.3%	105,538	33.6%
Subtotal, Employed Persons with a Disability	2,024	39.3%	113,494	36.2%
Not Employed Persons with a Disability				
Age 5–15	392	7.6%	17,070	5.4%
Age 16–20	260	5.1%	8,744	2.8%
Age 21–64	1,327	25.8%	93,126	29.7%
Age 65–74	439	8.5%	33,665	10.7%
Age 75 and over	704	13.7%	47,575	15.2%
Subtotal, Not Employed Persons with a Disability	3,122	60.7%	200,180	63.8%
Total Persons with a Disability	5,146	100.0%	313,674	100.0%
Total Population (Civilian Non-institutional)	57,215	-	-	-

Source: 2010 US Census

TABLE 32: PERSONS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES BY AGE, 2010

Persons with Developmental Disabilities	City of Davis		Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)	
	Number	Percent of Developmental Disabled Population	Number	Percent of Developmental Disabled Population
Age 14 and below	108	40.3%	6,086	38.2%
Age 15–22	58	21.6%	2,838	17.8%
Age 23–54	90	33.6%	5,817	36.5%
Age 55–64	10	3.7%	814	5.1%
Age 65 and above	2	0.7%	390	2.4%
Total Developmental Disabled Population	268	100.0%	15,945	100.0%

Source: 2010 Census

TABLE 33: YOLO COUNTY FARM EMPLOYMENT, 1990 TO 2010

Year	Farm Employment (a)	Annual Percent Change
1990	4,400	-
1991	4,400	0.0%
1992	4,700	6.8%
1993	4,400	-6.4%
1994	4,400	0.0%
1995	5,000	13.6%
1996	5,300	6.0%
1997	5,100	-3.8%
1998	4,800	-5.9%
1999	4,900	2.1%
2000	4,900	0.0%
2001	4,100	-16.3%
2002	4,500	9.8%
2003	4,200	-6.7%
2004	3,800	-9.5%
2005	3,800	0.0%
2006	4,100	7.9%
2007	4,300	4.9%
2008	4,700	9.3%
2009	4,900	4.3%
2010	4,900	0.0%
Total Change 1990–2010	500	11.4%

Note:

(a) Workers employed by farm employers.

Source: California EDD, 2013

TABLE 34 A: YOLO COUNTY HOMELESS POPULATION, JANUARY 2013

	Davis		Rest of Yolo County		Yolo County Total	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Men	54	1.1%	201	42.4%	255	53.8%
Women	37	7.8%	98	20.7%	135	28.5%
Gender Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Children (under 18)	23	4.9%	61	12.9%	84	17.7%
Total Homeless Population	114	24.1%	360	76.0%	474	100.0%
Families with Children	12	2.5%	24	5.1%	36	7.6%
Number of Persons in Families with Children	36	7.6%	93	19.6%	129	27.2%

Note:

The above figures represent a point-in-time count on the day of the survey. Since many individuals and families move in and out of homelessness over the course of a year, the above figures may understate the homeless population in Yolo County jurisdictions.

Source: Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition, 2013

TABLE 34 B: YOLO COUNTY UNSHELTERED COUNT

	Rural/ Wint	Davis	West Sac	Woodland	Total
Households with Dependent Children	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Persons in these Households	0	0	0	0	0
Households without Dependent Children	9	22	121	39	191
Number of Persons in these Households	9	23	126	40	198
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Individuals-Singles	0	17	75	5	97
Chronically Homeless- Families	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Individuals with Families	0	0	0	0	0
Severely Mentally Ill	0	8	33	3	44
Chronic Substance Abuse	0	12	61	3	76
Veterans	0	0	19	1	20
Victims of Domestic Violence	0	3	37	3	43
Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18)		0	0	0	0
Development Disability		1	26	1	28
Chronic Physical Illness or Disability	0	3	32	4	39
Men	6	16	86	32	140
Women	3	7	40	8	58
Gender Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
Children	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	23	126	40	198

Source: Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition, 2013

TABLE 34 C: YOLO COUNTY SHELTERED COUNT

	Rural	Davis	West Sac	Woodland	Total	
Emergency	Households with Dependent Children	0	6	0	3	9
	Number of Persons in these Households	0	21	0	12	33
Transitional	Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0
	Households without Dependent Children	0	37	2	34	73
	Number of Persons in these Households	0	37	2	35	74
	Households without Dependent Children		6	9	12	27
	Number of Persons in these Households		15	33	48	96
	Households without Dependent Children		18	4	51	73
	Number of Persons in these Households		18	4	51	73
	Chronically Homeless Individuals-Singles	0	24	2	11	37
	Chronically Homeless- Families	0	0	0	0	0
	Chronically Homeless Individuals in Families	0	0	0	0	0
	Severely Mentally Ill	0	24	7	31	62
	Chronic Substance Abuse	0	34	7	73	114
	Veterans	0	7	0	17	24
	Victims of Domestic Violence	0	0	0	2	2
	Persons with HIV/AIDS	0	14	3	34	51
	Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18)		0	0	0	0
	Development Disability		2	0	13	15
	Chronic Physical Illness or Disability	0	6	86	32	140
	Men	6	38	7	70	115
	Women	3	30	10	37	77
	Gender Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
	Children	0	23	22	39	84
	Total	0	91	39	146	276

Source: Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition, 2013

TABLE 35: HOUSEHOLDS BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2000 AND 2010

Household Race/Ethnicity (b)	City of Davis				Sacramento-Yolo CMSA (a)			
	2000		2010		2000		2010	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Not Hispanic or Latino								
White	16,214	70.7%	42,571	64.9%	473,653	71.0%	1,389,804	64.7%
Black or African American	497	2.2%	1,528	2.3%	43,045	6.5%	158,426	7.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native	92	0.4%	339	0.5%	4,750	0.7%	21,603	1.0%
Asian	3,362	14.7%	14,355	21.9%	47,190	7.1%	255,995	11.9%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	114	0.5%	136	0.2%	2,021	0.3%	15,840	0.7%
Some Other Race	72	0.3%	3,121	4.8%	1,167	0.2%	180,226	8.4%
Two or More Races	809	3.5%	3,572	5.4%	19,189	2.9%	127,233	5.9%
Subtotal: Not Hispanic or Latino	21,160	92.3%	65,622	100.0%	591,015	88.6%	2,149,127	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino								
White	772	3.4%	Unavailable	0.0%	32,854	4.9%	Unavailable	0.0%
Black or African American	15	0.1%	Unavailable	0.0%	731	0.1%	Unavailable	0.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native	21	0.1%	Unavailable	0.0%	1,450	0.2%	Unavailable	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%	Unavailable	0.0%	551	0.1%	Unavailable	0.0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	Unavailable	0.0%	59	0.0%	Unavailable	0.0%
Some Other Race	823	3.6%	Unavailable	0.0%	34,624	5.2%	Unavailable	0.0%
Two or More Races	136	0.6%	Unavailable	0.0%	5,781	0.9%	Unavailable	0.0%
Subtotal: Hispanic or Latino	1,767	7.7%	Unavailable	0.0%	76,050	11.4%	Unavailable	0.0%
Total Households	22,927	100.0%		100.0%	667,065	100.0%		100.0%

Note:

(a) The Sacramento-Yolo CMSA consists of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.

(b) Based on race/ethnicity of the head of household. Race/ethnicity is self-represented.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census

3.6 Energy Conservation in Housing: Going Green from Slab to Ceiling

Home energy costs fluctuate according to national and worldwide conditions, but will always contribute to the cost of housing. When energy conservation measures are incorporated into new housing construction and existing units are retrofitted for energy conservation, gas, electric and heating oil costs are reduced, which also reduces the cost of housing to some extent.

The State of California sets energy conservation standards for new residential construction through Title 24 of its Uniform Building Code. Additionally, the City's 2001 General Plan includes the statement that the city recognizes that personal energy consumption is generally categorized into the categories of:

- transportation, which accounts for approximately 50 percent;
- space heating and cooling, which accounts for approximately 25 percent; and
- appliances and hot water heating, which accounts for approximately 25 percent.

Energy conservation efforts in Davis have involved various sectors of the community, including the city government, UC Davis, utility companies, architects, engineers, builders, and consumers. The following include energy conservation strategies and policies in the 2001 General Plan:

- Subdivisions are planned to maximize natural heating and cooling opportunities, primarily through the climate orientation of lots and building "envelopes." State and City building codes require new buildings to meet minimum standards for energy conservation.
- The design review of multifamily residential and commercial projects includes the review of landscapes for water conservation and plantings which promote energy conservation and comfort. The shading of parking lots by trees is intended to reduce re-radiation of heat from pavement.
- The use and re-use of existing buildings is encouraged to conserve building materials and increase community identity.
- Bicycle facilities have been constructed to provide an alternative to automobile use. Public transit is provided by YoloBus and Unitrans, with subsidies from the City.
- Dispersed, smaller neighborhood shopping centers are encouraged to reduce the length of frequent trips.

- Reduced lot sizes, yielding higher population densities, have been encouraged to allow for more efficient use of existing public facilities, police and fire protection services, water and sewage services, and public transit.
- The city and PG&E are experimenting with propane, methanol, compressed natural gas and electric powered cars.

Additionally, the following are some 2001 General Plan key provisions for the city's energy conservation policies and programs that positively impact residential energy conservation:

- Develop programs to increase energy conservation on the household and business level.
- Develop and distribute educational materials to Davis residents, including energy usage audits and analyses and information about the direct financial benefits and community benefits of reducing energy use.
- Pursue the creation of a community energy management corporation, whose purpose shall be to reduce energy use in the city.
- Study and implement options for providing incentives for property owners to upgrade their homes and businesses for improved energy conservation.
- Provide incentives for retrofitting existing homes and businesses for improved energy efficiency. An example of a retrofit feature would be a passive solar device.
- Promote the development and use of advanced energy technology and building materials in Davis.
- Use subsidies, expedited permit processing, density bonuses or other incentives to support implementation of photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies to provide a portion of the City's energy needs.
- Promote energy-load management programs for both the residential and commercial sectors through an education and outreach program.
- Continue to enforce landscaping requirements that facilitate efficient energy use or conservation.
- Energy efficient landscaping and preservation of existing shade trees is encouraged on all building sites.
- Provide information and education to residents on how, what type, and where to plant trees to reduce energy demand.

- Encourage the development of energy-efficient subdivisions and buildings.
- Natural factors such as cooling breezes, solar access, wind protection, and shade shall be considered in site and building design.
- Site planning should maximize the effects of cooling southwest winds to the extent possible.
- At least 80 percent of all residential lots in any proposed new development should be oriented so that buildings have their long axes within 22.5 degrees of east/west. Allow a developer not providing the required percentage to demonstrate that other site design, building design or construction measures would provide similar opportunities for conserving energy.
- Develop and implement energy-efficient design requirements that go beyond the State building standards for energy efficiency.
- Develop design guidelines for climate-oriented site planning, building design and landscape design to promote energy efficiency.
- Establish a technical assistance program to help developers in complying with the energy code and implementing energy efficient technologies.
- Offer incentives to developers for projects that result in energy savings of at least 20 percent when compared to the energy consumption that would occur under similar projects built to meet the minimum standards of the energy code.
- Provide recognition for projects that maximize energy efficiency in the form of awards and presentations at council meetings.

Current Efforts

In June 2010, the City Council adopted the Davis Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) which focused on addressing greenhouse gas emissions and the impact of climate change in the City of Davis. As part of the CAAP, City staff developed several action items that focus on the current and future housing stock. Examples include guidance on developing local financing district for solar energy production, energy efficiency standards for new development, and locating new housing projects within walking distance of commercial service areas.

City staff continues to work with local affordable housing developers to promote their use of energy-efficient design. The most recently completed affordable housing project at 1220 Olive Drive, Cesar Chavez Plaza, has made efforts to become LEED-certified for its leadership in energy and environmental design. Future affordable housing projects are working with the city, as well as energy credit programs, to plan features that promote energy efficiency. Features that either have been or

plan to be included in affordable projects include building orientation, solar panels, efficient appliances, and additional insulation beyond Title 24.

Affordable housing projects have incentives to include energy-efficient features, as it can lead to greater city partnership and increased publicity for the project. The city recognizes that sometimes these features require additional financial assistance to the project, but often features can be added without much additional cost or through the purchase of energy-efficient items that are accompanied by rebate programs. The planning and assistance provided to affordable housing projects today may reduce their operating costs and tenant utility costs for the future.

In addition to affordable housing, the City's Community Development Department continues to work with local developers on their incorporation of city policies related to energy-efficiency within the design and development of all new projects. A large part of these efforts relates to the placement and density of housing being planned. The work of the City's Steering Committee is aimed at identifying the optimum locations for future housing and city development, including consideration of energy efficiency, related to its proximity to community resources, shopping, schools, etc. and opportunities for alternative modes of transit. In addition to the Committee's in-depth review of potential future housing locations, the special sustainability assessment currently underway will assist with the identification of other methods for the City to utilize as it continues to promote energy-efficiency in all new and existing development.

3.7 Affordable Housing Units At-Risk: Taking Stock and Saving It

Housing element law requires all jurisdictions to provide an analysis of assisted low-income units that may be at risk of converting to market rates due to expiration of affordability restrictions. The analysis must cover a 10-year period from the beginning of the current Housing Element planning period. There are three main types of conversions; 1) prepayment of HUD Mortgages for Section 221(d)(3), 202 and 236; 2) opt-outs and expirations of Project-based Section 8 Contracts; and 3) other, which includes all other financing mechanisms that may expire such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits, CalHFA, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and HOME funds.

The City currently has 2,355 affordable rental units that provide housing to special needs and non-special needs groups and serve households from extremely low- to low-income categories. The majority of these housing units have covenants recorded to their properties that require unit affordability in perpetuity. All newly-built affordable rental and ownership units in Davis, and those rehabilitated with local financial assistance, include sustained affordability requirements through affordability covenants and appreciation caps. The affordable housing units listed in the table below were provided using resources from HUD under set affordability terms as well as the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), some that could expire and result in the loss of affordable units to market rates during this planning period. These units were developed with special programs outside of standard City requirements or prior to the adoption of the City's affordable housing ordinance in 1990 that put ongoing affordability requirements in place.

**TABLE 36: AFFORDABLE UNITS
AT-RISK OF CONVERTING TO MARKET RATE RENTS**

Project Name	Project Address	Number of At-risk Units	Affordability Requirements	Level of Risk/Actions Needed During this Planning Period
Suntree Apts	2033 F Street	60 Units	HUD Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments contract. Affordability requirements expire: March 6, 2020.	Moderate risk; Initiate discussions with HUD and project owner, exploring options for affordability preservation.
El Macero Village	4735 Cowell Blvd.	58 Units	HUD Section 8 Vouchers	Units are transitioning to market-rate when Section 8 tenants move out. City has no plans to provide resources for preservation of assistance.

Sources: City of Davis and CHPC, 2013

There are 118 units with potentially expiring affordability during this planning period; however, the City continues to work with the local housing authority, Yolo County Housing Authority, and continues to assess local resources in hopes of determining options for ensuring ongoing affordability in these units. Many factors go into identifying opportunities to extend affordability in expiring units, including:

- the willingness of the owner to consider ongoing affordability requirements.
- the owner's need for reinvestment and rehabilitation of the units.
- the per-unit costs of preserving affordability vs. per-unit costs of developing new units that would be permanently affordable.
- the number, type, and existing affordability of the expiring units.
- the availability of local resources to purchase more affordability through rent subsidies, rehabilitation, or purchase.

Cost Estimate (Preservation vs. Replacement)

Generally, there are three ways to preserve at-risk units: preservation, replacement or tenant-based subsidies. The following describes each of these approaches.

Preservation

An analysis of the cost to preserve at-risk units includes determining the cost to acquire and rehabilitate the at-risk project as well as determine the monthly subsidy necessary to preserve affordability. In the event that the affordability terms expire on any of the at-risk properties and the owners of the projects decide to convert the rental rates of the units to be equal to or more than the fair market rental rates, interested parties (such as non-profit entities or the City) may purchase and rehabilitate (if necessary) the property in order to maintain the affordability of the units. The Homestead project was an acquisition rehabilitation project that the City assisted with recently. The total cost to acquire the site and rehabilitate the 15 units was \$2,547,307 or \$169,820 per unit. Assuming the costs associated with the Homestead project, preservation of the Suntree Apartments is about \$10.2 million and preservation of the El Macero Village would cost about \$9.8 million. If the City preserved all 118 at-risk units, the total cost would amount to about \$20 million.

Replacement

If acquisition and subsidizing rents is not possible, the other way to preserve affordable units is for a non-profit builder to replace the units with new construction. A completed multifamily project in the City is Cesar Chavez Plaza with 53 total 1 bedroom units including 19 units for extremely low-income, 13 very low-income, and 20 units for low-income persons. The total cost for Cesar Chavez was \$10,595,494 or a per unit cost of \$199,915. To preserve the Suntree Apartment and the El Macero Village units, the expected costs are about \$12 million each, leading to a total of \$24 million.

Tenant-Based Subsidy

The appropriateness of this approach depends on the income of the family, the shelter costs of the apartment and the number of years the assistance is provided. The 118 affordable units can also be maintained using rental subsidies from non-federal (state, local, or other) funding sources. The rent subsidies can be structured much like the federal Section 8 program which pays the difference between what tenants can pay (defined as 30 percent of household income) and what HUD estimates as the fair market rent (FMR) on the unit. In Yolo County, the 2013 fair market rent was determined to be \$741 for a studio, \$801 for a one-bedroom unit, \$1,082 for a two-bedroom, and \$1,594 for a three bedroom.

The feasibility of this providing rental assistance is highly dependent upon the availability of other funding sources necessary to make rent subsidies available and the willingness of property owners to accept the City rental vouchers. The total estimated cost of subsidizing the rents for all 118 at-risk units is estimated at \$37,000 per month or and estimated \$444,000 annually. However, the total lifetime cost (assumed to be 30 years) inflates the annual cost above to \$13 million.

Altogether, the subsidy approach is the slightly more cost effective of the above example. Please note, however that many factors can affect the true outcome of these equations. The City is committed to considering all plausible approaches to preserving at-risk units in the City.

The City is very active in expanding and conserving its affordable housing stock. The city has a number of resources for assisting in the creation and the preservation of affordable housing. Resources that could assist with preservation of affordable units are: the Community Development Block Grant, the Housing Trust Fund, and the HOME Investment Partnership Program. Competition for these resources is tight, so the City annually adopts a critical needs list for the use of CDBG and HOME funds, and has adopted funding priorities for affordable housing funds.

Community Development Block Grant

HUD funds the CDBG program. Since becoming an entitlement community, the City of Davis has been provided approximately \$23 million dollars from this funding source. The City has allocated approximately one-third to one-half of its CDBG funds to various housing activities, with other uses of the fund including community mediation, fair housing services, other public services, and City accessibility projects. Assisted housing developments at risk of conversion to market-priced housing can be preserved with CDBG funds, but applications for this source always exceed available funds.

City of Davis Housing Trust Fund

The Housing Trust Fund was established by the City to receive in-lieu fees and shared-appreciation payments for affordable housing units and loans. Contributions also come from payments of second mortgages on homes built under the affordable housing program. Because this is not a Federal or State program, the City has a great deal of discretion in use of the funds. The Housing Trust Fund has been used in the development of multiple local affordable housing projects. Due to the affordable housing ordinance updates that limited the type of projects with the ability to pay fees in-lieu of building affordable housing, this fund does not currently experience much income. There are still some mortgages being repaid to this fund, so available resources could be used in the preservation of at-risk housing units. In addition, all housing-related assets from the defunct redevelopment agency, including properties and loan receivables, have been moved into the Housing Trust Fund.

Redevelopment Successor Agency

Upon dissolution of the redevelopment agency during the previous planning period, the City established the Davis Redevelopment Successor Agency as per State law. There is still general admin money with the successor agency and there are regular bond payments being made. The last redevelopment-related housing commitment—funding of the permanent closing for the New Harmony affordable housing project—was finished in fiscal year 2013 (by the end of June 2013). The City will also paid settlement in a housing-related lawsuit in July 2013 when they received successor funds. Other than that, there is no more redevelopment funding. All housing-related assets from the agency (properties and loan receivables) have been moved to the City's Housing Trust Fund.

HOME

Davis is an entitlement jurisdiction for the Federal Home Investment Partnership Program and has received about \$9 million through the program since initial participation. Retention of an at-risk project would not directly qualify for funds under this program, but these funds do assist housing projects that would otherwise require assistance from other local housing resources.

Other Resources

In addition to City-controlled resources, State and Federal funding programs (such as those funded from Proposition 1C, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006) are available to assist preservation efforts. Eligible recipients for these funds include nonprofit agencies and the City.

While the City would be a likely candidate to help preserve any at-risk unit that may convert to market rates, there are other qualified nonprofit entities active in the City that may also be able to help preserve this affordable housing stock. Those nonprofit groups are: Community Housing Opportunities Corporation (CHOC), Yolo Mutual Housing Association (YMHA), Sacramento Mutual Housing Association (SMHA), and New Hope Community Development Corporation (nonprofit subsidiary of Yolo County Housing Authority). See Program Action 31, Objective a. for the City's plan to conserve at-risk units.

3.8 Existing and Projected Housing Needs: RHNA and Local Needs

Davis has exhibited consistently low vacancy rates, indicating high levels of local housing demand relative to available supply and contributing to high local housing costs. As a consequence of the high housing costs in Davis, approximately 46 percent of all Davis households experienced some level of excessive housing cost burden in 2010, though renter households experienced a disproportionate share of housing affordability problems. These high rents also contributed to 1.4 percent of renter households experiencing some level of overcrowding as a response to costs.

The 2013 average rental rates for one- and two-bedroom units are not affordable to the extremely low-, very low- and low-income households that may be interested in renting these units. With the majority of renter households categorized as very low- and low-income households, there seems to be a demonstrable need to relieve cost pressures in the Davis rental market.

Also, with a median home price of \$463,500, the majority of the Davis for-sale housing market is affordable only to a portion of households with above-moderate income levels. Very few for-sale housing options exist for households earning less than \$100,000 annually. The high household income threshold impacts the ability of the Davis workforce to reside in the City.

The UC Davis community greatly affects population, household, employment, and housing trends in the City of Davis. Approximately 11,000 households associated with UC Davis reside within the

City, of which 6,500 are student households. Looking forward, the university expects to provide housing for the anticipated increase in student households.

Housing Types in Need

Based on local information regarding affordability, overcrowding, and workforce commuting, there is evidence that the City needs additional rental housing units for students and other low and very low income households, including elderly households, single-parent households, and persons with disabilities. Although it is difficult to directly connect low and very-low income student households to local affordable housing, based on State and Federal funding requirements, development of low and very-low income units for other groups could decrease competition of market rate apartment units and make rents more affordable for students. Vacancy rates and market rents would also contribute to a more affordable rental housing market by the addition of moderate rental units.

Moderate and above moderate ownership housing continues to be in demand for the local workforce, elderly households, persons with disabilities, as well new employees in the City. This could assist with decreasing the large percentage of commuting workforce and could assist in addressing housing needs based on job increases in the local workforce during this planning period, particularly from the city's largest local employer: UC Davis.

Table 37 displays the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation that is based on SACOG and Department of Finance Projections. This requirement is followed by Table 36, showing the City's estimated housing production to meet the statutory requirement of Table 35.

TABLE 37: RHNA BASED ON SACOG AND DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROJECTIONS

Income Category	New Construction Needs
Extremely Low Income (0–30% of area median income)	124
Very Low Income (31–50% of area median income)	124
Low Income (51–80% of area median income)	174
Moderate Income (81–120% of area median income)	198
Above-Moderate Income (over 120% of area median income)	446
Total Units	1,066

Sources: SACOG, 2012

TABLE 38: CITY ESTIMATED HOUSING PRODUCTION (BASED ON AVAILABLE SITES) TO MEET RHNA

	Extremely Low	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
Construction	124	124	174	198	446
Rehabilitation	2	4	7	0	0
Conservation/Preservation	8	12	0	0	0
Total	126	140	181	198	446
Grand Total	1,091				

Sources: PMC, 2013

4.0 SITES INVENTORY: SITE DESCRIPTIONS AND LOCATIONS

4.1 Regional Housing Needs Allocation

State law (California Government Code Section 65584) requires that each city and county plan to accommodate a fair share of the region's housing needs. In urban areas, state law provides for councils of governments to prepare regional housing allocation plans that assign a share of a region's housing need to each city and county. SACOG is the entity authorized to determine the future housing needs for the greater Sacramento region. SACOG adopted a regional housing allocation plan in September 2012, called the "Regional Housing Needs Plan" (RHNP). This plan covers the period from January 1, 2013, through October 31, 2021.

SACOG's methodology is based on regional population and housing forecasts developed for its transportation model. The numbers of housing units assigned in the plan to each jurisdiction are goals that are intended to address the minimum new housing unit need from anticipated population growth in the region. The RHNP allocated a total of 1,066 housing units to the City of Davis as shown in Table 37.

4.2 Land Inventory

The City's 2013–2021 housing needs will be provided through a combination of development on entitled sites including some which have received certificates of occupancy or building permits since January 1, 2013 (see Table 39). Approved units on these sites total 120 housing units. Other sites with residential development potential have received planning permits (334 units). Approved projects are detailed in Table 40.

**TABLE 39
BUILDING PERMITS AND CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY
UNITS CREDITED TOWARD REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)
JANUARY 1, 2013 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2013**

Project Name Location	CO / BP	Total Units	Allowed Density (net)	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
Verona Subdivision	BP	13	21				13	Sales price	Y
Verona Subdivision	CO	6	21			1	5	Sales price	Y
Verona Subdivision CO Pending	CO pending	13	21			5	8	Sales price	N
Central Park West 337, 343 & 349 B Street	CO	3	20				3	Sales price	N
Willowbank Park #2	BP	3	11				3	Sales price	N
Willowbank Park#2	CO	3	11				3	Sales price	Y
Mathews Tract #2	CO	2	5				2	Sales price	Y
Aspen #2	CO	1	7				1	Sales price	Y
Sierra Vista Oaks #1	CO	1	5				1	Sales price	N

Project Name Location	CO / BP	Total Units	Allowed Density (net)	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
Park View Place 444 4 th Street5	BP	4	29				4	Sales price	Y
Willow Creek #2	BP	1	5				1	Sales price	Y
East Acres #2 1321 E 8 th Street	BP	1	8		1			Rental price	N
New Harmony Affordable 3030 Cowell Boulevard APN: 69-530-06-3992-A	CO	69	20	46*	23			Subsidies – (City Redevelopment, HOME, and Tax Credit)	Y
Overall Total		120		46	24	6	44		

Source: City of Davis, 2013.

Notes:

This table consists of Certificates of Occupancy and Building Permits issued from January 1, 2013 through April 30, 2013.

*These 46 units consist of 25 extremely low-income units and 21 very low-income units as is further detailed in Table 42.

Abbreviations: BP = Building Permit; CO = Certificate of Occupancy; VL = Very low-income units; L = Low-income units; M = Moderate-income units; and AM = Above moderate-income units.

Y = Yes and N = No.

SITE INVENTORY AND LOCAL RESOURCES TO ADDRESS HOUSING NEEDS

**TABLE 40
APPROVED PROJECTS
UNITS CREDITED TOWARD REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)
AS OF APRIL 30, 2013**

Project Name	Total Units	Allowed Density (net) ¹	Status	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of Subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
Approved Projects									
Grande School Site APN: 35-097-12	41	7	Approved: DA, Z, TM, AH, Pending: FM			8	33	Sales price	Y
Verona Subdivision	9	21	Approved: All			5	4	Sales price	Y
Verona Lot "O"	10	10	Approved: Z Pending: TM, FM, FPD, AH				10	Sales price	N
Willowbank Park	5	10	Approved: All				5	Sales price	N
Willowbank Park Affordable / Remainder Parcel	4	13	Approved: Z Pending: TM, FM, FPD			4		Sales price	N
Mace Ranch / 2990 Fifth Street ²	29	13	Approved: Z, AH Pending: TM, FM, FPD	15	14			Sales price	Y
Woodbridge 4100 Hackberry	13	12	Approved: Z, AH, TM, FM	7	6			Subsidies	Y

Project Name	Total Units	Allowed Density (net) ¹	Status	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of Subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
			Pending: FPD						
Christopher Hollow / 404 E. 8th Street - APN: 70-610-04	4	20	Approved: All				4	Sales price and Rent price	Y
Callori Properties 1207 & 1233 Olive Dr. APN: 70-290-01	49	19	Approved: Z Pending: TM, FM			10	39	Sales price	Y
Willowcreek Commons APN: 069-020-83	21	16	Approved: Z, TM Pending: FM, FPD			4	17	Sales price	Y
Chiles Ranch Subdivision ³	118	16	Approved: DA, Z, FPD Pending: FM		20	10	88	Sales price and Rent price	N
Carlton Plaza 2726 Fifth Street (under construction)	116	54	Approved: Z, TM Pending: FM, FPD				116	Rental price	N

Other Fully Entitled Vacant Single Family Lots

Glacier Place – 2346 and 2351 Glacier Place	2	12	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
---	---	----	------------------------	--	--	--	---	-------------	---



SITE INVENTORY AND LOCAL RESOURCES TO ADDRESS HOUSING NEEDS

Project Name	Total Units	Allowed Density (net) ¹	Status	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of Subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
2204 Bryce Lane	1	5	Approved: Z, TM, FM				1	Sales price	Y
Cassel - 1305, 1311, 1318, 1323, 1329 Cassel Lane and 1304 and 3050 Cassel Place	7	5	Approved: Z, TM, FM				7	Sales price	Y
North Davis Farms - 3122, 3128 Northfield Court and 1219 Southfield Court	3	2	Approved: Z, TM, FM				3	Sales price	Y
Wildhorse - 2537, 2603 Rockwell Drive	2	4	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
El Macero Estates - 5731 Guthrie Place	1	5	Approved: Z, TM, FM				1	Sales price	Y
Oakshade - 2640 Regatta Lane 1405 and 1406 Exeter Court	3	3	Approved: Z, TM, FM				3	Sales price	Y
Willowcreek - 3606 Washoe Street, 3925 Yana Place	2	4	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
Woodbridge - 4222 Dogwood Place, 919	2	4	Approved: Z, TM,				2	Sales price	Y

Project Name	Total Units	Allowed Density (net) ¹	Status	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of Subsidy	In 2008–13 Housing Element Site Inventory to Meet RHNA – Y or N
				VL	L	M	AM		
Eucalyptus Street			FM						
3326 and 3338 Monterey Ave	2	7	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
1009 and 1110 Los Robles Street	2	4	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
324 Antioch Drive	1	6	Approved: Z, TM, FM				1	Sales price	Y
1212 L Street (Owned by Yolo County Housing Authority)	1	7	Approved: Z, TM, FM		1			Sales price	Y
1015 and 1017 Fifth Street	2	13	Approved: Z, TM, FM				2	Sales price	Y
Overall Total			448	22	41	41	344		

Source: City of Davis, 2013.

