

4. SETTING: POPULATION AND HOUSING STOCK

4.0 POPULATION AND HOUSING TRENDS

The 2000 Census provides some detailed demographic characteristics of Davis. The tables in this section are used to summarize these characteristics. Historically the Davis population predominantly consisted of the white race. However, the city's minority population nearly doubled between 1970 and 1980. In 1970, about 2,300 (9.8%) of the city's residents belonged to the minority group. In 1980 the minority group figure was 4,580 (12.5%). In 1990 the minority group population was 23.9%. In 2000 it was approximately 34.1% under the two or more races' data. The Census Bureau changed the enumeration of races in 2000. This change in the way races are counted significantly altered the ability to effectively evaluate racial trends. However, under the one race data provided in Table 6 below, whites are 70.1% of the total population. Those who identified themselves as whites alone were 65.9% of the total population in 2000.

RACE	All ages		18 years and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total population	60,308	100.0	49,072	100.0
One race	57,372	95.1	47,119	96.0
White	42,256	70.1	34,029	69.3
Black or African American	1,417	2.3	1,089	2.2
American Indian and Alaska Native	407	0.7	316	0.6
Asian	10,576	17.5	9,587	19.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	144	0.2	112	0.2
Some other race	2,572	4.3	1,986	4.0
Two or more races	2,936	4.9	1,953	4.0
HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE				
Total population	60,308	100.0	49,072	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	5,793	9.6	4,231	8.6
Not Hispanic or Latino	54,515	90.4	44,841	91.4
One race	52,177	86.5	43,260	88.2
White	39,714	65.9	32,213	65.6
Black or African American	1,354	2.2	1,052	2.1
American Indian and Alaska Native	274	0.5	212	0.4
Asian	10,514	17.4	9,536	19.4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	134	0.2	106	0.2
Some other race	187	0.3	141	0.3
Two or more races	2,338	3.9	1,581	3.2
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census				

There have been steady increases in the ethnic mix of the city in the past 30 years. However, no drastic changes that would tend to significantly alter the distribution of the population have taken place in Davis since the past 30 years. Both Davis' population and enrollment at the University have increased over the years. However, the basic make-up of 1) Davis population, 2) University employees, 3) service employees and 4) Davis residents who commute to jobs in Sacramento, or other surrounding areas has remained fairly the same.

The analysis of population in this Housing Element focuses on the area within the City of Davis. It is noteworthy that the demographics data provided exclude the unincorporated areas surrounding the city. This is because the Census data, being the primary source of data available, are based on the incorporated city limits. Other than on the UC Davis campus, those areas outside the city limits that are in the planning area are mostly undeveloped, except for pockets of residential development, including Cactus Corners and El Macero.

It is not anticipated that drastic growth will occur during this Housing Element planning period to significantly alter the characteristics of the city. Potential changes in the area that might influence the population characteristics of the city include UC Davis student enrollment increase, and likely new residential developments, such as Covell Village and the proposed UC Davis Neighborhood Master Plan (NMP). The NMP presents the detailed site plan and design guidelines that will be used to create a new student, faculty and staff neighborhood at UC Davis. The extent to which these potential developments might affect the city's population is unknown at this time. It is not anticipated that major businesses would be locating in the city to generate significant job opportunities that may result in a substantive change to the city's population during this five-year planning period.

4.1 POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

The majority of the tables in this section are from Census 2000 data. Some of the city's chief population and housing characteristics include:

- The city's population is relatively young. The 2000 Census reveals that the median age was 25.2. This is largely attributable to the large proportion of UC Davis students in the population. The 2000 Census shows that almost half the residents were under 24; approximately a third were between ages 15 and 24. Also, it shows that about 35.14% (i.e., 21,196 of the 60,308) of the population are enrolled in college or graduate school.
- The city has a well-educated population. Approximately 37.24% of the total population (i.e., 22,461 of 60,308) have an associate, bachelor, graduate or professional degree.
- Incomes are high, especially for families. According to 2000 Census, the Davis per capita income, median family and household incomes are relatively higher than Yolo County (See Section 4.2 below for income data).
- The housing stock is fairly new. As of December 2002, about 41% of the city's housing stock was constructed in the past 20 years, and 72% of the units in the past 30 years.