Notes:

This table consists of projects approved as of April 30, 2013.

1. Allowed density is based on the approved project, not the actual density of the zone.
2. The affordable units in the Mace Ranch project will be located on City-owned land dedicated for affordable housing. The 15 units for very low and 14 units for low-income households will be deed-restricted for those income categories.
3. The 20 affordable units in the Chiles Ranch project will be deed-restricted for low-income households. The allowed density (net) on this site is for the entire subdivision. The density of the 20 low-income units is higher, between 20-30 units/acre.

Abbreviations: VL = Very low-income units; L = Low-income units; M = Moderate-income units; AM = Above moderate-income units.

Abbreviations: Z = Zoning; TM = Tentative Map; FM = Final Map; AH = Affordable Housing Plan; DA = Development Agreement. All = All approved required entitlements are in place.

Y = Yes, and N = No.

In addition to entitled and pending sites, there are underutilized sites with residential development potential in the City. Government Code Section 65583.2(a) states that land suitable for residential development includes underutilized residentially zoned sites that are capable of being developed at a higher density. In the City of Davis, the following types of underutilized zoned sites have the potential to contribute housing units toward the City's RHNA:

- B and 3rd Streets Corridor (Planned Development #2-86B) including Mission Residences site
- Residential One and Two Family (R-2) districts
- Residential Garden Apartment (R-3) districts
- Downtown Mixed Use (M-U) and Central Commercial (C-C) districts
- Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) districts
- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in residential districts
- The Cannery site approved in November 2013 on PD-1-00

The sites in Table 41 are made up of vacant and underutilized sites or sites where the existing property owner has stated interest in future residential development. All sites listed in Table 41 have the necessary General Plan designation, zoning, and entitlements to develop. A full list of parcels included in Table 41 is listed in Appendix A. Maps depicting the approved and pending sites and the underutilized sites are included in Appendix B. Additionally, based on historic trends, Table 41 provides the number of ADUs that could be produced during the course of the planning period in addition to a summary of unit potential on underutilized sites.

4.2 A. Mission Residences

A development has been approved on this 1.93 acre site at 225/229 B Street. However, building permits have not been approved. The applicant is requesting to combine two adjacent lots, remove the two existing dwellings, and construct a five-level (four stories above a basement garage) 14-unit condominium building. The condominiums are designed to accommodate aging in place or residents with disabilities, with single-level living, elevator access, common areas including exercise and meeting rooms, and great room / master bedroom floor plans. Sustainability components include a commitment to CalGreen Tier 2 in addition to City requirements for greenhouse gas reduction.

The project required amendment to the Core Area Specific Plan and Planned Development standards to allow Floor Area Ratio of 2.0 (where 1.0 is permitted unless there is a bonus) and density of 42.4 units per acre (in subareas of the PD where a 24 unit per acre base density is allowed). The approved height is also above the 38-foot limit in this subarea. The habitable space is up to 45 feet high, and the exempt elevator tower in the center of the structure is 50 feet to the roof ridge.

4.2 B. The Cannery

A development has been approved by the City Council on this approximately 100-acre site at 1111 E. Covell Boulevard. A public vote was not required for approval of this project. However, building permits have not been approved and aren't expected to be approved until sometime in 2014 or 2015. The project proposes a mix of land uses consisting of low, medium, and high density residential uses; a mixed-use business park component; drainage detention areas; open spaces including greenbelts, agricultural buffers, an urban farm; parks; and a homeowner association neighborhood center. The project site is the former location of the Hunt-Wesson tomato cannery.

Con Agra is the applicant for the planning entitlements. The New Home Company is acquiring the residential portion of the property and will likely contract with a builder of affordable housing for development of the multi-family affordable housing portions of the site. The Mixed-use areas will be developed by separate identities. The New Home Company is proposing to make a portion of the residential lots available to small builders and owner-builders. The urban farm is proposed to be transferred to the City; the City and the applicant team have been meeting with the Center for Land-Based Learning about design and program considerations for the farm and the ultimate lease of the farm to CLBL for their operation and management. The following unit types are proposed as part of the Cannery Project: single-family, stacked flats, land dedication, accessory dwelling units, mixed use apartments and mixed use live work.

The ADUs in The Cannery are required under the City's affordable housing ordinance. The provisions of the ordinance that apply to ADUs created under its requirements ensure that a higher percentage of this type of ADU results in rental units. The recent revisions to the affordable housing ordinance require that accessory dwelling units receiving affordable housing credit meet specific performance standards to improve the likelihood that they will be leased. These include:

- Size between 400 and 650 square feet;
- Private, direct access from an alley, street, or greenbelt/paseo; and
- Common usable interior space to accommodate family living.

The 40 ADUs in the Cannery are required by the PD zoning to be constructed concurrently with the primary unit on the property, and must meet the above performance standards. Page 4-32 describes a citywide survey of ADUs that concluded that those ADUs that are rented are all rented to lower-income households. Because the units will be suitable for rental, and purchasers of the homes will choose those with ADUs, the City anticipates that all, or nearly all, will be rented, thus affordable to those with lower-incomes. The ADUs in the Cannery are comparable in their purpose-built nature to the ADUs at Aggie Village, near downtown Davis. Anecdotally, the City understands that all of the Aggie Village ADUs are rented and that is the property owner expectation at the time of purchase.

The ability to use accessory dwelling units to satisfy a portion of a project's affordable housing obligation remains in effect only for projects approved with such a provision before December 31, 2015 unless an extension or re-authorization is approved by the City Council. The densities of the various unit types and realistic units are shown in Table 41 below.

TABLE 41
INVENTORY OF AVAILABLE UNDERUTILIZED SITES AND ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS
TO MEET UNMET RHNA AS OF APRIL 30, 2013

Available Sites	Zone	Allowed Density (net per GP)	GP Designation	Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity	Environment Constraints	Units by Income Level			
									VL	L	M	AM
Summary of B and 3rd Streets Corridor (P-D #2-86B) Underutilized Sites												
7	P-D #2-86B	30.00-42.40	CASP: Retail with Offices	2.39	64	Commercial, Single-family & Duplex	Adequate	None		64		
Summary of Residential One and Two Family (R-2) Underutilized Sites												
184	R-2	7.19	RLD	30.94	37	Single family	Adequate	None			18	19
Summary of Residential Garden Apartment (R-3) Underutilized Sites												
36	R-3	24.00	RHD	6.73	72	Single family, Duplex	Adequate	None			72	
Summary of Downtown Underutilized Sites – Mixed Use (M-U) and Central Commercial (C-C)												
65	C-C, M-U	30.00	CASP: Retail, Retail with Offices	17.28	65	Retail, office, commercial, residential	Adequate	None		10	55	
Summary of Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) Underutilized Sites												
5	C-N, CR, PD	30.00	C-N, CR	40.40	46	Neighborhood retail, Commercial retail	Adequate	None			46	
Summary of The Cannery Site												
Single Family - 1111 E. Covell Blvd.	PD-1-11	Ranges from 7 to 15 du/ac	RLD, RMD, RHD	100 – total site	367	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None				367
Stacked Flats - 1111 E. Covell Blvd.	PD-1-11	30+ du/acre	RHD	3.08	96	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None		96		



SITE INVENTORY AND LOCAL RESOURCES TO ADDRESS HOUSING NEEDS

Available Sites	Zone	Allowed Density (net per GP)	GP Designation	Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity	Environment Constraints	Units by Income Level			
									VL	L	M	AM
Land Dedication - 1111 E. Covell Blvd.	PD-1-11	30+ du/acre	RHD	1.69	60	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None	30	30		
ADUs - 1111 E. Covell Blvd	PD-1-11	N/A	RLD	N/A	40	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None		35	5	
Mixed Use Apart-ments	PD-1-11	2 du/acre	NMU	12	12	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None				12
Mixed Use Live Work	PD-1-11	2 du/acre	NMU		12	Vacant Industrial	Adequate	None				

Summary of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Varies	R-1, R-2, PD	7.19	RLD	N/A	40	Single family, Duplex	Adequate	None	25	15		
--------	--------------	------	-----	-----	----	-----------------------	----------	------	----	----	--	--

Total **911** **30** **260** **211** **410**

Source: City of Davis, 2013.

Notes:

- a. This table is a summary of underutilized sites and accessory dwelling units based on historic trends. See Appendix A for site locations (address and assessor's parcel number).
- b. In the R-2 districts, ADUs are permitted in addition to a second primary unit. This table factors only the second primary unit, which could be attached or detached. Of the 184 available and zoned underutilized sites, 20% (184 x .20) or 37 units are projected during the planning period. Also, it is projected that about 50% of the units will be rented to moderate-income households because 1) the R-2 districts are within the older parts of the City and close to UC Davis, which means some will be rented to students and/or UC Davis moderate-income households; 2) typically new primary units on the R-2 lots charge higher rents as compared to ADU and apartment units; and 3) second primary units typically vary in sizes and are larger than ADUs and apartments are usually studio and/or one-bedroom units.
- c. In the R-3 district, there is potential for the identified sites to accommodate more than 24 units per acre.
- d. Low-income household units for the Downtown area are determined by computing 15% of the sub-area, based on reasonable rental assumptions for the sub-area. Given that studio and one-bedroom units are typical new additions within this sub-area, it is reasonable to anticipate that some units would rent to households within this income group. This determination is based on the City's "2013 Rents for Low and Very-Low Income Rental Units in a Garden Apartment Building (1-5 stories)" and "2012 The City of Davis Vacancy And Rental Rate Survey U C Davis Student Housing."

Table 42 provides a summary list of units from Tables 39, 40, and 41 that the City of Davis has provided to meet its RHNA.

TABLE 42: LAND INVENTORY SUMMARY AND PROGRESS TOWARDS RHNA

	2013–2021 RHNA	Building Permits and Certificates of Occupancy (see Table 39)	Approved and Pending Projects (see Table 40)	Sites to Address Remaining Need (see Table 41)	Total Land Inventory Sites by Income Category	Combined Units by Lower and Density ¹	Remaining Need/ Surplus
Extremely Low-Income Units	124	25	0	0	25		
Very Low-Income Units	124	21	22	30	73	423	+1
Low-Income Units	174	24	41	260	325		
Moderate-Income Units	198	6	41	211	258	n/a	+60
Above Moderate-Income Units	446	44	344	410	798	n/a	+352
Total Units	1,066	120	448	911	1,479		+413

Source: City of Davis, 2013

Notes:

1. The units for extremely low, very low, and low income categories may be combined to meet the RHNA.

Based on the information in Table 42, the City can meet its remaining share of regional housing needs for all income levels. The City will continue to monitor development of affordable housing and the available land for residential development throughout the planning period and has included Program Action 36 to implement this monitoring.

4.3 Site Inventory Analysis: Suitability and Availability of Sites and Necessary Local Resources for Housing

Site Categories

The sites listed in Table 41 are other existing opportunities within categories of development or specific areas of the City: ADUs, B and 3rd Streets area, R-2 Residential One and Two Family, R-3 Residential Garden Apartment Underutilized Properties, Downtown Mixed Use (M-U) and Central Commercial (C-C) districts, Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) districts and The Cannery site. Each estimate for these categories or areas is based on historical data, existing opportunity, and financial feasibility. Although underutilized site redevelopment continued to be intensified during the 2007–2012 recession, the data on built units were not considered useful because of the downturn in the economy that adversely affected the real estate market. City staff conducted a field survey of all of the sites discussed in this section (except for the projected ADUs) to verify the status of sites and update data and maps. Improvements in the real estate market are anticipated to continue and so will the trend in the redevelopment of underutilized sites.

Table 43 below contains the basis of the realistic projections for some of the underutilized sites. The projections are conservative and reflect the slow economic recovery.

TABLE 43: PROJECTIONS ANALYSIS

	2006– 2013 Housing Element Projections (per year for 6 years)	2013–2021 Housing Element Update Projections (per year for 8 years)	2013–2021 Housing Element Update Projections (total for 7.8 years)
R-2 Districts	1.7 du / year	4.6 du / year	37 du
R-3 Districts	4.0 du / year	2.0 du / year	72 du
Downtown Districts (1-2 stories permitted and 3+ stories conditional) both with design review	8.7 du / year	8.6 du / year	69 du
Commercial Neighborhood Districts (Final planned development and design review only)	2.0 du / year	5.8 du / year	46 du
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs; ministerial only)	3.0 du / year	5.0 du / year	40 du
Total	19.4 du / year	26.0 du / year	26.4 du

Accessory Dwelling Units

To substantiate the inclusion of the 40 projected accessory dwelling units in Table 41, staff has conducted the following analysis. Under existing zoning, ADUs are permitted within low-density

residential districts (R-1 and R-2) without need for planning entitlements, as long as they meet the following conditions:

- ADU conforms to the primary dwelling unit's setbacks, and if detached is no greater than 15 feet in height.
- ADU is a maximum of 500 square feet, including a maximum of 325 square feet of new living space (325 square foot maximum for detached unit).
- All other planning conditions related to lot coverage, open space, and parking requirements are fulfilled.

Some of the development standards differ for ADUs required in a development based on the City's affordable housing ordinance requirements. The standards under the affordable housing ordinance are described under The Cannery site on page 4-10. With approximately 74 percent of the City's single-family lots at least 6,000 square feet or more in size, there is great opportunity for the development of ADUs within existing low-density residential neighborhoods under existing zoning. Lots in new residential subdivisions typically are smaller than 6,000 square feet, yet the ADUs are permitted. Examples of subdivisions include Glacier Place, Chiles Ranch, and Mace Cottages. Based on historic trends, 40 additional ministerial units could realistically be provided on available and zoned sites through the end of the Housing Element planning period (October 31, 2021).

Basis

Financial feasibility

ADUs are an economical way for owners to gain a secondary independent unit on their property, usually costing about \$75,000 to \$90,000 per unit. Although this is often more affordable than purchasing a secondary house, or even buying a duplex to replace an existing single-family home, it is still a large investment for most households. Commercial loans provided by a private lender may be with a higher interest rate than households can afford, but some of these costs can be outweighed by the income that can be generated with an accessory dwelling unit.

Developer/owner interest

Financial feasibility and opportunity indicate that many owners might be able to build an ADU, but some owners may determine that greater value is maintained on a lot by preserving its open space and/or the primary unit's total square footage. ADUs often either occupy existing open space on a lot or cut into square footage of an existing home, unless provided in existing unused attic space or through second-story additions.

Historical trends

In 1995, the City estimated the existence of about 53 ADUs. This number increased to approximately 150 units by the end of July 2013. Based on the City's development trend for ADUs

which has led to an average of five units per year, the City believes that development of approximately 40 additional ADUs can be projected through October 31, 2021. This projection includes a minimum of 26 ministerial units based on the 10-year local development trend of three ministerial ADUs each year. This annual number is considered conservative and may increase with City efforts to educate the community about ADU options.

Other actions

To augment existing data used above as a means of providing basis, the City commits to the following actions of encouragement for the development of ministerial ADUs:

- Commitment to streamline planning review for such a project.
- Commitment to continued outreach and public education to the owners of low-density residential lots about their ability to develop an ADU, including an article in the citywide newsletter, creation of a web page, and handout distribution at City Hall.

B and 3rd Streets including Mission Residences (Planned Development #2-86B)

In 2006 the City of Davis adopted B and 3rd Streets Visioning Process plan, and amended Planned Development #2-86B to accommodate new units at higher densities on existing underutilized parcels. The plan area comprises 22 properties totaling approximately 4.0 acres within the Core Area Specific Plan (CASP) boundaries. An EIR was prepared for the CASP that identified specific sites within the plan area, their redevelopment potential and allowed densities. The City paid for the preparation of the EIR in order to streamline subsequent approvals in the plan area. Seven of these properties totaling 2.39 acres are included in this Housing Element land inventory (see Table 41). The Mission Residences site is in one subarea of the CASP which has a minimum density of 24 units per acre. Additionally, the approvals for that site allow multifamily residential units at a density of 42.4 units per acre which is expected to result in 14 units as described in Section 4.2 A., above.

The remaining six sites are located in a subarea of the CASP that allows between 30 and 40 units per acre. These properties front on the west side of B Street, between 2nd Street and 4th Street, and on the north and south sides of 3rd Street, between A Street and B Street. The amended P-D#2-86B zone permits large scale development and redevelopment of the subject parcels to accommodate increased densities, increased floor area ratio, reduced building setbacks, increased building heights (two-, three-, and possibly limited four-story), higher density residential, and mixed-use development. The B and 3rd Street plan projected that redevelopment would result in 79 net additional dwelling units. It also anticipated the demolition of up to 32 existing structures (i.e., 18 above moderate-income principal units, and 14 accessory buildings/garages). The amended P-D#2-86B identified parcels for redevelopment that would generate 49 net new units (on the six sites) at densities of 30 units per acre and higher.

Rationale for choosing the study area

The City of Davis envisioned redevelopment of the subject area with higher densities as it is a corridor between the Downtown and UC Davis and there is mounting redevelopment pressure in the plan area. Many of the already developed properties in this area (in addition to some of the other underutilized sites study areas) contain an older single-family home surrounded by apartment buildings. Other characteristics of existing uses in this area include single-story residential and commercial structures, multiple story structures lacking elevators and substantial amounts of surface parking. The City works to ensure these older homes are maintained in good condition. However, many property owners are interested in developing on these underutilized sites with more units at higher densities to take advantage of the demand for multifamily housing in the area related to student demand and the overall desirability of the neighborhood. The City has received many inquiries from property owners in this area about redeveloping their parcels. To allow for more redevelopment opportunities, the following amendments were adopted by the City: 1) text and land use map of the General Plan and Core Area Specific Plan, 2) Davis Downtown and Traditional Residential Neighborhood Design Guidelines, and 3) text and zoning of parcels within P-D#2-86A to accommodate higher density redevelopment demand. Since the amendments, the higher density projects approved and redeveloped include the Central Park West subdivision on a combined parcel of 12,000 square feet with a total of seven townhome dwelling units (with a net new of five units) at a density of 26 units per acre. Another recently approved project is the Mission Residences on a combined parcel of 14,250 square feet with 14 stacked flat dwelling units with a density of 42 units per acre. Both of these are market-rate projects. This area's higher density zoned parcels qualify to accommodate lower-income units to meet the City's RHNA.

Projection

It is anticipated that redevelopment of this area will continue through 2021 and beyond. There are available and appropriately zoned parcels to accommodate 49 units. Given the location of the subject area and the continued demand for redevelopment in the area, it is anticipated that the available zoned parcels will be redeveloped within the current planning period. All of the identified parcels in this area are smaller than half an acre. Certain parcels within the CASP area have the highest potential for lot consolidation. Three sets of parcels could be combined into sites for high density residential development. The sets of parcels making up the three sites are in common ownership. The three sites are detailed in Table 44. The City has proposed Program Action 35 to encourage and facilitate lot consolidation opportunities. Additionally, Program Action 35 will also encourage development in mixed-use areas in this subarea and other identified underutilized areas and to maintain sufficient sites throughout the planning period.

TABLE 44: LOT CONSOLIDATION SITES IN THE B AND 3RD AREA

Site	Address	Existing Use	Density Allowed	Acreage	Realistic Unit Capacity
1	247 Third St.	Restaurant	30-40 du/ac	.33	5
	301 B St.	Restaurant			
2	236 3 rd St.	Single story houses. One converted to copy shop.	40 du/ac	.44	15
	232 3 rd St.				
	240 3 rd St.				
	232 University				
3	235 3 rd St.	Two single-story houses	40 du/ac	.26	8
	239 3 rd St.				

Source: City of Davis Core Area Specific Plan EIR, 1997

Basis

Financial feasibility

Despite the downturn in the economy since 2008, the housing demand in the City of Davis has not been significantly reduced. The demand for housing near Davis Downtown by a diversity of residents further assures redevelopment investors within this area of a reliable return on their investment. Continued lower interest rates have contributed to the housing demand.

Developer/owner interest

Given the continued redevelopment of parcels within the subject area and its surrounding areas, it is reasonable to state that developer/owner interest in redevelopment of underutilized available zoned parcels within the plan area is high. Two projects have already been approved in the subject plan area; another project was not approved due to failure to comply with the amended design guidelines at 233 and 241 B Street. Other higher density redevelopment projects have been approved in the surrounding areas, such as 315 D Street (with two net new units; 22 units per acre), 336 C Street (student living group housing; 25 units per acre), and 337 D Street projects (apartment project; 29 units per acre). There are continued inquiries being made for other parcels within the plan area for higher density redevelopment, including the parcel at 231 3rd Street, that were not included or envisioned in the B and 3rd Streets plan. Staff believes that there will be continued interest in the redevelopment of parcels within the subject plan area with higher densities.

Historical trends

The demand for redevelopment of underutilized available zoned parcels within the subject plan area has been established above. It is anticipated that this demand trend will continue. There have been a total of three formal proposals made since the adoption of the zoning amendment in 2006. Two of the proposals were approved, while one was not due to deviation from the established design guidelines. Staff continues to receive inquiries about potential redevelopment of identified parcels in the plan area and other parcels not identified in the plan area with higher densities ranging from 20 to 46 units per acre.

R-2 Zoned Underutilized Properties

The study area comprises the University Park #2 through #4 subdivisions, and the “Old North” and “Old East” neighborhood areas. The University Park #2-4 subdivisions are approximately bounded by Antioch Drive on the north, Miller Drive on the east, West Eighth Street on the south, and Oak Avenue on the west. “Old North” is generally bounded by Seventh Street on the north, G Street on the east, Fifth Street on the south, and B Street on the west. “Old East” is generally bounded by Yale Drive on the north, L Street on the east, Second Street on the south, and H Street on the west.

Rationale for choosing the study area

The purpose in looking at the R-2 districts is to determine if potential exists for additional residential units. All R-2 zoned properties are permitted to have up to two dwelling units plus accessory dwelling units. In order to make a determination of potential, an R-2 zoned lot must either be vacant or contain only one dwelling unit. The City looked at all of the current R-2 zoned districts for either vacancy or the potential to build another primary dwelling unit. Of all the R-2 districts, the three chosen had the highest rates of R-2 zoned properties with relatively small single-family residential structures on lots with 6,000 square feet lots or greater. Therefore these areas have the greatest potential for additional development under the existing zoning and General Plan land use designation. Other areas reviewed were nearly all in duplex use (that is, fully utilizing their potential under R-2 zoning for two dwelling units per lot). No other factors were considered in selecting the study areas.

Projection

It is important to understand that this study only considers second primary dwelling units and not second ADUs. Because additions in the Old East and Old North R-2 zones require design review approval, any ADUs were included within the primary second unit category.

Under existing zoning and General Plan land use designation there are 296 residential lots within the study area. Of these lots, there are 184 lots that are able to add a second primary unit. Please note that the apartment sites in the Old East neighborhood have been removed from the lots for the purposes of calculating a projection because their development potential is calculated differently from the lots allowing two primary units. Based on this statistic, it follows that a total of 184 units

could potentially be built within existing underutilized R-2 zoned neighborhoods. However, when the financial feasibility, developer and owner interest, and historical trends are taken into consideration, a conservative estimate of about 20 percent of 184 units, or 37 units, are anticipated to be built through 2021. The 184 lots are available zoned parcels ready to be redeveloped at any time.

Basis

Financial feasibility

Second primary dwelling units are a way for owners to gain a second independent unit on their property, usually costing from about \$200,000 to in excess of \$250,000 per unit. Although constructing a second primary dwelling unit is often more affordable than purchasing a second house, it is still a large investment for most households. However, commercial loans today have lower interest rates that have made it more affordable for some developers/homeowners to consider such redevelopment. Developers/homeowners may be motivated to pursue this option today and in the future given the income that can be generated with a second primary dwelling unit from rents. Typically these second units are built as either a duplex or separate units, which are conducive to rental.

Developer/owner interest

Financial feasibility and opportunity indicate that property owners have been able to afford a second primary dwelling unit, but less so than second ADUs. Property owners may determine that preserving open space or adding floor area to the existing primary dwelling unit would be preferable to creating second primary dwelling units. Second primary dwelling units typically occupy existing open space or floor area of the existing primary dwelling unit. The property owner interest in redevelopment depends on various factors that include finance, lower interest rates, existing home configuration on the lot, and interest in an ADU versus another primary second unit. It is anticipated that developer/owner interest will continue in the future.

Historical trends

In the R-2 districts, ADUs are permitted on a lot in addition to a second primary unit. Only the second primary unit, which could be attached or detached, is counted toward meeting RHNA numbers. Of the 184 available and zoned underutilized parcels, 20 percent (i.e., $184 \times .20$) or 37 units are projected for the planning cycle. Also, it is projected that about 35 percent of the units will be rented to moderate-income households because 1) the R-2 districts are within the older parts of the City and close to UC Davis, which means primarily rented to students and/or UC Davis moderate-income households; 2) typically new primary units on the R-2 lots charge higher rents as compared to ADU and apartment units; and 3) second primary units typically vary in sizes and are larger than ADUs and apartments that usually studio and/or one-bedroom units.

The conservative 20 percent projection of the available sites, estimated at one unit per lot, is to address the concern that redevelopment within this sub-area cannot be based solely on historical trends given the unstable economic conditions since the previous Housing Element cycle. However, the recent upward economic trends and the continued lower interest rates support the 20 percent conservative estimate.

R-3 Zoned Underutilized Properties

The study area comprises portions of the Bowers Acres subdivision. The area is bounded mostly by Ninth Street and some of Tenth Street on the north, H Street on the east, mostly Seventh Street and some of Eighth Street on the south and B Street on the west. A map of the area is included in Appendix B.

Rationale for choosing the study area

As in the B and 3rd Streets study area, many of the already developed properties in this area (in addition to some of the other underutilized sites study areas) contain an older single-family home surrounded by apartment buildings. Many of the property owners are interested in developing these underutilized sites with more units at higher densities to take advantage of the demand for multifamily housing in the area related to student demand and the overall desirability of the neighborhood. The City has received many inquiries from property owners in this area about redeveloping their parcels. The purpose in looking at the R-3 districts is to determine if potential exists for additional residential units in R-3 zoned properties. In order to make this determination, an R-3 zoned lot must either be vacant or contain less than three dwelling units, since all R-3 zoned properties are permitted to have three or more dwelling units. The City looked at all of the currently zoned R-3 districts for either vacancy or the potential to build additional dwelling units. Only the subject R-3 area was selected for further study because it had the greatest number of underutilized properties (not multifamily).

Projection

Under existing zoning and General Plan land use designation there are 88 R-3 lots within the study area. Of these R-3 lots, there are 43 lots currently with multifamily uses, 7 lots with office and church uses, 22 with single-family residential use only, and 14 with duplex use. For the purposes of this study, only the 36 lots with single-family and duplex residential uses were evaluated. Given the potential to generate a significant number of units within the area, and the other factors associated with redevelopment of underutilized sites, a conservative estimate of two units per lot is projected to be constructed through 2021. This would result in a minimum of 72 net new units.

Basis*Financial feasibility*

For all of the underutilized properties within the study area, additional units are a way for owners to gain income on their property. The cost of constructing additional units varies from about \$150/square foot to \$200/square foot based upon the number of stories involved, existing site conditions, and size of potential projects. Using this information, an additional 1,000 square foot unit could cost approximately \$150,000 to \$200,000. In cases where a single-family residence exists and sufficient area is available to build two or more additional units, the costs will begin at approximately \$300,000, not including site preparation, demolition, and plan preparation costs. With these costs, the number of investors able to develop lots with these types of opportunity is limited. Commercial loans provided by a private lender may be provided with a higher interest rate than many individual property owners can afford, but these costs can be outweighed by the income that can be generated with additional dwelling units. R-3 lots do not have a specific unit maximum, and development of these lots is only limited by zoning standards and General Plan maximum densities.

As Table 45 shows, in 2013 a low-income household can pay \$1,076.25 for an unfurnished studio, while an average market-rate rent for a studio in Davis is \$871.00. Similarly, in 2013 a low-income household can pay \$1,230.00 for an unfurnished one-bedroom, while an average market-rate rent for an unfurnished one-bedroom is \$998.00. On the basis of the 2013 affordable payments for low-income households, it is reasonable to credit some market-rate units within the R-3 zones to lower-income level. The City conservatively projects 72 units in the R-3 districts, and credits 20 percent or one-fifth of the 72 units, or 14 units, to low-income level through 2021.

TABLE 45: 2013 RENTS FOR LOW- AND VERY LOW-INCOME RENTAL UNITS IN A GARDEN APARTMENT BUILDING (1-5 STORIES)

Income and Unit Size	Household Gross Annual Income ¹	Total Monthly Housing Allowance	Utility Allowance ⁴	Maximum Rent
Low Income Units				
80%-single room occupancy	\$43,050.00 ²	\$807.19	\$59.25	\$747.94
80%-studio	\$43,050.00 ³	\$1,076.25	\$79.00	\$997.25
80%-one bedroom	\$49,200.00 ⁷	\$1,230.00	\$97.00	\$1,133.00

Notes:

The utility allowance included in this chart assumes that the tenant does not pay for water, sewer, or trash and also assumes that a refrigerator and stove range are provided in the apartment unit by the owner. The cooking and water heating appliances are assumed to be powered by natural gas, while the heating is assumed electric.

HCD 2013 Yolo County maximum income for one-person low-income household.

HCD 2013 Yolo County maximum income for two-person low-income household.

The Household Gross Annual Income used for each unit size is based on the occupancy standard of number of bedrooms plus one. For example, for a two-bedroom unit the gross annual income for a family of three is used.

Source: City of Davis

2012 Average Rental Rate Comparison By Type Of Unit (Fair Market Units)

Unit Type	Total # of Units	2012 Average Rent ¹	2011 Average Rent ¹	% Change
Studio unfurnished	180	\$871	\$705	23.55%
Studio furnished	2	\$995	\$699	42.35%
I-Bedroom unfurnished	2,192	\$998	\$946	5.50%
I-Bedroom furnished	5	\$800	\$1,157	-30.86%

General Notes:

- Subsidized apartments, i.e., those which require income eligibility test to qualify low-income residents for reduced rent, were not included in this report.*
- Typically, affordable rental units are not furnished, and telephone, e-mail account, and non-free television utilities are not included.*
- Typically, market-rate rental units do not pay separate utilities, excluding telephone, e-mail account, and paid television utilities.*

Notes:

- This is a weighted average based on the number of units of each type. The apartment complexes with more units contribute more to this figure.*

Source: UC Davis Student Housing 2012, City Of Davis Vacancy And Rental Rate Survey

Developer/owner interest

Financial feasibility, opportunity, and historical trends indicate that property owners have been able to afford expanding the number of dwelling units in this area. Individual property owners may determine that preserving open space or adding floor area to the existing primary dwelling unit are preferable to developing ADUs, which typically occupy existing open space or floor area of the existing primary dwelling unit. It should be noted that within this district, a variety of housing types and other uses exist that may be conducive to the development of increased density. Ultimately, developer/owner interest will be dependent upon the cost to potential income ratios, as well as individual goals and preferences.

Historical trends

Staff established a time period of 7.5 years, from January 2000 to June 2007, to gather historical data for the study area. Staff found that, for the study area, 33 additional dwelling units were constructed within this time frame. This trend is anticipated to continue. However, the City conservatively projects 20 percent or two units per year, which is less than the anticipated four units per year.

Downtown Mixed Use (M-U) and Central Commercial (C-C) districts

This study area is the oldest developed portion of the City. It has small-sized buildings on large lots. The Davis Downtown is also characterized with predominantly single-story buildings in an urban grid with eight east/west and five north/south streets. This area consists of commercial, office and professional and residential buildings. The zoning designations for the downtown are mainly Central Commercial (C-C) and Mixed-use (M-U). The C-C zoning district allows residential densities of 30 units per acre. Appendix A provides additional detail about the existing uses on the sites in these districts. The C-C zoning district has a permitted floor area ratio of 3.0. The M-U zoning district has a permitted floor area ratio of 2.0.

Rationale for choosing the study area

These sites were analyzed to determine how much potential exists for additional residential units in M-U and C-C zoned properties within the City where residential uses are permitted by zoning. Residential units are permitted in one- to two-story buildings and require a conditional use permit for three-plus-story buildings in the C-C zone. The analysis of potential residential units recognizes that the discretionary review for three stories is primarily for design and that virtually all projects with three stories have been approved (including but not limited to McCormick Building, Roe Building, and Parkview Place). A site is considered to have physical potential if it is currently vacant or contains a one-story building. Typical discretionary reviews are conditional use permit and/or design review.

There are 65 sites zoned M-U and C-C with potential for additional residential units. Given the financial feasibility, developer/owner interest, and historical trends, staff has determined that an

estimate of 65 units through 2021 is a reasonable projection in the M-U and C-C districts. Staff's estimate is based on existing zoning and does not include added development potential if additional incentives or changes in zoning were carried out in order to facilitate greater interest in residential development. Also, it is not unusual for developer creativity to result in additional units not anticipated, such as the case with the McCormick and Roe projects.

Basis

Financial feasibility

As stated under R-3 category discussion above, in 2013 a low-income household pays \$1,076.25 for an unfurnished studio, while an average market-rate rent for a studio in Davis is \$871.00. Similarly, in 2013 a low-income household pays \$1,230.00 for an unfurnished one-bedroom, while an average market-rate rent for an unfurnished one-bedroom is \$998.00. On the basis of the affordable housing rental charges for units, it is reasonable to credit some market-rate units within the Downtown to lower-income level. The City conservatively projects 65 units in the Downtown area, and credited approximately 15 percent (10 units) of the 65 units to low-income level through 2021. The decision to choose 15 percent instead of 20 percent as used in R-3 zones is because typically higher rents are charged in the Downtown as compared to the R-3 zones.

Developer/owner interest

The demand for housing in Davis Downtown by a diversity of residents further assures redevelopment investors within this area of a reliable return on their investment. Continued lower interest rates have contributed to the housing demand. The developer/owner interest to redevelop depends on various factors that include finance, lower interest rates, existing configuration of building on the lot, and interest in first floor uses envisioned. It is anticipated that the developer/owner interest will continue in the future.

Historical trends

As attested by the recent projects—McCormick Building, Roe Building, and Parkview Place—there is a demand to redevelop underutilized sites in the downtown area. Staff continues to receive inquiries regarding redevelopment of some of the sites identified herein, and others not identified. While the downturn in the economy might have played a role in delaying additional redevelopment with the recent past, it is anticipated that the trend will pick up again with the improving economy and continued lower interest rates.

Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) districts

This study area focused upon five sites in the C-N district with potential for additional residential units. These sites were analyzed to determine how much potential exists for residential units in C-N zoned properties within the City where residential uses are permitted by zoning. A site is considered to have physical potential if additional floor area ratio is permissible per the General Plan. The other C-N and similarly zoned sites do not permit residential units by right, and were not factored into this computation. In order to determine the maximum potential for residential units, the existing

floor area ratio (FAR) was determined by comparing floor area of the existing buildings on a given Commercial Neighborhood zoned center against the square footage of the property. The maximum permitted floor area ratio of 65% (FAR) for mixed use development is applied to determine how much additional floor area can be constructed upon the site. In each case, it is assumed that the only additional floor area added to the site would be for residential use. For the projection, it is assumed that the average residential dwelling unit will be approximately 1,000 square feet with two bedrooms. Standard assumptions are made to account for the space needed for the parking and open space required for each unit, based upon existing city standards.

Under existing zoning, buildings with up to three stories are permitted within the Commercial Neighborhood zones. Most of the existing buildings on the sites are single-story. There are no density caps on residential units. However, there are limitations in the amount of dwelling units permissible in each Commercial Neighborhood center as established either by the site's zoning or designation in the General Plan. The description of each site in Appendix A provides those residential limitations. Using the current zoning standards, residential limitations, and assumptions for space needed for parking and open space, the existing maximum capacity for shopping centers that currently allow residential units is a range of 173–231 dwelling units.

Of the 231 units available on these five sites for redevelopment, approximately 20 percent are anticipated to be developed through 2021. This conservative estimate is based on the fact that City policies favor densification and infill developments. Given inquiries received by staff and continued demand for housing in the City, it is anticipated that developer/owner interest will result in actual redevelopment of some of the sites during this planning cycle. While it is very likely that some of the anticipated units could be at the low-income rental level, they are projected to be at moderate-income level. This is because it is anticipated that the housing types, based on inquiries, could be live-work housing types.

Capacity Assumptions Used:

Residential units average 1,000 square feet and two bedrooms. Parking (350 sf) and open space (250 sf) require an additional 600 square feet of area per unit on the lot.

Actual residential development could vary depending on whether units are built to the maximum potential FAR for a given site, or if the residential projects are built to occupy the maximum floor area permitted with the existing commercial floor space. The amount of FAR permitted in residential varies between sites, but is generally limited to 49% of the total floor area on the site with the exception of University Mall and Westlake Plaza, which have differing limits to the amount of residential that can be built. University Mall has a Community Retail land use designation in the General Plan and is limited to 15% of the 65% FAR permitted for mixed use on the site. Westlake Plaza is limited to a maximum of twelve dwelling units by zoning.

Given that these five sites are zoned to accommodate the residential units, it is reasonable to anticipate that at a minimum 15% of the potential units could be provided within the next eight years.

Basis

Financial feasibility

Construction costs have increased in recent years and in most projects exceed \$200 per square foot. This will be true also of Commercial Neighborhood centers because 1) there is great demand for housing in the city; 2) the sites are located where neighborhood retail and services are readily available; and 3) the sites are on transit routes and in close proximity to UC Davis. These factors are attractive to property owners and investors, and are great reasons for financial institutions to lend to the redevelopment of the centers.

Developer/owner interest

As stated above, there is market demand and locational advantages to prompt developer/owner interest in redevelop these sites. Staff continues to receive inquiries about the prospect of redeveloping these centers with varying types of residential units, which leads to the belief that developer/owner interest, will result in actual redevelopment of some of the sites during this planning cycle. While it is very likely that some of the anticipated units could be at the low-income rental level, they are projected to be at moderate-income level. This is because it is anticipated that the housing types, based on inquiries, could be live-work housing types.

Historical trends

There is no direct historical data from which to draw. This type of development is considered a mixed use product. While there is nothing at this time to draw from to establish a trend, it is reasonable to rely on the conservative estimate and the factors influencing housing development in the City, such as the underutilized nature of the sites (mostly single-story structures) high housing demand, the improving real estate market, and the location of the sites relative to retail, services, transit routes, and UC Davis. These factors lend support to the belief that these sites would see some redevelopment during the next eight years.

Suitability and Availability of Sites for Housing

The sites included in Table 41 are already designated for residential uses by zoning. None of the sites listed in the table have environmental or infrastructure constraints that are likely to hold up residential development of the property. All of the sites have been determined to be developable, as demonstrated by either a submitted and in process planning application, existing approval of necessary entitlements, or staff on-site field review. Sites available for affordable housing and those required to provide affordable housing are shown in Table 41 based on the income levels met by the housing units to be developed. Units in very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories are counted based on City inclusionary housing requirements, affordable housing developments on land

dedication sites restricted to affordable units, and other projects that provide densities of greater than 30 units per acre, as noted. Most rental housing units are counted as moderate-income housing units. Some rental units in the R-3 and Davis Downtown are counted as lower-income units. Units with specific affordability restrictions, such as those based on the inherent affordability provided through rental housing opportunities, also counted as lower-income units.

Staff mailed surveys to owners of 131 single-family properties with approval (zoning or building permit) for accessory dwelling units. Staff received responses covering 52 ADUs. Of the 52, 24 ADUs are rented and an additional eight are occupied by someone as a primary residence. Rented units included 17 studios (five at very-low-income rents and all the others within low-income levels). Five rented one-bedroom units included three at low-income rent levels. Two rented two-bedroom units included one at low-income rent levels. Responses to the question on occupancy of the ADU included working adults, graduate students, and family members. Three of the ADUs were rented to retired individuals. Property owners seeking approvals for ADUs cited various reasons for the desired construction, including accommodation of parents or adult children, rental properties, or caretaker housing. Those units that are rented can be assumed to be in the low-income category or lower based on the survey. The City acknowledges that not all ADUs will be rented. This is the basis for only estimating that 65 percent of anticipated future citywide ADUs will be rented. Therefore, 26 of the 40 projected ADUs have been assigned to the low-income category and half have been projected as moderate income.

Other Steps to Identify Potential Housing Sites

The City has reviewed other potential housing sites. None of these potential housing sites are needed for the City to meet its RHNA. For the sake of the Housing Element, these sites are a source of alternative residential opportunity sites. The sites are grouped into three groups: those ripe for development (“Green Light” sites), those to be considered as needed (“Yellow Light” sites), and those that are not needed in the foreseeable future (“Red Light” sites). Applications for all projects in the “Green Light” group sites would be processed as submitted and permits would be released on a first-come, first-served basis of approved projects within the “Green Light” list. Table 46 below lists the “Yellow Light” and “Red Light” sites as well as the “Green Light” sites. Site locations are shown in Figure 1 below.

TABLE 46
ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL OPPORTUNITY SITES – NOT NEEDED FOR RHNA
2013-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT

Map Key	Rank	Site Description	Recommended General Plan Land Use Overall Density	Existing Zoning Designation	Development Potential
SECONDARY SITES – Additional Sites Recommended For Housing (“Green Light”)					
1	Green	DJUSD Headquarters, B Street	Residential High	R-2CD, Two-Family Residential with conservation overlay district	Underutilized ; 40-60 units
2	Green	Kennedy Place	Residential Medium	PD 11-82, Office	Vacant : 7-16 units
3	Green	Nugget Fields, Wildhorse	Residential Medium	PD 3-89, Elementary School	Underutilized; 110-118 units
4	Green	Sweet Briar Drive	Residential High	PD 14-80, Central Commercial	Vacant; 16 units
5	Green	Second Units- Increases With Program Changes Re: Discretionary Units	Residential Low	Single-Family Residential	Underutilized; 24 units
6	Green	Downtown – Increases With Plan / Zoning Changes	Core Area Specific Plan	Central Commercial, Mixed Use & Res	Underutilized; 0 units
7	Green	PG& E Service Center, Fifth and L St.- Mixed Uses	Residential High	I, Industrial	Underutilized; 277-495 units
8	Green	Transit Corridor – Anderson Road	Residential High	Single-Family & Two Family Residential	Underutilized; 23 units
9	Green	City / DJUSD Corp Yards, E. Fifth Street	Residential Medium	C-S, Commercial Service	Underutilized; 80-160 units
10	Green	RHD Zone, Oxford Circle (net increase)	Residential Higher	R-H-D, Residential High Density	Underutilized; 16-32 units



SITE INVENTORY AND LOCAL RESOURCES TO ADDRESS HOUSING NEEDS

Map Key	Rank	Site Description	Recommended General Plan Land Use Overall Density	Existing Zoning Designation	Development Potential
11	Green	Fifth Ave Place (net increase)	Residential High	PD R-2, Two-Family Residential	Underutilized; 4-16 units
12	Green	Willowbank Church, Mace Blvd.	Residential Medium	PD 4-92, Public/Semi Public	Vacant; 22-50 units
13	Green	Civic Center Fields, B Street	Residential Medium	R-1-6, Single-Family Residential	Vacant; 56-60 units
14	Green	Willow Creek, Commercial Neighborhood	Residential Medium	PD 6-87, Neighborhood Retail	Vacant; 24-47 units
15	Green	Nishi Property - Option With Access Via UCD Only	Residential Higher	A-1, Agriculture (Yolo County)	Vacant; 460-1,000 units
16	Green	Neighborhood Shopping Center – Increases With Plan / Zoning Changes	Neighborhood Retail	Neighborhood Retail	Underutilized; 0 units

Map Key and Rank	Site Description	Recommended General Plan Land Use Overall Density	Existing Zoning Designation	Existing Improvements/ Development Potential
------------------	------------------	---	-----------------------------	--

ALTERNATE SITES – To Be Considered Only If Needed (“Yellow Light” Sites)

17	Wildhorse Horse Ranch	Residential Medium	PD 3-89, Horse Ranch (Underutilized
18	Willowbank Church, NW Corner Mace Boulevard and Montgomery Avenue	Residential Medium	PD 4-92, Public/Semi-public	Vacant
19	Ott, Cowell Boulevard (includes SE parcel and part of NW parcel)	Residential Medium (SE) & Residential High (NW)	PD 12-87, Commercial Mixed Use (NW) & PD 7-95, Office, Light Industrial, Research and Commercial Service (SE)	Vacant


Map Key and Rank	Site Description	Recommended General Plan Land Use Overall Density	Existing Zoning Designation	Existing Improvements/ Development Potential
20	Signature Properties Site	Residential Medium	AP, Agricultural Preserve (Yolo County)	Vacant
21	NE Corner of Mace and Cowell Boulevards	Com. Retail / Mixed Use	AC, Auto Center	Vacant
22	Nishi Property Option With Access Via Olive Dr. Only	Residential Higher	A-1, Agriculture (Yolo County)	Vacant
23	Little League Fields, F Street	Residential High	R-1-6, Single Family Residential	Underutilized
24	Willow Creek Light Industrial, Chiles Road (south half of site only)	Residential Medium	PD 6-87, Office-Research	Vacant
25	Covell Village Site	Residential Medium	ML, Limited Industrial (Yolo County)	Agriculture
26	Seiber, Cowell Boulevard (south half of site only)	Residential Medium	PD 12-87, Industrial Research	Vacant
SITES NOT NEEDED (“Red Light” Sites)				
27	Parlin - With On-Site Ag Mitigation	Residential Medium	A-1, Agriculture (Yolo County)	Vacant
28	Lin Boschken - With On-site Ag Mitigation	Residential Medium	A-1, Agriculture (Yolo County) and AP, Agricultural Preserve (Yolo County)	Agriculture
29	West of Stonegate - With On-site Ag Mitigation	Residential Medium	A-1, Agriculture (Yolo County) and AP, Agricultural Preserve (Yolo County)	Agriculture
30	Oeste Ranch - With On-site Ag Mitigation	Residential Medium	AP, Agricultural Preserve (Yolo County)	Agriculture

Source: City of Davis, 2013.

**Note: The Grande School Site and Verona at Mace Ranch (map key #3 and #7) were removed from the above list because they were recently granted approvals for residential development consistent with previously provided Regional Housing Needs Assessment information.*

1. *The recommended General Plan land use overall density categories correspond with the following housing unit types:
Residential Low – This density supports developments with single-family units on lots within more of a traditional subdivision. The corresponding residential district (as listed in Section 5 Governmental Constraints), are R-1 and R-R.
Residential Medium – This density supports developments with single-family units as well as duplex, single-family attached, mobile home, small cottage condominium projects, and some low-rise apartments. The corresponding residential districts (as listed in Section 5 Governmental Constraints) are R-2, R2-MH, R-3, and M-U.
Residential High – This density primarily supports developments with high-rise apartment buildings or condominium units. The corresponding residential district (as listed in Section 5 Governmental Constraints), are R-3, R-HD, R-C, C-C and M-U.*
2. *A subdivision is where an existing lot or parcel can be divided into two or more residential lots or parcels. Based solely on the size of each site and the unit density that each site can accommodate, and without relation to ranking, Sites 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18/28, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, and 33-36 could accommodate a subdivision.*

FIGURE 1



Housing Opportunity Sites.mxd

City Infrastructure Resources

The City has adequate infrastructure capacity for the development of the 1,066 units to meet the City's RHNA, and furthermore has capacity for the 2,300 total units allowed by the City's 1 percent housing needs policy. In making an assessment of City capacity, the following resources were considered:

- Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity
- Sanitary Sewer System
- Stormwater Sewer System
- City Water System
- Transportation System
- Fire Protection
- Police Protection

Although large projects not needed for the City's RHNA would require additional analysis and potential mitigation measures related to such things as street capacity/traffic impacts, sewer line connections, and other site-specific review items, overall capacity exists for the total number of housing units that could be developed during the current planning period.

Other Local Resources Available to Address Housing Needs

In addition to the sites and categories described above, the City has both financial and land resources available for affordable housing production and general housing incentives.

Financial Resources

Details related to the majority of local housing resources are described in Section 3.7: Affordable Housing Units At-Risk.

5.0 GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

The analysis of constraints on housing is an important part of the Housing Element. The Housing Element is required by state law to include an analysis of governmental and nongovernmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement or development of housing for all income levels and for persons with disabilities, including the availability of financing, the price of land, the cost of construction and other nongovernmental constraints. The law also requires that the analysis demonstrate local efforts to remove governmental constraints that hinder the necessary level of housing development within the jurisdiction.

This section of the Housing Element looks at constraints to housing availability and affordability. The constraints on housing are divided into two parts: governmental and nongovernmental. The governmental constraints are policies, standards, requirements or actions imposed by the various levels of government upon land and housing ownership and development. The roles of federal and state agencies relative to governmental constraints are beyond the influence of local governments and are therefore not addressed in this document.

The analysis of governmental constraints in this document refers to the policies and regulations that the city applies to the approval of land use proposals. Growth management policies that may be constraints to housing, such as Measure J and the Phased Allocation Program, are discussed in detail. The governmental constraints analysis also looks at city regulations and development practices, such as permitted residential densities, the inclusionary ordinance, the building code, fees and exactions, development processing fees and development standards to determine their potential impacts on housing availability and affordability. While these regulations were adopted to protect community character, to ensure provision of affordable units, and to fund necessary community services, some may affect housing availability or affordability. Potential effects of local policies are examined further in this section. The analysis in this section includes:

5.0 Governmental Constraints

- A. On Housing Production: Land Use Controls, Codes and Enforcement, On/Off-site Improvements, Fees and Exactions, Processing and Permit Procedures
- B. On Persons with Disabilities: Reasonable Accommodation, Building Code, and Land Use Requirements
- C. Efforts to Remove and Reduce Government and Non-governmental Constraints

5.1 Non-Governmental Constraints On Housing Production: Construction Financing, Price of Land, Cost of Construction

With the analysis of these governmental and non-governmental constraints, the City has determined that none of these constraints will have impact on the City's ability to fulfill its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the current planning period. All of the sites necessary to comply with the City's RHNA are currently available for development. Therefore, while it is necessary for the City to assess and consider potential constraints on local housing production, these constraints will not interfere with Davis's RHNA compliance. The City continues its efforts to balance the principles stated in Section 1 in the development of all new housing units with its intent to accommodate necessary housing production to meet local needs.

5.0 A. Governmental Constraints On Housing Production: Land Use Controls, Codes and Enforcement, On/Off-site Improvements, Fees and Exactions, Processing and Permit Procedures

Land Use Controls

The primary land use controls related to housing development in the City are discussed below. They include: General Plan, Specific Plan, Zoning Ordinance, parking standards, Planned Development zoning, Measure J, Phased Allocation, the City's 1% Growth Policy, the Affordable Housing Ordinance, the Middle Income Ordinance, and the Visitability/Accessibility Policy.

General Plan and Density Bonus

General Plan Land Use Element policies set forth densities for a mix of all types of housing, including single-family, mobile homes, split-lots, and multifamily units. The General Plan establishes residential density ranges that, together with limits on land to be developed, define the number of housing units to be added. Projects gain credit for additional units, or density bonuses, when they either build affordable or elderly housing units or dedicate land as a provision of affordable housing units. Density bonuses are provided by allowing one additional market rate unit for each affordable or elderly unit provided on-site or through affordable land dedication by the project. With the City's twenty-five to thirty-five percent affordable housing requirement, the permitted density of a project can increase substantially through the use of a project's density bonus. An elderly housing project can gain even greater amounts of density bonus if the project is entirely dedicated to elderly housing. The city density bonus results in a higher possible density than the use of the state's density bonus standards. The city's program provides a one-to-one bonus, increasing the total allowed market-rate units and effectively lowering the required inclusionary units for that particular development. With the one-to-one density bonus, bonuses effectively go up to the thirty-five percent through the rental housing inclusionary requirement, consistent with state law. This is appropriate, as this is the type of housing that would provide the very low and extremely low income housing units that qualify for a thirty-five percent density bonus under state law. Table 47 shows the standard density ranges for low, medium and high density area.

TABLE 47: GENERAL PLAN RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES WITH DENSITY BONUS

Density	Unit	General Plan Densities	General Plan Densities with Bonus (a)
Low Density	Units per Gross Acre	2.40-4.79	3.00-5.99
	Unit per Net Acre (b)	2.88-5.75	3.60-7.19
Medium Density	Units per Gross Acre	4.80-11.20	6.00-13.99
	Unit per Net Acre (b)	5.76-13.44	7.20-16.79
High Density	Units per Gross Acre	11.21-20.00	14.00-25.00
	Unit per Net Acre (b)	13.45-24.00	16.80-30.00
Neighborhood Mixed Use	Units per Gross Acre	Per FAR	Allowed bonus based on amount of units allowed per FAR
	Units per Net acre (b)	Per FAR	Allowed bonus based on amount of units allowed per FAR

Notes:

(a) Assumed to be 125% of normal general plan density

(b) Assumed to be 120% of gross density

The highest density permitted by the General Plan is 30 units per net acre with density bonus. Even with the 30 units per net acre density, the city encourages high quality residential construction throughout, including in the Core Area. The City's Affordable Housing Ordinance (Municipal Code Article 18.05) specifies requirements for inclusionary housing in ownership and rental developments including density bonuses for provision of very low and low-income units. The City proposes Program Action 56, Objective a. to update the density bonus ordinance to comply with Government Code Section 65915.

In keeping with General Plan policies regarding the protection of open spaces, particularly agricultural properties, and in accordance with smart growth principles used for the region's Blueprint project through SACOG, the City continues to promote appropriate densities that maximum opportunity for unit development and utilization of properties within the City while accounting for surrounding neighborhood character and sensitivity. During the previous planning period of 2006 to 2013 and so far in the current planning period, the City has seen increased project densities in both single family and multi-family types of development. Nearly all approved or under construction single family developments consist of medium densities in the range of 6 to 13 units per net acre (examples are Verona, Willowbank Park, and Chiles Ranch) compared to the low densities of 5 to 6 units per net acre in earlier planning periods. Approved or under construction multi-family developments are all at the upper end of the higher density range, that is 30 units per net acre (examples are Parkview at 444 Fourth Street, The Cannery, and Mission Residences).

With the trends toward increased efficiency of land and energy, the City expects that it will continue to receive and to support applications for projects at these increased densities. The City finds that these land use and density policies do not hinder the production of housing.

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan is used to further define the parameters of development within an area. The plan is always consistent with the General Plan. There are three Specific Plans in the city. They are South Davis Specific Plan, Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan and Core Area Specific Plan. These plans establish standards for development within the plan areas. The plans allow residential densities consistent with the General Plan, therefore, are not an impediment to availability and affordability of housing.

Zoning Ordinance

Zoning regulations control development by establishing requirements related to height, density, lot area, yard setbacks and minimum parking spaces. Site development standards are comparable to other community requirements and are necessary to ensure a quality living environment for all households and to protect the City's historic and natural resources. The residential districts in Davis are:

- Residential One-Family District (R-1) – principally permitting single-family dwellings among others. The minimum lot area ranges from 6,000 to 15,000 square feet.
- Residential One and Two Family District (R-2) – principally permitting up to two single-family dwellings per lot, or a duplex. The minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet. The maximum height is two stories or thirty feet, and maximum lot coverage is forty percent.
- Residential One and Two Family Conservation District (R2-CD) – principally permitting up to two single-family dwellings per lot, or a duplex. The minimum lot area ranges from 5,250 to 5,625 square feet, based on the historical characteristics of the neighborhood. This zoning is used in both the Old North and Old East traditional neighborhoods in Davis.
- Core Area Residential Infill District (C-I) – principally permitting single-family dwellings, a duplex, or two-family dwellings. The minimum lot area is 5,500 square feet.
- Residential Restricted District (R-R) -- principally permitting single-family. The minimum lot area is 8,800 square feet.
- Residential One and Two-family and Mobile Home District (R2-MH) - principally permitting single-family dwellings, a duplex, or two-family dwellings. No minimum lot area is prescribed.

- Single family zoning in the City typically allows for a maximum of thirty feet or two stories in height for the primary structure, limits lot coverage to forty percent, and has minimum setbacks of 20 feet for the front yard, 20 feet for the rear yard (25 feet for second story portions), and varying side setbacks that total 12 feet with minimum side setbacks of 3 to 5 feet (10 feet per side for second story portions). Street side yards require a fifteen foot setback. Adjustments are made in zoning based on the character of varying residential neighborhoods, including historic neighborhoods or those with larger lots. Based on the history of development of single family housing types affordable to low- and moderate-income households as demonstrated in Section 4, these standards do not have a negative impact on the development of housing for lower-income households. Examples of projects that developed without the City providing flexibility in development standards are the Cesar Chavez and Cantrill Dr. Senior Housing Projects. Both of these are affordable multi-family projects; Cesar Chavez had a maximum density of 20 units per acre prior to the application of the density bonus, which allowed it to develop at a density of 24.66 dwelling units per acre and Cantrill Senior Housing was designated at 24 dwelling units per acres but developed at 25.97 dwelling units per acre. Each were developed within the City's established development standards and without any waivers or exceptions to achieves these densities. Residential Garden Apartment District (R-3) -- principally permitting single-family dwellings, duplexes, or multiple dwellings. The minimum lot area is 7,500 square feet.
- Residential High Density Apartment District (R-HD) -- principally permitting single-family dwellings, duplexes, or multiple dwellings. The minimum lot area is 7,500 square feet.
- Residential Transitional (R-T)- The purpose of a residential transitional (R-T) district is to provide areas which will tend to separate intense commercial development from residential development. These areas are intended to contain uses which are not detrimental to other uses in the district nor to the uses in areas they separate.
- Interim Residential Conversion (R-C) - To implement policies of core area plan; to preserve and enhance the tree-shaded ambience, and older architectural styles found in the near downtown; to provide for use and retention of existing residences as dwellings or commercial ventures, or both combined; to encourage intermingling or combining of residential and commercial activities; to insure that new construction or substantial remodeling be in harmony with surrounding structures and streetscape character; to provide sufficient flexibility to encourage creative solutions in the reuse of older structures and the utilization of contemporary design in a setting of older structures.
- Central Commercial (C-C)-The purposes of the central commercial district are as follows: To implement the core area plan; to provide for an increased variety and density of commercial activities; to preserve older architectural styles where feasible, and to encourage a harmonious intermingling of other structures; to permit residential uses where feasible; to

promote pedestrian use and enjoyment of the core; to provide an area of intensive commercial activity.

- Mixed Use (M-U)- The purposes of the mixed use (M-U) district are as follows: To implement the policies of the core area plan; to preserve the older architectural styles, and to encourage a harmonious intermingling of other structures; to provide for an increased variety and intermixture of residential and commercial activities; to enhance the tree-shaded ambience, the pedestrian usage and character of the district.

Multi-family zoning in the City typically allows for a maximum of three stories or thirty-eight feet, limits lot coverage to forty percent, and has minimum setbacks of twenty to twenty-five feet for the front, twenty to twenty-five in the rear, and six to twelve minimum side yards with a total of eighteen to thirty feet. The variations in setback are based on whether the building is two or three stories. Street side yards require a fifteen foot setback. These setback requirements and height and lot coverage restrictions are significantly reduced in the High Density District, but that zoning only exists in one neighborhood of the City and is not treated as standard multi-family zoning. Standards can be modified with planned development zoning, often used in the City. Examples of projects that developed without the City providing flexibility in development standards are the Cesar Chavez and Cantrill Dr. Senior Housing Projects. Both of these are affordable multi-family projects; Cesar Chavez had a maximum density of 20 units per acre prior to the application of the density bonus, which allowed it to develop at a density of 24.66 dwelling units per acre and Cantrill Senior Housing was designated at 24 dwelling units per acres but developed at 25.97 dwelling units per acre. Each were developed within the City's established development standards and without any waivers or exceptions to achieve these densities.