The California State Department of Finance (DOF) estimated Davis population as of January 1, 2002 at 63,324. The 2003 population projection has not been released at the time of this document. The 2000 Census Davis Urbanized Area population was 66,022, while the Davis City population was 60,308. In 2000 the population of the Davis Urbanized Area was 5,714, which consists of UC Davis, El Macero, Old Willowbank, Cactus Corner, Binning Tract, and North Davis Meadows.

Table 7 below compares Davis 1990 and 2000 household characteristics. There are no significant changes since 1990. However, the minor changes in the household characteristics include the reduced percentage of renters, from 61.8 to 55.4 percent.

TABLE 7 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS				
Group	1990	Percent	2000	Percent
Total Households	16,891	100.0	22,948	100.0
Owners	6,444	38.2	10,235	44.6
Renters	10,447	61.8	12,713	55.4
Families			11,291	49.2
Householder				
White	13,797	81.7	17,034	74.2
Black	526	3.1	502	2.2
Amer. Indian	121	0.7	141	0.6
Asian	1,972	11.7	3,601	15.7
Other	475	2.8	850	3.8
2 or more races			820	3.6
Hispanic (any race)	1,035	6.1	1,756	7.7
Elderly householder	1,817	10.8	2,552	11.1
Owner	N/A	N/A	1,901	74.5
Renter	N/A	N/A	651	25.5
Married couple	N/A	N/A	1,118	43.8
Other family	N/A	N/A	176	6.9
Living alone	N/A	N/A	1,184	46.4
Not alone, not family	N/A	N/A	74	2.9
Households of 5 or more persons	1,145	6.8	1,785	5.0
Family	N/A	N/A	1,287	72.1
Nonfamily	N/A	N/A	498	27.9
Owner	N/A	N/A	865	48.5
Renter	N/A	N/A	920	51.5
Single householder with children	N/A	N/A	1,588	6.9
Male householder	N/A	N/A	323	20.3
Female householder	868	5.1	1,265	79.7
Sources: 1990 Census, 2000 Census Data				

Population and Age Distribution

Table 8 below summarizes the city's 2000 age distribution. The table shows that a significant proportion of the city population is young. The age range 15 to 24 in 2000 was 34.2. This is slightly less than the 34.8% in 1990 for the same age range.

Subject	Number	Percent
Total Population	60,308	100.0
Median age (years)	25.2	Not Applicable (N/A)
Under 5 years	2,772	4.6
5 to 9 years	3,195	5.3
10 to 14 years	3,306	5.5
15 to 19 years	6,911	11.5
20 to 24 years	13,698	22.7
25 to 34 years	9,015	14.9
35 to 44 years	7,348	12.2
45 to 54 years	6,807	11.3
55 to 59 years	1,939	3.2
60 to 64 years	1,313	2.2
65 to 74 years	1,976	3.3
75 to 84 years	1,511	2.5
85 years and over	517	0.9
Source: U. S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 from Table DP-1		

Enrollment in School

Table 9 below shows that a little over 50% of the total population in 2000 was enrolled in school. Approximately 30,572 of this population was enrolled in college or graduate school. The college or graduate school students may be enrolled at the University of California, the community colleges, or elsewhere.

Subject	Number	Percent
Total Population	60,308	100.0
School Enrollment	30,572	100.0
Nursery School, Preschool	937	3.1
Kindergarten	678	2.2
Elementary School (Grades 1-8)	5,217	17.1
High School (Grades 9-12)	2,544	8.3
College or Graduate School	21,196	69.3
Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3, DP-2		

Poverty Status in 1999

In 1989 there were 604 families in poverty according to the 1990 Census. The 2000 Census revealed that there were 609 families in poverty in 1999. This was an increase of five families. In 1990, 7.9 percent of the total families lived in poverty as compared to the 5.4 percent in 2000. There was a decrease in the total poverty level in the city since the 1990 Census. The 2000 Census shows that there are 335 families with female householder and no husband present and 14,101 individuals that are below poverty level. The overwhelming majority of persons in poverty are non-elderly adults in nonfamily households. Table 10 summarizes the poverty level in 1999.