- Residential Planned Development Districts -- the city has a significant portion of its residential districts zoned as planned developments. This allows for deviations from the standards of conventional residential districts listed above. In planned development (P-D) districts, the minimum lot areas are often reduced from the minimum of the conventional district. In some city subdivisions with P-D zoning, lot sizes range from 3,500 to 15,000 square feet. Also, other zoning standards, such as building height, yard setbacks, lot width, open space, and parking requirements are reduced. The P-D district promotes and encourages innovative design, variety and flexibility in housing types that would not otherwise be allowed in conventional districts. It ensures the provision of open space as part of an overall development and provides a greater diversity in housing choices and standards based on the actual context of a project. The densities of P-D districts are required to be consistent with the General Plan.

Parking Standards

Parking standards vary by the number of bedrooms in the unit for both single-family and multifamily developments. The city has historically used planned development zoning to reduce the

required parking for some projects or allow parking to be provided for within landscape reserves. The parking requirements of the city do not hinder the availability and affordability of housing. Often affordable multifamily projects have received parking requirement reductions. Examples of affordable housing multifamily projects with parking reductions or modified requirements include Homestead (2610 Grambling Court), Twin Pines (3333 F Street), Owendale (3023 Albany Avenue), Pacifico (1752 Drew Circle), Windmere I/II (3030-3100 Fifth Street), Moore Village (2444 Moore Boulevard), Cesar Chavez (1220 Olive Drive) and Tremont Green (5663 Marden Street) developments.

The multifamily conventional parking standards are as follows:

Studio Unit	1.00 space per unit
One Bedroom Unit	1.00 space per unit
Two-Bedroom Unit	1.75 space per unit
Three Bedroom or more Unit	2.00 space per unit

In general, the parking requirements under this standard do not provide adequate parking to meet current vehicle ownership standards. Instead of a typical vehicle ownership of one to two cars per household, there tend to be one vehicle per tenant in the many all-student households that occupy a majority of market rate rental housing units in Davis. The City has required alternative transportation plans in order to address this need. Additional planning has included increased bike parking and shared bicycles, proximity to and promotion of bus options, and apartment parking permit requirements.

Provision for a Variety of Housing Types

The City of Davis Zoning Ordinance, consistent with the General Plan, has provisions for a variety of residential use types by zoning districts. On June 25, 2013, the City of Davis City Council adopted Ordinance 2413, which defined emergency shelter, single-room occupancy (SRO) units, transitional and supportive housing, and allowed these uses in the applicable zoning districts. The adopted ordinance: 1) recognizes “transitional housing” and “supportive housing” as “residential uses” and treats them the same as other similar residential uses of the same type within the same zone; 2) identifies a zone or zones that allows emergency shelter as a permitted use and SROs as either as a permitted use or conditionally permitted use; and 3) defines emergency shelter, single-room occupancy (SRO) units, transitional and supportive housing. The purpose of the ordinance is to comply with California Senate Bill 2 that became effective January 1, 2008 and Assembly Bill 2634, effective January 1, 2007 which were addressed in the City’s 2006-2013 Housing Element Implementation Program. The uses addressed by the adopted ordinance are shown in Tables 48A and 48B below.

TABLE 48A: PROVISIONS FOR A VARIETY OF RESIDENTIAL USE TYPES BY ZONES

Residential Use Types	Zoning District							
	A	I	R-1	R-2	R2-CD	C-I	R-R	R-2-MH
Ranch/Farm dwellings	PU							
Single family dwelling			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Group care home (<6 persons)			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Group care home (>6 persons)				CU	CU	CU	CU	CU
Secondary dwelling units			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Two single family dwellings ¹				PU	PU	PU		PU
Duplex				PU	PU	PU	CU	PU
Multiple dwellings				CU	CU	CU		
Cooperative housing*							CU	
Mobilehome park								CU
Boarding house								
Emergency Shelter		PU ² /CU ³	CU	CU	CU	PU ² /CU ³	CU	CU
Transitional Housing			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Supportive Housing*			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Single room occupancy*						CU	CU	
Factory-Built Housing/Mobile home*			PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Farmworker housing*								

¹ Refers to lots which allow two detached single family homes

² 35 or fewer beds

³ More than 35 beds

“PU” refers to Permitted Uses and “CU” refers to Conditional Uses

*These categories of housing are processed based on the type of units being proposed (single-family, multi-family, etc.). The unit type is what determines zoning that these categories could be provided within.

**TABLE 48B: PROVISIONS FOR A
VARIETY OF RESIDENTIAL USE TYPES BY ZONES**

Residential Use Type	Zoning District					
	R-3	R-HD	R-T	RC	C-C	M-U
Ranch/Farm dwellings						
Single family dwelling	PU	PU		PU		PU
Group care home (<6 persons)	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Group care home (>6 persons)	CU	CU	CU	CU	CU	CU
Secondary dwelling units	PU	PU		PU	PU	PU
Two single family dwellings ¹						
Duplex	PU	PU		PU		PU
Multiple dwellings	PU	PU		PU		PU
Cooperative housing*	PU	PU	PU	PU		
Mobilehome park						
Boarding house	CU	PU		PU		
Emergency Shelter	CU	CU	CU	CU	CU	
Transitional Housing		PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Supportive Housing*		PU	PU	PU	PU	PU
Single room occupancy*		CU	CU	CU	CU	CU
Factory-Built Housing/Mobile home*						
Farmworker housing*						

¹ Refers to lots which allow two detached single family homes

"PU" refers to Permitted Uses and "CU" refers to Conditional Uses

*These categories of housing are processed based on the type of units being proposed (single-family, multi-family, etc.). The unit type is what determines zoning that these categories could be provided within.

Emergency Shelters: As discussed in Section 3, the homeless count method includes persons in transitional housing and shelters at the time of the survey so the actual count of unsheltered homeless persons was 33 persons. The existing Fifth Street shelter has capacity for 10 persons and a local interfaith rotating shelter has capacity for 25 persons or greater at some shelter locations. The City also contributes to a Countywide Homeless Coordination contract that includes a subcontract for cold weather shelter at Third and Hope (formerly the Yolo Wayfarer Center). Third and Hope provides an additional 73 beds to homeless individuals throughout the county.

Emergency shelters with 35 beds or fewer are allowed by right in the Core Area Infill (C-I) and Industrial (I) districts. Emergency shelters with more than 35 beds are conditionally allowed in the C-I and I districts. All emergency shelters are required to comply with the performance standards found in Zoning Ordinance Article 40.24. The review and approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) takes from four to eight weeks. Requests for CUPs by shelters are not treated any differently from other CUP applications processed. The process involves the filing of a complete application, the staff review and report writing for the Planning Commission review, and determination on the application. Decisions of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council. Thus far, CUPs for current and former locations of the Davis Community Meals shelter were approved in the Core Residential Infill, Mixed Use, and Residential Garden Apartments zoning districts.

Additionally, the City processed temporary use permits the past five cold weather seasons for a cold weather shelter that rotates amongst local churches located within a variety of zoning districts. And in 2012, the City processed a conditional use permit for the rotating shelter that allows for shelter of 25 to 50 persons, depending on location, during cold weather months. Approval of this conditional use permit results in the Interfaith Rotating Winter Shelter no longer needing annual city planning approval prior to opening.

Lastly, the City has existing conditional use permits on two shelters within residential districts that have been in place for more than fifteen years. CUPs within the City are valid for as long as the use is in place and for up to six months after it vacates a site, if assumed by another user.

The city has approved all of the conditional use permit applications submitted for emergency shelters. Conditions of approval placed on the use permits have required neighborhood notice of changes in operations and policies to reduce loitering and inappropriate behavior within the neighborhood, and measures to ensure that the premises are well maintained.

The typical conditions of approval that the City places on most CUP applications include the following:

- Obtaining building permit prior to occupancy.
- Ensuring that the developed project is in substantial compliance with the approved plans.
- Determining the use will not constitute a nuisance and be detrimental to adjacent properties.

- Other site/project-specific conditions may apply to address issues raised due to the project, such as adequate on-site parking, open space, and landscaping being provided.

All CUP applications are reviewed subject to the standard of the city Zoning Ordinance, which states:

40.30.030 Considerations in issuing. In considering an application for a conditional use or nonconforming use, the planning commission or city council shall give due regard to the nature and condition of the proposed or existing use and all adjacent uses and structures. The planning commission or city council may deny an application for a conditional use. In authorizing a conditional use, the planning commission or city council may impose such requirements and conditions with respect to location, construction, maintenance and operation, in addition to those expressly stipulated in this chapter for the particular use, as the planning commission or city council may deem necessary for the protection of adjacent properties and the public interest.

40.30.080 Issuance.

(a) The planning commission or city council shall issue a conditional use permit provided the planning commission or city council is satisfied that the proposed structure or use conforms to the requirements and intent of this chapter and the city master plan, that any additional conditions and requirements stipulated by the planning commission or city council have been or will be met, and that such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community.

(b) The planning and building director shall ensure that the development and use is undertaken and completed in compliance with such permit.

Vacant and Underutilized Industrial Properties. There is over 75 acres of vacant and underutilized space that could be utilized through the Industrial zoning change to permit emergency shelter. Most likely, a smaller parcel could accommodate emergency shelter needs. With smaller parcels ranging from 0.80 acres to 1.02 acres, buildable space would result in being about 0.60 to 0.82 acres or approximately 26,000 to 35,000 building square feet that could be developed. The buildable square footage could be doubled or tripled by adding a second and/or third story.

According to a local shelter provider, Davis Community Meals, four beds are typically provided within approximately 120 square feet of bedroom space. Based on this information, staff has determined that adequate space for one shelter bed is approximately 30 square feet, with some additional space needed for common areas. In a 26,000 square foot building, there is ample space to address the 2013 identified 23 bed-gap in local shelter needs, which would require approximately 1,050 square feet. There would be more than enough space for these beds and necessary common areas. Thus, even the smaller sites within the Industrial zoning district demonstrate adequate space in which an emergency shelter could be built if needed. With this capacity in the zoning district, the

emergency beds and transitional units already provided in the City, and the City's participation in the countywide contract with the Fourth and Hope (formerly the Yolo Wayfarer Center) in Woodland for its provision of emergency shelter on a countywide basis, ability to address local shelter housing needs is demonstrated.

Transitional Housing: Transitional housing is a residential use, permitted in all zones allowing residential uses, subject to the same development standards of the residential districts.

Davis Community Meals currently has fifteen transitional housing units in single-family and multifamily zoned areas. The majority were allowed by right with no city planning review, aside from the main shelter and resource center that combines transitional and emergency housing with a semi-public office use. This conditional use permit was processed and approved in the early 1990s and remains in place as long as the use is present and/or if it was assumed within six months of being vacated.

In recent cold weather seasons, the City also received a temporary use permit application for an interfaith rotating shelter group consisting of six host congregations and a seventh site for intake, working together and proposing to provide emergency shelter in a rotating manner at each site for up to one week at a time during the nights from late November to mid-March. This permit was processed with community outreach, including neighborhood meetings, and was approved with conditions attached related to fire and building code requirements. At the city's expense, this permit has since been processed as a conditional use permit that no longer requires annual city review. Now the rotating shelter can continue annually under its conditional use permit.

Supportive Housing: Supportive housing has been added as a permitted use in all residential zoning districts. Single-family homes have been used as supportive housing units, typically with six or fewer residents. Larger supportive housing has been developed within multifamily housing complexes either as a portion of the units or with services to the entire complex. Supportive housing on this larger scale in multi-family housing does not require any additional planning approvals than what is required of a multi-family housing application without supportive services. To clarify where supportive housing is allowed, the City amended its Zoning Ordinance to include a definition of "supportive housing" in accordance with state law.

Single-Room Occupancies: Single-room occupancy (SRO) units projects are conditionally permitted in the Core Area Infill (C-I), Residential Restricted (R-R), Residential High Density Apartment (R-HD), Residential Transitional (R-T), Interim Residential Conversion (RC), Central Commercial (C-C), Mixed Use (M-U), and all planned development zones of a similar nature. Lower parking requirements within the City Zoning Ordinance promote smaller units, including SROs.

Second Units: Chapter 1062, Statutes of 2002 (Assembly Bill (AB) 1866), effective July 2003, requires local governments to use a ministerial process for considering second-unit applications for the purpose of facilitating production of affordable housing. AB 1866 does allow cities to establish development standards for second units addressing issues such as building size, parking, height,

setbacks, and lot coverage. Consistent with California Government Code 65852.2, the City has amended its second-unit ordinance and permitting process to allow approval of second-dwelling units through a ministerial review process in areas that are zoned for single-family dwellings. Approvals are over-the-counter for smaller second units. As described in Section 4, Davis's Zoning Ordinance allows for two types of second units: ministerial and discretionary. Ministerial second units must conform to the primary dwelling unit's setbacks; if detached be greater than 15 feet in height and be no larger than 500 square feet, including a maximum of 325 square feet of new living space (325 square foot maximum for detached unit); adhere to lot coverage and floor area ratio standards of the base zone; provide one parking space, covered or uncovered, per bedroom; and the units can be either renter- or owner- occupied.

Discretionary second units are those that are larger than the maximum allowed for a ministerial unit or if the second unit conflicts with other planning conditions related to lot coverage and floor area ratio maximums for the lot. The City is committed to processing permits for larger second units within four to eight weeks. Permit approval is subject to a planning staff level review of the plot and building plans to ensure compliance with height restrictions, setbacks, maximum floor area, and parking requirements. Building plans are then processed for building permit issuance. Although outreach was completed with the code amendments that allowed for administrative processing of smaller second units, the city plans to provide additional education to the public on what is permitted for developing a second unit. Promoting the construction of second units has been of interest to local commissions and is currently being considered by the City Council.

These standards are all within those allowed by AB 1866 and are established to ensure the City's character and quality of life is preserved. Additionally, the City's development standards and processing procedures for second units do not constrain their development as demonstrated by the historical trends discussed in Section 4. There has been a consistent number of applications and development of second dwelling units in the last 10 years. The City is also taking steps to continue incorporating second units in the initial planning of a project, by including second units as part of the initial project approvals. Planning for second units during project design ensures adequate planning, financing, and actual construction of these units.

Housing for Farmworkers: While there is no housing type specifically designated for farmworkers, Davis' Zoning Ordinance offers a wide range of housing types that help to address the housing need of agricultural workers. Such housing types include: multifamily, single-room occupancy, manufactured housing and second units. In addition, the City allows employee housing, including housing for farmworkers, consistent with Health and Safety Code Section (HSC) 17021.5 and 17021.6. These sections declare that no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves six or fewer employees as long as it is not required of a family dwelling of the same type in the same zone. In addition to a variety of permanent housing opportunities at both affordable and market rates, the City of Davis works with Yolo County to accommodate seasonal agricultural workers at the Davis Migrant Center just south of city limits (please refer to Section 3).

Factory-Built Housing and Mobile Homes: Factory-built homes are permitted in any residential district where single-family units are permitted, and are subject to the same zoning requirements and planning application processes as single-family residential houses. Existing single family lots would not trigger planning review aside from an administrative plot plan check, even if developed with factory-built housing, as long as they met the standards of Section 40.26.380 of the Zoning Ordinance. This section states the standard residential development standards, requires a permanent foundation (as required by state law), and includes neighborhood design consistency. A new subdivision that provided new lots and units would be subject to planning application, regardless of the type of housing being provided. Mobile homes are specifically allowed under the R-2-MH zoning district in city zoning. The flexibility built into the city's zoning allows for the provision of housing to all income levels. The zoning standards are necessary to ensure appropriate quality of life and the compatibility of new development within existing neighborhoods.

Planned Developments

Summary. The stated purpose of the planned development district in the city's Zoning Ordinance

“is to allow diversification in the relationship of various buildings, structures and open spaces in order to be relieved from the rigid standards of conventional zoning. A planned development district shall comply with the regulations and provisions of the general plan and any applicable specific plan and shall provide adequate standards to promote the public health, safety and general welfare without unduly inhibiting the advantages of modern building techniques and planning for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. The criteria upon which planned development districts shall be judged and approved will include the development of sound housing for persons of low, moderate and high income levels, residential developments which provide a mix of housing styles and costs, creative approaches in the development of land, more efficient and desirable use of open area, variety in the physical development pattern of the city and utilization of advances in technology which are innovative to land development.”

Below is excerpt of the Zoning Ordinance procedure for applying for the P-D district.

- a) Application for a planned development district (hereinafter sometimes referred to as P-D) shall be submitted as two separate applications as provided in this article. Such applications are described as the preliminary application and the final application. Except as otherwise provided in this article, an application for a P-D zone shall be treated as any other amendment to this chapter.
- b) When an application for a planned development district is initiated by the city council and/or the planning commission, the following criteria shall apply:
 - 1) The processing of zoning amendments by the city council and/or planning commission shall be treated as if the application has been filed with the planning department by the property owner.

- 2) The preliminary development plan shall designate land use classifications, development densities and street circulation patterns. Other data required for a preliminary application hereinafter described may be included. Such data normally will be developed in cooperation with the landowner.
- 3) No fee shall be charged for applications initiated by the city council or planning commission.

According to the Zoning Ordinance, “all uses in a P-D district shall conform to the height, area, lot and yard, parking, loading, and other standards normally required for such uses, except where the total development will be improved by deviation from these standards and such deviations are identified as previously set forth herein.”

Consideration of Impacts. The P-D zoning does not hinder the production of housing. It allows for creative ways to provide housing that would otherwise not be provided under conventional zoning standards. The city has effectively utilized this provision to integrate housing on difficult sites that might not even be possible in cities with more rigid zoning provisions. The General Plan established densities for various residential types apply to the planned development district. Also, as Table 47 shows, the High Density Residential designation in the General Plan can accommodate densities of up to 24 units per net acre exclusive of density bonus. The General Plan densities apply to all P-D districts. Ordinarily, the effect of the P-D zoning is to increase the variety and feasibility of development through reduction in setbacks, flexibility in parking requirements, and similar project benefits.

Entitlement Conditions

The required entitlement applications for the development of residential and commercial land are usually subject to conditions. These conditions of approval are in place to protect community character, or ensure privacy of adjacent neighbors, or for health and safety reasons, or environmental protection, among other reasons. The conditions of approval are usually acceptable to the project proponents. Thus, the conditions of approval are necessary and not believed to impede the availability and affordability of housing.

Measure J Ordinance (also known as Measure R, Ordinance No. 2350)

Summary. Ordinance 2350 extends the life of Measure J (Ordinance No. 2008) from June 2010 to December 2020. Measure R is the same as Measure J with the exception of the life of the measure that is extended. The discussion below refers to them interchangeably.

The purpose of the Measure J Ordinance (Ordinance No. 2008) was "to establish a mechanism for direct citizen participation in land use decisions affecting City policies for compact urban form, agricultural land preservation and an adequate housing supply to meet internal City needs, by providing the people of the City of Davis the right to vote, without having to evoke referenda, on general plan land use map amendments that would convert any agricultural, open space, or urban

reserve lands, as designated on the Land Use Map of the City of Davis General Plan, dated August 1, 1999, to an urban or urban reserve land use designation and on any development proposal on the Covell Center or Nishi properties.

The purpose of this Article is to ensure that the purposes and principles set forth in the City of Davis General Plan relating to voter approval, land use, affordable housing, open space, agricultural preservation and conservation are fully considered by establishing an expanded land use entitlement process for proposed conversion of properties to urban use that are designated or in agricultural or open space use. This action recognizes that continued conversion of agricultural lands to meet urban needs is neither inevitable nor necessary, and that any land use decision affecting such properties shall be subject to a public vote."

The only dissimilarity with a Measure J type project as compared to a similar project prior to Measure J adoption is the required voter approval. The normal entitlement applications review processes are done similarly for a Measure J and a pre-Measure J project, depending on the types of applications involved. A copy of the Measure J Ordinance can be found on the City's website at the following weblink: <http://qcode.us/codes/davis/> under "Article 41.01 CITIZENS' RIGHT TO VOTE ON FUTURE USE OF OPEN SPACE AND AGRICULTURAL LANDS." The level of detail required for project exhibits and plans is identified in Section 40.22.060 of the City's Zoning Ordinance for any planned development zoning application. This information is available at: <http://cityofdavis.org/municipal-code>.

The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance prescribe policies and standards that apply to new residential projects. New residential projects must identify basic features meeting these requirements, such as neighborhood greenbelt, minimum open space, recreational facility (i.e., park land dedication), infrastructure standards, affordable housing, and a host of other features. A Measure J project also will be expected to show how these features will be met or addressed consistent with the city policies and codes just as would be the situation prior to the measure. There are also components that must be adequately identified for a valid analysis of the potential impacts of a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15124).

Historically, developers propose a phasing plan that works for their project. A proposed residential development phasing plan is analyzed by the City using a number of factors prior to approval. Some factors that affect City decisions on a phasing plan include project size, economic viability of the project based on the phasing plan, identified City housing needs, outstanding allocations, and the City's ability to meet its Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA). Most large subdivisions in the City have phasing plans, which in some cases were made part of the development agreement between the developer and the City. Measure J does not change this process. The Phased Allocation Plan establishes the policy that project buildout would be allowed within the general plan period or some other reasonable period. Previous projects were approved with buildout of three to four years (Evergreen subdivision), to eight to ten years (Mace Ranch subdivision). The process for reviewing

of a developer proposed phasing plan remains the same notwithstanding Measure J, which provides the right of citizen participation in land use decision through voting.

The basis for the statement that Measure J encourages infill can be found in the stated purpose of Measure J. The goal of Measure J is “to establish a mechanism for direct citizen participation in land use decisions affecting city policies for compact urban form, agricultural land preservation and an adequate housing supply to meet the internal city needs, by providing the people of the City of Davis the right to vote, without having to evoke referenda, on general plan land use map amendments that would convert any agricultural, open space, or urban reserve lands, as designated on the Land Use Map of the City of Davis General Plan, dated August 1, 1999, to an urban or urban reserve land use designation and on any development proposal on the Covell Center or Nishi properties.” The conversion of any agricultural, open space, or urban reserve lands as designated on the Land Use Map of the City of Davis General Plan is what Measure J would impact.

Measure J requirements exempt units needed to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. The measure explicitly provides opportunity for five acres to be designated in the Land Use Element of the General Plan for residential development, or more if the City cannot meet its RHNA. Given that the city will meet its fair share allocation there is no expectation in the law for the city to document how the five acres would be designated. The methodology for designating the sites would depend on a number of factors, which include the type of housing needed to meet the allocation.

Measure J permits project modifications to occur as a project is developed. Section 41.01.020(c) of Measure J reads:

“Once the voters have approved a land use map designation or land use entitlement for a property, additional voter approval shall not be required for:

(1) Subsequent entitlement requests that are consistent with the overall approved development project or land use designation and entitlements including the baseline project features and required provision of open space, recreational amenities, design features and public facilities, as specified in the exhibits and plans approved by the voters.

(2) Any requested modification to a land use designation or development project entitlement that does not increase the number of permitted dwellings or units or the intensity of commercial/industrial development and does not significantly modify or reduce the baseline project features and required provision of open space, recreational amenities, design features and public facilities, as specified in the exhibits and plans approved by the voters.”

Measure J defines “significantly” or “significantly changed or modified” to mean that the proposed change or modification of the Measure J project materially alters the essential characteristic of the project or the baseline feature or requirement. Since adoption of Measure J in 1999, there has been one project that has completed the Measure J review process, the Covell Village Project. With the 2005 processing of the Covell Village Project application, this provision was addressed with a

specific project description and list of features defined as Baseline Project Features. Providing a specific list related to this provision ensures consistency between developer and public expectations, while allowing for minor modifications within the long-term build-out period for any large subdivision. The City found this application of the provision to work well and would repeat the same definition of Baseline Project Features as part of future planning processes on projects requiring a resident vote under Measure J. Additionally, the City adopted specific procedures and criteria for modifying Measure J-approved projects with the adoption of Resolution 06-40 on March 7, 2006.

Measure J Process. Any proposal submitted to the voters through Measure J must first be approved by the City Council, after review by the Planning Commission. This process ensures that the proposal must provide the required inclusionary units and comply with City General Plan policies in order to be approved by the City, prior to voters' action. Projects may undergo modification during the initial review process to ensure consistency with community goals, including affordable housing, before being submitted to the voters. The process envisions community outreach for proposed developments, which may include notification through the local newspaper, direct mails, neighborhood meetings, the City website, and local cable television.

Consideration of Impacts. As previously stated, the City has the capacity to meet state law and accommodate its allocated regional housing allocation for this period with the ongoing ability to provide sites to meet RHNA and the City's additional efforts to review and consider sites under its local 1% growth guideline, Measure J has not prohibited any development required by state law or deemed necessary based on local housing needs. Additionally, under Measure J, the City could have the ability to annex land for the purpose of affordable housing development or compliance with its RHNA, if ever deemed necessary. To date, the City consistently produces low- and very low-income housing units and has had no trouble meeting its regional allocation under State law. In fact, both continue to be exceeded.

The Measure J requirement contributes to the City's managed growth system. Measure J encourages compatible infill development by explicitly excluding infill projects from the requirement for voter approval, which will provide needed housing, while protecting the region's farmland. Measure J recognizes that through infill, appropriate housing can be provided to address City housing needs. Encouragement of infill development leads to what can be more complicated projects that result in greater City and project resident benefits. For example, the increased reuse of sites leads to more occasions of brownfield clean-up of toxics or previous environmentally sensitive uses (e.g. gasoline stations), while connecting residents of the units to existing neighborhoods with shopping and transit opportunities. A focus on infill also promotes mixed-use development that maximizes site potential and creative use of vacant sites or buildings which can add a step or two of additional research or demolition. Results of these projects lead to developments with increased community amenities (shopping, transit lines, open space, proximity to community services, etc.) and reinvestment into the character of surrounding existing neighborhoods.

Measure J could potentially add costs to the development review process and extend the time for approval. However, it is possible that the time and cost associated with a Measure J election could be less than or equal to that of a potential referendum. It is speculative to conclude that election costs will adversely affect the cost or supply of new housing, given the other known factors that affect housing costs and supply. Given that the developers have knowledge of Measure J, it is reasonable to expect that the costs associated with Measure J would be factored into the purchase price of the agricultural land proposed for conversion to residential development. Had Measure J not been approved and a new major residential proposal was proposed not requiring a referendum, then the argument of added costs and time would be legitimate. Any major project runs the risk of a referendum challenge, even if voter approval would not otherwise be required. To provide some range of potential costs borne from an election process, the table that follows provides information from various recent elections and measures. The actual cost to be borne by the developer is based on the type of election being held.

TABLE 49: SAMPLE ELECTION COSTS

Type of Measure	Date/Election Type	Cost
Measure I – Surface Water Project	March 2013; Special Election	\$122,564.40
Measure P – Wildhorse Horse Ranch	November 2009; Special Election	\$220,399.48
Measure X – Covell Village Project	November 2005; Statewide Special/UDEL/ School Election	\$47,666.92
Measure O – Open Space Protection	November 2000; General Election	\$27,995.63
Measure J – Right to Vote, Open Space and Ag Land	March 2000; Primary Election	\$30,776.12
Measure M	June 1998; Primary Election	\$29,061.38
UDEL/School District Election	November 1997; UDEL/School District Election	\$37,336.55
Richards Boulevard Corridor Upgrade Project	March 1997; Special Election	\$46,512.95
Measure R – Wildhorse Development Agreement	May 9, 1995; Davis Referendum Election	\$44,305.40

Notes:

The type of election held has direct impact on the cost of the election. It would be speculative to state how much it will cost in the future for a Measure J project.

In a special election that involves a Measure J project only, like Measure P shown above, the applicant would pay the full cost. If there are other measures from the City or other jurisdictions, the cost is shared. If a Measure J project participates in a general election, the developer will share the cost of the elections. The table above contains costs for past elections involving measures. As can be seen from the table the range is from \$27,995.63 to \$220,399.48. Potential election costs for a future Measure J project would depend on several variables, such as the type of election involved and how many other measures and jurisdictions are involved. The costs of the election are minimal compared to other project costs (EIR, planning processing and public outreach, public

improvements and fees). Although Measure J may add costs and some processing time to the development of projects, it has not proven to interfere with the City's ability to meet its RHNA and produce affordable housing units.

Phased Allocation

In the past, the City has used a phased allocation system in order to regulate the amount of building permits issued in any given year. Although the phased allocation system still exists in City Code, it has not been used recently as a means by which to control growth and so has little to no effect on the production of housing. With the current size and amount of vacant lots in the City currently available for the development of housing, use of the Phased Allocation system has not been deemed necessary for the most part since there is not possibility for a large housing development in any given year without review and approval by the City Council through a planning application. Large projects that are currently in application (Lewis Cannery Project) if approved, would include provisions for phasing development with the Development Agreement and would not likely require use of the Phased Allocation system either. In addition, this phased allocation system has been further defined by the City's 1% Growth Policy discussion in the following section. Under the 1% Growth Policy up to 325 units can be built each year, with exemptions for affordable units, second units, and other projects that Council deems necessary.

Summary. The City adopted its first "slow growth" General Plan in 1973. The ability to build housing in Davis has been phased since 1975. The Phased Allocation Ordinance has five stated goals, which are:

1. Prevent premature development in the absence of necessary utilities and municipal services.
2. Coordinate city planning and land regulation in a manner consistent with the General Plan.
3. Facilitate and implement the realization of General Plan goals, which cannot be accomplished by zoning alone.
4. Provide significant incentives to developers to include very-low, low and moderate-income housing in their development.
5. Prevent unplanned growth, which has no relationship to community needs and capabilities. (Ordinance No. 1638, adopted May 20, 1992.)

Consideration of Impacts. All active subdivisions in the City have full allocations. All allocations have no effects on the previous housing production in the prior planning period because all allocations were made as part of the Development Agreements. Following adoption of the 1973 General Plan, a new housing allocation system was adopted. That system has been in place since then.

Programs and policies included in this Housing Element ensure that various types of needed housing, including affordable housing are exempted from any allocation system that has been adopted, and would be adopted, including the City's 1% Growth Policy discussed in the next section. With the 1% Growth Policy allowing up to 325 units to be developed each year and with exemptions for affordable and other units from this cap, a phased allocation system under that policy will not lead to a constraint in the production of housing to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 1,066 units for the current eight-year planning period.