TABLE 10 POVERTY STATUS IN 1999 (BELOW POVERTY LEVEL)			
Subject	Number		Percent below poverty level
	All income levels	Below poverty level	
Families	11,345	609	5.4
With related children under 18 years	6,415	441	6.9
With related children under 5 years.	2,260	170	7.5
Families with female householder, no husband present	1,764	335	19.0
With related children under 18 years	1,220	335	21.5
With related children under 5 years	197	64	32.5
All individuals for whom poverty status is determined	57,568	14,101	24.5
Under 18 years	11,098	813	7.3
65 years and over	3,660	102	2.8
Unrelated individuals for whom poverty status is determined	23,292	12,321	52.9
All individuals below:			
50 percent of poverty level	9,443		
125 percent of poverty level	16,133		
130 percent of poverty level	16,515		

Source: 2000 Census SF 4

Household and Family Income

In 2000 and 1990, Davis' per capita, median household and median family income figures were higher than those of Yolo County as a whole. However, the Davis median household income figure was 8.6 percent lower than the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA in 2000.

As is the case with many Davis statistics, students play a significant role. The personal and household incomes of students are often low. The Davis incomes in 1990 and 2000 are relatively higher than the incomes of the surrounding communities, the presence of students notwithstanding. Table 11 compares the per capital, median household and median family incomes of Davis, Yolo County, and Sacramento-Yolo CMSA.

TABLE 11 PER CAPITAL, MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD AND MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME COMPARED					
	Davis, 1990	Yolo, 1990	Davis, 2000	Yolo, 2000	Sacramento- Yolo CMSA, 2000
Per Capita Income	\$15,269	\$13,861	\$22,937	\$19,365	\$22,302
Median Household Income	\$29,044	\$28,866	\$42,454	\$40,769	\$46,106
Median Family Income	\$47,262	\$36,866	\$74,051	\$51,623	\$53,795
Source: 1990 Census STF3, 2000 Census SF3 - compiled by SACOG					

Table 12 below shows per capita incomes for the Sacramento region by counties and cities in 2000. This table shows that Davis had the fourth highest per capita income among cities in the region.

TABLE 12 CENSUS 2000 SACRAMENTO REGION PER CAPITA INCOMES			
Counties		Per capita income in 1999	
El Dorado County		\$25,560	
Placer County		\$27,963	
Sacramento County		\$21,142	
Sutter County		\$17,428	
Yolo County		\$19,365	
Yuba County		\$14,124	
Cities	Per capita income in 1999	Cities	Per capita income in 1999
Davis	\$22,937	Rocklin	\$26,910
Folsom	\$30,210	Roseville	\$27,021
Galt	\$16,620	Sacramento	\$18,721
Isleton	\$19,767	Wheatland	\$14,889
Lincoln	\$19,447	Winters	\$17,133
Live Oak	\$9,571	Woodland	\$18,042
Marysville	\$15,315	Yuba City	\$15,928
Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 - compiled by SACOG			

Housing Preferences

A strong market exists in Davis for both ownership and rental housing. The UC Davis campus is largely a non-commuter campus, with about 95 percent of the student body living within the Davis urban area. Characterized by smaller households, greater transiency, and lower incomes than the non-student population, student households create a strong demand for rental housing.

In addition to single-family and multi-family housing units, there are group-living quarters in the city. Group quarters or group living situations include fraternities, sororities, and institutions such as retirement homes, nursing homes, hospitals, group homes and halfway houses. These types of housing exist in varying forms in the city. The population of group quarters in 2000 was 2,970. The State of California Department of Finance January 1, 2002 estimated the group quarters population in Davis at 3,091.