The City's 1% Growth Policy

Summary. In March 2005, the City Council adopted the following growth policy that was clarified further in February 2008 to consist of the following:

1. The City Council finds that an annual average growth parameter for the City is appropriate for future growth management and planning after considering:
 - a. The internal housing needs identified in the "Internal Housing Needs Analysis" report.
 - b. The most recent and likely future fair share housing needs issued by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).
2. The City Council hereby directs staff to:
 - a. Prepare draft amendments to the growth management and housing sections of the General Plan and the Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance for City Council review. Base the amendments on the following concepts:

City growth concepts:

- (1) Growth guideline of 1%. Implement an annual average growth guideline of one percent (1%), tied to the 2010 General Plan, based on the following:
 - (a) The total estimated existing number of housing units and dwelling unit equivalents for living groups.
 - (b) 1% currently equals approximately 260 units per year. The number of units allowable based on the 1% guideline shall increase proportionate to city growth.
- (2) Exempted units. The following types of units are exempt and not subject to the 1% growth guideline:
 - (a) Permanently affordable housing units for very low-, low- and moderate- income households including both required units and units provided in excess of

standard requirements. This exemption includes permanently affordable housing units for seniors. This exemption does not include middle income units.

- (b) Approved second units as defined by State law including both ministerial and discretionary units.
- (c) Residential units within “vertical” mixed use buildings.
- (3) Control peripheral. Strictly control peripheral units to a maximum of 60% of the 1% growth guideline per year. It is recognized that building permits for new peripheral development probably would not occur until at least 2007.
- (4) Manage infill. Manage infill units within the 1% growth guideline per year. Infill may constitute 40% of the total units in a year if peripheral units constitute 60% and infill units may constitute 100% of the total units in a year if peripheral units constitute 0%. Provide flexibility to allow for multi-family rental projects by designating a proportion of the yearly allocation to multi family rental units that can be rolled over and accumulated over several years as needed for the typical apartment complex.
- (5) Allow for extraordinary project. Council shall have the ability to allow an infill project with extraordinary circumstances and which provides for particular community needs with extraordinary community benefits, even if it would exceed the annual growth guideline of 1%.

Clarification Provided on February 15, 2008:

The City Council provides the following clarifications regarding the city growth concepts above. The one percent growth guideline:

- Is a cap not to be exceeded, except for units that are specifically exempted and allowed by City Council as an infill project with extraordinary circumstances and community benefits.
- Extraordinary typically means that the project is providing features and amenities that go beyond minimum city standards and requirements and would be difficult for the city to obtain without the developer's willingness, even using a development agreement. Extraordinary projects could include projects with an exceptional affordable housing provision, projects that aim to address a local unmet housing need in the community, or projects that provide other items of public benefit including public facilities, funding for community needs, advanced green technology, etc. In addition to qualifying as extraordinary, the project must also be an infill project.

- Is to provide for identified housing needs without compromising City standards for development quality.
- Translates to 260 “base” or non-exempt units. An estimate of the total number of units per year is approximately 25% above the 260 units or a total of 325 units per year including the exempted types of units not subject to the guideline.
- Does not include a mandatory increase (or “catch-up”) provision should building activity not achieve the annual growth guideline in certain years. Conversely, the guideline does not include a mandatory reduction in years following the approval of an infill project with extraordinary community benefits which causes the annual growth guideline to be exceeded.

Growth management system concepts:

- (1) Use development agreements where appropriate. Use development agreements or a metered allocation system to phase peripheral units. Use development agreements where appropriate for large infill projects (such as 100 or more units).
- (2) Use tools to ensure that peripheral and infill development decisions are consistent with growth guidelines. Create a new development status monitoring and reporting system. Use reports in decisions on projects and their timing. Provide annual report and adopt annual resolution to direct prospective developers and staff where the city will consider growth and development in the short term (one to two years) and longer term (three to ten years).
- (3) Study changes to existing allocation ordinance. Study whether changes are needed to the existing phased allocation ordinance. If appropriate, pass a resolution to clarify that formal allocations pursuant to the ordinance will not be required unless / until the Council deems such allocations are needed.
- (4) School impacts. Work with City and DJUSD legal counsel to determine means of mitigating school impacts.
- (5) Study required findings. Study whether growth limitation ordinance findings are required pursuant to State Government Code 65863.6 regarding the public health, safety, and welfare of the city to be promoted by the adoption of the ordinance.

Consideration of Impacts. The City does not find that the 1% growth policy will have a negative effect on housing production, and specifically the City’s RHNA, for the current planning period. The City’s RHNA is 1,066 units for this planning period, which the City is more than able to provide for. Even a cap of one percent in growth during the current planning period allows more than 2,800 new housing units to be built. This capped amount is approximately 1,700 units greater than the RHNA that has been assigned to the City for this planning period.

Additionally, the City's one-percent growth policy includes very specific exemption categories for second units, affordable housing units, and units in vertical mixed-use developments and also allows the Council to approve "extraordinary projects" above the growth cap based on community needs and benefits. The City finds that this growth cap does not negatively impact the production of housing, it is only used to manage its timing. The exempt categories and placement of the cap do not affect the City's ability to provide housing to meet local needs and provide sites that can accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Affordable Housing Policy and Ordinance

Summary. The General Plan has a policy that reads:

Policy HOUSING 4.1. Maintain and periodically review the Affordable Housing Ordinance to require the inclusion of affordable housing in all new development areas to the extent feasible.

Standards

- a. New for-sale residential development should provide housing units that are affordable to very low, low and moderate-income households. The units should be affordable rental or ownership. Affordable housing should be provided as follows, based upon the type of residential housing product being developed:
 - For projects comprised of single family detached residential units on lots equal to or larger than 5,000 square feet in area, 25 percent of the total units being developed should be developed as affordable units.
 - For projects comprised of single family detached residential units on lots smaller than 5,000 square feet in area, 15 percent of the total units being developed should be developed as affordable units.
 - For projects comprised of single family attached residential units, 10 percent of the total units being developed should be developed as affordable units.
 - "Stacked flat" condominiums or residential units within vertical mixed use developments are exempt from the requirement to provide designated affordable housing units.
- b. Continue to administer an affordable housing ordinance, which accomplishes the following:
 - Rental housing developments containing 5 to 19 units shall provide, to the maximum extent feasible, 15 percent of the units to be affordable to low-income households (with incomes at or below 80% of the median income) and 10 percent of the units as affordable to very-low income households (with incomes at or below 50% percent of median income) for a total requirement of 25 percent.

- Rental housing developments containing 20 or more units shall provide, to the maximum extent feasible, 10 percent of the units as affordable to low income households and 25 percent of the units to be affordable to very low-income households for a total requirement of 35 percent.

The Affordable Housing Ordinance, the document used to implement this policy, was initially adopted in 1990, amended in 1993, amended again in 2005, and amended again in 2013. The ordinance requirements are intended to implement the General Plan policies that require affordable housing for all income categories as stated above, and to meet the city's share of the regional housing need for these impacted households at very low-, low- and moderate- income levels. The focus of the 2013 amendments was to focus the ordinance on providing housing for low and very low-income households as those with the greatest need. They also provided a graduated scale of inclusionary unit obligations for ownership developments, provided the mechanism to receive inclusionary credit for Accessory Dwelling Units, and revisited in-lieu fee requirements. The ordinance is in compliance with Government Code Section 65589.8 by allowing developers to satisfy all or a portion of the inclusionary requirement by constructing rental housing at affordable monthly rents.

The developer is required to submit an Affordable Housing Plan prior to or at the time of application for the first discretionary approval for a project. The Plan must describe how many and what type of affordable units the project will produce. The guidelines are as follows:

Ownership Developments

- Developments of 5 or more units provide units for very low-, low- and moderate-income households. Some required affordable units may be rental and some may be for sale. Developments less than five units are exempt.
- Developments of between 5 to 200 units must provide units through one of the following methods:
 - On-site affordable unit construction
 - On-site construction of accessory dwelling units for rental to fulfill up to half of the requirement¹,
 - Payment of in-lieu fees, if approved by the city council; and/or

¹ The allowance of accessory units to count towards the inclusionary requirement will sunset December 31, 2015.

- On-site construction of affordable rental units, if the developer voluntarily requests to satisfy its requirements through this alternative.
- Developments of 201 or more units must provide units through one of the following methods:
 - On-site affordable unit construction
 - On-site construction of accessory dwelling units for rental to fulfill up to half of the requirement¹,
 - Land dedication; and/or
 - On-site construction of affordable rental units, if the developer voluntarily requests to satisfy its requirements through this alternative.
- Project individualized programs are also an option where the developer may meet the city's affordable housing requirement with a project individualized program that is determined to generate an amount of affordability equal to or greater than the amount that would be generated under the standard affordability requirements.
- For on-site construction of ownership units, a one-for-one city density bonus is awarded for units meeting the requirements for a State density bonus, a mix of two- and three-bedroom units with a minimum of fifty percent of the units as three bedroom units and in combination of unit types as approved within the Affordable Housing Plan through the appropriate review process. Smaller and larger size units can be provided depending on local housing needs and project character. The affordable units will be affordable to moderate-income households, households with incomes ranging from 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) to 120 percent AMI, with the average affordability targeted.
- Affordable rental units shall be leased a rent affordable to low and very low-income households. The average price for each size of rental unit based on the number of bedrooms, shall not exceed the low target income, 65 percent of AMI. The maximum income level served shall not be greater than 80 percent of AMI. Rental units in each size category shall be offered in order to achieve the required average target income.
- Land dedication is an alternative to on-site construction of affordable units for projects of 201 units or larger. This option also receives a one-for-one density bonus on the basis of 15 units per acre. At least two acres of land must be dedicated. Housing built on dedicated land must be permanently affordable. Property is conveyed to third parties who enter into an agreement with the City to produce affordable housing with a certain period of time. Housing types should consist of: resident-controlled housing, mutual housing, community based rental housing, limited equity cooperatives, public housing, land trusts, self-help housing, etc.

- Accessory dwelling units used to satisfy the inclusionary requirements must be constructed on-site. Each accessory dwelling unit counts as one-half of an affordable unit towards satisfying the required number of inclusionary affordable units.
- Payment of in-lieu fees are an alternative to on-site construction of affordable units for projects between five and 200 units in size. The payments shall be determined according to the adopted fee schedule revised annually. The city council reviews requests to utilize the in-lieu fee option.

Rental Developments

- Rental housing development with 20 or more units that requires legislative approval must provide at least 25 percent of the total units affordable to low-income households and ten percent affordable to very low-income households. Such housing shall be provided either by the construction of units on-site or by land dedication.
- A developer of multifamily rental developments requiring legislative approval and containing between five and nineteen units shall provide fifteen percent of the units to low-income household and ten percent to very low-income households.
- Residential projects consisting of fewer than five market rate units will not be required to produce affordable units.
- Affordable rental units shall rent to low-income households at not more than 30 percent of 80 percent (30 percent of 80 percent is 24 percent) of AMI, and to very low-income households at not more than 30 percent of 50 percent of AMI, adjusted for family size. An in-lieu fee is also offered as an option in the downtown area.

Consideration of Impacts. The ordinance has built-in flexibility to allow a "project individualized program", which is an alternative to the standard provisions if the project generates the same or more than the number and level of affordable units that would have been generated under the standard requirements. The ordinance also allows an appeal or modification process for any project that can prove the requirement to be constituted as a "taking" by the City. The City has not received any appeals or arguments of a taking under this provision. The City works with applicants prior to and during planning application submittal to clarify the requirements and identify options for compliance with this ordinance.

Some have argued that provision of affordable housing adds to the costs of the market-rate units, thus, increasing the cost of housing. This argument may be valid to some extent provided the cost of affordable housing contribution is not reflected in the value of land purchased by the developer or the profit made by the subdivider. However, to provide housing for all income segments of the city, it becomes necessary to require inclusion of affordable units in new residential development. The

majority of the affordable units come at minimal direct cost to the subdivider, although they may have opportunity costs through reduced profit.

Middle Income Housing Ordinance

The City has suspended the Middle Income Housing Ordinance. It presents no current constraints. Staff will revisit the need for this ordinance based on future market changes.

Accessible/Visitable Housing Policy

The General Plan has a policy that reads:

Policy HOUSING 1.41. Encourage a variety of housing types that accommodate persons with disabilities and promote aging in place, including a one-hundred percent universal access requirement in all new single-family residential units, not otherwise subject to multi-family building code requirements and to the maximum extent feasible unless otherwise successfully appealed to the Community Development Director. Accessory structures, including secondary dwelling units and guest houses, carriage units, and small projects in the Core Area of fifteen units or fewer are not subject to this policy.

Standards

- a. Universal Access in all new single-family units shall include:
 - i) Low threshold entry. One low threshold entry at either the front door or from the garage to the house. The door shall have a minimum 32 inch clear opening, the threshold shall be no higher than 1/2 inch and comply with the following:
 - (1) Thresholds with a change in height of not more than 1/4 inch (6.35 mm) may be vertical.
 - (2) Thresholds with a change in height between 1/4 inch (6.35 mm) and 1/2 inch (19.05 mm) shall be beveled with a slope no greater than 1 unit vertical in 2 units horizontal (50-percent slope).
 - ii) Exterior path of travel. Exterior zero-step walkway to low threshold entry at least 36 inch wide, without any steps, which is provided from driveway into house or an alternative path. It is not the intention of this ordinance to require a fully accessible path of travel in compliance with State and or Federal accessibility regulations from the public right of way to the dwelling.
 - iii) Interior path of travel. A no step interior path of travel on ground floor with interior doorways having at least a 32-inch clear opening and hallways at least 36-inch wide throughout.

- iv) Bathrooms and half bathrooms. Accessible bathrooms and half bath/powder rooms with reinforced walls. Reinforcement for grab bars at the water closet shall be installed on both sides or one side and the back. If reinforcement is installed at the back, it shall be installed between 32 inches and 38 inches above the floor. The grab bar reinforcement shall be a minimum of 6 inches nominal in height. The backing shall be a minimum of 40 inches in length. Reinforcement installed at the side of the water closet shall be installed 32 inches to 38 inches above the floor. The reinforcement shall be installed a maximum of 12 inches from the rear wall and shall extend a minimum of 26 inches in front of the water closet. The grab bar reinforcement shall be a minimum of 6 nominal in height.). Reinforcement for grab bars at the bathtub shall be located on each end of the bathtub, 32 inches to 38 inches above the floor, extending a minimum of 24 inches from the front edge of the bathtub toward the back wall of the bathtub. The grab bar reinforcement shall be a minimum of 6 inches nominal in height. Grab bar reinforcement shall be installed on the back wall of the bathtub a maximum of 6 inches above the bathtub rim extending upward to at least 38 inches above the floor. Grab bar backing shall be installed horizontally to permit the installation of a 48-inch grab bar with each end a maximum of 6 inches from the end walls of the bathtub. The grab bar reinforcement shall be a minimum of 6 inches nominal in height.
 - v) Common room. An accessible common room with no steps that is connected to the 36-inch wide path of travel.
 - vi) Stairs accommodation. In two or more story units, electrical outlets at stairs for future stair chairlift OR placement of stacked closets to accommodate a future home elevator (meets dimensions and has power outlet to accommodate elevator).
 - vii) Electrical panel. Accessible electrical panel on the interior of the unit (accessed from an accessible path of travel, no higher than 54 inches off the ground and no less than 15 inches off the ground from the outer edges of the panel) or on the exterior of the unit when accessible from a hard surface path of travel and includes sufficient clearance in front.
 - viii) Switches and fixtures. Use of rocker light switches and single lever door fixtures, or other types of accessible switches and fixtures (e.g. motion sensors) throughout the unit.
- b. Exempt project types. The City recognizes that there are inherent constraints of including Universal Access features in the following types of projects:
- i. Accessory dwelling units/second units.
 - ii. Carriage units, with living space over a private garage.
 - iii. Projects of 15 units or fewer that are developed within the Core Area

Due to the constraints of these projects, features of Universal Access will be encouraged but not required.

(Note: Accessible features may be required for buildings with elevators or other features that are subject to accessibility requirements under the California Uniform Building Code.)

- c. Affordable housing projects. The City shall require increased accessibility in all affordable housing projects where the City provides financial assistance or land to the project.
- d. Waivers and modifications. Any project has the ability to appeal infeasible items based on project characteristics, terrain, or due to an alleged taking. These appeals are reviewed by the Community Development Director. If the request is substantial or controversial, staff can take the request before commissions or the City Council, at staff's discretion.

Actions

Universal Access in new housing projects. Facilitate the inclusion of Universal Access features in the construction of new housing to the greatest extent possible, increasing overall accessibility and visitability of new housing.

- b. Policy evaluation. Evaluate the policy in 2018 after it has been applied to a variety of projects. Specifically, review the effectiveness of the policy targets and its categories of exemption, and determine if any modifications should be made including consideration of converting the policy to an ordinance.

Consideration of Impacts. After outreach to the local development community, architects, buyers, advocates for persons with disabilities and residents, the City Council adopted the above-stated policy in November 2012, after previously administering a similar policy from 2007 through 2012. The costs associated with various features that this policy requires were discussed and analyzed prior to the policy's adoption. The majority of costs (shown in Table 50 below) associated with accessible and visitable features were deemed negligible and not likely to have significant impact on the cost of construction if planned for early in project development stages. The most notable impacts of these requirements were anticipated to be found in accessory dwelling units, carriage units, and projects of fifteen units or fewer in the Core Area that typically are planned on smaller lots, with vertical orientation, and at greater density. These impacts were primarily requirements associated with providing a zero-threshold entry and exterior zero-step walkway. As a means of removing this potential impact, these groups were included in the exempt project category.

The City adopted these requirements as a means for providing ownership housing units accessible to persons with disabilities (typically not required by UBC). It was originally adopted in 2007 in policy form so that the need for modifications could be assessed with the consideration of the requirements in 2010. As part of the latest update, the development community indicated a desire for the certainty of an ordinance rather than just a general plan policy. With its list of exempt projects, the ability to

waive or modify requirements for projects with topographical or financial hardship, and the City's plans to assess the policy again in 2018 when more information is available, the City does not find this policy to be a constraint on housing production.

TABLE 50: POTENTIAL COSTS OF UNIVERSAL ACCESS FEATURES

Accessibility Item	Estimated Cost and Feasibility from Developers/ Builders
<p>Exterior Zero-Step Wider Exterior Walkway to Low Threshold Entry (at least 36" wide, without steps)</p>	<p>A zero entry threshold can be quite a feat practically and has now been adjusted to a low-entry threshold, not to exceed 1/2" with up to a 1/4" slope on each side. If a small ramp to the threshold is needed, concrete and forming could cost \$10-20 per square inch or the project could use another material to reduce costs. If the project has an uneven grade, costs of providing an accessible path increase and make the feature less feasible. The revised requirement on the path is that it be without steps and at an adequate width of 36", but it is not required to be a strict grade.</p>
<p>Low threshold entry at a minimum of one exterior door that is 34" wide or 32" clear opening.</p>	<p>To avoid water entering the unit, a zero or low threshold entry may require good overhead weather protection. In the garage, access would be adequately covered, but additional overhangs might be necessary if the unit has a front or rear entrance with a zero threshold. Costs of additional overhang would contribute to slight additions in materials and labor costs, but these are likely negligible. Including the necessary door with a zero or low entry threshold is estimated to be a cost of less than \$25. Increasing flexibility and practicality of installation, a low threshold entry is being recommended, at not more than a 1/2" threshold, with up to 1/4" slope on each side.</p>
<p>Interior path of travel throughout the ground floor</p>	<p>No additional cost if included in the original unit design, although it could redistribute small amounts of space to the hallway and out of other rooms in the unit. This would be required at 36" wide and doorways with a clear opening of 32" on the ground floor of the unit. There can be an opportunity cost with this item due to the potential redistribution of space from other rooms.</p>
<p>Accessible ground floor half bathroom/powder room</p>	<p>An accessible half bath may require additional space and result in an opportunity cost. Grab bar backing (2x backing) installed in the wall surrounding the toilet and shower is a negligible cost of only the extra pieces of lumber required. The accessible powder room is recommended as the minimum requirement because a full bath can often be infeasible due to space limitations.</p>
<p>Accessible ground floor Common Room/area</p>	<p>No additional cost, would just need to design for it up front.</p>

Accessibility Item	Estimated Cost and Feasibility from Developers/ Builders
Electrical outlets for future stair lift OR Placement of stacked closets to accommodate a future home elevator	Most of this item relates primarily to design of the unit. Cost of additional/relocated outlets is negligible. If closets are already included in the unit design, stacking them would require additional foresight, but not likely additional cost. These items, which could allow for future accessibility upgrades to a unit, represent limited additional cost.
Accessible electrical panel on the ground floor interior or exterior of the unit	Expense of a secondary interior panel would likely be less than \$1,000-\$3,000 and could be located in a closet or pantry on the ground floor. A similar cost would be associated with providing an exterior path of travel to an exterior electrical panel.
Rocker light switches throughout	\$50-\$100 per house
Single Action Hardware at Accessible Entrance and on Ground Floor	\$50-\$100

Source: City of Davis, 2013

The Right to Farm and Farmland Preservation Ordinance

Summary. The May 2001 General Plan has a policy that reads:

"Policy AG 1.1 Action j. In order to create an effective permanent agricultural and open space buffer on the perimeter of the City, immediately upon completion of the General Plan Update, pursue amendments of the Farmland Preservation ordinance to assure as a baseline standard that new peripheral development projects provide a minimum of 2:1 mitigation along the entire non-urbanized perimeter of the project. The proposed amendments shall allow for the alternate location of mitigations for such projects including but not limited to circumstances where the project is adjacent to land already protected by conservation easements or by some other form of public ownership that guarantees adjacent lands will not be developed."

The city adopted an ordinance on November 15, 1995, establishing the Right to Farm and Farmland Preservation requirements. The Right to Farm portion of the ordinance states that properly operated agricultural operations are generally not to be considered a nuisance, and requires that properties within 1,000 feet of agricultural lands carry a deed restriction that notifies owners and buyers of potential inconveniences associated with lawful agricultural operations when they are subjected to any discretionary permit issued by the city. It also requires that lands within 150 feet of an agricultural, greenbelt or habitat area shall be maintained in an agricultural buffer/agricultural transition area. The buffer is to be made up of a 100-foot agricultural buffer without public access, as well as a 50-foot transition area that may include bike paths, trails and other facilities for public access.

The Farmland Preservation portion of the ordinance requires agricultural mitigation by applicants for general plan or zoning changes or any other discretionary entitlement applications that would change the use of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Agricultural mitigation is required to be adjacent to the proposed project and must be provided on a 2:1 replacement basis. The mitigation may include granting of a farmland conservation easement or similar conservation mechanism for lands not subjected to non-agricultural development or payment of a fee for purchase of farmland rights in another area. Mitigation lands must be within the Davis planning area. A portion of agricultural mitigation lands may be used for habitat mitigation.

Consideration of Impacts. Some have argued that this ordinance and the 2001 General Plan 2:1 requirements may impede housing development. It is anticipated that prospective developers would take into consideration this requirement in making offers for land to be developed that would be required to comply with the requirements. The city's agricultural mitigation policies reflect the public policy tension between affordable housing and agricultural preservation. The city has shown that it can be successful in protecting open space and farmland while meeting fair share housing allocation. Additionally, the adjacency requirement of the agricultural mitigation has not been found to be a constraint because the city continues to receive preliminary applications and proposals that allow for the inclusion of this mitigation onsite without objection from applicants and because the Covell Village proposal that was approved by the City Council and failed in its Measure J vote by the citizens in November 2005, included the 2:1 agricultural mitigation adjacent to its proposed development as well.

Greenbelt and Open Space Policies

Land Use Element policies requiring the provision of greenbelts and other amenities may affect the cost to the developer of constructing housing. This in turn could affect the cost to the purchaser or renter of housing. The city requires that 10% of the land in a residential subdivision be dedicated and improved as neighborhood greenbelt. The greenbelt requirements do not reduce the number of units that may be built on a given parcel of land. Although a portion of the land is required to be built as greenbelt rather than housing, the number of allowed units is determined by the gross acreage of the parcel, including the greenbelt area. The greenbelts will reduce the lot size per unit, however, which may either reduce the market value of the unit or decrease developer profit. Similarly, on-site open space and parking requirements for multi-family developments also act to reduce the amount of land available for building.

Neighborhood greenbelts, like other recreational amenities, add to the cost of producing housing. They also add to the value of housing by increasing the desirability of the unit and the surrounding neighborhood. One of the reasons people want to live in Davis is the availability of bike paths and neighborhood greenbelts. Neighborhood greenbelts, by providing an off-street transportation system, also encourage travel on foot and by bicycle, reducing automobile congestion and assisting in the preservation of air quality. Thus, the costs associated with the greenbelt and open spaces are necessary and do not significantly impede housing provision.

Conclusion

Even though the City has passed many regulations that could potentially constrain development of housing for a variety of income levels, the City diligently pursues funding for affordable projects and is very active in the development of housing for lower-income persons. As such, the policies analyzed above do not unreasonably constrain Davis' housing market. During the previous planning period of 2006 to 2013 and so far in the current planning period, market and affordable housing units continue to be built. During calendar years 2006 through 2012, 532 housing units were built (for a seven-year average of 76 units per year) which included 159 deed restricted affordable housing units (for a seven-year average of 23 units per year. The 2008 downturn in the economy resulting in uncertainty in the housing market and financing limited building activity more than City of Davis regulations and other government constraints. The City will continue to monitor the effects of these policies and regulations to ensure they do not have a negative impact on the development of affordable housing (see Policy 2.1 Action k).

While costs of the city's inclusionary requirement are estimated at approximately \$20,000 per unit, these costs are offset by the City's one for one unit density bonuses that provide increased project revenue by allowing development of market rate housing units beyond city density limits. As shown in Program Actions 7, Objective a. and 15., Objective a., city staff will continue to "evaluate residential development policies (e.g. Middle Income Ordinance, Affordable Housing Ordinance, Accessibility/Visitability Policy, etc.) to determine if any one or combination of these policies constrains housing development." This review will continue to include input from the local development community as well as staff analysis.

Codes and Enforcement

Local Amendments to Uniform Building Code. The City of Davis has adopted the following notable amendments to the State of California's Building Standards Code, in addition to minor edits mostly related to adapting it for local procedures:

- a. Physical guard materials for gas-burning appliances to protect from damage.
- c. Physical guard materials for water heaters to protect from damage.
- d. Provisions for future water softener systems in single-family and duplex units.
- e. Requirement for mandatory Tier 1 compliance for building permits for new construction or, when applicable, remodels.

Other than these amendments and the adaptations, the City has adopted and enforces the standard California Building Standards Code. Under state law, this code can be amended by local governments only due to geographical, topological or climatological reasons. The UBC that the city operates under consists of Uniform Building, Plumbing and Mechanical Codes and the amendments

made were done so on the basis on the necessary findings stated above. The building code may be considered to increase housing costs above the cost of nonstandard development. However, its benefits, including health and safety benefits, outweigh its disadvantages. The minor amendments made locally do not represent substantial additional costs and are not found to be a constraint on housing production. The mandatory Tier 1 elements have the potential to increase the cost of construction, but also have the potential of reducing energy costs for residents of the housing, and therefore the overall cost of shelter.

Degree or type of enforcement. The City of Davis requires submittal of a building permit application, with project plans, that is reviewed by plan check staff for consistency with California Building Standards Code. Once the plans are approved and the permit is issued, inspections of the development at identified critical stages are required in order to ensure that the project is built consistent to the approved plans that reflect Code requirements. A final inspection of all projects is required to complete one last review of the project against the city-approved plans. Final sign-off after this inspection constitutes issuance of Certificate of Occupancy (when applicable) and record of city approval on the project (large or small) that was completed.

Upon the resale of housing units, representatives of the City's Building Division conduct an inspection to assess any noncompliance with building and zoning codes, including any work done to the housing unit without building permit issuance and final building inspection approval. Items identified in a resale inspection report are required to be addressed either by the existing owner selling the unit or by the future owner purchasing the unit. Buyer and seller are able to negotiate who will be responsible for addressing city-identified items. This program assists in providing full disclosure to buyers and ensures maintenance of the city's housing stock.

In addition to the resale inspection program described above, the City also has a code enforcement program. This program is based on complaints received by the City requiring any code violation throughout the City, including building and zoning codes. The City responds to complaints, and takes the necessary steps to remedy instances where code violations are identified. The city-adopted steps related to noticing and enforcement are adhered to, and notices of code violation include information regarding the City's appeal process. This program promotes compliance with city codes to ensure the health and safety of the community.

On and Off-site Improvement Requirements

The City of Davis, as is typical in most jurisdictions in the state, has various on- and off-site improvement requirements for residential developments. The city has established minimum standards required to assure orderly development similar to urban settings. The city has historically applied flexibility to the minimum standards in order to accommodate innovative residential projects or affordable housing projects as long as there are no public safety concerns. For instance, a local street right-of-way is a minimum of 50 feet. This width has been reduced in some cases to 36 feet or less in order to accommodate an affordable housing project, or an innovative residential subdivision.

Examples where this flexibility standard has been applied include Village Homes, El Macero Estates 2, Southfield Park 2 and 3, Glacier Place, Oasis Place, and Woodbridge subdivisions. It should be noted that planning values and traffic calming values have often been used as justification for such reductions. The 2001 General Plan update included changes in the traffic congestion level of service standards. These will serve to facilitate infill development projects and potentially reduce costs of mitigating traffic impacts when new development is approved.

The city believes that the on- and off-site standards do not constitute an unreasonable or unnecessary constraint on housing production. The provision of roadway, drainage, water and sewer and all underground utilities needed to deem a lot ready for residential development must be in place before the city accepts any public infrastructure. Also, no building permit will be issued for a lot that does not have infrastructure in place. The city does not approve subdivisions without adequate knowledge that there is sufficient public infrastructure capacity to accommodate the residential development. As stated in previous sections, there is adequate water, wastewater, and infrastructure to accommodate the City's RHNA for this planning period and up to the City's 1% Growth Cap for this same timeframe.

Processing and Permit Procedures

Historically multifamily discretionary review projects are submitted as part of a larger project. For example, the Wildhorse, Mace Ranch, Evergreen, or El Macero Estates 2 subdivisions contain multifamily General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designated parcels, which were established at the time of preliminary planned development stage. In most residential subdivision projects in the city, the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance land use designations for multifamily parcels are usually established at the preliminary planned development stage. Once this is done the level of entitlement review is far less cumbersome. There have been multifamily project applications requiring discretionary approvals, such as General Plan and Specific Plan amendments and rezoning applications.