Several factors influence housing preference. A common factor is income level. Income level directly impacts one's ability to afford certain types of housing. Other factors include individual circumstances. For instance, it is normal for students to share a unit, while it may be difficult for families to share a unit.

4.2 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Davis is unusual because of the mix of housing types found in many neighborhoods, and within relatively small areas. Housing type mix has been promoted by many factors including limited land supply, the previous Allocation System rating criteria, and city affordability requirements. The existing mix of units results in a mix of residents - owners and renters, students and non-students, seniors and households with and without children living in close proximity.

General Plan and Housing Element policies have included the objective of achieving a mix of housing types and prices/rents in each planning area and neighborhood. To some extent, this mix integrates neighborhoods economically; it works against creating neighborhoods characterized by lower property values or poor maintenance, and also impedes development of upper-income neighborhoods.

Most Davis neighborhoods have a mix of housing types. Tight land supply and limited allocations also minimize the incentive for the creation of larger lots. However, previous and existing city policies and the fact that a developer can make more money per acre at higher density have led to a mix of small to large lots. Other city policies, such as impact fees, the relatively low maximum densities and the Phased Allocation Plan, have the opposite effect: they tend to increase unit size and housing cost for both single-family and multi-family developments. Some recent subdivisions now built out or near built-out, such as the North Davis Farms, Wildhorse, Oakshade, Mace Ranch, and El Macero Estate 2, contain a mix of small to large lots.

In the early 1990s, large areas of new residential developable land in which there were few or no housing units characterized Davis. Today, these large areas of residential developable land are nearly built-out and occupied.

Housing Type and Density

In the 1987 General Plan, the city had a policy of 60:40 ratio of single-family to multi-family units. This requirement was credited as one of the factors resulting in a long-term pattern of a strong apartment component of construction activity in Davis. The 2001 General Plan does not include the 60:40 ratio. The city analyzed it as part of the 2001 General Plan update job/housing balance, which was part of the 60:40 ratio policy. The city decided that it does not serve the goals of the city to include this 60:40 policy in the update. However, Table 13 below shows that the city is not significantly off the target of 60:40. Table 13 shows that in 2000 approximately 56% of the total housing units were single-family, while about 44% were multi-family units.

TABLE 13 EXISTING HOUSING UNITS PER 2000 CENSUS		
	Number	Percent
Total Housing Units	23,611	100.0
Single-family	13,307	56.36
Multifamily	10,304	43.64

Notes:

1. Single-family refers to one-unit attached and detached, mobile home, boat, RV, vans, and etc. 377 mobiles and 8 boat, RV, van and etc in the Census 200 SF3 table were added to 10,575 and 2,347 detached and attached one-unit figures to get 13,307
2. Multifamily refers to 2 units, 3 or 4 units, 5 to 9 units, 10-19 units and 20 or more units in the Census 2000 SF3 table.

Source: Census 2000 SF3 as compiled by SACOG

Table 14 below summarizes housing units in 2000 by tenure; whether they are owner-occupied or rented. Ownership housing may include single-family units, condominiums, or mobile homes. Rental housing includes rented single-family houses and duplexes as well as apartments. The table shows that the percent of the total-housing units' vacancy in 2000 was 2.8.

TABLE 14 SUMMARY OF HOUSING UNITS BY OCCUPANCY		
	Number in 2000	Percent in 2000
Total housing units	23,617	100.0
Occupied housing units	22,948	97.2
Vacant housing units	669	2.8
Owner-occupied	10,235	44.6
Renter-occupied	12,713	55.4
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	-	0.8
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	-	2.7
Average household size of owner-occupied units	2.64	-
Average household size of renter-occupied units	2.39	-

Source: Census 2000

Table 15 below contains residential building permit activities relative to the proportions of multi-family and single-family units. It shows that there have been fluctuations over the years in the proportion of single-family and multi-family units built. Similar to the ratio of single family to multi-family in the 2000 Census, single-family and multi-family building permit activities are 55.9% to 44.1%, respectively.

TABLE 15			
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY IN DAVIS, 1980 TO 2002			
Calendar Year	Single-family	Multifamily	Total
1980	230	128	358
1981	140	214	354
1982	120	3	123
1983	191	267	458
1984	153	356	509
1985	133	386	519
1986	156	272	428
1987	260	574	834
1988	96	51	147
1989	183	0	183
1990	387	360	747
1991	277	320	597
1992	231	220	451
1993	414	44	458
1994	279	78	357
1995	220	3	223
1996	283	98	381
1997	442	0	442
1998	524	475	999
1999	509	417	926
2000	397	173	570
2001	185	144	329
Total	5,810	4,583	10,393
Notes:			
1. Single-family includes attached, detached and duplex units.			
2. Multi-family includes 3-unit, 4-unit, 5 or more units plus group quarters, such as Pacifico Coop that has 28 beds counted at 3 beds to the unit, for a total of 9 units.			
Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department			

Table 16 below contains occupancy per room data from the 2000 Census. Section 6 of this Housing Element contains discussion of overcrowding. This table is to show occupancy characteristics of the city in 2000. It also contains overcrowding percentages for owners and renters in 2000.

TABLE 16 OCCUPANCY PER ROOM - 2000 OVERCROWDING				
Number of persons per room	Number of Units		Total	Percent
	Owner	Rental		
1.00 person or less	10,022	11,655	21,677	94.5%
1.01 to 1.50 occupants per room	99	538	637	2.8%
1.51 or more occupants per room	78	535	613	2.7%
Total:	10,199	12,728	22,927	100.0%
Total Overcrowded:	177	1,073	1,250	
Percent Overcrowded:	1.7%	8.4%	5.5%	

Source: Census 2000 SF3; Compiled by SACOG

Table 17 below summarizes the 2000 Census data for housing occupancy for Davis. It shows that in 2000, there were a total of 23,611 housing units, and that 22,927 of the housing units were occupied. It also shows that 9,184 housing units are owner-occupied, while 12,717 housing units were rental units.

TABLE 17 - DAVIS HOUSING OCCUPANCY IN 2000		
Owners	Number	Percent (%)
Total Owners:	9,184	100%
Housing units with a mortgage:	7,637	NA
Less than 10 percent to 29 percent	5,545	60%
30 to 34 percent	681	7%
35 to 39 percent	370	4%
40 to 49 percent	364	4%
50 percent or more	625	7%
Not computed	52	1%
Housing units without a mortgage:	1,547	NA
Less than 10 percent to 29 percent	1,453	16%
30 to 34 percent	20	0%
35 to 39 percent	32	0%
40 to 49 percent	17	0%
50 percent or more	9	0%
Not computed	16	0%
Renters		
Total Rental units:	12,717	100.00%
Less than 10 percent to 29 percent	4534	36%
30 to 34 percent	720	6%
35 to 39 percent	721	6%
40 to 49 percent	1,179	9%
50 percent or more	4,851	38%
Not computed	712	6%

Source: Census 2000 SF3; Compiled by SACOG

4.3 HOUSING STOCK CONDITION AND NEED FOR REHABILITATION

The housing stock in Davis is relatively new. Consequently, the Davis housing stock is generally in good shape. The city's ongoing Resale/Retrofit program, which requires that housing units be inspected upon resale and brought up to building code standards, has also worked to keep the existing housing stock in good condition. The Resale/Retrofit program requires all single-family houses, duplexes and apartment complexes to be inspected by the city prior to resale, and improved to building code, zoning ordinance, and special retrofit energy conservation standards. An average of 545 units was inspected from 1985 through 2002. It should be noted that in the last five years, an average of 765 units qualified and were logged for resale inspections. An average of 627 units was deemed to be qualified for resale inspection during the same period. The remaining logged units were exempted as they had been inspected within the last five years.