The types of discretionary applications processed include:

- Annexation,
- General Plan Amendments,
- Specific Plan and Amendments,
- Preliminary Planned Development, Rezoning and Preliminary Planned Development, or Zoning Ordinance Amendments, and
- Phased Allocation or Development Agreement.

There are several variables that influence the length of processing time for a discretionary project. The factors include

- the type of project proposed and its location;
- the time it takes the applicant to submit complete application materials;
- the number and nature of deviations requested from the conventional base zoning standards;
- the qualities of the proposed project, such as appealing, innovative, and compatibility with existing surrounding uses and structures;
- the level of controversy associated with the project; and
- the number of entitlements requested.

The typical conditions of approval that the city considers during a discretionary review include the following:

- Obtaining building permit prior to occupancy,
- Ensure that the developed project is in substantial compliance with the approved plans,
- The use will not constitute a nuisance and be detrimental to adjacent properties, and
- Other site/project specific conditions may apply to address issues raised due to the project, such as adequate on-site parking, open space and landscaping being provided.

All CUP applications are reviewed subject to the standard of the city Zoning Ordinance, which states:

40.30.030 Considerations in issuing. In considering an application for a conditional use or nonconforming use, the planning commission or city council shall give due regard to the nature and condition of the proposed or existing use and all adjacent uses and structures. The planning commission or city council may deny an application for a conditional use. In authorizing a conditional use, the planning commission or city council may impose such requirements and conditions with respect to location, construction, maintenance and operation, in addition to those expressly stipulated in this chapter for the particular use, as the planning commission or city council may deem necessary for the protection of adjacent properties and the public interest.

40.30.080 Issuance.

(a) The planning commission or city council shall issue a conditional use permit provided the planning commission or city council is satisfied that the proposed structure or use conforms to the requirements and intent of this chapter and the city master plan, that any additional conditions and requirements stipulated by the planning commission or city

council have been or will be met, and that such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community.

(b) The community development and sustainability director shall ensure that the development and use is undertaken and completed in compliance with such permit.

Where multiple applications are involved, the timing of discretionary review can vary depending on the level of public controversy. It is not uncommon for a non-controversial discretionary application to be acted upon within three to four months of the applications' filing. It should be noted that often the developers enter into a development agreement with the city. This negotiated agreement may affect the length of time a project takes before a final action on it. It is also worth noting that even when a project involves multiple discretionary actions, the city attempts to process them concurrently in order to minimize processing times.

Once a multifamily site has been identified in the Preliminary Planned Development Zoning, it typically requires a Final Planned Development and Design Review. If processed concurrently, these applications typically require four to six months but timing will vary with the complexity of the project. At the time of these final applications, there is much predictability in the process, as the Planning Commission and City Council review projects using the specified zoning as the basis for their subsequent decisions.

Most new residential developments in Davis are in a Planned Development zone and very few are subject to a conditional use permit (only in rare cases where it might have been required because of some special situation like an office or industrial district). The CUP process has no stronger relationship to Planned Development zoning districts than any other zoning districts (like conventional districts of R-1, R-2, R-3, etc).

Planned development zoning (as compared to conventional zones) are most frequently utilized by developers and the city because the PD zone allows for flexibility that is advantageous, especially for newer higher density projects and affordable housing projects in terms of setbacks, FAR, lot coverage, and other standards. There is not a separate process for affordable housing projects but since affordable housing sites are established at the time of approval of the PD zone for the larger project consisting of mostly market rate units, they do not need to go through the Preliminary Planned Development (establishment of the basic zoning and uses including affordable housing) stage. They do have to go through the standard Final Planned Development stage which is basically a plot plan stage with overlap with design review (if design review even applies). Therefore, the planned development zoning does not negatively affect affordable housing development as most affordable housing sites are already within a PD zone and no additional layer of regulation is placed on the development of the actual affordable units.

For non-discretionary single-family projects, only a plot plan review is required, which is an over-the-counter task. Then the process to secure a building permit takes approximately 1 to 2 weeks. For a non-discretionary multifamily projects, noticing and public comment periods plus design review take approximately 4 weeks to process.

Design Review Process

The citywide design review section of the Zoning Ordinance (40.31, Plot Plan and Architectural Approval) applies to multi-family and commercial projects but not single family projects. The guidelines consist of "Principles to be Followed" and "Findings for Approval", which are both listed below. These principles and findings are intentionally general and flexible because of the wide variety of projects that are reviewed and their context.

Principles to be Followed:

In carrying out the purposes of this article with respect to the external design of buildings and plot plans of all proposed new buildings, structures or uses for which plot plans and architectural review is required, the following principles shall be applicable:

- (a) Review of architectural character shall not be so restrictive that individual initiative is stifled in the design of any particular building or site or that substantial additional expense is required. Rather, it is the intent of this article that the review exercised shall be the amount necessary to achieve the overall objectives of this article;
- (b) Good architectural and landscape architectural character is based upon the suitability of a building or site for its purposes; upon the appropriate use of sound materials, good relationship with other structures and the character of the city; and upon the principles of harmony, preparation and design in the elements of the building or site;
- (c) Good architectural and landscape architectural character and site planning design are not, in themselves, more expensive than poor architectural character and poor site planning design, and are not dependent upon the particular styles of architecture; and,
- (d) Review of sign graphics shall be based upon suitability of the sign colors, placement, design to overall building design and adjacent sign themes. The community development department shall consider the extent, design and location of all temporary signs in the review of sign graphics. (Ord. No. 1694, § 1 (part).)

Findings for Approval:

- (a) A plot plan and architectural (design review) application shall be approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the Planning and Building Director, Planning Commission, or City Council pursuant to the requirements of article 40.39 of this chapter. The Design Review would go to one of these decision makers based on the approval requirements of the accompanying zoning applications.

On its own, a design review only requires administrative approval. With a conditional use permit or final planned development, Planning Commission approval is required. If attached to a rezoning or a General Plan amendment then City Council approval is necessary.

Such application may be approved only if the following findings are made:

- (1) The proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the general plan, complies with applicable zoning regulations, and is consistent with any adopted design guidelines for the district within which the project is located;
- (2) The proposed architecture, site design, and landscape are suitable for the purposes of the building and the site and will enhance the character of the neighborhood and community;
- (3) The architectural design of the proposed project is compatible with the existing properties and anticipated future developments within the neighborhood in terms of such elements as height, mass, scale, and proportion;
- (4) The proposed project will not create conflicts with vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian transportation modes of circulation; and
- (5) The location, climate, and environmental conditions of the site are adequately considered in determining the use of appropriate construction materials and methods. Sufficient conditions are included with the approval to ensure the long-term maintenance of the project.

Actual physical guidelines are not listed in the code except for the downtown area, which includes the Commercial areas and Traditional Residential Neighborhoods. More specific guidelines have been established for the downtown area and the traditional neighborhoods surrounding the downtown. These consist of principles and guidelines consisting of written guidelines supported by illustrations. The design guidelines for the Traditional Residential Neighborhoods have the following guidelines:

- Design a front elevation to be similar in scale to those seen traditionally on the block.
- Minimize the perceived scale of a building by stepping down its height toward the street and neighboring smaller structures.
- The primary building face should not exceed the width of a typical single family building in a similar context.
- Break up the perceived mass of a building by dividing the building front into “modules” or into separate structures that are similar in size to buildings seen traditionally in the neighborhood.
- If a garage door is to be incorporated, design it to minimize its visual impacts.

- Locate doors and windows to respect the privacy of neighboring properties to the extent possible.
- Use building forms that are similar to those seen traditionally.
- Use roof forms that are similar to those seen in the neighborhood.
- Brick, stucco and painted wood are suggested primary building materials.
- Roof materials should appear similar in scale and texture to those found traditionally.
- Adaptive reuse of existing buildings is strongly encouraged.
- An addition should not strongly alter the perceived character of the original building.
- The roof form of the new addition should be in character with that of the original building.
- For an existing structure that is listed as a historically significant property, design a new addition such that the evolution of the building can be interpreted.
- A new addition should respect the mass and scale of the main building.
- Site the addition to minimize visual impacts on the street and on adjacent properties.
- Locate a secondary structure at the edges of the building lot in a traditional manner while providing adequate.
- Locate doors and windows on a secondary structure in such a way as to respect the privacy of neighboring properties to the extent possible.

The Plot Plan and Administrative Review process is governed by Article 40.31 of the Davis Municipal Code. The majority of design review applications are processed administratively. Owners of property within 500' of the site receive notification, but no public hearing is required unless there is substantive comment that an application should not be approved.

Considerations for granting design review approval are found in Section 40.31.085. These include objective criteria such as compliance with zoning standards, as well as interpretative criteria such as neighborhood compatibility.

The design review process entails the following steps:

- Determination of whether application is complete (must be completed within 30 days).
- Determination of consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and any adopted design guidelines for the district within which the project is located.

- Determination that the proposed architecture, site design, and landscape is suitable for the purposes of the building and the site and will enhance the character of the neighborhood and community.
- The architectural design of the proposed project is compatible with the existing properties and anticipated future developments within the neighborhood in terms of such elements as height, mass, scale, and proportion.
- Determination of consistency with Design Guidelines for the Downtown and Traditional Residential Neighborhood Design Guidelines, if applicable.
- Determination that the proposed project will not create conflicts with vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian transportation modes of circulation.
- The location, climate, and environmental conditions of the site are adequately considered in determining the use of appropriate construction materials and methods. Sufficient conditions are included with the approval to ensure the long-term maintenance of the project.
- CEQA determination.

If project is consistent, it proceeds to the public review process

- Usually, the Community Development Department mails a notice of its intent to approve the application to owners of property within 500 feet of the site. If there are no substantive concerns raised within 10 days, the project is approved.
- If a design review application is being processed concurrently with an application requiring public hearing (such as a rezoning), all entitlements are scheduled together

The Phased Allocation Ordinance, the Affordable Housing Ordinance, and the Middle Income Housing Ordinance were discussed in the sections above. Usually applications that are applicable to a project under these ordinances are filed concurrently with other discretionary applications like General Plan and Specific Plan amendments, and/or pre-zoning/re-zoning/zoning amendments applications for a residential subdivision. Affordable Housing Plans under the Affordable Housing Ordinance and Middle Income Housing Ordinance do require review by the Social Services Commission. While there is little to no additional time required for these applications because of the Commission's accommodation of project applications, there is additional processing that this entitlement requires. This review is not found to negatively impact a project or hold up the processing of an application.

Processing Fees and Exactions

Processing fees. The City Council through ordinances and resolutions establishes fees for building permits and planning and engineering services. These include the full cost of the preparation of environmental impact reports when necessary, and payment based on amount of city staff time spent for plan checking, inspection of improvements and other necessary services. The fees are based on studies that analyze staff time and prevailing fees in the surrounding localities.

State law requires that local permit processing fees charged by local governments must not exceed the estimated actual cost of processing the permit. Table 51 below lists the current fees assessed with the processing of planning and building permit applications. There are two types of fees associated with planning applications: fixed/flat fees and deposit fees. Flat fees provided a standard cost for the processing of its corresponding application without regard to whether the actual project takes more time or less time to process. Deposit fees allows the City to refund projects that are less staff intensive than others and charge projects that require additional time based on the specifics of a project.

The hourly rate in the schedule is applied to the deposit. The deposits were established based on the actual costs of processing using estimated number of hours plus overhead. Upon completion of a project applications review, any remaining amount on the deposit is refunded to the applicant. If there is an outstanding balance to be paid the applicant is sent a bill. Fees charged by the Community Development Department are estimated to account for 68.5 percent of its total support operations. The remaining operations support funds are derived as follows: 25 percent from the City of Davis General Fund, and 6.5 percent from construction tax, development impact fees, and grant funds.

**TABLE 51: CITY OF DAVIS PLANNING
DIVISION FEE SCHEDULE, EFFECTIVE JULY 22, 2013**

Application/Fee Type	Fee Amount	Fee Type
Hourly Rates		
Technical Support	\$88	Per hour
Junior/Assistant Planner	\$182	Per hour
Planner/Management/Supervisor	\$200	Per hour
Design Review		
Administrative approvals—Outside Downtown and Traditional Residential Neighborhoods and Design Guidelines. Includes building additions and changes to existing plot plans, but not new structures. Includes minor modifications and garage conversions. (Includes categorical exemption fee.)	\$2,000	Fixed fee
Design Guideline areas—Tier II design review	\$1,000	Deposit

Application/Fee Type	Fee Amount	Fee Type
Design Guideline areas–Tier III design review	\$2,000	Deposit
Minor Improvements/Design Guideline areas–Tier I review project <u>not</u> requiring a categorical exemption Projects requiring a categorical exemption	1 hour/Planner 2 hours/Planner rate	Fixed fee Fixed fee
Design Review (COA) of Historic Structures–Not Categorically Exempt. (Exempt projects–no fee.)	\$1,000	Deposit
New projects–all new buildings	\$2,000	Deposit
Planning Commission–Additional deposit for referral to Planning Commission	\$1,000	Deposit
Sign program (signs not consistent with sign guidelines or approved sign program)	\$1,000	Deposit
Environmental Review		
Categorical exemption	\$154	Fixed fee
Negative declaration (CA Fish & Wildlife fee may also apply)	\$1,500	Deposit
EIR preparation	Full payment of cost estimate or contract + 20% administrative fee	
Yolo County–Notice of Determination filing fee	\$50	Fixed fee
California Department of Fish and Wildlife filing fees		Due at planning application submittal
Negative declaration*	\$2,206.25	
EIR*	\$3,045.25	
*Includes \$50 Yolo County filing fee		
Housing/Owner Occupancy		
Affordable Housing Plans Review	\$900	Deposit
In-lieu housing (affordable units) Discounts will be given for vertical mixed-use projects and projects that include 75% stacked airspace condominiums. Discounts include a \$10,000 reduction of the per-unit fee for vertical mixed-use buildings and a \$5,000 reduction of the per-unit fee for ownership projects that include 75% or greater of the project’s residential square footage as stacked air space condominium units. Projects that are both vertical mixed-use and predominantly composed of stacked air space condominium units shall receive a \$15,000 total reduction. (Please note: Vertical mixed-use for the purpose of calculating affordable housing in-lieu fees is defined as a multistory building that incorporates residential units above first-floor commercial and/or office space.)	\$37,500	Per unit

Application/Fee Type	Fee Amount	Fee Type
Owner Occupancy Declaration Exemption	\$204.36	Fixed fee
Phased Allocation Plan	\$196.50	Fixed fee
	\$2,000	Deposit
Map Applications		
Tentative map (five or more parcels)	\$3,000	Deposit
Other maps/vacation of right of way/lot line adjustment	\$2,000	Deposit
Parking		
In-lieu parking space for all zoning districts, excluding Central Commercial (C-C) and Mixed Use (M-U)	\$8,000	Per space, Resolution No. 8343, adopted April 22, 1998
Central Commercial (C-C) and Mixed Use (M-U) zoning districts	\$4,000	Per space, Resolution No. 04-51, 2004 adopted February 17, 2004
Zoning		
Conditional use permit:		
Minor (Second unit, guest house, core area fast food)	\$2,000	Deposit
Major (all other)	\$3,000	Deposit
Final planned development & revised final planned development	\$2,000	Deposit
Minor modification		
Not referred to Planning Commission (includes categorical exemption fee)	\$2,000	Fixed Fee
Referred to Planning Commission	\$2,000	Deposit
Prezoning/Rezoning/Preliminary planned development	\$5,000	Deposit
Public convenience or necessity determination	\$1,000	Deposit
Temporary use permit:		
Not requiring mailing or environmental review	1 hour/Planner rate	Fixed Fee
Requiring mailing (includes categorical exemption fee)	\$2,000	Fixed Fee
Variance	\$1,600	Deposit

Application/Fee Type	Fee Amount	Fee Type
Zoning letter/determination of permitted use	2 hours/Planner rate	Fixed Fee
Zoning Ordinance amendment	\$4,000	Deposit
Zoning verification (Planning Commission)	\$500	Deposit
Other Applications		
Annexations	\$3,000	Deposit
Appeals—A flat fixed fee to be paid by the appellant. Hours will be charged against the project; all costs in excess of the initial \$200 shall be paid by the applicant/developer	\$200	
Core Area Specific Plan amendment cost recovery fee (see note 5) below)		
Historic unit:	\$2,359 per historic structure and \$2.40 per net new sq ft of new structure	Fixed Fee
Non-historic unit:	\$2.40 per net new sq ft of new structure	Fixed Fee
Demolition review:		
Demolition review (Municipal Code Sec. 8.19). Includes approval of site management plan, public noticing and, if applicable, initial 30-day historic resource evaluation.	\$500	Deposit
Consultant (additional if necessary to process)	\$1,000	Deposit
Demolition review of potentially historic resources held over for HRMC and CC public hearings: (\$1,000 staff/planning deposit, and \$1,000 historical consultant deposit.)	\$2,000	Deposit
Development agreement:		
Preparation/implementation	\$8,000	Deposit
Annual review	\$1,500	Deposit
Amendment	\$2,000	Deposit
General Plan Amendment	\$4,000	Deposit
Specific Plan Amendment	\$3,000	Deposit

Application/Fee Type	Fee Amount	Fee Type
Grading permit:		
Biological survey	\$1,000	Deposit
No survey required	\$308	Fixed fee
Long-range planning/community planning/General Plan update fee	.002 of building permit valuation	Charged at building permit on all permit types except demo permits
Parkland in-lieu (Quimby) fee	Updated Annually	Per unit
Pre-application	\$1,500	Deposit
Pre-application meeting (One-hour meeting)	\$150	Fixed fee
Research	\$500	Deposit
Yolo County referrals (all projects)	\$2,000	Deposit
All other applications	\$500	Deposit

Plan Checking

Plot Plan Review (at building permit)

Actual hourly rate charged at building permit

Notes:

- 1) Projects may require review by other agencies. These agencies may impose a fee for this service.
- 2) If the deposit exceeds the final actual cost, the balance will be refunded to the applicant.
- 3) The Community Development Director may reduce deposits if deemed appropriate.
- 4) Refund policy:
 - Refund requests must be submitted in writing.
 - Fixed fee applications: A refund will not be granted if the project has been noticed for a public hearing. If the project has not been noticed for a public hearing, the refunded amount will be the original fee paid, less the cost of staff hours worked on the project, less a \$30 administrative processing fee.
 - Withdrawn applications: If staff has not completed any work on the project, a refund of the original fee paid, less a \$30 administrative processing fee, will be made.
 - Deposit applications: Any unused deposit fee, after project completion, shall be entirely refunded.
- 5) Core Area Specific Plan Amendment cost recovery fees shall be increased each year by the CPI-U (San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose) Index, not to exceed 4%. Last updated with June 2012 index change.

Processing Time Limits

Table 52 below lists the current and typical development processing time limits for the City of Davis Planning Division. A basic design review will take up to 1.5 months. Depending on the scope of the project, review time can vary greatly. For example, if a project is referred to the Planning Commission for approval, the timeline is extended by one to two months. Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance require an additional two to six months of review time.

TABLE 52: CITY OF DAVIS PLANNING DIVISION DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING TIME LIMITS

Review Type	Typical Development Processing Time Limits
Administrative	
Design Review	1.5 months
Minor Modification	1.5 months
Minor Improvement	Same Day – five to ten minutes
Planning Commission	
Design Review	1 to 2 months
Minor Modification	1 to 2 months
Other	
Lot Line Adjustment/Merger/Tentative Parcel Map	1 to 2 months
Vacation of Easements	1 to 2 months
Tentative Subdivision Map	1 to 4 months
Conditional Use Permit	1 to 2 months
Variance	1 to 2 months
Final Planned Development	1 to 2 months
Revised Final Planned Development	1 to 2 months
Prezoning/Rezoning/Preliminary Planned Development	2 to 12 months
Zoning Ordinance Amendment	2 to 6 months
Specific Plan Amendment	2 to 6 months
General Plan Amendment	2 to 12 months
Annexation	6 to 24 months
Environmental Documentation	Depends on the application

Source: City of Davis, May 2013

Development Fees

One effect of Proposition 13 in Davis, as in many California cities, has been an effort to require that new developments pay for themselves. The City has imposed a number of fees on new commercial, industrial, and residential development, including development impact fees, construction taxes, and building and planning fees. In addition, the city collects a school fee for the Davis Joint Unified School District.

The physical infrastructure needs of the City are identified and defined as capital facility projects in the City-conducted Development Impact Fee Study. The study provides detailed information on the expected costs of these facilities, and allocates costs appropriately based on the type of development that trigger the need for the project. State law limits the extent to which local governments can place the burden for new facilities on new development. The law requires that fees show a "reasonable" relationship or nexus between the type of development on which the fee is imposed and the public facilities being financed by the fee revenue.

Residential developers are required to bear much of the cost of the development review and approval process as well as to pay fees to provide services and ensure adequate facilities for the residents of new projects. Given strong housing demand, fees and exactions are unlikely to limit the amount of housing built in the City, but they do increase the cost of producing housing. The impact on consumer home prices and rents is likely more influenced by market forces than the costs of production.

The fees collected by the Davis Building Division at the time of permit issuance, which are associated with new residential construction relative to building code, include the following:

- State of California Strong Motion Fee. This is a State-mandated tax for seismic monitoring, and applied to residential construction.
- Davis Unified School District impact fee. The school impact fee is \$2.789 per residential square foot.
- Yolo County development impact fee of \$3,901.70 for new single-family homes, and \$2,869.90 per multifamily home (commercial and industrial rate varies), in Davis is paid at Yolo County Planning Department in Woodland prior to issuance of building permit.
- Construction water fee of \$81.75 is paid for valuation of construction from one dollar up to \$100,000, and scaled for valuations over \$100,000.
- Water meter and backflow preventor permit fees of \$106 for residential construction.
- Construction tax fee of \$3.10 per square foot for residential.

- Plan check fees are collected for the review of plans for the projects. The fees charged often depend on the level of review involved prior to approval of the plans. Stock plans are charged a \$175 administrative fee in lieu of the full plan check fee.
- Development impact fee is approximately \$25,000 for a new single-family dwelling. Development impact fees are enabled by State law to provide funding for capital facilities needed to adequately serve new development. The fees established by the development impact fee resolution adopted by the City are adjusted to account for the following factors: 1) normal cost increases associated with annual changes in the Engineer News Record Construction Cost Index, 2) the share of existing project cost increases and decreases assigned to future development, 3) the share of new project costs assigned by the Public Works Department on a case-by-case basis to future development, and 4) General Plan changes that alter a parcel's expected development potential or densification. Thus, the exact amount of the development impact fee will depend on the factors as evaluated in the City resolution establishing a schedule for increasing development impact fees. The City provides fee estimates to developers and, based on three recent projects in the City, the following fees are considered typical:
 - Based on the completed New Harmony project, total fees for this 69-unit multifamily project were approximately \$2,638,362 total or \$38,237 per unit. This represents approximately 11 percent of the total project cost, which was \$23,422,903.
 - Based on the completed Chiles Ranch-Simmons subdivision, total fees for this 108-unit subdivision was approximately \$5,889,806 or \$54,535 per unit.
 - Based on another recent project, Cesar Chavez, fees accounted for approximately 8 percent of the total overall housing development costs.

The City's development fees are applied to all developments. The fee shown here include all City planning, building and public works fee as well as development impact fees including roadways, drainage, sewer, water, parks, open space, public safety facilities, and general facilities fees. The City does not offer fee waivers but actually provides financial assistance to affordable housing developments that demonstrate the need for this assistance.

Exactions

Typically new housing projects are only required to pay and provide for fees and requirements discussed above—development impact fees, processing fees, affordable housing units, and middle income units. When a project requires a larger degree of entitlements, particularly annexation or a General Plan amendment, the City can consider and determine the merit for additional project exactions through a Development Agreement based on the unexpected change in land use that was not previously planned for. Exactions that have been discussed in previous projects are typically associated with provisions for public safety services for the development, parks services and maintenance, and installation of a city well site. The City has not identified any instance when a

project has been withdrawn or left incomplete due to the other exactions negotiated within a Development Agreement. The City does not find these exactions to be an impact on housing development.

5.0 B. Governmental Constraints On Housing for Persons with Disabilities: Reasonable Accommodation, Building Code, and Land Use Requirements

The City could not identify any specific governmental constraints that hinder the provision of housing for persons with disabilities. With recent affordable housing projects, the City has partnered with local housing and supportive services organizations that specialize in providing housing and services to persons with varying types of disabilities. The City of Davis has affordable housing units for households with the following types of disabilities: physical, mental, developmental, and drug/alcohol dependency. The following is a checklist of potential constraints on housing for persons with disabilities:

- The City has an adopted Uniform Building Code with a universal design element. The City has adopted the Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance and the Checklist Ordinance that are related to some standards in Building Code. Both are in Chapter 18 of Code, Housing Chapter.
- The City enforces the requirements of SB 2787 and AB 1400 and adopted an ordinance requiring the offer of a checklist of features. The City also requires accessibility and visitability in new single-family units, requires building code accessibility for multi-family units, and for units with funding or land donation from the city increased accessibility is strived for. (policy listed in Draft Housing Element).
- The City has a process for persons with disabilities to make requests for reasonable accommodation. The ordinance is described below. Information about this procedures are make available through the ADA Coordinator by contacting ada@cityofdavis.org or by calling 530 757-5644 or TTY at 530 757-5666. The information is also available at the Community Development Department and the City's website.
- In reviewing zoning laws, policies and practices for compliance with fair housing law, the City removed restrictions during its last Housing Element period related to a maximum number of unrelated adults within a household because it was determined to be out of compliance with such laws.
- Parking standards for persons with disabilities are not different, but the city will allow for "parking reserves" (landscaped areas that can act as back-up parking spaces, developed as needed) if a reduced reliance/need for parking spaces can be demonstrated.
- The City's Land Use Element does not regulate the siting of special housing in relationship to each other.

- The City does not restrict the siting of group homes with six or fewer clients, which are permitted by-right in all residential zoning districts.
- Larger group care homes are a conditionally permitted use in all of the residential zones. The conditions for these homes are no different than the conditions for any other use (as listed in the Section on Processing and Permit Procedures).
- The City does not have occupancy standards based on family defined as relation by blood, marriage or adoption. Occupancy is only regulated by health code and leases between owners and tenants.
- The City does not have a set of particular conditions or use restriction for group homes with greater than six persons. These would go through the typical conditional use permit process to consider compatibility with adjacent uses.
- Group care homes with greater than six persons requiring a conditional use permit would include a possible neighborhood meeting, a neighborhood comment period, and a public hearing at the Planning Commission, with a 10-day appeal period of the Commission's decision. Appeals would be referred to the City Council. This is typical of the conditional use permit process.
- No particular conditions are set for group homes that provide services on site.

The City of Davis is an entitlement community for federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Each funding cycle of CDBG funds, the City identifies necessary projects in public areas (parks, curbs, sidewalks, and intersections), city-owned facilities, and public housing to increase accessibility. For fiscal year 12-13, \$535,738 of the City's \$745,058 total allocation of CDBG funds was set-aside and used for City accessibility projects. Consistent with this year, it is typical that sixty-five percent or more of CDBG funding is committed to city and public facility accessibility projects. Most of these projects are based on items that were identified in the City's Americans with Disabilities Act Self-Evaluation that was completed approximately three years ago, although projects of great importance identified outside of the evaluation can be considered as well. The City has also encouraged a greater amount of accessibility in all new housing units using the state's checklist of accessibility features. The City adopted an ordinance requiring the offer of such features in all new ownership housing units. And in 2007 the City adopted the Visitability/Accessibility Housing Policy that is now the Universal Access Policy (described in Section 5.0) that requires projects with single-family units to incorporate features of accessibility. Modifications and exemptions are made for second units, carriage units, and projects of 15 units or fewer within the City's Core Area (downtown). These requirements can also be appealed to the Community Development Director.

Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance

The City has approved variances and minor modifications in the past when it has been asked for a reasonable accommodation. Related to Reasonable Accommodations, the Zoning Ordinance allows deviations in parking requirements to increase dwelling accessibility for individuals with physical disabilities. An application may be submitted by any interested party with the consent of the property owner. The processing fee is that charged for all administrative design review applications. There is an administrative fixed fee of \$100 for requesting a determination from the Handicapped Access Standards Board of Appeals for building code issues. Any fees that are found to present a hardship to an applicant are further considered and can be reduced or waived by the Community Development Director if found to be a barrier to a reasonable accommodation.

Additionally, the City adopted a reasonable accommodation ordinance in July 2008. The ordinance provides a structure for the processing of reasonable accommodations in the City. As stated in the ordinance “ reasonable accommodation in the land use and zoning context means providing individuals with disabilities or developers of housing for people with disabilities, flexibility in the application of land use and zoning and building regulations, policies, practices and procedures, or even waiving certain requirements, when it is necessary to eliminate barriers to housing opportunities.” A request for a reasonable accommodation can be made by completing the City of Davis Request for Reasonable Accommodation form to the Community Development Departments with the: name and address of individual(s) requesting reasonable accommodation; name, address and telephone number of property owner(s); address of the property for which accommodation is requested; the current actual use of the property; description of the requested accommodation and the Zoning Ordinance provision, regulation(s), policy or procedure for which the accommodation is requested; the basis for the claim that the individual is considered disabled under the acts; and reason that the requested accommodation is necessary for the individual(s) with the disability to use and enjoy the dwelling.

If the project for which the request for accommodation is made also requires a discretionary approval (conditional use permit, design review, general plan amendment, zoning change, annexation, etc.) the application for that approval must be submitted with the request for accommodation for concurrent review. There is no fee for the reasonable accommodation request alone, but any fees for other discretionary approval still apply for that application. A request for reasonable accommodation in regulations, policies, practices and procedures may be filed at any time that the accommodation may be necessary to ensure equal access to housing. A reasonable accommodation does not affect an individual’s obligations to comply with other applicable regulations not at issue in the requested accommodation. If an individual needs assistance in making the request for reasonable accommodation, the City will provide assistance to ensure that the process is accessible.

Requests for accommodation are reviewed by the Community Development Director if no discretionary approval is requested alongside the request for accommodation. The Director must issue a written decision within 45 days either granting the accommodation, granting with

modifications or denying the request. The City evaluates the following to determine if the request is reasonable:

- Would impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City; or
- Would require a fundamental alteration in the nature of a City land use and zoning, building program or State or Federal laws.

The following factors are considered in making a finding on the request:

- Whether the housing, which is the subject of the request for reasonable accommodation, will be occupied by an individual with disabilities protected under fair housing laws;
- Whether the requested accommodation is necessary to make housing available to an individual with disabilities protected under the fair housing laws;
- Potential impact on surrounding uses and residents
- Potential benefit that can be accomplished by the requested accommodation;
- Physical attributes of the property and structures;
- Alternative reasonable accommodations which may provide an equivalent level of benefit.
- Whether the requested alteration can be removed if the housing unit is not occupied by a person requiring the requested accommodation.

The Community Development Director can impose any conditions of approval deemed reasonable and necessary to ensure that the reasonable accommodation would comply with these findings.

The City provides notice of the availability of reasonable accommodations as well as the application form at the public information counters in the Community Development Department and it is also posted on the City's web site.

With the combination of these steps and policies, the City continues to adopt policy and create procedures to reduce any barriers to housing for persons with disabilities in Davis.

5.0 C. Efforts to Remove and Reduce Governmental Constraints

The City has shown its ability to meet its RHNA for the current planning period. However, the City recognizes the need to remove constraints to housing and a policy category in Section 6 of this document is devoted to it. In addition to the programs, policies, and actions in Section 6, the City has already adopted the following local efforts to remove potential governmental constraints that might hinder housing availability and affordability:

- The City has exempted all affordable housing and multi-family projects from Phased Allocation Plan requirements under the city's growth management program.
- The City has exempted all affordable housing, second units, and vertical mixed-use projects from the one-percent growth cap.
- The City has granted density bonuses for provision of affordable housing and housing for seniors, consistent with state law.
- The City has adopted reduced affordable housing in-lieu fees and parking fees for downtown/Core Area mixed-use and ownership housing development.
- The City has continued to maintain a supply of land adequate to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation for housing at all income levels and is currently reviewing potential housing sites for other future city needs.
- The City has developed and implemented guidelines for infill development and offers fee reduction and reduced requirements for in-fill development comprised of mixed-use and/or condominium development.
- The City has suspended its Middle Income requirements and modified its Affordable Housing Ordinance requirements based on recent housing market changes and affordable housing revenue reductions.
- The City has provided exemption categories for accessory dwelling units (second units), carriage units (units with living space over a private garage), and small projects (15 units or fewer) in the downtown/Core Area from the Universal Access requirements.

Measures taken to reduce governmental constraints on housing for persons with disabilities is detailed in subsection B above.

5.1 Non-Governmental Constraints to Housing: Construction Financing, Price of Land, Cost of Construction

Nongovernmental constraints are those factors limiting the availability of affordable housing over which local government has limited or no control. State law requires that this Housing Element contain an analysis of potential and actual nongovernmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction. The nongovernmental analysis includes:

- Availability of construction financing.
- Land costs.
- Construction costs.

5.1 A. Availability of Construction Financing

In spite of continued housing demand and property values locally, financing for new construction has become both more conservative and expensive with the recent mortgage lending issues and the slow economy that is currently impacting all lending branches. Even successful and experienced local for-profit developers have stated that in recent months they are only being offered in the lesser of these following calculations:

- 75% of the total project costs; or
- 65 to 70% of the projected appraised value of the completed subdivision

There is some ability to increase these percentages up to five percent more if the developer has pre-sold housing units being developed and has deposits from buyers prior to construction start.

Non-profit developers also face a different challenge. Most of their construction costs come from governmental sources. Government funds for affordable housing are limited. In February 2012, Redevelopment Agencies throughout California were dissolved, thereby reducing annual local affordable housing revenue by approximately \$2 million. Non-profit developers face nationwide and statewide competition for ever-reducing affordable housing funds. The city offers affordable housing assistance from its Housing Trust Fund, HOME and CDBG funds. These funds are limited and continue to decrease with federal funding cuts.

For homebuyers, interest rates have a major impact on housing affordability, as discussed in Section 3 of this document. There have been some significant decreases in interest rates, but with the recent mortgage crisis and high percentage of foreclosures, lenders have tightened up qualifying standards more than in the past. This makes silent second and downpayment loans to low and moderate income buyers even more critical. Having cash on-hand (even as a loan) for the transaction decreases lender risk and increases buyer's affordability. It is unclear when interest rates will increase again.

There is no data to indicate that financing is less available in the Davis area than elsewhere in the region or state. Financing is generally available in Davis for new construction, rehabilitation and refinancing. The overall steady housing market of the City adds to the attractiveness for lenders to locate here. During the last planning period the City offered silent second mortgages through the CalHOME Program and plans to continue this program in future affordable housing projects and funding cycles. It should be noted that the City has no control over the financial feasibility of any housing transaction relative to financing. Lenders weigh individual housing transactions on their merit using their individual underwriting standards. The City has worked with the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) to ensure it will provide mortgage products to the City's affordable units based on the existing affordability requirements. The City continues to maintain approval from CalHFA underwriting staff.

It is not believed that financing would be an impediment to availability and affordability of housing in Davis because of the many institutions seeking to lend money at the current market conditions. This is based on the attractiveness of Davis to lenders due relative stability of its housing market and values. The City continues to work with CalHFA to ensure availability of their loan products into all affordable housing opportunities.

5.1 B. Land Costs

Many factors and variables influence the cost of land, these include such things as: land scarcity, location, unique on-site features, lot size, accessibility, availability of services, type of financing between buyer and seller, zoning and General Plan designation. Typically the cost of land is the largest component of housing development costs. While the City can directly control the housing supply through Measure J and the Phased Allocation growth management program, there is little that it can do to influence the market price of land.

As of early 2013, the cost of an improved, ready-to-build residential lot ranges from \$300,000 to \$400,000, depending on lot size, location, zoning, and other factors. For instance, locations next to open spaces, such as a golf course, greenbelts, or Putah Creek, demand higher land values, while locations near the freeways (especially I-80) are less valuable, due to noise and traffic concerns. The current market price of an improved residential lot, or group of lots, typically ranges from \$40 to \$50 per square foot.

5.1 C. Construction and Improvements Costs

The hard costs of construction are based on labor and materials but do not include land (addressed above) and the costs to improve the land. Construction costs, including development fees, vary depending on the type of development. As of early 2013, local developers contacted by staff estimate that the production home construction cost typically ranges from \$100 to \$125 per square foot. The custom home construction cost typically ranges from \$150 to greater than \$200 per square foot. Because builders often attempt to maintain a constant ratio of land to building cost, increasing land values can result in increases in proposed unit size and amenities, further increasing the cost of the completed home.

The range of construction costs for affordable multi-family projects in Davis in the last five years was \$150 to \$180 per square foot. Affordable multi-family housing projects cost more than market rate multi-family projects because of prevailing wages and other governmental requirements. The range of construction costs for market rate multi-family projects in the last ten years has been \$130 to \$160 per square foot. Production builders have lower construction costs compared to non-production builders in both single-family and multi-family housing projects due to the economies of scale (including management costs) and where the homes are built with lower quality components and finishes compared to non-production homes.

This page intentionally left blank

6.0 HOUSING GOALS AND POLICIES

Below is a compilation of the goals and policies of this Housing Element and a reference to any related goals identified in other sections of the General Plan that are associated with the housing goals. The compilation has been grouped into the following policy categories:

- 6.1) housing supply
- 6.2) affordable housing
- 6.3) access to housing
- 6.4) removal of constraints on housing production
- 6.5) residential conservation
- 6.6) energy conservation

Section 7 details the Implementation Plan or the action items for each goal category that shows the action, the responsible party, the time frame, and any potential funding sources.

6.1 Housing Supply

GOAL HOUSING 1. Promote an adequate supply of housing for people of all ages, income, lifestyles, and types of households consistent with General Plan policies and goals.

Policy HOUSING 1.1. Encourage a variety of housing types that meet the housing needs of an economically and socially diverse Davis.

Policy HOUSING 1.2. Strive to maintain an adequate supply of rental housing in Davis to meet the needs of all renters, including students.

Policy HOUSING 1.3. Encourage the construction of housing to meet the needs of single persons and households with children with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

Policy HOUSING 1.4. Encourage a variety of housing types and care choices for disabled persons.

Policy HOUSING 1.5. Encourage a variety of housing types that accommodate persons with disabilities and promote aging in place, including a requirement of 100 percent Universal Access features in all new single-family residential units not otherwise subject to multi-family building code requirements.

Policy HOUSING 1.6. Work with UC Davis to revise UC Davis/City agreement to develop plans, procedures, and priorities that will ensure the development of maximum student housing on campus.

Policy HOUSING 1.7. Include students from low-income families within the target population for affordable housing opportunities.

Policy HOUSING 1.8. Analyze the models and options to promote housing for local employees.

Policy HOUSING 1.9. Encourage a variety of housing types and care choices, as well as housing innovation, for seniors.

Policy HOUSING 1.10. Encourage construction of housing to meet the needs of farmworkers.

6.2 Housing Affordability

GOAL HOUSING 2. Provide housing that is affordable for residents with low incomes and low-paying jobs, fixed incomes, and pensions.

Policy HOUSING 2.1. Strive to meet the identified current and projected local need for housing and for housing affordable to extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households including provision of Davis' eight-year fair share of regional housing needs.

Policy HOUSING 4.2. Provide housing opportunities for the local workforce in the Davis area.

6.3 Access to Housing

GOAL HOUSING 3. Increase equal housing opportunities for all persons and households in Davis.

Policy HOUSING 3.1. Affirmatively further fair housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, disability, age, marital status, sexual orientation, source of income, and receipt of Section 8 or other subsidized rental program.

Policy HOUSING 3.2. Strive to ensure that required affordable housing is occupied by those with the greatest need.

Policy HOUSING 3.3. Maintain the scope of the Social Services Commission to include affordable housing.

Policy HOUSING 3.4. Strive to ensure that all new subsidized affordable housing and the land on which it is located remain affordable permanently. In a case in which that is infeasible, assure affordability for the longest feasible time and recapture of the local subsidies. Also, should economic circumstances or state and federal subsidies dictate that permanent affordability requirements be released for a specific development project, then

appropriate recapture mechanisms for the subsidies and owner occupancy for the longest period feasible shall be imposed. Specific findings for release of the permanent affordability requirement shall be established in the Affordable Housing Ordinance.

Policy HOUSING 3.5. Promote a linkage between new ownership housing and the local workforce.

See the Diversity Element of the General Plan for other standards and actions related to accessibility to housing.

6.4 Removal of Constraints on Housing Production

GOAL HOUSING 4. Disperse affordable and rental housing fairly throughout the City.

Policy HOUSING 4.1. Maintain and periodically review the Affordable Housing Ordinance to require the inclusion of affordable housing in all new development areas to the extent feasible.

Policy HOUSING 4.4. Encourage senior housing in all parts of Davis and near neighborhood centers, shopping centers, public transportation, and/or parks and greenbelts where compatible with existing uses.

Policy HOUSING 4.5. Encourage housing for special needs to be dispersed throughout the community to avoid an over-concentration in one area and to be located near neighborhood services and facilities. Special needs housing may include, but is not limited to, housing for physically and mentally disabled individuals, affordable low-income housing for single persons, emergency shelters, and transitional housing.

See the Land Use Element and General Plan Implementation Element for additional actions related to removing governmental constraints to housing.

6.5 Residential Conservation

GOAL HOUSING 5. Maintain Davis' housing stock in good condition.

Policy HOUSING 5.1. Ensure that existing housing stock is maintained in sound condition and up to code requirements.

See the Land Use Element of the General Plan for additional actions related to residential conservation.

6.6 Energy Conservation

Goal Housing 6. Promote energy conservation.

Policy Housing 6.1: Encourage the use of energy-efficient materials and technology in new construction.

See the Energy and Water Element of the General Plan for additional policies related to energy conservation.

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM OVERVIEW

This details the action items consistent with the Housing Goals, Standards, and Policies in Section 6, including a table for each policy category that shows the action, the responsible party, the time frame, and any potential funding sources.

Consistent with the Housing Goals, Standards, Policies, and Actions section, the action items have been grouped in the following policy categories:

- 7.1) housing supply
- 7.2) affordable housing
- 7.3) equal housing opportunities
- 7.4) remove constraints
- 7.5) preserve housing stock
- 7.6) energy conservation

Many of the program actions in the table indicate that the potential implementation funding is by staff time that is already budgeted. The City shall make a concerted effort to identify and secure grant funding whenever feasible to implement the program actions. It is noteworthy that some budgeted items are funded by developer fees.

7.1 Provide Adequate Sites: Regional Needs, Income Levels, Housing Types

The primary focus of this part of the Implementation Plan is to ensure provision of adequate sites for the City to comply with its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). All sites necessary to provide housing for the City's RHNA that accommodate all income categories are currently available for housing development.

Specific types of housing, including shelter and transitional housing, housing for farmworkers, housing for single persons and small households including single-room occupancies, and second units, are all included in this portion of the Implementation Plan.

TABLE 53A: PROVIDE ADEQUATE SITES (HOUSING SUPPLY) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
1. Continue to give priority water and sewer services to units necessary to meet the City's RHNA for this planning period, with specific priority given to affordable housing units.	a. Ensure priority when processing required units for RHNA and affordable housing units	a. Community Development and Public Works Departments, with action by the Planning Commission and City Council	As applications are processed	Already budgeted staff time and planning application fees
2. Process applications for the highest ranked sites with the highest development potential for housing to meet local housing needs and remain under the City's 1% Growth Resolution, including development agreements that include adequate citizens' participation and City Council oversight in the planning implementation of the allocation processes.	a. Process applications	a. Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council	As applications are received.	Already budgeted staff time and developer paid processing fees
3. Analyze the mechanism whereby existing and future mobile home sites can be made permanently affordable.	a. Analyze various models and policies, including Rancho Yolo grant research, make recommendation b. Review and take action	a. Housing staff b. Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	December 2018	Already budgeted staff time
4. As part of proposed large housing developments, consider requiring a percentage of small residential lots and structures with related floor area ratio standards to contribute to the supply of affordable housing and to avoid overbuilding of lots.	a. Continue to consider policy beyond current requirement for a mix of housing types	a. Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council	December 2016	Already budgeted staff time
5. Evaluate mechanism by which the City can encourage increased densities in Davis in order to facilitate greater affordability without sprawl. Study such dwellings as row houses, town houses, second-story apartments over	a. Continue to consider policy beyond current requirement for a mix	a. Planning Division, with action by Planning Commission and City Council	December 2016	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
businesses, impact of increased allowable densities, and second dwelling units. At a minimum, the study parameters should include analysis of the cost of construction impact on local infrastructure, impact to the city General Fund, affordability, proximity to shopping and services and consistency with neighborhood preservations standards as they relate to adaptive reuse, privacy, open space, building mass and scale and parking impact issues.	of housing types			
6. Strive to provide owner-occupied townhouses, small cottages, and condominiums in and near the core area and the neighborhood shopping centers geared to empty-nesters and singles and couples without children, in order to limit sprawl and provide lifestyle alternatives for those who do not need large suburban houses.	a. Consider additional steps to promote these types of development, particularly for potential housing sites that rank high on City list	a. Planning Division, with direction from City Council	December 2016	Already budgeted staff time and developer fees
7. As directed by City Council, City staff will develop a report on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the suspended Middle Income Housing Ordinance.	a. Evaluate whether the requirement is a constraint on housing development	a. Housing Staff b. Social Services Commission and City Council c. Planning Division	December 2015	Already budgeted staff time
8. The City of Davis will complete a comprehensive review of the following policies to evaluate the cumulative impact on residential development: the 1% Growth Resolution, Measure J, the Phased Allocation Ordinance and the Middle Income Housing Ordinance (currently suspended). The review will identify the cumulative impact of these separate policies, initiatives and ordinances on residential development and direction on any changes to address the identified regulatory barriers. The review will evaluate the City's	a. Evaluate whether the cumulative requirements are a constraint on housing development	a. Planning Division	December 2016 and then monitor annually through Housing Element annual report to HCD.	General Fund/Staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>ability to achieve the ultimate common goals established by these policies and ensure that there is no redundancy in the combination of their implementation. As issues are identified as part of this review the City will implement changes to mitigate and remove barriers, increase the transparency of these policies and establish ways to streamline these policies and processing permit procedures to assist with the development of a variety of housing types to serve a range of income levels.</p>				
<p>9. The City will review the current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to evaluate the 2013 changes to the ordinance, including the allowance of second units to fulfill affordable housing requirements. The City will also review recent court cases regarding inclusionary housing requirements to ensure compliance with state law.</p>	<p>a. Evaluate whether the requirement is a constraint on housing development. b. Evaluate whether the allowance of second units meets affordability goals including a survey to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - occupancy of the credited accessory dwelling units. - information on households served. - information on rents charged in relation to unit size. 	<p>a. Planning Division</p>	<p>December 2015 for second units and July 2018 to complete survey.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing Funds</p>
<p>10. Amend the zoning for the University Flats sites within the Residential High-Density subareas of the Cannery site to require a minimum net density of 20 units per acre or greater. Alternatively, subject to the approval of the Cannery developer, the City shall amend</p>	<p>a. Amend zoning code.</p>	<p>a. Planning Division and City Council</p>	<p>February 2017</p>	<p>General Fund</p>

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>the zoning in a subarea within the Cannery site where all the following criteria can be met: achieve a minimum net density of 20 units per acre or greater, accommodate at least 96 units, and the requirements of Government Code Section 65583.2(h).</p> <p>11. Superior planning and design shall be promoted through the following development expectations: A mixture of housing types and uses to the extent feasible. Ability to walk, bike and use transit for daily needs, services and amenities. Design for energy efficiency and resource conservation. Local sense of place and social interaction promoted through well-designed public spaces. High quality design which is attractive and distinctive. Universal Design as a goal. (Resolution No. 11-077, 6/14/11)</p>	<p>a. Facilitate redevelopment and new development that considers these factors</p>	<p>a. Community Development and Sustainability</p>	<p>As applications are submitted</p>	<p>Developer fee</p>
<p>12. Work with the Housing Authority to provide Housing Choice Vouchers to small households with extremely low and very low incomes.</p>	<p>a. Support vouchers as a mechanism for providing affordable housing, including referrals of members of the public and individual projects. b. Program outreach and education to Section 8 owners and tenants. c. Maintain reciprocal communication with Yolo County Housing when either agency is</p>	<p>a. Planning Division and Housing Staff</p>	<p>a. Participation on Housing Authority Board of Directors. b. Meet quarterly with a representative of the Housing Authority to discuss local projects.</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
	made aware of the filing of opt-out notices by Section 8 tenants.			
13. Streamline the permit-approval process to the extent feasible by offering pre-application meetings and concurrent review of applications.	a. Encourage the construction of housing to meet the needs of single persons and households with children with extremely low, very-low, and low incomes	a. Planning Division	As applications are received.	Staff time and developer fees
14. Adopt a Universal Access Ordinance for single-family housing units to implement the policies incorporated into the Housing Element, carrying out the City Council direction from Resolution 12-169.	a. Adoption of Universal Access Ordinance	a. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council	Winter 2014	Already budgeted staff time
15. Evaluate the City's Universal Access Ordinance requirements after they have been applied to a variety of projects. Specifically, review the effectiveness of the policy targets and its categories of exemption, and determine if any modifications should be made.	a. Track development of visitable and accessible units b. Assess the policy for areas to improve, update as needed	a. Housing staff b. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council	December 2018	Already budgeted staff time
16. Continue to work with UC Davis to provide housing for students. Support the provisions in the Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between the City of Davis and UC Davis in 1989, including but not limited to the following: 1. The goal and intention of UC Davis to provide on-campus housing for 25% of the current base student population and for 35% of the new student	a. Meet regularly with UC Davis staff to communicate on areas to collaborate	a. City Manager's Office and City Council	December 2016	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>population.</p> <p>2. The agreement that UC Davis' maximum and optimum three-term student population on the Davis campus is 26,000.</p> <p>In addition, rely upon the University to provide on-campus student housing. Seek an update of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) including the percentage of student housing to be provided on campus.</p>				
<p>17. Continue to explore programs to assist City staff, UC Davis staff and faculty, Yolo County staff, and school district staff to live in Davis. Continue to utilize local employee incentive system as a means of connecting local employees to local affordable and middle ownership opportunities.</p>	<p>a. Apply Affordable Housing Ordinance</p> <p>b. Require use of Local Workforce Incentive System</p>	<p>a. and b.</p> <p>Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council</p>	<p>Upon application for development with inclusionary requirements.</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>
<p>18. Work with housing providers to meet the special housing needs of individuals with disabilities and developmental disabilities, extremely low, very low, and low incomes, large families, senior citizens, farmworkers and their families, female-headed households with children, and others with special needs. Develop a plan that assesses the need and identifies options for an affordable assisted living project.</p>	<p>a. Seek to meet these special housing needs through a combination of regulatory incentives, zoning standards, new housing construction programs, and supportive services programs</p>	<p>a. Housing staff with action by Social Services Commission</p>	<p>December 2017</p>	<p>Federal Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, California Child Care Facilities Finance Program, and other state and federal programs designated specifically for special needs groups.</p>
<p>19. Review new housing projects against the city-adopted Senior Housing Guidelines.</p>	<p>a. Implement developed criteria</p>	<p>a. Housing staff and Planning Division with action by the Social</p>	<p>As applications are received.</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time and</p>

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
		Services Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council		developer fees
20. Support efforts by the USDA Rural Housing Services and Yolo County Housing Authority to provide housing for farmworkers and their families by offering letters of support, attending meetings with developer and USDA, and offering funding priorities if needed.	a. Support efforts b. Encourage developers and offer letters of support	a. Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	As requested.	Already budgeted staff time

TABLE 53B: PROVIDE ADEQUATE SITES (HOUSING SUPPLY) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
21. Provide sites for at least 1,066 housing units during the current planning period, including at least 248 very low-income units, 174 low-income units, 198 moderate-income units, and 446 above moderate-income units.	a. Process applications, as required by law	a. Community Development Department with action by Social Services Commission, Planning Commission, City Council	As applications are received.	Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees
22. Strive to achieve 200 units of first-floor accessible and fully accessible housing units.	a. Review all housing developments for consistency with accessibility and visitability requirements	a. Housing staff and Planning Division, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	December 2020	Already budgeted staff time, planning processing fees

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
23. Continue to facilitate ministerial second units and discretionary second units.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Expedite processing of second unit applications b. Provide education on developing second units c. Consider code changes to accommodate additional second units, include public workshops and noticing with any proposed changes d. Consider neighborhood plans that would further facilitate the development of second units 	a-d. Community Development Department	December 2014	Already budgeted staff time
24. Continue to support existing transitional housing and emergency shelter options provided in the city, and consider opportunities to provide shelter for 5 to 10 additional households at risk of homelessness or currently homeless, potentially including: youth transitioning out of foster care homeless individuals post hospital care in need of shelter to accommodate physical recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain existing levels of transitional and emergency shelter options b. Work with local housing and service providers to identify opportunities to provide shelter for local needs groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Housing Team, Social Services Commission and City Council b. Housing Team, with actions by Social Services Commission and City Council 	Review as part of supportive Housing Program (SHP) applications and discussions with the Housing Authority	Already budgeted staff time. Specific funding needs would be requested by individual projects.

7.2 Assist in Affordable Housing Development: Utilize State and Federal Programs, Local Incentives, Local Funding Resources

TABLE 54: ASSIST IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
25. Encourage use of Federal Tax Credits and other federal and state subsidy programs for production of low-income housing.	a. Provide letters of support	a. Housing staff	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
26. Encourage the use of all non-City available affordable housing incentive programs available to Davis residents for both new and existing housing by advertising the programs on the City website and in public meeting places.	a. Encourage use of available programs b. Promote and facilitate use of homebuyer education	a. Housing staff b. Housing staff	Posted. Effective immediately and ongoing as programs change.	Already budgeted staff time and grants like CalHOME that fund education
27. Pursue means of securing additional housing affordable to extremely-low and low-income households and land for such housing including, but not limited to, land dedication, land exaction, and other private funding opportunities.	a. Look for new opportunities to provide affordable housing b. Partner with local affordable housing providers	a. Housing staff, City Council b. Housing staff, City Council	Ongoing as applications for development are submitted and annually with CDBG and HOME grant funding process	HOME, CDBG, Housing Trust Funds
28. Create incentives to the development of affordable housing through measures such as flexible development standards that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Most of the City's vacant sites are in the PD zone, which is meant to foster development flexibility. For non-PD sites, the City can consider parking reserves or waivers on development standards such as setbacks, lot coverages, and open space of up to 10 percent.	a. Process affordable housing projects under planned development zoning	a. Community Development Department, with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council	As applications are recieved.	Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
29. Use local resources to support programs in the city that assist in placing high-risk renters into affordable housing units.	a. List this objective as a critical need in future CDBG/HOME funding cycles	a. Housing staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council	Annual funding cycle	Already budgeted staff time
30. If new lands are added to the City's General Plan Area, identify, zone and develop affordable housing sites early in the planning process.	a. Apply to projects in application	a. Housing staff and Planning Division, with actions by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	As development applications are received.	Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees
31. Work to maintain continued affordability of existing affordable housing with expiring federal, state, or local subsidy programs by annually monitoring each at-risk project and working with owners to develop a plan for conservation of the units. This may include offering technical assistance in identifying alternative funding sources if original funding will expire.	a. Enforce affordability covenants and resale restrictions b. Provide technical assistance	a and b. Housing staff, with support from the Social Services Commission and City Council	Annually and ongoing as needed	Already budgeted staff time
32. Assist residents who are displaced from subsidized housing in finding comparable accommodations.	a. Assist displaced residents	a. Housing staff and other City staff as needed	As needed	Already budgeted staff time
33. Establish a referral service to assist very low- and low-income households in identifying affordable housing in Davis and surrounding areas.	a. Create central application system for affordable rental housing units b. Maintain City affordable housing webpage	a. and b., Housing staff, working with Yolo County Housing, with assistance from Informational Systems staff	a. Dec. 2016 b. Ongoing	Undetermined
34. Compile and maintain a list of vacant sites in Davis which are suitable for affordable housing development.	a. Maintain list on City affordable housing webpage	a. Housing staff	Posted. Update as needed.	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>35. The City will encourage and facilitate development on underutilized sites listed in Appendix A by providing assistance with site identification and entitlement processing, provide marketing materials for residential opportunity sites and provide technical assistance to interested developers; including technical assistance to acquire necessary funding, offering fee deferrals for affordable housing projects, and providing financial support when available. On an annual basis, the City will also organize special marketing events; workshops geared towards the development community, and post the sites inventory on the City's webpage.</p>	<p>a. Facilitate and incentivize lot consolidation opportunities</p>	<p>a. Planning Division</p>	<p>a. Establish incentives and provide marketing materials by July 2015 and organize events annually</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>
<p>36. Monitor creation and availability of affordable housing in particular on underutilized parcels on an annual basis. If monitoring shows that the percentage of affordable units available does not meet identified affordable housing needs, take further actions to encourage construction of affordable housing, such as increasing allowed densities, restructuring the Affordable Housing Ordinance, identifying additional sites, and/or revising or adding additional incentives for lot consolidation and mixed-use development.</p>	<p>a. Annual monitoring of new affordable housing units</p>	<p>a. Housing staff</p>	<p>Annually through Housing Element annual report to HCD</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>
<p>37. Encourage and seek funding for shared housing for residents with low incomes, fixed incomes and pensions.</p>	<p>a. Provide information and shared housing agreements b. Post opportunities for shared housing</p>	<p>a. and b. Housing staff and Senior Center staff</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>
<p>38. Maintain standards for the regulation of condominium conversion applications so that low-income households receive appropriate displacement protection or benefits.</p>	<p>a. Process applications under City's condo conversion ordinance</p>	<p>a. Planning Division</p>	<p>As applications are received.</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees</p>

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
39. Provide written handouts and work with developers to provide signs to disclose the locations of sites approved for future affordable housing development to low- and moderate income-persons. In written materials, disclose that affordable housing sites may be developed with affordable housing as envisioned in the General Plan.	a. Review and/or generate disclosure handouts	a. Housing staff	As projects begin development	Already budgeted staff time and developer fees
40. The City shall review the Housing Element to determine (1) its progress toward meeting the goals of the Housing Element and any further actions needed to meet them before the end of the current Housing Element planning period; and (2) whether adequate sites will be available to meet the prospective identified needs for the next planning period and, if not, any actions needed during the remainder of the current planning period to make them available.	a. Review Housing Element for progress in Implementation Plan and availability of adequate sites	a. Housing and Planning staff	Annually through Housing Element annual report to HCD	Already budgeted staff time
41. The City shall petition our state and national representatives for more affordable housing resources.	a. Track and state support (in writing) for bills that provide more affordable housing resources	a. Housing staff, with action by the City Council	As related bills are processed in the legislature	Already budgeted staff time
42. Amend the Affordable Housing Ordinance to establish a more precise timeline for transfer of dedicated land and the award of dedicated land for development by nonprofits to promote neighborhood acceptance.	a. Amend ordinance b. Incorporate into new projects	a. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	a. December 2016 b. As applications are received.	Already budgeted staff time
43. The city shall review the Affordable Housing ordinance at least every five years to confirm its effectiveness. The next such review shall be scheduled no later than December 2016. The review shall evaluate number and types of affordable and market housing units constructed, the effectiveness of	a. Evaluate whether the Affordable Housing Ordinance is providing the desired number and types of affordable units	a. Planning Division and Social Services Commission	Completed Summer 2013. Next review by December 2016.	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>accessory dwelling unit pilot program in providing affordable housing, in-lieu fees generated and the purposes to which they are allocated, and consistency with other local policy objectives, including smart growth principles, accessibility, energy efficiency, etc. Robust public outreach shall be a required component of this review.</p>				

7.3 Program to Promote Equal Housing Opportunities

TABLE 55: PROGRAM TO PROMOTE EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES (ACCESS) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
44. Continue to monitor the number of persons seeking emergency shelter in Davis and Yolo County. Evaluate the resulting data to determine what facilities and social services are needed in Davis to cooperatively address the overall county needs of the identified population.	a. Monitor the local needs (city and county) for emergency housing	a. Interagency county homeless task force, with Housing and Social Services staff	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
45. Continue to participate in the Yolo County Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.	a. Participate in meetings and with financing for the 10-Year commission	a. Housing and Social Services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time and through assistance from HOME
46. Serve at least 100 people annually with the City's Fair Housing Services by disseminating information about these services throughout the community.	a. Provide information related to California Housing Law	a. Fair Housing staff	Ongoing	CDBG funds
47. Permanently maintain the affordability of required affordable rental units for very low-, low-, or moderate-	a. Monitor affordability	a. Housing staff, with actions by the Social	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
income households.	covenants and resale restrictions	Services Commission and City Council		time
48. Work with residents and landlords/owners in the event of sharp rental increases or evictions of groups of tenants by landlords of rental properties with 40 or more units. Special attention shall be given to projects with potential for large-scale gentrification or displacement of Section 8 residents without appropriate relocation to other similar affordable units.	a. Assist residents with housing information	a. Housing staff, with support from the Social Services Commission and City Council	As needed	Already budgeted staff time
49. Social Services Commission shall continue to monitor affordable housing programs supported by CDBG, HOME, and Housing Trust Fund identified for affordable housing and whether current needs of extremely low, very low, low and moderate-income households are being met. Currently produced annual reports will be amended to include information about the Housing Trust Fund including expenditures and income.	a. Maintain affordable housing in the Commission's scope and provide necessary information	a. Housing and Social Services staff, the Social Services Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
50. Forward all existing and new affordable housing opt-out notices to Legal Services of Northern California in Woodland.	a. Forward opt-out notices	a. Housing and Social Services staff	As notices are received.	Already budgeted staff time
51. In all cases of new subsidized affordable for-sale housing, except those cases in which the City determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the housing shall be in or under the control of a housing land trust, a limited equity cooperative, fee simple ownership with permanent affordability requirements and significant city oversight, or other permanent affordability arrangements with significant city oversight. Also, should economic circumstances or state and federal subsidies dictate that permanent affordability	a. Develop all new ownership housing units with permanent resale restrictions to maintain long-term affordability.	a. Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	As applications are submitted and new affordable housing is built.	Already budgeted staff time and developer fees

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
<p>requirement be released for a specific development project, then appropriate recapture mechanisms for the subsidies and owner occupancy for the longest period feasible shall be imposed. Specific findings for release of the permanent affordability requirement shall be established in the Affordable Housing Ordinance.</p>				
<p>52. In all cases of new subsidized affordable rental housing, except in those cases in which the City Council determines that permanent affordability is infeasible, the city shall develop appropriate mechanisms to assure permanent affordability.</p>	<p>a. Record a permanent affordability covenant to the deed of all new affordable rental housing units</p>	<p>a. Housing staff, with actions from the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council</p>	<p>As applications are submitted and new affordable housing is built</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>
<p>53. If the common-law Rule Against Perpetuities or any other provisions of state law prove to be an obstacle to implementation of a policy for permanent affordability and these actions, the City Council shall seek state legislation to amend or waive the provision that is the obstacle.</p>	<p>a. No state law has been an obstacle, but staff is working on connecting all available funds to permanently affordable units</p>	<p>a. Housing and Social Services staff</p>	<p>As legal challenges arise</p>	<p>Already budgeted staff time</p>

7.4 Address Governmental Constraints: Land Use Controls, Building Code, Site Improvements, Fees and Exactions, Processing and Permit Procedures, Constraints on Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Actions in this section of the Implementation Plan are aimed at reducing and removing governmental constraints to housing, with particular focus on potential constraints in the development of housing for persons with disabilities.