The number of annual inspections for energy retrofit has decreased since the mid-1980s. This is because all homes built since 1975, and all homes retrofitted since 1983, were required by the Uniform Building Code to meet state mandated energy conservation standards and are not required to be retrofitted. The resale program has served as a conduit to addressing any unit not brought to code since the 1980s. Most homeowners in Davis voluntarily seek ways to improve their energy consumption. It is not believed that there are many homes left that do not comply with the minimum energy standards of the state.

Also, it is believed that the higher cost of housing in the Davis area encourages homeowners to maintain their units in good condition. In addition, the city's code enforcement program is believed to contribute to the maintenance of homes in good condition. While the city's code enforcement program is on a complaint basis, residents are quick to report potential code violations that appear to affect their property values.

The city has no figures on how many units were found in need of rehabilitation and were consequently rehabilitated. The Chief Building Official has stated that the city is unaware of any housing units that are so badly deteriorated as to require replacement.

Table 18 below shows the ages of the housing built in Davis. It shows that 41% of the total housing units were built in the last 20 years, and 72 percent of the total units in the last 30 years. It should be noted that the cut off date for the 2000 Census data was March 2000. The current estimate for the total housing units in the city by DOF as of January 1, 2002, was 24,717. This is an additional 1,106 new units since the Census 2000 data was gathered and released. Effectively this increases the percentage of new units in the city.

It is appropriate to conclude that varying circumstances and factors have contributed to the good condition of the Davis housing stock. It is not anticipated that there will be any changes to the factors and circumstances during this Housing Element planning period.

TABLE 18		
DAVIS HOUSING STOCK, AGE OF HOUSING UNITS IN 2000		
	Number of Units	Percent of Units
Total Units:	23,611	100%
Age of Unit		
1	1,205	5%
2 to 5	2,027	9%
6 to 10	2,611	11%
11 to 20	3,698	16%
21-30	7,271	31%
31-40	4,021	17%
41-50	1,639	7%
51-60	551	2%
61 or older	588	2%
Year Structure was Built		
1999 to March 2000	1,205	5.1%
1995 to 1998	2,027	8.6%
1990 to 1994	2,611	11.1%
1980 to 1989	3,698	15.7%
1970 to 1979	7,271	30.8%
1960 to 1969	4,021	17.0%
1940 to 1959	2,190	9.3%
1939 or earlier	588	2.5%
<u>Source:</u> Census 2000 SF1 & SF3; compiled by SACOG		

4.4 HOUSING RESOURCES

Housing Units to be Provided

The city has adequate sites to meet and exceed its fair share allocation as determined by SACOG. Section 6.2 of this Housing Element contains a full discussion on city's ability to meet and exceed its fair share allocation. The tables also show that when very-low and low-income household units are combined, the city has the ability to provide more units than allocated by SACOG. The very-low income and low-income households are the most impacted statewide. Provision of housing to these two groups is often difficult for local agencies due to many factors, which include land costs, construction costs, market conditions, and neighborhood opposition.

Table 19 below contains the city's fair share allocation by income levels and percentages. It also contains built units from the Interim Planning period, January 1, 2000 to February 14, 2002 and the remaining units to be built during the Planning Period, 2002 through 2007. The table shows that the city has built approximately 68.91 percent of the housing units allocated for the planning period. The city has capacity to provide 14.62 percent of the units to very-low income households as compared to the allocated 4 percent. Additionally, the table shows that the city

has capacity to provide 28.59 percent of its housing units to the combined very-low and low-income households during the planning period as compared to 23.6 percent of its fair share allocation.