TABLE 56: ADDRESS GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
54. Consider a more equitable tax structure for future proposed city parcel tax by basing tax on unit square footage so that smaller units pay proportionally lower tax.	a. Consider variation on tax structure	a. Finance Department, with action by the City Council	Upon renewal of parcel tax	Already budgeted staff time
55. Provide financial incentives to rental property owners on the condition of making individual units permanently affordable. Options for incentives include but are not limited to market-rate rehabilitation loans and fee waivers.	a. Offer incentives to owners of expiring affordable units b. Offer incentives to increase affordable housing stock	a. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council b. Housing staff, with action by the Social Services Commission, Planning Commission and City Council	As units become at-risk and resources are available	Housing Trust Fund
56. Initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment to add a section detailing allowing density bonuses for affordable housing in compliance with Government Code Section 65915 which would encourage density bonuses for residential projects in proximity to	a. Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with state density bonus law updates.	a. Community Development Department staff with action by the Planning Commission	December 2014	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
public facilities and services including bus stops.		and City Council		
57. Periodically review Zoning Ordinance performance standards and revise them as needed to ensure high environmental quality, streamlined processing where appropriate, and compliance with state standards.	a. Omnibus updates to the Zoning Ordinance	a. Community Development Department	Every 2-3 years	Already budgeted staff time
58. Streamline the permit-approval process to the extent feasible by offering pre-application meetings and concurrent review of applications.	a. Streamline permit approval process	a. Community Development Department	Implemented and in progress	Already budgeted staff time and planning and developer processing fees
59. Investigate a “one-stop” approval process for non-discretionary applications, which require actions from multiple departments. The purpose would be to avoid unnecessary and confusing processing steps.	a. Investigate the potential for such process	a. Community Development Department, with all other Departments	Implemented and in progress	Already budgeted staff time
60. Encourage inter-organizational representation in the long-term planning efforts of each agency, especially in relationships between the City, UC Davis, Yolo County, surrounding cities and DJUSD.	a. Attend inter-organizational meetings and attend public hearings related to long-term planning, information decision-makers	a. Community Development Department, Planning Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
61. Develop a method for documenting, distributing and maintaining interpretations of the municipal code, the General Plan, and program policies as each relate to development approval	a. Maintain Interpretations Binder at planning counter.	a. Planning Division	Ongoing as interpretations occur.	Already budgeted staff time and planning processing fees
62. Continue outreach efforts to inform architects and builders of City standards and requirements.	a. Write articles for the City newsletter, provide updated	a. All City Departments	Ongoing and as code changes	Already budgeted staff

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
	information online, create and maintain user friendly handouts		occur	time
63. Consider expanding the use of third-party project reviewers and plan checkers to reduce permit processing time.	a. Reduce permit processing time	a. Community Development Department	Utilize as needed and/or requested by applicant	Already budgeted staff time and planning and building processing fees

7.5 Conserve and Improve Condition of Affordable Housing Stock

TABLE 57A: CONSERVE AND IMPROVE CONDITION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
64. Periodically conduct a survey of the condition of residential structures in Davis to identify any need for rehabilitation or replacement.	a. Conduct surveys with home retrofit program	a. Housing staff with HOME sub-recipients NeighborWorks and Community Housing Opportunities Corporation	2013-2014	HOME
65. Continue to require maintenance and preservation of the existing housing stock through the existing Resale/Retrofit Inspection Program and by requiring inspection of houses on resale.	a. Continue Resale/Retrofit Inspection Program	a. Building Division	Upon home resale	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
66. Encourage landlords to maintain all rental units in sound condition through City information, the resale program, and technical assistance and support. Affordable rental units shall be further maintained through regular City monitoring.	a. Provide information to local landlords b. Inspect a sample of affordable housing units	a. Community Development Department and housing staff b. Community Development Department and housing staff	a. Ongoing b. Every 1 to 3 years	Already budgeted staff time
67. Continue to support the existing program at the Senior Center which assists senior home owners in maintaining their homes by providing arrangements for volunteers to perform home maintenance services.	a. Continue support	a. Housing and Social Services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council	Currently available	Already budgeted staff time and use of HOME or CDBG funds
68. Upon the completion of infill-related studies and the adoption of infill and densification design guidelines and strategies, the Community Development Department shall make available a basic information sheet to inform interested parties that second or additional units are allowed in residential categories and the design guidelines affecting their construction and design.	a. Information sheet exists and will be continued to be disbursed.	a. Community Development Department	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time

TABLE 57B: CONSERVE AND IMPROVE CONDITION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Local Funding
69. Provide financial assistance to ensure housing retrofit assistance for at least 10 elderly or disabled low-income households.	a. Provide funding to retrofit program	a. Housing and Social Services staff, with actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council. Program administered by NeighborWorks.	2013-2014	CDBG, HOME

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Local Funding
70. Preserve at least 118 affordable housing units at risk of conversion to market.	a. Negotiate with owners and other potential funders with the objective to preserve affordable units.	a. Housing and Social Services staff, with negotiations and actions by the Social Services Commission and City Council partnering with Yolo County Housing.	As units become at-risk	CDBG, HOME, Housing Trust Funds, or Housing Choice vouchers

7.6 Energy Conservation

TABLE 58A: ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
71. Use subsidies, expedited permit processing, density bonuses or other incentives to support implementation of photovoltaic and other renewable energy technologies to provide a portion of the City's energy needs.	a. Identify potential incentives b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources
72. Offer incentives to developers for projects that result in energy savings of at least 20 percent when compared to the energy consumption that would occur under similar projects built to meet the minimum standards of the energy code.	a. Identify potential incentives b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources
73. Provide incentives for retrofitting existing homes and businesses for improved energy efficiency. An example of a retrofit feature would be a passive solar device.	a. Identify potential incentives b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
74. Support the opportunity for efficient public transit by siting large apartment complexes on arterial streets, in the core and near neighborhood centers and the university.	a. Support appropriate projects that utilize existing transit and a close proximity to community services and shopping	a. Community Development with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
75. At least 80 percent of all residential lots in any proposed new development should be oriented so that buildings have their long axes within 22.5 degrees of east/west. Allow a developer not providing the required percentage to demonstrate that other site design, building design, or construction measures would provide similar opportunities for conserving energy.	a. Enforce lot orientation requirements	a. Community Development with actions by the Planning Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
76. Develop and implement energy-efficient design requirements that go beyond the state building standards for energy efficiency.	a. Identify potential requirements b. Review and adopt necessary requirements	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from the Planning Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
77. Develop design guidelines for climate-oriented site planning, building design and landscape design to promote energy efficiency.	a. Identify design guidelines b. Review and adopt necessary guidelines	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from the Planning Commission and City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
78. Energy-efficient landscaping and preservation of existing shade trees is encouraged on all building sites.	a. Encourage the landscaping and provide additional information to developers	a. Community Development	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
79. Continue to enforce and support water conservation ordinances.	a. Enforce existing water conservation ordinances	a. Community Development and Public Works Departments	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time
80. Explore incentives to retrofit water conserving plumbing in existing residences and businesses.	a. Identify potential incentives b. Review and identify most cost-effective incentives	a. Community Development b. Staff, with action from City Council	Ongoing	Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources

TABLE 58B: ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Program Actions	Objective	Responsible Agencies	Time Frame	Potential Funding
81. Reduce the City's greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels or neutral no later than 2050.	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions	a. All City departments, commissions, and the City Council in collaboration with "Cool Davis" nonprofit organization	Resolution adopted November 2008, ongoing, goal for 2050	Already budgeted staff time, identifying subsidy sources

This page intentionally left blank

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
B and 3rd Streets Underutilized Sites In P-D #2-86B						
255 2 nd Street	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.43	20	Single-story restaurant
233 B Street	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.17	2	House
247 3 rd and 301 B Streets	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.34	5	Restaurants
241 B Street	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.24	3	Residence with Office
236 3 rd , 232 3 rd , 240 3 rd Streets, & 232 University Avenue	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.44	15	Single-story houses. One converted to copy shop.
235-239 3 rd Street	P-D#2-86B	30	CASP: Retail with Offices	0.28	8	Two single-story houses
225/229 B Street (Mission Residences)	P-D#2-86B	42	CASP: B Street Transitional District	.33	14* gross number of units approved	Single-story house and duplex

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
Subtotal			67			
Residential One and Two Family District (R-2) and Residential One and Two Family Conservation District (R-2CD) Underutilized Site						
642 E Street 070 182 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
637 E Street 070 181 18	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
647 D Street 070 173 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
602 D Street 070 181 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
630 F Street 070 191 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
648 D Street 070 181 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
617 E Street 070 181 14	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Well Site -- City
635 C Street 070 171	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
11			Density			
619 6th Street 070 182 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
611 E Street 070 181 13	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
829 Douglass Avenue 070 031 20	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
636 B Street 070 171 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.24	1	Single Family
613 F Street 070 182 13	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
612 D Street 070 181 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
626 B Street 070 171 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
607 E Street 070 181 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
620 B Street 070 171	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.18	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04			Density			
704 6th Street 070 194 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
524 E Street 070 183 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
526 B Street 070 172 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	2.20	1	DJUSD -- Office
646 F Street 070 191 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
642 F Street 070 191 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
643 F Street 070 182 20	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
636 F Street 070 191 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
639 E Street 070 181 19	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
532 C Street 070 174	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
05			Density			
650 E Street 070 182 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
637 F Street 070 182 21	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
232 I Street 070 312 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
213 J Street 070 312 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
518 J Street 070 343 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
620 D Street 070 181 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
818 Douglass Avenue 070 032 03	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.20	1	Single Family
612 C Street 070 173 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
630 E Street 070 182	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04			Density			
815 Douglass Avenue 070 031 23	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.20	1	Single Family
648 C Street 070 173 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
625 F Street 070 182 16	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
620 F Street 070 191 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
631 E Street 070 181 17	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
651 C Street 070 171 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
622 E Street 070 182 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
646 C Street 070 173 09	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Duplex
623 F Street 070 182	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
15			Density			
618 F Street 070 191 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
630 D Street 070 181 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
648 B Street 070 171 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.16	1	Single Family
910 Eureka Avenue 070 033 10	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
645 C Street 070 171 09	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
618 E Street 070 182 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Duplex
640 C Street 070 173 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Duplex
909 Douglass Avenue 070 031 16	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.23	1	Single Family
618 C Street 070 173	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04			Density			
613 D Street 070 173 18	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
530 E Street 070 183 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Duplex
626 D Street 070 181 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
520 C Street 070 174 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
915 Douglass Avenue 070 031 15	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.26	1	Single Family
637 C Street 070 171 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
616 E Street 070 182 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Duplex
510 6th Street 070 184 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Church
517 D Street 070 174	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
11			Density			
915 Eureka Avenue 070 032 15	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.25	1	Single Family
703 6th Street 070 191 20	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
824 Douglass Avenue 070 032 04	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.25	1	Single Family
628 C Street 070 173 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
621 6th Street 070 182 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
815 Eureka Avenue 070 032 23	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
816 Eureka Avenue 070 033 03	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
629 C Street 070 171 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
617 D Street 070 173	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Duplex

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
17			Density			
910 Douglass Avenue 070 032 27	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Duplex
909 Eureka Avenue 070 032 16	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
601 E Street 070 181 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
609 D Street 070 173 19	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
807 Douglass Avenue 070 031 24	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
613 C Street 070 171 15	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
606 C Street 070 173 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
601 D Street 070 173 20	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
616 B Street 070 171	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.13	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
03			Density			
600 6th Street 070 183 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
603 C Street 070 171 16	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.26	1	Single Family
531 F Street 070 183 15	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
602 C Street 070 173 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
901 Douglass Avenue 070 031 17	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.23	1	Single Family
513 F Street 070 183 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
533 E Street 070 184 13	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
516 E Street 070 183 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
514 J Street 070 343	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
06			Density			
539 E Street 070 184 14	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Duplex
309 6th Street 070 171 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.16	1	Single Family
819 Eureka Avenue 070 032 22	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
820 Eureka Avenue 070 033 04	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
301 6th Street 070 171 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
529 F Street 070 183 14	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
522 F Street 070 194 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
537 D Street 070 174 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
331 J Street 070 323	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	4 Units

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
11			Density			
335 I Street 070 324 09	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
327 J Street 070 323 15	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
331 I Street 070 324 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
528 D Street 070 184 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.28	1	Single Family
516 F Street 070 194 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
809 Eureka Avenue 070 032 24	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
810 Eureka Avenue 070 033 02	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
527 E Street 070 184 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
522 E Street 070 183	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Duplex

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04			Density			
536 C Street 070 174 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
519 F Street 070 183 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
533 D Street 070 174 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
224 I Street 070 312 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
218 J Street 070 313 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
523 E Street 070 184 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
522 D Street 070 184 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
240 I Street 070 312 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.09	1	Single Family
812 Douglass Avenue	R-2	5.75	Residential Low	0.25	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
070 032 02			Density			
901 Eureka Avenue 070 032 17	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
517 E Street 070 184 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
512 E Street 070 183 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Duplex
528 C Street 070 174 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
507 F Street 070 183 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
825 Eureka Avenue 070 032 21	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
826 Eureka Avenue 070 033 05	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
504 F Street 070 194 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
513 E Street 070 184	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
09			Density			
508 E Street 070 183 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
522 C Street 070 174 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
502 E Street 070 183 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
514 C Street 070 174 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.83	1	Church
509 5th Street 070 184 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
503 5th Street 070 184 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.15	1	Single Family
234 J Street 070 313 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.21	1	Group Living
217 J Street 070 312 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
830 Douglass Avenue	R-2	5.75	Residential Low	0.25	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
070 032 05			Density			
410 K Street 070 332 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
421 J Street 070 322 15	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
411 K Street 070 331 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
404 K Street 070 332 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.28	1	Single Family
842 Douglass Avenue 070 032 07	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
841 Eureka Avenue 070 032 18	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
842 Eureka Avenue 070 033 08	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.22	1	Single Family
841 Douglass Avenue 070 031 18	R-2	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.23	1	Single Family
1114 5th Street 070	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.10	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
331 14			Density			
214 J Street 070 313 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
220 I Street 070 312 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
1107 5th Street 070 343 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
1112 5th Street 070 331 15	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
429 K Street 070 331 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.07	1	Single Family
420 K Street 070 332 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
1012 5th Street 070 322 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
427 K Street 070 331 11	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.10	1	Single Family
436 I Street 070 322	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
01			Density			
421 K Street 070 331 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
437 I Street 070 321 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
416 K Street 070 332 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
425 J Street 070 322 14	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
417 K Street 070 331 09	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
433 I Street 070 321 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
414 J Street 070 331 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
1121 4th Street 070 331 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
418 I Street 070 322	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.14	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
05			Density			
1115 4th Street 070 331 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
409 J Street 070 322 10	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Duplex
417 I Street 070 321 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
414 I Street 070 322 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
407 J Street 070 322 09	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.08	1	Single Family
405 I Street 070 321 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
402 I Street 070 322 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.28	1	Single Family
345 L Street 070 333 08	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Church
336 K Street 070 333	R-2CD	5.75	Residential High	0.14	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
01			Density			
334 I Street 070 323 01	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.28	1	Single Family
327 I Street 070 324 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
1207 3rd Street 070 333 04	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.28	1	Single Family
320 I Street 070 323 03	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.25	1	Single Family
323 I Street 070 324 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
319 I Street 070 324 05	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.12	1	Single Family
1021 3rd Street 070 323 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
1015 3rd Street 070 323 06	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
315 I Street 070 324	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low	0.12	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04			Density			
223 J Street 070 312 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.14	1	Single Family
221 K Street 070 313 07	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.41	1	4 Units
642 D Street 070 181 02	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.19	1	Single Family
641 D Street 070 173 12	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.13	1	Single Family
705 6th Street 070 191 21	R-2CD	5.75	Residential Low Density	0.11	1	Single Family
Residential Garden Apartment (R-3) Underutilized Sites						
731 G Street 070 164 02	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.15	1	Duplex
619 7th Street 070 165 19	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.13	1	Single Family
521 7th Street 070 165 10	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.19	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
519 10th Street 070 142 10	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.15	1	Duplex
1005 H Street 070 145 05	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.18	1	Duplex
515 10th Street 070 142 11	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.15	1	Single Family
721 7th Street 070 164 04	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.26	1	Single Family
511 7th Street 070 165 07	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.20	1	Commercial
821 9th Street 070 146 10	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.11	1	Single Family
1101 H Street 070 144 04	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.15	1	Duplex
813 10th Street 070 145 06	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.13	1	Duplex
813 9th Street 070 146 08	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.14	1	Duplex

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
806 11th Street 070 145 03	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.17	1	Single Family
830 B Street 070 151 04	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.13	1	Duplex
405 7th Street 070 152 11	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.56	1	Single Family
425 7th Street 070 152 09	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.28	1	Single Family
511 7th Street 070 165 06	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.23	1	Single Family
619 E 8th Street 070 161 17	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.17	1	Single Family
615 10th Street 070 142 08	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.15	1	Single Family
812 10th Street 070 146 04	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.13	1	Duplex
614 E 8th Street 070 165 14	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.11	1	Single Family

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
907 H Street 070 146 12	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.14	1	Single Family
812 11th Street 070 145 04	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.18	1	Duplex
618 E 8th Street 070 165 15	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.11	1	Single Family
516 E 8th Street 070 165 08	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.43	1	Single Family
717 D Street 070 152 08	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.18	1	Single Family
420 9th Street 070 151 10	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.16	1	Duplex
840 B Street 070 151 05	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.10	1	Single Family
822 B Street 070 151 03	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.13	1	Single Family
308 9th Street 070 151 06	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.23	1	Single Family

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
820 B Street 070 151 02	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.17	1	Single Family
508 E 8th Street 070 165 02	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.14	1	Single Family
610 E 8th Street 070 165 13	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.11	1	Single Family
615 E 8th Street 070 161 18	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.11	1	Duplex
324 E 8th Street 070 152 05	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.47	1	Single Family
415 7th Street 070 152 10	R-3	24.00	Residential High Density	0.21	1	Single Family
Downtown Underutilized Sites – Mixed Use (M-U) And Central Commercial (C-C)						
417 G Street 070 215 12	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.18	1	Retail
512 5th Street 070 211 07	Core Area Infill	30.00	Public and Semi-public	0.14	1	Single-story house and surface parking lot

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
500 5th Street 070 211 06	Core Area Infill	30.00	Public and Semi-public	0.14	1	City Owned
920 3rd Street 070 311 03	Commercial Service	30.00	General Commercial	0.65	1	Thrift store. Single-story building with surface parking.
802 2nd Street 070 252 06	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.40	1	Retail
413 E Street 070 211 12	Mixed Use	30.00	Core Area Infill	0.14	1	Vacant Open Space – Private
830 4th Street 070 218 07	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.53	1	Hardware
300 E Street 070 214 01	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.35	1	Bank
904 4th Street 070 324 01	Mixed Use	30.00	General Commercial	0.53	1	Hardware

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
230 A Street 070 064 01	Planned Development #2-86C	30.00	Residential Low Density	0.35	1	Multifamily residential
220 E Street 070 242 04	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.77	1	City Owned
216 F Street 070 251 03	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Service commercial
211 G Street 070 251 10	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Restaurant
212 F Street 070 251 04	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Retail
205 G Street 070 251 09	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Office
524 2nd Street 070 244 10	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.28	1	Restaurant
302/304 G Street 070 218 02	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.23	2	Newspaper print shop. Single-story building with surface parking.

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
304 F Street 070 216 01	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.39	1	Bank
314 F Street 070 216 02	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.13	1	Restaurant
407 G Street 070 215 10	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.23	1	Retail
337 G Street 070 216 05	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.26	1	Restaurant
330 G Street 070 218 04	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.24	1	Retail
612 4th Street 070 214 03	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.28	1	Retail
331 G Street 070 216 06	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.13	1	Surface parking lot
815 3rd Street 070 218 08	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.53	1	Hardware
335 F Street 070 214	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Restaurant

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
04						
325 G Street 070 216 07	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.13	1	Retail
330 E Street 070 214 02	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Bank
338 F Street 070 216 03	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.13	1	Surface parking lot
240 G Street 070 252 15	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.70	1	Hardware
239 F Street 070 242 08	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.28	1	Single-story restaurant
217 F Street 070 242 07	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.20	1	Single-story bank
231 E Street 070 241 11	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.27	1	Retail
305 D Street 070 203 09	Mixed Use	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Service commercial
239 E Street 070 241	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Bank

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
12						
232 E Street 070 242 03	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Retail
707 2nd Street 070 251 06	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.06	1	Restaurant
703 2nd Street 070 251 07	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.07	1	Retail
702 2nd Street 070 254 01	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.14	1	Single-story mattress store
630 2nd Street 070 243 09	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.16	1	Retail
322 C Street 070 203 03	Mixed use	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Single-story house
901 3rd Street 070 324 02	Mixed use	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.53	1	Single-story office/retail including chocolate shop. Surface parking.

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
511 G Street 070 194 10	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.13	1	Vacant
909 5th Street 070 341 04	Commercial Service	30.00	General Commercial	0.28	1	Single-story hardware store with lumber yard and surface parking lot.
517 Rowe Place 070 341 03	Commercial Service	30.00	General Commercial	0.28	1	Single-story door shop and auto repair.
907 4th Street 070 321 11	Mixed Use	30.00	General Commercial	0.53	1	Surface parking lot and seasonal nursery
826 2nd Street 070 252 22	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.88	1	Single-story retail restaurant including tattoo parlor and sandwich

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
						shop
110 F Street 070 254 07	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.25	1	Restaurant
227 E Street 070 241 10	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Service commercial
315 G Street 070 216 08	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.19	1	Newspaper
204 F Street 070 251 05	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail Stores	0.13	1	Coffee shop and bagel shop, upstairs offices (no elevator)
327 D Street 070 203 14	Mixed Use	30.00	Retails with Offices	0.14	1	Single-story duplex
321 D Street 070 203 13	Mixed Use	30.00	Retails with Offices	0.14	1	Single-story duplex
320 G Street 070 218 03	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.38	1	City Parking Lot

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
321 F Street 070 214 05	Central Commercial	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.97	1	City Parking Lot
307 D Street 070 203 10	Mixed Use	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Single Family
317 D Street 070 203 12	Mixed Use	30.00	Retail with Offices	0.14	1	Duplex
385 B Street 070 073 15	Planned Development #2-86C	30.00	Residential Low Density	0.17	1	Single Family
359 B Street 070 073 13	Planned Development #2-86C	30.00	Residential Low Density	0.17	1	Single Family
371 B Street 070 073 14	Planned Development #2-86C	30.00	Residential Low Density	0.17	1	Duplex
The Cannery (PD-I-11)						
1111 E. Covell Boulevard	PD-I-11	2 to 30+	Residential Low Density, Residential Medium Density, Residential High Density, Neighborhood Mixed Use	100.1	587	Vacant Industrial

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
---------------	------	-------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------	--	--------------

Commercial Neighborhood (C-N)

Davis Manor -- 1660-1800 East 8 th Street 070 520 02 through 05	Community Retail	30.00	Neighborhood Retail	6.21	23 – 39	Neighborhood shopping center. Single-story with surface parking.
Westlake Shopping Center -- 1260 Lake Blvd. 036 380 07 and 036 380 08	Planned Development #10-81	30.00	Neighborhood retail	6.63	12	Neighborhood shopping center. Upstairs offices with surface parking.
Oakshade Shopping Center -- 403-417 Mace Blvd & 4615 Cowell Blvd. 069 530 01	Planned Development #16-80	30.00	Neighborhood Retail	11.88	59-71	Neighborhood shopping center. Single-story with surface parking.
Mace and Alhambra -- 4699 Alhambra Drive 071 100 17	Planned Development #1-04	30.00	Neighborhood Retail	7.43	34-43	Vacant

FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
University Mall -- 705-885 Russell Blvd 034 253 07	Planned Development #2-97	30.00	Community Commercial	8.25	45-66	Neighborhood shopping center. Limited upstairs office with surface parking.

Notes:

The underutilized sites have **Adequate Infrastructure Capacity** and no significant **Environment Constraints**.

The actual density for an underutilized lot of record in the R-2 district may exceed 5.75 DU per net acre. Note 6 on page 77 of the General Plan states that duplexes, where proposed on an existing lot of record and under applicable regulations in the R-2 zoning district, may be permitted even if said units result in a density on the individual lot of record that exceeds the density range of the underlying Residential Low Density designation in the General Plan.

Realistic Unit Capacity is based on a conservative estimate that at least one unit can be added to each site in the R-2, R-3, and Downtown.

There are 231 total housing units zoned and available in the C-N district, and a very conservative estimate of 20% units is projected to be built during the next eight years, 46 units.

There are 65 total parcels zoned for and available for redevelopment with more units in the M-U and C-C districts; a conservative estimate of one unit per parcel through the eight years cycle is projected.

There are 36 lots in the R-3 district, and a conservative estimate of two units per parcel is projected during the next eight years cycle because the lots would permit at least two apartment units each.

There are 184 lots in the R-2 district, and a very conservative estimate of 20% units is projected to be built during the next eight years.

Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) Additional Details

	Davis Manor	Westlake Shopping Center	University Mall	Oakshade Shopping Center	Mace and Alhambra
Zoning	Community Retail	Planned Development #10-	Planned Development #2-	Planned Development	Planned Development #1-

Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
		81	97	#16-80		04
General Plan Land Use	Neighborhood Retail	Neighborhood Retail	Community Commercial	Neighborhood Retail	Neighborhood Retail	
Residential Use Permitted by Zoning (Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Limits to Residential Use by Zoning	Restricted to 2 nd story	12 units	Restricted to 2 nd story	Restricted to 1st story	Restricted to 1st story	
Limiting Restriction by the General Plan	FAR – GP 65% residential use limited to 49%	Zoning	FAR – GP 65% residential use limited to 15%	FAR – GP 65% residential use limited to 49%	FAR – GP 65% residential use limited to 49%	
Theoretical Potential No. of Residential Units (1,000 sf/unit) with 950 sf/unit for open space and parking	39 units	12 units	66 units	71 units	43 units	
Total Possible Units			828			

Notes:


This portion of the table shows how the estimated units that could be built on the underutilized C-N districts are derived. Each site is fully entitled to accommodate the units identified, and details as shown above. The sites are within urbanized area of the City, and there are no environmental or other constraints to preclude their immediate redevelopment. The


FULL UNDERUTILIZED SITES LIST


Locations Of Available Underutilized Sites To Meet Unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)


APN/ Location	Zone	Allowable Density (DU per net acre)	GP Designation	Lot Size in Acres	Realistic Unit Capacity (net increase)	Existing Use
---------------	------	--	----------------	-------------------	---	--------------

rationale for their development with residential units is provided in the narrative describing section.









Approved and Pending Projects

0 0.5 1 Mile