	Fair Share # & %		Built & %		Available Vacant Zoned Land & %	
	2002-2007	Percent	1/1/2000-2/14/2002	Percent of Fair Share	2/15/2002 - 6/30/2007	Percent of Fair Share
Very-low Income	79	4.03%	212	10.81%	75	3.82%
Low-income	384	19.57%	64	3.26%	210	10.70%
Moderate-income	621	31.65%	423	21.56%	3.6	15.60%
Above-Moderate	878	44.75%	653	33.28%	382	19.47%
Total	1,962	100.00%	1,352	68.91%	973	49.59%
Total Ability					2,325	118.50%
<u>Notes:</u>						
1. Data on built units was based on the Interim Planning Period of January 1, 2000 and ended on February 14, 2002.						
2. Some of the units identified as being under construction are either completed or are about to be completed at the time this document is being reviewed for certification.						
<u>Source:</u> City of Davis Planning and Building Department						

The city's supply of land designated for residential development is sufficient to meet the five-year need for housing. There is no guarantee that the units will all be built during the planning period. Market factors, the state of the economy, and financing availability all affect whether or not the units will be built. Also, development of housing for very-low and low-income households requires significant financial subsidies, which often need assistance from external sources. Nonetheless, it is believed that more than the housing units allocated to the city by SACOG will be built during this planning period, including housing for impacted income-levels. Noteworthy is that the majority of the units required to meet city's fair share allocation is either constructed, or under construction, or in building permit plan check.

Resources Available for Providing Housing

Similar to other cities in California, most housing is created by development corporations and individuals on privately owned land. The city facilitates this development by providing General Plan and zoning designations allowing urban development, as well as processing subdivision maps and other necessary land-use approvals. Analysis of constraints to development of housing is found in Sections 8.1 (Governmental Constraints) and 8.2 (Nongovernmental constraints) of

this document. Thus far, most of the city's affordable housing efforts have been focused on creation of affordable units through new construction. The city's existing housing stock, which is typically less expensive to sell or rent than new construction, is another source of relatively affordable housing.

The City Council has embarked on an analysis of Internal Housing Needs through the year 2015. While this is beyond the current planning period, the city is in the process of planning for future housing development. Resolution No. 03-48 was passed by the City Council on April 2, 2003, which directs staff to implement an annual city growth parameter, prepare amendments to the General Plan and Phased Allocation Ordinance, and prepare a joint housing strategy with UC Davis. The potential benefits of this process is the potential for opportunity to provide more housing units that would further increase the number of units built beyond the allocated number for this planning period.

Resources Available for Affordable Housing

The city has access to a number of resources for creation, enhancement, or preservation of affordable housing. Financial resources for the development of affordable housing, such as Community Development Block Grants, the Redevelopment Agency Low and Moderate Income Housing Trust Fund, and the Housing Trust Fund, are discussed in Section 6.4, Conversion of Assisted Housing Developments.

The city's prime non-financial resource for creation of affordable housing is its Affordable Housing Ordinance. Enacted in 1990 to implement Policies 9.1D and 9.1E of the 1987 General Plan Housing Element, this ordinance requires an affordable housing contribution in new residential developments. The updated 2001 General Plan Policy HOUSING 4.1 Standards "a" and "b" contain current affordable housing requirements. Standard requirements are established for both ownership (for-sale) and rental developments.

This Affordable Housing Ordinance based on the 1987 General Plan is under review for update. The Affordable Housing Ordinance is under review due to this Housing Element update, the 2001 General Plan and some real and perceived difficulties associated with the program. Some features of the existing ordinance include encouraging developers to propose Project Individualized Affordable Housing Plans. This plan may provide a more innovative approach to affordable housing, or allow the affordable housing to be tailored to the needs of an individual development, or changes in needs perceived by the city.

For most developments, the General Plan policy to be updated in the ordinance requires affordable units totaling 25% of developments to be affordable ownership (for-sale) units, 25% of developments containing between 5 and 19 units to be affordable rental units, and 35% of developments containing 20 or more to be affordable rental units. Given the 25% density bonus that is allowed actual anticipated affordable units could comprise 20% of for-sale developments and 28% of rental developments. The characteristics of the Affordable Housing Ordinance include the following summarized topics:

Payment of in-lieu fees

The current ordinance allows property developers to pay in lieu fees when the development is smaller than ten acres, and other hardship findings are made. Although payment of fees (currently \$23,737 per affordable unit) provides funds to be used for developing affordable housing elsewhere, it does not provide affordable units as a percentage of the particular development. In addition, the current fee is generally not sufficient to create an affordable unit without another source of subsidy.

Density bonuses

Consistent with the General Plan and State law, developers who provide affordable units are entitled to a 1:1 density bonus (or 25% density bonus) units required under the Affordable Housing Ordinance. The density bonus units do not have affordability requirements. The density bonus credit may be earned for land dedication and applied to other housing developments.

Difficulty of building on dedicated land

All dedicated land is expected to be developed at multi-family densities. Land dedicated through the current Affordable Housing Ordinance is credited at 15 units/acre (for for-sale developments) and 20 units/acre (for rental developments). However, the ordinance may be amended to reflect 2001 General Plan densities, 14 to 25 units per gross acre. Recent infill project densities were based on the 2001 General Plan high density standard. The recent approved infill projects using the 2001 General Plan density were Cantrill and Youmans. No development proposals have been presented for the affordable housing sites contained within these developments.

Despite occasional difficulties in program implementation, the city's Affordable Housing Ordinance remains its strongest tool in the creation of housing affordable for low, very-low and moderate-income households. However, as stated earlier in this document, the city's Affordable Housing Ordinance is under review for revision due to this Update, the 2001 General Plan and some identified difficulties associated with the program.

Funding or lack thereof is one of the difficulties for development of affordable units on dedicated or donated land. Due to limited city, state and federal funding sources, it takes a considerable time to develop dedicated affordable land with affordable units. As part of the Project Individualized Plan of certain projects, developers make donations of affordable housing land to entities that would provided identified needed affordable housing to certain impacted groups, such as seniors. The donated land, similar to dedicated affordable housing land, is then developed with affordable units based on availability of funds.

Table 20 below contains approved vacant dedicated or donated sites, and their status. It also contains their sizes and the number of units approved for the sites, except for the Mace Ranch site.

**TABLE 20
VACANT/UNDER CONSTRUCTION APPROVED LAND DEDICATION OR
DONATION SITES FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

Subdivision/Project Name	Site Size	Units	Status
Wildhorse Subdivision Land Dedication - 2444 Moore Blvd	3.9 acres	59	Final P-D and Design Review have been approved
El Macero Estates 2 Land Dedication / Tremont Green-5663 Marden	2.48 acres	36	Entitlements approved; Building permit plans in plan check
Woodbridge land dedication - 4100 La Paz Drive	1.1 acres	16	No developer selected or funding identified
Mace Ranch Subdivision 1. Single family dedicated site - 2990 5 th Street 2. Walnut Terrace - 3101 5 th Street	1. 1.67 acres 2. 2.3 acres	1. TBD 2. 30 units	1 Zoned single-family 2 Under construction; less than 25% constructed as 2/14/03
Midtown Senior Affordable - Cantrill Drive @ Fifth & Second Streets - land donation	2.31 acres	53 units	Developer is Davis Senior Housing Cooperative. No data on construction start.
Olive Drive Affordable Youmans - 1102 Olive Drive - land donation	2.15 acres	43 units	Developer is Neighborhood Partners. No data on construction start date.
Pacifico Phase 2 (28 beds @ 3 beds to a unit, 9 units) - student coop - land dedication	0.39 acres	9 units, or 28 beds	Developer is DCC. Plans for the building are under going building permit plan checking.
Oakshade Commons land dedication @ Southwest corner of Drumond Avenue and Cowell Boulevard	0.512 acres	15 units	No developer selected or funding identified.
Totals	14.502 acres	261+ units	Mace Ranch site is undetermined at this time. A change of zoning to allow multi-family units would be required.

Source: City of Davis Planning and Building Department

Note:

All donated or dedicated sites are part of a development project that have been built or under construction, or in Building plan check.